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YOKOYAMA TAIKAN: THE LANTERN FESTIVAL, 1909

Three maidens of Benares gaze intently out at the lanterns they have set adrift on the River Ganges. Upon the fate of these little lantern-boats will depend their future happiness—so they believe.

This painting recalls in a striking manner Taikan’s trip to India in 1903; at the same time, in its universality it well illustrates Okakura Kakuzō’s famous dictum, “Asia is one.”

(Kakemono, colors on silk, 143×51 cm.)
SHIMOMURA KANZAN: PORTRAIT OF OKAKURA KAKUZÔ

The present illustration formed the draft for Kanzan’s famous portrait of his mentor Okakura, which was shown at the twenty-fifth anniversary exhibition of the Japan Art Academy in 1922, some nine years after Okakura’s death. The finished painting was lost in the great Tokyo earthquake of the following year, whereupon Kanzan retouched the sketch in its present state. (Note that the scroll on Okakura’s desk is an actual manuscript from his hand—the plan for a pictorial scroll which he had suggested to Kanzan—pasted on the surface of Kanzan’s sketch.)

This sketch was subsequently given by Kanzan to his friend the American art scholar Langdon Warner, who, however, after the death of Kanzan in 1932 presented it to the Tokyo Art School in the name of the Harvard-Yenching Institute.

Okakura is depicted wearing Confucian robes and the cap given him by the Indian poet Rabindranath Tagore.

(Kakemono, light colors on paper, 170 x 70 cm.)
PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

ALTHOUGH my own interests lie more in the pre-Meiji schools of Japanese painting and graphic arts, when I heard, several months ago, that the English version of the Meiji art volume was to be abandoned—partly through lack of a suitable translator-adaptor, partly through deficiencies in the Japanese original—I offered my services, feeling that the omission of Meiji art from the Centenary Series would be a major loss, however incomplete the volume itself might be.

The principal omission in the Japanese original is the all-important section on painting. This section, due to the illness of the proposed contributor, was never written—though the plates stand as originally selected. In its place, at the last moment, the editor Professor Uyeno combined an incidental discussion of painting with his general introduction. I had hoped, at first, to expand this section, but the few months allowed for the completion of the adaptation would not permit it. Nevertheless, I have, whenever feasible, slightly expanded the text, and added notes and comments for the Western reader.

The addition of the frontispieces was also my idea. The first commemorates the death of Yokoyama Taikan, just as this manuscript was being completed. As for the second, if there is any hero in Meiji art it is certainly Okakura Kakuzô—or as he is more usually known in Japanese, Tenshin, "the natural heart."

Most of the dates for the artists are also innovations of the English edition, as are the textual references to the plates.

The total bulk of the volume has, on the other hand, been considerably reduced. The most consistent omissions are the numerous repetitious passages and the long lists of works shown at various exhibitions; the latter I have often reduced to a few
lines recording the major artists represented, noting individual works only when reproduced in this volume. Further, the extended documents concerning the founding of schools and societies and lengthy quotations from secondary sources have often been abridged.

I am aware, of course, that minute details and lengthy listings of works, however dull for the average reader, might be to the advantage of a few students. The present volume, however, though encyclopedic in scope, was never meant to provide a primary source for research; my own aim has been simply to transmit the major facts and ideas of the original, omitting incidental matter of little significance to the general Western reader, but adding details and explanations where I thought that they were of value. In this matter I have followed the directions of the Committee in charge of the project, for a "reduced but substantial adaptation for a Western audience."

Had time allowed, I should particularly have liked to add a section on Meiji prints. Though the modern Japanese prints in fashion at the moment date from the past four decades, some mention should have been made of the work of such late Ukiyo-e masters as Hiroshige III, Yoshitoshi, Kyōsai, Kiyochika and others.

Regarding format, Japanese names are given in native style, with the surname first. Further, painters of traditional schools are referred to by their pen-names, but Western-style artists by their surnames. (Thus Hōgai or Taikan for Kanō Hōgai and Yokoyama Taikan, but Kuroda or Koyama for Kuroda Seiki and Koyama Shōtarō. ) Foreign names have been reconstructed, so far as possible, from the kana originals (thus Hontanēji for the Italian Fontanesi), but Meiji phonetic renderings are sometimes erratic and with minor figures a few slips are probably inevitable.

The fact that Japanese given-names are often susceptible to two or more equally correct readings has necessitated a good deal of research on how the artist himself read his name. (In
the process, I discovered that the editor of this volume prefers the form "Uyeno Naoteru," though he is universally known as "Ueno Naoaki," and all of the earlier volumes in this series so list him.)

Although I have, of course, had to rely generally upon the original text in factual matters, an interpretive adaptation—more than a literal translation—must inevitably reach out for the context beyond the literal text. I can only hope that this has been accomplished without undue violence to the intentions of the original authors.

Richard Lane

Far East Program
University of Maryland
Tokyo, Early Spring, 1958
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PART ONE

THE CULTURAL BACKGROUND
OF MEIJI ART
WITH AN OUTLINE OF PAINTING

Uyeno Naoteru
PART ONE: THE CULTURAL BACKGROUND OF MEIJI ART, WITH AN OUTLINE OF PAINTING

I. INTRODUCTION

With the opening of Japan in the Meiji Era (1868-1912), art, like all other culture forms, turned to new paths. Amidst the widespread influx of culture from abroad, it was unlikely that art alone should have resisted this influence. Indeed, even before the opening of Japan there had been a few pioneer artists who had, through their contacts with the Dutch, commenced the study and practice of Western art. Notable among these pioneers were Hiraga Gennai [1723-1779], Shiba Kōkan [1747-1818] and Aōdō Denzen [1747-1822]. But each of these men represented only a chance encounter with foreign culture; there was yet no general movement or trend; nor was there any social prestige attached to such studies nor any attempt to attain such. Nevertheless, these pioneers represent one of the streams that was to flow into Meiji life, mingle with and enrich the culture soon to form from the conflicting elements of conservatism and progressivism.

How these elements revealed themselves in actual works of art will be made clear in later sections of this volume. Here I should like to discuss the cultural background that formed them and made them possible.

The opening of Japan was, in effect, a revolution; this, and its accompanying social changes played, of course, a vital role in influencing the direction of artistic effort. These developments are covered in other volumes of this series, however, and I should like here to concentrate upon the two background elements which had the greatest direct influence upon art: edu-
cation, and government administration.

If we set aside, for the moment, the highly individual efforts and background of the artist, among the factors most directly influencing art must be counted the attitude of the public toward art, and facilities for exhibition and education in art appreciation. These factors all changed and developed greatly during the Meiji Period. For convenience I should like to treat these developments in periods of about a decade each; yet this division is not, it will be seen, an entirely arbitrary one, and each of these decades will be found to represent some new trend.

Thus the first period, from the opening of Japan to about the tenth year of Meiji (1877), represents the widespread influx of Western culture due to demands both internal and external. At the same time, plans were being made for the gradual advance of our culture: Japan contributed to expositions abroad, and planned exhibitions at home. In 1877 the First Industrial Fair was held in Tokyo, and from this stimulus art, which had been but treated as one of the "industrial exhibits," took on a new importance, leading to plans for a museum and art school. In the following year the Technological Art School was founded, with its main aim the introduction of Western art methods. Its influence was considerable, but finally, with the growing movement for a return to things Japanese, and various financial and other difficulties within the school itself, it ceased its courses in 1882, and went out of existence in the following year.

It was at this time that the movement for a return to Japan's own past was gaining momentum, under the leadership of the American Fenollosa. In 1887 a new Government Art School was founded, and the museum offices of the ministries of Agriculture and Industry were combined under the Imperial Household Office to form the Imperial Museum. Here ancient art and historical objects could be preserved and exhibited for their own sakes, rather than as a branch of industry. At the same time, the important work of surveying the nation's art treasures was begun.
Although the new Art School had been instituted with quite different motives from the old one, and was possessed of a quite different make-up, it too could but follow the trend of the times, and thus in 1896 had to add courses in Western painting; about this time, art horizons in general came to be widened. The next decade was one of disturbance in the Art School as in artistic circles generally. The Art Academy appeared, and under Okakura Kakuzō's leadership a group was formed to take the lead in Japanese-style painting; but in both Tokyo and Kyoto small art groups began to appear, each working and exhibiting after its own lights.

Here the government stepped in, in an effort to unify the art groups and artists throughout the country. Thus the First Ministry of Education Exhibition took place in 1907 at Ueno Park. But this effort, too, soon fragmented, the original group in part remaining, but more often splitting into factions of varying sizes. Here we enter the Taishō Era (1912-1926) and the terminus of our account. What happened to Japanese art after that, the creature of so many new factors, is another story.
II. FROM THE OPENING OF JAPAN TO 1877

With the commencement of the Meiji Era in 1868, by what amounted, in effect, to a revolution, the ruling class was overthrown; yet for a time, there was no fixed, new authority; native culture forms became confused, and the attractions of foreign culture became irresistible. At the same time, many of the forms of Tokugawa culture persisted, while others disappeared through lack of demand. For example, with the edict abolishing the carrying of swords, the artisans who had provided the sword furniture which so delights Western collectors today, found their profession in effect abolished. Many of the other arts and crafts were similarly affected. In seeking to catch up with the advances of the Western world, Japan put her energies into strengthening her economy and her military might; there was no time for the appreciation of art, the enjoyment of life. Only a few of the artists felt strongly enough the power of their tradition, and confidence in the intrinsic value of their art, to carry on alone. Some years later, Imaizumi Yūsaku wrote as follows of the sorry state of the Japanese art world at this period.

“During the early Meiji Period, art was hardly recognized by society. The word ‘Art’ was of course not yet in use at this time, but there was hardly a man alive who took notice of painting and calligraphy. And what notice there was, was entirely of the Nanga school of Chinese-style painting, as practiced by the Kyoto scholars of things Chinese.... As I recall, a painting of the master Tanyū [1602-1674] went for about thirteen cents; the most expensive painting I saw was a set of four hanging-scrolls by Watanabe Kazan [1793-1841] which cost seven yen.... Dealers were happy when they sold a painting for ten cents, hardly more than the price of scrap paper. Tani Bunchō [1764-1840] and his pupil Satake Eikai [1802-1874] were respected, but living masters such as Kanō Hōgai
[1828-1888] and Hashimoto Gahō [1835-1908], for example, had truly a difficult time. Gahō received a salary of about ten yen a month from the Naval Office for drawing maps; and Hōgai had some patronage from the Satsuma clan; but it was really a matter of some surprise that either of these master painters was able even to keep alive."

Painting in the Japanese style was, thus, hardly recognized, while painting in the Chinese, Nanga style was seldom more than a hobby for Sinologists. It was, rather, to be the methods of Western art that first attracted official Japanese attention.

The study of Western painting and print methods had been carried out during the Tokugawa Period by such men as Gennai, Kōkan and Denzen. This tradition was continued in the Meiji Period by Kawakami Tōgai [1827-1881], a painter with wide experience likewise in the Nanga and Kanō traditions. The Tokugawa government had already established a bureau for inspection of foreign documents, and in 1857 Kawakami was appointed Inspector of Painting, his job being the study of Western painting methods. This bureau changed its name several times both before and after the Restoration, finally becoming the Kaisei School, which was later incorporated into Tokyo University. In 1861 a Painting Office was set up within the Kaisei Bureau, with Kawakami and Maeda Matashirō in charge. Among the students of this "school" were Takahashi Yuichi, Kondō Seijun and Miyamoto Sampei. Kawakami later became the director of the Office, in 1871 published his adaptation, A Guide to Western-style Painting and established a painting study institute at Shitaya in Tokyo.

Kawakami's oil paintings are hardly extant, but many of those of his pupil Takahashi Yuichi [1829-1894] remain. (See Plate 38.) Takahashi's writings include notes on his early astonishment at the realism achieved in Western oil painting (which he saw first in an inferior Japanese copy, used as a signboard by an optician), and his experiments at emulating the methods and the materials of Western art. It must not be forgotten that few
of these pioneers in Western style painting had yet seen a genuine European oil painting. Kawakami had adapted a Western book on the subject into Japanese, but could hardly translate the theory into practice. A few lithographs and color reproductions were the only models these painters had until a group of oil paintings were brought back by some Japanese students from Holland. Even then, no Western painting materials were available, and the pioneer artists had to try, as best they could, to adapt the Japanese brush, ink and paper to an alien tradition.

In the meantime, other students of Western painting began to make their appearance, and attract pupils of their own. This thriving intellectual interest in Western painting, combined with the highly utilitarian concerns of the Meiji government, resulted, in 1876, in the founding of the Technological Art School (Kōbu Bijutsu Gakkō), for practical training in Western techniques.

Takahashi Yuichi had, in the meanwhile, continued his individual experiments and teaching, and in the mid-1870's began to attract some attention with his school exhibits, and with the art magazine which he began to issue in 1880—the first of its kind to appear in Japan. By this time, nationalistic elements had already appeared to condemn the wholesale adoption of Western artistic methods. Yet, it is interesting to note, this sentiment had not yet advanced to the point of advocating a return to the native Japanese styles, and we have hardly any record of the activities of such traditional painters as were able to survive.

It is clear, however, that those painters who managed to retain some vestige of popularity were largely in the Nanga, Chinese style. The only detailed notice we have on this subject appears in the Tōkyō saikenki of 1885, which lists Tokyo painters “in the Japanese style”; but these are predominantly of the Nanga school. Among these painters will be found Taki Katei [1830-1901] and Watanabe Shōka [Kazan’s son; 1835-1887]. A notable exception is the name of Shibata Zeshin [1807-1891] of the Maruyama-Shijō School. Whatever the popularity of the Nanga school painters, however, official recognition was
nil, and when the new Tokyo Art School was founded in 1887 Nanga was not among the subjects included in the traditional Japanese curriculum.

It will be seen that the main trend of the early Meiji period was emulation of the West. In order to further their knowledge of the West, the Japanese brought in foreign advisors and teachers. It was to be these foreigners who, while teaching the techniques and spirit of their own culture, were to take a passionate interest in Japanese traditional art, and redirect Japanese interests to their own tradition. With the arrival of Fenollosa in 1878 this tendency began to gain momentum; the earliest record we have regarding foreign interest in and re-evaluation of Japanese art, however, is dated 1875 and bears the name of Dr. Wagner.

This document is the Report of the Vienna Exposition, and in it Wagner treats at length of the necessity of Japan providing facilities for the preservation, study, and further practice of her native art. Wagner appears to have been employed, at the time of the Austrian Exposition, by the Japanese emissary to that affair, Viscount Sano Tsunetami. Sano, in the same year, sent a report to the Japanese government also urging the establishment of an art museum.

(In this connection it is interesting to note that the concepts of "art" and "the fine arts" had not existed before in the Japanese language. Through contact with Western culture, the need came to be felt for such general terms and so, in the early 1870's, the terms bijutsu and geijutsu were invented. This fact is of more than simple linguistic interest, for it indicates that to a Japanese of the pre-Meiji period, the work of a painter, a maker of Buddhist images, and an architect were not considered really related; each object served a quite different function, and the fact that they were part of a great realm called "art" would have been incomprehensible. On the other hand, painting and calligraphy were considered aspects of the same thing, and the term shoga encompassed them both. R.L.)
III. FROM THE INSTITUTION OF
THE TECHNOLOGICAL ART SCHOOL
TO THE TOKYO ART SCHOOL (1876-1887)

The Technological Art School (Kōbu Bijutsu Gakkō) was
instituted in November of 1876, as a part of the Technological
College, with a division of painting and of sculpture. The
painting courses consisted of principles of drawing, and oil
painting; the sculpture course employed principally the medium
of modeling clay and plaster of Paris. Three Italians were
employed as teachers.

It is to be noted that the students of sculpture were awarded
government scholarships. The proclamation setting up the
school makes it clear that, whereas the sculptor in Japan had
hitherto been considered a simple artisan, the profession was,
in fact, highly esteemed in Europe, and should in the future be
likewise valued in Japan. The school, it may be added, ad-
mitted women as well as men students—a remarkable innovation
at this period.

Many factors led to the institution of this school, but promi-
nent among them was the interest of the Minister Itō Hirobumi,
who, it is said, was influenced by the advice of the Italian
Ambassador. That same year the Ministry of Education had
published, in its Education Magazine, a translation of an ex-
tremely detailed plan for setting up a college of fine arts in
Tokyo. The plan, which had been submitted by a Russian
newspaper correspondent, and was addressed to Minister of
Education Tanaka, emphasized the study of art and music, but
included most of the background courses of a liberal arts college.
It was, indeed, to be some years before such an ideal college
actually made its appearance, but plans like these prepared the
way for such future developments.

As actually instituted, the Technological Art School followed
the Italian rather than the Russian proposals, and its emphasis
was on the plastic arts and sketching of a practical nature.

According to plan, the three teachers arrived from Italy: Fontanesi for painting, Ragussa for sculpture, and Cappelletti for preparatory courses such as geometry, perspective and decoration.

This was the first time that Japanese students had the chance to study under foreign art teachers, using the real methods and materials of Western art, and the response was immediate. Each of the several ateliers which had been privately giving training in what rudiments of Western art were known—Kawakami, Takahashi, Kunisawa—sent pupils. Enthusiasm was great; here for the first time photographs and prints of great European paintings were readily available, together with reproductions of the masterpieces of Greek sculpture. Materials for painting had been brought direct from Italy, and were given to the students at government expense. The first class consisted of fifty-four male students and six girls.

For the first time in Japan sketching from the nude was attempted, though, as Matsuoka Hisashi, one of the early pupils, comments, "This proved very difficult, for at the time even to have one's photograph taken was considered a horrifying experience. A nude female model proving unavailable, we employed a coolie who worked for the Ministry of Technology, who, however, continually complained that standing up there on the platform was the hardest labor he had ever performed. We did finally obtain a female model, a girl who lived near the school, and whom we persuaded by telling her that it was because she was so beautiful that we wanted to paint her picture. When we went on outdoor sketching trips, with our parasols and tripods, people usually asked us if we were conducting a land survey."

Here at last the earnest but ill-equipped students of Western art had a place to gather and study, and under official auspices. So great was the new prestige of Western art that many of the Nanga teachers admitted the future to lie solely in that
direction. Even such masters of the traditional styles as Hashimoto Gahō, Araki Kampo and Kawabata Gyokushō began to study Western methods of painting.

The professed aims of the new school were to master Western art methods, and apply them to practical purposes; also, to make up for the deficiencies in Japanese art in the field of realistic depiction. The ready admission of women students is a startling development in this still near-feudal period, but it was clearly done simply in imitation of European methods, and was not really a conscious step toward sex equality.

Regarding the foreign teachers, Antonio Fontanesi [1818-1882] was in charge; since 1869 he had been professor of landscape painting in the Royal Art School of Turino, and was fifty-eight at the time of his arrival in Japan. He seems to have taught all aspects of painting, from the use of pigments, to copying and sketching from all conceivable models. He emphasized that the purpose of painting was to reproduce nature, and stressed such background studies as geometry, perspective and anatomy. The didactic nature of his lectures on theory was perhaps necessitated by the only superficial knowledge that his pupils possessed of European art.

Thus, along these two lines of theory and practice, Fontanesi directed his pupils to notable early achievements in painting. But the times were not entirely favorable: the Satsuma Rebellion of 1877 had strained the government’s finances, and the planned new buildings for the school did not materialize; Fontanesi himself became ill, and returned to Italy toward the end of 1878.

In charge of sculpture at the school was Vincenzo Ragusa [1841-1928]. His employment represented the first development of Western sculpture in Japan. At the time the work of Buddhist sculptors and of doll makers was the only Japanese equivalent, and these were considered but lowly trades, with no social standing. Thus it was that the promoters of the new art school, determined to emulate Europe as best they could,
tried to recreate the art of Western sculpture in Japan, and went to the extent of offering government scholarships to students who would attempt this new field.

Ragusia was only thirty-five when he arrived in Japan. Though young, he had already proven his ability in his native land. Indeed, it would seem that the Italian government took great care in sending able men, the better to represent the peak of her own culture. Rugusa worked with his pupils from morning till night, taking out time for his own sculpture when he could. His students worked first at copying Greek models in modeling clay. Plaster of Paris had to be imported at first, but soon a deposit of suitable material was discovered at Sendai, and Ragusa oversaw his pupils in preparing it for artistic use.

As we shall see shortly, the Technological Art School continued in operation only until the year 1882, but in these five short years Western art had its first real chance to deeply and directly influence the ideas and methods of Japanese painters and sculptors.

It is of interest to see just what the situation was with Japanese sculptors of the old school. Takamura Kōun, later to be known as the "grand old man" of Japanese sculpture (see plates 60, 62), writes that the decade of the 1870's was the most difficult period traditional Japanese artists have known. For the traditional sculptor the principal difficulty lay in the fact that Buddhism and Shintoism, which had hitherto coexisted, were now being strictly divorced; Buddhist temples were destroying their Shinto sculpture, and Shinto shrines were discarding their Buddhist statuary. The final effect of this reform was for the religious sculptors to lose their work entirely, and be reduced to carving toys and souvenirs. After about ten years, however, from 1881-82, with the increasing encouragement of Japanese crafts, exhibitions, and Imperial patronage, Japanese traditional sculptors once again were able to return to their true work.

Takamura was a young man at the time, just established as an independent Buddhist sculptor. Hearing stories of the
wonderful clay that never hardened, of the plaster of Paris that reproduced any shape, he was overcome by a longing to know the methods of this new school that he could never, as an established, traditional artisan, attend. He concluded that the traditional method of wood carving was indeed inefficient, in that the slightest mistake might ruin the whole statue. It was his deep training in, yet dissatisfaction with, the older forms that led him eventually to establish a school of sculpture that, combining Japanese and Western methods, was to fill a need that neither of the forms alone could.

Although the fascination with the newly discovered Western art was most strikingly apparent in Tokyo, in the old capital Kyoto signs of the new age had also begun to appear. The establishment of an art school in Kyoto had been urged as early as the year 1878, when such masters of traditional painting as Chokunyū, Bairei and Beisen formulated a proposal to the Prefect of Kyoto District. Although the authors of the proposal were entirely of the traditional schools, it is noteworthy that they included the teaching of Western art in their plans.

The Prefect, Makimura Masanao, was sympathetic with the proposal, and in the following year held a meeting of industrial leaders to discuss the feasibility of the plan, which was put into effect in 1880. Chokunyū was placed in charge of the school, which had the four divisions of Yamato-e (directed by Gyokusen), Western Painting (Koyama Sanzō), Nanga (Aizan), and the Kanō Style (Hyakumen and Bairei). The classes met in a building of the old Imperial palace. Koyama left the school after a year and a half, and was replaced by Tamura Sōritsu.

Whereas the teachers of the traditional schools had few pupils, the Western painting class always exceeded the limit of twenty, and comprised a lively, and often rowdy group. Although the teachers all received the same small salary of 20 yen per month, the traditional painters were lucky to get half a yen for their productions, while Tamura was able to sell his oil portraits for five to seven yen apiece.
The exact motives of these students in commencing the study of Western art were doubtless complex, but prominent among them were such simple exterior impulses as seeing Western paintings in reproduction, being attracted by the sight of a painter sketching from nature, and visiting an art exhibit.

Art exhibitions must, indeed, be considered one of the principal forces in the development of interest in Western painting. The Kyoto Exhibition had commenced already in the fifth year of Meiji (1872), with Tamura exhibiting frequently, in 1875 receiving the Bronze Medal for a water color. Takahashi Yuichi also exhibited, including his famous "Salmon" of about 1877 (see Plate 38), the realism of which so impressed his contemporaries. Private exhibitions also flourished for a time in Kyoto, but with the establishment of the American Fenollosa's "Painting-Appreciation Society" for the cause of Japanese-style painting, the prestige of Western-style painting fell greatly. In 1891 the school came to be known as the Kyoto Municipal Art School, but the students of Western painting were reduced almost entirely to aspiring country schoolteachers, and the department of Western painting had eventually to be abandoned. In 1893, Tamura, Koyama, Itō and other Western-style painters organized a large exhibition in Kyoto of some one hundred paintings, but not a single one was sold, and only one order for a portrait was received during the whole exhibit.

Thus it will be seen that though the fad for Western-style painting had spread even to Kyoto, the ancient capital of Japan, it was not to prove a lasting enthusiasm there among the art public at large.

In Tokyo, Fontanesi was succeeded at the Art School by Feretti, another Italian who, however, proved a far cry from the splendid person and artist that Fontanesi had been. After a half-day of lectures by this person the students rebelled, and sent a delegation to Ōtori Keisuke, head of the school, demanding Feretti's recall. The authorities were troubled by the situation, but had no ready replacement.
In November of 1878 the leading students of the painting division—including such later great names as Koyama Shōtarō, Asai Chū and Matsuoka Hisashi—resigned from the school and formed their own private group, the Jūichi-kai. The sculpture division continued with little change until June of 1882, when it was abolished; at that time it included some twenty students, among them such names as Ōkuma, Fujita, Kikuchi, Sano and Naitō, to be discussed in detail in another section of this volume.

The Art School as a whole was officially abolished in January of the following year, the remaining ten painting students receiving certificates—as they had not completed the full term for the diploma. Thus the Art School ended its brief career after some five years of training the first fully qualified Western-style artists in Japan.

Although Wagner's proposals at the time of the Vienna Exposition had already laid a theoretical groundwork for the establishment of a museum and traditional art academy, it was to Ernest Fenollosa [1853-1908] that credit must go for the first foreign sparking of a widespread re-interest in the traditional forms of Japanese art.

Fenollosa arrived in Japan from the United States in the eleventh year of Meiji, 1878, as an employee of the Japanese Ministry of Education. His official work involved the teaching of Western philosophy and economics, but his interest in Japanese art seems to date from the first year of his arrival.

Japanese elements were already at this time beginning to advocate a return to the appreciation of traditional art. The Ryūchi Society, formed about 1879, was prominent in this work. Fenollosa seems to have had some influence on this group and, in fact, it was because of disagreements with members of the Ryūchi Society that a second group, the Painting-Appreciation Society, was to be formed several years later.

The leading Japanese element in the movement was Kawase Hideji, who relates that his idea of founding a group for the preservation and appreciation Japanese art was greatly stimu-
lated during a trip to England by a discussion with the director of the Kensington Museum. This Englishman is quoted as telling Kawase: "The reason that we collect foreign art objects is because in England we do not have important works of our own. Such a collection is vital in stimulating an appreciation of art among our people. However, in your country you have great quantities of important art objects. You should not try to collect foreign art objects, but rather collect the ancient art of your own country."

Prominent among the activities of the Ryūchi Society were its great annual exhibitions of Japanese art, which were co-sponsored by the Japanese government. Exhibitions were, indeed, considered by the group the optimum method of bringing about an appreciation of the neglected native art, for they reached a large audience, whereas funds spent on art schools and on the support of artists were felt to produce only limited effects. Although there had been exhibits of Japanese art before, both at home and abroad, it was the Ryūchi Society that first produced important, independent exhibitions of native art.

With time, the Ryūchi Society's function changed, and in 1884 another art group was formed under the name Painting-Appreciation Society (Kanga-kai). Fenollosa was prominent in the founding of this new group, the principal purpose of which was to exhibit works of ancient art in private collections. Secondary functions of the group included lectures on art history, and expert advice on the authenticity of paintings.

For the latter function a committee of four was set up, comprising Fenollosa and three noted painters of the traditional schools—Yamana Tsurayoshi, Kanō Yūshin and Kanō Eitoku. (Fenollosa himself adopted the nom de plume "Kanō Eitan" for this work.) A unanimous opinion was necessary for issuing an official certificate of authenticity, and during the first six months of 1884 (during which time six meetings were held) it is recorded that over 480 paintings, scrolls and screens were examined, seventy-nine of these receiving certificates.
The monthly exhibitions themselves were great achievements for the time. Each exhibit featured an artistic style, from the Kanō, Buddhist, and Sesshū schools through the Shijō and Ukiyo-e. At each meeting Fenollosa delivered a lecture—which was then interpreted into Japanese—on such subjects as connoisseurship and the training of future artists. For the purpose of encouraging and improving contemporary art, a separate group was formed which exhibited modern works, heard Fenollosa's criticism of them, and occasionally even effected sales of modern paintings.

The Society was reorganized more efficiently the following year, with Kawase Hideji as President, Fenollosa as Director, and Okakura Kakuzō and Ariga Nagao—Fenollosa's students at Tokyo University—as assistants.

Although the full details of Fenollosa's activities in Japan are difficult to determine, his influence on early Meiji connoisseurship and art appreciation was a decisive one. His lectures—often adaptations of Hegelian theory—threw new light on the nature and importance of Japanese art, and opened Japanese eyes to the necessity of reexamining and revaluing their heritage. Fenollosa, carried away by his enthusiasm, even went so far as to argue the superiority of Japanese painting over Western oil painting, and these arguments, doubtless aimed specifically at the Government-sponsored Art School, were to be instrumental, as we have seen, in its abolishment.

Fenollosa had his strong prejudices in Japanese art too, and the Nanga, or "Literary-men's" school of painting was roundly damned by him.

Among his concrete proposals, Fenollosa urged the founding of a new art school, the encouragement of Japanese painters, and the training of the public in art appreciation. These proposals were, of course, in effect an attack on the current policy which made Western-style art the entire object of such attention.

Although there doubtless lay quite different ideologies and ambitions behind their efforts, Fenollosa and the conservative-
nationalistic elements among the Japanese art leaders were united in their condemnation of Western-style art as it was being transplanted in Japan. (Interesting parallels suggest themselves here with the situation in post-war Japan, where the foreign admirer of traditional Japanese art or literature often finds himself allied with narrow, chauvinistic elements [or, occasionally, "counter-revolutionary" professional iconoclasts] quite alien to his own nature. R. L.)

The following summary will indicate some of the activities of Fenollosa and his group during these decisive years.

October, 1882: The First National Painting Exhibition was held under the auspices of the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce, with Fenollosa as advisor. The purpose of the exhibition was the encouragement of Japanese-style painting, and Western-style painting was strictly excluded.

(January, 1883: The Technological Art School was abolished.)

June, 1883: In France, the Ryūchī Society sponsored the First Paris Exhibition of modern Japanese art. "Literary-men's painting" was, so far as possible, excluded, and the aim of the exhibit was to present works "which preserve the characteristic essence of our nation, and show no trace of Western influence."

November, 1883: Okakura Kakuzō and Imaizumi Yūsaku commenced the "New Journal of Japanese Art."

February, 1884: Machida Heikichi and Fenollosa founded the Painting-Appreciation Society. From the following month (as outlined earlier) meeting-exhibitions were held, with Fenollosa giving lectures on the past and future of Japanese art.

April, 1884: The Second National Painting Exhibition was held, with Fenollosa again as advisor and Western-style painting again excluded. At this exhibition Fenollosa became acquainted with the eminent painter Kanō Hōgai, and the two joined forces for the advancement of Japanese painting. The government-sponsored exhibitions, it may be added, were gradu-
ally influencing the thought of art circles in the provinces, paving the way for a nation-wide revival of Japanese painting.

May, 1884: The Second Ryūchi Society Exhibition was held in Paris. In the summer of this year Fenollosa, Okakura and others travelled to the Kansai area, and it was at this time that the *zushi* shrine of the Yumedono Kannon in the Hōryū-ji was first opened.

August, 1884: The Oriental Painting Society was formed, and the Imperial Household Office established its Library.

November, 1884: The Ministry of Education established a Painting Education Study Group, including Okakura, Kanō Hōgai, Kanō Yūshin, Koyama Shōtarō and, in the following month, Fenollosa. Early the following year the group decided upon prescribing Japanese-style painting in the lower schools; Koyama, who had advocated Western-style painting, resigned from the group in protest.

September, 1885: The Painting-Appreciation Society held its First Grand Exhibition.

December, 1885: At the recommendation of the Painting Education Study Group, the Ministry of Education set up a Painting Office, with Okakura in charge. Plans were made for the establishment of the Tokyo Art School, and Fenollosa also presented plans for the establishment of an Art Museum.

April, 1886: The Second Grand Exhibition of the Painting-Appreciation Society was held, Kanō Hōgai receiving First Prize for his "Niō." The Oriental Painting Society held its First Exhibition this month.

June, 1886: Fenollosa delivered lectures in Kyoto, encouraging art groups in that area.

August, 1886: Fenollosa's post was changed from Tokyo University to a position directly under the Ministries of Education and the Imperial Household. Henceforth his energies could be directed entirely to the art world.

September, 1886—October, 1887: Fenollosa and Okakura
were sent to Europe and America to survey art conditions abroad.

April, 1887: The Ryūchi Society was enlarged and re-organized as the Japan Art Association and its new Japan Art Exhibition replaced the National Painting Exhibition of the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce. Thus did government interest in art encouragement and preservation gain momentum.

October, 1887: By Imperial Order—on the basis of Follenlosa's reports and recommendations from abroad—the Tokyo Art School was established. Follenlosa and Okakura, returning to Japan this month, began setting up plans for opening the School.

Further this year, the Tokyo Prefecture Crafts Exposition was held, with Western-style paintings at last permitted to be exhibited.

January, 1888: A group, including Okakura, was sent by the government to conduct an art survey of the Kansai area, to be joined by Follenlosa in April. The Japan Art Association also held its First Exhibition this month.

June, 1888: The proposal of Sano Tsunetami, Director of the Japan Art Association, for the encouragement of Japanese artists was approved and eighteen Craft Members were selected by the Imperial Household Office, among them Kanō Natsuo (see plates 73 and 74).

September, 1888: The Imperial Household Office established a Temporary National Treasure Survey Office, under the direction of Follenlosa, Okakura, and Kanō Hōgai. (The latter died, however, in November.)

February, 1889: The Tokyo Art School was opened, its purpose the preservation of traditional Japanese art, exclusive of Nanga "Literary-men's Painting." Follenlosa, Okakura, and Hashimoto Gahō were given charge of the school operation and teaching of classes.

May, 1889: At Follenlosa's suggestion the Imperial Museum was established; Okakura was named Chief of the Art Section,
and Fenollosa, Acting Director. On the other hand, Western-style artists such as Koyama Shōtarō and Asai Chū formed the Meiji Art Society, to oppose the Japanese-style art movement.

October, 1889: Okakura and Takahashi Kenzō began the art journal *Kokka*. In the same month the opposition Meiji Art Society held its First Exhibition at Ueno Park.

January, 1890: Inspired by the example of the Japan Art Association, Kōno Bairei and Kubota Beisen formed the Kyoto Art Association.

March, 1890: The Third National Industrial Fair opened, Hashimoto Gahō’s “White Clouds and Autumn Leaves” (Plate 24) receiving First Prize for painting.

October, 1890: A new Imperial Art Academy was set up to replace the Imperial Household Office Craft Members. Tasaki Sōun, Mori Kansai, Hashimoto Gahō and Kanō Eitoku were among the first to be honored.

The degree of the American Fenollosa’s influence on the Japanese art world in this period was, it will be seen, a most remarkable one. His own activities and theories were not always consistent, and there was even active opposition to his Hegelian art theories; but his importance lay in that he brought new light and new attention to play upon important art subjects long neglected in Japan—and, moreover, he moved officialdom to do something concrete about this neglect. It is further significant that through the efforts of Fenollosa and his fellows, the hitherto unknown, secluded island Japan became widely known to the Western world first through her art.

Thus both publicly and privately the art of Japan came to the attention of foreign eyes. Japanese prints, especially, came to be exported in quantities to Europe, to be widely praised there and to influence the painters of the Impressionist School. The great foreign print collections were formed, and we were later to see the phenomenon of Japanese collectors buying back the art of their own country from Europe.
The first display of actual Japanese paintings abroad was probably that at the Paris World Exposition of 1872, and the Vienna Exposition of 1873. And, as we have seen, one of the founding precepts of the Ryūchi Society was the holding of annual exhibitions of Japanese art in Paris, the art capital of Europe. Though at the beginning the unique qualities of Japanese art were hardly appreciated, by the time of the Ryūchi Society exhibitions of 1883 and following, European connoisseurs and art lovers were able to distinguish Japanese works from Chinese and other Oriental art objects, and demand originals rather than cheap imitations prepared for export.

It was at this time that Wakai Kanezaburō, one of the Ryūchi Society members, visited Europe and made contact with the chief dealer in Japanese art objects there, Bing, who was soon named Paris representative of the Society. The actual objects exhibited were largely limited to modern Japanese-style paintings, particularly of the Kanō, Tosa, Shijō and Ukiyo-e schools, with, as we have seen, a stricture against the usual "Literary-men's School" of painting.

For the purpose of gathering suitable paintings, Viscount Sano, the Society's director, invited over thirty of the leading Japanese-style painters of the time to his mansion, and urged their best efforts for the exhibition. Similar meetings were held in Kyoto, and as a result some fifty-one new paintings were accepted for exhibition in Paris. To increase the number, and provide comparison, twenty-two examples of pre-modern Japanese paintings were also selected from the collections of the members. Bing and the Mitsui Company Branch seem to have handled the financial details regarding the actual exhibition and insurance.

Upon the arrival of the paintings in Paris, however, on the advice of Gonse the exhibition was restricted to modern works, and to supplement the arrivals from Japan, one hundred modern paintings from the three thousand Japanese paintings in the Bing collection were selected. The commercial aspects of
the exhibition are not entirely clear, but the Society initially paid all costs of materials and mounting, this to be deducted from the amount the painter received in the case of a sale. The Society was also making plans for an exhibition of Japanese arts and crafts, and Bing emphasized in his letters that quality and variety were what was desired, but that mere reputation of the maker in Japan was not enough; while, on the other hand, genuine Japanese folk art was not to be eschewed.

As for the actual First Exhibition, it does not seem to have been entirely a success, and the reason for this was simply that, though European connoisseurs could appreciate the beauty of ancient Japanese art, the new paintings seemed to them but copies of the great classical masters; to a European, the fine distinctions that differentiated modern painters from their predecessors were lost, and the general effect was of copies, rather than original works typifying the new age. Thus Wakai returned to Japan with most of the paintings that had been sent.

In 1885 Fenollosa lectured that the causes for the failure of modern Japanese painting abroad lay in the neglect that art had suffered during the Restoration years, together with the evil influence of Chinese “Literary-men’s Painting,” and other deficiencies. He pointed out that the Japanese genius lay in the line of art objects featuring decoration and design, and to forget that was to presuppose failure among Western audiences.

Fenollosa’s above comments were of course aimed primarily at improving the work of Japanese artists. More influential, and more nearly his own views, were his criticisms at the meetings of the Painting-Appreciation Society. We have already noted the organization and exhibitions of this society, but it may be further noted that the First Grand Exhibition was limited to new works; it prohibited copies which showed little originality and, of course, “Literary-men’s Paintings.” Prizes were awarded both by a committee, and by popular ballot. Following the announcement of the awards, Fenollosa delivered impromptu criticisms of the prize-winning paintings on display.
More than seventy paintings were exhibited, and the prize-winning painters were Eitaku, Shōkei, Hōgai, Gahō, Yūshin, Shūsui, Shisen and Gyokuen. Fenollosa’s prefatory comments related the unsatisfactory state of Japanese painting in recent years, but pointed out that this exhibition marked the beginning of a new era. He noted certain changes that were taking place even in the technique of such painters as Shūsui and Hōgai, adding that these were not derived from Western art, but were native innovations which would eventually provide one of the characteristic elements of the new Japanese art. He praised the artists on the increasing nobility and originality of their works, and added his pleasure that only “complete paintings” were to be found in the exhibit—in which, he felt, rough sketches and casual drawings had no place.

A list of the order of the prizewinners is not without significance:

First Prize (¥15): Sensai Eitaku. (The priest Yūten)
Second Prize (¥10): Yamamoto Shōkei. (Landscape)
Third Prizes: Kanō Hōgai. (Dragon and Buddhist Saint)
              Hashimoto Gahō. (Landscape)
Fourth Prizes: Kanō Yūshin. (Figure)
              Okakura Shūsui. (Eagle)
              Hashitake Shisen. (Fish)
              Kaneko Gyokuen. (Landscape)

Receipt of the First Prize by Eitaku [1843-1890], an established painter of the Kanō school, doubtless caused no surprise. However, the second prize winner Shōkei was but a lad of seventeen at the time, and had studied painting in the Kanō school little over a year.

