

**Pictures of Social Networks:
Transforming Visual Representations of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering
in the Tokugawa Period (1615-1868)**

by

Kazuko Kameda-Madar

B.A., The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, 1997

M.A., The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, 2002

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

The Faculty of Graduate Studies

(Art History)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(Vancouver)

May 2011

© Kazuko Kameda-Madar, 2011

Abstract

This thesis examines the cultural networks that connected people holding common ideological values in the Tokugawa period by surveying a range of visual representations of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering. It explores the Tokugawa social phenomena that gave rise to the sudden boom in the Orchid Pavilion motif and how painters of different classes, belonging to different schools, such as Kano Sansetsu, Ike Taiga, Tsukioka Settei and Kubo Shunman, came to develop variations of this theme in order to establish cultural identity and to negotiate stronger positions in the relationships of social power. Probing the social environment of artists and their patrons, I demonstrate how distinct types of Orchid Pavilion imagery were invented and reinvented to advance different political agendas.

The legendary gathering at the Orchid Pavilion in China took place in 353 CE, when Wang Xizhi invited forty-one scholars to participate in an annual Spring Purification Festival. At this event, Wang Xizhi improvised a short text that has come to be known as the *Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. In Japan, while the practice of the ritual gathering and the text describing it were introduced in the Nara period, its pictorial representation in the format of a stone rubbing was not imported until the early seventeenth century. The Orchid Pavilion theme belongs to the genre of “elegant gatherings” depicting idealized communities of Chinese scholars, including the “Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden” and the “Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove,” which had been frequently painted since the preceding Muromachi and Momoyama periods. During the Tokugawa period, however, the “Orchid Pavilion” became one of the most important and popular painting themes of this genre.

Tokugawa society is commonly thought to have been rigidly stratified, and the Tokugawa period a time of peace. The Pax Tokugawa, however, was a peace inspired by military force, and although the lives of people under the Tokugawa regime were at times heavily and unfairly oppressed, people of all classes retained enough power to voice resentment. From the different perspectives voiced through cultural activities like the representation of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering, I demonstrate the class permeability and dynamism of Tokugawa society.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	viii
Acknowledgements	xxiii
Introduction: Issues and Questions	1
State of the Field	5
Methodological Structure and Background Theory.....	6
Outline of the Thesis	8
Chapter One: The Authorship of the Orchid Pavilion Pictorial Tradition: Canon Formation and the Authentication of Power	17
From Wang Xizhi to the Ming-Dynasty Ink Rubbings	19
The Ming-Dynasty Ink Rubbing Handscrolls.....	20
The Orchid Pavilion as Text	22
The Orchid Pavilion Pedigree	23
Wang Xizhi and His Political Background in the Eastern Jin Dynasty	25
Tang Taizong and the Orchid Pavilion as Calligraphy	27
The Orchid Pavilion Illustrations in Texts during the Song Dynasty	31
Description of an Orchid Pavilion Image Recorded in the Texts	34
Engraving the Orchid Pavilion in the Ming Dynasty.....	45
Chapter Two: The Orchid Pavilion Painting as Aesthetic Resistance: The Kyō-Kano School and Their Network System	70
The Orchid Pavilion Paintings by Kano Sansetsu	74

The Mainstream Aesthetic: The Orchid Pavilion Paintings by the Edo-Kano	76
Kano Sansetsu: Eccentricity Reconsidered.....	86
Political Discontent Embodied in the Kyō-Kano Text	99
The Possible Patronage of the Orchid Pavilion Painting	104
Sansetsu's Production Attitude Recorded in the Texts.....	116
Re-attributing Authorship of an Orchid Pavilion Painting	118
Comparing the Orchid Pavilion Screen by Kano Einō	122
Scrutinizing the Orchid Pavilion by Sansetsu.....	124
The Landscape of the Orchid Pavilion.....	125
Eccentric Rocks and a Mysterious Cave.....	125
Waterfalls and the Meandering Stream.....	131
Woods, Bamboo Groves and Orchids.....	133
Architectural Elements in the Orchid Pavilion	134
Sansetsu's Sources of Inspiration	134
The Fence to Enclose the Garden Party	138
The Representation of the Human Figures	142
Narrative Elements in the Orchid Pavilion	145
Japanese Tea Ceremony.....	148
The Orchid Pavilion and the Kan'ei Aesthetics.....	150
Chapter Three: The Orchid Pavilion as an Alternative “Classical” Theme:	
Performing Literati for Identity Construction.....	185
The Orchid Pavilion Theme as an Alternative “Classicism”	186
Chinese <i>Wenren</i> / Japanese <i>Bunjin</i>	189
Diverse Sources for the <i>Bunjin</i> Orchid Pavilion Images	195
Conceptualizing a New Taste for the Orchid Pavilion	200
Constructing a New Canon for His Community: Ike Taiga	207
Taiga's Votive Panel and Its Draft.....	211
The Alternative Canon of the Orchid Pavilion	214
Iconography of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering.....	219

Evolution of the Orchid Pavilion <i>Byôbu</i> by Taiga.....	226
Possible Trajectories of Iconographical Combinations	229
Taiga's Pointillism in the Orchid Pavilion.....	233
 Theory and <i>Funpon</i> of the Orchid Pavilion: Nakayama Kōyō	235
Kōyō's Theory: Constructing the <i>Bunjinga</i> Tradition	237
Kōyō's Anti-Kano Sentiment	239
Kōyō's <i>Funpon</i> Copying Practice.....	240
Copying after Wen Zhengming	243
<i>Bunjin Funponism</i>	244
 Re-articulation of the Orchid Pavilion: Fukuhara Gogaku	245
The Status of Fukuhara Gogaku, Yesterday and Today	246
Impression and Innovation.....	249
Performing Chinese Literati.....	252
 Literati Irony: Nakabayashi Chikutō's Ideology	258
Chikutō's Painting Style and his Contemporary Reception	259
Chikutō's Painting Theory	260
Chikutō's Orchid Pavilion Gathering	262
New Approaches Following Chikutō's Model	264
<i>Bakumatsu</i> Ideology and the Shift in Chikutō's Aesthetic	265
The <i>Kokugaku</i> Aesthetic in Chikutō's Orchid Pavilion.....	267
 Chapter Four: the Nativization of Orchid Pavilion Imagery:	
Genre Painting Adaptation and the <i>Kokugaku</i> Movement	307
 Genre Painting Adaptation of <i>Kyokusuien</i> Imagery	309
<i>Kyokusuien</i> as a Painting Theme	310
Popularization of the Orchid Pavilion Images	311
Reinventing a New <i>Yamato-e</i> Tradition	313
 From Court Ritual to the Visual Expression of Tsukioka Settei	315
Nativization of the Orchid Pavilion through <i>Waka</i> Poetry	317
Visualization of the Nativized <i>Kyokusuien</i>	324
Visualized <i>Kyokusuien</i> and the Restorationism	328
The Fusion between <i>Kyokusuien</i> and <i>Misogi</i> Imagery	333
 The Cult of <i>Kyokusuien</i> in the Tokugawa Period	337
<i>Yatsushi</i> , <i>Mitate</i> and Kubo Shunman's <i>Kyokusuien</i>	339
Kubo Shunman and His Intellectual Environment	342
The Contemporaneity of Classical Themes	346

<i>Kyokusuien</i> and the <i>Kokugaku</i> Movement.....	349
Chapter Five: Images of the Purification Ritual Reinvented: The Orchid Pavilion Gathering and the Doll Festival	372
Meanings of Purification Rituals in the Third Month.....	374
The Significance of Peach Blossoms	376
<i>Kyokusuien</i> in the Annual Events and the Five Seasonal Festivals	379
Purification Rituals with Dolls.....	382
From Purification Ritual to <i>Hina-matsuri</i>	384
Purification Ritual as a Commodity.....	384
Women’s Participation in <i>Kyokusuien</i>	386
Events to Represent the Third Day of the Third month in <i>Haikai</i>	387
The Reinvention of Spring Purification Rituals as Tourist Attractions	389
Conclusion	398
Figures	408
Bibliography	491
Appendices	516
Appendix A: Chinese Texts	516
Appendix B: Selected List of Orchid Pavilion Images (China).....	521
Appendix C: Selected List of Orchid Pavilion Images (Japan)	528
Appendix D: Textual Materials Related to the Kyō-Kano Family	538
Appendix E: <i>Bunjin</i> Texts.....	550
Appendix F: <i>Kyokusuien</i> -related Texts.....	560

List of Tables

5. 1 Events of the Third Day of the Third Month in <i>Haikai</i>	388
--	-----

List of Figures

1. 1 Prince Yi. <i>Lanting</i> (<i>Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion</i>), Xianyuan version, 1592. Handscroll, ink rubbing compilation on paper, 32.7 x 100.9cm. Former Robert van Gulik Collection	408
1. 2 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Rantei kyokusuien</i> (<i>Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion</i>), early seventeenth century. Two pairs of eight-panel folding screens, ink, color, and gold leaf on paper. 107.4 x 355.8 cm. Zuishin-in, Kyoto	409
1. 3 Attributed to Wang Xizhi. <i>Lantingxu</i> (<i>Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i>). Dingwu version. Ming-period copy. Album leaves, ink rubbing on paper. Kyoto National Museum.	410
1. 4 Prince Yi. <i>Lanting</i> Huangnan version, 1592. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Colophon: 32.5 x 107cm; Calligraphy model: 32.1 x 1675cm; Illustration: 31.9 x 628.5cm. Palace Museum, Beijing	410
1. 5 Prince Yi. <i>Lanting</i> , Xianyuan version. 1592. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Colophon: 32.5 x 107cm; 32.1 x 1675cm; Illustration: 31.9 x 628.5cm. Palace Museum, Beijing.	411
1. 6 Prince Yi. <i>Lanting</i> , Huangnan version. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. 32.3 x 62.3cm. Henanxinxiang Municipal Museum.....	411
1. 7 <i>Lanting xiuxu</i> . Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Height 34cm. Exhibition catalogue, <i>Shôwa kichû Rantei-ten</i> , 28-37	412
1. 8 <i>Lanting</i> . Huangnan version. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.	413
1. 9 <i>Lanting</i> . Huangnan version. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. 22.2 x 574cm. Gotô Museum, Uno Sesson Collection.	414
1. 10 <i>Lanting</i> . 16 th -17 th Century. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. 22.6 x 326.4cm. Inscription by Tomioka Tessai. Harn Museum, Florida.	414
1. 11 <i>Lanting</i> . 1616. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. 31.0 x 1482.5cm. Private Collection	415
1. 12 <i>Lanting</i> . Qing dynasty. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. 22.1 x 489.0cm; illustration section: 17.9–18.1 x 329.1 cm. National Library of China	415
1. 13 <i>Lanting</i> . 1780. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper.	

Formerly Qianlong Collection. Palace Museum, Beijing.....	415
1. 14 Prince Yi. Colophon of <i>Lanting</i> . 1592. He Yanzhi. <i>Lanting ji</i> . Mid-Tang dynasty. Xianyuan version Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.	416
1. 15 Attributed to Yan Liben. <i>Zhuan Lanting (Seizing the Preface to the Orchid Pavilion)</i> Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. Taipei National Palace Museum.	416
1. 16 Attributed to Juran. <i>Zhuan Lanting (Seizing the Preface to the Orchid Pavilion)</i> . Hanging scroll. Taipei National Palace Museum	417
1. 17 Li Gonglin. <i>Dwelling in the Longmian (Sleeping Dragon) Mountains</i> . c.1049 - 1106. Handscroll mounted as an album leaf. Ink and color on silk. Cleveland Museum of Art.....	418
1. 18 A section of Wang Xizhi seated in the Orchid Pavilion, detail, <i>Lanting</i> , Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection	419
1. 19 Qian Xuan. <i>Wang Xizhi Observing Geese</i> , c.1295. Handscroll. Ink, color and gold on paper. Metropolitan Museum of Arts, New York	419
1. 20 A section of page boys in the cave, detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.	419
1. 21 The first group of participants, detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.	420
1. 22 Ōhara Tōno, <i>Meisū gafu (Painting Manual of Renowned Numbers)</i> . 1809. Woodblock book. Osaka Museum of History.....	420
1. 23 The second group of participants, detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection	421
1. 24 <i>Chikurin Shichiken (Seven Sages in Bamboo Grove)</i> . Eastern Jin dynasty. Ink rubbing reproduced from the tomb wall engraving. Nanjing Museum.....	421
1. 25 The third group of participants, detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.	422
1. 26a Li Gonglin, <i>Classic of Filial Piety</i> , Chapter 7, detail of the dancing figure. C.1085. Handscroll. Ink on silk. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.....	422

1. 26b Li Gonglin, <i>Classic of Filial Piety</i> , Chapter 10, detail of the dancing figure. C.1085. Handscroll. Ink on silk. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.	422
1. 27 The forth group of participants, detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.	423
1. 28 The fifth group of participants, detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version Former Robert van Gulik Collection.	423
1. 29 The sixth group of participants, detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection	423
1. 30 The seventh group of participants, detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.	424
1. 31 The eighth group of participants, detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.	424
1. 32 A section of two willows and a stone bridge, detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.....	424
1. 33 Zhu Youdun. A colophon. 1417. Detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.	425
1. 34 Zhu Youdun. A colophon. 1592. Detail, <i>Lanting</i> . Huangnan version. At the end of the scroll. Palace Museum, Beijing.....	425
1. 35 Prince Yi. A detail of <i>Lanting</i> . Huangnan version. 1592. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Colophon: 32.5 x 107cm; Calligraphy model: 32.1 x 1675cm; Illustration: 31.9 x 628.5cm. Palace Museum, Beijing.....	426
1. 36 A detail of <i>Lanting</i> . Huangnan version. 22.2 x 574cm, Gotō Museum, Uno Sesson Collection.....	426
1. 37 Prince Yi. A detail of <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. 1592. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation. Colophon: 32.5 x 107cm; 32.1 x 1675cm, Illustration: 31.9 x 628.5cm. Palace Museum, Beijing	426
1. 38 Prince Yi. A detail of <i>Lanting</i> . Xianyuan version. 1592. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation. 32.7x1400.8 + 100.9cm. Former Robert van Gulik Collection	426
1. 39 Prince Yi. A detail of <i>Lanting</i> . 1602. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation. 22.4 x 66.5cm; 22.4 x 522cm. Palace Museum, Beijing.	427
2. 1 Kano Einō. <i>Rantei kyokusuien (Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion)</i> . A pair of six panel byōbu, Ink and color on paper. 153x359 cm.	

Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art.	427
2. 2 Kano Sansetsu. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . A section of handscroll. Ink on paper. A draft for <i>fusuma-e</i> at Higashi Honganji Temple, Kyoto. Private Collection.....	428
2. 3 Kano Tan'yū. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink on paper. Private Collection.....	428
2. 4 Kano Tan'yū. "Bestowing Cloth for Resisting at the Gate" section of <i>Teikanzu</i> . Before 1621. From a scroll remounted as <i>byōbu</i> . One of six-panel <i>byōbu</i> . Ink, light color and gold on paper. 82.9x31.5cm. Tokyo National Museum.....	429
2. 5 "Bestowing Cloth for Resisting at the Gate" section of <i>Teikanzusetsu</i> . Woodblock printed book. 26.6x18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo.	429
2. 6 Kano Eisei-in Michinobu. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . 1767. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on paper. 57.9 x 116.5 cm. Museum of Fine Art, Boston.	429
2. 7 Kano Yasunobu. <i>Lanting Pavilion by the Winding Stream</i> . Right of a pair of six panel <i>byōbu</i> . Ink on paper. 150.4 x 353 cm. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.....	430
2. 8 Kano Yasunobu. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . A pair of six panel <i>byōbu</i> . Ink and color on paper. Tochigi Prefectural Museum	430
2. 9 Kano Shō'un. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Ink and light color on paper. Handscroll. Private Collection	431
2. 10 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Chōgonka (The Song of Everlasting Sorrow)</i> . Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. Chester Beatty Library, Dublin.....	431
2. 11 Kano Sanraku, <i>Kuruma arasoī (the Carriage Battle)</i> . <i>The Tale of Genji</i> . Originally <i>fusuma</i> , remounted into a four-panel folding screen. Tokyo National Museum	432
2. 12 Kano Painters. <i>Taima-dera engi emaki</i> . Before 1627. Handscroll. Noshi Collection, Nara National Museum.....	432
2. 13 A letter addressed to Einō by Sansetsu. Suzuka Family Archive	432
2. 14 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Kannon tenryūyasha-zu (The Goddess of Mercy in the Realm of the Heavenly Dragon)</i> . 1647. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. 116.0 x 55.0 cm. Tōfuku-ji, Kyoto	433
2. 15 Signature: Kano Sanraku; Painter: Sansetsu. Calligraphy: Ishikawa Jōsan.	

<i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink on silk. Eigawa Museum of Art, Hyōgo Prefecture.....	433
2. 16 Kano Sansetsu. Details of rock in <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering byōbu</i> , Zuishin-in, Kyoto	434
2. 17 Attributed to Kano Sanraku. <i>Rantei kyokusui yokomono (Horizontal Orchid Pavilion)</i> . Ink and color on paper, hanging scroll. Isaac Douman Auction Catalogue (1919)	434
2. 18 Kano Sanraku. <i>Peony. Fusuma</i> . Ink, color and gold on paper. 184 x 98.6 cm. Daikaku-ji, Kyoto	434
2. 19 Kano Einō. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Ink and colors with gold on paper. Six panel <i>byōbu</i> , Private collection.....	435
2. 20 Kano Motonobu. <i>Soshi-zu (Zen Patriarch Kyōgen Chikuan Sweeping with a Broom)</i> 1513. Ink and light color on paper. 175.7x137.5cm. Tokyo National Museum.	435
2. 21 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Seiko-zu (C. Xihu; The Western Lake)</i> . A pair of six-panel <i>byōbu</i> . Ink and light color on paper. 153.7x357.0 cm. Private Collection	436
2. 22 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Landscape. Haritsuke</i> . Ink on paper. 1631. Tenkyū-in, Myōshin-ji, Kyoto	436
2. 23 Fan Qi. <i>the Landscape</i> . 1645. Handscroll. Ink and light color on paper. 31.8 x 411.7cm. M.H. De Young Memorial Museum, San Francisco	437
2. 24 Wu Pin. <i>A Thousand Peaks and Myriad Ravines</i> . 1617. Hanging scroll. Ink and light color on paper. 306.5x98.5cm. Richard Lin Collection, London	437
2. 25 Fan Yi. <i>The Purification at the Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . 1671. Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. 28.1 x 392.8 cm. Cleveland Museum of Art.....	438
2. 26 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Bangoku-zu (Pangu Valley)</i> . Ink on paper. Hanging scroll. 31.5 x 122.8 cm. Yūgensai Museum of Art.....	438
2. 27 Xiaoting youjing tu of <i>Gujin huapu</i> . Woodblock printed book. Musashino Art University, Tokyo	438
2. 28 “Plank Roads to Sichuan” and “Mount Emei” from <i>Sancai tuhui</i> . 1609. Woodblock printed book. 20.8 x 13.8cm. Ming Wanli edition. Shanghai Library	439
2. 29 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Kanbaku-zu in Sanraku Sansetsu Sansuijō</i> .	