In his criticisms Fenollosa made clear his reasons for each of the awards, gauging the “nobility” of each work, the originality of the painter’s idea, and the degree of his success in achieving that goal. Fenollosa’s confidence in his own connoisseurship was extreme, and his detailed criticism of each work on the basis
of aim, knowledge, and technique, made clear the responsibilities of the critic.

It is of interest that Fenollosa pointed out, in his criticism, the special expectations he held for Hōgai’s future. Fenollosa’s interest in Kanō Hōgai probably dates from the Second National Painting Exhibition of 1884, at which time he bought several of Hōgai’s paintings, one of which is still preserved in the Freer Gallery.

From Fenollosa’s continued and detailed advice to Hōgai it would almost seem that the critic was trying to create his own ideal of art through this painter’s hands. The two men, indeed, mutually filled a definite need.

Hōgai [1828-1888] had been fully trained in the Kanō style, but had almost been disowned by his teacher Kanō Shōsen-in [1823-1880] for his unconventional approach to painting. (Hōgai’s very pen-name is a pun on a word meaning “outside the traditional methods.”) His interest in Western painting dates from at least several years prior to his contact with Fenollosa. But Hōgai’s remarkable development under Fenollosa’s influence can hardly be denied, and will be readily apparent from a comparison of the ambitious Kanō style works of his early and middle years, and the fully developed, original masterpieces of his later years. (For the latter, see Plates 1 and 23.)

As noted earlier, in September of 1886 Fenollosa and Okakura were despatched by the government to conduct an art survey abroad. Their purpose was a broad one: to investigate the organization of Western art schools and their curricula, art societies and related organizations, art museums and their methods of exhibition and preservation, as well as architectural details of their construction; the organization of public exhibitions; methods of improving crafts, Western architectural decoration which could make use of Japanese art, methods of art reproduction; and finally, to investigate the development of Western art and the criticism of its masterpieces.

We have already mentioned briefly Fenollosa’s work in the
Ministry of Education. The establishment of Western-style pencil sketching as part of the curriculum of the elementary schools dates from as early as 1872, with copybooks by such men as Kawakami Tōgai being officially employed. To Fenollosa, as to other advocates of Japanese style painting, this official advocacy of Western methods was naturally highly distasteful. By 1884 Fenollosa’s views were sufficiently well thought of in ministry circles to bring about a general reconsideration of art education in Japan. As early as June of this year plans were forming for the establishment of a new Art School. And, as we have seen (p. 20 above), the Ministry of Education’s Painting Education Study Group had, in the same year, determined to substitute Japanese-style brush painting for pencil sketching in the lower schools, which decision caused Koyama Shōtarō, the principal advocate of Western painting in the group, to resign his post in anger.

The report of the group stressed the fact that the two uses of drawing were in sketching life, and in decoration. Regarding the first of these uses the report stated that the native Japanese techniques were in no way inferior to Western methods in depicting nature, and those who said otherwise were simply ignorant of the possibilities of the native methods. As for decorative art, this was from the beginning the strong point of native Japanese art, and was already so recognized in Europe. The arts and thought of each country differed; to adopt Western art methods necessarily meant to adopt Western aesthetics and abandon native ideals. To imbue the impressionable minds of Japanese children with Western art methods alone was surely to destroy in them that native sense of beauty which was one of the traditional virtues of the country, not to mention that facility with the soft brush which so amazed foreign critics. Further, there were numerous economic reasons for preferring native methods.

In an additional report on the practical uses of drawing, Fenollosa went on to advocate a careful distinction between
drawing for purposes such as mathematics, mechanics and science, and drawing as a part of general education. For the former he did not deny the necessity of Western methods, but considered this a matter for specialists; in general education, however, the first aim should be the appreciation of beauty, art for its own sake—as a part of the liberal education of the student; for this purpose, the artistic possibilities for gradation of line and tone with the Japanese brush were obviously superior to anything that could be accomplished with pencil or crayon, which were seldom, by themselves, capable of creating a finished work of art.

Though we may perhaps detect certain exaggerations in the report of the Group, it goes without saying that this was an age of extremes, and that, as we have seen, there was a very strong opposition group which advocated retention of purely Western styles of art education. The latter group, it happens, was out of favor so far as government officialdom went, and their further indignation at being excluded from official exhibitions during the years from 1882 to 1887 may well be imagined.

Koyama has written at length of the extremes of the anti-foreign movement in art circles, from the abolishment of the Art School, to the removal of Western art from exhibitions, lest it stir up public interest. He somewhat acidly analyzes Fenollosa’s motives as simply the necessity of finding suitable employment, since his contract at Tokyo University was about to terminate and the exploitation of the growing interest in native art seemed a good method of furthering his own interests.

Of the Painting Education Study Group, Koyama writes that matters were decided entirely by the majority, so that he had no word in the final decisions; Fenollosa and his group, with no regard for the actual needs of elementary education, simply decreed the Kanō style as the ideal, and since the Group’s recommendations were taken as gospel in the provinces, soon
practically four-fifths of the country was practicing Kanō painting.

The results were nearly disastrous to Western-style painting. Art shops were no longer able to obtain materials from abroad; shops which were attempting to manufacture art materials in imitation of European ones were closed. Students in the private schools and ateliers of Western-style art were removed by their elders—on the advice of local officials; and thus many of the schools had to close. On the other hand, organizations fostering Japanese-style art grew in numbers, as did exhibitions of such art.

The Western-style painters, though oppressed, did not concede defeat. Their prime sympathizers were their fellow students of things European, namely the university professors. With the help of the professors the Meiji Art Society was formed in 1889, with some three hundred members, for the promulgation of Western art. With the aid of such statesmen as Hara Kei, the group was able to commence exhibitions in Ueno Park, and begin to recover the students they had lost in the first stages of the anti-foreign movement.

As one of the major activities of the Society, the Meiji Art School was set up at Koishikawa in Tokyo, with men such as Matsuoka Hisashi, Asai Chū and Koyama Shōtarō among the teachers. The school continued until the time when the Society achieved most of its aims, and the Tokyo Art School was reformed with a Department of Western Painting, Asai Chū among its professors.

It will be seen that the early Meiji twenties [1887 ff.] were to mark another turning point in the history of Meiji art. But when Fenollosa left Japan in July of 1890, to take up his new duties as Curator of Far Eastern Art in the Boston Museum, he must have felt that most of his variegated aims in the fostering of Japanese-style painting had been accomplished.
IV. SECOND HALF OF THE MEIJI ERA:
FROM THE INSTITUTION OF
THE TOKYO ART SCHOOL TO 1897

Of the developments mentioned above, that most influential in the progress of art was doubtless the formation of the Tokyo Art School. The School was established by Imperial Decree in October of 1888, and in December the site of the former Education Museum in Ueno Park was selected as its grounds. Students were screened, and in February of the following year classes began.

The first Director was Hamao Shin. The lower division consisted of two years' work in painting or plastic arts, and the upper division of three years of advanced work in painting, sculpture or crafts. The crafts department was further divided into metal and lacquer work. The two years' course was considered sufficient training for teachers of drawing in the lower schools.

Painting was limited to the Japanese style, and the plastic arts and sculpture consisted, in effect, of carving from wood, together with metalwork. With subsequent changes in administration—Okakura being named Acting Director—the curriculum was revised, casting being added in 1892, and wrought metalwork in 1895.

Various changes were also made in the organization of the upper and lower divisions, the latter being renamed the Preparatory Course, with new courses in mechanical drawing and education being added for aspiring teachers. In 1896 the painting curriculum was finally divided into Japanese painting, and a new section for Western-style painting. In 1898 the section for Western painting was divided further into oil painting and charcoal sketching groups, and Western-style sketching was made the basis for work in sculpture, which itself was tending to emphasize Western methods now.
In the same year Kubota Kanae, Director of the Imperial Museum, was named Acting Director of the school, and within the Sculpture Department a new section for plaster modeling was set up, and the latter method made likewise the basis for work in wood sculpture.

Although it will not be necessary to detail the full curriculum here, it may be noted that it followed closely Fenollosa's own ideas on the proper methods of educating future artists. In the upper division, for example, emphasis was upon copying of old models of painting and sculpture, together with sketching from nature and, increasingly during the second and third years, original work. In the final year of the painting curriculum, considerable emphasis was placed on architectural decoration, for Fenollosa felt strongly that the divorcement of painting from architecture and the crafts was the cause of its late decline.

With Hamao and Okakura as administrators, the school commenced with the following instructors: Kurokawa Mayori, Hashimoto Gahō, Fenollosa, Kanō Kōtarō, Fujita Bunzō, Kawabata Gyokushō, Kanō Yūshin, Takeuchi Kyūichi, Yūki Masaaki and, as part-time instructor, Kojima Noriyuki. Except for the last-named, all were artists or scholars of the Japanese style, and Western art as such had no part in the curriculum.

It will be seen that the new Art School bore no resemblance to the early Russian proposal for such, which had as its aim the Westernization of Japanese art and music. Indeed, although music had been mentioned in the plans for an art school, "music" of course implied Western music, and so it could hardly be reconciled with the strongly pro-Japanese elements which lay behind the founding of the new Art School.

It is somewhat ironic to note that the Fenollosa-Okakura tour of Europe served only to strengthen their basic prejudices for Japanese art. Fenollosa, at least, seems to have been oblivious to the fact that the most venturesome of the Japanese painters in the Western style were at that very time already
engaged in intensive study in Europe: in Paris, Kuroda Seiki, Kume Keiichirō, Fuji Masazō, Yamamoto Hōsui and Goseda Yoshimatsu; in Rome, Matsuoka Hisashi; in Venice, Naganuma Shukei; in Munich, Harada Naojirō.

To be sure, such men, who were to form the vanguard of Impressionist painting in Japan, were at the time but considered eccentrics in their own country. Yet such statements of Fenollosa as “With the purity of Japanese art, to attempt to imitate European art would indeed be but to carry out national suicide” would seem to indicate that the European tour had no effect on his ideas at all, that, indeed, the results of the survey were settled before it was ever made.

As with most questions, there were two sides, and the Western-style artists expressed theirs strongly in the “Aims” of the Meiji Art Society: “In this new era we are opening our eyes through foreign books, clothing ourselves in Western clothes; it is a season wherein all activities, from government, the military and industry to literature are competing to take their methods from the countries of Europe. At a time like this, is art alone to turn its back upon the modern world, to preserve its ancient methods, and aim at a rejuvenation of times long past?”

Such sentiments were not without support, both among scholars and government officials, and it is significant that President Watanabe of Tokyo University was elected first Director of the Meiji Art Society, being replaced in 1890 (at which time he was named Japanese Ambassador to Austria) by Prince Tanaka Fujimaro, with Hara Kei among the managing directors.

Such painters as Yamamoto, Matsuoka and Harada returned from abroad in the years 1887-1888, and added their voices to the movement. However it was not to be expected that a society formed of such individualistic, and often conflicting elements, should work in perfectistic unity. Further, public sentiment (where such existed) was still opposed to Western art,
and the Society encountered great difficulty in obtaining a site for its first exhibition of October 1889. Finally, after being refused the use of such halls as the Kazoku Kaikan, the Rokumeikan, and the Hibiya Shrine Hall, they had to settle on the grandstand by Shinobazu Pond at Ueno. Once the exhibition was commenced, however, visitors exceeded expectations, and financial support by the Imperial Household Office, the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce, and Tokyo Prefecture, enabled the Society to realize a profit of ¥300 on the venture. The exhibition time was extended, a fair number of paintings were sold, and the grounds were even visited by the Empress—this and the Imperial Household’s support an indication that persons in rather high circles must have been interested in the Society’s work.

The actual exhibit consisted of three rooms, commencing with the work of Western masters, and such pre-Meiji Japanese pioneers as Shiba Kökan and Aōdō Denzen; then came the work of the Meiji pioneers, among them Koyama, Gosedo, Honda, Yanagi, Kamei, Sakuma, Asai and Harada. In the work of these men rustic scenes predominated, but there were also a number of scenes from Japanese history and mythology, which struck the public with their unusual treatment of native material.

The period of official discouragement of Western painting was now approaching its end, and with the Third National Industrial Fair of 1890, Western-style painting regained its official place. At this exhibit Koyama, Harada, Matsuoka and Naganuma, as well as Okakura, were among the judges. One of the more controversial works of the exhibition was Harada’s “Kannon Riding on a Dragon,” of which one critic complained, “How can you paint Kannon riding on a dragon, when you believe in neither? . . . It looks, rather, like a circus girl walking a tightrope by torchlight.” The artistic value of the painting was another matter, but it must be admitted that the works of painters in the Western style were at this period redolent
in such idealized or mythological subjects.

The Second Exhibit of the Meiji Art Society, held in November of the same year at the Kazoku Kaikan (Peers’ Hall) in Ueno Park, was attended by the Empress, the Empress Dowager and the Crown Prince, and impromptu demonstrations of painting and sculpture work were given for them. One hundred and forty-one new works were shown, together with some eighty reference works, among the latter, paintings by Theodore Rousseau and Degas, sent from Paris for their first appearance in Japan by the art dealer Hayashi Tadamasa.

The Third Exhibit of the Society followed in May and June of 1891, and from the beginning of the following year plans were under way for a new Meiji Art School, which materialized the same year on a modest scale, instruction being limited to Western painting. From March to May of the following year the Fourth Exhibit of the Society was held, this time at Shiba Park.

In 1893 the Meiji Art Society made plans for taking part in the Columbian Exposition to be held in Chicago; but official advice opposed the plan, on the grounds that Japanese oil painting was still in its infancy. The Society felt this advice surely to derive from Baron Kuki Ryūichi, one of the directors of the Japanese efforts for the Exposition, and a strong critic of Western-style art. The Society, at any rate, angrily withdrew its application.

The Fifth Exhibit of the Society was held at Ueno Park in the spring of the same year, again with the works of eminent French Impressionist painters being sent by Hayashi from Paris. Kuroda Seiki returned from study abroad in the same year, and lent his considerable influence to the Society; in the Sixth Exhibit of the following year he exhibited his famous nude study, “Morning Toilette” (Plate 51a), which drew widespread comment. The Seventh Exhibit was held in October of 1895, with increasing space devoted to the works of Kuroda and Kume Keiichirō, produced during their period of study
abroad. (See Plates 43, 52a and b for Kuroda, 51b for Kume.)

Kuroda Seiki was already considered by many to be the great genius of the artists in Western style. Yamamoto Hōsui had, during his period of study in Paris, come to know and respect Kuroda, and was fond of saying that he himself was not a real artist, but only a painter by trade, and that when the great Kuroda returned from abroad he would simply turn his atelier-school, the Seikōkan, over to the master, and remove himself from the picture.

And that is, in fact, what he did; thus was born Kuroda’s famed school, the Tenshin Dōjō (“Naivete Seminary”), which he operated with Kume Keiichirō. The school produced such famous pupils as Fujishima Takeji (Plates 45 and 55b) and Shirataki Ikunosuke (Plate 54a), and soon was attracting the better pupils from other ateliers, among them Okada Saburosuke (Plate 53a), Wada Eisaku (Plate 53b), Nakazawa Hiromitsu (Plate 54b), and Yamamoto Morinosuke (Plate 58a).

Kuroda was active in other circles too, acting as correspondent for the Paris Monde Illustré in covering the Sino-Japanese War, judging at various exhibitions, and exhibiting works such as his “Morning Toilette” in the Fourth National Industrial Exposition held at Kyoto in 1895.

Whereas the latter painting had caused no complications when exhibited in Tokyo, in Kyoto Kuroda’s nude soon became famous, and the subject of violent attack on moral grounds. The nude as a set art form had been unknown in Japan, and to critics unsympathetic, or unfamiliar, with Western art, the nude seemed but one form of pornography.

Kuroda, however, was firm in his convictions, and determined to stand or fall with this painting. He wrote, “Are we to be satisfied painting only boneless dolls, and then still call ourselves the Country of Art? . . . They say ‘What will country peasants think, looking at a painting like this?’ What foolish talk! For what purpose, and for whom, is art anyway? In what age and what country have there been people who made
eyeglasses for the blind? Art is not intended for those who cannot see. . . .” Kuroda’s famous nude, it may be noted, had been painted at Paris in 1893, when he was but twenty-seven years old.

The attack on Kuroda’s painting was widespread, and actively supported by such newspapers as the Hinode, Asahi and Nichinichi. In the minority belonged the Osaka Mainichi, whose Kikuchi Yūhō wrote a strong article pointing out the importance of the nude in art. Baron Kuki Ryūichi, though opposed to Western-style art in general, in reply to the Police Commissioner’s warning wrote a letter in which he defended his committee’s action in selecting the painting for the exhibition. Kuki pointed out that Western nude sculpture, for example, had already become such an accepted part of the aesthetics of Japanese intellectuals that it would be difficult simply to ban the nude as an art form. Further, it would be strange for Japan to be the only civilized country in the world to adopt such an attitude, especially in that her own Buddhist sculptors, and Ukiyo-e masters such as Harunobu, Utamaro and Hokusai, had made occasional artistic employment of the nude. Kuki hastened to add that he had no particular love for the painting himself, and if there were Imperial objections, or if the police were determined to ban the work, he would of course comply with their instructions.

Kuki’s bold (for the time) reply to the police authorities, and his forthright stand on the matter eventually won out over strong opposition from government and police groups. This victory was a significant one, not only for freedom in the artistic depiction of the nude, but for Western-style art in general. Young Kuroda, freshly returned from abroad, became a towering figure in the art world overnight. And the conservative, anti-Western Kuki had proved himself able to rise above his personal prejudices.

The world had changed, and the time was coming when the Tokyo Art School could no longer keep its doors closed to
Western art. Indeed, Okakura had already in June of 1894 drafted a report in which he recommended two instructors each for the following six painting classrooms: 1. Ancient, Kose, Tosa schools. 2. Ashikaga, Early Tokugawa. 3. Late Tokugawa. 4. Design. 5. Chinese Styles. 6. Western Styles.

Whether the institution of a classroom for Western painting was Okakura’s own idea, or was suggested to him by higher authorities is not clear; but just as the opposition to Western-style art had been fervent, so also was the support of its advocates. Indeed, for the artists themselves it was almost literally a matter of life and death, though this is difficult for us to conceive today, when Western art is so firmly entrenched in Japan. At any rate, after the crucial years 1893-94, the painters’ battles with the authorities for the life of their art ceased, and they had only to concern themselves with the practical problems of making a living through art.

As for the Art School itself, as we have seen, it had been instituted in the same year as the Fenollosa-Okakura survey-tour of Europe. Its first director was Hamao Shin, but he was soon replaced by Okakura [1862-1913], who was but twenty-nine at the time. The painting teachers were entirely of the Kanō school except for Kawabata Gyokushō [1842-1913], originally a Kyoto painter of the Maruyama school, who had also in his youth once studied Western-style painting. Gyokushō’s inclusion on the faculty may well have been at the behest of Okakura, who was a less narrow individual than the Kanō-prejudiced Fenollosa, and who continued to broaden his artistic horizons as the years went on. The exclusion of the “Literary-men’s School” from the curriculum remained, however, until the end of the Meiji Period.

In the Department of Sculpture of the new Art School were Takeuchi Kyūichi (Plate 61) and Kanō Kōtarō, both sculptors in wood, though Kanō was later replaced by the great Takamura Kōun (Plates 60b, 62). The only instructor who could be considered Western-style was Kojima Noriyuki, a graduate
of the old Art School, who had studied in America; however, his subject was mechanical drawing, and related subjects, where Western technique was doubtless considered inevitable.

The first group of fifty students was chosen by examination from 114 applicants. In addition, fifteen students were selected by prefectural authorities, making the total sixty-five. Several of the students of this first class were to make their names among the great figures of modern Japanese art: Yokoyama Taikan (Plates 6, 28a, 31a), Shimomura Kanzan (Plates 7, 28b, 34a), and Saigō Kogetsu (Plate 29a), among others.

This period, from the founding of the Tokyo Art School to the institution of the Art Academy, marks the peak of Okakura's activities. From the administration of the Art School, to the display and encouragement of new works and artists, together with the preservation of ancient art, there was no area of the art field where his activities did not reach. Most of the later government policies and methods of encouraging art date back to Okakura's efforts.

Notice has already been made of some of his art activities: laying the plans for the Imperial Museum, and acting as Chief of the Art Section; helping to organize and direct the surveys of ancient Japanese art, which brought attention to the hidden treasures in many old temples and shrines, and saved them from damage and eventual destruction; instituting the important journal of ancient art, Kokka; and in general reawakening in the Japanese people a consciousness of their great heritage of art. Of course, it is often difficult to distinguish Okakura's efforts from those of Fenollosa and others of the group; yet he seems to have been one of the most active participants in the actual work of getting Fenollosa's proposals translated into action. [Cf. Frontispiece II.]

In addition to the training of young artists, the various efforts made at this time toward encouraging and supporting already established artists should be noted in greater detail. The Imperial Art Academy, set up in 1890, honored the painters
Tasaki Sōun (Plate 12b), Mori Kansai (Plate 18a), Hashimoto Gahō, Kanō Eitoku, and Morizumi Tsurana; the sculptors Takamura Kōun and Ishikawa Kōmei (Plates 59b, 63, 111); the metal-worker Kanō Natsuo (Plates 73b, 74); the painter and lacquer-worker Shibata Zeshin (Plates 22b, 88); and the dyer Date Yanosuke (Plates 105c, 106).

It is notable that the painters, though all in the Japanese style, included only one member of the Fenollosa group, Gahō; this serves to remind us that even within the pro-Japanese faction there were elements in conflict with the Art School group, and that, when it came to Imperial appointments, these elements possessed considerable influence.

In 1893 the painters Noguchi Yūkoku (Plate 16a), Taki Katei (Plate 15a), Kōno Bairei (Plate 18b), and the potter Seifū Yohei (Plate 100a), were also nominated to the Academy. As with most such Academies, the members were generally old men, and with the deaths of Kansai, Eitoku, Tsurana, Bairei, Zeshin and Yanosuke, in 1896 the following members were added in painting: Kishi Chikudō (Plate 3), Yamana Tsurayoshi and Kawabata Gyokushō (Plate 26a). At the same time eight members were added in the other arts. By the end of the Meiji Period some sixteen other members had been nominated, among them the painters Araki Kampo (Plate 20a), Kumagaya Naohiko, Mochizuki Gyokusen, Imao Keinen (Plate 16b), the woman painter Noguchi Shōhin (Plate 15b) and, finally, the Western-style master Kuroda Seiki, as well as the photographer Ogawa Isshin.

During the year 1894 Okakura continued to develop plans toward his ideal in the government administration of art. These included Higher Art Schools in Tokyo and Kyoto; Technical Schools in the provinces, as required; an Art Academy; and finally, National Museums in Tokyo, Kyoto and Nara, with provincial museums under their direction. Also, as noted earlier, he proposed the inclusion of Western art in these plans.

As was customary with most of the planners of the Meiji
Era, Okakura cited in detail the example of the Western nations, including their methods of financing such projects. He proposed in 1895 the setting up of an Art Council, under the Minister of Education, to handle the practical details of art education, museums, the survey and preservation of art objects and ancient architecture, exhibitions, the encouragement of art, the market in art objects, the inspection of art industries in the various districts, receipt and examination of proposals from home and abroad regarding art affairs, together with such other art matters as the Minister of Education might propose.

In 1897 Okakura prepared another report in which he deplored the lack of progress in art education, the fact that there was still only one Art School, the fact that there was little communication between the various officials concerned with art, and went on to reaffirm the need for the organs of art education he had already outlined.

Yet, despite Okakura's enthusiasm for the cause of art and art education, the time had come when he was to be compelled to leave the Tokyo Art School. This event, known as the "Art School Affair," was to mark another of the turning points in the history of Meiji art.

Certain details of the event are yet unclear, but the basic facts of the incident seem to be as follows. One of the professors at the Art School, who had formerly been highly trusted by Okakura had, because of his excessive willfulness and arrogance caused great unrest among the faculty, and had eventually been forced to resign his position. Combining forces with one or two other similarly dissatisfied persons, he plotted to cause the ruin of both the School and the Museum.

Whatever the methods used by the plotters may have been they succeeded in part, for Kuki Ryūichi, Director of the Museum, was forced to resign his secondary post as Acting Assistant Director of Expositions, and even his Museum position seems to have been in danger. At the same time, on March 17th of 1898 Okakura was forced to resign his functions as Acting Director of
the Museum, and Chief of the Art Section. He was followed in protest by the teachers of the Art School who also held posts in the Museum, namely Hashimoto Gahō, Takamura Kōun and Kawasaki Senko.

On the twenty-first of the same month, the Yomiuri Newspaper, which specialized in cultural news, carried an article on “The Truth of the Upheaval in the Art World,” which only served to quicken the excitement of the affair. At the same time a document was sent out under the name of the Keisei [“Watch and Awaken”] Society to all newspapers, ministers, officials and business firms, for the purpose of slandering Okakura and his group.

The document of this fictitious society was phrased in the most crude language. It wildly exaggerated certain of Okakura’s eccentricities, calling him “a hereditary madman, frequently seized by fits of blood lust.” Hōgai was characterized as a “mad painter,” and Gahō as a painter of “ghoul-pictures.” The document was obviously the work of a crank, but somehow the pertinent officials in the Ministry of Education chose to take it seriously, and the general public, knowing nothing of the actual facts, followed their lead.

The readiness with which the art world aided and abetted the downfall of Okakura would also seem to indicate some deep-seated resentment against him and the “constructively conservative” movement in general. He had his supporters, of course, but the unexpected wave of hatred against him, both personally, and as a symbol of the movement, was hardly conducive to making him wish to fight for his position. Thus he determined to resign, and induced his friend Takamine Hideo, Principal of the Women’s Normal School, to take over as Director of the Art School.

On March 26th Okakura called a meeting of all the instructors and, half weeping, told them of his intention and bid them farewell. The response from his teachers was immediate. From Gahō, Kōun, Kōmei and Gyokushō on down, over twenty
of the professors signed a mass resignation document, and determined to follow their director in whatever direction fortune might lead.

The three hundred students of the school were of course in utter confusion, not knowing which way to turn. The only calm one of the professors was Kuroda Seiki, who had but the year before taken up the new position in Western-style painting. He declared the duty of a teacher was to teach, and would have nothing to do with the revolt.

The Education Minister was Saionji, and his Assistant, Tsuzuki, a classmate and old friend of Okakura. But the pressure of public opinion was too much upon them, and on the 29th of March they sent Okakura notification of his retirement, and of the appointment of Takamine in his stead. Receiving the notice, Okakura visited the homes of each of his professors, urging that they withdraw their resignations; then he went traveling in order to get away from the confusion in Tokyo.

The instructors were not to be so easily dissuaded, however, and on April 6th they issued a proclamation of their resignations, with full reasons therefor. This time, fully thirty-six names were signed to the document, which outlined Okakura's eminent achievements in the field of art education, and protested the Education Ministry's blindness in disregarding his ten years of splendid service, and dismissing him on the basis of unfounded calumny.

Of the instructors, some ten of them had graduated as students under Okakura's directorship, including such great painters as Taikan, Kanzan, Kogetsu and Shunsō. The almost unanimous loyalty of his professors—in a country where such a resignation was no light matter—is surely an indication that, whatever the personal idiosyncracies of Okakura's genius, he was loved and respected by the men who knew him best.

The Ministry of Education was greatly surprised at the solidarity of Okakura's supporters, which threatened to cause
the Art School literally to close its doors. The officials tried every means to persuade the teachers to continue at their posts: they had the new Director visit each professor personally; they threatened disciplinary punishment in addition to dismissal; they wheedled relatives into using their personal arguments to persuade the teachers. Gyokushō, as a matter of fact, was forced to withdraw his resignation when his long-time patron and benefactor, the head of the Mitsui family, sternly warned him that “anyone who opposes the Government is a rebel against the Emperor.” As a result of one type of pressure or another, Kōun, Kyūichi and Kōmei were also forced to withdraw their resignations; the four announced this in a newspaper advertisement of April 15th.

Despite official and unofficial pressure, however, in the end seventeen professors remained adamant. Of these, eleven received “voluntary dismissal,” among them Gahō, Senko, Shisui, Kanzan and Tomoto (Tomone). The other six were given “strongly disciplinary dismissal”; these included Kōgyō, Kogetsu, Taikan and Shunsō.

It will be remembered that among Okakura’s proposals was the plan for an Art Academy, to stand, in effect, one level above the Art School. It was only natural that the teachers who followed him in dismissal should think of beginning a new, private art school under his leadership. Thus was born the Japan Art Academy (Nihon Bijutsu-in), which was to make its own great contribution to the advance of art in Japan.

The new academy of course had its financial difficulties, but was already organized by June that year, and on the seventh of July held a conference of some two hundred interested persons to celebrate its institution. The Japan Art Academy proposed to concentrate its attention on painting and sculpture, but also to include the other arts. It set up a Department of Research, as the foundation for its work, and a Department of Production, where its members would engage in their own creative art work. A third Department of Exhibition was to
follow as soon as the two more basic departments were in running order.

The development of the Japan Art Academy was to mark a new era in Meiji art; this will be the subject of a subsequent chapter. For the moment we must return to the other movements which characterized the decade prior to its formation.

At about the time when Fenollosa’s Painting-Appreciation Society reached the height of its influence, founding the Tokyo Art School and, in effect, becoming an official educational organ of the government, the old Ryūchi Society had reorganized, broadened its activities, and in 1887 become the Japan Art Association. This organization was to prove the most influential semi-private art group in Japan during the ensuing decade.

The Director of the Japan Art Association was, as we have seen, Viscount Sano Tsunetami. Likewise active in leading the Association was Shimojō Masao, an amateur painter and former naval officer. The huge exhibition of the Association was held twice a year, in spring and autumn, at Ueno. The spring exhibition featured sculpture and crafts, the autumn one, painting. In opposition to the Western-style Meiji Art Society, Japanese-style art was the domain of the Association.

Inspired by the Tokyo group, Kyoto artists formed the Kyoto Art Association in 1890, with particular emphasis on crafts, publishing the *Kyoto Art Magazine* as their official organ. Kyoto painters often submitted their works for exhibition by the Tokyo group, but in the Tokyo exhibitions, work by local painters necessarily predominated.

In 1892, under the leadership of Murata Tanryō, the younger members of the Japan Art Association formed their own Japan Youth Painting Association, with Okakura as their President. The new group was not formed in open opposition to the older Association, but simply because the younger painters wanted their own group, more suited to their own needs. The group appears to have been formed with the blessings of the older one, and the younger painters still continued to exhibit
with the Japan Art Association, in addition to their own Youth Exhibitions. Prominent among their members were such painters as Kōgyō, Tomoto, Tanryō, Gekkō, Hanko, Shinsai, Shūsui and Shisen—i.e., the pupils of such older masters as Zeshin, Senko, Mitate, Gyokushō, Yūkoku, Hōgai and Katei.

Unlike the exhibitions of the older Association—which usually awarded eight or nine silver medals, and twice that many bronze—the Youth Exhibitions were sparing in their awards. At the first exhibition the Silver Medal went to Ikeda Shinsai for his “Kōfukuji Pagoda,” a good example of the mastery of architectural perspective already achieved by this time. Winners of the Bronze Medal were Kōgyō, Tanryō, Shisen and Gekkō.

In 1896 the Tokyo Art School group joined forces with the Youth Association, and a new Japan Painting Association was formed. Such a merger was only natural in that Okakura was head of both groups, and had never been very close to the parent Japan Art Association anyway, nor overly fond of its style of conventionalized painting either. Doubtless he hoped to lead the younger painters in the Japanese style toward the ideal art he envisioned for the future. However, revolutionary art alone could not sustain a lasting group, and so two basic sections were formed in the new Association: “Those who follow Far Eastern painting methods,” and “Those who wish to open new fields of art.” A third group was also set up, for “Those who follow Western painting methods”; but as we shall see, the formation of Kuroda’s “White Horse Society” for that purpose this very year prevented the third group from developing extensively.

Though the new Japan Painting Association was still composed primarily of younger men, such professors at the Art School as Gahō, Gyokushō, Kanzan and Shunsō also now came to participate in the exhibitions.

Kanzan’s “Birth of Buddha” (Plate 28b) proved the sensation of the exhibition of 1896. Whereas the paintings of the
conservative Japan Art Association most often took as their models Kanō, Old Tosa, or Chinese paintings of the Ming-Ch'ing periods, here Kanzan took his inspiration directly from the ancient murals of the Hōryūji. That alone was a considerable innovation. But the size of the painting—nearly five by seven feet—also astonished the onlookers. For hitherto Japanese-style paintings had been designed primarily as hanging scrolls, their size limited by the dimensions of the tokonoma in the average home. Now, for the first time, the influence of the exhibition itself came to be felt on the form of Japanese-style painting, and this gradual divorcement from the strict kakemono scroll form was to prove one of the deciding factors in the future of Japanese-style painting. (It showed, among other things, that Japanese-style painting could adapt itself to Western architecture; that a foreign-style room, hall, or building did not necessarily imply a Western painting for its decoration. Of late, Japanese hanging scrolls have been successfully employed by Western decorators in connection with modern architecture; but to the Japanese mind even today, the kakemono is too intimately associated with the tokonoma alcove to allow such a striking innovation to be employed widely in their own homes. R.L.)

Kuroda Seiki, it will be recalled, returned home from France in June of 1893. He had been abroad ten years, much of this time spent in the intensive study and practice of Western painting under expert foreign guidance. He had fully mastered authentic Western technique, and his painting had even been acclaimed in the salons of Paris. He soon became an influential member of the Meiji Art Society, exhibiting his controversial “Morning Toilette” in the fall of 1894. With the commencement of the Sino-Japanese War in the same year, he, together with Yamamoto Hōsui, Koyama Shōtarō, Asai Chū, Kubota Beisen and other artists, accompanied the army to the front.

In May, 1896, while Saionji was Minister of Education, a Western Painting Department was finally set up in the Tokyo
Art School, with Kuroda in charge and Kume as his associate. The course was a four year one, in principal the first year being devoted to sketching from plaster models, the second to charcoal sketching from living models, the third to oil painting, and the fourth to original work in oils. Kume taught anatomy in the second and third years. Okada Saburosuke (Plate 53a) and Wada Eisaku (Plate 53b) were appointed Assistant Professors, but Wada soon determined he needed more training in technique, resigned his position, and was accepted as a student in a fourth-year class arranged especially for him. Fujishima Takeji (Plates 45, 55b), who had been teaching at a middle school in Ise, was made Assistant Professor; at the same time, all of Kuroda's pupils in the Tenshin Dōjō enrolled in the new department, which immediately began to flourish as a full-fledged Western art school.

Kuroda was a master of technique, besides being a dominating personality; his students called him "Maître," and treated him with all the respect due a teacher under the old feudal system. Kume was a classical scholar, a master of prose and elocution, and served as the "brain trust" of the department, together with directing the more scholarly fields such as art history and anatomy. The two men formed an excellent combination, and the department was a success from its inception.

The institution of a Department of Western Painting had been made inevitable by the changing times. Fenollosa's movement in violent opposition to Western-style painting had at first seen the latter's exclusion from the Art School's curriculum. But in reaction, the Meiji Art Society and Meiji Art School had been formed, each devoting its efforts to the cause of Western art. In 1887 the Tokyo Prefecture Crafts Exhibition opened its doors to Western-style painting, and in 1890 Fenollosa returned to America, leaving his work in Okakura's hands.

As we have already suggested, Okakura, though greatly influenced by Fenollosa, was basically a broader, more tolerant individual. During the year 1886-87 he had the rare opportunity
of surveying the museums and art schools of Europe and America, and could hardly but be impressed by the greatness of Western art in its own context.

In the Report of the Third National Industrial Fair of 1890, Okakura wrote at length on the past, present and future of Western painting in Japan. He cited the year as a turning point in the history of Western-style painting in Japan. He praised the new assurance and originality, the fresh, native element he now discerned in Japanese painting, where formerly imitations of foreign works had been all too common. He went on to express his joy that whereas in the past landscapes and portraits had predominated, now Japanese painters had learned to master the human figure too, and come to produce figure studies and historical scenes which were entirely up to Western standards. In Japanese technique, and especially the use of colors, he saw not only mastery, but a native contribution to oil painting.

Okakura emphasized that these developments were not simply an accident: they were the result of the accumulated studies of the primitive pioneers in the decade before and after the Meiji Period began, together with the advances made during the period of the old Art School in the late 1870's and after. But the real advances toward a truly Japanese style of Western painting were, Okakura felt, a development of the last two or three years. He concluded his remarks by pointing out certain flaws of technique that still remained in Japanese oil painting, urging even greater originality of design, greater nobility of conception, and greater attention to the fundamental studies that must underlie figure work and historical paintings, namely, anatomy, perspective, and accuracy of historical detail.

As already noted, it was in the year 1894 that Okakura had drafted a plan for setting up a Western Painting Department in the Tokyo Art School. The Minister of Education at this time was Saionji, who had resided for a long period in France, and understood European culture well. Kuroda's return after ten years studying in France provided them with a man in whom they
could feel confident both in technical skill and in personal character. Thus, with the addition of Kume as a stabilizing element, the new department was born.

In May of 1896, almost simultaneously with Kuroda’s appointment to the new teaching position, the “White Horse Society” was formed, with Kuroda as its center. The essence of this new Western-painting society was to be freedom: there was to be no president or director; all members were to be equal. There were to be no fees except when actual exhibitions were held, at which time all members were expected to lend their best efforts.

The emphasis of the new group on individual freedom was doubtless partly based on French ideals, but perhaps more on the fact that the then dominant Meiji Art Society was so bound by rules, rank, and bureaucratic procedure. In September of the same year, Kuroda, Kume, Oshiro Tameshige and Gōta Kiyoshi resigned en masse from the Meiji Art Society.

Just as the younger members of the conservative Japan Art Association had seen fit to form their own group, so was it only natural that the more modern elements of the Western-style Meiji Art Society should also seek to free themselves from troublesome restrictions, especially now that they had such a dominant artist and personality as Kuroda to lead them. It may also be sensed that, though they belonged to different artistic traditions, the younger men of each group probably had more in common with each other than they did with the conservative members of their own association.

Thus the following events of the year 1896 displayed an inevitable logic: Okakura’s Japan Painting Association planned its exhibition at Ueno, but, since its members belonged preeminently to the two sections comprising traditional Japanese painting and new Japanese-style painting, it could not muster enough notable work for the third section of Western-style paintings. The painters who should have formed this third section, i.e. the young instructors at the Art School, were now part of Kuroda’s White Horse Society. The latter group doubtless prized its independ-
ence, but, after all, they were part of a similar movement, and so it came about that the White Horse Society allied with the Japan Painting Association, and the two exhibitions were held at the same hall in consecutive weeks. As for the Meiji Art Society, though it still retained a strong group of old-guard painter-members, it at length decided not to enter into competition with the younger men, and cancelled its exhibition for the year.

Whereas the older Meiji Art Society was hardly pleased with the withdrawal of Kuroda's group, and his appointment as the head of the Art School's Western Painting Department, it is clear that Kuroda himself held no great grudge against the parent Society, even though he could not himself tolerate its conservative, almost feudalistic, methods. Indeed, in 1898 Asai Chū, one of the most prominent remaining members of the Meiji Art Society, was made professor in Kuroda's department at the Art School.

Though they cancelled their 1896 exhibition, the Meiji Art Society exhibited early in the following year. However not only were its active younger members now missing, but Koyama Shōtarō and his Fudōsha atelier also failed to submit any paintings. Indeed, Asai Chū carried the weight of the exhibit, though Harada, Nakamura Fusetsu (Plate 42) and others also submitted important works. (Asai, it should be added, went to France for prolonged study only a year after his appointment to the Art School, and upon his return in 1902 he settled in Kyoto, becoming professor at the Higher Arts School there.) Soon after the exhibit of 1896, at any rate, the Meiji Art Society closed its exhibition halls for good.

As we shall see shortly, the remaining elements of the Meiji Art Society still had considerable influence in the Japanese art world; they, together with other supporters, were to band together again several years later, in the spring of 1902, to form the Pacific Ocean Painting Society (Taiheiyō Gakai). This reorganized group was, with the Art School's
White Horse Society, to become the leading association of Western-style artists and art lovers during the last decade of the Meiji Period.

To return to the Tokyo Art School at the beginning of this third decade of Meiji, Fenollosa's great friend Kanō Hōgai had died in November of 1888, only a few months before the School was opened. That left only Hashimoto Gahō (like Hōgai, a pupil of Kanō Shōsen-in) as a fully qualified transmitter of the Kanō style.

Gahō was not, like Hōgai, a revolutionary painter. His importance lay in the fact that he was the last great eclectic consolidator of the Kanō style. He never claimed, however, that the Kanō style was the only one; rather he emphasized the importance of "feeling" (kokoromochi), by which he seems to have meant that vital spark of energy and inspiration that must infuse the artist's whole being at the moment of creation, if his work is not to be worthless.

As his own pupil Hishida Shunsō later remarked, in Gahō's own work the technique often eclipsed the feeling. [Cf. Plates 2, 23a, 24a, but less so the more evocative paintings 23b and 24b.] But to Gahō's pupils at the time, the master's words were pregnant with meaning, and they strove to put his theory of "feeling" into practice. Among Gahō's pupils in the Art School mention should be made of Yokoyama Taikan (Plates 6, 28a, 31a), Seki Yasunosuke, Rokkaku Shisui and Omura Seigai of the first graduating class of 1893, and Shimomura Kanzan (Plates 7, 28b, 34a), Saigō Kogetsu (Plate 29a), Mizoguchi Teijirō and Shimada Kasai of the second graduating class. It was with the aim of leading these graduates toward even higher goals in the new art that the Art School Director Okakura, in 1896, combined their strength with the Youth Painting Association to form the Japan Painting Association just mentioned.

To return to the Japan Painting Association's First Exhibition of 1896—which in effect routed the old Japan Art Association—the judges consisted of Okakura and the leading teachers
of the Art School, Gahō, Gyokushō and Tsurayoshi. As we have noted, the Association had three divisions. The awards given to the First Division (painting in the traditional Far Eastern styles) were few, and the painters not to prove themselves of the first rank in Meiji art [the best was perhaps the Nanga painter Miss Noguchi Shōhin; Plate 15a]. The Second Division, Western-style paintings, was the province of the White Horse Society, and will be discussed below.

It was to the Third Group—new, original painting in the Japanese style—that the awards went in numbers; and here were to be found most of the great names of later Meiji art in the Japanese style: Keinen (Plate 16b), Kanzan, Kōgyō, Tomoto, Keichū, Shunsō, Seihō, (Plates 5, 34b), Beisen, (Plate 19b), Shunkyō (Plate 30b), Tanryō, Chikudō (Plate 3), Somei, Shōnen, Gekkō (Plate 21a), Gyokusen, Sobun, Taikan, Kogetsu, Gyokudō, Shūsui, Kōun, and many others.

[Judging from the names, one might suppose that a number of the artists of group three really belonged in group one. But the divisions were not too sharply made, being based, perhaps, as much on the artist’s intention as on the result. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that the great names of later Meiji art considered themselves to be working in really new styles, quite apart from the traditions to which they owed their training. It is notable also that so many of the names should be those of Kyoto artists, and that they fared so well before a committee composed of teachers at the Tokyo School. R.L.]

The exhibition’s Second Division, handled by the White Horse Society, was certainly the most lively. There were only sixteen artists represented, but with a total of 209 paintings on exhibit. The master Kuroda alone exhibited sixty-four paintings and sketches, including the preliminary sketch for “Tales of Old” (Plate 52a), which he was to complete in oils two years later. Prominent among the other Western-style painters represented were Fujishima, Andō, Kobayashi, Oshiro, Kume, Wada, Shirataki, Okada, Yuasa and Nakamura, with a few works of
sculpture and carving by Sano and Gōta.

With its Second Exhibition of the following year, 1897, the Japan Painting Association abandoned its three divisions, and limited itself to work in the third category only—original works in the Japanese manner. At the same time, the exhibit became more predominantly the scene of artistic competition among the different members of the Art School group. Notable, arrestingly new works were numerous at this Second Exhibition: Gahō’s “Rinzai Admonishing a Pupil” (Plate 2), depicting in India ink both the solid reality and the spiritual content of Zen Buddhism; Kanzan’s “Empress Kōmyō,” revealing with quiet grace the influence of his studies in the Hōryūji murals and the Old Tosa style; and Taikan’s masterly “Know-nothing” (Plate 28a), imbuing in the motionless figure of a child his compassion for the whole human race.

In part, at least, as a result of the atmosphere aroused by the Japanese victory in the Sino-Japanese War, in the years 1896-97 noted painters, sculptors and artisans in the native style found themselves almost deluged with orders for work. In particular popularity in Tokyo—despite Fenollosa’s rantings—were such established artists of the Nanga school as Mitate, Katei, Yūkoku, and Shōhin. Ironically enough, it was just at this prosperous time that the “avant-garde” in the Japanese style were, under the tutelage of Okakura and Gahō, expending their best efforts toward new horizons in Japanese art, but with their works directed toward public exhibit, and in forms quite unsuited to traditional private ownership.

The Third Exhibition of 1898 continued to display original, new work based on Japanese traditions, by such artists as Gahō, Gyokushō, and the younger Art School teachers such as Taikan, Kanzan, Kogetsu, Kōgyō and Shunsō (the latter with his “Water Mirror,” Plate 27a). Kogetsu and Shunsō in particular showed an increasing trend toward lyrical, flowing, natural lines of beauty, with, at the same time, an evident urge to make their paintings say something intuitive beneath the pretty
surface. Such paintings formed a striking contrast to the conventional, tradition-bound work of the Japan Art Association, and both the critics and the interested public were now clearly divided into allegiances to one or the other style.

It will be of interest to note the prizewinners at this Third Exhibition, together with their respective ages:

Silver Medals: Shimomura Kanzan (25)
              Hishida Shunsō (24)
              Takeuchi Seihō (34)

Bronze Medals: Saigō Kogetsu (25)
               Yokoyama Taikan (30)
               Honda Tenjō (30)
               Terazaki Kōgyō (32)
               Kawai Gyokudō (25)
               Yamada Keichū (30)
               Ogata Gekkō (39)
               Kobori Tomoto (34)
               Imao Keinen (53)
               Nomura Bunkyō (44)

Certificates: Utsumi Kichidō (48)
              Yūki Somei (23)
              Kikuchi Hōbun (35)
              Yamamoto Shunkyo (27)

—and a dozen more, including some painters still in their teens. Youth, at any rate, was clearly the motif of the Japan Painting Association; it is interesting how many of these painters were to prove to be the great names in Japanese-style painting during the ensuing decades. The increasingly large sizes of the individual paintings were also significant, since they indicated the general trend among avant-garde painters to aim their work at exhibition, rather than toward decorative use in the average Japanese home.
V. FROM THE LATE 1890’S TO THE END OF THE MEIJI ERA

It was in the midst of the increasingly fruitful creative activities of the Japanese Art Association that the aforementioned "Art School Affair" occurred, early in 1898. Okakura was forced to resign his important positions, and he was followed by fully half of his teaching staff. This event, and the almost immediate formation of the Japan Art Academy, were, as we have suggested, to mark another turning point in Meiji art.

The new Academy was not without its supporters. The important American collector, Bigelow, contributed funds for its construction, and Hashimoto Gahō painted a number of large screens to help pay for the initial costs of the school. A site was selected at Yanaka, a secluded area northwest of Ueno Park, and construction was already completed in September of the same year.

The Academy consisted of one main building and several smaller ones. In the rear of the central building Okakura had his own private study, packed with Japanese, Chinese and foreign books of all kinds; but he seems to have spent most of his waking hours in the Academy office, earnestly engaged in conducting the school's business. Okakura's own residence was built only a few minutes from the school, and just across from the school grounds itself were constructed eight faculty residences, into which Taikan, Kanzan, Shunsō, Kogetsu, Kōgyō, Tomoto and others moved with their families.

All concerned worked practically day and night, and on October 15th the opening ceremonies of the Academy were held. On the same day, in combination with the Fifth Exhibition of the Japan Painting Association, the First Exhibition of the Japan Art Academy was opened on the school premises. Hashimoto Gahō, Supervisor of the Academy, read a moving speech in which he pointed out that the new buildings were only
the skeleton of the school: that it was up to all the instructors to make it into a real seat of knowledge and inspiration in the arts.

These sudden moves and changes were not, of course, made without considerable sacrifices on the part of the artists and their families. Such "art colonies" had of course existed before in other countries, but this one was characterized by a remarkable spirit of selflessness, vitalized by the love and respect the members felt for their leader Okakura.

It may be of interest to note here just what were some of Okakura's ideals for the future of Japanese art, the theories that he had, over the years, in classroom, conference or private conversation, been imparting to his students, colleagues, superiors and friends.

Perhaps the clearest exposition of Okakura's ideals appears in a Report of his issued in 1890. Fenollosa had just returned to the United States, and Okakura was now independently established as Director of the Art School and Chief of the Art Section at the Imperial Museum. He was at last free to formulate his own individual views and aspirations for the future of Japanese art.

In this report Okakura set up six basic principles for the modern artist:

First, while guarding the old traditions and attempting to create a new art, the artist must strive for the expression of his own individual personality; he will make reference to foreign styles, ancient Far Eastern styles, and to nature itself, but the result must be an assimilation of these elements within the artist's own subconscious.

Second, the ancient techniques must not be lost. For an artist to discard the rich heritage bequeathed him by the masters of the past would be simply to return to primitivity, to start again from scratch; at the same time it must be remembered that study of the ancients is primarily for the purpose of enriching one's own background, never simply for the purpose of imi-
tating them.

Third is the artist's spirit: If the artist is not imbued with passion, how is he to move his viewers? if he is not possessed of exalted sentiments, how is he to lead his viewers above and beyond the actual confines of the paintings?

Fourth is technique: however keen the artist's spirit, without a mastery of technique he must fail to accomplish his purpose. Yet technique must always be subordinated to originality; and new ideas must be accompanied by new techniques.

Fifth is dignity, nobility—qualities all too often lacking in modern painting. Yet these qualities are not simply a result of education, they must be inherent in the artist's character. An artist must remain a part of the world of men, yet never let his art be degraded by mundane matters.

Sixth is the particular necessity for advances in two fields: historical painting, and Ukiyo-e. Landscapes, flowers, Buddhist and Taoist figures—each form has its own ancient technique; and in the field of historical painting also, the Old Tosa scrolls set high standards for us to follow. Yet, though historical paintings are numerous today, they seldom indeed succeed in moving us to sentiments of compassion for the ancients, or admiration for our country; new methods must be found for such paintings. As for Ukiyo-e, many have been the masterpieces produced in the past centuries, but the form has somehow not yet fulfilled itself in the new age. Of course, by "Ukiyo-e" I do not mean simply the usual glamorous depiction of men, women and children; for Ukiyo-e, like the ancient picture scrolls, should also endeavor to be a record of the customs and appearance of the modern age. Indeed, historical painting may be called the Ukiyo-e of the past; and Ukiyo-e, the historical paintings of the modern age. I look for both forms to develop increasingly in the future.

Okakura closed his remarks by adding that such suggestions were, of course, easy to make but difficult to effect. Nor were the present shortcomings really the fault of the artists them-
selves, what with the upheavals and changes of the new age, and the difficulty in making even a bare living through art—much less thinking of producing masterpieces for posterity. However, with the proper encouragement and leadership, he looked for great things in the Japanese painting of the future. Such were Okakura’s sentiments at the commencement of his career as an independent leader of Japanese art education, and we have no reason to suppose that he saw fit to change them radically during the subsequent years of his life.

To return to the opening of the Japan Art Academy, and its First Exhibition, the two revered painters Hashimoto Gahō and Matsumoto Fūko (1840-1923; Plate 20b) served as judges, selecting some two hundred paintings for display. Of course, in judging the size of the exhibit, it must be remembered that—unlike some of the monster exhibitions of later times—most of the paintings conformed to the traditional kakemono sizes, though there were, to be sure, several large screens, and a few exceptionally large paintings by Taikan and Kanzan.

The painters included the major artists of the new Academy itself, together with other eminent painters in the Japanese style, from Kyoto as well as Tokyo. The judges awarded a certain number of points to each painting, and the distribution of awards was as follows:

Silver Medals: Taikan, Kanzan, Kōgyō, Gekkō.
Bronze Medals: Kogetsu, Shunsō, Tomoto, Gyokudō, Keichū, Tanryō, and Kimura Buzan.

It is interesting to note that, in addition to the discussion and criticism of the paintings by the judges and Academy members, the need was felt for outside criticism; thus, shortly after the exhibition, five of the celebrities of the day—including the important novelists Ozaki Kōyō and Takayama Chogyū—were invited to engage in a round-table discussion of the exhibition. Such innovations were a clear indication that the new Academy realized it was no longer under Government sponsorship, and had to seek the interest and support of the public at large. For, al-
though the Academy had its financial backers, such could not be depended upon indefinitely, and, in effect, the only permanent source of support the Academy had was in the sale of its members' artistic works. The official number of such regular members was set at twenty-six, nominally about half painters and the rest sculptors, lacquerers, designers and metalworkers. The painters, however, actually formed the nucleus and guiding force of the group.

As will be recalled, this was essentially a young group, composed of men in their late twenties and early thirties. The oldest man among them was Okakura, who was thirty-seven and, it would appear, revered almost as a god by the members of the group, who never quite forgot that initial spirit of sacrifice for a common ideal which had impelled them to resign from the Art School in the first place. The members usually wore the same type of Japanese-style clothing, and shut themselves up all day in their studios, hard at work. At night they would go out together for drinking and relaxation—in both their work and pleasure resembling indeed the heroes of the Restoration of a generation or so before.

Each of the Academy members received just twenty-five yen in salary. All of their productions were donated to the Academy, and the proceeds from their sale formed the basis for the group's existence. However inexpensive the cost of living was in those days, it may well be imagined that the artists' families had no easy time of it.

Although the young Academy members were to constitute the great names of the coming generation of painters, at the time they were only beginning to be established, and proceeds from the sale of their works alone were of course hardly sufficient to operate the Academy. Nevertheless, it was upon the Academy exhibitions—in which painting predominated—that the group pinned their hopes for survival. Here they strove to lead the coming generation of artists, and indicate the new paths that Japanese painting must take while not losing sight of its own
tradition.

The activities of the Academy included, nominally, all facets of Japanese arts and crafts. In effect, however, it was only in the Department of Painting that advanced work was undertaken and students given instruction. The students lived in a dormitory, the second floor of which consisted of the studios of Taikan, Kanzan, Kogetsu and Shunsō. These four painters were in charge of instruction, and each student selected one of them as his teacher. Among the first students of the Academy may be mentioned Kimura Buzan, Uehara Konen and Okada Baison.

In addition to the usual instruction, lecturers were sometimes brought in from outside the Academy, and Okakura himself often lectured to the group as a whole on his ideas of the future of Japanese-style art. Frequent meetings were held for the criticism of each other's painting, and a common theme was often assigned to the group, each to interpret it in his own way, and then later compare the results.

Possessed as they were with genius, and with a firm and unified conviction of the need for revivifying Japanese-style painting, it is no wonder that the Art Academy group was to form the effective nucleus of native painting from the end of the Meiji Period nearly to the present day.

Okakura made clear the foundations of his, and the Academy's philosophy: you should honor tradition; but under that tradition develop your own individuality; and always be Japanese.

One of the methods employed by the Academy for self-improvement was to hold monthly exhibitions, the subject of which was usually settled beforehand (e.g., "Winter Plum-trees," "Winter Sky," "Spring Sunrise," etc.). To these private exhibitions the Academy members brought their best efforts on a given theme, and cash prizes were awarded. The first such exhibition was held in October of 1899, with contributions not only by the teachers and students of the Academy, but also by such members of the Japan Painting Association as Gekkō,
Tanryō, Hanko and others. At the discussion groups that followed the exhibitions, such non-academic Western-style painters as Kawamura Kiyoo (Plate 49b) sometimes even took part.

Interestingly enough, at the time of the fourth such monthly exhibition Okakura found it necessary to remark that—doubtless due to the financial difficulties they were experiencing—he had begun to note in the paintings a tendency toward cleverness and overemphasis on technique. He warned that in the future the size of the painting, and the vigor of its execution, would not be taken into account by the judges.

Gradually the assigned subjects of the monthly exhibitions changed from the concrete to the abstract. Heated discussions seem to have been frequent at the meetings, as both the young and the experienced gave their personal views on each other's compositions. Unfortunately, it is difficult today to ascertain just what works were produced for a given exhibition by each painter. We do know, however, that the inspiration and experience derived from this long series of communal exhibitions was tremendous, serving both to stimulate and guide the efforts of a group which had given up security in order to follow Okakura in the creation of a new Japanese art.

While striving to improve the quality of its members' work by means of the monthly school exhibitions, the Academy also sought the attention of the general public with its Painting Exhibitions, held in the Spring and Fall in conjunction with the Japan Painting Association. The latter Association, it will be recalled, had been deprived of its leading painters when the Japan Art Academy was formed, and it was perhaps only natural now that the Academy members should join for exhibition purposes with the group that had chosen to stay behind at the Art School after Okakura's resignation.

The fresh and lively atmosphere of the Art Academy exhibitions brought both extravagant praise and damnation, in which the newspapers and magazines joined, making the period 1899-1900 one of the most colorful in the history of Japanese
art criticism. The Yomiuri, leading cultural newspaper of the
time, even made it a practice of publishing every Sunday an Art
Supplement, in which were featured the recent works of living
painters. Early in 1899 the newspaper selected Okakura and
Gahō as judges in a contest for the best modern paintings on
historical subjects. The contest attracted much public attention,
and the First Prize went to Toyama Shōichi, Professor at the
Imperial University and well known as a master of historical
subjects.

As a result of this contest various discussions arose in
literary and artistic circles on the nature of historical painting.
For example, the eminent novelist Takayama Chogyū main-
tained that historical painting was for the purpose of presenting the
beautiful aspects of man's past. The opposition group was led
by Tsubouchi Shōyō at Waseda University, and the arguments
continued on into the following year, the two groups being
joined by less artistic elements who maintained that exact de-
lineation of past customs and costumes was the principal pur-
pose of historical painting.

Simultaneously, there arose arguments to the effect that
"Japanese-style painting is not pure art," and these were an-
swered by critics who stated that the only painters who really
understood the future of Japanese painting were the members
of the Art Academy. The latter critics were in turn answered
by the poet Masaoka Shiki, who claimed that the future lay in
the improvement of Western painting on Japanese lines. And
so the discussions went on (intensified, doubtless, by the impend-
ing Paris International Exposition), reaching no definite conclu-
sions, but stimulating artists and public alike in the search for
a new art for the new Japan.

In October of 1899 the Second Exhibition of the Art Aca-
demy was held in conjunction with the Seventh Exhibition of the
Painting Association, and at the same time the winners in the
historical painting contest were shown. The next regular ex-
hibition was in April of the following year; in addition to the
regular exhibits were displayed a group of paintings on Japanese musical themes by members of the two groups. The latter effort was, unlike the historical display of the year before, something entirely new in Japan, and both painters and public were stimulated by the idea. In actual practice, however, the successful transference of abstract music into concrete art-forms proved beyond the power of Japanese painting, and the newspaper critics were unanimous in proclaiming the effort imprudent. Nevertheless it is interesting as an extension of the monthly “theme-exhibitions” of the Art Academy, and an indication that in their experimental enthusiasm, artists in the Japanese style were not far behind the avant-garde in Europe.

The Exhibition of the following autumn, 1900, was notable for masterpieces. The Gold Medal went to Kanzan for his moving depiction of a scene from the Tales of the Heike, entitled “Dewdrops at Ōhara.” Seven painters were awarded the Silver medal: Shunsō, for his magnificent “Cranes among the Clouds”—which, unfortunately, disappeared into a foreign collection immediately; Taikan, for his penetrating study of the female warrior Mokuran; Gyokudō for his “Waterfowl” (Plate 26b); the woman painter of Kyoto, Uemura Shōen (1875-1949; Plate 35a), for her “Full Bloom”—depicting a Kyoto bride; and in addition, Toshikata, Shōnen and Kōgyō.

These exhibitions were notable not only for their quality, but also for their vitality and, it must be added, quantity. For they had become the focal point for all of the younger painters in the Japanese style, whether in Tokyo, Kyoto, or the smaller centers, and the number of paintings shown at each exhibit usually totalled seven or eight hundred. On Saturdays and Sundays the number of visitors per day often exceeded a thousand. This was indeed the golden age of the Japan Art Academy and the Painting Exhibitions.

With the Tenth Painting Exhibition of April, 1901, such masters as Shunsō and Taikan departed even further from the conventions of the traditional Japanese style. The critics were
quick in their reactions and derisively termed these “mōrō (misty, hazy) paintings,” a term that soon became the equivalent of “ultra-impressionism,” and was closely associated with the Art Academy in general.

The Academy and Painting Association members were, however, hardly to be treated as a homogeneous group. The most daring painter was Taikan, the most original, Shunsō. Closely following them in the search for new methods was Kogetsu. Kanzan, however, had studied deeply the Kanō and Tosa styles, and strove to create a new Yamato-e style based upon tradition. Of the group, Kōgyō and Tomoto were clearly the most conservative. Kōgyō loved the techniques of the ancients, and was a master of all subjects; of the Academy group he was doubtless the most popular among the general public, but it cannot be denied that his work lacked in depth. Tomoto was strictly a painter of the Tosa tradition, and though he found means of personal expression within that style, he could not escape a certain rusticity and lack of gracefulness.

Gyokudō had been trained in the Kyoto Shijō style, later coming under Gahō’s influence; the clean, moderate quality of his painting was, however, a characteristic of his own personality. Kason was another of the Academy painters who never really escaped the limits of his tradition. Toshikata and Eisen were trained in Ukiyo-e methods; Hanko sought other styles, but was allied with them in his concentration on paintings of fair women. Their paintings carried the most appeal for the general public, but were undeniably lacking in nobility. As for the leader of the group, Gahō, he was the master of many styles and moods, the most experienced of them all in the total range of traditional Japanese art, but at the same time, well aware that art must change with each generation; he had his critics, but was generally conceded first place in honor among the painters in the native style.

Though Taikan and Shunsō certainly constituted the most controversial members of the Academy, the experimental spirit
colored the work of all, and, accordingly, they were hardly favored by the general public. Orders for paintings were rare, and financial distress led to a gradual decline in enthusiasm.

In 1901 the new director of the Art School, Masaki Nao-hiko, proposed a reconciliation with the Art Academy, requesting the services of two professors from among their numbers. This request was complied with, and Kōgyō and Kanzan were selected for the positions. In October of this year the Eleventh Painting Exhibition was held, but without its customary excitement. Though Okakura was still Chief Judge, and Gahō and Fūko were still Special Judges, beside them sat Kawabata Gyokusčō, leader of the group which had refused to quit the Art School despite Okakura's dismissal.

Other judges included such outsiders as Shunkyo and Hōbun from Kyoto; and Taikan and Shunsō were missing. Clearly the nature of the Exhibitions was changing, and Art Academy influence was diminishing. In November, as soon as the exhibition had closed, Okakura put the declining Academy— together with his native land—behind him, and set off to see the regions that had given birth to much of East Asiatic civilization, India.

Okakura was absent from Japan a full year. Upon his return from India, he sent Taikan and Shunsō to Calcutta, from where they were supposedly to set out upon a commission to decorate the palace of one of the native rulers. This plan did not bear fruition, however, and the two returned to Japan soon after. [Cf. Frontispiece I.]

In the meantime, during Okakura's absence, the Twelfth Exhibition had been held in March, 1902. Unlike the previous exhibition, this one proved a unified effort, with the members united in an attempt to restore the esprit of the group. The ten winners of the Silver Medal were: Shunsō (for his "ōshō-kun," Plate 27b), Kanzan, Kōgyō, Taikan, Hanko, Kason, Seihō, Gekkō, Chikuha and Gyokudō, and their works were among the best they had ever produced.
Nevertheless, this was to prove the last pinnacle in the group's efforts. The Thirteenth Exhibition of the following October, though commemorating the Fifth Anniversary of the Japan Art Academy and exhibiting a total of some eight hundred works, was not up to its usual standards, and public interest also reached a new low. The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Exhibitions of the following year represented, if anything, an even further decline, for both Taikan and Shunsō were missing, and Kanzan was engaged in study abroad. These marked, at any rate, the end of the Japan Painting Association and Art Academy Exhibitions.

Although painters in the Japanese style, Taikan and Shunsō were unusual in their appreciation of Western painting, and they had long wished for a chance to study the art treasures of the Western world, as a means of realizing their own aim to renovate Japanese art. In March of 1902 the two painters even formed a society to gather sponsors for a study trip abroad, but sufficient funds were nowhere forthcoming.

In 1904, however, as the clouds of the Russo-Japanese War were approaching, Okakura was called to America to become Curator of Far Eastern Art at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and with him he brought, in March of that year, the lacquer artist Rokkaku Shisui and the two painters Taikan and Shunsō. Up to the time of their return to Japan in August of the following year, the artists busied themselves with arranging exhibitions of their work in New York, Boston and London, hoping thus to help strengthen the finances of the declining Art Academy. Even more important, in the painters' own words, "Though we have not made Western painting our profession, through contact with it we have strengthened our own resolve."

At home in Japan, however, with the effective leaders of the Art Academy all abroad, the remaining members tended to split into cliques: the pupils of Gahō formed their own Futaba Society, and the students in the atelier of Kōgyō formed the Bijutsu Kenseikai. Other members formed the Hatsuka So-
ciety, holding monthly meetings and exhibitions for mutual criticism; at first—late in 1903—Okakura and Gahō still took part in the new group, but later Hanko and Gyokudō assumed effective leadership, and new members were added.

No efforts by its members proved of any avail in solving the financial difficulties of the Art Academy, however. In 1905, with its seventy-ninth number, the Academy’s journal *Japanese Art* passed into private ownership. In October of the same year, Okakura left again for Boston. In March of 1906 the principal remaining members of the group—Kōgyō, Gyokudō, Hanko, Kason, Toshikata, Kanzan and Buzan—under the name of the Art Academy opened the Japan Painting Exhibition, but with little public response.

The leaders of the Art Academy, though doubtless discouraged with the practical difficulties of the organization, still felt strongly the need for cooperative effort. They also felt the need to get away from Tokyo. Thus it came about that in 1906 the Academy officially moved from the capital out into a seaside hamlet in the Province of Hitachi, named Izura. Okakura, returned from America, remained head of the Academy, with Taikan, Shunsō, Buzan and Kanzan in charge of painting. In addition, a separate Division of Sculpture was set up at Nara—mainly due to the location there of Niiro Chūnosuke, who was currently engaged in the repair of national treasures of sculpture.

The wild, isolated beauty of the new site proved a great stimulus to the members of the group. They forgot their urban involvements and devoted themselves anew to their art, calling the spot an “Oriental Barbizon.” Though there were no permanent students out here in the country, groups of younger painters would often come from Tokyo to stay a month or so and study; among them were Yasuda Yukihiiko (Plate 36b), Imamura Shikō (Plate 37b) and Odaka Chikuha. The isolated village became a kind of Kōyasan [i.e., Mecca] to young aspirants in the field of Japanese painting.
The principal loss to the group in moving to the country was a ready means of public exhibit. Fortunately, however, the Government had just at this time decided that official sponsorship was warranted in the art field, and set up the "Bunten," art exhibits under the auspices of the Ministry of Education. These unexpectedly provided a free and ready outlet for the work of the painters—who, though they had their critics, had no fear of being overlooked by an impartial jury. Spurred on and inspired by their new surroundings and new opportunities, the members of the rejuvenated Academy produced some of their most famous works: Kanzan, his screen "Autumn in the Forest" (Plate 7) and his long handscroll "The Imperial Visit to Ōhara" (for a detail, see Plate 34a); Shunsō his "Saint Kenju" (Plate 31b); and whether they were actually painted there or not, the memory of Izura was to live in the work of each of the painters there during the years to come.

If we have dwelt at some length on the activities of the Japan Art Academy it is because we feel this group to have represented the best that Meiji art was to produce. More than any other group, this movement led by such men as Okakura, Gahō, Taikan, Shunsō, Kanzan, was to point the way to the future of Japanese art, and at the same time to realize some of the finest expressions of that ideal that we were to find.

The First Bunten exhibition of the fortieth year of Meiji (1907) marks another epoch-making step in the development of Meiji art, in effect, consolidating all of the varied efforts of the Meiji thirties. Before turning to this last phase of our account, let us first review the previous decade of activity on the part of Japanese-style painters not in the Academy group, together with the work of painters in the Western style.

Perhaps the most striking element in the Japanese art world of the late 1890's and early 1900's was the formation of all kinds of minor societies for the promulgation of special styles of Japanese painting. Although there were at least a dozen such notable groups, they were divided about evenly be-
tween the advocates of traditional styles of Japanese painting, and those who sought new means of expression employing more or less traditional techniques. Quite separate, again, were the advocates of purely European-style painting, for which the White Horse Society of Kuroda Seiki formed a rallying point.

Soon after Okakura’s resignation from the Tokyo Art School, Asai Chū had been appointed professor there, presumably through the efforts of the declining Meiji Art Society. However, Asai was soon after sent to Europe for advanced study, so that his students never really had a chance to challenge those of Kuroda in the same school. As we have seen, the Meiji Art Society disbanded after their last exhibition in the year 1900. Such painters as Koyama, Asai and Matsuoka were prominent in forming the Pacific Painting Society which proved to be its successor. Other members of the old group, such as Kawamura Kiyoo and Goseda Hōryū formed their own Tomoe Society, but this did not prove any great success, and it was principally the White Horse Society and the Pacific Painting Society that dominated the Western-style painting scene.

Contributions from Japan were numerous at the Paris Exposition of 1897; Kuroda and Kume accompanied the paintings, and it was also at this time that Asai Chū was sent to Europe. Okada Saburoosuke was already studying in Paris on a government scholarship; Wada Eisaku had at first gone to Europe on his own, later to receive government support. At the time of the Exposition, Koyama, Gōta and Oshiro also went to Paris, together with a number of other Japanese painters in the Western style, including even Nakamura Fusetsu, who had often proclaimed that a painter had no need for such experience abroad. Among the other painters who arrived in Paris at this time were Yoshida Hiroshi and Nakagawa Hachirō, who set something of a precedent by going to America first, selling their water-colors there, and then setting off for Europe on the proceeds. They were followed in this method by Kanokogi, Mitsu- tani (both Plate 50) and several others.
It was only natural that when these painters returned to Japan to show the work they had done abroad, there should have been certain reactions. Thus when Kuroda displayed, at the 1900 autumn exhibition of the White Horse Society, an even more daring nude painted during his second visit to Paris, it was banned by the police. The painters were supported by prominent writers, and the controversy raged for some time, without, however, moving the police to reverse their decision.

The Pacific Painting Society held its first exhibit early in 1902, with the works of Yoshida Hiroshi, Nakamura Fusetsu and Mitsutani Kunishirō, among others, drawing considerable attention. In 1904 Kanokogi Takeshirō and Kawai Shinzō returned from France and added their influence to the group. They had both (together with Nakamura Fusetsu) studied for some time with Jean Paul Laurens in Paris, and they brought back his impressive “Luther and his Disciples” for display in Japan. This painting drew considerable favorable comment, much to the pleasure of his Japanese pupils. Hitherto, the principal foreign painter included in the Tokyo exhibits had been Raphael, Collin teacher of Kuroda Seiki and Okada Saburosuke. Now the two French painters found themselves being employed in the competition between their pupils in the respective Pacific Painting, and White Horse societies. The former group—like their French master—tended to emphasize design; the latter, color and plein air.

It was about this time that Kanokogi moved to the Kansai district. Already, as we have noted, in 1902, after returning from abroad, Asai Chū had left Tokyo for a professorship at the Kyoto Higher Arts School. Asai gave private lessons at his own home, but in 1905, through the efforts of Kanokogi, a separate atelier was constructed and named the Kansai Art Academy, with Asai as its director. The Academy’s first exhibit had to lean heavily on contributions from the Tokyo area, but largely through the efforts of Asai and Kanokogi it succeeded in arousing renewed interest in Western-style art in the Kansai
district.

The years 1904-1905 saw the Russo-Japanese War, but unlike the case of the earlier war with China, few artists went to the front, and few notable paintings were produced on the subject. During the same years there was a great increase in the number of magazines published, and it became common for them to include masterpieces of Western art in their frontispieces. Art journals also increased in number, including the *Bijutsu Shimpō*, commenced in 1902, which emphasized Western art. The White Horse Society began its own journal in 1905, with Kuroda, Kume and Wada writing often on the appreciation of Western masterpieces. It was only natural that public interest should gradually grow in regard to Western art, and from about the year 1902 applicants for the study of Western-style art began to predominate at the Tokyo Art School.

This was a period of great activity and ferment in Japanese art circles, and among the critics and writers who had come increasingly to concern themselves with art. There was no unity of opinion, however, even among the members of the two principal factions—painters in the Western style, and painters in the Japanese style—and no attempt to reconcile the elements within each group. Painters in the Western style had in common an allegiance to the Paris that had trained them, but in Japan itself they acted more like rival enemies than workers in the same cause. Painters in the Japanese style were divided into the two main groups of those who wished simply to carry on the traditions of the previous generations, and those who, though taking ancient Japanese art styles and methods as their basis, combined these with such elements, Western or Japanese, as might enable them to express their own originality the better.

As we have seen, the only real meeting ground of the various styles and groups was the National Industrial Fairs, which had been held in 1877, 1881, 1890, 1895, and 1903, the first three in Tokyo, and the last two in Kyoto and Osaka respectively. In these Fairs, of course, painting was only one of
the exhibits, though one that came to draw more and more public attention. With the Ministry of Education's "Bunten" exhibition of 1907, the painting world at last found full official recognition.

Only the year before, Saionji had become Prime Minister, with Makino as Minister of Education. Makino had, from the time of his ambassadorship to Italy and Austria, been greatly interested in European governmental methods of encouraging art, and their applicability to Japan. There were also several other officials and advisors in high positions who advocated official support of an annual art exhibition. Thus through the efforts of these government officials who had been impressed by European methods (and particularly those in France) of officially encouraging art, the Bunten exhibitions were born.

The judges at the First Bunten exhibition numbered twenty-three for Japanese-style painting, thirteen for Western-style painting, and ten for sculpture. The selection of judges in the Japanese-style division was naturally broader than that of the more restricted exhibitions, and in addition to such men as Okakura, Gyokushō, Gahō, Kanzan, Taikan, Tomoto and Kōgyō, included several Kyoto artists, in addition to a few art critics and scholars. However, there was an almost total disregard of painters in the Japanese traditions of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—the pupils and followers of such men as Kazan, Bunchō, Chinzan, and the "Literary Men's Style" in general. These painters were not slow in protesting the unfairness of the selection, and immediately formed a new society of their own, which found considerable support among the conservative upper classes, for whom the new fad for Western art, and for experimental Japanese art, had little appeal.

At the same time, the artists of the "Neo-Japanese" style, realizing that their present official recognition was not necessarily perpetual, accordingly formed a new group of their own, the Kokuga Gyokuseikai.

Despite the protests from painters of the conservative
schools, the Bunten exhibition opened in October of 1907. The total number of entries was 635 for Japanese-style paintings, 329 for Western-style paintings, and forty-six for sculpture; from these the works selected for exhibit numbered eighty-nine, eighty-three and fourteen, respectively, in addition to works by the judges, which numbered ten, eight and two for the respective categories. The total number of works exhibited was 206.

The awards of the exhibition generally followed the allegiance of the judges; in the Japanese style, the Art Academy and Art School members predominated, with a number of Kyoto painters in addition. No First Prize was given, but Second Prizes went to Shunsō (for his "Saint Kenju," Plate 31a), Noda Kyūho and Kijima Okoku (1877-1938; for his "Autumn Shower," Plate 32b). In the Western-style division, both judges and selections were divided between members of the rival White Horse and Pacific Painting societies. There was only one Second Prize awarded, to Wada Sanzō, a graduate of the Art School, for his evocative "South Wind" (Plate 46). The scarcity of top prizes is explained simply by the fact that commencing this year (with the Tokyo Municipal Industrial Fair of a few months earlier) works by judges were eliminated from the prize competitions.

In opposition to the Government Exhibit, the traditional painters held their own First Exhibition, in conjunction with the Forty-first Art Association Exhibit, displaying over seven hundred works. Besides the group's own leaders, it is interesting to note that Gyokushō and Araki Kampo also acted as judges, in addition to judging at the Government Exhibit. Further, several of the more conservative members of the Art School group also acted as judges. Curiously enough, Uemura Shōen (Plate 35a) exhibited works at both exhibitions, and from both received a Third Prize. This doubtless reflected her position as a Kyoto woman painter not very strongly allied to any faction. (It may be noted, in passing, that this same year the Kyoto Municipal Painting School was founded).
The following year the traditional Japanese group held their Second Exhibit, but it was no great success, and they accordingly decided to direct their efforts more toward gaining entry into the Government Exhibition. A new Minister of Education, Komatsubara, had been appointed and the group’s efforts proved successful, six of their members being named as judges for the Second Bunten exhibition.

At this development, however, the members of the Neo-Japanese painting group became indignant and determined to exhibit no works, instead arranging their own exhibition. The balance of the Second Bunten exhibition thus fell to the conservative Japanese group, which, however, put up a poor showing in comparison with the independent Neo-Japanese group. With the Third Bunten exhibition the Neo-Japanese group was reconciled and exhibited with the other painters in the Japanese style, Second Prizes going to Shunsō and Odake Kokkan. In the Western-style painting division Second Prizes went to Nakazawa Hiromitsu (Plate 54b) and Yamamoto Morinosuke (Plate 58a).

With the Meiji forties [1907 ff.] several of the pioneers of Meiji art passed away, among them Tanomura Chokunyū (Plate 13a) and Asai Chū (1907), Hashimoto Gahō and Mizuno Toshikata—as well as, in England, Fenollosa—(1908), and in 1911 one of the greatest of all, Hishida Shunsō. The previous decade had already seen the deaths of such important painters as Kubota Beisen and Yamamoto Hōsui (1906), Kawanabe Mitate (1905), Yamana Tsurayoshi, Yamazaki Senko and Morikawa Sobun (1902), Taki Katei (1901), Kozaka Shōdō (Plate 29b) and Harada Naojirō (1899), and Kishi Chikudō (1897; Plate 3), among others.

With various changes in the judges, the annual Bunten exhibitions continued as scheduled. The work of the Art Academy members continued to draw the greatest attention, as in the Fourth Exhibit of 1910, where Taikan and Kōgyō exhibited the long scrolls they had painted during a trip to China, and Kanzan
and Shunsō also produced works that may be counted among their masterpieces.

With the prosperity that followed the Russo-Japanese War the demand for Japanese-style paintings increased greatly. Excepting the already established masters, however, there was no generally accepted standard for judging the artistic merit, and monetary value, of new paintings. With the establishment of the annual Government Exhibitions, however, both the art dealers and the public found a ready method of assessing the value of a given artist. It soon came about that the prizewinners at the Bunten Exhibitions found themselves immediately supported by dealers, and sometimes even by wealthy patrons. Hitherto impoverished artists came into demand overnight.

Even the fact of having been accepted for exhibition at the Government Exhibit proved a vital point in an artist's livelihood. The same held true among painters in Western style, and sculptors, although the demand for Japanese-style works was still by far the greatest.

Since the results of the Bunten Exhibitions were so vital in the future of an artist, it may well be imagined that the responsibility of the judges was great. However, it will be remembered that among painters in the Japanese style the master-apprentice system was still very strongly entrenched; the student owed allegiance to the painter in whose atelier he had received his training, and the master was naturally anxious to see his pupil succeed. This factor could not but color the decisions of the judges—the more so in that it is no easy matter even for impartial critics to judge the comparative ability and genius of young artists working in experimental styles.