Album of landscape paintings by Kano Sanraku and Sansetsu. Private Collection.....	439
2. 30 Kano Sansetsu. Detail in the fourth screen of <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> , <i>shuro</i> (hemp palm). Zuishin-in, Kyoto.	440
2. 31 Kano Eitoku. <i>Kinkishoga-zu</i> (<i>Four Noble Pastimes of zither, go game,</i> <i>calligraphy and painting</i>). <i>Fusuma</i> . Ink on paper. Daitokuji, Kyoto	440
2. 32 Kano Sanraku. <i>Teikan-zu</i> (<i>Illustrations of the didactic stories for emperors</i>) A pair of six panel <i>byōbu</i> . Tokyo National Museum.....	441
2. 33 Zhaoru jiangjing. Section of <i>Teikan-zu-setsu</i> . Woodblock printed book. 26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo	442
2. 34 Binli guren. Section of <i>Teikanzusetsu</i> . Woodblock printed book. 26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo	442
2. 35 Xiefeng chuguan. Section of <i>Teikanzusetsu</i> . Woodblock printed book. 26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo	442
2. 36 Yushu xinshen. Section of <i>Teikanzusetsu</i> . Woodblock printed book. 26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo	443
2. 37 Kano Sanraku. <i>Nanban byōbu</i> (<i>Arrival of Westerners in Japan</i>). Suntory Museum of Art, Tokyo.....	443
2. 38 Kano Sansetsu. A detail of <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Dragon bridge foundation. Zuishin-in, Kyoto	444
2. 39 Kano Sanraku. <i>Shōsan shikō zu</i> (<i>Wen-wang and Lu-shang, and the four</i> <i>hermits at Shang-shan</i>). Myōshin-ji, Kyoto	444
2. 40 Kano Sansetsu. Detail, <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> , dragon panels. Zuishin-in, Kyoto	445
2. 41 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Dragon</i> . A <i>shukuzu</i> sketch of the Lecture Hall. Tōfuku-ji, Kyoto.	445
2. 42 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Dragon</i> . Ceiling painting. 1647. 630 x 1450 cm. Sen'nyū-ji, Kyoto.....	445
2. 43 Zhao Yuanchu. 1364. <i>Lanting shangyong tu</i> (<i>Drinking wine and</i> <i>composing poetry at the Orchid Pavilion</i>). Ink on paper. 17.5 x 432cm. Colophon: 26 x 75.4cm. Palace Museum, Beijing.....	446

2. 44 Yao Shou. <i>Lanting xiuxi tu (Purification Ritual at the Orchid Pavilion)</i> Ink on silk. Beijing Municipal Art and Craft Museum.	446
2. 45 Wen Zhengming. Calligraphy by Zhu Yunming. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Ink and color on paper. Image: 22.9 x 48.7cm; calligraphy: 20.8 x 77.8cm. Liaoning Provincial Museum.....	447
2. 46 Kano Sanraku. <i>Genshiryō-zu (The Sage Yan Ziling Advising a Eastern Han Emperor)</i> . Two-panel <i>byōbu</i> . Ink and color on paper. 178 x 172.1 cm. Myōshin-ji, Kyoto.....	447
2. 47 Anonymous Kano painter, <i>Fūryūjin zu (Minghuang and Yang Guifei)</i> . Momoyama period. A pair of six-panel <i>byōbu</i> . Ink and color on paper. Private Collection.....	448
2. 48 “Minghuang’s dreams of Yang Guifei.” <i>Leijiang ji</i> version. <i>Tang Minghuang Qiuye Wutongyu (Tang Minghuang Listening to the Rain Falling on Chinese Parasols on an Autumn Night)</i> . 1633. Woodblock-printed book. Private Collection.....	448
2. 49 “Yang Guifei’s dancing” scene. <i>Gu zaju</i> version. <i>Tang Minghuang Qiuye Wutongyu (Tang Minghuang Listening to the Rain Falling on Chinese Parasols on an Autumn Night)</i> . 1619. Woodblock-printed book. Private Collection.....	449
2. 50 <i>Queqianlima</i> section of <i>Teikanzusetsu</i> . Woodblock-printed book. 26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo	449
2. 51 <i>Chongxin lianren</i> section of <i>Teikanzusetsu</i> . Woodblock-printed book. 26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo	449
2. 52 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Seireki daiju zu (A Series of Twenty-One Portraits of Chinese Confucian Masters)</i> . 1632. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. 129.5 44.5cm. Tokyo National Museum.	450
2. 53 Prince Yi. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . depicting the image of Yu Yun, detail. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.....	450
2. 54 Kano Sansetsu, the <i>Orchid Pavilion</i> , depicting the image of Yu Yun, detail. Zuishin-in, Kyoto	450
2. 55 Qiu Ying, <i>Spring Morning in the Han Palace</i> . Detail of handscroll. Ink and color on silk. 30.6 x 574.1cm. Taipei National Palace Museum.	451

2. 56 Prince Yi. The section of dancing Yang Mo. A detail of <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Former Robert van Gulik Collection	451
2. 57 Kano Sansetsu. The section of dancing Yang Mo. A detail of <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Zuishin-in, Kyoto	451
2. 58 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Karako kinki shogazu (Four Noble Pastimes of Chinese Boys)</i> located in one of the four panels of <i>tsukeshoin</i> at the Tenkyû-in, Myôshin-ji, Kyoto	451
2. 59 A scene of tea ceremony. Detail of <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Zuishin-in, Kyoto	452
2. 60 A scene of tea ceremony. 1631. Detail of <i>fusuma</i> of Tenkyû-in, Myôshin-ji, Kyoto	452
3. 1 A copy of Qiu Ying. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . 17 th Century. Handscroll. Ink and color on paper. Tokyo National Museum	453
3. 2 Qiu Ying. <i>Yingxiuxi tu (The Orchid Pavilion Gathering)</i> . Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. 29.7 x 207.5cm. Taipei National Palace Museum.	453
3. 3 Sheng Maoye. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . 1621. Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. 31.1 x 214.7cm. University of Michigan Museum of Art.	453
3. 4 Ike Taiga. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . 1754. <i>Ema</i> (votive wooden panel). Gion Shrine, Kyoto	454
3. 5 Ike Taiga. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . A draft of the votive wooden panel at the Gion Shrine. 1751. A six-panel <i>byôbu</i> , Private Collection	454
3. 6 Ike Taiga. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> , reproduced by Aikawa Minwa and Kitagawa Harunari. 1819. <i>Hengaku Kihan Shukubaku zu</i> . Woodblock-printed painting manual. Art Research Center, Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto	455
3. 7 Kano Eitoku, The Story of Lao Laizi (Old Master), one of the <i>Twenty-four Paragons of the Filial Piety</i> . Fukuoka City Museum	455
3. 8 Kano Eitoku. <i>Twenty-four Paragons of the Twenty-four Examples of Filial Piety</i> . Nanzen-ji, Kyoto	455
3. 9 Kano Hideyori. <i>Drunken Li Bai</i> . 1566. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on paper. 94.8 x 31.6 cm. Itabashi Municipal Museum of Art, Tokyo	456
3. 10 Ike Taiga. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> , ink on paper, hanging scroll. Ruth and Sherman Lee Institute for Japanese Art at the Clark Center, Hanford	456

3. 11 Anonymous. *Landscape*, one of a pair of hanging scrolls.
The 15th Century. Ink on silk, 148 x 92cm.
West Norway Museum of Applied Art, the Munthe Collection456
3. 12 Qiu Ying. *Yingxiuxi tu (The Orchid Pavilion Gathering)*. Hanging scroll.
Ink and color on paper. Taipei National Palace Museum456
3. 13 Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering and the Elegant Gathering
at the Western Garden*. A pair of six-panel *byōbu*. ink and color on paper.
Kōsetsu Museum.457
3. 14 Mikuma Katen. Portrait of Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran,
an illustration of *Kinsei kijinden (Biographies of Extraordinary Persons)*.
1790. Woodblock printed book.
International Research Center for Japanese Studies, Kyoto.458
3. 15 Tomioka Tessai. Portrait of Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran,
from Ike Taiga kafu (Records of the Taiga Lineage). Holograph manuscript.
Private Collection.....458
3. 16 Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering (Rantei Shūkei zu)*. A six-panel *byōbu*,
paired with *Shūsha Suisō zu (Harvest Festival in Autumn)*. Ink and color on paper.
162.8 x 359.1cm. The Mary and Jackson Burke Collection, New York458
3. 17 Attributed to Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, a six-panel *byōbu*,
paired with *Ranteijo* (calligraphy inscribed by Rai Sanyō). Ink and color on paper,
Private Collection459
3. 18 Qian Gu. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Handscroll. Ink on paper. 1560.
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.459
3. 19 Ike Taiga. *Autumnal Tints on the Riverbank (Arashiyama in the Style of
Kōetsu)*. A pair of two-panel screens. Ink, colors, and silver flecks on paper.
171.5 x 209.1cm. Collection of Y. Ushioda.460
3. 20 Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, paired with *Ryūzan Shōkai-zu
(Banquet at Longshan Mountains)*. A pair of six-panel *byōbu*. 1763.
Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art.460
3. 21 Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. A six panel *byōbu*. 1763.
Ink and color on paper. Shimane Prefectural Museum of Art.460
3. 22 Kano Einō. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering. Fusuma and shōhekiga*.
Ink on paper. Hara Museum of Art, Tokyo, originally located at
Nikkō-in, Mi'i-dera, Shiga.....461

3. 23 Mu Qi. <i>The Crane</i> (from the triptych of the <i>White Robed Kannon</i>). Hanging scroll. Ink on silk. Daitokuji, Kyoto	462
3. 24 Kano Eitoku. <i>The Crane</i> . Daitoku-ji, Kyoto.....	462
3. 25 Hasegawa Tōhaku. <i>The Crane</i> . Idemitsu Museum of Arts, Tokyo	462
3. 26 Kano Tan'yū and others. <i>Tan'yū Shuku-zu</i> (Tanyū's Study Sketches). Handscroll. Ink on paper. Kyoto National Museum	462
3. 27 Attributed to Li Zai (?-1431). <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Ink and light color on silk. Handscroll reformatted into a folding screen. Private Collection	463
3. 28 Chen Hongshou. <i>Tao Yuanming Returning to Home</i> . Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. Honolulu Academy of Arts	463
3. 29 Cheng Dayu. <i>Chengshi moyuan</i> . 1605. Woodblock printed catalogue of Ink-sticks. Gotō Museum of Art.	464
3. 30 Ike Taiga. <i>Daibutsukaku</i> (<i>The Great Buddha Hall</i>), from <i>Six Sights in Kyoto modeled after Mi Fu</i> . Private Collection	464
3. 31 Wang Kai, "Mi Fu" in the <i>Kaishien gaden</i> 's woodblock-printed model Private Collection.....	464
3. 32 Ike Taiga. <i>Fūu kiryū zu</i> (<i>Dragon Rising from Wind and Rain</i>). 1746. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on paper. Private Collection.....	465
3. 33 Nakayama Kōyō. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering, funpon</i> . Handscroll. Ink on paper. 1778. Kōchi Municipal Library.	465
3. 34 Nakayama Kōyō, <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering, funpon</i> copied after Wen Zhengming, date unknown. Handscroll. Ink on paper. Kōchi Municipal Library	466
3. 35 Kano Tan'yū, <i>Tan'yū Shukuzu</i> (<i>Tan'yū Study Sketches</i>), detail Kyoto National Museum.....	466
3. 36 Nakayama Kōyō. <i>Inchu hassenzu</i> (<i>The Eight Immortals of the Wine Cup</i>). Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. Private collection.	466
3. 37 Nakayama Kōyō. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . 1779. Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. Private Collection.....	467
3. 38 Nakayama Kōyō. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> , 1778, detail, Handscroll. Ink and light color on paper. Tokyo National Museum.....	467

3. 39 Fukuhara Gogaku. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Handscroll. Ink and colors on paper. Museum of Anthropology, UBC	467
3. 40 Fukuhara Gogaku. <i>Four Noble Pastimes of Chinese Ladies</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Osaka Municipal Museum of Art.	468
3. 41 Fukuhara Gogaku. <i>Landscape with Figures</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink on paper. Private collection in the Netherlands	468
3. 42 Shen Maoye. <i>River Landscape with Willows</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. University of Michigan Museum of Art.....	468
3. 43 Fukuhara Gogaku. <i>Dōteiko (Dongting Lake)</i> . 1772. A pair of six-panel <i>byōbu</i> . Ink and light color on paper. Osaka Museum of History	469
3. 44 Rin Rōen. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink on silk. Osaka Museum of History.	469
3. 45 Nakai Rankō. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Osaka Museum of History	469
3. 46 Nakabayashi Chikutō. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> , modeled after Sheng Maoye. Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. Hakutaku-an Collection, Kyoto	470
3. 47 Nakabayashi Chikutō, <i>Birthday Party of Okada Shingawa at the Mamiya Estate</i> . 1796. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on paper. Private collection	470
3. 48 Nakabayashi Chikutō. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Private collection.	470
3. 49 Yoshida Kōkin. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Private Collection.	470
3. 50 Nakabayashi Chikutō. <i>Sui Rihakuzu (Drunken Li Bai)</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink on paper. Nagoya Municipal Museum.	471
3. 51 Nakabayashi Chikukei. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Indianapolis Museum of Art	471
3. 52 Nakabayashi Chikutō, <i>True View of Mt. Kasagi</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink and light color on paper. Private collection.	471
3. 53 Nakabayashi Chikutō, Tanaka Totsugen, Mimurodo Yasumitsu.	

<i>Snow, Moon and Flower</i> . 1822. Hanging scroll. Ink and light ink on paper. Private collection.	472
3. 54 Nakabayashi Chikutō. <i>Mt. Fuji (Shinshū kikan-zu)</i> , modeled after Niwa Kagen. After 1837. Handscroll. Ink and light color on silk. Nagoya Municipal Museum.....	472
3. 55 Nakabayashi Chikutō. <i>Konko ichi zushiki</i> . 1849. Woodblock printed book. Kariya Municipal Library	472
4. 1 Tsukioka Settei. <i>Kyokusuien zu in the Annual Events of Twelve Months</i> . A Pair of six-panel <i>byōbu</i> . <i>Oshie-bari</i> style. Color on silk. each painting 100.3 x 37.6 cm. 1773- 1787. Biwako Bunkakan, Shiga.	473
4. 2 Kubo Shunman. <i>Kyokusui no en, nishiki-e</i> triptychs. 1786-1789. left: Tokyo National Museum; center and right: British Museum.	473
4. 3 Designed by Nishimura Nantei. <i>The Orchid Pavilion Gathering</i> . 1816. Silk Tapestry of the Tsukihoko portable shrine, Kyoto.....	474
4. 4 Ike Taiga. <i>Kyokusuien in the Annual Events of Twelve Months</i> . A pair of a six-panel <i>byōbu</i> . Ink and light color on paper. Private collection.	474
4. 5 Kano Tan'yū. <i>Teika yomitsukinami kacho utae (Poem-Pictures of Birds & Flowers Based on Teika's Poems)</i> . A pair of six-panel folding screen. Ink and light color on paper. Michigan University Library.	475
4. 6 Tsukioka Sessai. <i>Kyokusuien in the Annual Events of Twelve Months</i> . A pair of six-panel <i>byōbu</i> . Ink and color on paper. Kansai University Library.....	475
4. 7 Tsukioka Sessai. <i>Kyokusuien</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Osaka University, Dept of Literature.	475
4. 8 Tsukioka Settei. <i>Kyokusuien in Wakan Meihitsu Kingyoku gafu</i> , published by Nunoya Tadasaburō, 1770. Woodblock print book. Private Collection.....	476
4. 9 Reizei Tamechika. <i>Kyokusuien in the Annual Events of Twelve Months</i> . 1843. Handscroll. Ink and color on paper. Hosomi Museum of Art, Kyoto	476
4. 10 a. <i>Kemari</i> and b. <i>toriawase Annual Event of Twelve Months</i> scroll, originally painted by Tokiwa Genji Mitsunaga with supervision of Fujiwara Motofusa in 1157. Copied by Sumiyoshi Jokei and Gukei in the 17 th century. Private Collection	477

4. 11 Sakai Hōitsu. *Kyokusuien zu*. Hanging scroll, one of five scrolls of *Gosseku zu*. Ink and color on silk. Ōkura Shūkōkan Museum.477
4. 12 Sakai Hōitsu. *Ise monogatari* episode 65, *misogi-zu* or purification ritual scene in *Kōrin Hyakuzu*. 1815. Woodblock print book.
Private collection 477
4. 13 Ogata Korin. *Ise monogatari* episode 65, *misogi-zu* or purification ritual, (also titled as Ietaka's *misogi*), early 18th century. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Hatakeyama Museum.....478
4. 14 Attributed to Tawaraya Sotatsu. *Ise monogatari-zu byōbu*. 17th century. A six panel folding screen. Ink and color on paper.
Idemitsu Museum of Arts, Tokyo 478
4. 15 Suzuki Ki'itsu. *Ise monogatari* episode 65, *misogi-zu* or purification ritual, 19th century. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk.
Yelen-Gitter Collection, New Orleans..... 478
4. 16 Anonymous. *Ietaka Purification Ritual*, from *A Hundred Verses from Old Japan*. Atomi Gakuen Tanki Daigaku Library. Woodblock print.
After Joshua Mostow, *Pictures of the Hearts* (1996) 430 figure 98-3.478
4. 17 Nishikawa Sukenobu. *Kaisei Ise monogatari*. 1747. Woodblock printed book.
Kansai University Library.....479
4. 18 *Ise monogatari*, Saga version. 1608. Woodblock print book. Published by Suminokura Soan. Kansai University Library479
4. 19 Illustrated by Qian Geng. *Garden Views of the Huang Yingzu Studio*. ca. 1610. Woodblock carved by Huang Yingzu, *Huancuitang Yuanjing tu*. 24.3 x 1470cm. Private Collection..... 479
4. 20 Kubo Shunman. *Waka* on a *tanzaku* poem card. 1796.
Moto'ori Norinaga Memorial Museum480
4. 21 Suzuki Harunobu. *Kyokusuien* in *Fūzoku Shiki Kasen (Immortal Poets in the Customs of Four Seasons)*. *Cūban nishiki-e*. Woodblock print.
Tokyo National Museum480
4. 22 Kubo Shunman. *Mutamagawa (Six Jewel Rivers)*. *Benigirai-e*. Woodblock print. British Museum. 480
4. 23 Kubo Shunman. *Gensō Yō Kihī yūrakuzu (Emperor Xuanzhong and Yang Guifei Enjoying Themselves)*. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk.
Museum of Fine Art, Boston.481

5. 1 <i>Hakuōsha Poetry Society</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink and color on paper. Private Collection.....	481
5. 2 Kano Sansetsu. <i>Xiwangmu (Jp. Seiōbo; the Queen Mother of the West and Mu Wang)</i> . Early 17th century. 152.5 x 350.6 cm. One of a pair of six-panel <i>byōbu</i> . Ink on paper. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.....	482
5. 3 Scene of <i>Tori awase</i> or Cockfighting from <i>Jūnikagetsu fūzoku zukan</i> (<i>Book of Manners and Customs for Each Month</i>). Momoyama period. Ink and color on paper. Yamaguchi Hoshun Memorial Museum.....	482
5. 4 <i>Tori awase</i> or Cockfighting from <i>Jūnikagetsu fūzoku zukan</i> (<i>Book of Manners and Customs for Each Month</i>). Early Edo period. Ink and color on paper. Private Collection	483
5. 5 Iwasa Katsumoto. Chapter 12 <i>Suma, The Tale of Genji</i> , 17 th -century, Ink and color on paper. Private Collection	483
5. 6 <i>Amagatsu</i> (Godchild). Mid-Edo period. Tōyama Memorial Museum.	484
5. 7 <i>Hōko</i> (Creeping-child). Mid-Edo period. Tōyama Memorial Museum.....	484
5. 8 <i>Tachi-bina</i> . Mid-Edo period. Tōyama Memorial Museum	484
5. 9 <i>Kyōho-bina</i> . c.1716-1735. Hayashi Family Collection, Kyoto National Museum.....	484
5. 10 <i>Ka'ei hana raku hosomi zu (An Illustrated Guide to Seeing Sites in Kyoto)</i> . 1704. Kyoto Prefectural Library and Archives.....	485
5. 11 Nishikawa Sukenobu, <i>Ehon yamato waranbe (Picture Book of the Japanese Children)</i> . 1731. Reproduced in <i>Kinsei Nihon fūzoku ehon shūsei</i> , Suzuki Jūzō (Tokyo: Rinzei shoten, 1980)	485
5. 12 Nishikawa Sukenobu. <i>Jokun eiri hin- asobi no ki (Edifying Story for Women with Illustrations of Hina-dolls at Play)</i> . 1749, reproduced by Ōzora-sha in 1995...485	
5. 13 <i>Nagashi-bina</i> . Mochigase area of Tottori Prefecture, retrieved on June 12, 2009, http://www.geocities.jp/seijiishizawa/NewFiles/hina-okuri.html	485
5. 14 An image of <i>Awashima ganjin</i> . <i>Jinrin kinmō zui (Category of Occupations)</i> Vol.7, 1690, Kyoto University Library, retrieved on June 12, 2009, http://edb.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/exhibit/i101/image/07/i101s0154.html	486
5. 15 An image of <i>Awashima ganjin</i> . <i>Ehon otogi shina kagami (Illustrated Encyclopedia of Occupations)</i> . 1730. Osaka Municipal Library	486

5. 16 Tsukioka Settei. <i>Kyokusuien zu</i> . Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Private Collection.....	486
5. 17 Tekisei Hokuba. <i>Mitate Kyokusui en (Gathering at the Meandering Water)</i> c.1804-1830, Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Museum of Fine Art, Boston...	486
5. 18 Utagawa Toyokuni. <i>Kyokusuien-zu (Gathering at the Meandering Water)</i> . 1792-3. Art Institute of Chicago.	487
5. 19 <i>Kimono</i> . Design of <i>kyokusuien</i> . Tokyo National Museum.	487
5. 20 Cover page of <i>Fūzoku gahō</i> , first published by Tōyōdō Vol. 70 (April 1894) and Vol. 88 (March 1895), reprinted by Kokusho kankōkai in 1975. Asian Library at UBC	488
5. 21 Cover page and a page of <i>Fūzoku gahō</i> , Vol. 418, Tōyōdō (March 1911), reprinted by Kokusho kankōkai in 1975. Asian Library at UBC	488
5. 22 Back page of <i>Fūzoku gahō</i> , Vol. 485, Tōyōdō (March 1915), reprinted by Kokusho kankōkai in 1975. Asian Library at UBC.....	489
5. 23 Performing <i>kyokusuien</i> using <i>ushō</i> . Jōnangū, Kyoto	489
5. 24 Okamoto Sukehiko. <i>Kyokusuien</i> . Late 19 th Century. Ink and color on cedar sliding doors. Kyoto Imperial Palace	490

Acknowledgements

This dissertation, which crosses the borders of many different specialized areas of scholarship, is a study of Tokugawa society and is also a record of my own social network. It would have been impossible to produce this work without the support and advice that I received from innumerable experts. However, any mistakes in this dissertation are singularly my responsibility.

At the University of British Columbia, first of all, I would like to express my immense appreciation for my supervisor Joshua Mostow, who instructed me with his unparalleled scholarship and nurtured me with an endlessly generous source of support throughout this endeavor. With his brilliant guidance and his up-to-date and wide ranging knowledge of Japanese literature, art history and visual culture, I was encouraged to take a new route in studying the Orchid Pavilion Gathering theme. He also guided me in translating Japanese *waka* poetry into English, which was the most challenging assignment for me but an extremely important component in this study, especially in Chapters Four and Five. I owe him much more than I can ever repay in my lifetime.

For her many brilliant lectures, seminars and personal guidance in Chinese art, I am especially grateful to Hsingyuan Tsao, who has been my advisor since I was in the MA program at the University of Hawaii. She saved me from many difficult academic situations during the past years and gave me numerous opportunities to develop the ideas in this dissertation. Only because of her support and kindness was I able to complete this project.

My profound gratitude goes to Marvin Cohodas, who always inspired me with intellectually provoking questions that often opened my eyes to see new issues to explore

in this dissertation. His vital suggestions led me in the direction of *hina-matsuri* when I was battling to find a way to conclude it. He also taught me the joy and meaningfulness of teaching an art history course to undergraduate students when I was his teaching assistant for three and a half years.

I am deeply thankful to the faculty, alumni and fellow graduate students at UBC. With the generous support of the former department head, Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe, I was able to conduct my research at prestigious institutions, which was necessary to produce this dissertation. It is impossible to thank Brent Epp enough, who constantly gave me his insightful comments and advice from the viewpoint of modern art/cultural studies, and also proofread numerous papers including the chapters of this thesis. I appreciate the guidance, support and friendship that I received from Jasmina Karabeg, April Liu, Jean Kares, Zoe Li, Susan Chang, Adam Chu, and Ikeda Asato of the Art History department, as well as Sharalyn Orbaugh, Christina Laffin, Monika Dix, Gergana Ivanova, Nagase Mari, and Maiko Bear of the Asian Studies department.

Outside of UBC, I am deeply indebted to James Cahill who counseled me with his incomparable erudition on how Chinese images were transmitted into Japanese pictorial representations, which was particularly important to Chapter Three. My special gratitude goes to Scott Johnson and Ellis Tinios who guided me in exploring the relationship between the paintings and print media. I am also deeply thankful to Steve Goldberg who has enlightened me in the discipline of art history since I was an undergraduate student at UH.

In Hawaii, I would like to express my deep appreciation to Howard and Mary Ann Rogers who gave me tremendous support and insightful comments. I truly

appreciate Jerome Feldman who edited part of the dissertation and inspired me with his provocative feedback. My heartfelt gratitude goes to Leslie Benji Nerio, who always cheered me up with his brilliant suggestions and discussed with me a number of issues that I raised in this dissertation. Special thanks also go to John Szostak, Roger Ames, Kuan-Hung Chen, Shawn Eichman, and Sawako Chang. I offer enduring gratitude to my late advisor at UH, Inoue Mariko, for introducing me to the importance of studying Japanese art through her meticulously prepared lectures.

In Japan, my appreciation forever goes to Kohara Hironobu, who introduced me to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering theme eleven years ago, when I was struggling to find a topic for my MA thesis. Since then, his noble scholarship and continuous guidance have constantly invigorated my enthusiasm for this painting theme. He taught me how to read the inscriptions and seals on the paintings as well as how to decipher the various classical Chinese texts, which is absolutely crucial in the study of Orchid Pavilion Gathering.

For my studies at Kyoto University as a visiting student, I am thankful to Sasaki Jōhei and Nedachi Kensuke, who educated me in a solid, orthodox research method for the study of Japanese art, which I always deem to be a powerful tool.

No other training gave me more excitement than the internship at the Kyoto National Museum, where Yamashita Yoshiya taught me how to appreciate the expression of artworks -- understanding the brushstrokes or application of pigments, while analyzing and critiquing them directly. His brilliance and kindness fueled my passion for a particular Orchid Pavilion screen by Kano Sansetsu, which is a focus of Chapter Two. Special thanks also go to Sasaki Jōhei, Nishigami Minoru, Akao Eikei, Yamamoto Hideo,

Ōhara Yoshitoyo, Hada Satoshi, Nagashima Meiko, Kure Motoyuki and Sakaguchi Satoko of this institution.

I am very fortunate to have taken part in the third research mission of the Comprehensive Illustrated Catalogue of Chinese Paintings in Europe, which was conducted by the University of Tokyo's Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia. I thank Ogawa Hiromitsu who gave me the opportunity to receive intense research training and to discover hidden paintings, such as the Ming-dynasty Orchid Pavilion in Bergen, Norway, which I discuss in Chapter Three. I can never thank Itakura Masa'aki enough, who provided brilliant answers to my questions regarding the Orchid Pavilion paintings and theme during and after the trip. I would like to express appreciation also to Suzuki Hiroyuki, Fujita Shinya, Kure Motoyuki, Uematsu Mizuki, Nokubo Masatsugu and Cola Wurmell for their support, guidance, and friendship.

At the Art Research Center of the Ritsumeikan University, where I currently hold a Visiting Researcher position, I benefited greatly from using their resources and from participating in their workshops and symposiums. Some of the chapters in this dissertation were developed from presentations delivered at this institution. I am especially thankful to Matsuba Ryōko for organizing these academic events and for her kind invitations. My earnest appreciation goes to Matsumoto Ikuyo and Idemitsu Sachiko for their leadership in conducting the workshops. It has been an honor to collaborate with Princess Akiko of Mikasa and Maezaki Shinya in various academic projects. Special gratitude also goes to Kawashima Masao, Akama Ryō, Genjō Masayoshi, Shimosaka Mamoru, Zhang Xiaogang, Suzuki Keiko, Kaneko Taka'aki,

Tsukamoto Akihiro, Ishigami Aki, and Kamo Mizuho for their insightful advice, assistance and friendship.

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to Igarashi Kōichi, who generously sent me his unpublished dissertation which is filled with invaluable information. Matsumoto Naoko not only sent me her dissertation, but also rescued me by supplying numerous textual and visual materials related to the Orchid Pavilion theme from Japan when I desperately needed them. Paul Berry read chapters of this dissertation, corrected some crucial points, and gave me vital suggestions on Japanese literati painting issues in Chapter Three. He also arranged a private viewing session of the many Orchid Pavilion paintings in a private collection in Kyoto and gave me a chance to directly study them. Murata Daisuke provided me opportunities to expand the understanding of this theme from the perspective of contemporary art.

Special credit goes to Kametani Eiō of the Zuishin-in temple and Toba Shigehiro of the Jōnan-gū shrine for giving me permission to study the Orchid Pavilion paintings there and for showing me related materials in their invaluable collections. Other professors, curators, collectors and dealers in Japan to whom I am indebted are: Shimao Arata, Ōta Takahiko, Yamamoto Tokurō, Iwasa Shin'ichi, Okudaira Shunroku, Fujioka Yuzuru, Morizane Kumiko, Hamasumi Mayu, Marui Kenzaburō, Yanagi Takashi, Oka Yasuhiro, Yamazoe Haruki, Inagaki Tomoko, Yoshizumi Kyōko, Nakano Shiho, Tatara Takiko, and Takamiya Kōichi.

My final thanks are reserved for my family. I appreciate my parents, Osamu and Yoshiko Kameda, who gave me tremendous support for my academic venture. Since their home is conveniently located in Takatsuki, a bedroom community to Kyoto and

Osaka, they provided me a station from which to conduct research in Japan for many years. From the bottom of my heart, I would like to thank my husband Yoav Madar and our daughter Mazal, who have been patiently moving around the world, crossing the Pacific Ocean with container shipments filled with books -- from Hawaii to Japan, to Vancouver and back to Hawaii -- in order for me to pursue my academic goals and to run after Orchid Pavilion images located elsewhere. Without their love and understanding, it would have been absolutely impossible to complete this dissertation.

Introduction: Issues and Questions

When the people of the future investigate us, it is the equivalent of our looking back at people from the past. Alas, I have no choice but to pay attention to my contemporaries and record their words. The world will change and events will differ, but perhaps future generations will achieve pleasure in the same way we do. Reading this prose, they will experience some sense of identification.

*Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering*¹

Including Dongpo, there were sixteen men in all, experts in literature, poetry, calligraphy, painting, and antiquities, real heroes of their kind, besides great Buddhist and Daoist priests. They all stood high above the common level, and their fame has even reached foreign countries all over the world. People of future generations may find it worthwhile not only to look at this painting but also to imitate these men.

*Record of the Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden*²

The study of Japanese art has long been conducted around the concept of “schools” and lineages, rather than epochs, periods, or movements. With the introduction of Western art historical methodology in the nineteenth century, the concept of schools was further reified with the addition of the ideas of “style” and “genre.” Today, we speak of “the Kano School,” “the Tosa School,” but also of *bunjinga* (literati painting) and *ukiyo-e* (pictures of the floating world). Despite the overlap and confusion between some of these terms, Japanese art historians typically identify any given artist as belonging exclusively to one particular school and proceed with their analysis from there.

The purpose of my research is two-fold. The first is to challenge this pigeon-holing of individual artists and the division of the artistic field into mutually exclusive camps. I aim to reveal the social networks of artists during the Edo period (1615-1868) and how artists from various “schools” connected with one another and exchanged ideas. The second purpose is to explain how artists of different social classes and artistic

lineages used “orthodox” themes as a form of resistance to the oppressive social control of the military shogunate. Through intricate networks, artists from different painting schools met not only with each other but also with intellectuals, publishers, merchants, and other cultured contemporaries. Their shared ideology was often manifested in the pictorial representations of assemblages of scholars. To illustrate this, I propose to examine the narrative and pictorial theme called *Rantei*, or The Orchid Pavilion Gathering.

The Orchid Pavilion Gathering theme has as its source a historical/legendary event that took place in China in the year 353, when Wang Xizhi, the famous calligrapher, invited forty-one scholars – relatives, friends and pupils of his – to participate in the Spring Purification Festival. In celebration of this annual event, the scholars positioned themselves along a stream; they agreed to compose two poems before a cup of wine floated downstream reached them. If they succeeded in composing two poems by that time, they would have to drink only one cup of wine; if not, they would have to drink more. For the collection of poems written at this gathering Wang Xizhi wrote a preface describing the event. The description in this preface is the textual source for the images I am considering.

Both the text describing the historical Orchid Pavilion Gathering and the later wine-drinking poetry-composing contests held in emulation of it were introduced to Japan in the seventh century. However, pictorial representation of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering in Japan is unknown until the early seventeenth century when it was introduced in the form of ink rubbings (a kind of reproduction made by rubbing paper onto an inked stone engraving). The Orchid Pavilion theme belongs to the genre of

“elegant gatherings,” which depict a community of idealized Chinese scholars and includes the “Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove” and the “Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden,” both of which had been frequently painted since the preceding Muromachi (1336-1573) and Momoyama (1573-1603) periods.³ During the Tokugawa period (1603-1868), however, the “Orchid Pavilion” became one of the most important and popular painting themes in Japan.

By examining a wide range of visual representations of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering, my thesis inquires into the political and ideological circumstances of Tokugawa society. It will explore the Tokugawa social phenomena that gave rise to the boom in the Orchid Pavilion theme from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century and how so many painters of different classes, belonging to different painting schools, and working in different formats, came to develop their own “trade-marked” variations of the same theme in order to establish their cultural identity and to negotiate stronger positions in relation to power. I will also investigate the social differences among patrons and attempt to uncover how distinct types of “Orchid Pavilion” were reinvented to promote different political agendas.

The examination undertaken in this thesis considers a number of questions: What accounts for the surprising popularity of Orchid Pavilion imagery in Japan between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, especially considering its absence earlier? What social, economic and political forces shaped the transformation of the Chinese model of Orchid Pavilion illustration into nativized Japanese versions during this period? How did the increasingly diverse production and consumption of Orchid Pavilion imagery contribute to the dynamism of identity formation in Edo society? And how does the

tracing of a network connecting scholars, artists, and consumers of all classes help us understand the breadth and nature of resistance to the oppressive Tokugawa regime?

Contrary to the common impression of it being rigid and stratified into four classes – samurai, peasants, artisans, and merchants – I will demonstrate instead the dynamism of Tokugawa society. Although the Tokugawa period is generally thought to have been a time of peace, the Pax Tokugawa was a peace brought by military force.⁴ The Tokugawa regime was at times heavily and unfairly oppressive; yet, as I will show, people of all classes retained enough power to voice their resentment and perspective through the visual language of Orchid Pavilion Gathering theme.

Hence, I propose that the Orchid Pavilion paintings are crucial for a study of the social, political, economic, cultural and ideological circumstances of the Tokugawa period. In this study I take an anti-essentialist stance and show that identity formation is a dynamic process. I will shed new light on Tokugawa society by examining stereotypical understandings of Japanese culture and by reconsidering the “Edo boom” (the new interest in Tokugawa-era history and culture), which has been a driving force of the new nationalism that has emerged in Japan since the 1980s and continues today.⁵ The recent spate of exhibitions dedicated or related to the Orchid Pavilion theme provides further evidence of the process whereby constructions of Japanese nationalism involve historical themes that originated in China.⁶ As this thesis will show, a significant aspect of Japanese national identity is the degree to which it is underpinned by a cultural relationship with China.

State of the Field

Sources for this project may be divided into two categories: publications that explore the broader issues concerning Tokugawa art and society, and those that specifically concern illustrations of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering. Several scholars outside of Japan, such as Melinda Takeuchi, Patricia Graham, Paul Berry, Philip K. Ku, Felice Fischer and Kyōko Kinoshita, have given academic attention to Orchid Pavilion paintings.⁷ While numerous studies on this subject have been produced in Japan, Japanese scholarship has with few exceptions focused on stylistic concerns. Hence, one of my goals is to bridge this gap between English and Japanese scholarship by examining Orchid Pavilion paintings in their sociopolitical and historical context.

As Patricia Graham exhaustively demonstrated in her 2002 essay, “Early Modern Japanese Art History,” the discourse on visual representation in Tokugawa-era Japan has tended increasingly to stress connoisseurship, working to construct specific “masterpieces” such as the Ike Taiga version of the Orchid Pavilion, and also focusing on the importance of specific collections, like the Burke Collection in which it is located.⁸ The overriding issue is thus current market value rather than historically situated social practice.

A conscious effort to resist this tendency is made in the 2007 book by Anna Maria Beerens, *Friends, Acquaintances, Pupils, Patrons: Japanese Intellectual Life in the Late Eighteenth Century: A Prosopographical Approach*.⁹ By compiling the biographies of 173 Tokugawa-era literati painters, Beerens emphasizes their social circumstances and describes a system of networking among communities of intellectuals. Through a prosopographical or collective-biography approach, she is able to stress and

detail the networks linking not only individual artists but also the various schools that have previously been constructed as utterly distinct. Beerens' method has provided an important model for a non-essentialist analysis of visual representation in this historical period.

The collection of essays in *Critical Perspectives on Classicism in Japanese Painting, 1600-1700*, edited by Elizabeth Lillehoj in 2004, also offers critical studies of Tokugawa society that provide non-essentialist models for my research.¹⁰ Although none of the contributors discusses the Orchid Pavilion, one theme common to several papers involves the process by which a particular painting theme is transformed through the networking system connecting artists and scholars of different schools. A second theme in this collection that is pertinent to my thesis involves the interconnections among painting schools concerning canon formation and the issues of classicism.

Methodological Structure and Background Theory

Another important model for my analysis of the Orchid Pavilion theme in Tokugawa imagery is Michele Marra's theory of aesthetic resistance, which he developed through a study of medieval Japanese *waka* poetry. Marra's *Aesthetics of Discontent* concerns the entire social context of reclusion in the oppressive regimes of medieval Japan.¹¹ According to Marra, the creativity of the oppressed is usually ignored by history unless blood is shed, while aesthetic reclusion is a subtle expedient that can be easily dismissed. Marra establishes four modes of expressing discontent in medieval Japanese literature: 1) allusion, or the process of using the aesthetic products of the past to express problems in the present while evading censorship, 2) contextual reinterpretation, or the

idealization of the past in order to critique the present, 3) rejection, the more overt expression of discontent with the present situation, and 4) allusive variation, or the flight from the present situation into reclusion. All four of these modes, which are rooted in Chinese literati theory, were applied to the Orchid Pavilion theme.

However, in this imagery, other methods were also developed by Tokugawa painters for the same purposes of resistance. I will incorporate this model of analysis but will also add the following: 1) alternatives, by which I mean the substitution of elements or themes with others, 2) canon formation through easily recognized diagnostics, which permit other kinds of politically communicative expression, and 3) performance, which relates to Marra's mode of contextual reinterpretation, but I am more concerned with Japanese figures taking on Chinese identity. These added categories are interrelated in a Chinese-dependent construction of Japanese identity.

Marra's understanding of the relationship between art and society shown through aesthetic resistance heavily relies on the Frankfurt School social theorist Theodor Adorno's (1903-1969) *Aesthetic Theory*.¹² Adorno investigates the relation between the form of an individual art work and its meaning or significance, in order to better understand how it might function as potentially transformative social practice within its sociopolitical context. I attempt to show how Orchid Pavilion paintings were understood at the time as political commentary, with often dire consequence for the painters. Together the paintings encourage, to use Mieke Bal's words, "a conceptual laboratory of thinking about how art can be both political and art – political not in spite of being art, as a side effect or abuse, but because it is art."¹³

Marra's approach is applied by Kendall H. Brown in his analysis of aesthetic reclusion. In *The Politics of Reclusion*, Brown focuses on two other themes of communal Chinese scholars in Japanese painting, the "Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove" and the "Four Graybeards of Mt. Shang."¹⁴ With Brown's argument about these other themes I share a concern to show how the multivalent implications of aesthetic reclusion central to such paintings made them appropriate for patrons of all classes. His study supports what I demonstrate with respect to the "Orchid Pavilion," which is that it serves as both "a symbol of power and a salve of power."¹⁵

I also follow the lead of the post-structural historian, Joan W. Scott, who argues that we need to conceive of processes that are so interconnected it is impossible for them to be disentangled.¹⁶ Within these processes "there is room for a concept of human agency as the attempt to construct an identity, a life, a set of relationships, a society within certain limits and with language – conceptual language that at once sets boundaries and contains the possibility for negation, resistance, reinterpretation, the play of metaphoric invention and imagination."¹⁷ My study of painting in Tokugawa Japan further follows Scott in replacing the notion that social power is unified, coherent and centralized with a concept of power that is made up of dispersed constellations of unequal relationships, discursively constituted in social "fields of force."¹⁸

Outline of the Thesis

As a way of conceptualizing the tradition of Orchid Pavilion paintings and exploring their historical relations, my study is organized into five chapters, each with its own thematic and methodological concerns; they thus may not always follow

chronological order. In Chapter One, which introduces the “Orchid Pavilion” theme, I discuss Wang Xizhi’s *Preface to the Orchid Pavilion*, the text from which subsequent illustrations were developed. In this preface, Wang Xizhi highlights several of the themes that are most important to this study, including the writing of history, the strategic re-interpretation of the past, and the political necessity of identity formation. In examining the Orchid Pavilion tradition in China and the cultural pedigree it formed, I redefine how it came to be established as a sign of power and an ideal. I consider how the Ming dynasty (1368-1644) revived the Orchid Pavilion theme as emblematic of China’s glorious past in order to restore a sense of cultural authority at the imperial court. It was during this period that Orchid Pavilion paintings were also commodified by the professional painters of Suzhou province and later exported to Japan via Nagasaki.