Combining, as they did, the efforts of the Art School and Art Academy groups, it was only natural that the Neo-Japanese judges should have dominated the selection of winners in the Japanese-style category. Indeed, in glancing at the winners during the first five years of the Bunten exhibitions, painters of the traditional schools only occasionally received Third Prizes, and
only Ōkoku managed to get a Second Prize.

Thus it came about that following the Fifth Exhibition of 1911 the four principal judges of the traditional school sent in their resignations to the Minister of Education, expressing their disgust with the unfairness of the judging, and their unwillingness to take further part in a contest where they had no effective voice. [It is interesting to note that Yokoyama Taikan, one of the principal objects of their displeasure, was to issue a similar manifesto several decades later, lamenting the fact that Japan was, artistically, becoming a mere colony of France, and expressing a similar fear that native art was in danger of disappearing.]

The resignation and accompanying manifesto by four important members of the Bunten Committee naturally aroused considerable comment in the press. The Ministry of Education itself was anxious not to appear one-sided or prejudiced in regard to the only government art salon. Thus in May of the following year (1912, the last year of Meiji) the Bunten organization was revised, and the section for Japanese painting divided into two groups. Traditional painting was termed First Division (Ikka) and Neo-Japanese painting Second Division (Nika). Painters could choose the division they wished; there were separate judges for the two divisions.

With July of this year we reach the end of the Meiji Period and the commencement of Taishō. Although the advocates of traditional Japanese painting styles would seem to have won a victory in acquiring their own division at the government exhibitions, in fact, they were digging their own graves. Isolated from the progressive elements which were attempting to adapt Japanese painting to the new age, the conservatives revealed their essential weaknesses and their lack of really active support even among the art public at large.

The Neo-Japanese group, on the other hand, though they did not succeed in their attempt to dominate Japanese-style painting in the Bunten Exhibitions, never failed to win both
public and critical acclaim through the excellence of their individual works.

As we have seen, the institution of art exhibitions was one of the major contributions of the Meiji Era to the development of modern Japanese art, and the Government Exhibitions, in effect, served to unify all the preceding efforts in the direction of public education. In many ways the final years of the Meiji Era were to prove a peak, not only for the Era itself, but in the total history of Japanese art. All of the efforts of such pioneer leaders as Fenollosa and Okakura were to find their culmination here, and Japanese art both in native and Western styles may be said to have achieved a level of quality and originality that was to provide both a guide and an inspiration for the generations to come.
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I. SCULPTURE IN THE FIRST DECADE OF MEIJI

1

Social Changes and the Situation with Traditional Sculptors

Although the arts of carving and modeling had been known in highly advanced forms from ancient times, the concept of "sculpture" as a unified art form hardly existed in the early Meiji Period. There were, to be sure, highly skilled craftsmen in the fields of Buddhist and Shinto sculpture and ornamentation, in netsuke carving, the making of dolls and marionettes, and all kinds of architectural sculpture. But each trade was considered a separate skill, with its own traditional nomenclature.

The various arts of the traditional sculptors were supported almost entirely by the temples and shrines, the Shōgun and the various lords and samurai. Thus with the fall of the Shogunate in 1868 and the subsequent religious and social reforms, much of the traditional patronage of the sculptors disappeared entirely, and many of these artisans were forced to seek other means of livelihood.

Already in the previous Edo Period (1600-1868), with the decline of Buddhism the art of the Buddhist sculptor had degenerated likewise, and in the late Edo and early Meiji periods the only atelier of note was that of Takamura Tōun. Tōun is best known today as the teacher of Takamura Kōun, who led the revival of wood sculpture in the mid-Meiji period. The latter had, it so happened, just completed his eleven-year
period of apprenticeship as a Buddhist sculptor when the edict banning the dual practice of Buddhism and Shintoism was promulgated (April, 1875). We have already (p. 13) seen the plight of such men as Kōun, their profession abolished almost before their eyes, reduced to carving umbrella handles and toys to eke out a bare existence. Other sculptors, such as the skilled traditional court carvers Gotō, Ishikawa and Shimamura, all men of great attainment in their profession, had to cater to the foreign trade at Yokohama, carving dolls and ornaments for souvenirs.

At the same time, the purpose of sculpture was changing radically. Hitherto, public, practical use had been the end; now, appreciation, often on an individual basis, became the purpose, and the carving of dolls, netsuke and household ornaments emerged as full-fledged professions, where they had hitherto been considered but insignificant crafts.

2

The Founding of the Technological Art School and the Development of Western-style sculpture

The pioneer in the introduction of Western methods of modeling and sculpture was Vincenzo Ragusa [1841-1927], who arrived in Japan to teach at the Technological Art School in 1876. The Japanese government had set up already in the third year of Meiji (1870) a Ministry of Technology, and in the following year a Technological School under its administration. Foreign teachers in the fields of engineering; mechanics, electricity, architecture, chemistry and mining were brought to Japan to instruct in the school, which in 1876 extended its work to cultural fields by adding an Art School. As we have seen (p. 11 ff.), the Italian government cooperated in this plan and arranged for three able artists and teachers—Fontanesi, Cappelletti and Ragusa—to come to Japan.

In charge of sculpture was Ragusa, one of the most pro-
mising young Italian sculptors of the day; he arrived in Japan in November of 1876 under a three-year contract.

Although a few influential officials of the government realized the importance of the subject, the Japanese public at large—whether educated or not—was of course in total ignorance of the nature and value of Western sculpture. Thus, although there were a fair number of applicants for the painting course, students had to be persuaded to enter the sculpture course by means of exemption from fees and other inducements. They had also to endure considerable joking by friends and relatives as to what they intended to do with those "big plaster dolls" even after they had finished them.

It may be imagined that Ragusa had no easy time in instructing students who had never even heard of his subject before. He believed, however, in practice rather than theory, so that the language barrier at least proved no obstacle. At the beginning, in addition to sketching with crayon, each student was given a plaster model to copy in modeling clay—the first time that such material had been used in Japan. Ragusa would then oversee each student's efforts, pointing out errors, or sometimes taking over the refashioning of a faulty piece himself. In the afternoon, he would go to his room to engage in his own original work, while his students also attempted new subjects, here using live models for the first time.

Following such basic instruction, work was attempted in plaster of Paris, and in marble. Later a Japanese professor from the Medical College was brought in twice a week to give lectures on anatomy.

Despite, however, the earnest efforts of Ragusa and the others, in June of 1882 the Sculpture Department was abolished, and in December of the same year the Technological Art School was closed entirely. The reasons for this development are nowhere recorded, but lay doubtless in the financial difficulties experienced by the Japanese government following the Satsuma Rebellion (which, indeed, caused the abolition of the entire
Ministry of Technology), together with a growing feeling against fostering foreign art forms while leaving the traditional native art neglected.

With the closing of the school, each of the twenty students was given a certificate and sent out into the world to make his way as a sculptor. Unfortunately, however, Western-style sculptors were in even less demand than were native sculptors, and many of the students had to turn to other work. Even those who were able to continue with their art had great difficulty in obtaining materials, now that the only Western art school was no longer in existence. Several of the sculptors, however, were able to continue work on their own funds, and even take in pupils, continuing the work of Ragusa, who had returned to Italy in August of 1882.

Ragusa, in addition to his teaching work, had completed much original sculpture during his stay in Japan—including several busts of eminent men and of Japanese ladies—which formed a model for later sculptors in Japan, whether they had studied directly under him or not. Ragusa married a noted Japanese girl painter, Kiyohara Tama [1861-1939], and his bust of her youthful beauty ranks among his masterpieces (see Plate 65). Ragusa left many other memorable works of sculpture behind him, including such subjects as the Kabuki actor Ichikawa Danjurō IX in the role of Sukenori, the statesman Ōkubo, and numerous others, from officials to carpenters and rickshaw-boys.

Although many of the students of Ragusa were forced to turn to other trades, some six of them managed to continue their work as sculptors, notably Ōkuma, Fujita, Kikuchi, Sano, Kondo and Terauchi.

In particular, Ōkuma Ujihiro [1856-1934] had from his student days been recognized for his genius as a sculptor, receiving special instruction from Ragusa, and being appointed his assistant in 1880. He was also the first in the school to master methods of casting—Ragusa having constructed a small
foundry at his own home. Immediately after his graduation in 1882 Ōkuma was placed in charge of architectural decoration at the Kasumigaseki Detached Palace; the following year he was employed by the Ministry of Technology and in 1885 he was employed as sculptor in the construction of the Imperial Palace. In 1888 he went to study in Italy, at the Rome Art School, and later to Paris, returning to Japan in the following year. He took a prominent part in various sculpture societies and the Japan Art Association, and acted as judge at numerous exhibitions and fairs, including the Bunten exhibitions for a period of seven years. He left a number of well-known bronzes, the most famous being his pioneer statue of the Restoration leader Ōmura Masujirō, unveiled in February of 1893 (Plate 60a).

Fujita Bunzō [1861-1934] was also a graduate of 1882. He was fortunate enough to have private means of support, and in 1884 opened a private Sculpture School. Later he was given a post in charge of painting and design in the Ministry of Education, and in 1900 was made a professor in the Tokyo Art School; subsequently he founded the Tokyo Women’s Art School, acting as its Principal. He had already received a prize for his sculpture at the Louisiana Exposition of 1884, and has left a number of well-known bronzes.

Of the other men, Kikuchi Chūtarō [1859-1934], in addition to his own sculpture work, was active in the fields of art appreciation and the plaster reproduction of Western masterpieces of sculpture. Sano Shō [1866-] found employment with the Imperial Household Ministry, handling architectural decoration in such buildings as the Akasaka Detached Palace and the National Diet. Terauchi Shin’ichi was to become famous as a potter.

Besides these men, Ogura Sōjirō [1846-1913], though of an earlier generation, had studied privately under Ragusa; he was one of the pioneers in marble sculpture in Japan, in addition to his work in bronze, which included notable statues of the statesmen Ōkuma and Itō. Among Ogura’s pupils were to be counted
several of the great names of the next generation of sculptors: Shinkai, Kitamura and Takeishi, among others. Thus did Ragusa’s brief but intensive period of teaching in Japan bear fruit in a soil that could hardly be called receptive.

3

The Awakening of Traditional Sculptors

Takamura Kōun, as we have seen, found himself fully trained in the art of the Buddhist sculptor just at the moment that profession ceased to exist. At the same time Japan’s foreign trade through the port of Yokohama came to assume great proportions. Takamura determined that he must break away from the Buddhistic tradition, and produce works more suited to the new age, if he was to continue in the profession of sculptor. As he has recorded in detail in his memoirs, Takamura searched out every example he could find of Western drawing and lithography. He was greatly impressed by the realism of Western art, where every object depicted was drawn in exact imitation of the object itself, rather than in the overall, impressionistic manner of native Japanese art. Thus he took for his subjects the objects around him, and set about “sketching” with knife and chisel. After a year or two of assiduous practice, he relates, he found himself at last freed from the conventions of his traditional training, and ready to produce a new art, combining the skill of the native carver with the eye of the Western sculptor.

Although they were unable, like Takamura Kōun, to adapt themselves to the new age, there were other notable sculptors in the native style, among them, Morikawa Toen (Plate 114b), who was employed as sculptor and painter by the Kasuga Shrine in Nara, and in his late years, from about 1880 until his death at seventy-five in 1894, did important work in the artistic reproduction of ancient works of Japanese sculpture. Among other traditional Meiji sculptors should be mentioned Arakawa Kisai and Kobayashi Jodei; yet their work must be admitted more significant for its technical skill than for its artistic interest.
The Popularity of Ivory Sculpture

While the other native forms of sculpture declined greatly in the early Meiji Period, ivory sculpture alone found great popularity; and this was entirely due to the interest of foreigners. At the beginning, it was the small netsuke carvings which interested foreigners with their intricate, clever carving of curious native customs. This interest soon spread beyond the circle of foreigners in Japan, and developed into a lively export trade. Gradually Japanese netsuke carvers learned to adapt their skill to foreign demand, and began producing larger, independent ivory figures, often exploiting the earthy elements of lower-class Japanese life—subjects that were apparently favored by Western male collectors.

The great popularity of ivory carvings will be apparent from the sculpture exhibited at the First National Industrial Fair of 1877, where important ivory works by Asahi Gyokuzan, Ishikawa Kömei and several others were displayed. The majority of the carvings, however, were still in the netsuke form and of the subjects most favored by exporters—ferry-boats, native minstrels, entertainers and the like. By the time of the Second Fair in 1881 ivory carving had become the real darling of the export trade, and more than one wood carver had changed his profession. In the words of Takamura Kōun, "If it wasn't ivory, it just wasn't sculpture." Further, larger figures became common.

But although this period marked a peak in the popularity of ivory sculpture, it was not to last for long. The export market declined. With the enlargement of the carvings, they lost their intimate qualities, and the greatly increased cost of materials and time made them excessively expensive. Further, foreign interest had lain largely in the decorative depiction of strange customs, whereas the sculptors were increasingly developing a talent for more realistic depiction of more universal subjects,
lacking in the quaintness loved by collectors.

In 1880 several of the major carvers and critics in Tokyo had formed a Sculpture Competition Society for the improvement of carving, and in 1886 they instituted their annual exhibitions. Lecturers were hired on such subjects as anatomy and costume, and self-criticism was taken as the Society's aim.

The Society's achievements became apparent at the time of the Third National Industrial Fair of 1890, where the members displayed their finest works. The most obvious of the changes that had taken place due to the Society's efforts were these: a great increase in the employment of subjects with historical associations—reflecting not only the Society's group studies in the subject, but also the rising nationalist movement in Japanese art. Further, considerable restraint was visible on the earlier tendency of the carvers to concentrate upon superfluous detail. And finally, the works were larger in scale.

Most notable in the last connection was the effort to exceed the natural limits of size in ivory carving. For example, Kaneda's "Giant Eagle," with its thousands of separately carved ivory feathers, on a wooden base. Of the large works of this period extant today, one of the most notable is surely Asahi Gyokuzan's "Court Lady" (Plate 59a), an ivory statuette two feet in height, first exhibited at the Japan Art Association Exhibit of 1901.

But though such artists had succeeded in transcending the natural limits of ivory sculpture, they had, in effect, displaced the need for this material. The special quality of ivory was, of course, its ability to sustain the finest detail in small figures. With the enlargement of such works, broader, more generalized carving became necessary, and it was only natural that the sculptors should eventually return again to the more readily obtainable wood.

Thus did the very effort to make ivory sculpture a full-fledged form result in its death. From this period on, wood became the standard material for the native-style sculptor, and ivory-carving returned to its place among the minor crafts.
II. SCULPTURE IN THE MID-MEIJI PERIOD

1

The Nationalistic Art Movement and the Tokyo Art School

Once the upheavals and changes brought about by the Meiji Restoration had become settled, there was a reaction against the reckless destruction of old things and the excesses of Europeanization. The result was a movement for the preservation of native traditions, a movement as active in the art field as in any other.

The beginnings of this movement had become apparent in art circles as early as the year 1873 when, at the time of the Vienna Exposition, traditional Japanese art objects received unexpected acclaim, making the influential Japanese who accompanied the exhibits conclude that the encouragement of native art might prove an important source for strengthening Japan's financial situation. Thus began the renewed encouragement of such ancient arts as netsuke and other ivory carving, pottery and porcelain, cloisonné and dyeing—this time for a foreign market.

The demand arose also for a similar exposition in Japan, and thus in 1877 the First National Industrial Fair was held. The industrial arts dominated at this Fair, but painting, sculpture and the other arts were also included. This was, of course, an exhibition with primarily economic and practical aims in mind, yet it proved of considerable cultural importance too, for it brought to light many little-known artists and their works. The young sculptor Takamura Kōun exhibited—under the name of his teacher Tōun—a figure of Kannon that took First Prize and received much favorable comment.

With the gradual reappearance of treasures of ancient Japanese art—till now hidden in the storehouses of the temples and the daimyō—interest in and appreciation of the grandeur
of traditional art gradually increased. In 1879 this interest crystallized with the formation of the Ryūichi Society for the preservation and encouragement of Japanese art. According to the founders of the Society, their immediate stimulus had been this very National Industrial Fair of two years earlier, where they had been greatly troubled by the various artists’ apparent abandonment of Japanese traditions, in their attempts to create something new.

We have already seen the efforts of the American Fenollosa at this time in the appreciation and encouragement of Japanese painting. His work extended also to the field of sculpture, and it is notable that when, due to his efforts, the Tokyo Art School was founded in 1889, its Sculpture Department was devoted entirely to traditional sculpture in wood.

The first professor in the Sculpture Department was Takeuchi Kyūichi (Hisakazu) [1857-1916], who had first made his name in the field of ivory carving. Following the acclaim he received at the Second National Industrial Fair of 1881, he had moved to Nara for research and study, hoping to effect a revival of the native traditions of wood sculpture. It was at this time that Fenollosa and Okakura were conducting surveys of the treasures of ancient art in Nara; Takeuchi acted as their guide and consultant, and it was he that they first called to Tokyo when the new school was ready.

Takeuchi was followed soon after by two other leading figures of Meiji sculpture, Takamura Kōun [1852-1934] and Ishikawa Kōmei [1852-1913]. Of Takamura Kōun we have heard much already. Fully trained in the tradition of Buddhist wood sculpture, he had not, even at the height of the ivory-carving craze, changed his field. Under the influence of Western art, however, he attempted to direct his native skill toward more naturalistic forms. To the end, he considered himself an artisan of Edo, and was proud of it. When Takeuchi approached him about teaching at the new school, he firmly refused, and it was only after Okakura promised that he could continue his work
undisturbed at the school—limiting his teaching only to what students could learn by simply watching him—that he found it impossible to refuse.

Ishikawa Kōmei (Mitsuaki) had been born in a family of traditional carvers and sculptors, and first made his name in the field of ivory carving. He was also a master of wood sculpture, specializing in relief work, whereas Takamura was best at sculpture in the round. In addition to these two masters of Japanese-style sculpture, the names of two Western-style sculptors, Fujita Bunzō and Naganuma Shukei, together with the specialist in sculpture-reproduction, Kanō Tessai, appear on the school’s rosters, but they do not seem to have taken a very active role in instruction.

Takamura Kōun has recorded the difficulties he experienced in first assuming the role of teacher. According to him, the equivalent of a full-time teacher of art had hardly existed before in Japan; each school had kept secret its special methods, and each artist had striven only to advance his own skill to the utmost, without any special thought given to the teaching of students.

2

Early Japanese Terminology for Sculpture

One of the first graduates of the Tokyo Art School was ômura Seigai. Although he had specialized in sculpture, it was as a scholar of Far Eastern art history that he was to make his name, first in Kyoto, and later as a professor at his alma mater. In 1894, during his period as a teacher at the Kyoto Municipal Art School, ômura first published his views on the proper nomenclature in Japanese for such words as “sculpture,” “modeling,” and “plastics”—words that had hitherto not been standardized in the language. (The first extensive attempt to translate Western art terms into Japanese, the Report of the Vienna Exposition of 1873, employed the phrase “The Art of
Making Statues.”) Where the Technological Art School had employed the new term chōkoku for Western-style sculpture, it was Ōmura who invented the term chōso, still used today for the the general art of carving and plastics.

3

The Cooperative Work of the Tokyo Art School on the Statue of Kusunoki

As public interest in things Western grew, so also did a limited interest in Western art. Fortunately for the sculptors, there also grew a desire for public statues of great Japanese figures, in imitation of such objects in the West. The first such project was the bronze statue of Ōmura Masujirō, already noted (Plate 60a), which still stands in the grounds of the Yasukuni Shrine in Tokyo. First planned in 1883, the work was entrusted to Ōkuma Ujihiro two years later, but was not finally completed and unveiled until 1893, following Ōkuma’s period of study in Europe.

Such public works in bronze would naturally be thought the province of Western-style sculptors; but in this field too the influence of the nationalist movement came to be felt. Thus when the Sumitomo family proposed to erect a statue of the fourteenth century loyalist hero Kusunoki Masashige in front of the Imperial Palace, it was to the new Tokyo Art School that their request was made.

In the year 1890 the Sumitomo family, to commemorate the 200th anniversary of their copper mines at Besshi, had determined to produce some important work from that same copper, and present it to the Imperial Household Office. Entrusted with this important commission, the new Art School determined to prove itself. Designs were submitted by both teachers and students, and that selected for use was by the painter Okakura Shūsui (see p. 25 above). The historical aspects of the work were carefully detailed by experts in that
field, as were all of the minor matters of armor, etc. Nearly a dozen members of the school staff cooperated on the project. The actual statue was taken charge of by Takamura Kōun; he first did the entire work in wood, and this model was presented for Imperial inspection in 1893. The final bronze statue of Kusunoki was unveiled at last in the year 1900 (see Plate 60b). In the meanwhile, the school had also undertaken the construction of the famous bronze statue of Saigō Takamori, which was completed in 1898, and still forms one of the landmarks of Ueno Park in Tokyo.

4

Sculptors and the Formation of the Meiji Art Society

The Tokyo Art School had been founded on nationalistic principles, and limited its teaching to Japanese-style painting and sculpture. In opposition to this, the Meiji Art Society was formed for the cause of Western-style art; it is notable that the principal Western-style sculptor, Naganuma Shukei, was included among its founders.

Naganuma Shukei [1857-1942] had been influenced by Ragusa, but went direct to Italy for his training. He taught Japanese at a commercial school in Venice by night, and studied sculpture at the Royal Art School by day. Naganuma was abroad from 1881 to 1887, and his return to Japan served greatly to strengthen the cause of Western sculpture, which in the meantime had been only feebly supported by a few of Ragusa’s old pupils. As we have seen in the case of Kuroda in Western-style painting, great prestige was attached to the fact of prolonged study abroad under noted foreign teachers. And well it might—particularly in the case of sculpture, for Ragusa’s old pupils had been without a teacher or leader for five full years.

In February, 1889, the Meiji Art Society was formed, with six Western-style painters and the sculptor Naganuma as its founders. The Society’s first exhibition was held in October of
the same year, and the Society there made clear its view that
the art of each age must reflect that age, and that in the case of
Meiji Japan it was Western-style art that best reflected the
new era.

Naganuma was the dominant force among the advocates
of Western-style sculpture, but he was soon followed by those
of Ragusa's pupils who had continued with their work, and
by the year 1891 the names of fully fifteen sculptors were to be
found on the Meiji Art Society's rolls. At the Society's First
Exhibition Naganuma exhibited three works, and Kikuchi Chū-
tarō one. Western-style sculptors at last had a place to display
their art, and this fact proved a powerful stimulus to them.
The Empress's visit to the exhibition, and support from other
eminent personages, also did much to establish the position of
the sculptor in Japanese society.

In addition to its other activities, in November, 1891, the
Meiji Art Society also set up a school for the teaching of West-
ern painting and sculpture, and this continued in operation until
the time when the Tokyo Art School admitted these subjects
into its curriculum. Sculpture was taught by Naganuma, Ōkuma
and Kikuchi.

5

Imperial Encouragement of Japanese-style Art

From the time of the First National Industrial Fair of 1877,
visits by members of the Imperial family were frequent at the
exhibitions of Japanese art, and Imperial purchases were often
made as a form of encouragement. Indeed, for the traditional
artist or artisan, there could be no higher commendation of his
work than purchase by the Imperial family.

Construction of the new Imperial Palace had begun in 1885,
and in 1887 its sculptural decoration was entrusted to the Tokyo
Sculpture Society. The work was divided among the members,
especially notable work being accomplished by Takamura Kōun.
The latter’s “Bantam Rooster” (Plate 62a), shown at the Japan Art Association Exhibit of 1889, was also purchased by the Imperial family, adding further to the prestige of the native sculptors.

As a more standardized, official method of encouraging native artists, in 1890 the Imperial Art Academy was established. Among the first ten artists honored by membership were the native-style sculptors Takamura Kōun and Ishikawa Kömei. Membership in the Academy involved no special work, but was accompanied by an annual stipend. In this era there was no higher honor possible for a Japanese artist. In 1906 another Japanese sculptor, Takeuchi Kyūichi from the Tokyo Art School, was added to the group.

Through these and other developments, the former lowly artisan or Buddhist sculptor found himself raised to Professor in the Government School, selected for honors by the Imperial Household, and generally recognized as an important member of society. In this still near-feudal period the influence of the Imperial family and their advisors upon these developments can hardly be minimized.

6

Exhibits at the Chicago World’s Fair

The prestige of Japanese-style sculpture in wood was just reaching a peak at the time of the Chicago World’s Fair of 1893. It had been twenty years now since the Austrian Exposition, and officials and artists alike welcomed the chance to show their work to the world. The government even went so far as to pay half the cost of production—an unprecedented act. At this time the artists produced some of their finest works, many of which are preserved in our museums today.

Takamura Kōun’s contribution is considered by many to be his masterpiece—“The Old Monkey” (Plate 62b), in which we see an aged monkey angrily grasping the tail-feathers of an eagle.
which has just escaped him. The sculptor sought out unusual material for this work, employing the wood of the *tochi* (horse chestnut) tree.

Ishikawa Kōmei likewise submitted some of his finest work, including the large panel "Kannon in White" (Plate 63), in which he demonstrated that wood carving is capable of all of the delicacy and detail of ivory. Takeuchi Kyūichi also submitted one of his most notable works, the "Goddess of the Arts" (*Gigeiten*; Plate 61), a life-size figure in wood with vivid coloring, which harkened back to Tempyō and Fujiwara sculpture. There were other notable sculpture exhibits, but let it suffice to say that visitors to the Fair had an opportunity to see some of the finest Japanese-style sculpture that was to be produced during the Meiji Period.
III. SCULPTURE IN THE THIRD 
DECADE OF MEIJI

1

The Addition of Plastics to the Sculpture Curriculum

With the increasing appreciation of Western art in Japan, Okakura came to feel the necessity of including the subject in the Tokyo Art School curriculum. Thus in 1896 a Department of Western Painting was set up, and in 1898—the year of Okakura's dismissal—Western-style modeling was added to the Sculpture Department.

As we have seen, the return of Kuroda Seiki to Japan brought new life to the Meiji Art Society. When he and Kume Keiichirō formed the White Horse Society in 1896, the group included three sculptors in Western style, Sano Shō, Kikuchi Chūtarō and Ogura Sōjirō. Where early Meiji sculpture had been based entirely on Italian models, now the influence of French art came to be felt increasingly in the field of sculpture as well as painting.

Prominent in the introduction of Western methods of sculpture to the Tokyo Art School was Shirai Uzan, a sculptor and Associate Professor there. He argued, in a memorandum to the Ministry of Education, that the only way for Japanese sculpture in Western style to escape its imitative nature, was for students to be given full opportunities for advanced training, in order that they might eventually produce really original, Japanese works using Western methods. He argued that the basis of modern sculpture must inevitably rest in the realistic depiction of things, strengthened by sketching from nature and the study of anatomy.

The first instructor of Western-style sculpture was Naganuma Shukei, followed later by Fujita Bunzō. Thus it was that Western-style sculpture came to be taught officially for the first
time since the departure of Ragusa. There were few students actually specializing in Western-style modeling, but foreign influence came gradually to be felt even in the department of Japanese-style wood sculpture, the students learning to work also in clay and plaster of Paris and (much to their delight) beginning to use live models. Shirai Uzan continued his efforts toward publicizing the new department, even sending out descriptions of its function to all of the middle schools in the country, urging more students to attempt the new subject.

2

The Activities of the Youth Sculpture Society

As the number of graduates from the Tokyo Art School increased, they came to form a study group of their own, for the purpose of advancing their knowledge and skill. This was the Youth Sculpture Society (Seinen Chōsokai), which included students and alumni from both the Japanese and Western-style sculpture departments, as well as several instructors and other interested persons.

The new society was formed in 1897, and immediately held an exhibition of over forty works at the Art School. This was, it will be recalled, the year before the official establishment of a department of Western sculpture in the Art School; yet it is notable that already several of the works exhibited were in clay rather than wood. It was, indeed, just at this period that the younger sculptors in wood were beginning to use foreign methods for their preliminary models.

In 1900 the Sculpture Society held its first large public exhibition at Ueno Park. Well over a hundred works were exhibited, and nearly all were in modeling clay or plaster of Paris—which will indicate the popularity of these new materials, even among students specializing in wood sculpture. This unusual exhibit drew much attention in art circles, and critics were almost unanimous in their praise and high expectations for
the future.

For the Fifth National Industrial Fair of 1903, held in Osaka, the Tokyo Art School group planned and executed two large fountain displays, which proved one of the major attractions of the Fair. The largest work was a fountain some sixty feet in diameter, including an impressive figure of Kannon upon a rock, surrounded by figures of children, cranes and turtles. The work on the fountains was supervised by such instructors as Takamura, Kuroiwa and Takeuchi, with much of the actual execution handled by a group of the School’s graduates. Such projects served well to educate the general public in the uses of sculpture, and indicated the practical ability of the Art School graduates—to a public that had little use for “pure art.”

At the same Fair, Yamazaki Chōun received a Silver Medal for his “Child of the Seashore” (Plate 64a), a notable example of wood carving that is far closer to Western sculpture than to native Japanese. The work was purchased by the Imperial Household Office.

In 1905 the Sculpture Society opened another huge exhibition at Ueno Park, displaying over two hundred works. From the fact that nude sculpture predominated, we may discern the changing policies of the leaders of the group—the professors at the Art School—since the addition of the Western sculpture department. Unfortunately, however, the times were not yet ripe for such a public display, and the whole exhibition—including the photographs of ancient Western sculpture—was closed by the police, much to the consternation of the artists.

3

Sculptors Newly Returned to Japan

Just at the time that Western sculpture became an official part of the Art School curriculum, Japanese sculptors who had been studying abroad began returning to their native land, to strengthen the ranks of the Western-style sculptors. One of the earliest and finest of these sculptors was Naganuma Shukei,
already mentioned, whose “Old Man” (Plate 66) had received a Gold Medal at the Paris Exposition of 1900. This bronze may certainly be counted among the masterpieces of early Japanese sculpture in Western style.

Further, as we have already noted, Okuma Ujihiro returned from study in France and Italy in 1889, a year after Naganuma. With the early 1900's the number of such students increased considerably, among them being men like Shinkai Takerō, Kitamura Shikai, Takeishi Kōzaburō, and Shirai Uzan—the last of whom had, as a professor at the Tokyo Art School, been the first sculptor sent abroad for study under a Ministry of Education Fellowship.

Private schools also began to pay attention to sculpture. The Pacific Painting Society's school introduced a sculpture atelier under Shinkai Takerō, later joined by Kitamura Shikai. Several of the later great names of Japanese sculpture were to receive their training at this atelier—Ishikawa, Asakura, Nakahara, Hori.

4

Sculpture and the Japan Art Academy

Okakura's dismissal and the formation of the Japan Art Academy had a strong influence upon the sculpture world as well as upon painting. Among the first regular members of the Japan Art Academy were the sculptors Shinkai Takerō and Niiro Chūnosuke, together with several other artists in related fields. Okakura's first concern in the field of sculpture was the preservation of works of ancient Japanese sculpture, which were in danger of being ruined irreparably. For this reason, the sculpture section of the Art Academy was set up at the Tōdaiji in Nara, under the charge of Niiro, and its work was mainly in the field of preservation rather than that of creation. It was not, in effect, until 1907—with the formation of the Japan Sculpture Society—that Okakura's theories in the field of creative sculpture were to find realization.
IV. SCULPTURE IN THE LATE MEIJI PERIOD

1

The Ministry of Education Art Exhibits

The First Ministry of Education Art Exhibit was held in 1907, and proved of tremendous significance to the Japanese art world. Early in the same year had been held the Tokyo Municipal Industrial Exposition, where notable works had been displayed by Ishikawa Kōmei, Takamura Kōun, Yamazaki Chōun and Yonehara Unkai in the field of wood sculpture, and Shinkai Taketarō in the field of Western sculpture.

That the judging at the Exposition was not entirely satisfactory to Western-style sculptors will be indicated by the fact that Kitamura Shikai destroyed his important marble statue "Mist" on the morning of the Exposition, in protest. This act aroused considerable public sympathy, and had influence on the judging of the Government Exhibit that followed later in the same year.

The Ministry of Education Art Exhibit was, as we have seen, modeled on the French Government salons. The committee which planned the Exhibit included sculptors and scholars from both public and private schools, and of both Japanese and Western styles. Despite, however, the ideal nature of the judging committee, notable works of sculpture at the first exhibit were few in number. Shinkai Taketarō's "Bathing" (Plate 67a) was perhaps the most important work exhibited.

With the second exhibit of 1908 the number and quality of the sculpture works increased greatly. A newcomer, Asakura Fumio, who had graduated from the Tokyo Art School only a year earlier, took Second Prize with his powerful study "Darkness" (Plate 67b), in which is expressed man's courage in the face of the unknown. Third prizes were received by five sculptors, Yonehara, Yamazaki, Kitamura, Ogiwara and Tatehata.
In addition, notable works were exhibited by two of the judges, Shirai Uzan and Shinkai Taketarō.

The third exhibit of 1909 produced an even larger number of entries, but a slightly lower level of achievement. Only Asakura and Ogiwara received Third Prizes. The fourth exhibit of the following year resulted in another Second Prize for Asakura with his "Grave Keeper," in a strong, naturalistic style. Ogiwara Morie, upon whom great hopes had been placed, had died this year at the age of thirty-two. His "Woman" (Plate 70) depicts well the figure of a Japanese woman in a striking posture, and received a Third Prize posthumously. Although not receiving prizes, other significant works of this exhibit included Yonehara’s “Sentan” (Plate 64b)—which reveals a new trend in wood sculpture—and Fujii Kōsuke’s “Hair-washing” (Plate 68a), which grasps with rare beauty a common scene from daily Japanese life.

The Fifth Government Exhibit of 1911 saw again a number of notable works of sculpture. Among the prizewinners were Tatehata Taimu—for his "The Current" (Plate 68b), depicting with realism the characteristic form of Japanese woman—and Asakura, Fujii and Hirakushi. Of the judges, Shinkai again displayed his mastery of group studies in wood sculpture with his "Accord." But in general of the Government exhibits, it is evident that realistic, Western-style sculpture in plaster or bronze dominated, and that native-style wood sculpture never quite succeeded in competing with the massive forms of Western art.

2

The Japan Sculpture Society

Soon after the First Ministry of Education Exhibit, Oka-kura had summoned Takamura Kōun and told him that he felt his basic aims in the field of Japanese painting to have been accomplished. Now, he wished to lend his efforts to the field
of Japanese wood sculpture. Thus the Japan Sculpture Society was born in 1907, under the leadership of Okakura, with the assistance of such artists as Kōun, Unkai, Chōun and several others—all sculptors in wood.

Although the Society was primarily concerned with the propagation of Japanese-style sculpture, this did not mean simple adherence to traditional forms. For, just as Okakura had made clear in the Japan Art Academy, the ultimate aim of the artist was freely to express his own genius, whatever the form. Further, though the group did not strictly limit itself to work in wood, its members did feel strongly that there was some intimate quality, inherent in the nature of wood, that appealed strongly to the Japanese sensibility where ivory, stone or bronze could not.

In the fall of 1908 the Japan Sculpture Society held its first exhibit, in collaboration with the Kokuga Gyokuseikai, and displayed notable attempts to fulfill the precepts of the group in revealing the artist's genius through the special medium of wood. The group continued its exhibitions through the final years of Meiji, increasing its membership and furthering the cause of wood sculpture. With the end of Meiji, however, the group tended more and more toward repetition and academicism, and eventually lost its raison d'être. During its early years, however, it proved a notable element in opposition to the predominately Western-style work of the Government exhibitions.

3

The Influence of Rodin

Although the last quarter of the Meiji Era marked a peak in Western-style sculpture activities, this work was mainly in the academic or classic styles that the Japanese leaders had learned at home or abroad. In Europe, however, the appearance of Rodin had effected a revolution, which was only now to begin to influence Japanese sculpture circles.
At the time of the Paris Exposition of 1900, numerous Japanese works of sculpture were exhibited for the first time in Europe. This same year, Rodin's extensive one-man exhibition was also held in Paris, and his permanent greatness reaffirmed. The noted painter Kume Keiichirō was in Paris at this time conducting a survey of European art for the Ministry of Education, and in his Report of 1902, which was widely quoted by Japanese magazines, he gave what was probably the first detailed account of Rodin's work to appear in Japan.

In the next few years photographs of Rodin's work came to appear occasionally in Japanese magazines. It was the young sculptor Ogiwara Morie, however, who, in 1908, first brought back a true understanding of Rodin with him from France, and made that artist's name known throughout Japanese art circles.

Ogiwara had been born in a rural farm family in 1879. Wishing to become a painter, he had traveled to America in 1901, and from there to France. Upon seeing Rodin's "The Thinker" he had been converted to the art of sculpture. Returning to Japan, he received a prize in the Second Government Exhibit, and also did much writing for the Japanese press on the state of European art and on the greatness of Rodin. He emphasized the importance of internal life in sculpture, whatever the rough exterior—an idea that was to find increasing favor among Japanese artists in the years to come. Ogiwara's own genius—as well as his indebtedness to Rodin—is clearly displayed in his "Miner" (Plate 69), produced in France. Like others of Ogiwara's works, this failed to find comprehension on the part of the exhibition judges, and was dropped from the competition. From the following year, however, Ogiwara began to achieve some recognition, but his early death in 1910 cut off his career just as it was beginning.

Among other Japanese sculptors influenced by Rodin may be named Nakahara and Tobari, but even more, Takamura Kōtarō—son of the great Kōun, and a sculptor of note himself—who made intensive studies of Rodin, which were published
together in 1916 under the title *Rodin's Words*, and reached a wide audience in Japan. Rodin's influence on Takamura may be seen most clearly in the bust of his father made in 1911, to commemorate the latter's sixtieth birthday.

In literary circles, too, the cause of Rodin was taken up, and the new, influential magazine *Shirakaba* devoted an issue of 1910 to commemorate Rodin's seventieth birthday. Rodin himself donated three small pieces of sculpture to Japan, and these were exhibited under *Shirakaba* auspices in 1912, giving Japanese artists and public alike their first opportunity to see the master's actual work. Thus did the influence of Rodin grow in Japan, an influence that was to become almost predominant in the succeeding Taishō Period.

* * *

As we have seen, the Meiji Period represented a revolution in Japanese sculpture. Traditional carvers had to seek new markets for their work, and adapt their art to those markets; on the other hand, the new art of plastic Western sculpture was introduced, and in three brief decades began to assume a form not inferior to modern sculpture in the West. Due to the difficulty of the new medium, fewer masterpieces of Western-style sculpture were produced in the Meiji Era than were paintings. But by the end of this period the form had been mastered, and it remained for the succeeding generation to realize the aspirations of the Meiji pioneers.
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I. INTRODUCTION
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The Meiji Restoration and the Decline of Crafts

The crafts, being so much a part of daily life, and depending so strongly upon current science and techniques, bear a very close relation to the times that produce them. The crafts of the Tokugawa Period had as their basis the various feudal clans’ support of local industry, together with the buying power of the populace of such cities as Edo, Kyoto and Osaka, and of the privileged classes. Even in the disordered times of the late Tokugawa Period the organizations and traditions of the craftsmen remained relatively undisturbed.

But the Meiji Restoration represented a complete revolution. For a moment all customary economic activities came to a standstill. Craftsmen found their traditional markets suddenly disappearing, and the higher the quality of their products, the less the demand. Casters of temple bells, lanterns and bronze works for the feudal lords, lacquerware makers, carvers of both architectural ornament and sword-furniture—all found their jobs abolished.

This situation did not, of course, mean the death of Japanese crafts, but it did signify the end of an age. With the new demands of the new age Japanese crafts were to revive; at the beginning, however, this revival was principally directed toward “hamamono”—goods for export from the port of Yokohama.
The Japanese government—both to strengthen its own weak finances, and to provide employment for the large numbers (both samurai, artisans and merchants) who now were out of work—lent its best efforts to the encouragement of export industries. Rather than artistic quality, the first problem was rendering the production of export goods more efficient. This meant changes both in materials and methods, and applied as much to crafts as to any other field.