Chapter Two will investigate how this Chinese theme was transformed by a Japanese approach when Kano School artists of the early Tokugawa period adapted Ming-dynasty ink rubbings of the Orchid Pavilion. I complicate the process of this particular transculturation by explaining the political struggle of the Kano School in Kyoto, which was victimized under the harsh treatment of the military system, and which used the Orchid Pavilion to express resentment and resistance in a non-threatening way. I examine the Orchid Pavilion painting by Kano Sansetsu to demonstrate how aesthetic resistance was formulated through interaction within his cultural network. I also use Kano Einō’s *Honchō gashi* (*History of Painting in Our Realm*) to show how artists resorted to the fabrication of artistic lineages in order to survive.¹⁹

Chapter Three explores issues around the literati painting movement. There I reexamine the how various sources, including the Ming Suzhou commercial tradition of

Orchid Pavilion paintings, served as models for Japanese literati paintings. When the cultural blossoming of the Genroku era (1688-1709) had passed, literati painting developed as a reaction against the socially dominant and artistically restricted Kano School.²⁰ It was a time when unhappy samurai, who failed to fit in the overly constrained political system, and the newly emerging *chōnin* (townspeople), who had accumulated enough wealth but continued to be excluded from political participation, began to create a kind of counterculture that was inspired by Chinese cultural models. Under such circumstances, cultured people from various classes developed social networks to engage in the production of paintings, calligraphy, art treatises, poetry, and so forth to transmit, among other things, their messages of social frustration.²¹

I explore the circumstances of town painters like Ike Taiga (1723-1776) and his followers in Kyoto and Osaka in relation to their performance of the role of Chinese scholars. At this time merchants had economic power but they were situated at the lowest of social strata. Especially during the Kyōhō (1716-1745), Kansei (1787-1793), and Tempō (1830-1843) Reforms, their activities were widely restricted. Hence, they produced versions of Orchid Pavilion with an implied message of resistance by portraying themselves as the scholars gathering at the Orchid Pavilion. While the whole of literati painting presented itself as a kind of spontaneous style; not to be overlooked are the cases where literati painters also relied on *funpon* (study sketches), while at the same time heavily criticizing the Kano School system, whose own pedagogy relied heavily on the practice of *funpon* copying. I analyze the paintings produced and the study sketches collected and used by Nakayama Kōyō (1717-1780), who was one of the early pioneers of the literati tradition in Japan, in order to demonstrate the literati use, contrary

to their professed objections, of Kano *funponism*. In so doing, I shall also reconsider issues of copying and authenticity.

Chapter Four builds on the previously discussed means by which the Orchid Pavilion theme was nativized and adapted into Japanese classical culture. This chapter begins by tracing the performance of Orchid Pavilion gatherings and the popularization of Wang Xizhi in seventh-century courtly practice in the Nara period (710-794).

Aristocrats and the imperial court reinvented the tradition of scholarly gatherings and poetry competitions, now having them take place along an artificial stream in a practice called *kyokusuien* (party at a winding stream).²² In the ninth-century Heian period, this nativized Orchid Pavilion practice reaches its peak in the production of *waka* poetry.

Although no paintings of this Heian-period practice survive, the event was reimagined by Tsukioka Settei (1710-1786) and other painters of *fūzokuga*, or genre painting. In order to formulate a *fūzokuga* version of this theme, Settei studied the Chinese “Orchid Pavilion” image and combined it with the pictorial motif of a purification ritual from *The Ise Stories* (*Ise monogatari*). *Fūzokuga* versions of *kyokusuien* inspired *fukko yamato-e*, a revival movement of classical Japanese paintings in the nineteenth century. This movement was based on *kokugaku* ideology, which involved the study of ancient Japanese texts and culture and rejected foreign influences, such as Confucian Chinese learning, and Buddhism, all of which the Tokugawa regime used to legitimate its authority. In the nineteenth century, by reviving courtly cultural practices, *kokugaku* intellectuals militated for the restoration of the emperor in order to overthrow the Tokugawa regime.

I investigate an *ukiyo-e* adaptation of *kyokusuien* by Kubo Shunman (1757-1820), who created multiple layers of meanings by incorporating contemporary *kabuki* actors. Shunman also layered images of courtesans writing letters to their clients with images of Chinese scholars or Japanese courtiers attending the poetry competitions on the third day of third month. This *ukiyo-e* represents the cult of *kyokusuien* in the Tokugawa period, which was also associated with *kokugaku* networks.

In Chapter Five, I conclude by tracing the impact that the Orchid Pavilion had on another visual tradition: that related to *hina-matsuri* or the Doll Festival. During the Tokugawa period, all cultured painters were well informed about the Orchid Pavilion theme. They competed with one another both economically and politically and strategically fashioned versions of this theme in both types of competition. Although the “Orchid Pavilion” theme was nativized, it was impossible to separate it from Chinese culture since every aspect of the nativized version bore reference to its Chinese origin. Every “Orchid Pavilion” image, even though it portrayed contemporary Japanese figures and events, was produced as part of an artistic activity that alluded to Chinese subject matter. Today annual gatherings modeled after the Orchid Pavilion gathering have been revived and reinvented as tourist attractions. They are held at multiple locations such as the Kamigamo Shinto Shrine and Jonangū in Kyoto, as well as Sengen-en and Dazaifu Ten’mangū in Kyushu. They demonstrate the continued practice of constructing a Japanese identity that is crucially dependent on Chinese heritage and that interweaves political and socio-economic interests.

Notes:

¹ Translation by Marshall P.S. Wu in *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering: Chinese Painting from the University of Michigan Museum of Art*, Volume II (Seattle: The University of Washington Press, 2000), 45.

² Translation by Paul Berry, “Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden,” *Literati Modern: Bunjinga from Late Edo to Twentieth-Century Japan* (Honolulu: Honolulu Academy of Arts, 2008), 61.

³ While Kendall Brown calls this genre “‘hermit painting’ – painting that takes as its primary subject the recluse actually engaged in the act of reclusion” – Itakura Masa’aki defines it as “elegant gatherings,” which I think is more appropriate for my study. See, Kendall H. Brown, *The Politics of Reclusion: Painting and Power in Momoyama Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1997), 2; Itakura Masa’aki, “The Historical Position of Ma Yuan’s Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden (The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art): Concerning the Pictorialization of this Theme as Fiction.” *Bijutsushi ronsō* 美術史論叢 [*Tokyo University Art Journal*] Vol.16 (1999): 1. I discuss the “Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove” and “Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden” themes more in Chapter Three of this thesis.

⁴ Tsunoda Ryūsaku, et al., “The Tokugawa Peace” in *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, Vol.1, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), 298.

⁵ On the “Edo boom,” see Joshua S. Mostow, “Introduction” in *Gender and Power in the Japanese Visual Field* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2003), 1-16; and also Mostow, “Museum as Hometown: What is “Japanese Beauty?” in *Japan at the*

Millennium: Joining Past and Future, ed. David W. Edgington (University of British Columbia Press), 2003.

⁶ Recent exhibitions concerning the Orchid Pavilion Gathering theme include: *Spirit of Brush and Ink: The World of Chinese Paintings and Calligraphies* at the Kyoto National Museum, Jan. 8, 2011-Feb. 20, 2011; *The Orchid Pavilion* at Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium, Oct. 14, 2009-Jan.31, 2010; *Beijing The Palace Museum: Masterpieces of Chinese Calligraphy* at Edo-Tokyo Museum, Jul. 15, 2008-Oct. 15, 2008; *The Orchid Pavilion Special Exhibition* at Tokyo National Museum, Mar. 4, 2008-May 6, 2008.

⁷ Melinda Takeuchi, *Taiga's True Views: The Language of Landscape Painting in Eighteenth-Century Japan* (California: Stanford University Press, 1992), 68-74; Patricia J. Graham, *Tea of the Sages: The Art of Sencha* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1998), 48-52, 85-87; Christine Guth, *Art of Edo Japan: the artist and the city 1615 -1868* (New York: Harry N. Adams, Inc., 1996), 70; Paul Berry, "Suzuki Fuyō," *Literati Modern: Bunjinga form Late Edo to Twentieth-Century Japan* (Honolulu: Honolulu Academy of Arts, 2008), 42-43; Philip K. Hu, "Sail Returning from Distant Shore: Chinese Themes and Styles on Japanese Folding Screens," in Janice Kats, ed., *Beyond Golden Clouds: Japanese Screens from The Art Institute of Chicago and the Saint Louis Art Museum* (The Art Institute of Chicago, 2009), 69-70 ; Felice Fischer and Kyōko Kinoshita, *Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran: Japanese Masters of The Brush*, Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007), 25, 57, 97, 288-293, 421, 445-446.

⁸ Patricia Graham, "Early Modern Japanese Art History: An Overview of the State of the Field," *Early Modern Japan: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 10, 2 (2002): 2-21.

-
- ⁹ Anna Beerens, *Friends, Acquaintances, Pupils, Patrons: Japanese Intellectual Live in the Late Eighteenth Century: A Prosopographical Approach* (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2006).
- ¹⁰ Elizabeth Lillehoj, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Classicism in Japanese Painting, 1600-1700* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2004).
- ¹¹ Michele Marra, *The Aesthetic of Discontent: Politics and Reclusion in Medieval Japanese Literature* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991).
- ¹² Theodor Adorno, *Aesthetic theory: On the Relation between Art and Society*, originally published in German in 1970, translated into English by C. Lenhardt (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984); and Robert Hullot-Kentor (University of Minnesota Press, 1997).
- ¹³ Mieke Bal, "Response: Ariel Dorfman's Quest for Responsibility," *The Art Bulletin*, Volume XCI, Number 1 (March 2009): 46.
- ¹⁴ Brown, *The Politics of Reclusion*, 1-181.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 53.
- ¹⁶ Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis" in *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 91, No. 5 (Dec., 1986): 1053-1075.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 42.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁹ Kanō Einō 狩野永納 *Honchō gashi* 本朝画史 (1693) Kasai Masaaki 笠井昌昭 /Sasaki Susumu 佐々木進 and Takei Akio 竹居昭男, ed. (Kyoto: Dōhōsha shuppan 同朋社出版, 1985). See Quitman E. Phillips, "Honcho Gashi and the Kano Myth," *Archives of Asian Art* 67 (1994): 46-57.
- ²⁰ Yoshizawa Chū, *Nihon nanga ronkō* (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1977), 113.

²¹ Ibid., 115.

²² Kubota Jun 久保田淳, “Waka/ renga ni okeru shiki no fūbutsu/ keibutsu” 和歌・連歌における四季の風物・景物, *Nenjū gyōji* 年中行事, *Kinsei fūzokuzufu* 近世風俗図譜, Vol.1 (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1983), 128-138.

Chapter One: The Authorship of the Orchid Pavilion Pictorial Tradition: Canon Formation and the Authentication of Power

As with many cultural phenomena in Japan, the Orchid Pavilion pictorial tradition, since its first arrival in print form around the beginning of the seventeenth century, has been closely modeled on a Chinese archetype. However, due to limited trading conditions under the policy of self-imposed isolation (*sakoku*) regulated by the Tokugawa shogunate, as well as cultural and sociopolitical differences, the information transmitted from China to Japan during the Tokugawa period was not always accurate or complete.¹ Therefore, in order to understand what sources from China the Japanese rejected or added and adapted in the course of transmission, I start my study of the Orchid Pavilion pictorial tradition with a survey of how it emerged and developed in China.

Since there are large gaps in time between the first historical Orchid Pavilion gathering during the Eastern Jin 東晉 dynasty (317 - 420) and the first written record of it in calligraphic form during the Tang 唐 dynasty (618-907), as well as between that text's first illustrated version during the Song 宋 dynasty (960-1279) and the canonization of the illustrated form of the Orchid Pavilion during the Ming 明 dynasty (1368-1644), I propose that one of the most complex problems within this tradition is embedded in the "death" and "resurrection" of its authorship.² Although the "original" calligraphic record and the "original" painting of the Orchid Pavilion have been both lost to the remote past and only copies of these have survived, the glorious names of the "master artists" are still admired. Many mysteries surround the construction of authorship, and even the historical facts of the first gathering have been questioned.³ How, then, did the authorship of this

Chinese classic matter to the Japanese painters and patrons who reimagined the Orchid Pavilion under the newly established Tokugawa shogunate? In this study, I will not try to determine who the “original” authors were, but rather will reconsider how and why people in Ming-dynasty China and in Tokugawa-era Japan tried to construct and authenticate the authorship of the Orchid Pavilion.⁴ In so doing, I will focus on arguably its “earliest” canonization in the form of a *takuhon* 拓本 (stone rubbing, or *taben* in Chinese, figure 1. 1) in fifteenth-century China, which became a model for its “first” adaptation in *byōbu* 屏風 (folding screen) format (figure 1. 2) in early seventeenth-century Japan.

Those who took part in the canonization of the Orchid Pavilion pictorial tradition in Ming-dynasty China and in early Tokugawa-era Japan were mostly born into the elite class in a time of political instability and held high-ranking military positions. Yet, when we pay closer attention to the textual and circumstantial evidence, many of them faced political pressure and often were persecuted by political opponents. At the same time they were highly cultured members of an intellectual community and would have used the images of hermits in reclusion engaging in cultural and intellectual activities rather than political struggle to express their discontent.⁵

Hence, I hypothesize that these artists and their patrons needed to capitalize on the cultural value of the Orchid Pavilion in order to reassert some form of power in order to protect themselves and to strike back at their opponents without using arms. In this sense, I explore the political urgency and ideological necessities in establishing the canonical tradition of the Orchid Pavilion as an artistic means of identity construction. The process of canon formation involved complicated sociopolitical issues in both China and Japan.

Drawing on the concept of cultural capital articulated by Pierre Bourdieu, who showed that “the form of cultural goods” acts to elevate the owner’s social status, this study will analyze the historical messages encoded in the pictorial representations of the Orchid Pavilion.⁶

From Wang Xizhi to the Ming-Dynasty Ink Rubbings

Best known for its calligraphic excellence, the text *Lantingxu* 蘭亭序 (*Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Collection*, *Ranteijo* in Japanese; figure 1. 3) is said to have been written by the sage calligrapher Wang Xizhi 王羲之 (303-361) during the Eastern Jin dynasty.⁷ The first pictorial representation said to illustrate a scene from *Lantingxu* is credited to the literati master Li Gonglin 李公麟 (ca. 1049-1106) and was painted and mounted in handscroll format during the Song dynasty (960-1279).⁸ Since the original works have been lost, we can study them only through the numerous copies of Wang Xizhi’s calligraphy which developed from the Tang dynasty (618-907) onwards, and through the copies of Li Gonglin’s illustration in the form of ink rubbings (figure 1. 1) taken from stone tablets engraved during the Ming dynasty (1368-1644).⁹

Besides Li Gonglin’s, a few Orchid Pavilion paintings by other artists made during the Song dynasty have been recorded, but none of these paintings has survived.¹⁰ The stylistic and iconographic features of the various extant Orchid Pavilion paintings produced in the Ming and Qing dynasties indicate some degree of influence from the ink rubbing. A few paintings said to have been painted in the pre-Ming dynasty period also show evidence suggesting that they were copied after the Ming dynasty.¹¹ It seems

probable, therefore, that this Ming ink rubbing, attributed to Lin Gonglin's pictorial composition, is the earliest surviving example of the Orchid Pavilion illustration.

The primary objective in this chapter is tracking the development of how the Orchid Pavilion was illustrated. When the impressions of illustration were printed from the stone tablets, they were formatted into handscrolls and in most cases accompanied by compiled colophons of ink rubbings, tracing copies, or sometimes free hand writings. These colophons, which are richly loaded with textual information – model calligraphies, letters, narratives, authentication certificates – reveal the historiography and provenances of the scrolls. By examining these texts alongside the pictorial configuration, I will examine how the Orchid Pavilion as a calligraphic text representing the Eastern Jin dynasty became a symbol of power and an ideal at the Tang imperial court and the reasons for its pictorialization in the Song dynasty. Based on these accounts, I reconsider the sociopolitical reasons for resurrecting authors (of calligraphy and of painting) from the past through the pictorial tradition canonized after the engraved the stone tablets at the Ming-dynasty court. These ink rubbings were imported to Japan at the latest near the beginning of the seventeenth century. Although these were modified considerably, they provided one of the key models for the Japanese canonization of the Orchid Pavilion pictorial tradition.

The Ming-Dynasty Ink Rubbing Handscrolls

The extant ink rubbings in the handscroll format are housed in various locations today. The overall pictorial compositions of these handscrolls are similar; however in detail differences among several versions are recognizable. Some scrolls have been

examined thoroughly by various scholars, to which my study is indebted. For instance, the entire scroll (figure 1. 1), including all the colophons, of the former Robert van Gulik Collection, was studied and published by Sydney Moss in 1984.¹² Jong Phil Park has identified three versions of the stone tablets and has compared them with *Tianxing daomao* 天形道貌, a painting manual devoted to the genre of figure painting.¹³ Wang Yi 王緯 has differentiated four types of ink rubbings among the eight handscrolls that are housed in the Palace Museum in Beijing 北京故宫博物院.¹⁴ Among them, the two types of large scrolls are approximately 32cm in height: one is referred to as the “Huang Nan version 潢南本” (figure 1. 4) and the other the “Xian Yuan version 仙原本” (figure 1. 5).¹⁵ The small scrolls measure approximately 22cm in height, one of which is a Xian Yuan version. The other small scroll was largely repaired and collected by the Qianlong emperor of the Qing dynasty. I have added the Huang Nan small version to Wang Yi’s list of four types and identified five types. Most of the other examples of the ink rubbings located elsewhere seem to fall into the five types as follows:

Type A. Huang Nan Large version (approximately 32cm in height)

Four identical handscrolls, Palace Museum in Beijing (figure 1. 4)

Handscroll, Henan Xinxiang Municipal Museum (figure 1. 6)

Handscroll, Tokyo National Museum (previously owned by Takahashi Kikujirō)

Handscroll, published in *Shōwa Kichū Rantei* exhibition catalogue (figure 1. 7)

Handscroll, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (figure 1. 8)

Type B. Huang Nan Small version (approximately 22cm in height)

Handscroll, Uno Sesson Collection at Gotō Art Museum in Tokyo (figure 1. 9)

Handscroll, Harn Museum, Florida (figure 1. 10)

Type C. Xian Yuan Large version (approximately 32cm in height)

Handscroll, Palace Museum in Beijing (figure 1. 5)

Handscroll, former Robert van Gulik Collection (figure 1. 1)

Handscroll, published in *Chugoku shōkei* exhibition catalogue (figure 1. 11)

Type D. Xian Yuan Small version (approximately 22cm in height)

Two identical handscrolls, Palace Museum in Beijing

Handscroll, National Library of China (figure 1. 12)

Type E. Qianlong Emperor version (approximately 22cm in height)

Handscroll, Palace Museum in Beijing (1780) (figure 1. 13)

The Orchid Pavilion as Text

In almost every case, the Ming ink rubbing handscroll starts from the *Lantingxu* 蘭亭序 (*Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Collection*) as *fatie* 法帖 (model calligraphy, or *hōjō* in Japanese), which precedes the illustration. If a scroll has survived in complete shape, it bears one of the five different versions of such model calligraphies: the Dingwu version 定武本 (figure 1. 3), the thick Dingwu version 定武肥本, the thin Dingwu version 定武瘦本, the Chu Suiliang version 褚遂良本, and a Tang dynasty copy 唐模賜本.¹⁶ There are a vast number of in-depth calligraphic studies of *Lantingxu* and other works of Wang Xizhi. However, the history of calligraphy is another dissertation-length subject. As indebted to those studies as I am, I will limit my discussion to the issue of how *Lantingxu* as calligraphy was received by later generations in order to consider its pictorialization. As my focus is on a pictorial tradition involving the illustration of a narrative, I will examine *Lantingxu* as a textual source for iconography.

The Orchid Pavilion Pedigree

The *Lantingxu* describes the legendary Orchid Pavilion gathering when Wang Xizhi invited forty-one prominent scholars – his relatives and close friends – to participate in the annual Spring Purification Festival.¹⁷ Wang Xizhi's famous retreat, the Orchid Pavilion, was located on the northern slope of Kuaiji Hill 会稽山麓 in Zhejiang Province 浙江省. This region was famous for its many orchid flowers, to which the pavilion owes its name.¹⁸ The gathering is said to have taken place on the third day of the third month in the ninth year of the Yonghe 永和 reign, which was the year of *guizhou* 癸丑 (water/tenth-oxen) in the Chinese lunar calendar (the twenty-second day of April in 353 CE).¹⁹ According to tradition, scholars congregated to bathe, sing, and drink wine in observance of this holiday. The scholars sat by a winding stream, floated wine cups on the water, and competed in composing poetry. If a scholar failed to compose a poem before the wine cup reached him, he had to drink the wine in the cup.

At this event, Wang Xizhi, under the influence of alcohol, improvised *Lantingxu*, a passage of 324 characters in *xingshu* 行書 (running script). This preface highlighted several of the themes that are most important to this study, including the writing of history, the strategic re-interpretation of the past, and the political necessity of identity formation. The English translation by Marshall P.S. Wu is given here in full:

During the tenth oxen annum, the ninth year of the Yonghe reign (353), people assembled at the end of late spring to participate in the purification gathering at the Orchid Pavilion, which is located on the north side of a hill in the prefecture of Kuaiji. All of the social elite, young and old, attended. The area had high mountain ridges, luxuriant woods, and tall bamboo, as well as limpid streams with

surging rapids glittering like a jade belt on both sides. The water was channeled to a meandering rivulet for floating the wine cups, with guests seated on both banks. Although there was no music from string or wind instruments, the drink and the recitation of poems were more than enough to cheerfully express our exquisite feelings. On that day, the sky was bright and clear with a gentle, soothing breeze. We gazed up to comprehend the vastness of the universe. We looked down and observed the numerous species of plants and creatures. Our eyes explored freely and our minds raced unbridled. This was the utmost enjoyment for our senses of sight and sound. What a pleasure! Associating with other people is a joy that endures over the whole span of our lives. It may be in the form of an intellectual discussion in a room that draws upon our own hearts and minds or may come from outside stimulation to which we abandon ourselves in unrestrained happiness. The preferences of each individual may be opposite, just as quietude and rowdiness are vastly different. However, when one is exhilarated by something, even if it is ever so fleeting, he often feels so satisfied that he forgets that old age lurks before him. But enthusiasm wanes and emotions fluctuate as situations change, and this occasions our laments! In the blink of an eye, past pleasures become mere traces in history. Despite its ephemeral nature, pleasure is something everyone seeks. Our short lives are in constant flux and eventually come to an end. The ancients used to say, "Birth and death are truly the two grimmest events of life!" It pains one greatly to even think of such a saying! Whenever I examine the manifold reasons for the pleasure of our predecessors, I find they seem to be concordant. Sometimes, I regret that when I

read others' writings, I do not share their expressed feelings. I know that the idea [of philosopher Zhuangzi] that life and death are the same is ridiculous. To claim that the thousand-year-old Pengzu died young and unexpectedly is inaccurate and untrue. When the people of the future investigate us, it is the equivalent of our looking back at people from the past. Alas, I have no choice but to pay attention to my contemporaries and record their words. The world will change and events will differ, but perhaps future generations will achieve pleasure in the same way we do. Reading this prose, they will experience some sense of identification.²⁰

This record not only of Wang Xizhi's pleasures at the gathering, but also of his speculations on the transience of life, became the preface to the collection of poems composed by his guest-scholars on that commemorative day.