The special characteristic of Japanese crafts had always lain in their production by hand, in small quantities, and with emphasis on quality. For export, however, once a market was found it was necessary to provide uniform goods in whatever amount could be absorbed. The different Japanese crafts responded variously to these requirements: among dyers and potters the change was marked; but lacquer- and metal-workers were most often unable—or unwilling—to adapt their art to mass production. In effect, the crafts most closely related to the necessities of life responded the most readily, whereas the decorative, luxury crafts found such a changeover most difficult.

2

Overseas Expositions and Meiji Crafts

Japanese craftsmen were greatly encouraged by the reception their work received at expositions abroad; at the same time, they were stimulated to improvement by what they saw of Occidental crafts. Japanese participation in international fairs during the Meiji Period was very extensive. As early as 1867 Japanese works had been displayed at the Paris Exposition, and in 1871 at San Francisco. But active Government support was still lacking at this time, and the results were minimal. With the Vienna Exposition of 1873, however, Japanese participation became both active and fully supported by the Government.

Viscount Sano Tsunetami was prominent in directing Japanese participation in the Vienna Exposition. He stressed five
long-range aims in this activity: the introduction of Japanese products abroad and the recognition of Japan thereby; the opportunity to inspect and study foreign techniques and industrial science, with a view to improving Japan's own products; the utilization of this opportunity to effect the establishment of a museum and of native exhibitions, for the purpose of advancing Japanese science and arts; the employment of such a museum for the improvement of Japanese products, with particular reference to export; and the investigation of foreign prices and ascertainment of just what Japanese products would be most suitable for export purposes.

In order to gather the finest possible work, the Japanese government called together the best artisans available and explained the purpose of the project, gave them a salary of ¥5 a month in addition to the price of the items made, and hired noted connoisseurs to oversee the quality of the work. Before being shipped to Europe, the exhibitions were presented for Imperial inspection. Perhaps even more indicative of the government's concern with the exhibition is the fact that—despite the financial difficulties of the time—the huge sum of ¥560,000 was allotted for its management.

Together with the exhibits were dispatched several officials possessed of special knowledge or interest in crafts, and these men were to prove among the leaders in the development of crafts in the Meiji Period. In addition to the government officials sent along to survey conditions in Europe, a number of artisans were also dispatched, among them such men as Fujiyama Tanehiro (glass), Date Yanosuke (textiles), Nakamura Kiichirō (dyeing), Nōtomi Kaijirō (pottery), Kawahara Chūjirō (pottery), Tanzan Rokurō (plaster work), Saitō Shōzaburō (paint-coating) and Hirayama Eizō (design). These artisans, as well as the government officials, all brought back with them Western goods related to their fields, and these were subsequently exhibited in Japan, providing a much-needed stimulus to Japanese craftsmen.
Produced, as they were, for a yet unknown foreign audience, Japan's exhibits did not necessarily represent the peak of Japanese achievement in the arts; yet they received a hearty welcome abroad. In particular, the numerous medals and certificates awarded for the Japanese crafts made a great impression on Japanese officials and artisans alike. In a sense, the Vienna Exposition served to reawaken the creative spirit of Japanese craftsmen, who had been bewildered by the confused economic and social conditions during the years immediately following the Restoration.

With the change of emphasis to export production, the study and introduction of foreign methods of factory production became vital; for example, the manufacture of textiles by machinery and pottery from plaster moulds, the use of chemical dyes and glazes. Thus although the word kōgei ("crafts") remained in use, it came to assume a far broader meaning than simple hand crafts, and now came to include all kinds of industrial arts and technology. At such a time of economic instability the distinction between the crafts and industry often became lost. For example, entrepreneurs in Kyoto and Kanazawa gathered together groups of traditional metal carvers and engravers, and set them to work manufacturing vases and bronze works for foreign export.

Between the London Exposition of 1874 and the Paris Exposition of 1900, Japan participated in fully fifteen international expositions. None of these received quite the attention that the Vienna Exposition had, yet each served to further enhance the prestige of Japanese crafts abroad, as well as to further educate Japanese craftsmen in European methods. Notable among these fairs was the Nürnberg Metalwork Exposition of 1885, to which Japan sent some 492 works by ninety-nine artisans, receiving a considerable foreign acclaim that did much to strengthen the self-confidence of Japanese artisans in metal.

The Paris Exposition of 1900 was a big event for Japan. The government contributed ¥1,310,000 for the Japanese ex-
hibits, thereby doubtless hoping to display Japan's power following the Sino-Japanese War, as well as further the national cause along political and economic lines. Whatever the government's aims, the exposition proved a considerable stimulus to Japanese craftsmen. The results of the exposition were of even greater educational value, for here all of the arts were represented and, for the first time, it became clear that to Westerners the hand crafts were on a definitely lower level than the "pure" arts of painting, sculpture and architecture—a concept that had never been clearly defined in Japan. (From about the end of the Meiji Period there appeared an active movement to restore the crafts to their place among the fine arts.) Further, the Japanese crafts contributions, despite acclaim for individual works, were in general criticized on the grounds of lack of originality of design, and lack of practical usefulness. European critics stressed that although great technical skill was evident, there was little attempt to escape from the conventional styles and forms of the Tokugawa Period. Further, there was no attempt to distinguish between art and utility, and works of pottery and lacquerware, for example, were executed in forms and prices that only a feudal lord could utilize or afford.

Such criticisms were meant to be constructive, and were taken in good grace by officials and artisans alike. Yet improvement and reform were to prove no easy matter for Japanese traditional craftsmen, who could hardly, like sculptors or painters, spend long periods in research and study abroad. Thus these criticisms at the time of the Paris Exposition have to some degree held true of Japanese crafts even to the present day (and the current popularity of Japanese hand-crafts is perhaps more a result of educating foreigners to Japanese taste than the other way around).

From the time of the Paris Exposition to the end of the Meiji Period Japan participated in some ten international fairs, the most significant of which was the Japan-British Exhibition of 1910, held in London. Here over a hundred important works
of industrial arts were exhibited, and the aim of the exhibit seems to have lain as much in stimulating artisans at home as in making Japanese products known abroad.

3

Meiji Art Dealers and the Craftsmen

The crafts could only flourish where there was a demand for them. Yet even when the markets for crafts had been re-established it was not easy for the artisan himself to exploit the possibilities for sale at home and abroad. At the time of the Vienna Exposition the Japanese government had assumed the role of intrepreneur, but this function was soon taken over by specialists in the field of art sale and export.

At the time of the Vienna Exposition European art dealers had approached the Japanese delegation regarding the commercial possibilities of Japanese crafts, and with the cooperation of the authorities, in 1874 two Japanese dealers formed the Kiritsu Kōshō Company for this purpose. At the time of the Paris Exposition of 1878 the company even received a government grant of 100,000 yen to support its activities. Rather than simply handling the works of individual artisans, the company soon built a factory of its own, employing, for example, as many as twenty artisans for the painting of pottery and porcelain alone. And among these men were to be found many of the important names in this field.

Subsequently, however, the company found it more efficient to give contracts to such independent producers as Kawahara and Namikawa. By the time of the Melbourne and Philadelphia expositions of 1875 and 1876, works of industrial art produced under the supervision of the Kiritsu Kōshō Company began to predominate among the Japanese exhibits. In 1877 the company even set up a branch store in New York, and in 1878 in Paris, as permanent outlets for its products. By the year 1881 the company had two main factories in Tokyo, one for handling wood, lacquer, embroidery and cloisonné, and the other for
brass and copper work; and many of the great names of Meiji crafts were to be found on the company's rosters. By 1882 the company employed an office staff of over eighty, together with more than sixty craftsmen, in addition to its numerous subcontractors. This year was to mark, however, the peak of the company's success, for its activities gradually declined thereafter, and the whole company was disbanded in 1891.

A glance at the designs for the products of the company (preserved in the Tokyo Fine Arts College) reveals that most of them are simply reduced copies of paintings of the various Edo Period schools, together with designs derived from a combination of netsuke techniques and Western sculpture. (Plates 71a and b; 72a and c). As we shall see later, the company was also influential in organizing exhibitions at home as well, and its Director, Matsuo Gisuke, remained a leader in the development of Meiji crafts even after the disbandment of the company.

At least a dozen other important entrepreneurs could be cited. A glance at the catalogues and prize citations of the Meiji Period reveals the curious fact that the art dealer's name is most often recorded together with that of the actual artisan. This is indicative of the fact that these men were not simply dealers, but lent both financial support and artistic direction to the efforts of the craftsmen. They performed the vital function of entrepreneur, guide and critic to the artisans in an age when the traditional craft markets had ceased to exist.

4
Meiji Crafts Criticism

It had been the Japanese government that first lent its hand to redirecting the efforts of craftsmen who had lost their traditional markets with the Restoration. Various organs were set up for the purpose of direction, and improvement of methods, in Kyoto as well as Tokyo. The importance of this official encouragement and direction can hardly be overstressed in a land where the government has always been considered on
a level far above the common people.

The government officials involved in this work came naturally to assume the function of critics, as did likewise the foreign teachers and technicians which the government brought to Japan. Once conditions were settled again, of course, great artists and craftsmen began to make their appearance, and with them, professional art critics and historians, to take over this function from the officials, foreigners and dealers who had filled in during the early years of Meiji.

Among the principal critical controversies of the period, the conflict between Western methods and styles, and traditional crafts, of course loomed large. At the same time, the conflict between utility and decorativeness, commercialized manufacture and patrician, artistic crafts, was also a vital concern of the critics as well as the artisans. Toward the end of the Meiji Period a strong movement also appeared aiming at establishing the crafts as a pure art form, quite separate from their functional use.

With the development of professional critics, there came also a cleavage between the artisans and their judges. Thus, for example, for some time after the new word bijutsu (art) was invented in 1871, many artisans tended to think it referred to what they considered the ultimate in their craft—careful, detailed, elaborate work employing rare materials.

Although critics, officials and dealers alike agreed that what was needed for export were articles that would fill a definite need in the West, and yet retain a distinctive Japanese quality, there was little agreement on what items and methods would be most suitable. In fact, during most of the early Meiji Period the principal crafts exports tended to consist of curios that appealed to collectors, or decorative objects, whereas little progress was made in the field of daily necessities where the market was potentially the greatest.

The critics were fond of advocating cooperation between craftsmen and artists in producing new, original works. In
the early Meiji Period, when painters and sculptors were at a
loss for suitable work, this had been an easy matter. And
there were, of course, masters such as Shibata Zeshin and
Kanō Natsuo who excelled both in design and craftsmanship.
But the average artisan was often lacking in the breadth of
imagination necessary to create an original design suitable for
export, and by the end of the second decade of Meiji, with
the increasing return of the better artists to their true work,
Japanese crafts tended more and more to repetition, despite
the great advances made in technique.

The critics were well aware of this tendency, and the
Ryūchi Society, in particular, was prominent in its efforts to
courage the continued cooperation of arts and crafts. Such
members of the society as Kawasaki Senko and Imaizumi Yū-
saku were active in this work, followed in later years by other
eminent painters such as Kajita Hanko, Suzuki Kason and,
toward the end of the Meiji Period, such Western artists as
Asai Chū and Okada Saburosuke (Plate 72b).

Most famous of the foreigners who interested themselves
in Japanese arts and crafts were Ernest Fenollosa and Gottfried
Wagner. Both of these men urged the preservation of tradi-
tional, native crafts, and presented strong arguments in sup-
port of their views. Both men felt keenly that the Japanese
arts were unique in the world, and should be preserved un-
tainted by foreign influence; Fenollosa went so far as to main-
tain that Japan was the only country in the world where crafts,
in the true sense of the word, were still alive. It was at this
period, too, that the concept of functionalism became prominent
among the critics, who urged a return to the functional crafts
of earlier times, and a closer bond between art and life.

The aim of such nationalistic organizations as the Ryūchi
Society and the Japan Art Association lay, in effect, in a return
to the patrician craft traditions of the Edo, Momoyama, and
even earlier periods. Such aims, though only half achieved,
were certainly more successful in the crafts than they were in
the fine arts, where Western influence was much more strongly felt. From the turn of the century, however, the Art Nouveau movement was transplanted in Japan by returning students, and came gradually to find favor among critics in the crafts field. New magazines of arts and crafts began to appear in the cause of a fresh new art for the new age. In opposition to the Tokyo Art School, which concentrated upon more purely artistic work, the Tokyo Higher Industrial School instituted, in 1897, a Department of Industrial Design. The forces of tradition were still very strong in the crafts, however, and these new trends served, for the moment, more to point the way to future developments than to effect them overnight.

5

Imperial Interest in the Crafts

The Meiji Period marked, in name at least, a Restoration of Imperial authority; so far as Japanese crafts go, it is impossible to consider their great revival without taking into consideration the part that Imperial encouragement played. When the Emperor moved from Kyoto to Tokyo Japanese crafts moved with him. Imperial purchase soon became the greatest prize of any exhibition, and art organizations took great pains to find a suitable member of the nobility as their president.

Internal demand for high quality crafts never reached any great peak during the Meiji Era, and throughout the period the Imperial household remained the artisan’s best native customer, as much in fact as in the prestige involved. One effect of this situation was that entrepreneurs and craftsmen alike spent their best efforts on the type of objects that were most favored at court. In the field of architectural ornament too, the court and the nobility remained the principal customers of the skilled artisan. From these conditions evolved the “Imperial Household Type” of crafts which formed one of the mainstreams of Meiji art; they were characterized by extreme detail and the skilled employment of precious materials, but they avoided any
excessively original concepts of design or usage. The actual extent of Imperial purchases may be seen from the example of the Art Association Exhibit of 1889, at which more than one hundred and ten items were bought by the Court, in a selection which covered the range of contemporary crafts as well as any panel of judges might.

The idea of more standardized Imperial support of the great craftsmen grew in strength in the mid-Meiji Period, and reached fruition with the nomination of eighteen "Imperial Household Office Craft Members" in 1888, and the formation of the Imperial Art Academy two years later. (See above, p. 21.) Here the great Japanese artisans in traditional styles at last received the official recognition and financial support that they deserved. In passing, we should note likewise the considerable influence that Imperial trips to the provinces had upon the rejuvenation and improvement of local crafts and industries.

6
Exhibitions and Crafts Groups

Just as the exhibitions abroad served to give strength to the revival of Japanese crafts, so too did industrial and other exhibits at home contribute to this movement. The National Industrial Fair of 1877—itself stimulated by the Vienna Exposition of four years earlier—gave Japanese artisans their first opportunity to exhibit at home. Sequels followed in 1881 and 1890 (at the latter Fair, for the first time "art-crafts" and general crafts were exhibited separately) in Tokyo, and at Kyoto in 1895 and Osaka in 1903. (Plate 73a.) Through these and numerous other exhibitions the great names of Meiji arts and crafts came to be settled, known to the public, and more generally patronized.

Of the art groups, certainly the most influential in the improvement and encouragement of Japanese crafts was the famed Ryûchi Society, and indeed, nearly all of the Imperial Household Craft Members were derived from among its mem-
bership. More specialized societies were formed, as we have seen, in the field of Japanese-style sculpture, as well as in lacquerware, metalwork, pottery and porcelain, textiles and industrial design.

7
Art-crafts and General Crafts

The term kōgei (crafts, industrial arts, technology) was used in the Meiji Period, as today, in several meanings. The organs of Government encouragement of course thought of the crafts as one branch of industry, in this following what was known of conditions in France and England following the Industrial Revolution. Thus Government policy was directed toward adapting Japan’s patrician crafts to mass production, and at the same time improving them through the cooperation of Japanese painters and designers. From this concept arose the mistaken idea that a beautiful design was the principal factor in producing a beautiful craft work, and the crafts came to be divided into “art-crafts,” where the design had been drawn by some noted artist, and “general crafts,” where both design and execution were the artisan’s. The next step in this mixup involved the assertion that such “art-crafts” were to be considered on the same level as painting and sculpture, as one of the fine arts.

This situation had been created first in the exhibitions of the Japan Art Association, where, in the beginning, there was no distinction between arts and crafts. Subsequently, through knowledge of European standards and other influences, painting and sculpture came to be recognized as on a higher level than the crafts, and exhibited separately. But public recognition of painters and sculptors as on a higher level than the artistic craftsmen naturally did not sit easily with the latter, who considered themselves genuine artists as compared with the common artisans. With the Government “Bunten” exhibitions of the late Meiji Period this controversy became a real problem, for
the crafts were completely excluded. Thus arose the movement to return artistic crafts to the realm of fine art, a movement which was to find official recognition only in the late 1920's, well after the Meiji Period had ended.
II. METALWORK CRAFTS

During the Edo Period the principal customers of the metalworkers had been the Shogunate and the feudal lords, and the best of the artisans had usually lived under the direct employ of the aristocracy. With the Restoration, the feudal class was abolished and so likewise were the artisans' patrons. Some of these workers changed their trade; others turned to the manufacture of vases and other goods for foreign consumption.

After a few years, however, social conditions became more settled, and most of the artisans were able to return to their original work, though now with a new class of consumers. From the time of the Vienna Exposition (1873), in particular, Japanese craftsmen found renewed financial and technical encouragement; metalworkers, however, unlike artisans in the fields of pottery, porcelain and textiles, made few marked changes in either methods or materials during the whole Meiji Period.

1

Metal-carving

The manufacture of sword-fittings had been the principal activity of metal carvers during the Edo Period, and the best of them had been under the direct patronage of the Shogunate or the feudal clans, though a few catered to the needs of the commoners in the cities. Once order was restored following the Restoration, these metal-carvers turned to such items as vases and various accessories and ornaments more suited to the new age.

Without doubt the greatest of the artists in metal was Kanō Natsuo [1828-1898], whose work ranged over many fields, but always maintained a high level of taste and quality. Unlike
many of the Meiji artisans, who left the preliminary designing to other specialists, Kanō Natsuo was a skilled painter in the Maruyama-Shijō style, and spent much effort creating new designs for his metalwork. His work in *katakiri-bori* produced the effect of an actual brush-painting incised in the metal, and he tended to avoid the use of elaborately colored metals.

Kanō's work is typical of the fields covered by Meiji metal-carvers, and includes vases and plaques, as well as numerous smaller items such as cigarette boxes and cases, netsuke, sash-ornaments, clock-rims and cuff-links. From the mid-Meiji period, with increasing national consciousness, the collection of sword-furniture became the fad, and metal-workers found themselves back at their old occupation. Kanō Natsuo is also remembered for his fine work for the Government Mint, and much of the gold and silver coinage of the Meiji Period was designed and engraved by him.

Kanō's art was purely traditional, however; one looks in vain for markedly original designs or techniques. He chose his own special (and difficult) field, and seldom strayed from it. Aside from his own work, Kanō Natsuo was prominent in most of the art societies that included the crafts, serving as judge for both the Ryūchi Society and the Japan Art Association, and as Professor of Metal-carving at the Tokyo Art School. He was also one of the first artists elected to Imperial Household Office Craft Member. Plates 73b and 74 show representative masterpieces of his late years.

Notable among Kanō's pupils were Shimizu Nanzan, who followed in the master's footsteps with little significant deviation; Tsukada Shūkyō (Plate 75a), who had studied earlier the Nara style of metal-carving, was Zeshin's pupil in painting, and obtained Gold Medals at both the St. Louis Exposition of 1904 and the Japan-British Exhibition of 1910; and Kagawa Katsuhiro (Plate 76b), a versatile craftsman, but lacking in a distinctive style of his own.

After Kanō Natsuo, the great figure of Meiji metalwork
was Unno Shōmin, who had been trained in the Mito school of metal-carving, and studied painting under Adachi Baikei. In contrast to Kanō’s work, Unno made much use of ivory inlay and highly colorful metals to achieve spectacular decorative effects (plates 75b, 76a). Like Kanō, Unno was a Professor at the Tokyo Art School and an Imperial Craft Member, and took active part in various art groups. His sons Minjō and Kiyoshi were also notable metal-carvers in their own right, but were rather overshadowed by Unno Bisei, who had practiced metal carving under his father, but greatly extended his range by studying painting under such masters as Kyōsai, Keinen and Dōitsu, and later, Western-style sculpture on his own. Bisei’s work represents several new trends in Meiji crafts, while maintaining a strong basis in the older traditions. (Plates 77a and b.) Bisei also became a Professor at the Tokyo Art School, and lent his efforts to the various Meiji art groups. Several dozen lesser names in the field of metal-carving could be mentioned, among them such minor masters as Toyokawa Mitsunaga (Plate 78a), and Kashima Ippu (Plate 78b).

2

Wrought Metal

Wrought metalwork in the pre-Meiji era had been devoted almost entirely to arms and armour, and artisans in this form found far less opportunity to adapt their art to the changing times than did the chasers. There was some market for vases, ornaments and plaques of wrought metal, but it was a limited one, and many of the workers in this field had to change to other crafts more suited to the new age.

The pupils of the traditional Hirata school of wrought metal were the pioneers in adapting this form to the times. Kurokawa Eishō, for example, was prominent in assuring the place of wrought metal in the Meiji arts, and displayed his works from the first exhibitions of the Japan Art Association. (Plate 79a.) Hirata Sōkō, a Professor in the Tokyo Art
School, was the great innovator in techniques in the field of wrought metal, and managed to retain a high Japanese standard of quality while at the same time studying methods and forms most suited to export. (Plate 79b.) His pupil Ishida Eiichi specialized in simplified figures and animals in the round, and set a style for wrought metal that was to persist through the subsequent Taishō and Shōwa periods. (Plate 80a.)

Fujimoto Mansaku had been trained first in the Chōjusai style, and later studied under Hirata Sōkō, but his most notable work was produced under the Art Nouveau influence of the early 1900's (Plate 80c). The names of such leaders as Ōbori Shōju and Suzuki Chōjusai should also be noted, as well as the specialist in wrought iron, Yamada Chōzaburō (Plate 80b), who excelled in both Japanese and Western styles.

3

Cast Metal

Although the primary work of casters during the pre-Meiji period had lain in projects for the Buddhist temples—statuary, bells and ornaments—there was also considerable activity in the field of architectural ornament and household items for the wealthy classes. When the country had become settled again following the Restoration this latter function assumed greater importance, and such new areas as goods for export, and public statuary and architectural ornament, tended to make up for the loss of temple and daimyō contracts. (The fact that much of the metal work of the Akasaka Tōgū Palace [Plate 81] was produced abroad may reflect more the Japanese reverence for imported goods than the inability of Japanese casters to undertake such an extensive job.) Further, with the rapid development of modern industry in the Meiji Era, the need for precisely cast machinery fostered a new industry in itself, which assumed methods and standards quite different from traditional, artistic casting by hand.

Perhaps the greatest name in Meiji artistic casting was
Homma Takusai (Plate 82a). He had been born in a family of traditional casters on the Island of Sado, mastered the _circé-perdue_ method at an early age, and produced notable artistic castings for daily use. Like many casters of the late Edo Period his services had been requisitioned by the daimyō of his district for the casting of cannon, and in this field he had been instructed by the great Sakuma Shōzan. With the Restoration, Homma Takusai, like his fellows, was able to return to his true profession, and soon excelled in the production of the small cast implements of the tea ceremony. This was a field where Japanese connoisseurship was very active, and already by the early Meiji Period Homma’s name was known as a master. He soon began experimenting with many other forms, and from the time of the Vienna Exposition of 1873 to his death in 1891, Homma was recognized at home and abroad as the master of his field. His name, indeed, is often cited together with that of Kanō Natsuo and Shibata Zeshin as the “Three Masters of Meiji Crafts.”

Another master of Meiji casting was Hata Zōroku (Plate 82b), who also specialized in the _circé-perdue_ technique, and took ancient Chinese bronzes as his models, though today his smaller, more original works are the more highly valued.

Several names could be noted among the makers of artistic cast iron pots and kettles for the tea ceremony, but probably the greatest was Ōkuni Hakusai of Osaka (Plate 82c), whose pots display a marked individuality and artistic strength.

Kanaya Gorosaburō (Plate 83a) was one of several traditional Kyoto casters who turned whole-heartedly to the production of items for export. His works seldom achieved great artistic excellence, but are typical of the better export items of the early Meiji Period.

Suzuki Chōkichi (Plate 83b) and Hōshisan Sōmin were prominent in the creation of artistic Japanese-style sculpture in bronze. Both achieved fame abroad at the Nürnberg Metalwork Exposition of 1885, and this was soon echoed at home as
well. Suzuki, in particular, continued to develop his art along several varied lines, on the one hand achieving a peak in realistic depiction through bronze, and on the other, continuing the Edo Period traditions of impressionistic grace.

Among other Meiji masters of casting must be mentioned Ōshima Joun and Okazaki Sessei, both of whom taught at the Tokyo Art School. Ōshima Joun was famed for the amazing detail of his cire-perdue casting. A representative work of his is the bronze shishi plaque of Plate 84a, in which we see a fanciful lion drenched in the rain. As is typical of one strain in Meiji art, Ōshima's marvelous technique must sometimes be admitted to defeat its own purpose, and to render a tour de force rather than a creative work of art.

Okazaki Sessei is most noted for his large castings. Rather than being a creative sculptor, he often had the basic model for a work made by another specialist, which he then transmuted into bronze; further, he often undertook orders from sculptors, to handle the casting of their works. Okazaki must thus be considered the leading caster of the Meiji Period, rather than a creative artist in bronze. (Plates 84b, 85.)

Of the graduates of the Tokyo Art School three were to prove most active in the casting world during the later Meiji Period. Sakuraoka Sanshirō had studied casting in America, and later returned to teach at his alma mater, where his influence was exerted in education rather than in creation. Katori Hozuma had from school days been fascinated by ancient Japanese sculpture, which he studied at great length. Much of his work is an attempt to recreate the great past of Japanese sculpture in modern terms. (Plate 86a.) Tsuda Nobuo, on the other hand, took Western sculpture as his model, and achieved considerable popularity with his careful depictions of Japanese life in semi-Western terms. (Plate 86b.)
III. LACQUERWARE

1

Lacquerware as an Industry

The art of lacquerware was an ancient one in Japan. By the nineteenth century articles of lacquerware formed an indispensable part of the life of the commoners as well as the nobility. From the furniture, household decorations, palanquins and sword-gear of the samurai, to the eating utensils and hair ornaments of the plebeian classes, there was hardly a field in which lacquerware was not employed.

There were various methods of producing lacquerware, from the most complicated process of fixing cloth to the wood base, and then affixing numerous coats of lacquer and polishing after each one, finally delineating a pattern in gold dust, lacquering and polishing again—to the easiest method of simply attaching a coat of lacquer directly on the wood. Due to the widespread use of lacquerware, each section of Japan produced its own variety, and even the lower classes of samurai engaged in its production as a home craft.

With the disorder of the Restoration, the production of both artistic and practical lacquerware ceased for a time, but the material was too much a part of Japanese life to remain out of circulation for long. Soon, with encouragement from both the local and central governments, lacquerware resumed its place in Japanese industry and crafts, and began to be adapted for foreign export and exhibition.

Among the most famous provincial centers of lacquerware manufacture were Wajima (Plate 87a), Yamanaka and Takayama, but a dozen other centers could be noted. The varying prosperity of the lacquerware business—together with that of the nation in general—may be seen from the following figures of the average daily pay of lacquerware artisans in Kyoto:
1871, twenty-five sen; 1881, forty sen; 1890, twenty-five sen; 1900, fifty sen. The following charts will also indicate the uneven development of the industry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount of Business</th>
<th>Number of Professional Artisans</th>
<th>Number of Families Engaged in Lacquerware Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>¥82,000</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>84,300</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>85,400</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>91,700</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>109,800</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>120,500</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>132,700</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>145,600</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>92,400</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>68,500</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>43,912</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>50,600</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>63,900</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>205,870</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>228,300</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity of Internal Production</th>
<th>Amount of Export</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>2,595,049 items</td>
<td>797,539 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>3,119,268</td>
<td>1,083,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>3,295,947</td>
<td>948,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>4,106,477</td>
<td>767,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>4,885,432</td>
<td>782,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>5,640,228</td>
<td>988,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>6,284,318</td>
<td>1,066,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>5,768,099</td>
<td>994,654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the face of increasing competition from Germany, the lacquerware makers attempted to improve and to reduce the cost of their products, but the industry proved in general the most conservative of all the crafts, and the use of inferior lacquer for economical production aroused protests both at home and abroad. The Yokohama photographer Mizuno Hambei developed a mechanical method of reproducing gold designs on lacquer, but this method never produced quality work and was principally employed in goods for export.

By the time that the demand for larger quantities of lacquerware goods had developed, many of the lacquer trees in Japan had been cut down to make way for the vast tracts of mulberry trees needed by the silk industry. Thus Japan was forced to import an inferior variety of lacquer from China to meet the demand.

2

Artistic Lacquerware

The first concern of the Meiji Government was industrial advancement, and even the makers of artistic lacquerware could not but be influenced by this trend and to some extent aim their productions at export.

During the Edo Period the centers of artistic lacquerware had been Kyoto, Edo and Kanazawa, but with the Meiji Period the major artists tended to gather in Tokyo. Nevertheless, both Kyoto and Kanazawa still retained something of their reputation for fine lacquerware, and the work of Kimura Hyōsai and Sawada Sōsai (Plate 87b), for example, must be counted among the finest lacquerware produced during the Meiji Era.

The great master of Edo and Tokyo was without a doubt Shibata Zeshin [1807-1891], who had studied lacquerware under Koma Kansai, and painting under Suzuki Nanrei, Okamoto Toyohiko and Tani Bunchō. Zeshin had also made intensive studies in the ancient temples of Kyoto, and possessed a rare creative talent in addition to technical skill. The fact that
many of Zeshin’s productions are lacking in refinement must be ascribed to the unfortunate circumstances that most of his commissions were from the tea-houses and the pleasure quarters, where excessively refined work was unwelcome. Yet in his best work Zeshin reveals an original, creative genius that even today seems modern. (Plates 88a and b.)

Notable among Zeshin’s early pupils was Ikeda Taishin [1825-1903], who had won fame already in the expositions of the first decade of Meiji. His best-known work is undoubtedly the large Enoshima landscape (Plate 89a) which he exhibited at the Chicago Exposition of 1893. Produced for foreign consumption, it lacks, from a Japanese point of view, refinement and originality, but is nevertheless an impressive production, and forms an interesting contrast with the more native-style works of plates 87 and 88. Taishin’s finest works are rather to be found in his smaller, traditional lacquerware, done in the “Edo-mood.”

Another master of Edo-style lacquerware was Kawanobe Itchō [1830-1910], who had studied in the Kōami school, and painted after the Tosa-Sumiyoshi style. Among his masterworks is a set of furniture produced for the Imperial household in the 1890’s (Plate 89b).

Ogawa Shōmin [1847-1891], like Itchō, was a Professor in the Tokyo Art School; he specialized at first in high-quality reproductions of classical lacquerware, but later developed an original style which was to prove one of the most popular in the later Meiji Period (Plate 90a).

A younger colleague of Itchō at the Art School was Shirayama Shōsai [1858-1923], whose influence extended well after the Meiji Era. He had begun as an artisan at the Kiritsu Kōshō Company, but soon developed a highly individual, independent style of his own, combining a realistic vision with a sureness of composition and technique that have caused him to be considered the master lacquer artist of the current century. (Plates 90b and 91a.)
Several other important lacquer masters of the later Meiji Period could be cited, but perhaps most notable was Rokkaku Shisui [1867-1950; see above, p. 66], associate of Fenollosa and Okakura, and an innovator of techniques and styles which still predominate today. (Plate 91b.) Tsujimura Shōka (Plate 92a) typifies the best of the new generation of Meiji lacquer artists, among whom the influence of modern Western art was strongly tempered by a devotion to the spirit of ancient Japanese forms.

In a somewhat different field of lacquer work we should also mention Hashimoto Ichizō [1817-1882], who developed several new techniques, including the production of lacquer vases in bamboo shape which are hardly distinguishable from the natural wood (Plate 92b).

Having cited the masters of Meiji lacquerware, we must add that the lesser artisans in the field were to prove the most conservative and least pliable of all the Meiji craftsmen. At the same time, the influence of real or imagined foreign taste had its unfortunate influence on the majority of Meiji lacquer-makers, who had necessarily to direct much of their work to export.

With the second half of the Meiji Period notable young graduates of the Tokyo Art School appeared to give new life to the lacquer world; among them were Rokkaku Shisui and Tsujimura Shōka (graduated in 1893 and 1896 respectively), already mentioned. With the exception of such rare talents as these, however, it may in general be said that what the traditional artisans lacked in originality, the new generation of art school graduates lacked in technique. Thus although the dozen great names of Meiji lacquerware produced work equal to that of any earlier age, the general average of the tremendous production could hardly be called distinguished.
IV. CLOISONNÉ AND GLASS

1

Cloisonné

Although cloisonné had been imported from China in earlier times, it was the popularity of this form in the Muromachi Period that led to the first Japanese production toward the end of the sixteenth century. Cloisonné work continued through the Edo Period on a limited scale, and was exhibited at the Paris Exposition of 1867, but it was not, in effect, until the Meiji Period that Japanese cloisonné achieved its remarkable standards of technique and artistry. In this respect cloisonné differed considerably from most other Meiji crafts, which were continuations of skills already perfected in the previous age.

From 1874 to 1878 Dr. Wagner engaged in research on enamel work at the request of a foreign export company. A factory was formed for the production of cloisonné, and the Japanese cloisonné craftsman Tsukamoto Kaisuke was brought to Tokyo with a dozen or more of his pupils. This marked the first concrete step in improving the hitherto rather crude art of cloisonné in Japan.

In 1878, however, Wagner was called to Kyoto for official work and the Tokyo factory was dissolved. Its skilled artisans, though, were recruited by two other cloisonné makers, Muramatsu Hikoshichi in Nagoya, and Namikawa Sōsuke in Tokyo (Plate 93a). In the meanwhile, Wagner continued his experiments in Kyoto, and found there an already established master of early Meiji cloisonné, Namikawa Yasuyuki (Plate 93b), who had opened a small shop as early as 1871.

Wagner's contribution to Japanese cloisonné was based largely upon French methods and models, and the imitation of Western art styles proved, it may be imagined, no easy matter for traditional Japanese craftsmen. At the same time,
there was criticism at home of this imitation of foreign models, when Japan had a cloisonné tradition (however elementary) of her own. By the mid-Meiji period, however, these conflicting styles and techniques had been resolved sufficiently for first-class cloisonné to be produced in Japan.

With the 1880's and 1890's new techniques began to enlarge the range of Japanese cloisonné, so that intricate paintings, with full gradation of coloring, could be produced in enamel. The techniques of transparent red cloisonné and enameling without the use of dividing wires were also devised at this time. In general it may be said that Namikawa Sōsuke in Tokyo made the most effective use of these new methods, whereas Namikawa Yasuyuki in Kyoto achieved nearly equal success while employing the traditional wire techniques. Skilled, but less notable work, was at the same time being produced in some quantity at Nagoya and other centers.

Mention should also be made of the work of potters in the cloisonné field. Notable cloisonné on a pottery base was produced by such men as Kinkōzan Sōbei and Kanzan Denshichi ('Plate 94a) in the late 1870's. We may add that a member of the traditional Hirata family was employed by the Japanese Mint as early as 1874 for the production of official medals and decorations made of cloisonné.

The two Namikawas were generally conceded to be the masters of Meiji cloisonné; both were elected to Imperial Craft Membership and were active in the Japan Art Association and the various National Fairs. The Tokyo craftsman Sōsuke was always the most popular, with his intricate copies of the masterpieces of Japanese painting, whereas the more quiet, traditional Kyoto artisan Yasuyuki never achieved such popular acclaim. The Meiji critics in general favored the Tokyo worker too, though already at this period Dr. Wagner was pointing out that with all the time and labor expended on such elaborate productions, they could never really equal the paintings themselves. Indeed, this tendency toward intricate, time-consuming
reproduction—with the consequent high cost of manufacture—has proved a recurrent problem of the cloisonné industry even to the present day.

2
Glass

During the Edo Period glass was a luxury item, produced only in small quantities and for a limited market. It was not until the Meiji Era that glass became an inexpensive item of daily use among the middle classes. Although scientific knowledge of glass-making was but elementary during the Edo Period, the items of artistic glass produced during the first half of the nineteenth century in Edo, Nagasaki, Satsuma, Yamaguchi, Fukuoka and other areas are often remarkable for their originality and quality.

The Shinagawa Glassworks was commenced in 1873 to meet the growing demand for sheet glass and utensils. At first it was under private control, employing English advisors and Japanese craftsmen who had specialized in the older glass manufacture. The company was not a success, however, and in 1876 it became a part of the Ministry of Technology. At first the principal work was the manufacture of plate glass for the various new government buildings, together with colored glass for ships' lights and warning signals. From the year 1879 glass utensils were added to the output (Plate 95), and in 1882 the technique of cut glass was taught the artisans at the plant.

Despite government support, however, the Shinagawa Glassworks proved seldom able to operate at a profit. The reasons for this lay first in the plant's difficulties in the efficient mass-production of plate glass, and secondly in the fact that the average Japanese was not yet familiar with the uses of glass, whether in architecture or in daily life. It was said that the glass utensils produced in a month by this one small glassworks were enough to supply the public demand for a
full year.

With the 1880's there was a trend toward reversion of industrial control from government to private hands, and the works became the Shinagawa Glass Company in 1884. German methods of glass manufacture were introduced, and many improvements made under the new private company which, however, failed to survive the depression of 1892.

In the meantime, glassworks had been founded in Kyoto and Osaka as well, but here too the Japanese manufacturers found themselves unable to compete with foreign imports of the basic plate glass, and unable to find a suitable market at home for glass utensils, so that these enterprises ended likewise in financial distress. By the 1890's a renewed demand had arisen for government protection of the infant glass industry, and finally in 1906 the Far Eastern Glassworks Company was formed through the cooperation of the Japanese, English, French and Prussian governments. In the following year Iwasaki's Asahi Glass Company was also founded. With these two enterprises, Japanese glass manufacture was at last commenced on a scale large enough to compete with the factories of the West.

From a technical point of view Japanese glass probably developed more remarkably than any other craft of the Meiji period. By the same token, however, there was little leisure for the artisans fully to explore the artistic possibilities of the medium. By the end of the Meiji Period Western techniques had been fully explored and mastered, and it remained for the succeeding generation to turn these techniques to the realm of artistic endeavor.

Some notice should also be made here of stained glass in the Meiji Era. Although the process had been known and practiced to a limited extent during the Edo Period, this difficult art became practically extinct during the Restoration upheavals, and was only re-introduced in the mid-Meiji Period by a student of the Tokyo Industrial School who had studied the
process in Germany.

Perhaps the master of stained glass work in the Meiji and Taishō periods was Ogawa Sanchi (Plate 94b), who had studied the industrial arts in the United States for a full eight years after graduating from the Tokyo Art School in 1900. Ogawa owed his success to the combination of a fine background in Japanese painting methods, and extensive experience with Western technology—a background unfortunately rare among Meiji artisans. In any event, the use of stained glass was limited to a few public works and private mansions, and never found the chance to develop into a major craft either during the Meiji Period or after.
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From 1868 to 1882

The ancient Japanese art of ceramics had seen renewed growth and development in the seventeenth century, following the Korean Campaigns, and greater diffusion and popularity during the early nineteenth century, with each of the clans fostering and encouraging the development of local kilns and ceramic styles. With the Restoration and the subsequent abolition of the clans, the potters lost their major patrons, but their work had already such strong support among the middle classes that the ceramic industry suffered only minor and temporary disruption during the Restoration years. Moreover, the Meiji government was quick to discern the export possibilities of Japanese ceramics, which—unlike many of the Japanese crafts—were already at a high stage of technical and stylistic perfection when the Meiji Era began.

As early as the Paris Exposition of 1867 Japanese entrepreneurs had noted the possibilities of improving Japanese ceramics for export by the use of European techniques and materials, and from the following year experiments along this line were begun at the Arita kilns of Saga. The German chemist Dr. Gottfried Wagner had arrived in Japan this very year (1868), and in 1869 visited Nagasaki, where he gave much valuable advice to the Kyushu potters. From this period the
import (from Germany) of cobalt oxide and other Western coloring materials greatly increased, and with the official abolition of the clans in 1871, various entrepreneurs gradually took over the management and improvement of the local ceramics industries. Dr. Wagner was called to Kyoto to improve the ceramic and dyeing industries there, and Satsuma and Kutani also joined Saga in strenuous efforts to adapt their kilns to export production. It was not, however, until after the Vienna Exposition of 1873 that Western techniques and materials came to be employed extensively throughout the Japanese ceramic industry.

Government support of the ceramic and dyeing industries in preparation for the Vienna Exposition was most positive, and in addition to the cost of their productions, artisans were given five yen per month in wages. This early official support of certain crafts was to prove most influential in their later development during the Meiji Period. The aim of the Japanese government in its exhibitions was primarily to show that though Japan had known no industrial revolution, her artisans were equal to any in the world.

At the same time, it was the government’s intention to take this opportunity to discover and master whatever Western techniques might be most useful for the expansion of Japan’s export potential. To this end, more than twenty Japanese artisans accompanied the Japanese exhibits to Europe. The potters were Nōtomi Kaijirō [1844-1918], Kawahara Chūjirō [1849-1889] and Tanzan Rokurō. Each of these men spent varying periods of time studying and working in European pottery centers, collecting both practical knowledge and actual samples of the Western materials that should prove most useful in improving Japanese ceramics.

In particular, the technique of using plaster molds in the production of ceramics was to prove the most significant innovation for the Japanese industry. This technique had been known as early as the 1830’s, but was never successfully practiced
in Japan. Following the Vienna Exposition the government established the Edogawa Ceramics Plant for the purpose of utilizing the knowledge gained in Europe, and here, through the efforts of Nōtomi and Kawahara, plaster molds were first used efficiently in the production of Japanese ceramics. This technique was immediately transmitted to the cooperating kilns in Aichi, Saga, Ishikawa and Kagoshima, and was to prove a great force in the success of Meiji export ceramics.

European-style kilns were also constructed, one on the Austrian model in 1877, and a vertical round kiln on the French model soon after. In 1882 and 1884-85 Wagner supervised the construction of two Western-style kilns in Tokyo. From the years 1884-85 the use of imported coloring also became widespread, and even when home-made glazes were employed they were usually derived from imported coal rather than from native charcoal as was formerly the case. This period following the Vienna Exposition marked, in effect, a revolution in Japanese ceramic techniques and materials.

Along with the improvements in technique, the export market for ceramics expanded greatly in the mid-Meiji Period, and the various kiln-centers of Arita, Kutani, Kyoto, Seto, etc. saw a new peak of activity. At the same time Tokyo, which had never been prominent as a ceramic center, became active in production, spurred in part, as we have seen, by the support of the Kiritsu Kōshō Company. It may be said in general of the potters, however, that they were prone to tend their own kilns, and develop their own provincial specialties rather produce a national (or international) product such as we find today.

Though he had not had the advantage of study in Europe, one of the most active innovators of Western methods in Japanese ceramics was Takemoto Hayata [1848-1892], who came from a family of traditional potters. It was he who had planned the first French-style kiln, and also made early experi-
ments in plaster-molded ceramics. His early experiments at exporting Satsuma-ware *kinrande* ceramics ended in failure, but with his subsequent work in Cochin-style China he achieved extraordinary success, which was followed by other notable innovations in the use of glazes. (Plate 96b.) Another noteworthy pioneer was Katō Tomotarō (1851-1916), a native of Seto and a good friend of Dr. Wagner. Katō had served as manager of the Edogawa Ceramics Plant, but in 1882 formed his own kiln, the Yūgyokuen, which featured one of Wagner’s foreign-style kilns, and at which Katō developed many of the new glazes that were to distinguish Meiji ceramics. (Plates 101c, 103a.)

In 1872 the government had set up a kiln in Asakusa for the production of ceramics for the Vienna Exposition, and when this was closed the following year, the principal potter there, Kawahara Tokuryū, continued the detailed work in ceramic painting that had distinguished that kiln. He called his own kiln the Hyōchien, which gave the name to a careful style of ceramic painting that was to remain in popularity throughout the Meiji Period. (Plates 96a, 99b.)

Other notable potters of the first half of the Meiji Era include Miura Kenya [1825-1889], who, prior to the Restoration, had specialized in the intricate pottery-inlaid lacquerware of the Haritsu style, and later even learned the art of European shipbuilding in Nagasaki. Following the Restoration he turned to pottery in the style of the great Ogata Kenzan [1663-1743], and proved the most important exponent of that style since the death of its innovator.

Another significant potter was Miyagawa Kōzan [1842-1916], who came from a traditional Kyoto family but lent his principal endeavors to ceramics for export at Yokohama. He received great acclaim at the Philadelphia Fair of 1876 for his sculptured ceramics and pottery in the Satsuma style, and continued to produce important work throughout the Meiji Era. (Plates 101a, 103b.)
The traditional potters of Kyoto had early realized the necessity of improving their methods to meet the changing times and in 1870 had formed a special organization for this purpose, had called in Dr. Wagner, and within a few years were making significant experiments in the use of Western methods and materials. Notable among the individual potters of Kyoto were Kinkōzan Sōbei (Plates 96a, 101b); Seifū Yohei II and III (1844-1878, 1851-1914; Plate 100a); Takahashi Dōhachi IV [1845-1897]; Kiyomizu Rokubei III and IV (d. 1883; 1842-1914; Plate 97c); Kanzan Denshichi (d. 1890; Plate 94a); and Eiraku Wazen (d. 1896; Plate 97b), among others. Seifū Yohei III, in particular, was singled out for acclaim by his contemporaries, who considered him with Takemoto Hayata and Miyagawa Kōzan as the great master of the period.

Other regions prominent in the early development of ceramics for export were, as we have seen, Arita in Saga, with such masters as Kawahara Chūjirō and Nōtomi Kajirō; and Kagoshima with its famed Satsuma ware, among the notable exponents of which was Chin Jukan (Plate 98d), who moved the kilns to Naeshirogawa after the Kagoshima plant's dispersal in 1874. Chin Jukan's kilns produced notable work of many varieties, but were in the end unable to compete with the excellent imitation Satsuma ware produced by the Kyoto potters. The Kutani kilns of Ishikawa Prefecture passed through various hands during the early Meiji Period, producing such masters as Utsumi Kichizō [1830-1885], Takeuchi Ginshū (1832-1913), his younger brother Asai Ichigō (1836-1916; Plate 98a), and Kutani Shōzō (1816-1883; Plate 98b), among others. Mention should also be made of the kilns of Seto in Aichi Prefecture, and of the Mino ware of Gifu, together with other areas which specialized in inexpensive ware for daily use. Kilns in Hyōgo and Ehime, interestingly enough, specialized in ceramics for export to China.

With export their main object, Japanese ceramic manufac-
turers vied with each other for awards at exhibitions both at home and abroad. For the Philadelphia Exposition of 1876 the Japanese government urged artisans to aim at quality, rather than quick profit. Nōtomi Kajirō was included among the ceramic judges, and in his report he concluded that although progress had been made since the Vienna Exposition, in general the ceramics were lacking in Japanese qualities, and too often were imitative of European styles. He urged a renewed study of the traditions of Far Eastern ceramics on the part of Japanese potters, with the aim that their work remain essentially Japanese even though the methods were modernized along Occidental lines.

The First and Second National Industrial Fairs of 1877 and 1881 gave potters a chance to exhibit on a grand scale at home, but in general both the prizes and public acclaim went to the works displaying the most striking designs and techniques, and it was still too early for the artisans—who had only with difficulty at last mastered Western techniques—to reflect on their own tradition and produce essentially Japanese work. In general it may be said of these first fifteen years of Meiji that—though there were masters, already described, who produced notable work in the Japanese style—this was a period of assimilation of Western techniques, and the average artisan had not the leisure to think of producing ceramics based on his own past.
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From 1883 to 1897: A Period of Consolidation

This second period of Meiji ceramics is notable for the discovery of new glazes, the improvement of methods, quality and designs, and the spread of ceramic studies in the various technological schools.

Dr. Wagner continued to assist the Japanese potters in their experiments with new techniques. In his spare time (he
was teaching chemistry at various Tokyo colleges), he now set about devising a pottery base upon which the full beauty of Japanese painting could be expressed, just as on paper or silk. He carried out his experiments first at the Edogawa Ceramics Plant [Plate 99c], and later built a small kiln with his own funds at Koishikawa. By the year 1885 he had developed his process sufficiently to display the results in a Ueno exhibition, and soon after named the result "Asahi Ware." Wagner's efforts, we may add, extended as well to the realms of cloisonné, dyeing and glass, and his achievements for Japanese crafts during the twenty-five years from his arrival in 1868 to his death at Tokyo in 1892, may well be compared with Fenollosa's in the painting world.

One of Dr. Wagner's notable pupils was Katō Tomotarō (Plate 101c), whose greatest achievements lay in his work with difficult colors such as yellow, red and purple, though he also developed the use of ivory inlay in ceramics. Another notable experimenter was Itō Tōzan (Plate 99a), who also achieved success with new color glazes and, moreover, laid his methods and kilns open to the public, declaring that scientific advances should no longer be made into family secrets as they had been in the past.

The 1880's and 1890's were decades of technical progress and discoveries, and in addition to the individual workers, several technological schools in Tokyo, Osaka and Kanazawa fostered ceramics research and experimental production, while Seto, Arita, Tokyo and Kyoto established municipal trade schools or experimental centers devoted principally to ceramics. The Ryūichi Society and the later Japan Art Association were also active in ceramics encouragement, and in 1892 the Japan Ceramic Association was formed for that exclusive purpose, also publishing its own journal.

At the same time that techniques were being improved and extended, a movement arose among critics and leaders for the improvement of ceramics design as well. Active among
the critics was Shioda Shin of the Ryūchi Society, who in the 1885 *Ryūchi Society Report* criticized the painting on export ceramics as uniformly dull in both subject, design and execution—belonging to a special variety of crude painting style that was neither Kanō, Tosa, nor Ukiyo-e. And the potters were complacently perpetrating this uninspired style as though no other were possible. Fenollosa also added his voice to those urging the reunion of artistic painting and ceramics as the only method of ensuring the successful growth of this craft either at home or abroad.

Such criticisms, however, had no immediate effect, for most of the painters of ceramics were artisans who had little or no background in artistic painting, and of course the pay was hardly sufficient to attract a real painter of any stature. With the subsequent decline of export business, however, the entrepreneurs were finally moved to attempt improvements in design as well as technique, and the results began to appear gradually at the various exhibitions. Leading the field, of course, were the few master potters who had from the beginning combined a fine technique with a genius for design—such men as Kawanaka Tokuryū, Chin Jukan, Seifū Yohei, Miyagawa Kōzan, Katō Tomotarō, Obiyama Yohei and Inoue Ryōsai (Plate 96c).

At the Chicago Columbian Exposition of 1893 Japanese crafts were for the first time exhibited abroad on the same level as the fine arts, and Miyagawa Kōzan and Takemoto Hayata received particular acclaim. In the same year the master potter Seifū Yohei was nominated to Imperial Art Academy membership, followed in 1896 by Miyagawa Kōzan. This official, Imperial recognition of such craftsmen was a great stimulus to potters in general, and paved the way for the new development of ceramics as art in the succeeding period. The same years saw, however, the deaths of several of the great pioneers of Meiji ceramics—Miura Kenya in 1889, Dr. Wagner and Take-moto Hayata in 1892, and Takahashi Dōhachi in 1897.
From 1898 to 1912: The Separation of Crafts and Industry

Western methods and materials had now been mastered and native improvements made in both techniques and design. It remained for the potters of the last decade or so of Meiji to exploit this groundwork that had been laid by the pioneers.

The Paris Exposition of 1900 gave Japanese craftsmen an ideal opportunity to display the products of the first thirty years of modern Japan. The government cooperated to the utmost, and we learn, for example, that for a set of vases costing ¥1,500 to produce, Miyagawa Kōzan received a government subsidy of ¥600. In general, ceramics were the most successful of the Japanese entries, Miyagawa Kōzan, Takemoto Kōichi and several other potters receiving special acclaim. Indeed, in technical matters some of the Japanese ceramics were generally conceded to reach a higher level of quality than the Occidental productions. On the other hand, as Kawahara Tokuryū noted in his Report of the Exposition, Japanese ceramics had yet to reflect the new age in their designs, and some of the best works were but variations on designs created over a millenium earlier. Kawahara adds, interestingly enough, that whereas Japan had hitherto been treated as a precocious child in the international fairs, with the Paris Exposition she came of age, and her products had, by the same token, to stand scrutiny under the same cold, critical eye as the older exhibitors’.

There had been calls for design improvement in Japanese ceramics before, but following the Paris Exposition criticism increased to such a degree that it could not longer be disregarded. One of the most common proposals for the improvement of ceramic design was to obtain the cooperation of Japanese painters and end the strict division between art and applied art. Along this line, by 1901 Ceramic Painting Associations had been formed in Yokohama and Tokyo, and in 1903 the two groups held a joint exhibition in Tokyo which did much to
point the way to future developments. One particular criticism of Japanese ceramic design at this time was that independent paintings predominated, with only a small percentage of ceramics featuring decorative designs. Moreover, the two forms were always kept quite separate, and not blended as in European ceramics.

Several other groups were founded for the improvement of Japanese ceramic design, the Japan Design Society having been formed in 1901, and a Department of Design having been added to the Kyoto Higher Crafts School the following year. It was to be some years, however, before the average potter was able free himself from the conventions of full-scale painting in the decoration of ceramics. Thus, although the ideas and styles of the *art nouveau* were imported into Japan just at this time, their effect upon Japanese potters was for the moment practically nil.

Simultaneous with the cry for better design came the call for improvement not only in luxury items but in ceramics for daily use as well. Several critics complained that all the attention and fame were being conferred upon the dozen or so high quality potters, whereas the artisans who produced ceramics for practical use were left completely in the dark.

These criticisms came at an opportune time, for the end of the Sino-Japanese War had seen the sudden development of light industries in general, and the time was ripe now for combining the idea of modern, artistic ceramics with the methods of mass production.

A pottery factory on the French model had been attempted in Kyoto as early as 1887, but had ended in failure and no attempt to Westernize mass-production methods reappeared until the time of the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905, when the nation was confronted in all fields with the problem of suddenly modernizing industry to meet the demands of war. In 1904 the first new Western-style ceramics plant was constructed at Nagoya, on the German model, and this was follow-
ed in 1906-1907 by similar projects in Kyoto, Seto, Arita and elsewhere. At the same time the peculiar qualities of each district's ceramics tended to disappear as each factory standardized its materials and methods; and together with the Westernization of methods came a trend toward adopting Western designs as well.

Although the makers of artistic ceramics were now often allied with and directing the production of commercial tableware, the wholesale adoption of Western methods and styles soon created a renewed need for more individualized, artistic ceramics, and before long it was generally recognized that the master potters had necessarily to follow their own lights. A few potters had, of course, continued their creative work during this period, not only for exhibition purposes, but for the small clientele of wealthy connoisseurs who demanded individual work. Among these potters were most of the remaining masters of the mid-Meiji Period, together with some newcomers—Miyagawa Kōzan, Takemoto Kōichi, Inoue Ryōsai, Kinkōzan Sōbei, Takahashi Dōhachi, Katō Tomotarō, Kiyomizu Rokubei, Miura Chikusen (Plate 102c), Ito Tōzan, Yabu Meizan (Plate 102a) and Uno Nimmatsu (Plate 102b). The St. Louis Exposition of 1904 gave renewed encouragement to those potters who thought of each piece of work as a separate creation, and sufficient reason for their existence.

Despite acclaim abroad, however, the rapid advances of commercialized ceramics tended more and more to eclipse the efforts of the artistic potters; thus when the Government "Bunten" exhibitions were instituted in 1907, ceramics and the other crafts were completely excluded. Part of the blame for this neglect lay, of course, with the potters themselves. They were either unwilling or unable to create the new styles that could have placed them within the range of "modern art," and the rare ceramic work of such Western-style painters as Asai Chū (see Plate 72b) served only to mark the traditional potters as hopelessly out of date so far as the art critics were
concerned. (Such happy experiments at combining the work of Western-style painters with the technique of such potters as Kinkōzan Sōbei and Itō Tōzan were arranged in the period 1904-1905 by Nakazawa Iwata [1858-1943], Principal of the Kyoto Higher Crafts School and brilliant leader in the modernization of the crafts.)

It was, of course, too much to expect the old masters of Meiji ceramics suddenly to develop as advocates of the art nouveau. With the younger generation of potters, however, a compromise was reached which marked their work as growing forth from Japanese traditions, yet pointing toward new horizons. We have already mentioned Miura Chikusen [1854-1915] and Uno Nimmatsu [1864- ]; other young craftsmen also appeared now to lead the way into the succeeding Taishō and Shōwa periods: Itaya Hazan (1872-; Plate 104c), a sculpture graduate of the Tokyo Art School, and still a leading potter today; Suwa Sozan (1851-1922; Plate 104b); Miyanaga Tōzan [1868-1941]; and Ishino Ryūzan (1862-1936; Plate 104a), among others. Numada Kazumasa, a pupil of the master sculptor Takeuchi Kyūichi, also did notable work in adapting sculpture to ceramics, and we must also mention the English painter Bernard Leach [1888-], who arrived in Japan in 1909, studied ceramics under Kenzan VI and Miyagawa Kōzan, and created a new style which combined the spirit of English ornamental ceramics with the rustic flavor of Japanese folk-pottery.

As we have seen, it was only with the end of the nineteenth century that Japanese potters had mastered the techniques of Western ceramics and could devote themselves to creating a new style of their own. The stimulus of criticism following the Paris Exposition, and the indignation at being excluded from the Government exhibitions were to form the background of the achievements of Japanese ceramics in the generation to come. This new world was to belong to the craftsman who could match his technical skill with an imagination firmly rooted in the traditions of both East and West.
II. TEXTILES

The second half of the sixteenth century saw remarkable progress in Japanese textiles, with Ming techniques introduced via the port of Sakai soon developing into the famous Nishijin fabrics of Kyoto. European styles were also introduced by the Portuguese, and the Momoyama Period proved a golden age of textiles even as for other art forms. The Edo Period saw the adaptation of these various techniques and styles to bourgeois life, as two and a half centuries of peace gave birth to a culture in which material comfort and beauty became the goal of the commoners as well as of the nobility.

Already in the Edo Period local textile centers had developed in competition with the great metropolises—Kiryū, Ashikaga, Gunnai, Yonezawa, Ōmi, Sakai and Gifu, among others. In the arts both of weaving and of dyeing the Meiji Era inherited a rich and fully developed tradition.
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From 1868 to 1887: The Introduction of Western Methods of Weaving and Dyeing

The social changes of the early Meiji Period—the decline of the great families as well as of the samurai, changing styles of clothing and costume—had adverse effects upon the textile industry. Yet, except for a few luxury items, textiles constituted an irreplaceable part of everyday life in Japan, and thus saw no such decline as did certain of the other crafts. The Meiji government too was quick to encourage such dependable industries as textiles and ceramics for export purposes, and at the same time lent official support to the rapid importation and adoption of modern Western techniques.

The city of Kyoto continued to take the lead in Meiji textiles, and as early as 1872 three of the leading Nishijin artisans
were dispatched for a year to Lyons to master French techniques of mass production for adoption in Japan. Dr. Wagner had, it will be remembered, already been called to Kyoto in 1870 to carry out experiments in the improvement of ceramics, dyeing and soap-making; in 1874 an official plant was set up in Kyoto for experiments in textile manufacture and the making of model goods, and craftsmen from other sections of Japan also received instruction there.

At the time of the Vienna Exposition of 1873 the leading Nishijin artisan Date Yanosuke IV [died 1876] had accompanied the exhibits to Europe, and though he received a prize for his own efforts he could not but feel keenly the technical inefficiency of Japanese textile-manufacturing methods as compared with those of the modern countries of the West. He thus stayed on in Europe, studying in particular the Jaguard-type looms, and bringing home with him over a thousand samples of the finest European textiles. When the various machines purchased from Europe were set up in Tokyo in 1875 Date devoted himself to experiments in their application to Japanese problems, and had already produced notable inventions and innovations at the time of his death in the following year.

Despite the early introduction of Jaguard-type looms into Japan, however, they were little used in commercial production until 1880, when the Nishijin master Sasaki Seishichi (Plate 105b), began to employ Japanese-made machines modeled on Austrian originals. With the success of machine-produced textiles at various exhibitions of the 1880's, the use of the looms came generally to be recognized as the most efficient method of weaving.

In dyeing also, Western aniline dyes were introduced from the first year of Meiji, but it was not until several years later that Kyoto artisans had mastered Western dyeing processes sufficiently for them to replace the more complex and expensive native methods employing vegetable dyes. In this field too, Japanese artisans studied intensively in France and Germany,
returning home to teach their fellows in the new methods—
for which purpose a special school was established in Kyoto
in 1886. Even the famous Yūzen process of printing silk and
muslin was successfully converted to Western materials and
methods in 1879. After the establishment of the Tokyo Trade
School in 1881, with its Dyeing Department, scientifically train-
ed artisans came increasingly to lead the way in the adoption
of new techniques in the various commercial textile plants.

Although Kyoto took the lead in experimenting with Western
methods and materials, interesting enough the provincial
centers Kiryū and Ashikaga were among the first to turn these
imported techniques to practical commercial use. Kiryū textile
makers had bought their first Jaguard loom at the First Na-
tional Industrial Fair of 1877, and continued to purchase such
equipment increasingly in the succeeding years, either from
Kyoto or direct from America. In 1885 they achieved consider-
able success with their first exhibit of machine-made textiles,
and in the following year opened a dyeing research institute
which did notable work in adapting Western techniques to Jap-
inese needs. The nearby city of Ashikaga followed much the
same pattern in renovating her traditional textile industry, and
other provincial centers such as Isezaki, Hachiōji and Fukuoka
soon followed suit.

In 1885 the Japan Textile Association was formed for co-
operation in both technical and commercial matters, and the
following year began publishing its authoritative Reports. In-
ternational exhibitions continued to play an important part in
the improvement and advertisement of Japanese textiles, and
at the Philadelphia and Paris Fairs of 1876 and 1878 Nishijin,
Hakata and Sakai fabrics were accorded special acclaim. The
new dyeing techniques had yet to be fully assimilated, however,
and at the First and Second National Industrial Fairs of 1877
and 1881 it was the elaborate work in combined embroidery
and dyeing by such craftsmen as Nishimura Sōzaemon (plates
109a and b) that received the greatest approbation.
From 1888 to 1898: the Diffusion of New Techniques and the Rise of Textile Crafts

Probably the greatest single achievement of the mid-Meiji textile craftsmen is represented in the decoration of the new Imperial Palace, completed in 1888. The building itself was in French style, and at a period when European styles were in great popularity—and Japanese textile design was generally at a rather uninspired level—it would have been only natural to follow the widespread opinion that Western textiles should be employed. The Nishijin craftsman Kawashima Jimbei (plates 105a, 107a and b, 110a and b) would hear nothing of such a plan, however, and practically single-handed pursued the authorities that the finest Japanese textiles were in no wise inferior to imported goods. In the end, he, with Nishimura Sōzaemon, Iida Shinshichi (plates 108a and b), and several other of the finest Japanese textile makers were commissioned to decorate the new palace.

Here was a remarkable opportunity for the Japanese artisans to prove themselves, and indeed, their success was notable. In general, the results might best be described as a happy compromise between classical Japanese patterns and subjects (especially derived from the Nara Period), and novel Western techniques and points of view. Here, for the first time, Japanese dyeing and weaving in Western style reached their maturity.

This high level of achievement was continued and extended in the Third National Industrial Fair of 1890, at which Nishimura Sōzaemon and Date Yanosuke V both received First Prizes. Meiji embroidery had hitherto been limited largely to designs, but now Nishimura revealed the full range of painting that could be reproduced on cloth. Kawashima Jimbei here also displayed the results of his studies in France of gobelin tapes-
try—combined with traditional Japanese figured brocade—producing the remarkable tapestry (twelve by seven feet in size) shown in Plate 105a.

The prestige of Japanese textile craftsmen was further enhanced this year when Date Yanosuke V (son of the early Meiji pioneer already mentioned) was nominated to the Imperial Art Academy. Date was a notable innovator in Meiji textiles, but at the same time a profound student of ancient Japanese textiles. Much of the recovery of the Nishijin factories following the devastating Kansai flood of 1885 has been attributed to his untiring efforts. Among the masterpieces of Date Yanosuke V may be mentioned his Quail Kakemono (Plate 105c) of this same year, which reproduced an entire hanging scroll by weaving. Date died in 1892, leaving behind his famous Butterfly Tapestry (Plate 106), which was one of the notable Japanese exhibits at the Chicago Fair of the following year.

Other important textile exhibits at the Chicago Fair included Kawashima Jimbei’s Nikkō Festival Tapestry, and Sasaki Seishichi’s Gion Festival Tapestry (Plate 105b), the latter an impressive work more than seven by eleven feet in size. The Fourth National Industrial Fair of 1895 was also notable for its fine textile exhibits, despite the difficulties occasioned by the Sino-Japanese War. Nishimura Sōzaemon and his associates led the field, their remarkable Brocade Kannon, for example, representing the ultimate in this type of work, with over three hundred different varieties of thread employed. Kawashima Jimbei and Iida Shinshichi were not far behind, however, displaying some of their finest works of figured brocade and embroidery. Indeed, Japanese textiles had by this time reached a peak in technical achievement, but—as the Report of the Fair pointed out—despite the number of excellent painters in Kyoto, the craftsmen were still relying primarily upon ancient Japanese art for their themes, and making little attempt to improve their designs in the light of modern tastes.
From 1888 to 1898: the Diffusion of New Techniques and the Rise of Textile Crafts

Probably the greatest single achievement of the mid-Meiji textile craftsmen is represented in the decoration of the new Imperial Palace, completed in 1888. The building itself was in French style, and at a period when European styles were in great popularity—and Japanese textile design was generally at a rather uninspired level—it would have been only natural to follow the widespread opinion that Western textiles should be employed. The Nishijin craftsman Kawashima Jimbei (plates 105a, 107a and b, 110a and b) would hear nothing of such a plan, however, and practically single-handed pursued the authorities that the finest Japanese textiles were in no wise inferior to imported goods. In the end, he, with Nishimura Sōzaemon, Iida Shinshichi (plates 108a and b), and several other of the finest Japanese textile makers were commissioned to decorate the new palace.

Here was a remarkable opportunity for the Japanese artisans to prove themselves, and indeed, their success was notable. In general, the results might best be described as a happy compromise between classical Japanese patterns and subjects (especially derived from the Nara Period), and novel Western techniques and points of view. Here, for the first time, Japanese dyeing and weaving in Western style reached their maturity.

This high level of achievement was continued and extended in the Third National Industrial Fair of 1890, at which Nishimura Sōzaemon and Date Yanosuke V both received First Prizes. Meiji embroidery had hitherto been limited largely to designs, but now Nishimura revealed the full range of painting that could be reproduced on cloth. Kawashima Jimbei here also displayed the results of his studies in France of gobelin tapes-
try—combined with traditional Japanese figured brocade—producing the remarkable tapestry (twelve by seven feet in size) shown in Plate 105a.

The prestige of Japanese textile craftsmen was further enhanced this year when Date Yanosuke V (son of the early Meiji pioneer already mentioned) was nominated to the Imperial Art Academy. Date was a notable innovator in Meiji textiles, but at the same time a profound student of ancient Japanese textiles. Much of the recovery of the Nishijin factories following the devastating Kansai flood of 1885 has been attributed to his untiring efforts. Among the masterpieces of Date Yanosuke V may be mentioned his Quail Kakemono (Plate 105c) of this same year, which reproduced an entire hanging scroll by weaving. Date died in 1892, leaving behind his famous Butterfly Tapestry (Plate 106), which was one of the notable Japanese exhibits at the Chicago Fair of the following year.

Other important textile exhibits at the Chicago Fair included Kawashima Jimbei’s Nikkō Festival Tapestry, and Sasaki Seishichi’s Gion Festival Tapestry (Plate 105b), the latter an impressive work more than seven by eleven feet in size. The Fourth National Industrial Fair of 1895 was also notable for its fine textile exhibits, despite the difficulties occasioned by the Sino-Japanese War. Nishimura Sōzaemon and his associates led the field, their remarkable Brocade Kannon, for example, representing the ultimate in this type of work, with over three hundred different varieties of thread employed. Kawashima Jimbei and Iida Shinshichi were not far behind, however, displaying some of their finest works of figured brocade and embroidery. Indeed, Japanese textiles had by this time reached a peak in technical achievement, but—as the Report of the Fair pointed out—despite the number of excellent painters in Kyoto, the craftsmen were still relying primarily upon ancient Japanese art for their themes, and making little attempt to improve their designs in the light of modern tastes.
From 1898 to 1912: The Continued Development of Textile Crafts

Official recognition of Japanese craftsmen continued and in 1898 Kawashima Jimbei was also elected to the Imperial Art Academy. One of his most elaborate works, the Mt. Fuji tapestry of Plate 107a, was completed at this time after some six years in production.

The general critical trend of the last decade of Meiji textiles was to be away from such magnificent, but difficult, tours de force, and toward works more adaptable to bourgeois life. Nevertheless, the influence of the international exhibitions remained a strong one. For the Paris Exhibition of 1900 the Japanese government spared no efforts to encourage a magnificent display of textiles, and even paid half the cost of the larger works of such craftsmen as Nishimura, Kawashima and Iida. The largest of all was a huge tapestry by Kawashima Jimbei, which cost ¥7,500 to produce, and for which the government granted a subsidy of ¥3,000. But although the Japanese exhibits—and in particular the embroidery—received much praise, there was a general feeling among critics both at home and abroad that a fresh approach and new designs were needed if Japanese textiles were to take a prominent place in world competition.

Younger craftsmen, who could direct Japanese textiles away from elaborate copies of paintings and toward modern, decorative designs more suited to the new age, were slow in coming forth, however, and despite the critical observations it was the old masters, and the old styles, that continued to dominate the exhibitions. It must be added, however, that the established Meiji masters, though unable to modernize their work, continued to progress and develop within their limited range. For example, such works as Kawashima Jimbei’s tapestry “Columbus’
Return" of 1903 (Plate 107b), his huge, 1905 ceiling tapestry (thirteen by forty-eight feet) of flying cranes (Plate 110b), and the other masterpieces of Kawashima, Iida and Nishimura displayed in plates 108-110, will suffice to show their continued efforts to perfect their art.

The exclusion of crafts from the first Government Exhibit of 1907 had its profound effect upon Japanese textiles. On the one hand, it reduced the craftsmen's opportunities to exhibit under official auspices, but on the other hand it did serve to awaken artisans to the fact that their efforts at modernization were lagging far behind those of the painters and sculptors. With this period the influence of the art nouveau movement at last made itself felt upon Japanese textiles in the work of such men as Fukuchi Fukuichi and Ide Umatarō; but the full development of this and other modernistic styles was not to be achieved until the succeeding Taishō Period.
III. OTHER CRAFTS

1

Ivory Carving

Though ivory carving had been known as early as the Nara Period, it was the Edo Period art of netsuke-carving that gave direct birth to Meiji ivory carving, and this largely through the interest of foreign collectors. By the same token, even with the development of independent ivory sculpture, the designs were most often uninspired copies after Hokusai's Manga and the like, often executed by craftsmen who had turned to ivory carving only because their traditional work had disappeared with the Restoration.

Nevertheless, a few masters did appear. Asahi Gyokuzan [1841-1923], Ishikawa Kōmei [1852-1913], Shimamura Shummei [1853-1896] and Shimamura Shunkō, for example, must be ranked among the leading artisans of the Meiji Era. Ishikawa Kōmei's "Ukiyo-e Figure" (Plate 111) of 1897, and Asahi Gyokuzan's "Skull Ornament" (Plate 112a) of 1881 reveal well the achievements of Meiji ivory carving, an art which, though it did not thrive on into the following period, provided one of the fountainheads of modern Japanese sculpture. (For a more detailed account of Meiji ivory carving, see above, pp. 86-87).

2

Inlaid Work

A craft that flourished along with that of ivory carving was inlaid work, at which both Ishikawa Kōmei and Asahi Gyokuzan excelled, although the members of the Shibayama family were the most noted early specialists in the form.

Perhaps the master craftsmen in this special form were the father and son Kiuchi Kihachi [1827-1902] and Kiuchi
Hanko [1855-1933], both of whom had made profound studies of the ancient treasures of the Shōsōin. Their representative works are shown in plates 112b and c. Nohara Teimei [1858-1924], a pupil of Ishikawa Kōmei, must also be counted among the masters of Meiji inlaid work (Plate 113a).

3
Shell, Wood, and Bamboo Work

Among the miscellaneous crafts of the Meiji Era must be mentioned shell inlay, tortoise-shell, wood and bamboo carving. A master of several of these forms was Kanō Tessai (Plate 113b), who combined a marked, original talent for design with his technical skill. Among the other noted carvers of the Meiji Period we should also mention Hotta Zuishō (1837-1916; Plate 114a) and Morikawa Toen (see above, p. 85; Plate 114b). In such minor arts as these—produced more for practical use than for display—may be found, contrary to expectations, some of the most satisfying work of Meiji craftsmanship.
PART FIVE

MEIJI CALLIGRAPHY

Itō Takuji
PART FIVE: MEIJI CALLIGRAPHY

JAPANESE calligraphy, by the nature of the script, embraces two quite different forms, namely, calligraphy based primarily upon Chinese models, and that which emphasizes the fluent nature of the Kana syllabary. The latter form may well be considered Japan's principal contribution to the Oriental art of beautiful writing. But, even in that calligraphy which harkens back to Chinese models, Japanese artists of the brush have made notable contributions which will be apparent to anyone who makes a study of the mutual development of that art in the countries of the Far East.

With the social upheavals of the Restoration the professional study and practice of calligraphy was interrupted, but the art was so much a part of the make-up of the scholar, statesman and poet that it continued undisturbed for the time being. Several of the great figures of the Restoration period may be numbered as well among the great calligraphers: Sakuma Shōzan, Saigō Takamori, Itō Hirobumi (Plate 118b) and at least a dozen other members of the government, samurai or court nobility. As is only natural with such men of affairs as these, it is their letters and impromptu writing, rather than set calligraphic exercises, that reflect the flavor of their lives and characters the best.

The official calligraphic style of the Tokugawa Shogunate had been the Oie-ryū, a soft, fluent, characteristically Japanese mode of writing which showed the strong influence of the cursive native syllabary even when employed for official documents in classical Chinese. With the Restoration, however, such master calligraphers as Iwaya Ichiroku and Kusakabe Meikaku
came to be employed as official secretaries to the new government, and nearly all of these men were advocates of the stronger, more precise, Chinese style of calligraphy.

From this largely fortuitous circumstance the formal, Chinese style came to predominate immediately in all government rescripts, proclamations and documents. Local governments soon followed suit, and before long even the schoolboy's copybook featured calligraphy in the Chinese manner, and the graceful Oie-ryū became practically extinct by the end of the first decade of Meiji.

One of the most popular of the early school texts appeared in 1877 featuring the calligraphy of Chō Sanshū (d. 1895; see Plate 115). Perhaps the most interesting copy-book of the period is the Inkajō of 1878-1879, prepared for middle-school use; this four-volume work took as its nucleus three exercises—in formal, cursive, and "grass" scripts—by Chō Sanshū, but then added, as prefaces and postfaces, the calligraphy of fully one hundred and twenty noted writers, such as Hidaka Chichibu (Plate 117), including Chinese and Europeans as well as Japanese, and representing all forms of Sino-Japanese writing, together with practice exercises even in English and French. It was surely a remarkable text to give to boys in their early teens. (See Plate 116 for the Postface by Oka Rokumon.)

With the second decade of Meiji, calligraphy styles began to change, and the inclusion of calligraphers among the prize-winners at the First and Second National Industrial Fairs of 1877 and 1881 did much to spark public interest in the art.

The new fashions in calligraphy were derived from recent Chinese research on stone inscriptions of the Six Dynasties Period. In distinction to the usual "Southern School" of calligraphy, which employed modern copies of handwriting dating back, supposedly, to Wang Hsi-chih, this new, "Northern School" employed stone rubbings as its models, claiming that these—dating from the actual period of the writing—were far more accurate than the endless stream of handwritten copies,
which had gradually lost the authentic flavor of the original.

Several early Meiji calligraphers, including the aforementioned Chō Sanshū, had studied in China, but it was not until the second decade of Meiji that Japanese calligraphers began to bring back with them the new ideas of Ch‘ing calligraphy, after periods of intensive study under contemporary Chinese masters. At the same time, several Chinese authorities on inscriptions and calligraphy came to Japan, notable among them being Yang Shou-ching—a pupil of the Peking master P’an Tsun—who numbered among his pupils Iwaya Ichiroku (Plate 118a) and Kusakabe Meikaku (Plate 119). The Nagasaki calligrapher Nakabayashi Gochiku (Plate 122) was in the meanwhile (1882-1884) studying intensively under P’an Tsun in Peking.

Such breaths of fresh insight from the homeland of Far Eastern calligraphy naturally had a marked effect upon the Japanese artists, who had hitherto depended largely upon the late Ming academic copy-books for their guides. Indeed, the strong, clean, masculine style of the Six Dynasties inscriptions was ideally suited to the active, inquiring spirit that characterized Meiji Japan, and this trend may probably be considered the greatest single innovation of Meiji calligraphy.

Ichiroku, Meikaku and Gochiku were among the undoubted masters of Meiji calligraphy in the Six Dynasties style. Another noted calligrapher of this period was Nishikawa Shuntō, who took, rather, the romantically eccentric, modern Ch‘ing style as his model (Plate 120), though in later life he too became adept in the Six Dynasties style.

To the reader unfamiliar with the Chinese and Japanese scripts, it may seem a bit curious to find the same “art nouveau” tendencies (this time from China) turning up in calligraphy as we have observed, for example, in Meiji painting and sculpture. Yet calligraphy had always been considered on a level with painting in the Far East, and had been practiced just as assiduously as the graphic arts over a period of at least two milleniums. It would be strange, indeed, then if such a highly
developed art form did not reflect in its styles and methods the age which created it.

By the same token, the new styles of Chinese calligraphy could hardly be accepted overnight, and during most of the first half of the Meiji Period practitioners of the old, academic Ming style naturally predominated in numbers, while the young innovators we have just mentioned were sometimes thought of as undisciplined modernists by their elders. As with most modern art, the trend was toward freedom of personal expression; yet even in the near-abstract creativity of Shuntō (Plate 120), for example, there lay concealed a firm tradition and discipline—without which, indeed, even abstract calligraphy must fail in its purpose.

Unlike the case with painting and the other arts, calligraphy had a definite place in the daily life of every educated Japanese. The new styles of calligraphy mirrored with peculiar accuracy the energetic Meiji spirit and hence were adopted as quickly by amateurs as by professionals. Already by the time of the Third and Fourth National Industrial Fairs of 1890 and 1895 the old styles of calligraphy were beginning to disappear from the competitions—though it was to be some years before the new style was to receive widespread official recognition.

Regarding calligraphy in education, the selection of school copy-books had formerly been left to the teachers but in 1903 the Ministry of Education decreed an official text for all schools. The principal calligrapher of the official texts until the time of his death in 1920 was Hidaka Chichibu (Plate 117), a pupil of Chō Sanshū and a fellow advocate of the academic Ming style. Both Chō Sanshū and Hidaka Chichibu were, of course, among the most skilled calligraphers of the Meiji Era. The former had served in the Ministry of Education and later in the Imperial Household, while the latter was the principal calligraphy teacher to the Imperial family in the second half of the Meiji Period. It was only natural that they—rather than the experimental calligraphers in modern styles—should have
been selected as school models. Thus, at any rate, the academic styles were perpetuated in the schools long after they had lost favor among both amateur and professional calligraphers alike.