Wang Xizhi and His Political Background in the Eastern Jin Dynasty

The presumed author of the *Lantingxu*, Wang Xizhi, was born into an aristocratic family prominent in the Eastern Jin court.²¹ Komada Shinji 駒田信二 outlines the biography of Wang Xizhi and his political background from *Liezhuan* 列伝 (*Collected Biographies*) in *Jinshu* 晉書 (*A History of the Jin Dynasty*). According to this account, Wang Xizhi was a son of Wang Kuang 王曠, the Governor of the Huainan 淮南 region.²² It was a time of tremendous political instability. When the Western Jin dynasty disintegrated, the Wang family, originally from the northern capital, fled to the south and helped establish a new dynasty, the so-called Eastern Jin.²³ Although aristocratic families settled down in a new environment surrounded by the beautiful, idyllic southern landscape, they remained hopeful of taking back their northern territory. In expression of

their melancholic and nostalgic feeling towards the homeland to which they could never return, they cultivated new styles of poetry and calligraphy. Under such circumstances, Wang Xizhi has been often credited with cultivating the styles of *kaishu* 楷書 (regular script), *xingshu* 行書 (running script) and *caoshu* 草書 (cursive script).²⁴

Liechuan in *Jinshu* explains that Wang Xizhi's pseudonym was Yishao 逸少, and that he was a nephew of Wang Dao 王導 (276-339).²⁵ It was in the residence of this uncle that Wang Xizhi was raised by relatives, since he lost his parents early in life. In 319, he married a daughter of the Xi 郗 family when he was at age sixteen. In the same year, one of Wang Xizhi's uncles, Wang Dun 王敦 (266-324), led a rebellion against the Eastern Jin court. The head of the Wang family, Wang Dao, who was the prime minister, commanded his troops to quell this movement and was indirectly responsible for taking Wang Dun's life two years later – an incident that reportedly had an emotional effect on Wang Xizhi.²⁶

As a result of witnessing this tragedy, Wang Xizhi avoided politics and the obligation to take up a military position. Eventually, however, he accepted the title of *Youjun jiangjun* 右軍將軍 (General of the Right Army), but requested to be transferred to a provincial territory in the Kuaiji Hills.²⁷ In so doing, he could fulfill family duties by conducting political affairs and at the same time pursue his cultural and intellectual interests in the remote province. Wang Xizhi never actually led troops into battle.²⁸ Owing to an avowed dislike of war, he attempted on a number of occasions to prevent armed conflict. In 346, when Yin Hao 殷浩 (?-356), in conflict with Huan Wen 桓溫 (312-37), tried to wage war with the people of the Northern area, Wang Xizhi tried three

times to stop him.²⁹ At the age forty-nine, he retired from government service but continued to reside at Kuaiji Hill, the site of the Orchid Pavilion. Thus, the image of Wang Xizhi could be interpreted by later generations as having two contrasting faces: as a manifestation of the courtly gentleman with high military rank, and as a symbol of the hermit-scholar.

Tang Taizong and the Orchid Pavilion as Calligraphy

The Tang-dynasty Emperor Taizong 唐太宗 (reigned 626-649) deemed the *Lantingxu* such a fine work of calligraphy that he wished to portray himself in the image of Wang Xizhi's noble archetype. However, not only was the original *Lantingxu* lost, but it was never recorded in any text written before the Tang dynasty. Wang Xizhi's calligraphy was already admired during his lifetime. Lothar Ledderose has noted that the warlord Huan Xuan (369-404) was the first collector of Wang Xixhi's works, but *Lantingxu* is not included in a list of his collection.³⁰ A title similar to *Lantingxu* was mentioned by Liu Yiqing 劉義慶 (402-444), who referred to “*Lanting ji xu* 蘭亭集序” in *Shishuo xinyu* 世說新語 (*A New Account of Tales of the World*) for the first time during the Liu-Song 劉宋 dynasty (420-479).³¹ A century later, about half the text was introduced with another title, *Linhexu* 臨河序 (*Preface to the Riverbank Gathering*), by Liu Xiaobiao 劉孝標 (462-521) in *Shishuo xinyu zhu* 世說新語注 (*Notes on the New Account of Tales of the World*) during the Liang 梁 dynasty (502-557).³² When Ouyang Xun 歐陽詢 (557-641) compiled *Yiwenlei ju* 藝文類聚 (*Chinese Classical Encyclopedia*) in 624 in the early Tang dynasty, he introduced the new title, *Lantingxu* 蘭亭序, but he

did not edit the text itself, which was almost identical with earlier *Linhxu*.³³ The full text of *Lantingxu* was finally recorded for the first time in the biography of Wang Xizhi in *Liechuan* of *Jinshu* mentioned earlier. The compiling project of *Jinshu* is known to have been conducted by Emperor Taizong himself in 648.³⁴ The sudden appearance of the *Lantingxu* that was introduced by Taizong in the Tang dynasty was over three centuries after the time of Wang Xizhi.

How can we account for the three-hundred year absence of *Lantingxu*? A textual record in the form of an ink rubbing, titled *Lantingji* 蘭亭記 (*The Record of Lanting*) (figure 1. 14) written by He Yanzhi 何延之 in the middle of Tang (713-41) dynasty, is included in the colophons of Ming handscrolls.³⁵ This text describes how Tang Taizong discovered and obtained the original calligraphy of *Lantingxu*. This story was retold and dramatized repeatedly and formed its own literary genre: “*Zhuan Lanting* 賺蘭亭 (*Seizing the Orchid Pavilion*).”

According to this text, Tang Taizong was obsessed with Wang Xizhi’s calligraphy, and ordered a search for the original *Lantingxu*, which had been passed down through successive generations in the Wang family in secrecy until the seventh generation, reaching the Buddhist monk Zhiyong 智永 of Yongxin Temple 永欣寺. As he was dying without an heir, he asked his disciple Biancai 弁才 to take care of it. When Taizong heard about this, he sent his messengers on three occasions to obtain the text, but each time Biancai claimed that it had been lost. Taizong was unsatisfied and dispatched the censor Xiao Yi 蕭翼 who disguised himself as a wandering scholar for this mission. Xiao Yi gradually gained the trust of Biancai and finally succeeded in tricking him into bringing out the *Lantingxu*. Soon after, Xiao Yi revealed his identity, “seized” the work,

and took it back to the capital. A delighted Taizong commissioned his official calligraphers to have it traced, copied, and engraved into stone tablets for posterity. According to Zhang Yanyuan 張彥遠 (836-906), the Tang court art historian, Chu Suiliang 褚遂良 (597-658), a chancellor and official historian, made a close copy of the original located in the imperial depository at this time.³⁶ Taizong treasured the *Lantingxu* so much that he had the original interred in his Zhaoling mausoleum 昭陵 upon his death. The dramatic story of Tang Taizong seizing the *Lantingxu* has since been the subject of numerous plays and novels, as well as paintings, such as the one attributed to Yan Liben 閻立本 (600-673), a government official and Taizong's court painter (figure 1. 15) or another example attributed to Juran 巨然 of the Five Dynasties 五代 (figure 1. 16), both located in the National Palace Museum at Taipei.

Owing to the inconsistency of the textual records, the modern scholar Guo Moruo 郭沫若 (1891-1978) began the first of many debates over the authenticity of the *Lantingxu* in 1965.³⁷ Guo argued that *Lantingxu* may have been a forgery by one of Wang's followers during the reign of Emperor Taizong in the Tang Dynasty. He suggested the monk Zhiyong 智永, who is one of the more prominent figures appearing in the *Lantingji*, as the calligrapher likely to have inscribed the *Lantingxu*. However, the recorded materials cannot prove the historical existence of Zhiyong, and thus his authorship is largely doubtful. The debates then moved to address the stylistic problems of *Lantingxu*, since its refined and advanced form of *xingshu* or running script seems unmatched by other examples of *xingshu* scripts excavated from Eastern Jin epitaphs, in which the characteristics of classical seal scripts still persisted. This argument was supported by Shang Chengzuo and others,³⁸ but many scholars argued against Guo

Moruo's theory. The authenticity debate seems to have ended in an inconclusive manner. Whether or not it was produced by the hand of Wang Xizhi, *Lantingxu* has certainly shaped the canon of calligraphy.

The question of what made Tang Taizong so fascinated with this particular model of calligraphy still remains. What did Taizong try to achieve by initiating what amounted to the first wave of the Orchid Pavilion craze? Tang Taizong came to the throne in 626 as a young and ambitious military general. He helped his father Gaozu, who was the chancellor of the previous Sui dynasty, to form a rebellion and establish the Tang dynasty. Eugene Wang points out that Taizong was aware of the need to rule by civil order rather than by military power when he rose to be the second emperor of the Tang dynasty.³⁹ He was following the principle of self-assurance, which was based on the Confucian value system, to explain that one's inner-self was reflected in calligraphic brushstrokes. The *Jiu Tangshu* 旧唐書 (*Old Tang History*) explains:

The Emperor pacified the world with his military prowess. Battling winds and braving rains he had little leisure for poetry and calligraphy. Now that he succeeded to the throne, he sought out the loyalists and virtuous ... and in his leisure hours, paid attention to literature and history.⁴⁰

In this way, Taizong sought to change his image from the violent warrior to the gentle scholar and bringer of peace. He wished his empire to endure for a long term of peace and prosperity, and the tranquil disposition and mellow content of the Orchid Pavilion was a perfect vehicle to convey such a political vision.

Robert E. Harrist, Jr. also suggests that Tang Taizong collected over two thousand pieces of Wang's calligraphy because it was closely associated with the southern gentry

and aristocratic culture.⁴¹ As imperial projects, Taizong ordered Yu Shinan 虞世南 (558-638) and Ouyang Xun to make ink rubbings of *Lantingxu* by engraving stone tablets, and distributed them among the nobility to standardize script and to legitimize his power over them. He also commissioned Chu Suiliang to compile a catalogue of Wang's calligraphy, titled *Youjun huamu* 右軍画目, a list of 266 pieces, including *Lantingxu* and numerous letters written by Wang.⁴² Similar to the strategy of the first emperor Qin Shi Huangdi 秦始皇帝, who promoted the unification of script, Tang Taizong attempted to use the spiritual power of writing and calligraphy as a symbolic means of national unification.⁴³

The Orchid Pavilion Illustrations Recorded in Texts during the Song Dynasty

The second wave of the Orchid Pavilion craze occurred during the Song dynasty, another height of cultural achievement owing to, as Amy McNair has noted, the second emperor Song Taizong 宋太宗 (939-997), who promoted Wang Xizhi's calligraphy in the way Tang Taizong had.⁴⁴ Like Tang Taizong, Song Taizong was a strong military personage, who personally led the campaign against the Northern Han, defeating them in 979. With the establishment of peace, it was necessary for him to construct his own image in the classic cultural tradition of Wang Xizhi. Toward this end, imperial efforts to preserve model calligraphy began to include narrative paintings in order to elaborate on works of calligraphy, as with the production of the ten-volume *Chunhua bige fatie* 淳化秘閣法帖 (*Model Letters in the Imperial Archives of the Chunhua era*) which was engraved on stone tablets and sponsored by Song Taizong.⁴⁵

Another incident that boosted the *Lantingxu* craze during the Song dynasty was the discovery of the so-called Dingwu 定武 version stone tablet, which thereafter became

the most renowned version. This stone tablet was engraved immediately following Ouyang Xun's copying of the original work, but it was lost at the end of the Tang dynasty. In the mid-eleventh century, it was accidentally excavated in the Dingwu region of Hebei province 北河省.⁴⁶ Acquiring the tablet, the Governor Song Qi (998-1061) carved a new version.⁴⁷ The governors who succeeded him also carved copies of the stone. Although many copies of the Dingwu version were produced, they were different from one another in intriguing ways, which has added complications to the issue of authenticity. Attesting to the significance of *Lantingxu* as model calligraphy, imperial records of the late Song Emperor Lizong 理宗 (r.1225-1264) note over one hundred copies in his collection.⁴⁸

The creative spirit that blossomed with *Lantingxu* reached the visual arts as well, and the tradition of visually representing the historical Orchid Pavilion gathering was established as illustrations came to be attached to the calligraphy. Satō Yasuhiro 佐藤康弘 has pointed out that the original intention of producing this type of illustration would have been to record the names and poems of the participants in the gathering.⁴⁹ Thus, each figure is labeled by a cartouche with a name, political title, and/or poem(s). The convention of including cartouches to indicate the figure's name was already a common technique in the stone engraving of the Han dynasty. Since I will refer to those particular figures frequently in this thesis, I list their names here. Among the forty-one guests at the historical Orchid Pavilion gathering, eleven scholars who composed two poems each were: Wang Xizhi, Wang Ningzhi 王凝之, Sun Tong 孫統, Xie An 謝安, Ma Sunzhao 馬孫綽, Wang Suzhi 王宿之, Wang Bingzhi 王彬之, Wang Huizhi 王徽之, Xu Fengzhi 徐豐之, Xie Wan 謝萬, and Yuan Jiaozhi 袁嶠之.

Fifteen who composed only one poem were: Wei Bang 魏滂, Xi Tan 郗曇, Huan Wei 桓偉, Yu You 庾友, Wang Huanzhi 王渙之, Cao Maozhi 曹茂之, Yu Yun 庾蘊, Yu Shui 虞說, Wang Yuanzhi 王玄之, Xie Yi 謝繹, Cao Hua 曹華, Wang Yunzhi 王蘊之, Hua Mao 華茂, Sun Si 孫嗣, and Wang Fengzhi 王豐之.

Sixteen who could not compose any poem were: Xie Teng 謝藤, Xie Gui 謝瑰, Qiu Mao 丘旄, Ren Ning 任凝, Wang Xianzhi 王獻之, Yang Mo 楊摸, Hou Mian 后綿, Lu Ji 呂系, Kong Cheng 孔盛, Liu Mi 鑄密, Cao Laoyi 曹勞夷, Hua Zhe 華耆, Bian Di 卞迪, Lu Ben 呂本, Cao Jin 曹謹, and Yu Gu 虞谷.

The Orchid Pavilion paintings produced during the Song Dynasty are recorded in various sources.⁵⁰ Of the paintings by Li Gonglin, two sizes have been recorded, but from these sources we cannot tell which scrolls were large or small. Other than those of Li Gonglin, the works of Chan Paochen, Tang Baiju, and Zhao Xiao are recorded in the texts listed above. However, no original copy or description of the paintings is available for study. Li Gonglin's work, however, was collected by significant collectors in his own time and was recorded in a number of texts. For example, although it has since been lost, a stone tablet copy of his painting was carved by Zeng Chun of Luling, in 1241.⁵¹ In addition, the details of Li Gonglin's work were described by a court writer in the early Ming dynasty.

Description of an Orchid Pavilion Image Recorded in the Texts

Li Gonglin was one of the most important Song-dynasty literati painters. His pseudonym was Longmian Jushi 龍眠居士 (Sleeping Dragon) and his style-name was Boshi 伯時. Li Gonglin was a native of Shucheng 舒城 (present-day Anhui Province), and was born into a family of Confucian scholars who provided him with an excellent education.⁵² At a young age he passed the highest level of examination to earn the *jinshi* 進士 degree. However, instead of seeking an official position, he returned in retirement to his homeland, Longmian Mountain, due to the political reform led by the grand councilor of that time, Wang Anshi 王安石 (1021-1086). The Li clan was the aristocratic family that ruled the Southern Tang Kingdom, but lost its status with the founding of the new Song state.⁵³ In 1086, Li Gonglin was summoned to the capital of Kaifeng to take an official position as the Reviser in the Rear Section of the Secretariat Chancellery. He did not demonstrate strong political beliefs but had a close relationship with scholars who were in the opposing political camp. His friends Su Shi 蘇軾 (1037-1101), Su Che, Huang Tingjian and others were repeatedly exiled.

Li Gonglin stayed in the capital, and rose to the rank of Legal Researcher in the Imperial Censorate. After taking one more position as an administrative supervisor, he retired owing to health problems. Li Gonglin died in 1106 soon after returning to Longmian Mountain.⁵⁴ If the paintings *Mountain Villa* (The Palace Museum, Beijing) and *Dwelling in the Longmian Mountains* (The Cleveland Museum of Art, figure 1. 17) are related to his private life, then one may speculate that his *Lanting* may have similar autobiographical content.⁵⁵ There are considerable similarities in these handscroll paintings – sequences of stage-like settings within crowded landscapes of waterfalls and

streams. There is no evidence of the date of the production of Li's *Lanting* painting, but it could have been produced during the years spent with his brilliant but frustrated literati friends. It must have been comforting to overlap themselves with Wang Xizhi and his associates at a time of political difficulty.

The original painting by Li Gonglin was described by the early Ming writer Song Lian 宋濂 (1310-1381).⁵⁶ The details of this description indicate that this scroll was the larger size, either the type A or type B. I shall compare this text with the ink rubbing illustration (type B, Xian Nan version, the former Robert van Gulik Collection) to clarify what motifs Li Gonglin added or eliminated. Song Lian's description is as follows:

First, there is the Lanting overlooking a limpid stream. The pavilion as depicted is an extremely peaceful spot, with curtains hung around on all its sides. The bamboo curtains are half drawn and the Pavilion is surrounded by railings. A square desk stands in the Pavilion, and on it is laid a stick of ink with an ink-slab and two or three rolls of paper. A handsome gentleman, wearing a bamboo-plaited cap and a loose-fitting robe, sits behind the desk. His right hand holds a brush: he has a far-away look in his eyes – I think this must be Wang Xizhi drafting his Preface. Two pages stand behind him: one waits on him, as the other blows into the fire to make it glow. On the fire is a pitcher in which water is boiling, and the page-boy is about to make tea. In the foreground there is another boy leaning against the railings and staring at the stream, on which are three white geese, one of which is swimming forward, one with its head turned back, and the third between the other two, spreading its wings on the water. Ranges of

mountains rise to a great height behind the stream, and at three different levels people are seen walking along them (figure 1. 18).⁵⁷

Song Lian begins his description of the Orchid Pavilion painting by describing the scene in which Wang Xizhi is seated in the Orchid Pavilion. According to this description, the ink rubbing is almost faithful to the original apart from the “ranges of mountains [that] rise to a great height behind the stream,” which, although they are in the *Lantingxu* text, are not included in this composition, perhaps because of the limited space of the horizontal handscroll format. However, this scene is actually alluding to another episode, recorded in the fifth century by Yu Ho, involving Wang Xizhi, who favored geese and, inspired by the movement of their necks while he was looking out from the pavilion, is said to have taken this as the source for his graceful calligraphic brushstrokes.⁵⁸ This episode resulted in the subject for another well-known painting, titled *Wang Xizhi Observing the Geese* (figure 1. 19) by Qian Xuan 錢選 (1235-1305).⁵⁹ In the rest of scroll, we can see the creative imagination of Li Gonglin, whose work eventually established the canon of the Orchid Pavilion pictorial tradition, despite not being entirely faithful to the *Lantingxu*.

To the west of the stream a boy is pouring wine into four cups with his right hand, while the left holds up his sleeve. Two boys stand on either side of the first, one holding up a goblet, the other a wine-pot. They all stand behind a table on which five goblets are seen on lotus-leaf shaped saucers. A boy is shown floating a goblet down the stream, while another bends down to give him another. The boy touches the goblet with a small stick that pushes it along, helping it to sail down the stream. Further to the west, a boat lies upturned on some stone

steps, on which three goblets rest. A boy pours wine into the goblets, while another steals a mouthful of wine (figure 1. 20).⁶⁰

The iconography in this section includes many additions which were likely invented by Li Gonglin. For example, lotus-leaf shaped saucers to float the wine goblets appear in both the ink rubbing and in Song Lian's description. As discussed earlier, this floating device was not mentioned in the *Lantingxu* text. There are many *Lanting* paintings of later generations that include lotus-leaves floating on the stream, all of which are certainly influenced by this composition. Likewise, many artists of later generations include a boy stealing a sip of wine, despite not appearing in the *Lantingxu* either. Lotus-leaves and a drinking boy are commonly represented in the Japanese versions of this subject, pictorial motifs whose appeal may have derived from their aesthetic effect and sensory humor. By contrast, the "boat [that] lies upturned on some stone steps," which was also not described in the *Lantingxu*, was mentioned in the description of the original Li painting but has disappeared from the ink rubbing.

The picture also depicts the Corvee Inspector of the Prefecture, Wei Bang, and the General of the Right Army, Wang Xizhi. Bang looks back at Wang Xizhi, holding a scroll in his left hand, while his right stretches out as though he wishes to see Wang Xizhi's scroll. Wang Xizhi hands him the scroll with his left hand, holding a brush with his right. His eyes are set on the scroll, his expression suggesting that he is not quite happy about some of the characters written on it. His refined pose still lingers in my mind. The picture also shows the Deputy-Commander of the Cavalry, Xi Tan, reading a scroll which he holds in both hands (figure 1. 21).⁶¹

The three figures described by Song Lian match those represented in the ink rubbing. A problem occurs, however, with the depiction of Wang Xizhi, the writer and protagonist of the Lanting narration, who appears twice in the same composition. He has already appeared inside the Lanting building and reappears again in this section. Because two painting themes centering on Wang Xizhi are blended, confusion in the counting of figures has occurred. The participants of this event were Wang Xizhi and his forty-one guests, so that they were forty-two altogether. Nevertheless, in some cases, Wang Xizhi was counted twice – to make the forty-three participants. This mistake appears in *Meisugafu* 名数画譜 (*Painting Manual of Numbers*) (figure 1. 22), which was published in Tokugawa-era Japan.

Then there are Huan Wei of Jungyang and the Magistrate of Yuhang, Xie Teng. Wei is seated, his belly bare, as his left hand twists his moustache, his right resting on his trouser-belt while he holds a scroll. He has a most relaxed look. Teng sits with his legs crossed and his robe unfastened. He looks as though he has for some time been seeking poetic inspiration, and is depicted tired, stretching out his arms and yawning. In the next scene the Vice-President Xie Gui is shown holding a scroll in his left hand in front of his chest, his right holding a brush which rests on his knees. Then come three figures – Wang Ningzhi, Yu You of Yingchuan and Wang Huanzhi. Ningzhi's shoulders are bare. His left hand lies close to an ink-slab, and with his right he offers another scroll to Yu. You is himself half-clothed, like Ningzhi. He looks as though he has just rolled a piece of paper and is trying to make the roll tidy by striking its end against his palm. Huanzhi is also half-clothed, with his hands clasped around his knees as he chants.

Then there appears the Acting Adviser of Military Affairs, Qiu Mao, who is no more clothed than Huanzhi. He sits with one leg stretched forward, as he drinks from a goblet (figure 1. 23).⁶²

In this description Song Lian groups together seven figures – Huan Wei, Xie Teng, Xie Gui, Wang Ningzhi, Yu You, Wang Huanzhi, and Qiu Mao. This group of seven may visually allude to *Chikurin shichiken* 竹林七賢 (*the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove*), which is another famous literary and painting theme, which represents the seven noble scholars – Shan Tao 山濤 (205-283), Ruan Ji 阮籍 (210-263), Ji Kang 嵇康 (223-266), Xiang Xiu 向秀 (226-300), Liu Ling 劉伶 (劉靈, ca. 225-280), Ruan Xian 阮咸 (230-281), Wang Rong 王戎 (234-305) – who were eccentric hermits of the Wei-Jin period (220-419). They secluded themselves in a bamboo grove in order to protest the corrupt government. However, this group of seven was an idealized community that was most likely imagined by the marginalized Eastern Jin aristocratic scholars.⁶³

The pictorial representation of the seven figures in the Orchid Pavilion ink rubbing is related to that of Seven Sages (figure 1. 24) engraved on the wall of tomb in the Eastern Jin dynasty.⁶⁴ Although their robes are loosely-fitted, the three figures in the Orchid Pavilion – Wei Bang, Wang Xizhi, Xi Tan – are properly dressed without any body parts being exposed. On the other hand, the seven figures grouped in this section of the Orchid Pavilion are all exposing parts of their bodies – some of their bellies are exposed, and some of their shoulders are bare. This is very similar to the way the Seven Sages bare their chest and shoulders, which Li Gonglin may have drawn from. As Daoists, they drank wine in a natural setting in order to free their minds and engage in pure discussion about social good. The image of the seven figures represented in this

section of the Orchid Pavilion echoes the description of “noble hermits” in *Wuxingzhi* 五行志 in *Jinshu* 晉書, where “the noble hermits during the reign of Emperor Huidi 惠帝 (291-299), drank wine and striped off their robes.”⁶⁵ In addition, the bamboo grove, which was also mentioned as part of the background setting in the *Lantingxu* text, is depicted to enclose the seven figures in the Orchid Pavilion.

Then come the figures of the Magistrate of Yuhang, Sun Tong; the Secretary to Prince Langya, Xie An; Acting Adviser of Military Affairs, Cao Maozhi, and the Treasurer of the Prefecture, Ren Ning. Tung has his legs crossed with both his hands resting on his left knee. An raises up his right foot; in his left hand he holds an ink-slab, and his right rubs a stick of ink on it. Tung and An are shown facing each other. Maozhi is rolling a piece of paper that has been unfolded in front of him. Ning has his left arm bare, as it rests on his knee. Like Tung, his legs are crossed, and he looks back at Maozhi, his eyes shining brightly.

Then there comes the Secretary of Military Affairs of the Left, Sun Zhao, sitting upright with his robe tidily arranged. He wears a blank expression on his face, since he is doing nothing. Then comes Yu Yun, a very old man. Having sat down for a while, he is about to rise. His right hand rests on the ground as a boy tries to help him up, holding on to his left arm. Then there is shown the Acting Adviser of Military Affairs, Yang Mo, standing on one foot, with his other leg bent. He is half-clothed, waving his long sleeves in front of him as if he were dancing (figure 1. 25).⁶⁶

Overall, the postures of the figures in the ink rubbing and in the text are correlated. Since Song Lian is observing the original painting, a much greater degree of detail is described.

It is impossible for a stone engraving to transmit such details as a stick of ink placed on an ink slab, or “Maozhi’s eyes shining brightly.” Li Gonglin painted a dancing figure in other works such as *Classic of Filial Piety* in chapter 7 (figure 1. 26a) and 10 (figure 1. 26b). The dancing posture of Yang Mo – lifting a sleeve and a leg – is certainly related to these figures.

Then comes a group consisting of Wang Xianzhi, Wang Suzhi, the Military Inspector Yu Shuo, Lu Ji of Jencheng, and the Treasurer of the Prefecture, Hou Mian. Xianzhi is shown with the front of his robe unfastened. His right hand touches the ground, as his left presses his knee. Suzhi looks very sleepy. He pokes a paper spill into his nostril, trying thus to sneeze. Shuo, also half naked, opens a scroll in order to read it. Lu Ji stares at Shuo. His right hand rest on the mat, while his left holds up his left sleeve as it rests on his knee. His left arm is half exposed, and he inclines towards Shuo, as if he were attentively listening to him. Mian slightly reclines, his legs crossed and showing the soles of both feet. He holds a scroll in both his hands (figure 1. 27).⁶⁷

Wang Xianzhi was the seventh son of Wang Xizhi and was regarded as the most talented successor to his father. They are often called “Two Wangs of Master Calligraphers.”⁶⁸ It is puzzling why Wang Xianzhi did not compose any poems on this day.

Then comes the Adviser of Military Affairs, Kong Cheng, looking up at the sky. His belly is bare and his legs crossed. His left hand, holding a scroll, rests on his knee and his right touches the ground. Beside him there is a boy lying full length on the ground and drawing towards him a floating goblet with a stick. His intention appears to be to get a drink for Cheng. In the next scene the Adviser

of Military Affairs, Liu Mi is shown sitting half clothed. His left hand hold up his sleeve as the right stretches out into the water which ripples round his fingers. There is a goblet floating in front of his hand, and he is trying to get hold of it. Beside him there is an upturned goblet which is still floating.

Then come Wang Yuanzhi; the Magistrate of Yuanxing, Wang Bingzhi; the Astronomer of the Prefecture, Xie Yi, and Wang Huizhi, Yuanzhi glances at a scroll, his left arm exposed, though not his right. Bingzhi sits opposite Yuanzhi. His shoulders are bare and he stretches out an arm as though he were asking for the scroll. Yi's shoulders are also bare. His right hand, holding a brush, rests on his left arm, which hangs down. It seems as though he were about to scratch himself. Huizhi holds up a scroll to his cheek with his left hand and picks up a brush with the other, as though he were about to write (figure 1. 28).⁶⁹

There are minor differences in the depiction of postures, but the basic composition in the ink rubbing is consistent with the text of Song Lian.

Then the artist shows the Corvee Inspector of the Prefecture, Cao Laoyi, and the Acting Adviser of Military Affairs, Xu Fengzhi, facing each other. Laoyi has a goblet in each hand. One of them is being held toward Fengzhi, as though Laoyi were about to drink to the health of Fengzhi. Fengzhi looks up, his sleeves rolled up to the elbow. He is depicted as with rather a fearful appearance, his right hand stretching out to the north as though he were about to take the goblet and drink a toast with Laoyi.

Then comes the Magistrate of Changtsen, Hua Zhe, raising a goblet in his right hand toward his mouth, while his left is shown twirling his moustache. He glances at Fengzhi and appears quite amused (figure 1. 29).

Then Cao Hua of Xiping in Xuzhou is shown reclining and about to read a scroll in his right hand. His left hand does not appear in the painting. Then there comes Wang Yunzhi; the Assistant to the Chenkuo, General Bian Di; an official in the Board of Revenue, Xie Wan; Cao Jin of Pengcheng, and Lu Ben of Rencheng. Yunzhi sits, his legs spread out and his hands hanging down between his knees. His open hand is placed on the back of his fist. Di reclines and holds up his hand as though he is about to take a goblet from the other. Wan's shoulders are exposed. His left hand presses on a piece of paper and his right supports his left elbow. He glances at Di. Jin has his right leg stretched out, and in his left hand he holds a goblet. He looks back at Ben, whose legs are crossed, his elbow resting on his knee. His hand supports his chin, while he holds a brush, which touches his ear. His head is slightly raised, as if thinking hard about the next line. Then we come to the figure of the Magistrate of Shangyu, Hua Mao; the Magistrate of Shanyin, Yu Gu; and Adviser of the Central Army, Sun Si. Mao is depicted with bare shoulders, holding in his right hand a brush, which he seems about to throw away. He looks round to talk with Gu. Gu is as unclothed as Mao. As he floats a goblet towards Mao, Si kneels on one leg, claps his hands and laughs (figure 1. 30). Then are pictured Yuan Jiaozhi of the Prefecture of Chen and Wang Fengzhi, the Acting Adviser of Military Affairs. Fengzhi opens a scroll to read it. His head is raised and he bends slightly forward. Jiaozhi is

shown dancing, the palms of his hands facing each other and suggesting that he is beating time (figure 1. 31).

There then appear two willow trees, one on either side of a stone bridge, which has railings and which two boys are crossing. One of them holds a container with, perhaps, goblets in it, and the other points to the stream in which two boys are navigating, one inviting the other to race against his own boat. Their boats, near either bank, are quite different from each other, and beside them are two upturned goblets. Another boy comes out from under a willow tree, only half his body showing (figure 1. 32).

From the Orchid Pavilion to the bridge, the stream winds in and out like a dragon and its water rushes. There are twenty persons on its right bank and twenty-two on its left. Among them, twelve wear hats, the rest being in caps or turbans. Their clothes are loose, all of them clothes of gentle-folk. Those who sit are seated on the ground either on square mats, or bear or tiger skin rugs. With them are writing brushes, ink sticks, ink slabs and paper.⁷⁰

As is made clear from this account, Li Gonglin begins his painting, moving from right to left, with the scene adapted from another theme of Wang Xizhi watching geese from a pavilion, and concludes with a bridge. Water rushes through the winding stream “like a dragon” from the beginning to the end. Scholars, who were politically influential, many of them holding high ranking military positions, are seated on either side of this stream, and the page boys are among them to assist the party. According to the description, the ink rubbing is faithful to Li Gonglin’s composition except for some minor differences.

Many creative attributes and iconographic additions, which were absent in the *Lantingxu* text of Wang Xizhi, appear in the pictorial tradition in the Song dynasty.

Based on a comparison of the text by Song Lian with the ink rubbing, we can conclude that the artist who painted the Orchid Pavilion handscroll may have been Li Gonglin. However, the original painting has not survived, and we cannot be certain whether the pictorial representation of Orchid Pavilion as it came to be known, including the theme of *Wang Xizhi Watching Geese* and the iconographic additions, was invented by Li Gonglin or were conventional expressions at that time. Considering the existence of almost identical compositions in two sizes, it is more likely that a pictorial tradition of depicting the Orchid Pavilion had been already set by this time. In any case, this pictorial representation of the Orchid Pavilion was eventually canonized on the basis of the Ming ink rubbing and credited to Li Gonglin.

Engraving the Orchid Pavilion in the Ming Dynasty

While the calligraphic canon of the Orchid Pavilion was established following the popularity it reached after Tang Taizong, it was during the Ming dynasty that the third wave of popularity of the theme resulted in the pictorial canonization of the Orchid Pavilion, and this was due to the Ming royal princes who based their efforts on the second wave of the Song dynasty.

Ming emperors divided their territory into many domains. During this period, there were sixty-two royal princes who ruled semi-autonomous kingdoms that were under the governance of the Ming Empire.⁷¹ Some kingdoms were large and powerful, while others were small and struggled to survive. It was not easy to maintain peaceful political

conditions, since the princes tried continually to wrest authority from others and to rule by themselves. Ming emperors encouraged these princes to be engaged in cultural activities such as collecting works of art – especially the calligraphy and painting of antiquity – conserving them and making copies, in order to keep them out of political trouble, such as organizing rebellion against the empire or fighting with other kingdoms. On special occasions, the emperor bestowed upon princes artworks from his collection. Consequently, wealthy princes collected numerous artworks and made copies based on their own collections. For this reason, many of the Ming royal princes became involved in the Orchid Pavilion visual tradition.

The ink rubbings under investigation are the products of such princely projects. In one handscroll, a colophon is located between the model calligraphy and the illustration. The colophon reads:

What has been discussed above is the Lanting Preface by Wang Xizhi. It is the finest calligraphy of all time. Numerous copies have been made and admired since the Tang dynasty; they are all different, but only stone engravings have been extant for a long time. Therefore we now have the Dingwu version, the copy of Chu Suiliang, and scores of others. Many of them are fakes; the Dingwu version is the closest to the original. Although there are also a few other fine versions. I myself have seen many. I now choose to engrave the three Dingwu versions, the copy of Chu Suiliang, and the copy made in the Tang [for the Taizong Emperor]. I have also decided to incorporate several worthy epilogues and a copy of the painting by Li Boshi.⁷² The various theories about the Preface are also incorporated in this work. It was designed for enjoyment's sake when I

was not studying, and was never meant to be shown to others as an example of style (figure 1. 33).⁷³

There are two seals at the end of the colophon, which read: *Lanxuexuan* 蘭雪軒; *Dongshutang* 東書堂 *tushuji*. These seals identify the person who is responsible for engraving the Orchid Pavilion picture for the first time, Zhu Youdun 朱有燾 (1376-1439) dated the fifteenth year of the Yongle 永樂 reign (1417).⁷⁴ According to *Mingshi* 明史 (*History of the Ming Dynasty*), Zhu Youdun was a native of Fengyang 風陽 in Anhui 安徽 Province.⁷⁵ He was a grandson of the first Ming Emperor, Zhu Yuanzhang 朱元璋 and the eldest son of Prince Ding of Zhou (or Zhu Su 1361-1425).⁷⁶

Shuchongke Dongshutang jigu fatiehou 書重刻東書堂集古法帖后 (*Epilogue of the Reprinted Ancient Model Calligraphies of Dongshutang Collection*) describes Zhu Youdun in more detail:

Prince Ding of Zhou was a knowledgeable scholar with multiple talents. He was a great calligrapher and painter, and also a prolific composer of music and playwright, who wrote over thirty different types of drama, and over one hundred poems. One of his hobbies was imitating ancient calligraphies. He was highly appreciated by his contemporaries.⁷⁷

Among the ancient model calligraphy collected in the Ming dynasty, those listed in *Dongshutangji gufatie* 東書堂集古法帖 (*Ancient Model Calligraphies in the Dongshu Hall Collection*), which was an assemblage of rubbings by Zhu Youdun, were the most famous and refined examples.⁷⁸ Zhu Youdun collected famous examples of calligraphy, traced them, and had them engraved in stone. Since they were reproduced within the

imperial court exclusively, however, not many copies survive, and they are rarely recorded in texts.

Zhu Youdun's efforts in engraving the Orchid Pavilion stone tablets was continued by his descendants; the three generations which held the rank of Prince Yi 益王: Zhu Yiyin 朱翊鉞 (Prince Yi I, 1536 -1602);⁷⁹ Zhu Changqian 朱常(水)遷 (Prince Yi II, who inherited the title in 1605, d. 1615);⁸⁰ and Zhu Youmu 朱由木 (Prince Yi III, 1588-1634).⁸¹ They were all native to Feiyan 風陽 in Anhui province 安徽.

The first Prince Yi, Zhu Yiyin, took up the reproduction project of the Orchid Pavilion stone tablets, which had been damaged with the passing of time. Zhu Yiyin's studio name was Huangnan daoren 潢南道人, which references the name of the place where Wang Kuang, the father of Wang Xizhi, served as a Governor. Based on Zhu Youdun's compilation of the colophons, Zhu Yiyin added more content. Among those he recompiled are: Lantingxu (three different Dingwu versions, Chu Suiliang version, a Tang copy); a colophon by Zhu Youdun; illustration of Li Gonglin; epilogue by Sun Zhe, a letter by Liu Kungchuan; postscript by Mi Fu; Two letters from the Southern Song Emperor Kaozong to Meng Yu, an imperial adviser and court official; the entire text of the Tang story of He Yanzhi's *Lantingji*; the eighteen colophons by Zhao Mengfu 趙孟頫; and the concluding remark by Zhu Yiyin. Zhu Yiyin wrote about his project in a colophon and included it at the end of the Orchid Pavilion handscroll:

Lantingxu, written by the General of the Right Army, Wang Xizhi, has been treasured the most among all the calligraphy models collected by Tang Taizong. There are tracing copies of the work by the General of the Right Army such as this, which have survived, but the original had the best quality. Among

over one thousand copies made in the Tang dynasty period, the Dingwu version is the closest to the one that is buried in Taizong's mausoleum. In our kingdom, when Prince Zhou Ding inherited his territory, he also received elegant works of calligraphy, such as three scrolls of the thick and thin Dingwu version; a Chu Suilian version; and a Tang dynasty copy along with Li Longmian's large and small paintings that are engraved on the stones. Collected inside the palace along the generations, we hardly take it out to appreciate, because the stone gets to be eroded and its authenticity will be fading. In my spare time of all the tasks and issues in my territory, I would like to work on this very much. Therefore, I took out the old collection and Zhao Mengfu's Eighteen Colophons and hired the Wu experts to engrave them again. This project will take ten years to complete. When it is completed, a very difficult task will have been accomplished. There existed one hundred and seventeen versions of Lanting in the Emperor's collection during the reign of Li's Song dynasty. It was recorded in Chuogenglü. Many books discuss how to distinguish genuine ones from forgeries. Hence I do not mention them. I do not dare to say that my task would be better than [Prince Zhou's version], but those who appreciate this type of work can see my hard work. In spring of the twentieth year of Wanli, Prince Yi, Huangnan doren has written at Xunsue shu yuan. (figure 1. 34).⁸²

According to this colophon, Zhu Yiyin inaugurated the reproduction project of Zhu Youdun's Orchid Pavilion at his studio, Xunxue shuyun 遜學書院, in the twentieth, year of Wanli 萬曆 (1592). He also mentions that he used both "large and small paintings of Li Longmian [Gonglin] engraved on the stones" as models for his

reproduction.⁸³ These engraved stones were produced by Zhu Youdun, who made copies after a copy of Li Gonglin's work. Thus, the Huang Nan versions, which exist in two sizes – large, such as the four identical scrolls of the Palace Museum (approximately 32cm, figure 1. 35), and small, as exemplified by the Uno Sesson Collection (approximately 22cm, figure 1. 36), – are the copies of copies of copies, the ink rubbings of stone tablets modeled after other engraved stones, which were in turn copied after a copy supposedly done after Li Gonglin.

On each scroll are seals that read “Huangnan” on the upper left of the title page, indicating that Zhu Yiyin directed the project. In the lower left of the colophon, two names are inscribed: “The experts from the region of Wu 吴下, Shen Youwen 沈幼文 and Zhang Tian 章田.” These are the experts at engraving stones from the Wu region who were hired by Zhu Yiyin.⁸⁴ The colophon also tells that it was a time consuming project, taking ten years to complete.