With the victories of the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars national consciousness rose to new heights, and with it the popularity of the fresh, new styles of calligraphy grew. Iwaya Ichiroku, Kusakabe Meikaku and Nishikawa Shuntō at last came into their own as the leaders of Meiji calligraphy. Each of these artists had his individual style, and public acclaim passed from one to the other of the trio depending on the mood of the critics and the legion of amateur calligraphers. Ichiroku was probably the best known of the three, for he had formed his style early, and practiced it consistently to the time of his death in 1905 at the age of seventy-two. Meikaku, on the other hand, did nothing of merit until he was over fifty years of age. Like the painter Tessai, his great work dates from his old age, from about the age of sixty until his death in 1922 at the age of eighty-five; and his finest work was done in the last decade of his life. In comparing the two men’s work it may be noted that Ichiroku’s calligraphy is more individual, more expressive of his own personality, where Meikaku’s represents a purer, more idealistic spirit (plates 118b, 119). It may be added that Meikaku spent great efforts in training his pupils, with the result that his style practically dominated Japanese calligraphy circles during the late-Meiji and Taishō periods.

Nishikawa Shuntō belonged to another class again and represented the rebellion of artistic genius against the restrictions of traditional form. His work is sometimes lacking in depth, but it expresses well the witty, cosmopolitan spirit of the coming Taishō Period (Plate 120). Shuntō also left several noted pupils after his death in 1915 at the age of sixty-nine.

Despite its innovations, the calligraphy of Meikaku represented, in effect, a new academicism, while the work of Ichiroku and Shuntō, though original and clearly expressive of their
personalities, never quite created a new world of art. It remained, rather, for two masters from Kyushu to achieve the summit of Meiji calligraphy. These were Soejima Sōkai, who died in 1905 at the age of seventy-eight, and Nakabayashi Gochiku, who died in 1913 at eighty-seven.

Both men were of the Saga fief and were intimate friends; both had studied for long periods in China and derived their styles from the Six Dynasties Period. Here, however, the resemblance ends, for Sōkai rose to great rank in the government, acting at various times as Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of Home Affairs; Gochiku, on the other hand, remained in obscurity most of his life, working quietly to perfect his art, rather than seeking worldly fame.

Despite his official career, Sōkai was to prove the most lyric, poetic genius of modern Japanese calligraphy. He has left a large body of works, but no two are alike; each is an entirely original creation. He was an original poet in the Chinese styles as well, and his works are a rare combination of creative verse and calligraphy. In particular, in the strength and variety of his lines Sōkai is unequalled in recent Japanese calligraphy. (Plate 121.)

Nakabayashi Gochiku developed later than his friend Sōkai; indeed, it was not until the final decade of his life, following the death of Sōkai, that he created his most perfect and original work. Whereas Sōkai was a romantic lyricist and a master of line, Gochiku was an idealist and a master of technique, unequalled in the totality of his compositions and the all-important matter of spacial relationships. (Plate 122.)

Thus Meiji calligraphy developed from academism through neo-classicism, to the final stage of individualistic art exemplified in the genius of Sōkai and Gochiku. Not until the succeeding Taishō and Shōwa periods, however, was the greatness of these men to be fully appreciated and accepted as a model for the new age.

In the above pages we have concerned ourselves entirely
with Japanese calligraphy in the Chinese manner. Let us turn now to developments in the native style of calligraphy, featuring the flowing forms of the Kana syllabary.

Although the Kana were of course an inseparable part of the script, so far as the professional calligraphers were concerned Kana as an art form practically ceased to exist in the early Meiji Period. In the Inkajō copy-book, already noted, some hundred and twenty calligraphers were represented but only two of these were Kana masters. This was a period when the Chinese styles of calligraphy were in the ascendance both among professionals and amateurs alike.

As we have seen in most other fields of Meiji art, from the early 1880's a movement gradually evolved in Japan in opposition to the wholesale adoption of foreign culture; and with this movement grew an increasing awareness of the danger that traditional Japanese culture might disappear entirely. This nationalistic movement soon spread to the field of education as well, where the mixed Kana-Kanji script was adopted in place of the Chinese-style Kambun form. Thus did Kana-calligraphy begin to resume its former position of importance in Japanese culture.

The leaders of the new movement in Kana-calligraphy were not the professional calligraphers, however, but the scholars of Japanese literature and the poets. One important facility utilized by these students was the new Ueno National Museum, where efforts were being made to collect and study the important works of ancient Japanese calligraphy. The students of Japanese-style calligraphy further, in the year 1890, formed the Naniwazuw Society, both to further their research among various private collections and to engage in mutual criticism of each other's creative calligraphy.

The early leaders of Meiji Kana-calligraphy, among them the scholars Kosugi Onson [1834-1910] and Kurokawa Mayori [1824-1906], worked in the styles popular during the Edo Period, such as the Son'en-ryū or the Taishi-ryū. With the
younger leaders of Meiji calligraphy, however, the more ancient styles of Kana-calligraphy found the greatest favor.

The first great name to be noted in Meiji Kana-calligraphy is that of Tada Shin’ai [1840-1905], who was a Shinto priest prior to his employment in the National Museum. This calligrapher had first studied the style of Prince Son’en [1298-1356], but from the 1880’s followed the more ancient Kana styles. He brought to Kana-calligraphy a strength and firmness which had been lacking in the Edo Period Oie- and Chikage-styles, where simple grace was the principal criterion for excellence. His “Tada-ryū” was the first important new style of Kana-calligraphy in the Meiji Period, and practically dominated the field during the 1880’s and 1890’s. (See Plate 124a, which shows a verse written at the age of sixty.)

The second great name, and in effect the consolidator of Meiji Kana-calligraphy, was Ono Gadō [1862-1922]. His style was an original creation, derived both from that of such ancient Japanese poets as Ki no Tsurayuki [868-946], and from an adaptation of the cursive styles of the Chinese master Wang Hsi-chih [321-379]. It was an elegant, graceful form of calligraphy, eminently suited to poetic expression; further, it was a modern, original style, which broke with convention and suited well the spirit of the new age. In its idealistic, eclectic, modern nature, the style of Ono Gadō in Kana may well be compared with that of Kusakabe Meikaku in the Chinese manner, and indeed, these two, with Nishikawa Shuntō, were often taken as the standard models of later Meiji calligraphy. (Plate 123.)

Ono Gadō’s style flourished not only from its modern qualities, but also from the efforts of its founder as a teacher and leader in calligraphy education. He was a favorite of the Imperial household, taught calligraphy for more than thirty years at the Girls Peers School as well as in his own private academy, and from the year 1904 published a calligraphy magazine that boasted a circulation well over thirty thousand. Unlike the difficult style of Tada Shin’ai, which required continual study
of the ancients, the style created by Ono Gadō was sufficient in itself, and simple enough that it could be imitated readily by students possessed of only ordinary talent. Such being the case, the dominance of Gadō's style in the later Meiji and the Taishō periods is hardly surprising.

The general trend of later Meiji calligraphy was toward the acceptance of ancient Heian calligraphy as a model, and this trend was greatly stimulated by the studies of such men as Tanaka Shimbi [1875-]—a pupil of Tada Shin'ai—who made intensive studies in ancient Japanese calligraphy, and in 1907 produced the first comprehensive guide to ancient writing which could readily be employed as a copy-book.

This return to the strength of the ancient calligraphers provided the element that had been lacking in much of Meiji calligraphy. With the work of Onoe Saishū [1876-]—a pupil of Oguchi Taiji—Meiji calligraphy may be said to have reached its full maturity. Saishū's calligraphy succeeded in retaining the pliant strength of the ancient poets, while yet expressing an individual, modern nature. (Plate 124b.)

In its totality, Meiji calligraphy represented the development from one of the lowest levels of the Japanese art of writing to the consolidation of new styles—based on the native and Chinese ancients—which were to provide the effective model for most of the Japanese calligraphy of the twentieth century.

It will be seen that Meiji calligraphy developed along lines somewhat similar to painting in the Japanese style. The important differences were, on the one hand, that Western calligraphy had little to teach to the Japanese, while, on the other, calligraphy never enjoyed the publicity and official support that were accorded most of the other arts, and was even excluded—with the crafts—from the Government Exhibitions of 1907 and following.

Nevertheless, the art of fine writing filled a definite need in the Japanese consciousness. Except in the field of teaching, it could never be more than a "hobby" for the average person,
yet even so, multitudes practiced this art, supported magazines and private exhibitions devoted to it, and through largely individual effort refused to let die this ancient, characteristic art of Japan.
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I. Early Meiji Architecture, 1868-1885

The modernization of Japanese architecture following the opening of Japan and the Restoration meant, in effect, the gradual adoption of Western styles and methods. Two factors that immediately come to mind in this connection are (1) the fact that traditional Japanese architecture featured wooden structure and the trabeated style [i.e., the use of beams rather than arches or vaulting] where Western architecture employed brick or stone and the arcuated style, and (2) the fact that Western architecture itself was undergoing many changes and innovations during this period. The first parts of the Meiji Era involved the mastery of the new foreign styles and materials, while in the later period Japanese architects were at last able to make their own original contributions to architecture in Western style.

Already at the beginning of the Meiji Era Japanese architects were making notable experiments in Western style. These we shall discuss first, before turning to the work of early foreign architects and engineers in Japan.

Full-fledged construction in such foreign materials as brick was of course impossible for the early Japanese architects, and they compromised by exploiting the exotic elements of Western architecture, while employing materials easily obtainable in Japan. This semi-foreign style thus featured a timber frame construction, faced with stone or stucco, and frequently the outer walls were decorated with tiles and semicircular joints, or faced with clapboards.
The models for these early attempts at imitating foreign architecture were the foreign settlements at the open ports, which had been designed by foreigners and erected by Japanese builders during the decade prior to the Restoration. The exotic architecture and customs of these settlements were a favorite subject of the Japanese color print artists, and we also possess photographs which reveal how they looked in the early years of Meiji. (Plates 125a, b, c.) The foreign mercantile houses and consulates were generally built of wood faced with stone, in the so-called colonial style.

It was through these foreign-supervised projects that Japanese architects first became familiar with the actual methods of Western architecture. In 1861, for example, four Japanese builders were appointed contractors for the foreign settlement at Yokohama, and among them was Shimizu Kisuke II [1815-1881], who was to prove one of the leaders of early Meiji architecture. In the fields of ecclesiastical and factory architecture also, Western-style buildings had already been designed by foreign clergymen or engineers in the 1860's. Notable examples were a cotton-mill in Kagoshima (1867), and Roman Catholic churches in Yokohama (1862-64) and Nagasaki (1862), the latter of which, as enlarged in 1874, has been reconstructed since the late war. (Plates 126-127.) Of these, the mill was of stone construction and the churches of timber frame.

Shimizu Kisuke II had come to Edo in the eighteen-thirties, working as a carpenter under Shimizu Kisuke I in the repair of Edo Castle, and later being placed in charge of the firm's Yokohama branch. The Tsukiji Hotel (1867-68) was his masterpiece, and representative of the best of the early Western-style architecture employed by the Japanese. (Plates 128-129).

This hotel had been designed for foreigners visiting Tokyo, and was built on a picturesque site by the bay. It was surrounded by grounds tastefully laid out with paths among flower-beds, shrubbery and grassy knolls, and featured a timber frame construction faced with stucco, the length of the building being
240 feet, the width 200 feet. A central tower ninety-three feet high commanded an extensive view of the city. Though the building, with its symmetrical plan and elevation, was characteristic of the new style, certain of its details nevertheless reflected traditional elements derived from Buddhist architecture.

That the Tsukiji Hotel provided superior accommodations is attested to by S. Mossman, who wrote in his New Japan (1873; p. 351): "There the traveller could find a building, with roomy apartments, equal in comfort to some of the best hotels in Europe or America. . . . The accommodation was suitable for about one hundred visitors, according to the size of apartments in Japan hotels; in Europe it would be made to suit three hundred. In addition to the dining-hall, there was a billiard-room and drawing-room, with long corridors and verandahs." Contemporary Japanese references indicate that the Tsukiji Hotel was highly esteemed as a symbol of civilization by a people who had just emerged from the feudal age.

Shimizu afterwards erected several foreign mercantile houses in Yokohama, as well as, in Tokyo, the First Bank of Mitsui (1871-72), which later became the First National Bank, but was called the "Mitsui House" at the time. (Plate 130a.) This building was of timber frame construction faced with stone, with galleries on the two stories. The columns and balustrade on the second gallery were of bronze.

Here also we can observe traditional and Western forms mingled: while the outer wall, cornice and other moldings were faced with stucco, the roof over the third story followed the style of Japanese traditional architecture. Like the Tsukiji Hotel, this building featured a central tower, eighty-three feet high (including a flag-staff), which preserved several native features.

After Mitsui House became the First National Bank it was Shimizu again who planned the new Mitsui Bank at Surugachō in Tokyo, completed in 1874. A contemporary photograph will give some idea how strangely the new architecture appear-
ed against the background of Edo Period structures (Plate 130b).

Another pioneer architect of the early Meiji Era was Hayashi Chūjo [1835-?], who had come to Yokohama as a carpenter in 1865, and studied architecture under English and American craftsmen. Later, as architect for the Public Works Bureau, he erected many buildings in Tokyo, such as the Kaisei School (1873), the predecessor of Tokyo University. (Plate 131a.) This manner of timber frame construction faced with stucco, and often faced with stone at the corners of the outer wall, was taken as a model, and many primary schools were built in this style. The Communications Ministry (1874) was another notable production of Hayashi, who, though he likewise featured an eclectic style, aimed at greater simplicity of design than did Shimizu. (Plate 131b).

From a study of these and other buildings by such early Meiji architects as Shimizu and Hayashi we can see that their attitude was primarily an eclectic one, based on exoticism. They produced excellent works for the time, but had not been afforded enough background to enable them really to understand the essential qualities of Western architecture. At the same time, Japanese designers were commencing a more intensive study of the history of Western architecture, and already in the year 1874 we find the construction of such a striking example of pure Renaissance architecture as the Osaka Prefectural Office (Plate 132a), produced by anonymous architects in West Japan.

Let us turn now to the achievements of the early foreign architects in Japan. Even before the Restoration the Japanese government had employed Dutch and French experts for the erection of dockyards at Nagasaki and Yokosuka, for the purpose of defense and foreign trade. According to a listing of 1872, the fifth year of Meiji, there were already 214 foreign employees of the government in Japan, of the following nationalities: English (119), French (50), American (16), Prussian (8), Dutch (2), Italian (1), Portuguese (1), Austrian
(1), Danish (1), Filipino (4), Chinese (9), Indian (2). As creative architects, however, two men deserve our particular attention, namely, Waters and Bridgens.

T. J. Waters, an Englishman, arrived in Japan in 1868 at the age of thirty-seven or thirty-eight and was employed in the Mint and Public Works Bureau of the Ministry of Finance. When the government determined to establish a Mint in 1868 Waters was asked to design this building on the recommendation of the English merchant T. B. Glover. The construction of the Mint buildings, interrupted once by fire, was completed in Osaka in 1871, and they were the first really authentic examples of Western architecture to be completed by a foreigner in Japan. Two of the buildings in particular deserve mention, the Sempukan (Plate 133a), which served as a reception building, and the Foundry itself (Plate 133b). The reception building was of brick faced with plaster and stone, and designed in the Renaissance manner; it still stands today. Its plan is almost square, with each floor surrounded by galleries on three sides. Waters’ favorite style will be seen in the façade, composed of the simple pediment, stone columns symmetrically arranged, and wooden balustrade of simple design. The Foundry, which was the first modern factory in Japan, was built of brick and stone, and followed Classic Revival architectural styles. In these buildings, and other notable works such as the Takehashi Barracks (1871), the British Legation (1872), and the Central Communications Office (1877), we may discern Waters’ consistent interest in reviving classical architecture, while rejecting superfluous decoration.

For the above buildings Waters had constructed a brick kiln out of imported bricks and, indeed, he might be termed the father of brick architecture in Japan. Except for various lighthouses planned by a French engineer, the first brick building in Japan was the Commercial Museum in Tokyo, designed and built by Waters in 1871.

Following the Tokyo Fire of 1872 the government deter-
mined to substitute brick buildings for the wooden ones on that part of the main street which lay between Shimbashi and Nihombashi. This section, called the Ginza, was the finest commercial thoroughfare in Tokyo. Waters, as the leader in this reconstruction work, began with the erection of a kiln in order to produce sufficient bricks. The reconstruction was executed by the Building Bureau and the main street was completed in 1873. For the first time the Ginza appeared as a well-ordered thoroughfare, rows of trees planted between sidewalk and roadway, gas lamps standing at important points and, on either side, rows of brick buildings with colonnades. (Plates 132b and c.) The praise of a contemporary writer, "Here one feels as if one were in a foreign country for a while," is echoed even today by country visitors to the Ginza. The Ginza reconstruction work was important not only in popularizing the new brick construction, but also as the first street improvement project in modern Japan.

The second foreign architect of note was R. P. Bridgens, who came to Japan in about 1868 and worked as a private architect in Tokyo and Yokohama. Among his works were the Shimbashi Railway Station, the Yokohama Railway Station, and the Hōraisha office building, all completed in 1872. The two-story Shimbashi Station (Plate 134a) consisted of a central block and two wings; it was of timber frame construction faced with stone. In the regular fenestration, triangular and round pediments over the windows, the cornices, and the whole symmetrical composition, we can discern a style rather different from Waters'. All of Bridgens' work displays a unity of style and provided Japanese architects with an excellent example of the pure Western style of stone building using a timber frame. Since Bridgens was the only private architect to arrive in Japan during these early years other works were doubtless produced by him; unfortunately, however, little is known of Bridgens' career in Japan other than his work on the three buildings already noted.
While most of the buildings in Western style were erected in the large cities, there were also some structures in Western style designed by foreigners in the provinces. An example of this group is the Hokkaidō Development Office (1873) in Sapporo (Plate 134b). This building, ninety-nine feet in length and sixty feet in width with a domical tower eighty-four feet high, was erected under the guidance of Horace Caplon, advisor to the Commissioner of Colonization in Hokkaidō. The pure Western style of the work was much admired by the Japanese of those days as an example of the American style in public buildings.

At about the same time two notable buildings of the Technological College in Tokyo were erected in a modified Gothic Revival style by Alexander McVean and William Anderson. In general, the work of Western architects in Japan it may be said that they followed—quite naturally—the purely Western styles then current, and were built largely of brick and stone.

With the establishment of the Ministry of Technology (Kōbu-shō) late in 1870 government building projects received a fresh impetus. In particular, from the year 1874 all official construction became the responsibility of this Ministry, and in the following year an Office of Architecture was set up which administered all government building projects until the abolition of the Ministry a decade later.

During this period, 1874-1885, architecture for government offices and schools suddenly turned completely Western. Concrete and brick now replaced the earlier compromise styles of wooden frame with stone or stucco facing. In this period too, the guidance in the new structures was provided by foreign architects and engineers.

The young French architect C. de Boinville [1849-?] had arrived in Japan in 1872 under a three-year government contract. He was to display to the Japanese something of the decorative style of current French architecture, as in the Printing Office (Plate 135b), built in 1876. This impressive build-
ing had been planned originally by Waters, but in the details of its final execution (note the thick glass chrysanthemum window and the phoenix which surmounts the entrance) it is typically de Boinville's work.

Another representative work of this architect was the Technological College Auditorium (Plate 135a) of 1877, built in brick and stone, and skillfully combining several styles of architecture, both classical and Renaissance. The Foreign Office of 1881 (Plate 136c) seems also to have been principally the work of de Boinville, though he was assisted by Cappelletti.

G. V. Cappelletti [d. 1887]—as has been recorded earlier in this volume—arrived in Japan in 1875 as a professor at the new Technological Art School. From the year 1879, however, he ceased his work at the school and was employed as architect in several government ministries until 1885, when he went to America, dying there two years later.

Cappelletti's masterpieces in Japan were the Army General Staff Office (Plate 136a) and the Army Memorial Hall (Plate 136b), both completed in 1881. The first of these was in the Italian Renaissance style, a three-story building in brick; the second followed the Northern Italian Romanesque style, in a skillful combination of brick and marble. Together, they served—as did most of the work of the early foreign architects—to introduce faithfully the best of the architecture of their builders' native traditions. They illustrated, as no words or pictures could, the solid reality of Western architecture, and formed the basis for later Japanese achievements in the field.

Perhaps the most influential of all the early Western architects, however, was the Englishman J. Conder [1852-1920], who arrived in Japan in 1877 as Professor of Architecture in the Technological College. Conder was not only to train the best of the new generation of Japanese architects, but also did much notable work in practical design for the government.

Doubtless his masterpiece was the Ueno Museum, a huge, two-story structure in brick, which was completed in 1882 and
made effective use of Oriental motifs in its details (plates 137a and b). Conder was also the designer of the famous Rokumeikan (Plate 137c), which was to become symbolic of the elements urging the Westernization of Japan, and provided a notable example of English Renaissance architecture and interior decoration. His Tokyo Imperial University, Department of Literature and Law (Plate 138a), of 1884, constituted another masterpiece of this period, and provided a fine example of English Gothic architecture, eminently suited to house one of the centers of Japanese scholarship.

Conder’s work also extended to fine houses for the nobility, such as the Arisugawa Mansion (1884) and the Kita-shirakawa Mansion (1885), the former in Renaissance, the latter in French Gothic style. Lesser foreign architects of this period included J. Lescasse, R. Mulder, and J. Diack, each of whom contributed his part in the diffusion of western architectural styles in Meiji Japan.

When we turn again to the work of Japanese architects during the first half of the Meiji Period we find them inevitably lagging behind their foreign colleagues. The semi-Western style still predominated and, indeed, was a necessity in the numerous government and educational projects where full-scale brick and stone buildings were too expensive. Such a building in full Western style as the Yokohama Post Office (Plate 139a) of 1874 is notable for this early period, but may well have been planned under Bridgens’ supervision.

With the Yokohama Customs Office (Plate 139b) of 1885, however, built by Shimizu Mitsunosuke [1852-1887], we find an excellent example of semi-Renaissance architecture produced by a Japanese worker. The first graduates of the Technological College’s new Architecture Department began to appear in 1879, and among them were such young men as Tatsuno, Kata-yama, Sone, Sadachi and Fujimoto, who were to provide the leadership in future Japanese architecture. Yamaguchi Han-roku [1858-1900] must also be mentioned here. He was one of
the first Japanese architects to study abroad, and after his return from France he was employed by the Ministry of Education, for whom he designed the pioneer College of Science (Rika Daigaku) Administration Building seen in Plate 138b (1885).

Although the majority of the early structures in Western style were produced in the centers of foreign trade and intercourse—Tokyo, Yokohama, Kobe, Nagasaki—developments in the provinces must not be overlooked. The northern city of Sapporo was especially notable in this respect, with the Toyohira-kan (Plate 140a) of 1881 only one example of the styles attempted in this area.

Kyoto was prominent in the building of elementary schools in Western style, but the best example extant today is the Nakagome Primary School in Nagano Prefecture (Plate 141a). Still standing much as it did at the time it was built in 1875, this school displays the watch-tower that predominated in the early Meiji schoolhouses. The building was the work of Ichikawa Daijirō, a country carpenter who had worked for foreign architects in Tokyo, and who from 1869 to 1873 had been employed in America.

A more elaborate example of early Meiji architecture in Nagano Prefecture is the Kaichi School at Matsumoto, built by another carpenter, Tateishi Kiyoshige, in 1876. This structure was doubtless influenced by the Kaisei School (Plate 131a), built three years earlier, but it stands out as a remarkable achievement for the time and place, and clearly attests to the spread of the fad for things foreign even to the country provinces.

In concluding this chapter on early Meiji architecture notice should be made of this subject in relation to theatres, parks and exhibitions.

From the year 1842 through the early Meiji Period Saruwaka-chō in Asakusa was the center of Edo drama, but the "Three Theatres of Edo" — the Morita-za, Nakamura-za and
Ichimura-za—featured surprisingly primitive architecture. Even such new theatres of the Meiji Era as the Saruwaka-za and the Shintomi-za showed only preliminary breaks with the earlier architecture. It was not, indeed, until Western drama became popular in Japan that the styles of theatrical architecture were to change radically.

The Morita-za had moved from Asakusa to central Tokyo in 1872 (with little architectural change), and in 1875 changed its name to the Shintomi-za. The theatre burned down, however, in the following year and the new building, completed in 1878, proved an excellent example of the new trends in Kabuki architecture (Plate 140b). As is true with much of the Westernization of Japan, it was the conveniences of Western architecture that were first adopted, and the use of gas lamps in illumination, for example, was to have its effect upon methods of staging.

The new theatre opened with the Kabuki actors appearing in trousers and swallow-tailed coats, the Army and Navy bands performing, and eminent persons from all quarters present at the premier. Other Tokyo theatres soon followed the lead of the Shintomi-za in renovating their appearance, but the changes were largely superficial, and it was not until the theatre reform movement arose that authentic Western-style architecture was to appear in the theatrical world.

In passing, we must note that the Meiji Era ushered in a new age for Japanese parks. These had hitherto been the property of the feudal lords or the temples, but now they came into the possession of the new ruling classes or the public. Most of the early public parks consisted of areas already in existence, and marked nothing new so far as the art of gardening was concerned. Thus in 1873 Ueno, Asukayama, and the temple or shrine grounds of Asakusa, Shiba and Fukagawa were named public parks. In such newly developed areas as Yokohama, Sapporo and Hakodate, however, the public parks were from the beginning constructed under Western influence, though it
was to be some years yet before Westernization spread to the parks of the older centers of Japan.

We may also record the place that fairs and expositions played in early and mid-Meiji architecture, for these gave architects a chance not only to experiment with new styles at home, but also to introduce Japanese architecture abroad. Thus at the Vienna Exposition of 1873 prizes were awarded for two Japanese buildings—the architects of which stayed on in Europe for study even after the Exposition was over.

In the face of the magnificent foreign structures at such fairs, the Japanese had no choice but to concentrate on picturesque and aesthetically appealing elements derived from ancient Japan, and this factor may well have had its influence in re-educating Japanese architects to the splendor of their own tradition. The greatest effort of Japanese architects abroad occurred at the time of the Chicago Columbian Exposition of 1893, when the entire Phoenix Hall of the Uji Byōdōin [eleventh century A.D.] was reproduced in America (Plate 149b). This enormous project was directed by Kuru Masamichi and Oda Senkichi, and both the materials and carpenters were sent over from Japan. The interior decoration too was designed to illustrate the best of pre-modern Japanese painting and carving in reproduction, and the project must be recognized as having demonstrated the remarkable qualities of Heian architecture at the same time to foreigners and Japanese alike.
II. ARCHITECTURE IN THE MID-MEJI PERIOD, 1886-1894

The Ministry of Technology was dissolved in 1885, and in the following year official construction became the province of a newly created Architecture Office. The Architectural Society was formed in 1886 for the advancement of architectural research, and in the same year the Architectural Department of the old Technological College became a part of the new Imperial University, which was to prove the center of architectural education throughout the Meiji Era.

With the mid-Meiji Period Western architecture may at last be said to have been mastered by Japanese architects. This was also—with the growing development of Japanese industry—a period of strong German influence on Japanese architecture. Matsuzaki Banchō, head of the new Architecture Office, had himself studied in Germany, and on the recommendation of the German government, the leading firm of Ende-Böckmann was selected to advise the Japanese architects. Both directors of the firm, H. Ende [1829-1907] and W. Böckmann [1832-1902], traveled to Japan in 1886 and 1887 to oversee the new projects, and they also brought Japanese architects and technicians to Germany to be trained in their own firm. In all, some dozen Japanese technicians and workers were sent to Germany for a three year period, returning to Japan in 1889.

The actual plans for construction of a complex of government buildings did not—for financial and other reasons—achieve realization. (The German architects had favored a style utilizing two-thirds Japanese traditional architecture and one-third Western, but this was strongly opposed by the Japanese Architecture Office.) The most significant fruit of this plan lay, rather, in the training and experience gained by the young architects and technicians who had studied under Ende
and Böckmann in Germany.

Typical of the Japanese architecture of this period executed under German direction was the Ministry of Justice (Plate 142b), completed in 1895 by Ende-Böckmann and their associates (with their apprentice Kawai Kōzō in charge of actual construction). German machinery was imported for the manufacture of necessary building materials, and for the first time veneer was widely employed. This rather austere style of Western architecture soon became a model for Japanese public buildings. Another notable work was the Tokyo National Court (Plate 142a) of the following year, planned by A. Hartung of the Ende-Böckmann firm and executed by Tsumagi Raikō, another Japanese architect who had studied with the firm in Germany.

In the meanwhile J. Conder continued his work of education and design, the latter including such noted buildings as the Nicolai Cathedral (Plate 143a) of 1891, based on the plans of the Russian architect M. A. Shtchurupov, and the Naval Ministry (Plate 142c) of 1894. Perhaps even more significant was Conder's construction of the Marunouchi business center, begun in 1894. This work had been planned by the Mitsubishi Company in imitation of London's Lombard Street, and proved the first group of office buildings for rent in Japan. Sone Tatsuō was the Japanese architect in charge of construction. (Plate 143b.)

With this period we may turn back to the first four graduates of the Technological College's Architecture Department; to them lay the task of adapting Western styles to the actual needs of Japan.

Tatsuno Kingo [1854-1919] was to prove the great educator in Meiji architecture. He had studied with W. Burges, and at the Royal Academy of Arts in London, and traveled widely before returning to Japan in 1883. In 1886 he was appointed professor in the Engineering College (Kōka Daigaku), for which, in 1888, he planned and constructed the impressive
building shown in Plate 144. Tatsuno is known to have had a hand in the planning of some 228 buildings during his lifetime, and did notable work for the Shimizu Construction Company, such as the Shibusawa Residence shown in Plate 145a. In addition to this practical work, however, Tatsuno Kingo was also the first important scholar of Japanese architecture, and did much work in surveying the architectural treasures remaining from traditional Japan.

Katayama Tōkuma [1853-1917] was known as the principal architect for the Imperial household during the Meiji Era, but his public works are also notable. The Japan Red Cross Hospital, for example (Plate 145b), and the Postal Communications Office (Plate 145c), completed in 1890 and 1892 respectively, are typical of his early work. Katayama's best-known edifices date from 1894 and 1895, however, namely the Nara and Kyoto National Museums (plates 146a and b), which still stand today.

Sone Tatsuzō [1852-1937] did his first important work with Conder for the Mitsubishi buildings, already noted, and he continued to improve the construction of these red brick office buildings that were extended year after year. In 1893 Sone was sent to America to study, in particular, iron-frame construction.

Unlike the above three architects, who worked mainly in Tokyo, Sadachi Shichijirō [1856-1922] propagated the new architecture in the other cities of Japan. His notable works included the Nagoya, Yokohama and Osaka Post Offices of 1887, 1889 and 1892 respectively.

Among other pioneer architects of this period who had studied abroad and mastered notable Western styles was Watanabe Yuzuru, whose Imperial Hotel of 1890 (Plate 147b) was one of the landmarks of the period. Tsumagi Raikō, already mentioned, worked principally for the Tokyo Prefectural Government, and his huge Prefectural Offices of 1893 (Plate 147a), in stone and brick, provided an interesting contrast with the English-style brick offices across the way.
Niinomi Takamasa [1857-1922] reverted to Gothic styles in such stately buildings as his Peers School for Girls (Plate 147c) of 1889. Other noteworthy architects of the period included Yamaguchi Hanroku, whose early work we have already seen above (page 181 and Plate 138b) and who went on to build a series of higher schools for the Ministry of Education.

The movement for the modernization of Japanese drama was now gaining force, and when Takahara Kōzō [1845-1918] built the new Kabuki-za in 1889 he employed a combination of Western and native styles in which, however, the former dominated (Plate 148b). Nakamura Tatsutarō’s [1860-1942] Kairyō Engeikan (Reform Theatre) of the same year, true to its name, broke entirely free of the traditions of Japanese theatre and was completely Western in design (Plate 148c). In the field of private mansions too, Japanese architects were now in full control of Western techniques, as will be seen in the Nabeshima Residence of 1892, planned before his early death by Sakamoto Mototsune [1855-1888] of the Shimizu Company (Plate 148a).

In a period when Japanese architects had only with effort succeeded in mastering authentic Western styles, it was still too early for any revival of a full-scale interest in traditional native architecture. In the field of Buddhist and Shinto architecture it was not, indeed, to be until the end of the Meiji Period that active rebuilding commenced. One notable example of the incipient reaction against Western architecture, however, was the Nara Prefectural Office of 1895 (Plate 149a). Here the architect, Nagano Uheiji [1867-1937], succeeded well in creating a modern building which yet blended with the ancient capital surrounding it.

Rather than facing the problem of the compatibility of Western and Japanese architecture, the scholars of the mid-Meiji Period were concerned primarily with the problems of the relationship of architecture with decoration, and with art in general. Kawai Kōzō, for example, had raised as early as 1888
the question of architecture's exact nature, with its foundation in engineering but its equal affinity to the fine arts. (As we have seen in the case of sculpture, only painting and calligraphy had been accorded a high place among the arts in old Japan.) Another critic, Shimoda Kikutaro, stressed that practical, formal and artistic qualities were all vital to any genuine work of architecture. Itō Chūta [1867-1954] went even further in the philosophical study of architecture, making a careful distinction between the builder and the architect, the latter’s final aim being the creation of a work of art. Such ideal distinctions were not always possible to make in practice, but credit must go to Itō Chūta for his continued efforts to remind Japanese architects of their responsibility to create beauty, in addition to simple protection from the elements.
III. LATER MEIJI ARCHITECTURE, 1895-1912

Perhaps the most striking innovation of later Meiji architecture was the use of iron frame construction and reinforced concrete. Iron and steel had been employed for bridge construction from the early years of Meiji, but it was not until the early twentieth century that these materials began to revolutionize Japanese building techniques. First used in factories and warehouses in 1895, steel reinforcement gradually came to interest Japanese architects familiar with its use in America. One of the notable early uses of this method was in the Mitsui Bank Main Office (Plate 152a), begun in 1896 by Yokogawa Tamisuke and completed in 1902. Effective use of the new reinforced concrete may be seen in the Maruzen Building of 1907-1909, by Sano Riki (Plate 152c), and the Imperial Theatre of 1907-1911 (Plate 152b) by Yokogawa.

Together with these technical innovations, the keynote of later Meiji architecture was the final mastery of Western techniques by Japanese architects, who no longer had to rely upon foreign advisors in their work.

Not, however, that Japanese architects were now ready to create entirely from their own experience. Thus for the important Bank of Japan buildings completed in 1896 (plates 150a and b), Tatsuno Kingo spent a full year abroad surveying the bank buildings of America and Europe, and received considerable help from English architects in planning the first drafts. Following this huge project, Tatsuno, in addition to his educational work, acted as advisor in the construction of several of the branches of the Bank of Japan, such as the Osaka Office (Plate 151b) of 1903, and a number of other similar projects such as the First Bank Main Office (Plate 151a) of 1902, and various banks constructed for the Sumitomo family during the last decade of Meiji.
Further, Tatsuno formed a commercial architectural office and planned a variety of other building projects, from offices to factories and private residences, all in purely Western style. One of Tatsuno’s most striking works in this connection was the huge Kokugikan arena at Ryōgoku in Tokyo (1909; plates 153b and c), which managed to combine a seating capacity of 13,000 with a certain massive beauty. Tatsuno’s impressive Tokyo Station (Plate 153a) of 1911-1914 further reveals the genius of his last years and represents one of the masterpieces of the late Meiji and early Taishō periods.

In the meanwhile Katayama Tōkuma had continued his work for the Imperial household, this culminating in his masterpiece—and perhaps the grandest edifice of the Meiji Period—the Akasaka Detached Palace of 1899-1909 (plates 154a and b, 155a; 81). This building, still used today as the Diet Library, represents the peak of Western-style architecture in the Meiji Era, and was the result of several trips to Europe and America on the part of the architect. It was modeled, quite frankly, upon the palace architecture of Europe, and particularly that of France. Yet even when we acknowledge the indebtedness of its designer, the edifice must be concluded a remarkable achievement for this period, only forty years after the introduction of Western architecture into Japan. Another work, still standing, completed at this time under the direction of Katayama was the Hyōkeikan Museum of 1901-1908 (Plate 155b).

Although iron and steel reinforcement had been introduced in the late Meiji Period, they were not to come into widespread use until the following era; the last decade of Meiji was, rather, a period featuring the diffusion of brick and stone building techniques into everyday Japanese architecture.

Conder continued his important work of displaying English-style architecture in all kinds of forms and places. Among his works of the period 1896-1898 were the Italian, German and Austrian Embassies, and the Nagasaki Hotel. The Yokohama United Club of 1901 (Plate 156b) is also typical of his work at
this time. The Marunouchi brick office buildings continued to
grow under Conder's supervision, with the actual design in the
hands of such Japanese architects as Sone and Tatsuno. The
completely foreign atmosphere of this group of buildings soon
gave the area the name "Little London" (Plate 156a). In 1908
Sone formed, with Chūjō Seiichirō, an architectural company
which produced such notable buildings as the Waseda University
Memorial Hall of 1911 and the Keiō Academy Memorial Library
of 1912 (Plate 157c).

While Sone followed Conder in the use of predominantly
English styles, there was an important group of architects who
featured the styles they had learned during their studies in
Germany. Most prominent of these workers was Tsumagi Rai-
kō, whose Tokyo Industrial Club was completed in 1899 (Plate
157b), but whose masterwork was probably the Yokohama
Specie Bank of 1904 (Plate 157a). Other prominent architects
of this German-oriented group were Watanabe Yuzuru, Kawai
Kōzō, and Taki Daikichi, the latter of whom constructed the
masterly General Staff Office of 1899 (Plate 158a).

Other notable architectural monuments of this late Meiji
Period include the Osaka Library of Noguchi and Hidaka,
completed in 1904 (Plate 158b), and the Ueno National Library
of 1906, in which several architects took a hand. An impressive
use of English Gothic style will be seen in the National Railways
Office of 1910, constructed by Ueno Hajime (Plate 159b), and
a striking use of red brick in the Metropolitan Police Head-
quarters of the following year, planned by Fukuoka Tsune-
jirō (Plate 159a).

In contrast to these large-scale public buildings in such
historical styles as Renaissance and Gothic, there began to ap-
pear at this juncture new, modern developments in Japanese
architecture. The Yokohama Bankers' Club of 1905, for ex-
ample, built by Endō Oto (Plate 160a), shows a simplicity and
grace typical of the best of the new architecture. It was, how-
ever, in shops and stores that these new trends predominated
toward the end of Meiji, the Ginza's Itōya Stationery Store of 1909 (Plate 160b), built by Kitada Kyūichi, providing an excellent example of the changing styles.

In Europe at this time nineteenth century eclecticism was giving way to the Art Nouveau and Secession movements, which attempted to free artists from the bonds of the past. But although the influence of these movements was already apparent in the construction of certain shops and private residences during the final years of Meiji, their necessity was not yet strongly felt by Japanese architects, who had only recently succeeded in mastering nineteenth century European eclecticism, and who did not yet feel any great urge to escape from such a recently acquired tradition.

The work of scholars of traditional Japanese architecture like Itō Chūta continued during the late Meiji Era, Itō even planning the construction of such fine modern examples in the traditional style as the Asano Residence of 1909 (Plate 162b). Even the masters of Western architecture had begun to feel the need to preserve some of the features of native architecture, and we see this need expressed already in such eclectic buildings as the Japan Industrial Bank of 1899, by Tsumagi Raikō and Takeda Goichi (Plate 161a).

Such buildings as the new Kabuki-za of 1911 (Plate 161b), by Shimizu Shōtarō, were by their nature traditional in general form, though taking advantage of the conveniences of Western construction methods. On the other hand, at this same period there developed a really eclectic style, typified by the Shirokiya Dry-goods Store of the same year (Plate 162a), by Itō Kichitarō, which was quite popular for a time, being known as the "Shirokiya" or "Itō" Style. In this style, Western architecture predominated, but in many of the external and internal details (note the tower modeled on the floats of the ancient Gion Festival) traditional Japanese forms were incorporated.