Begun in the year 1592 the project must have been completed around 1602, which was the year Zhu Youdun passed away at the age of sixty-six.⁸⁵ Initially, Zhu Yiyin had started to reproduce two versions of the large and two versions of the small tablets. However, he completed the reproduction of only one large one and one small one. His mission was passed onto his son Zhu Changqian, who inherited the title of Prince Yi II in the thirty-third year of the Wanli reign (1605), three years after his father's death. Zhu Quanjian's studio name was Xianyuan daoren 仙原道人.⁸⁶ When he completed one large and one small reproduction, he stamped his own seal that read “Xianyuan” on the upper left corner of the title page to differentiate the Xianyuan version from the earlier versions by his father. Examples of such large size scrolls are the versions located in the

Palace Museum (figure 1. 37) and the former Robert van Gulik Collection (figure 1. 38); the small scroll is the Palace Museum (figure 1. 39).

Since the Huangnan version and the Xianyuan version are both reproduced from the model set by Zhu Youdun, they convey similar characteristics. When we compare the large scrolls side by side, the lines of the Huangnan version are executed with much more refined precision than those of the Xianyuan version. In the Huangnan version, the figures are depicted with more detailed expression, and the eyeballs are defined. In contrast, the eyes of the figures are simplified and represented by a line in the Xianyuan version, which indicates that they are influenced by the woodblock engraving technique.⁸⁷ This stylistic difference could have been caused by Zhu Changqian's obligation to continue his father's project to properly inherit his princely title. In order to complete the project before 1605 when the title was inherited, Zhu Changqian probably had not had as much time as his father had and rushed the Wu experts. Hence the execution of the Xianyuan version engraving was more simplified.

As matter of course for small scrolls, the model is different from the large one. In both cases of the Huangnan and Xianyuan, the small scrolls are executed with much more refined lines and polished precision. Although the overall structure and figures are the same as the large scroll, the details indicate that the artist worked with care. Wang Xizhi's pavilion takes up the entire space at the beginning of large scroll, but rocks with shrubs are added in the small scroll. In contrast with the three geese represented in the large scroll, one more is added in the small. Examples of the Huangnan small version (figure 1. 10) were imported to Japan in the Edo period, and one was authenticated by

Tomioka Tessai, the Meiji literati master, who also produced several versions of the Orchid Pavilion.⁸⁸

A son of Zhu Quanqian, Zhu Youmu continued his grandfather's legacy. He had the Orchid Pavilion engraved on stone tablets once again in the forty-fifth year of the Wanli reign (1617) when he inherited the title of Prince Yi III. According to the *Zhuwang zhuan* 諸王伝 in Mingshi, Zhu Changqian died in 1615, two years before that occasion.⁸⁹ Zhu Youmu's studio name was Zhenhuan daoren 震寰道人.⁹⁰ He conducted the reproduction project under the name of his father Zhu Changqian, in order to legitimate his political authority through his cultural heritage.

In the Ming dynasty, the Orchid Pavilion Gathering theme, associated with the glorious past, was revived as a princely project in order to create a sense of cultural authority. After the epilogue, there are two colophons: one is by Mi Fu and the other is by Emperor Gaozong of the Song Dynasty. Mi Fu wrote that the *Lantingxu* was copied and engraved by Chu Suiliang and was illustrated by Li Gonglin and then collected by the Fuma Wang Jinqian family.⁹¹ Therefore, two sizes of stone tablets were engraved by Zhu Youdun in 1417, and their reproduction project was inaugurated by Zhu Yiyin in 1592. Zhu Yiyin's scrolls were completed by his son Zhu Changqian in 1602, and they were followed by the Zhu Changqian's version with his own seals. In 1617 when the grandson, Zhu Youmu, inherited the title of Prince Yi, he also had engraved a version under his father's name to continue the family tradition.

In addition, this tradition was revived by the Qianlong emperor 乾隆皇帝 (1711-1799) of the Qing dynasty 清朝 (1644-1917) in the forty-fifth year of Qianlong (1780). From a young age the Qianlong emperor was a successful military leader who expanded

the Qing territory. At a same time, he was a poet and major patron of the arts. He commissioned 15,000 copyists to produce a catalogue of all the important works of Chinese literary culture, *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書, which consists of 36,000 volumes. His purpose in compiling such project was to suppress political opponents by screening any books written against the Qing dynasty. He burned about 15,000 such books.

Nevertheless, the Qianlong emperor treasured the ink rubbing Orchid Pavilion scrolls in his gigantic Ming art collection and ordered official investigators to examine them. When he catalogued the ink rubbings of Zhu Youdun and the three generations of Princes Yi, he found many parts were missing or damaged. He commissioned a large project to conserve this tradition, and many stone tablets were engraved again (figure 1:13).⁹² As a part of the conservation project, Qianlong added another colophon to state how the first emperor of the Ming dynasty, Zhu Yuanzhang, appreciated the Orchid Pavilion tradition, particularly Li Gonglin's illustrations.⁹³ This account was titled *Gao huangdi yuzhi liushangtu ji* 高皇帝御制流觴圖記 (*Records of Emperor's Study on the Paintings of Floating Wine Cups*).⁹⁴ Needless to say, it must have been difficult for the Qing people to find accurate information regarding the Ming Orchid Pavilion tradition since they were lacking sufficient materials. When the Qing dynasty took over the Ming Empire, they destroyed large volumes of artifacts and records and killed most of the Ming princes.⁹⁵ Historians stayed away from information regarding the provenance of the Orchid Pavilion along with other treasures in order to avoid trouble. Hence, the Qianlong version of the ink rubbing indicates obvious stylistic differences. However, the Qianlong emperor included in this reproduction project the Ming Orchid Pavilion tradition, which was perceived as an emblem of cultural power and authority.

In this chapter, I have demonstrated that there is no traceable “original” authorship in the Orchid Pavilion visual tradition. This study revealed how the ruling class throughout history in China, including Ming princes, used the concept of “cultural power” inherent in the Orchid Pavilion pictorial representations to visually express their political discontent, and at the same time, to attempt to legitimate their cultural inheritance of that tradition. These Ming-dynasty ink rubbings were imported to Japan in the early seventeenth century, and established the archetype of Japanese versions. In next chapter, I will explore how the Kano painters in Kyoto, who were involved with the political downfall of the Toyotomi regime, expressed their political discontent and claimed cultural authority aesthetically in the early seventeenth century.

Notes:

¹ This foreign policy, called *sakoku* 鎖国 (literally, chained country), was gradually established by the second Shogun Tokugawa Hidetada 徳川秀忠 to limit trading ships from entering ports in 1616, and was eventually completed by the third Shogun Iemitsu 家光 in the Kan’ei 寛永 era (1624-1644). It was ended with the new trade agreement signed with American Envoy Townsend Harris in 1856. However, the term “*sakoku*” was coined by the Rangaku scholar Shiduki Tadao 志筑忠雄 in 1801, when the Japanese became increasingly conscious about their position in the world at the end of Edo period. See Fujita Satoru 藤田覚, *Kinsei Nihon no minshū bunka to seiji* 近世日本の民衆文化と政治 (Tokyo: Kawade Shobo Shinsha 河出書房新社, 1992); see also Ronald Toby,

“Reopening the Question of Sakoku: Diplomacy in the Legitimation of the Tokugawa Bakufu,” *Journal of Japanese Studies*, no. 3, vol. 2 (1977): 323-363.

² In a sense, the Orchid Pavilion visual tradition was gradually constructed by various “readers” throughout history, rather than by a single author. In an attempt to understand this situation I will follow Roland Barthes, who noted that “the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the author.” “The Death of the Author” in *Image-Music-Text*, ed. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 142-7 (This article first appeared in English in *Aspen* no. 5-6 in 1968). Within the Orchid Pavilion tradition, many cultural, historical and ideological borrowings have taken place. I will draw on Julia Kristeva’s notion of intertextuality, in order to demonstrate how, across time and space, one idea may allude to another, which in turn may allude to something else. See Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980).

³ I return to this issue later in this chapter.

⁴ There are some similarities between Ming China and Tokugawa Japan in terms of commercial development, but there are also tremendous differences.

⁵ Throughout this thesis I draw on the discussions of Michele Marra and Kendall H. Brown, who have described the political and aesthetic importance of “reclusion.” See Michele Marra, “The Aesthetics of Reclusion: Kamo no Chomei and the Last Age,” in *The Aesthetics of Discontent* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 70-100; Kendall H. Brown, *The Politics of Reclusion* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1997). Needless to say, the “reclusion” referred to here is that of an imaginary community of intellectuals which thought of itself in terms of classical Chinese intellectual groups such

as the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove and the Four Graybeards of Mt. Shang, all who left service at the palace and went into the mountains as a means of political protest rather than as a form of solitary reclusion. Although referring to much later developments, the construction of an imagined community for political purposes has been described by Benedict Anderson in *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London and New York: Verso, 1983).

⁶ See, Pierre Bourdieu, “The Form of Capital,” in *Handbook for Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. John G. Richardson (California: Greenwood Press, 1986), 241–258 (English version). Bourdieu’s article was first published in Germany in 1983 in *Soziale Ungleichheiten* as “Ökonomisches Kapital - Kulturelles Kapital - Soziales Kapital” (economic capital, cultural capital, social capital).

⁷ With the discovery of new materials, Wang Xizhi’s birth and death dates have often been disputed and revised. Based on a record in *Zhengao* 真誥 (*True Admonition*) by Tao Hongjing 陶弘景 (456-536), the latest theory suggests that Wang Xizhi lived between 303 and 361. Taniguchi Tetsuo 谷口鉄雄, “Jobun: Ronso no purofiru 序文—論争のプロフィール (Preface: Profile of Debates),” in Taniguchi Tetsuo and Sasaki Takeru 佐々木猛, *Ranteijo ronsoyakuchu* 蘭亭序論争訳注 (Tokyo: Chuokoron bijutsushuppan 中央公論美術出版, 1993), ii. However, based on a calculation of *Youjun nianpu* 右軍年譜 originally written by Lu Yitong 魯一同, and edited in 1855 in the Qing dynasty, many other scholars have suggested that Wang lived from 307-365. For biographical information on Wang Xizhi see, Kodama Shinji 駒田信二, *Chūgoku shojinden* 中国書人伝 (*Lives of Chinese Calligraphers*) (Tokyo: Geijutsu shinbunsha 芸

術新聞社, 1985), 10; Nakata Yujiro, *O Gishi* (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1974). See also, Qi Xiaochun 祁小春 *Ogishi ronkô* 王羲之論考 (*A Study of Wang Xishi*) (Tokyo: Toho shuppan, 2001); Sotoyama Gunji 外山軍治, “O Gishi to sono shui 王羲之とその周囲 (Wang Xizhi and his environment)” in *Chugoku shodo shi* 中国書道史 (*History of Chinese Calligraphy*) vol. 4: *Eastern Jin* 東晋 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1985): 12-19; Kanda Ki'ichirō 神田喜一郎, “Introduction” in *Chūgoku shodōshi*, 3.

⁸ Robert E. Harrist, Jr. even suggests that Li Gonglin might have been the first to depict the life of Wang Xizhi, referring to Li's painting titled *Sketch of Wang Xizhi Inscribing a Fan* listed in *Shuan-ho hua-pu* (I shu ts'ung-pien, ed.). Robert E. Harrist, Jr. “A Letter from Wang His-chih and the Culture of Chinese Calligraphy,” in *The Embodied Image: Chinese Calligraphy from the John B Elliott Collection* (The Art Museum, Princeton University, 2000), 241.

⁹ No single original work of calligraphy in Wang Xizhi's own hand has survived, and the extant examples of his work are copies produced from model calligraphy made either by tracing copies or from ink rubbings printed from carved stone tablets. In either case, these copies are several times removed from the original. Eugene Y. Wang, “The Taming of the Shrew: Wang His-chih (303-361) and Calligraphic Gentrification in the Seventh Century,” in *Character and Context in Chinese Calligraphy*, eds. Cary Liu, Dora Ching, and Judith Smith (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1999), 132-73. The works surviving today in the form of ink rubbings, such as the Dingwu Version, are copied from stone tablets engraved during the Song dynasty period (960-1279).

¹⁰ See Appendix B for a list of the textual records.

¹¹ The paintings listed below are the Orchid Pavilion paintings that have been claimed to date to the pre-Ming dynasty, but were actually painted after this pictorial tradition was canonized in the middle of the Ming dynasty. Guo Zhongshu 郭忠恕 (ca. 910–977) copied after the Gu Kaizhi's (345–406) *Lanting tu* 顧愷之蘭亭讌集圖, ink and light color on silk, The National Palace Museum; Anonymous, *Lanting tu* 蘭亭圖 Song Dynasty, ink on paper, 黑龍江省博物館; Liu Songnian 劉松年 (1174–1224) *Qushui liushang tujian* 曲水流觞圖卷, ink and color on silk, The National Palace Museum; Zhao Mengfu 趙孟頫 (1254–1322), *Lanting tu*, ink and color on silk, 18.8 x 158.8cm. National Palace Museum; Qian Xuan 錢選 (c.1235–before 1307), *Lanting tu*, ink on paper, private collection in Osaka.

¹² Sydney Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk: The Creative Personality in Chinese Works of Art* (London: Sydney L. Moss Ltd., 1984).

¹³ The three versions that he has identified are the scrolls in the Anhui Provincial Museum, the National Library of China, and the Robert van Gulik Collection. Jong Phil Park, “Ensnaring the Public Eye: Painting Manuals of Late Ming China (1550–1644) and the Negotiation of Taste” (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2007), 175–180.

¹⁴ Wang Yi 王禕, “The Ming Dynasty Fanfu (Princely Mansion) Block Editions of Lanting xu (Illustration of Orchid Pavilion) and its Evolution” 明代藩府刻《蘭亭圖》卷及其變遷 in *Journal of Palace Museum* 132, no. 4 (30 July, 2007): 141–155.

¹⁵ Ibid., 148.

¹⁶ In some cases, part of, or the entire model calligraphies are missing from the scroll.

Chu Suiliang 褚遂良 was one of the three master calligraphers in the Tang dynasty. The

most recent and comprehensive survey of the history of *Lantingxu* was compiled by Nishibayashi Shōichi 西林昭一, *Chugoku no sho no rekishi: Tenji sakuhin o omo to shite* 中国の書の歴史—展示作品を主として— in the exhibition catalogue of *Pekin kokyu Sho no Meihoten* 北京故宮—書の名宝展 (*Beijing the Palace Museum – Masterpieces of Chinese Calligraphy*) (Tokyo: The Edo Tokyo Museum, 2008), 11-24.

¹⁷ The development of scholarly gatherings on the annual Spring Purification Festival prior to and after the Wang Xizhi's Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion has been studied by Ōhira Kei'ichi 大平桂一, "Kyokusui no en saikō: Ō Gishi ga Rantei de kyokusui no en o moyōsumade, soshite sonogo 曲水の宴再考—王羲之が蘭亭で曲水の宴を催すまで、そしてその後 (Reconsideration of Kyokusui: Before and after the Wang Xizhi's event of Orchid Pavilion Gathering," *Hyōfū* 颯風, vol. 41 (15 November 2004): 97-110; The practice of the spring purification ritual on the third day of the third month is said to have originated during the Western Zhou 西周 dynasty (1046-256 BCE) and was already an established event by the Eastern Han 東漢 dynasty (22-195 CE). In China, documents regarding the formation of the purification ritual prior to the time of the Orchid Pavilion are included in the chapter of *Liyizhi* 禮儀志 (*The Archives of Decorum*) in *Hou Hanshu* 後漢書 (*The Book of the Later Han Dynasty*), which describes it thus: "on the third day of the third moon, government officials, as well as commoners, celebrated the purification festival and held drinking parties by the East Creek." It is also documented in *Lizhi* 禮志 (*The Document of Decorum*) in Fang Xuanling's 房玄齡 (578-648) *Jinshu* 晉書. See also Marshall P.S. Wu, *the Orchid Pavilion Gathering: Chinese Painting from*

the University of Michigan Museum of Art, Volume II (Michigan: The University of Michigan, 2000), 43; Fukumoto Gaichi 福本雅一, “Ranteikō 蘭亭考” *Sho no shūhen 2 Sōbokushū*. 書の周辺 2 瘦墨集 (Tokyo: Nigensha 二玄社, 1984).

¹⁸ Yoshikawa Kōjirō 吉川幸次郎, “Ranteijo o megutte 蘭亭序をめぐって” *Shōwa kichū Rantei ten zuroku* 昭和癸丑蘭亭展図録 ed. Nihon shogei'in 日本書藝院 (Osaka: Nigensha 二玄社, 1973), 17.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Marshall P.S. Wu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering* (2000), 44-45. I have replaced Pinyin with Wade-Giles for the romanization of the text. Other English translations of this Chinese text include: Arthur Waley, *An Introduction to the Study of Chinese Painting* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), 70; Chu Chai and Winberg Chai, *A Treasury of Chinese Literature: A New Prose Anthology Including Fiction and Drama* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1974), 29-30; Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk*, reverse of foldout; Richard E. Strassberg, *Inscribed Landscape: Travel Writing from Imperial China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 63 is reprinted in *Visible Traces: Rare Books and Special Collections from the National Library of China*, ed., Phillip K. Hu (New York: Queens Borough Public Library and Beijing: National Library of China and Morning Glory Publisher, 2000), 150-151.

²¹ Robert L. Thorp and Richard Ellis Vinograd, *Chinese Art and Culture* (New York: Prentice Hall, 2000), 174.

²² Kodama Shinji, *Chūgoku shojinden* 中国書人伝 (*Biographies of Chinese*

Calligraphers) (Tokyo: Geijutsu Shinbunsha 芸術新聞社, 1985), 8. *Jinshu* 晋書,

accessed 2009-12-04 <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/9642603/-1529>>.

²³ Robert E Harrist, Jr., “A letter from Wang Hsi-chih and the Culture of Chinese Calligraphy,” in *The Embodied Image: Chinese Calligraphy from the John B Elliott Collection* (Ann Arbor: The Art Museum, Princeton University, 2000): 241.

²⁴ These three styles of calligraphy were already used in the Western Jin dynasty. However, it was during the Eastern Jin dynasty that they were polished into a graceful art form. Kanda Ki'ichirō, “Introduction,” in *Chūgoku shodōshi*, 3.

²⁵ Kodama, *Chūgoku shojinden*, 8.

²⁶ Komada, *Chūgoku shojinden*, 12.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Robert E Harrist, Jr., “A letter from Wang Hsi-chih and the Culture of Chinese Calligraphy,” 241.

²⁹ Komada, *Chūgoku shojinden*, 18.

³⁰ Lothar Ledderose, “Chinese Calligraphy: Its Aesthetic Dimension and Social Function,” *Oriental Art* 17, no. 10 (October 1986): 46-49.

³¹ Taniguchi Tetsuo 谷口鉄雄, “Jobun: Ronso no purofiru 序文— 論争のプロフィール (Preface: Profile of Debates),” in Taniguchi Tetsuo and Sasaki Takeru 佐々木猛, *Ranteijo ronsōyakuchū* 蘭亭序論争訳注 (Tokyo: Chuokoron bijutsushuppan 中央公論美術出版, 1993), i. For more information regarding *Shishuo xinyu*, see Nanxiu Qian,

Spirit and Self in Medieval China: The Shih-shuo hsin-yu and its Legacy (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001).

³² Taniguchi, “Jobun: Ronso no purofiru,” i.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ *Sui Tang xi hua* 隋唐嘉話 by Liu Su is another version of *Zhuan Lanting*. Fukumoto Gaichi, “Ranteikō,” 241.

³⁶ Zhang Yanyuan, *Youjun huamu* 右軍畫目 (法書要錄 Vol.3), cited by Fukumoto, 246.

³⁷ Authentication issues of the Orchid Pavilion calligraphy were discussed earlier, but Guo Moruo is largely responsible for starting the heated debates. I will survey the ongoing debates on the issue of historicity of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering event; however, my primary concern is how this episode was received by later generations and how it was pictorialized, and thus I do not intend to add to those debates. See Guo Moruo 郭沫若, “You Wang Xie muzhi de chutu lun dao Lantingxu de zhenwei 由王謝墓志的出土論到蘭亭的真偽 (From Reading of the Newly Excavated Wang Xie and His Wife’s Epitaph to Authentication of the Preface of Orchid Pavilion Gathering),” in *Wenwu* 文物 6 (1965): 1-25. Discussion has continued by Zhang Chuanxu 張傳旭. 《蘭亭序》真偽之爭的核心問題 文芸研究 1 (2006): 147-149. The ongoing debates (pro-Guo, 15 articles; con-Guo, 3 articles) were collected in *Lanting lunbian* 蘭亭論辨 (Beijing: Wenwu Press 文物出版社, 1977). For Japanese translations see Taniguchi Tetsuo and Sasaki Takeru, *Ranteijo ronsōyakuchū*.