Such attempts to reassert the vitality of native architecture were only natural now after nearly a half-century of sub-
servience—in public buildings, at least—to Western styles. But such efforts were to prove short-lived in the realm of public architecture, except, of course, in such special fields as museum and theatre architecture, where a modicum of traditional Japanese flavor was considered vital for "atmosphere." In effect, the world of public architecture now belonged to the exponents of purely Western methods, and the scholarly debates on means of somehow creating a new, eclectic Occidental-Japanese style were never to find practical fulfillment.
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### ERRATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>page</th>
<th>line</th>
<th>for</th>
<th>read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22b</td>
<td>22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>practice</td>
<td>practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>principal</td>
<td>principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>, Collin</td>
<td>Collin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>(omit period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>86–87</td>
<td>87–88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>55b</td>
<td>Takeji: Fujishima</td>
<td>Fujishima Takeji:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>192,(148c)</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kenzan VI (六世乾山)</td>
<td>152</td>
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LIST OF PLATES

1. Kanō Hōgai: Hibo Kannon, 1888. (Tokyo Fine Arts College Collection, 6.45×2.85 shaku.*)
2. Hashimoto Gahō: Rinzai Admonishing a Pupil, 1897.
3. Kishi Chikudō: Cat in Moonlight, 1898. (5.25×2.33.)
5. Takeuchi Seihō: After the Rain, 1907. (Ministry of Education.)
7. Shimomura Kanzan: Autumn in the Forest, 1907. (National Museum of Modern Art, 5.6×5.6 each section.)
9. Tomioka Tessai: Wind and Rain at the Mountain Retreat, ca. 1912. (4.12×2.)
10 a. Taniguchi Aizan: Landscape, 1899.
10 b. Okuhara Seiko: Scene from "The Three Kingdoms," 1879. (4.22×2.08.)
11 b. Sugawara Hakuryū: Stormy Landscape, ca. 1885. (5.8×2.3.)
12 a. Tomioka Tessai: Tea Farm at Uji.
12 b. Tasaki Sōun: Autumn Mountain Afterglow, 1882. (4.75×1.9.)
13 a. Tanomura Chokenyū: Twelve Blossoms, 1900. (4.9×2.3.)
13 b. Hineno Taizen: Hollyhock and Bamboo. (Tokyo Fine Arts College, 4.14×1.8.)
15 b. Noguchi Shōhin: Autumn Grasses, 1901. (5.5×2.4.)
16 b. Imao Keinen: Old Pine and Peacocks.
17 a. Tosa Mitsubumi: Palace Ceremony.

* Measurements for paintings, where known, are given in Japanese shaku (approximately one foot); other art objects are given in the metric system.
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18 a. Mori Kansai: Landscape, 1886. (4.3×1.65.)
18 b. Kōno Bairei: Chinese Maiden, ca. 1885. (Collection Takeuchi Seihō, 4.35×1.65.)
19 a. Suzuki Kason: Wild Monkeys by Waterfall, 1901. (5.5×2.4.)
19 b. Kubota Beisen: Cat and Peonies, ca. 1885. (4.5×1.86.)
20 a. Araki Kampo: Plum Tree. (6.45×3.35.)
20 b. Matsumoto Fūko: Kusunoki Journeying to Kasagi, 1900. (5.5×3.)
21 a. Ogata Gekkō: Festival of the Nine Buddhas at Okuzawa, 1910. (Tokyo Fine Arts College, 2.65×4.05.)
21 b. Mizuno Toshikata: Satō Tadanobu in Attendance, 1898. (Imperial Household Office, 3.3×4.48.)
22 b. Kajita Hankō: Chinese Beauty, 1912. (3.68×1.3.)
23 a. Kanō Hōgai: Giant Eagle, 1888. (Tokyo Fine Arts College, 10.75×6.8.)
24 b. Hashimoto Gahō: White Clouds and Autumn Leaves, 1890. (Tokyo Fine Arts College, 8.8×5.3.)
25 a. Kobori Tomoto: Warrior, 1897. (Tokyo Fine Arts College, 7.45×3.77.)
25 b. Terazaki Kōgyō: Wang Yang-Ming, 1902. (6.56×3.84.)
26 a. Kawabata Gyokushō: Under the Trees, 1907. (5.78×8.41.)
26 b. Kawai Gyokudō: Waterfowl, 1900. (5.78×8.41.)
27 a. Hishida Shunsō: Water Mirror, 1897. (Tokyo Fine Arts College, 8.8×5.7.)
27 b. Hishida Shunsō: Wang Chao-chün (Ōshōkun), 1902. (5.54×12.24.)
28 a. Yokoyama Taikan: "Know-nothing," 1897. (Ueno National Museum, 4.74×2.8.)
28 b. Shimomura Kanzan: Birth of Buddha, 1896. (Tokyo Fine Arts College, 6.7×4.73.)
29 a. Saigō Kogetsu: Spring Warmth, 1897. (5.67×9.07.)
29 b. Kosaka Shōdō: In the Fields, 1898. (Tokyo Fine Arts College, 2.8×3.7.)
30a. Kikuchi Hōbun: Young Bamboo, 1910. (Ministry of Education, 6.15 \times 3.15.)
31a. Yokoyama Taikan: Mountain Road, 1911. (5.02 \times 2.3.)
32a. Nishimura Goun: Polar Bear, 1907. (5.65 \times 3.85.)
33b. Takahashi Kōko: Taira no Shigemori, 1907.
34a. Shimomura Kanzan: The Imperial Visit to Ōhara (section), 1908. (1.73 \times 41.8.)
34b. Takeuchi Seihō: Kyoto Dancer, 1909. (5.6 \times 2.8.)
35a. Uemura Shōen: Moonlight, 1908. (5.75 \times 3.3.)
35b. Tsuchida Bakusen: Coiffure, 1911. (2.65 \times 2.85.)
36a. Kobayashi Kokei: The Well of Paradise, 1912. (6.4 \times 3.35.)
36b. Yasuda Yukihiro: The Hall of Dreams, 1912. (Ueno National Museum, 3.7 \times 7.47.)
37b. Imamura Shikō: From "Eight Views of Lake Biwa," 1912. (5.55 \times 1.9.)
38. Takahashi Yuichi: Salmon, ca. 1877. (Tokyo Fine Arts College, 4.7 \times 1.53.)
39. Hyakutake Kaneyuki: Italian Scene, ca. 1881. (Same, 2.15 \times 1.8.)
40. Harada Naojirō: The Shoemaker, 1886. (Same, 1.95 \times 1.5.)
41. Asai Chū: Harvest, 1890. (Same, 2.3 \times 3.2.)
42. Nakamura Fusetsu: Founding the Nation, 1907.
43. Kuroda Seiki: By the Lakeside, 1897. (Tokyo Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo, 2.25 \times 2.75.)
44. Aoki Shigeru: The Fruit of the Sea, 1904. (Bridgestone Gallery, 2.3 \times 6.)
45. Fujishima Takeji: Butterflies, 1904. (1.4 \times 1.4.)
46. Wada Sanzo: South Wind, 1907. (Ministry of Education, 5 \times 6.)
47a. Sakuma Bungo: The Kiyomizu Temple, 1890. (2.4 \times 3.05.)
47b. Goseda Yoshimatsu: Marionette Theatre, 1883. (Tokyo Fine Arts College, 2.7 \times 3.)
48a. Asai Chū: The Search of Port Arthur, 1895. (Ueno National Mu-
48 b. Koyama Shōtarō: Cowherd, ca. 1879. (1.32×1.02.)
49 a. Matsuoka Hisashi: Bullfighter, 1881. (0.92×0.59)
49 b. Kawamura Kyōo: The Laundress. (0.99×1.47)
50 a. Mitsutani Kunishirō: Rickshawman’s Home, 1908. (Tokyo Fine Arts College, 5×3.93.)
50 b. Kanokogi Takeshirō: The Fisherman’s Home, 1907. (2.2×1.7.)
51 a. Kuroda Seiki: Morning Toilette, 1893. (6×3.25.)
51 b. Kume Keiichirō: Summer Dusk, 1894. (1.4×1.81.)
52 b. Kuroda Seiki: The End of Spring, 1908. (1.46×1.96.)
53 a. Okada Saburosoke: Portrait of a Woman, 1898. (1.53×1.17.)
53 b. Wada Eisaku: Echo, 1902. (4.1×3.)
54 a. Shirataki Ikunosuke: Music Lesson, 1897. (Tokyo Fine Arts School, 4.4×6.4.)
54 b. Nakazawa Hiromitsu: In the Noon Sun.
55 a. Miyake Katsumi: Seine Riverbank, 1901. (1.1×0.82.)
55 b. Fujishima Takeji: The Villa d’Este Pond, 1909. (Tokyo Fine Arts School, 1.5×1.73.)
56 a. Yamashita Shintarō: Girl with Shoes, 1910. (2.4×2.)
56 b. Ishibashi Kazukuni: Girl Reading Verses, 1909. (3.2×2.85.)
57 a. Ishii Hakutei: Dutch Boy, 1912. (1.5×1.15.)
57 b. Kosugi Misei: Water Village, 1911. (Ministry of Education, 5.3×3.45.)
58 a. Yamamoto Morinosuke: Inlet, 1908. (Same, 1.95×2.6.)
58 b. Minami Kunzō: June Sun, 1912. (Same, 2.2×1.7.)
59 a. Asahi Gyokuzan: Court Lady (ivory), 1901. (Imperial Household Office, height 59 cm.)
59 b. Ishikawa Kōmei: Falconer (ivory), ca. 1900. (Same, height 38.2 cm.)
60 a. Ōkuma Ujihiro: Ōmura Masujirō (bronze), 1893. (Yasukuni Shrine, height 333.3 cm.)
60 b. Takamura Kōun et al.: Kusunoki Masashige (bronze), 1900. (Imperial Palace Square, height 400 cm.)
61. Takeuchi Kyūichi: Gigeiten (wood, painted), 1893. (Tokyo Fine Arts School, height 227.3 cm.)
62 a. Takamura Kōun: Bantam Rooster (wood), 1889. (Height 18 cm.)
62 b. Takamura Kōun: The Old Monkey (wood), 1893. (Ueno National Museum, height 90.9 cm.)
63. Ishikawa Kōmei: Kannon in White (wood), 1893. (Same, height 141.2 cm.)
64 a. Yamazaki Chōun: Child of the Seashore (wood), 1903. (Imperial Household Office.)
64 b. Yonehara Unkai: Sentan (wood), 1910. (Ministry of Education, height 34 cm.)
65. Vincenzo Ragusa: Bust of Kiyohara Tama (plaster), 1878. (Tokyo Fine Arts School, height 63 cm.)
66. Naganuma Shukei: Old Man (bronze), 1898. (Same, height 55.4 cm.)
67 a. Shinkai Taketarō: Bathing (plaster), 1907. (Ministry of Education, height 256.5 cm.)
67 b. Asakura Fumio: Darkness (plaster), 1908. (Same, height 200 cm.)
68 a. Fujii Kōsuke: Hair-washing (plaster), 1910. (Height 33.3 cm.)
68 b. Tatehata Taimu: The Current (plaster), 1911. (Ministry of Education, height 94 cm.)
69. Ogiwara Morie: Miner (plaster), 1907. (Rokuzankan, height 47.9 cm.)
70. Ogiwara Morie: Woman (plaster). (Original of the bronze exhibited in the Fourth Bunten exhibition. Rokuzankan, height 97.9 cm.)
71 a. Kiritsu Kōshō Co.: Candlestick Design. (Tokyo Fine Arts College.)
71 b. Same: Lacquerware Tea-caddy Design. (Same.)
72 a. Gigsei no Tomo Co.: Designs.
72 b. Asai Chū: Vase (pottery).
72 c. Hirayama Eizō: Clock Design.
74. Kanō Natsuo: Metalwork Plaque (Herons in Reeds), 1893. (Ueno National Museum.)
75 a. Tsukada Shūkyō: Silver Cigarette Box. (Same.)
75 b. Unno Shōmin: Metalwork Plaque (Gagaku Dancer), 1893. (Same.)
76 a. Unno Shōmin: Oxidized Silver Tray (Dawn on Lake Biwa), 1896.
76b. Kagawa Katsuhiro: Silver Vase (Phoenix). (Same.)
77a. Unno Bisei: Beaten Iron Plaque (Bat and Moon). (Tokyo Fine Arts College.)
77b. Unno Bisei: Silver Vase (Phoenix). (Imperial Household Office.)
78a. Toyokawa Mitsunaga: Oxidized Silver Cigarette Box (Mt. Fuji). (Same.)
78b. Kashima Ippu: Gold and Silver Inlaid Urn, 1895. (Same.)
79a. Kurokawa Eishō: Oxidized Silver Candy Dish (Cherry Blossoms), 1887. (Same.)
80a. Ishida Eiichi: Beaten Copper Figure, 1907. (Same.)
80b. Yamada Chōzaburō: Beaten Iron Monkey. (From the Japan-British Exhibition Catalogue, 1910.)
80c. Fujimoto Mansaku: Silver Cake-dish, 1906. (Tokyo Fine Arts College.)
81. Metalwork, Doors to the Akasaka Tōgū Palace.
82a. Homma Takusai: Bronze Vase. (Tokyo Fine Arts College.)
82b. Hata Zōroku: Bronze Vase, 1878.
82c. Ōkuni Hakusai: Iron Tea-kettle. (Tokyo Fine Arts College.)
83a. Kanaya Gorosaburō: Bronze Cake-box, 1873. (From the Vienna Exposition. Ueno National Museum.)
83b. Suzuki Chōkichi: Bronze Eagle (detail), 1893. (Ueno National Museum.)
84a. Ōshima Joun: Bronze Plaque (Lion). (Tokyo Fine Arts College.)
84b. Okazaki Sessei: Korean Bell. (Imperial Household Office.)
86a. Katori Hozuma: Ancient Goddess (cast bronze; detail), 1897. (Tokyo Fine Arts College.)
86b. Tsuda Nobuo: Lady (cast bronze), 1900. (Same.)
87a. Wajima Ware: Chinkin-bori ("Sunken-gold Carved") Box, 1881. (Ueno National Museum.)
87b. Sawada Sōsai: Lacquer Box, 1894. (Same.)
88a. Shibata Zeshin: Lacquer Cake-box. (Same.)
88 b. Shibata Zeshin: Lacquer Letter-box. (Tokyo Fine Arts College.)
89 a. Ikeda Taishin: Lacquer Plaque (Enoshima; detail), 1894. (Ueno National Museum.)
89 b. Kawanobe Itchō: Lacquer and Mother-of-Pearl Inlaid Cabinet, 1892. (Designed by Rokkaku Shisui. Imperial Household Office.)
90 a. Ogawa Shōmin: Lacquer Tray, 1904. (Tokyo Fine Arts College.)
90 b. Shirayama Shōsai: Lacquer Inkstone-box. (Ueno National Museum.)
91 a. Shirayama Shōsai: Lacquer Plaque. (Tokyo Fine Arts College.)
91 b. Rokkaku Shisui: Lacquer Plaque (detail). (Same.)
92 a. Tsujimura Shōka: Lacquer Tray. (Same.)
92 b. Hashimoto Ichizō: Lacquer Vase in Bamboo Design, 1880. (Same.)
93 a. Namikawa Sōsuke: Cloisonné Panel. (Akasaka Tōgū Palace.)
93 b. Namikawa Yasuyuki: Cloisonné Vase. (Imperial Household Office.)
94 b. Ogawa Sanchi: Glass Mosaic. (From Yūkaishi Magazine.)
95. Shinagawa Glassworks: Glass Brush-holders, 1881. (Ueno National Museum.)
96 a. Hyōchien Kiln: Plaque of Carp, 1896. (Nihon Bijutsu Kyōkai Spring Exhibition.)
96 b. Takemoto Hayata: Cinnabar Vase, 1887. (Ueno National Museum, height 27 cm.)
96 c. Inoue Ryōsai: Incense-burner with Hydrangea Design. (Same, height 9.7 cm.)
97 a. Kinkōzan Sōbei: Kinrande (Enamel and Gold Decorated) Incense-burner. (Same.)
97 c. Kiyomizu Rokubei: Red and Green Vase with Dragon and Phoenix Designs, 1873. (Height 42.4 cm.)
98 a. Asai Ichigō: Cake-bowl. (Height 10 cm., width 21.7 cm.)
98 b. Kutani Shōzō: Plate with Cat and Morning-glory Design.
98 c. Matsumoto Sahei: Design for Dish with Fan-patterns, 1885.
98 d. Chin Jukan: Vase with Flower-patterns within Snowflakes. (Height 75.8 cm.)
99 a. Itō Tōzan: Vase in Trumpet-shape. (Ueno National Museum, height 28.5 cm.)

99 b. Kawahara Tokuryū: Plaque of Landscape with Figures. (59.4×38.2 cm.)

99 c. Wagner Edogawa Pottery Works: Daruma Dish-design, 1885.

100 a. Seifū Yohei: Vase with Cherry-blossom Design. (Imperial Household Office, height 43.3 cm.)

100 b. Chin Jukan: Satsuma-ware Incense-burner. (Same, height 18.6 cm.)

101 a. Miyagawa Kōzan: Water-bowl, 1897. (Ueno National Museum, height 30.5 cm., width 39.8 cm.)

101 b. Kinkōzan Sōbei: Vase with Raised Grape Design, 1903. (Fifth National Industrial Exposition, height 45.5 cm.)

101 c. Katō Tomotarō: Vase with Dragon Design, 1901. (Nihon Bijutsu Kyōkai Exhibit.)

102 a. Yabu Meizan: Satsuma-ware Vase with Peony Design. (Height 25.5 cm.)

102 b. Uno Nimmatsu: Vase with Chrysanthemum Design, 1903. (Fifth National Industrial Exposition, height 63.6×57.5 cm.)

102 c. Miura Chikusen: Bowl with Inlaid Pomegranate Design. (10×19.5 cm.)

103 a. Katō Tomotarō: Vase with Corn Design. (Imperial Household Office, height 48.5 cm.)

103 b. Miyagawa Kōzan: Vase with Plum Design. (Same, height 47.2 cm.)

104 a. Ishino Ryūzan: Vase with Dragon Design. (Height 48.5 cm.)

104 b. Suwa Sozan: Vase with Phoenix Pattern in Relief. (Imperial Household Office, height 47 cm.)

104 c. Itaya Hazan: Vase. (Tokyo Fine Arts College.)


105 b. Sasaki Seishichi: Gion Festival Tapestry, 1893. (Chicago World’s Fair, 3.33×2.15 meters.)

105 c. Date Yanosuke: Tapestry of Quail in Autumn Grasses, 1891.

106. Date Yanosuke: Tapestry with Butterfly Design, 1893. (Chicago World’s Fair, 3×1.81 meters.)

107 a. Kawashima Jimbei: Tapestry of Mt. Fuji Hunting Scene, 1898. (3
×6.06 meters.)

107 b. Kawashima Jimbei: Tapestry of Columbus' Return, 1903. (Fifth National Industrial Exposition. 3.33×2.57 meters.)

108 a. Iida Shinshichi: Embroidered Screen of Pigeons, 1903. (Same.)

108 b. Iida Shinshichi: Embroidered Landscape Tablet, 1904. (St. Louis Exposition.)

109 a. Nishimura Sōzaemon: Embroidered Screen of Birds and Foliage, 1903. (Fifth National Industrial Exposition.)

109 b. Nishimura Sōzaemon: Embroidered Tapestry of Eagle in Storm (detail). (3.12×1.51 meters.)

110 a. Kawashima Jimbei: Tapestries of Birds and Flowers, 1913. (4.54×3.33, and 5.54×2.72 meters.)


111. Ishikawa Kōmei: Ukiyo-e Figure (ivory), 1897. (Twelfth Competition of the Tokyo Sculpture Society.)

112 a. Asahi Gyokuzan: Skull Ornament. (Ueno National Museum, height 6.6 cm.)


112 c. Kiuchi Hankō: Inlaid Inkstone-box in Mulberry Wood. (23.6×18.8×4 cm.)

113 a. Nohara Teimei: Inlaid Box in Zelkova Wood. (25.7×22.7×6.3 cm.)

113 b. Kanō Tessai: Tea Ceremony Set.

114 a. Hotta Zuishō: Small Screen of Carved Wood. (26.3×27 cm.)

114 b. Morikawa Toen: Noh Actor. (Height 60 cm.)

115. Chō Sanshū: "Thoughts of an Autumn Night."


117. Hidaka Chichibu: Suishihyō.

118 a. Iwaya Ichiroku: "Verse on Autumn."

118 b. Itō Hirobumi: "In Praise of a Patriot."

119. Kusakabe Meikaku: "Verse on Trying Out a Brush of Cranes' feathers."

120. Nishikawa Shuntō: Ancient Verse.

121. Soejima Sōkai: "Thoughts on Seeing the Calligraphy of Yūeh Fei."

122. Nakabayashi Gochiku: "Written on Rising in the Morning."
123. Ono Gadō: "Verse on His Sixtieth Birthday."
125 a. Tsukiji Foreign Settlement. (The Far East, Jan. 17, 1871.)
125 b. Nagasaki Foreign Settlement. (The Far East, May 16, 1871.)
125 c. Kobe Waterfront. (The Far East, April 17, 1871.)
126. Ōura Tenshudō, Nagasaki. (1864; repaired 1874; reconstructed after the Pacific War.)
127. Same, side and interior views. (Photographs by Murazawa Fumio.)
128–129. The Tsukiji Hotel, Tokyo, 1868, front and side views, with plan. (Shimizu Kisuke II. The Far East, August 16, 1870, and Horigoshi, Meiji shoki no yōfū kenchiku.
130 a. The First National Bank, 1872. (Shimizu Kisuke II.)
130 b. Suruga-chō, the Mitsui Bank (center background), 1874. (Shimizu Kisuke II.)
131 a. The Kaisei School, Tokyo, 1873. (Hayashi Chūjo.)
131 b. The Communications Ministry, 1874. (Hayashi Chūjo.)
132 a. The Osaka Prefectural Office, 1874.
132 b. The Ginza, 1873. (J. Waters.)
132 c. Same.
133 a. Sempukan Reception Building, Federal Mint, Osaka, 1871. (J. Waters.)
133 b. The Foundry, Federal Mint, Osaka, 1871. (J. Waters.)
134 a. Shimbashi Station, Tokyo, 1872. (R. P. Bridgens.)
134 b. Hokkaidō Development Office, Sapporo, 1873. (Holt.)
135 a. The Technological College Auditorium, Tokyo, 1877. (C. de Boinville.)
135 b. The Printing Office, Tokyo, 1876. (C. de Boinville.)
136 a. General Staff Office, Tokyo, 1881. (G. V. Cappelletti.)
136 b. Army Memorial Hall, Tokyo, 1881. (G. V. Cappelletti.)
136 c. Foreign Office, Tokyo, 1881. (C. de Boinville.)
137 a. The Ueno Museum, detailed Plan.
137 b. The Ueno Museum, Tokyo, 1882. (J. Conder.)
137 c. The Rokumeikan, Tokyo, 1883. (J. Conder.)
138 a. Tokyo Imperial University, Department of Literature and Law, 1884. (J. Conder.)
138 b. College of Science Administration Building, Tokyo, 1885. (Yamaguchi Hanroku.)
139 a. The Yokohama Post Office, 1874.
139 b. The Yokohama Customs Office, 1885.
140 a. Toyohira-kan, Sapporo, 1881.
140 b. The Shintomi Theatre, Tokyo, 1878.
141 a. Nakagome Primary School, Nagano Prefecture, 1875. (Ichikawa Dairō.)
141 b. The Kaichi School, Matsumoto, 1876. (Tateishi Kiyoshige.)
142 a. The Tokyo National Court, 1896. (A. Hartung.)
142 b. Ministry of Justice, Tokyo, 1895. (Böckmann, Ende, Giesenburg.)
142 c. The Naval Ministry, Tokyo, 1894. (J. Conder.)
143 a. Nicolai Cathedral, Tokyo, 1891. (J. Conder.)
143 b. Mitsubishi Building Number One, Tokyo, 1894. (Sone Tatsuzō, J. Conder.)
144. The Engineering College, Tokyo, 1888, front view and detail. (Tatsuno Kingo.)
145 a. The Shibusawa Residence, Kabuto-chō, Tokyo, 1888. (Tatsuno Kingo.)
145 b. The Japan Red Cross Hospital, Tokyo, 1890. (Katayama Tōkuma.)
145 c. Tokyo Postal Communications Office, 1892. (Katayama Tōkuma.)
146 a. The Nara National Museum, 1894. (Katayama Tōkuma, Sō Hyōzō.)
146 b. The Kyoto National Museum, 1895. (Katayama Tōkuma, Adachi Hatokichi.)
147 a. Tokyo Prefectural Office, 1893. (Tsumagi Raikō.)
147 b. The Imperial Hotel, Tokyo, 1890. (Watanabe Yuzuru.)
147 c. The Peers School for Girls, Tokyo, 1889. (Niinomi Takamasa.)
148 a. The Nabeshima Residence, Tokyo, 1892. (Sakamoto Matatsune.)
148 b. The Kabuki-za, Tokyo, 1889. (Takahara Kōzō.)
148 c. Kairyō Engeikan, Tokyo, 1889. (Nakamura Tatsutarō.)
149 a. Nara Prefectural Office, 1895. (Nagano Uheiji.)
149 b. Phoenix Hall at the Chicago Columbian Exposition, 1893. (Kuru Masamichi, Oda Senkichi.) (Chicago Historical Society.)
150 a. Bank of Japan, Main Office, Tokyo, 1890-1896. (Tatsuno Kingo.)
150 b. Same, entrance.
151 a. First Bank, Main Office, Tokyo, 1902. (Tatsuno Kingo, Ishii Keiki-chi.)

151 b. Bank of Japan, Osaka Branch, 1903. (Tatsuno Kingo.)

152 a. Mitsui Bank, Main Office, Tokyo, 1896–1902. (Yokogawa Tamisuke.)

152 b. Imperial Theatre, Tokyo, 1907–1911. (Yokogawa Tamisuke.)

152 c. The Maruzen Company, Tokyo, 1907–1909. (Sano Riki.)

153 a. Tokyo Central Station, 1911–1914. (Tatsuno-Kasai Architectural Office.)

153 b. Ryōgoku Kokugikan Sumō Arena, Tokyo, 1909. (Tatsuno-Kasai Architectural Office.)

153 c. Same, interior detail.

154. Akasaka Detached Palace, Tokyo, 1899–1909, front view and interior. (Katayama Tōkuma.)

155 a. Akasaka Detached Palace, garden view

155 b. Hyōkeikan, Tokyo, 1908. (Katayama Tōkuma, Takayama Kōjirō.)

156 a. Marunouchi, Tokyo, Late Meiji Period.

156 b. The Yokohama United Club, 1901. (J. Conder.)

157 a. The Yokohama Specie Bank, 1904. (Tsumagi Raikō.)

157 b. The Tokyo Industrial Club, 1899. (Tsumagi Raikō.)

157 c. The Keiō Academy Memorial Library, Tokyo, 1912. (Sone-Chūjō Architectural Office.)

158 a. General Staff Office, Tokyo, 1899. (Taki Daikichi.)

158 b. The Osaka Library, 1904. (Noguchi Magoichi, Hidaka Yutaka.)

159 a. Metropolitan Police Headquarters, Tokyo, 1911. (Fukuoka Tsunejirō.)

159 b. National Railways Office, Tokyo, 1910. (Ueno Hajime.)

160 a. The Yokohama Bankers’ Club, 1905. (Endō Oto.)

160 b. The Itōya Stationery Store, Tokyo, 1909. (Kitada Kyūichi.)

161 a. The Japan Industrial Bank, Tokyo, 1899. (Tsumagi Raikō, Takeda Goichi.)

161 b. The Kabuki-za, Tokyo, 1911. (Shimizu Shōtarō.)

162 a. The Shirokiya Dry-goods Store, Tokyo, 1911. (Itō Kichitarō.)

162 b. The Asano Residence, Tokyo, 1909. (Ito Chūta, Sasaki Iwajirō.)
PLATES
2. Hashimoto Gahō: Rinzai Admonishing a Pupil.

5. Takeuchi Seihō: After the Rain.
7. Shimomura Kanzan: Autumn in the Forest.
8. Terazaki Kōgyō: From "Four Valleys."
10a. Taniguchi Aizan: Landscape.

10b. Okuhara Seiko:
Scene from "The Three Kingdoms."

11b. Sugawara Hakuryū: Stormy Landscape.
12 a. Tomioka Tessai: Tea Farm at Uji.

13a. Tanomura Chokunyū: Twelve Blossoms.

13b. Hineno Taizan: Hollyhock and Bamboo.


16 b. Imao Keinen: Old Pine and Peacocks.
17 a. Tosa Mitsubumi: Palace Ceremony.

18a. Mori Kansai: Landscape.


19b. Kubota Beisen: Cat and Peonies.

20b. Matsumoto Fūko:
Kusunoki Journeying to Kasagi.
21a. Ogata Gekkō: Festival of the Nine Buddhas at Okuzawa.

21b. Mizuno Toshikata: Satō Tadanobu in Attendance.


24a. Hashimoto Gahō: Bamboos and Cat.

24b. Hashimoto Gahō:
White Clouds and Autumn Leaves.


28a. Yokoyama Taikan: "Know-nothing."


29 b. Kosaka Shōdō: In the Fields.

31a. Yokoyama Taikan: Mountain Road.


33 b. Takahashi Kōko: Taira no Shigemori.
34a. Shimomura Kanzan: The Imperial Visit to Ōhara (section).

34b. Takeuchi Seihō: Kyoto Dancer.
35a. Uemura Shōen: Moonlight.

35b. Tsuichida Bakusen: Coiffure.


37 b. Imamura Shikō: From "Eight Views of Lake Biwa."
38. Takahashi Yuichi: Salmon.
43. Kuroda Seiki: By the Lakeside.
44. Aoki Shigeru: The Fruit of the Sea.
45. Fujishima Takeji: Butterflies.
46. Wada Sanzō: South Wind.

47 b. Goseda Yoshimatsu: Marionette Theatre.

48b. Koyama Shōtarō: Cowherd.


51a. Kuroda Seiki: Morning Toilette.

52b. Kuroda Seiki: The End of Spring.
54a. Shirataki Ikunosuke: Music Lesson.

54b. Nakazawa Hiromitsu: In the Noon Sun.
55b. Takeji: Fujishima The Villa d'Este Pond.

56 b. Ishibashi Kazukuni: Girl Reading Verses.

56 a. Yamashita Shintarō: Girl with Shoes.
57a. Ishii Hakutei: Dutch Boy.


58 b. Minami Kunzō: June Sun.
59 a. Asahi Gyokuzan: Court Lady (ivory).

59 b. Ishikawa Kōmei: Falconer (ivory).
60a. Ōkuma Ujihiro: Ōmura Masujirō (bronze).

60b. Takamura Kōun et al.: Kusunoki Masashige (bronze).

62b. Takamura Kōun: The Old Monkey (wood).
63. Ishikawa Kōmei: Kannon in White (wood).
64 a. Yamazaki Chōun:
Child of the Seashore (wood).

64 b. Yonehara Unkai: Sentan (wood).
65. Vincenzo Ragusa: Bust of Kiyohara Tama (plaster).
66. Naganuma Shukei: Old Man (brass).


69. Ogiwara Morie: Miner (plaster).
70. Ogiwara Morie: Woman (plaster).

71b. Same: Lacquerware Tea-caddy Design.
72a. Gigei no Tomo Co.: Designs.

72b. Asai Chū: Vase (pottery).

72c. Hirayama Eizō: Clock Design.

74. Kanō Natsuo: Metalwork Plaque (Heron in Reeds).
75 a. Tsukada Shūkyō: Silver Cigarette Box.

75 b. Unno Shōmin: Metalwork Plaque (Gagaku Dancer).
76a. Unno Shōmin: Oxidized Silver Tray (Dawn on Lake Biwa).


78a. Toyokawa Mitsunaga: Oxidized Silver Cigarette Box (Mt. Fuji).

78b. Kashima Ippu: Gold and Silver Inlaid Urn.
79a. Kurokawa Eishō: Oxidized Silver Candy Dish (Cherry Blossoms).

80 a. Ishida Eiichi: Beaten Copper Figure.


80 c. Fujimoto Mansaku: Silver Cake-dish.
81. Metalwork, Doors to the Akasaka Tōgū Palace.
82a. Homma Takusai: Bronze Vase.

82b. Hata Zôroku: Bronze Vase.

82c. Ōkuni Hakusai: Iron Tea-kettle.
83a. Kanaya Gorosaburō: Bronze Cake-box.

84 a. Ōshima Joun: Bronze Plaque (Lion).

84 b. Okazaki Sessei: Korean Bell.
86 a. Katori Hozuma: Ancient Goddess
(cast bronze; detail).

86 b. Tsuda Nobuo:
Lady (cast bronze).
87a. Wajima Ware chinkin-bori Box.

87b. Sawada Sōsai: Lacquer Box.

89 a. Ikeda Taishin: Lacquer Plaque (Enoshima; detail).

89 b. Kawanobe Itchō: Lacquer and Mother-of-Pearl Inlaid Cabinet.
90a. Ogawa Shōmin: Lacquer Tray.

90b. Shirayama Shōsai: Lacquer Inkstone-box.
91a. Shirayama Shōsai: Lacquer Plaque.

91b. Rokkaku Shisui: Lacquer Plaque (detail).
93a. Namikawa Sōsuke: Cloisonné Panei.

93b. Namikawa Yasuyuki: Cloisonné Vase.

94b. Ogawa Sanchi: Glass Mosaic.
95. Shinagawa Glassworks: Glass Brush-holders.

96 b. Takemoto Hayata: Cinnabar Vase.

96 c. Inoue Ryōsai: Incense-burner with Hydrangea Design.
97a. Kinkōzan Sōbei:
Kimande Incense-burner.

97b. Eiraku Wazens:
Bowl Decorated in Textile Design.

97c. Kiyomizu Rokubei:
Vase with Dragon and Phoenix Designs.
98 a. Asai Ichigō: Cake-bowl.

98 b. Kutani Shōzō: Plate with Cat and Morning-glory Design.

98 c. Matsumoto Sahei: Design for Dish with Fan-patterns.

98 d. Chin Jukan: Vase with Flower-patterns within Snowflakes.


100a. Seifu Yohei: Vase with Cherry-blossom Design.

100b. Chin Jukan: Satsuma-ware Incense-burner.


102 b. Uno Nimmatsu: Vase with Chrysanthemum Design.

102 c. Miura Chikusen: Bowl with Inlaid Pomegranate Design.
103a. Katō Tomotarō:
Vase with Corn Design.

103b. Miyagawa Kōzan:
Vase with Plum Design.
104 a. Ishino Ryūzan: Vase with Dragon Design.

104 b. Suwa Sozan: Vase with Phoenix Pattern in Relief.

104 c. Itaya Hazan: Vase.

105b. Sasaki Seishichi: Gion Festival Tapestry.

105c. Date Yanosuke: Tapestry of Quail in Autumn Grasses.
106. Date Yanosuke: Tapestry with Butterfly Design.


108 b. Iida Shinshichi: Embroidered Landscape Tablet.


111. Ishikawa Kōmei: Ukiyo-e Figure (ivory).
112 a. Asahi Gyokuzan: Skull Ornament.


113a. Nohara Teimei: Inlaid Box in Zelkova Wood.

113b. Kanō Tessai: Tea Ceremony Set.
謹然有仁閒佳實澤
余非三素力偏書五伯曰言而負
爾居則當還右手在途

115. Chō Sanshū: “Thoughts of an Autumn Night.”
なぜ我輩は戦に三思せむか、名流見聞録に
所為を示すべきか。書は珠玉、故に
言語を以て書らん。武者をも忘
越えず、筆を弄ぶにあたって、

両箇を詳く懐に見る宜か。"
三月十四日和三月二十一日

白湖

如是如是

是知

无常

香川

是無
118 a. Iwaya Ichiroku:
"Verse on Autumn."

118 b. Itō Hirobumi:
"In Praise of a Patriot."
Verse on Trying Out a Brush of Crane-feathers.

119.

Kusakabe Meisaku: "Verse on Trying Out a Brush of Crane-feathers."
123. Ono Gadō: "Verse on His Sixtieth Birthday."

126. Ōura Tenshudō, Nagasaki.
127. Same, side and interior views.
128-129. The Tsukiji Hotel, 1868, front and side views, with plan.
130 a. The First National Bank, 1872.

130 b. Suruga-chō, the Mitsui Bank (center background), 1874.
131 a. The Kaisei School, Tokyo, 1873.

131 b. The Communications Ministry, 1874.
132 a. The Osaka Prefectural Office, 1874.

132 b. The Ginza, 1873.

132 c. Same.
133 a. Sempukan Reception Building, Federal Mint, Osaka, 1871.

133 b. The Foundry, Federal Mint, Osaka, 1871.
134a. Shimbashi Station, Tokyo, 1872.

135 a. The Technological College Auditorium, Tokyo, 1877.

135 b. The Printing Office, Tokyo, 1876.
136 a. General Staff Office, Tokyo, 1881.

136 b. Army Memorial Hall, Tokyo, 1881.

136 c. Foreign Office, Tokyo, 1881.
137a. The Ueno Museum, detailed plan.

137b. The Ueno Museum, Tokyo, 1882.

137c. The Rokumeikan, Tokyo, 1883.
138 a. Tokyo Imperial University, Department of Literature and Law, 1884.

138 b. College of Science Administration Building, Tokyo, 1885.
140 a. Toyohira-kan, Sapporo, 1881.

140 b. The Shintomi Theatre, Tokyo, 1878.
141 a. Nakagome Primary School, Nagano Prefecture, 1875.

141 b. The Kaichi School, Matsumoto, 1876.
142a. The Tokyo National Court, 1896.

142b. Ministry of Justice, Tokyo, 1895.

142c. The Naval Ministry, Tokyo, 1894.
143 a. Nicolai Cathedral, Tokyo, 1891.

143 b. Mitsubishi Building Number One, Tokyo, 1894.
144. The Engineering College, Tokyo, 1888, front view and detail.
145 a. The Shibusawa Residence, Kabuto-chō, Tokyo, 1888.

145 b. The Japan Red Cross Hospital, Tokyo, 1890.

145 c. Tokyo Postal Communications Office, 1892.

146 b. The Kyoto National Museum, 1895.

147 b. The Imperial Hotel, Tokyo, 1890.

147 c. The Peers School for Girls, Tokyo, 1889.
148 a. The Nabeshima Residence, Tokyo, 1892.

148 b. The Kabuki-za, Tokyo, 1889.

148 c. The Kairyō Engeikan, Tokyo, 1889.

149b. Phoenix Hall at the Chicago Columbian Exposition, 1893.
151 a. First Bank, Main Office, Tokyo, 1902.

151 b. Bank of Japan, Osaka Branch, 1903.

152 b. Imperial Theatre, Tokyo, 1907-1911.

153a. Tokyo Central Station, 1911–1914.


153c. Same, interior detail.

155b. Hyōkeikan, Tokyo, 1908.
156a. Marunouchi, Tokyo, Late Meiji Period.

156b. The Yokohama United Club, 1901.
157 a. The Yokohama Specie Bank, 1904.

157 b. The Tokyo Industrial Club, 1899.

157 c. The Keiō Academy Memorial Library, Tokyo, 1912.
158 a. General Staff Office, Tokyo, 1899.

158 b. The Osaka Library, 1904.
159a. Metropolitan Police Headquarters, Tokyo, 1911.

160 a. The Yokohama Bankers' Club, 1905.

160 b. The Itōya Stationery Store, Tokyo, 1909.
161a. The Japan Industrial Bank, Tokyo, 1899.

161b. The Kabuki-za, Tokyo, 1911.
162 a. The Shirokiya Dry-goods Store, Tokyo, 1911.

162 b. The Asano Residence, Tokyo, 1909.
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