³⁸ Shang Chengzuo 商承祚, “Tôjin no shohô wo ronjite “Ranteijo” ni oyobu 東晋の書法を論じて「蘭亭序」に及ぶ,” in *Ranteijo ronsôyakuchû*, 191-240.

³⁹ Eugene Wang, “The Taming of the Shrew: Wang His-chih (303-361) and Calligraphic Gentrification in the Seventh Century,” in *Character and Concept in Chinese Calligraphy* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1999): 146.

⁴⁰ Liu Hsu et al, eds., Chiu Tang shu 旧唐書, 16 vols. (Beijing: Chung hua shu-chu, 1975), 73: 2600. Translation by Wang “The Taming of the Shrew,” 170.

⁴¹ Robert E Harrist, Jr., “A letter from Wang His-chih and the Culture of Chinese Calligraphy,” 241.

⁴² Ibid., 249. See also, Nishibayashi Shō'ichi 西林昭一, *Ranteijo [goshu] Tôjin Ô Gishi* 『蘭亭叙』＜五種＞東晋 王羲之, *Chugokuhoshosen* 中国法書選 15 (Tokyo: Nigensha 二玄社, 1988), 35.

⁴³ Since the beginning of recorded history in China, writing has been believed to be connected to supernatural power, an idea first introduced by the four-eyed sage Cang Jie 蒼頡, who was the official recorder at the court of the legendary Yellow Emperor Huangdi 黃帝 (2898-2679 BCE). See Charles Le Blanc, *Huai Nan Tzu: Philosophical Synthesis in Early Han Thought: The Idea of Resonance (Kan-Ying) with a Translation and Analysis of Chapter Six* (Hong Kong University Press, 1985); and Harold D. Roth, *The Textual History of the Huai-Nan Tzu* (Michigan: The Association for Asian Studies, 1992), 12. For more on the spiritual power of writing, see K.C. Chang, *Art, Myth and Ritual: The Path to Political Authority in Ancient China* (Massachusetts: Cambridge, 1983), 81.

⁴⁴ Amy McNair, “The Engraved Model-Letters Compendia of the Song Dynasty,”

Journal of American Oriental Society 114, no. 2 (Apr-Jul., 1994): 214.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ See Nishibayashi Shō’ichi, *Ranteijo*, 35.

⁴⁷ Sydney L. Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk* (London: Sydney L. Moss Ltd., 1984), 30.

⁴⁸ “Tao Zongyi reported 117 works in the collections of the Song emperor Lizong.” See Jong Phil Park, “Ensnaring the Public Eye: Painting Manuals of Late Ming China (1550-1644) and the Negotiation of Taste” (PhD diss. University of Michigan, 2007), 176.

⁴⁹ Satō Yasuhiro 佐藤康宏, “Ike no Taiga-hitsu Rantei kyokusui-zu kaisetsu” 池大雅筆 蘭亭曲水図解説, in *Genshoku Nihon no bijutsu* 原色日本の美術 在外美術 絵画 27 (Tokyo: Shōgakukan 小学館, 1980): 193, 209.

⁵⁰ See Appendix B for a list of the Orchid Pavilion paintings recorded in textual materials prior to the Song Dynasty. Titles of Lanting paintings appear in various sources dated prior to the Song dynasty as well. There is no surviving copy of any of these paintings, nor is there sufficient textual description to determine whether or not any of them ever actually existed. From the Tang dynasty 唐, Jing Hao 荆浩, *Shanying yan lanting tu* 山陰讌蘭亭図三 (A Mountain Feast at Lanting) is recorded in *Xuanhe huapu* 宣和画譜, 10: 9; from the Five Dynasties 五代, Tung Yuan 董源, *Lanting tu* 蘭亭図軸 (退菴金石書画跋, 12:14); Guan 關, *Shanying yan lanting tu* 山陰讌蘭亭図四 (Xuanhe huapu, 10:11).

⁵¹ Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk*, 32.

⁵² Robert E. Harrist, Jr., *Painting and Private Life in Eleventh-Century China: Mountain Villa by Li Gonglin* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1998), 11.

⁵³ Richard M. Barnhart, “Li Kung-lin and the Art of Painting,” in *Li Kung-lin’s Classic of Filial Piety* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1993), 9.

⁵⁴ Robert E. Harrist, Jr., *Painting and Private Life*, 14.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Song Lian was a prose writer working during the late Yuan and early Ming dynasties. From 1360, he was a political advisor to the first Ming emperor Zhu Yuanzhang 朱元璋, and rose to an official position as an eminent scholar. He played a chief role in the compilation of the *Yuanshi* 元史 (Official History of the Yuan Dynasty), and served in various offices in the Hanlin Academy. He left an extensive description of the original paintings of Li Gonglin. See Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk*, 31. For Song Lian’s political involvement, see *The Military Establishment of the Yuan Dynasty*, Council on East Asian Studies (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1978). According to Jong Phil Park’s study, Song Lian’s descriptions of Lanting are quite different from those of *Tianxing daomao*. For instance, Xie Teng and Yu Yun are both labeled “too drunk” in *Tianxing daomao*. However, Song Lian explains that Xie Teng is stretching his arms to yawn because he is tired, and Yu Yun is being helped by a boy-attendant because of his old age. See Jong Phil Park, *Ensnaring the Public Eye* (2007), 177.

⁵⁷ Translation by Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk*, reverse of foldout.

⁵⁸ For Yu Ho's *Lun-shu piao*, see Wen C. Fong, *Beyond Representation: Chinese Painting and Calligraphy, 8th-14th Century* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art and New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), 424-7.

⁵⁹ Qian Xuan was a Southern Song loyalist painter and a native of Hu Zhou in Zhejiang province. Initially an aspiring scholar official, he decided to give up this career path at a young age due to the Mongol establishment of the Yuan dynasty. While his friend Zhao Mengfu took a position, Qian Xuan refused to serve the foreign regime. Seeing the fall of Song dynasty, he may have aimed in his painting for the quiet reaffirmation of Chinese cultural traditions, which the literati of his generation viewed as being threatened by the Mongol conquest. See, Robert E. Harrist, Jr., "A Letter from Wang His-chih and the Culture of Chinese Calligraphy" (2000), 252.

⁶⁰ English translation of Song Lian's account by Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk*, reverse of foldout.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Kendall H. Brown, *The Politics of Reclusion* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997), 22.

⁶⁴ In addition to the seven sages, noble hermit Rong Qiqi 荣啓期 is depicted in this wall engraving. Furuta Shin'ichi 古田真一, *Chûgoku kodai no fukushoku kenkyû* 中国古代の服飾研究 増補版 (Kyoto: Kenbunsha 見聞社, 1995), 166-169.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ English translation of Song Lian's account by Sydney L. Moss (1984), reverse of foldout.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Together with his father, Wang Xianzhi (344-386) is considered the founder of the orthodox school of Chinese calligraphy. Shen Fu; Glenn D. Lowry; Ann Yonemura, *From Concept to Context: Approaches to Asian and Islamic Calligraphy* (Washington, D. C.: Freer Gallery of Art, 1986), 28.

⁶⁹ English translation of Song Lian's account by Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk*, reverse of foldout.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Wang, "The Ming Dynasty Fanfu Block Editions of Lanting xu and its Evolution," 143.

⁷² In this colophon, Zhu Youdun wrote that he had a copy of Li Boshi 倣李伯時之圖, but not the original painting. Li Boshi 李伯時 is a style name of Li Gonglin.

⁷³ English translation of this passage published in Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk*, reverse of foldout.

⁷⁴ *Visible Traces: Rare Books and Special Collections from the National Library of China*, ed., Phillip K. Hu (New York: Queens Borough Public Library, Beijing: National Library of China and Morning Glory Publisher, 2000), 150; Wang, "The Ming Dynasty Fanfu Block Editions of Lanting xu and its Evolution," 142; Howard Rogers, *Kaikodo Journal* XXV (Spring 2009): 88-9, 188; Yuan Yuhong 袁玉紅, "Beijing tushuguan cang Lantingtu taben qianshuo 北京圖書館藏蘭亭圖拓本淺說," *Beijing tushuguan guankan* 北京圖書館刊行 1 (1998): 94-96; Ma Daokuo 馬道闊, "Zhu Youdun de Lanting taben 朱有燾的蘭亭圖拓本," *Shufa yanjiu* 書法研究 1 (1984): 73-77.

⁷⁵ Zhang Tingyu 張廷玉, *Mingshi* 明史, completed in 1739. The *Mingshi*, Vol. 116, Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1974, 3566. In *Dongshutang jigū fatie*, there is a signature of “Prince Zhou, Zhu Youdun (Zhouxianwang, Zhu Youdun).”

⁷⁶ Zhu Youdun inherited his father’s position as Prince Xian of Zhou 周憲王 in 1425. Zhu Youdun’s pseudonym was Chengzhai 誠齋, his other name was *Quanyangweng*. Dongshutang was the name of his residence, and Lanxuexuan was the name of his art studio. See Wang Wei, “The Ming Dynasty Fanfu,” 143.

⁷⁷ Idema, W. L., “Zhu Youdun’s Dramatic Prefaces and Traditional Fiction,” in *Ming Studies* (Spring 1980): 17-22.

⁷⁸ Other examples of famous collections of Ming royal princes include *Baoxiantangji gūfatie* 寶賢堂集古法帖 (Ancient Model Calligraphies of the Baoxian Hall Collection) by Zhu Qiyuan and Zhu Shanyao and *Chunhua bige fatie* 淳化秘閣法帖 (Model Letters in the Imperial Archives of the Chunhua era) by Zhu Shihong Wang, “The Ming Dynasty Fanfu Block Editions of Lanting xu and its Evolution,” 142.

⁷⁹ *Mingshi*, and also Wang Wei, “The Ming Dynasty Fanfu Block Editions of Lanting xu and its Evolution,” 145.

⁸⁰ Wang, “The Ming Dynasty Fanfu Block Editions of Lanting xu and its Evolution,” 142.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk*, foldout.

⁸³ 李龍眠 大小函刻之藥(東)石” *Lanting tu* (large), Xianyuan version 仙原本. Produced by Prince Yi 益王刻大卷 Paul Moss, Robert van Gulik Collection. Ibid. See also Wang, “The Ming Dynasty Fanfu” (2007), 145.

⁸⁴ Wang, “The Ming Dynasty Fanfu Block Editions of Lanting xu and its Evolution,” 148.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Howard Rogers, *Time Travelers*, *Kaikodō Journal* XXV (Spring 2009): 88, 89, 188.

⁸⁹ *Zhuwang zhuan* 諸王伝 (*Biographies of Various Kings*) in *Mingshi*, 119: 3641.

⁹⁰ *Shōwa Rantei kinen ten* 昭和蘭亭記念展, exhibition catalogue (Tokyo: Goto Museum of Art, 1973), 25-6; Gotō Art Museum, *Uno Sesson Collection Catalogue* (Tokyo: Nihon geijutsu shoin, 1998), 178.

⁹¹ Lothar Ledderose, *Mi Fu and the Classical Tradition of Chinese Calligraphy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), 18.

⁹² Wang, “The Ming Dynasty Fanfu Block Editions of Lanting xu and its Evolution,” 151.

⁹³ Ibid., 152.

⁹⁴ 高皇帝即明太祖朱元璋。后有刻跋：自修禊帖 歷代書家宗也 伝至宗而李龍眠重其書遂欲永其並、繪而図之。 *Gao huandi yu zhiliushang tu ji*.

⁹⁵ Wang, “The Ming Dynasty Fanfu Block Editions of Lanting xu and its Evolution,” 154.

Chapter Two: The Orchid Pavilion Image as Aesthetic Resistance: The Kyō-Kano Workshop and Their Network System

As discussed in Chapter One, the message of cultural authority and political discontent was inherent in the Orchid Pavilion theme since the legend of its protagonist Wang Xizhi 王羲之 (321-79), a calligrapher who aspired to be a scholar-recluse at a time of political instability. The Orchid Pavilion image transmitted this stance not only by visually telling a story of his gathering, but also by conveying a certain aesthetic choice. Inspired by the Ming dynasty ink rubbing (figure 1. 1) imported from China, the earliest Japanese version of the Orchid Pavilion image (figure 1. 2) was painted by Kano Sansetsu 狩野山雪 (1590-1651) in Kyoto amidst the Kan'ei cultural upheaval, which took place in the beginning of the Edo 江戸 period (1615-1868) or roughly the first half of the seventeenth century.¹ At this time, the patrons of art in Japan were primarily the elite: the shogun, the imperial court, aristocrats, high-ranking *daimyo* (provincial military lords), and certain wealthy merchants. Art was, in most cases, created specifically for powerful individuals to satisfy their often political purposes. The term “political art” generally refers to state productions, but Karen Gerhart argues it also includes “art that influences political beliefs and actions, either by supporting such actions or by protesting against them, as well as art that is more indirectly intertwined with politics.”²

Following Gerhart, the Orchid Pavilion paintings produced in Japan under its then intricate political circumstances can thus be considered “political art.” Hence, it is necessary to elaborate this often “ill understood term,” before getting into the main subject.³ In *The Art Bulletin*, Mieke Bal attempted to complicate the term “political art” by discarding the three traditional meanings:

1. overtly, explicitly and exclusively about politics;
2. state-sponsored and/or censored art that either resists or supports official politics;
3. punctual protest, as a singular political statement addressing a specific issue for its own sake and presented within the framework of the art world.⁴

After loosening the boundaries attached to the term, Bal then quotes Theodor Adorno's disparagement of "the work (of art) that wants nothing but to exist" to support his position that "the fetishization of aesthetics is an apolitical stance that is in fact highly political."⁵ This means that art can be "political" and "aesthetic" simultaneously, and thus vitiates the traditional binary view.⁶ Adorno's *Aesthetic Theory* further explains a certain form of aesthetic work that avoids fetishization by way of a kind of reclusion – by avoiding the mainstream aesthetic codes – and in this negative sense constructs its own world of other potentials, which would propose alternative political possibilities.⁷

Although he concentrates on the situation of Europe threatened by fascism in the 1930s, which drastically differs from Kan'ei Japan, his critique of the relationship between art and society, in a broad sense, can be a useful tool to understand how and why the *Rantei* theme was painted by Japanese artists of the time.⁸

The Orchid Pavilion painting by Sansetsu represents a significant part of the extremely complex and diverse Kan'ei aesthetics formulated in a remarkable time of artistic innovation, social change and political transition. Ongoing civil war had finally ended in 1615, when the Tokugawa *bakufu* 徳川幕府 (the military government, alternatively called the "shogunate") – destroyed Osaka Castle to annihilate the previously ruling Toyotomi clan in the Osaka natsu no jin 大坂夏の陣 (the Summer

Campaign of Osaka Castle).⁹ The edifice of Pax Tokugawa was built on martial action, and thus, those who belonged to opposing camps were often severely persecuted. In order to solidify its victory, the newly established Tokugawa *bakufu* needed to construct an image of itself as the rightful ruler and bringer of peace by strategically fabricating its own glorious past and creating a sense of cultural continuity. Thus, Kan'ei culture is often considered a renaissance of Heian 平安 (794-1185) classicism, while continuing to produce arts depicting Chinese themes that had symbolized authority and power since the Muromachi 室町時代 (1392-1568) and Momoyama periods 桃山時代 (1568-1615).¹⁰ Prime members of the Kano-*ha* 狩野派 (the Kano School) were appointed as *goyô-eshi* 御用絵師 (official painters) to pursue this mission to produce art that conveyed a specific taste – the dominant mode of Kan'ei aesthetics – to please their patrons, and consequently they moved their headquarters from Kyoto to Edo, the new political center, where the Tokugawa *bakufu* was located.¹¹

It was, however, the other elite communities in Kyoto – aristocrats, religious practitioners and intellectuals – who contested the new regime and military system, and used this same strategy of alluding to classical culture in an attempt to restore their own prestigious social position, and to express their resistance.¹² They, too, were interested in Heian culture; yet at the same time, some artists and their patrons were fascinated with Chinese sources for different political purposes. Kano Sansetsu was the second generation leader of the Kyō-Kano 京狩野 workshop, who remained in Kyoto and continued to receive patronage from aristocratic families and religious institutions. The Kyō-Kano workshop was founded by Kano Sanraku 狩野山楽 (1559-1635), the father-in-law and teacher of Sansetsu. Needless to say “Kyō-Kano” is a term constructed after

the Meiji period to create a binary set with the Edo-Kano 江戸狩野, the mainstream Kano painters who moved to Edo at the invitation of Ieyasu.¹³

In this chapter, I will investigate how, under these circumstances, Sansetsu painted his version of Orchid Pavilion by selectively adapting the visual languages of Chinese archetypes, which were seen as symbols of cultural authority and political discontent. At the same time, while claiming to faithfully inherit the stylistic canon of the Kano masters of the past, Sansetsu largely revised and updated the Momoyama style, and purposefully avoided the new fashion of the mainstream Kano School that was developing in Edo. In turn, Sansetsu formulated a profound taste – that was another apparently “eccentric” mode of Kan’ei aesthetics. This taste was suitable for his audiences who shared Chinese presumptions and education in Chinese and Japanese classics. In this sense, the Orchid Pavilion painting by Sansetsu functioned as “political art” conveying a sort of “aesthetic resistance” as discussed in Adorno’s theory.

Therefore, I propose that the Orchid Pavilion image, produced by Kano Sansetsu of the Kyō-Kano in the seventeenth century, utilized complex Kan’ei aesthetics. Through its visual language and non-threatening manner, it implicitly communicated a sense of discontent among the members of his workshop and their literati networks. First, I will retrace the development of the Kano School system, and clarify how the Kyō-Kano workshop was positioned in Kan’ei society by highlighting the sociopolitical struggles of Sansetsu, who was extremely talented but humiliated by the harsh treatment of the new political order based on the military. In so doing, I will examine the texts that are related to the Kyō-Kano to contextualize the environment in which Orchid Pavilion images were produced and received. I will then scrutinize the Orchid Pavilion painting by Sansetsu,

while comparing it with various other pictorial representations, particularly with the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing (figure 1. 1), and with a version of same theme (figure 2. 1) painted by his son Kano Einô 狩野永納 (1631-97), who was the third generation leader of the Kyō-Kano workshop, to explicate how their aesthetic was formulated through their interaction with networks of influential cultured people in Kyoto.

The *Orchid Pavilion* Painting by Kano Sansetsu

Kano Sansetsu's version of the Orchid Pavilion image was officially titled *Rantei* (C. *Lanting*) *kyokusui zu* 蘭亭曲水図 (figure 1. 2), meaning the *The Winding Water of the Orchid Pavilion*. Registered as a *jûyô bunkazai* 重要文化財 (Important Cultural Property) by the Japanese government in 1980, this Orchid Pavilion screen has been owned by the Zuishin-in 随心院 temple in Yamashina 山科, the outskirt of Kyoto, since its production. This *byōbu* consists of two pairs of eight-panel screen, so there are four screens altogether. The image narrates the Orchid Pavilion Gathering episode featuring the forth-century idealistic literati-gathering in China.

The version by Sansetsu is considered the earliest extant example of the Orchid Pavilion visual representation in Japan. It is painted with ink and mineral color pigments on applied gold leaf on paper, and has been formatted into two pairs of eight-panel *kin-byōbu* 金屏風 (golden folding screens). The size of each screen is 107.0 cm in height and 335.4 cm in width; it is shorter than (approximately two-thirds of) standard-sized *byōbu*, typically 150 cm in height. In contrast to its height, its total combined width of four screens is almost 15 meters. This extremely long shape gives a sense of monumentality. The elongated composition of this work is derived from the handscroll

format, which is viewed from right to left. Its iconography overlaps with the basic pictorial scheme of the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing: beginning from the Orchid Pavilion represented as a structure standing in water, near waterfalls, caves, trees and bamboo, and the poet-scholars seated on both sides of a riverbank, and ending with a bridge.

Although they are no longer extant, Sansetsu painted the Orchid Pavilion theme at least two different locations besides Zuishin-in. Two paintings on *fusuma* 襖 (sliding doors) can be traced from Edo-period records. One of them is recorded in *Gaki* 画記, a text written by Rin Rōen 林蘭苑 in the middle of Edo period. According to Rōen, there was an Orchid Pavilion painting on *fusuma* at the Kō'un-an 興雲庵, a subtemple of the Ken'nin-ji temple 建仁寺.¹⁴ According to Rōen:

東山建仁寺什物画記（中略）同興雲庵襖 淡彩蘭亭図 山雪

A record of the utensils and paintings of Higashiyama Ken'nin-ji ... On *fusuma* at Kō'un-an sub-temple, the Orchid Pavilion painting with light colors by Sansetsu¹⁵ However, this Orchid Pavilion was burned in the fire of Great Fire of the Tenmei era.¹⁶

Another version of the Orchid Pavilion was a mural once located in the *shoin* 書院 (study room) of Higashi Hongan-ji temple 東本願寺. An Edo-era text, entitled *Miyako meisho zue* 都名所図会, records in a section on Higashi Honganji:

「寢殿」大広間と号す 画は山楽の筆なり

「小寢殿」小広間ともいふ 画は山雪の筆なり

The sleeping chamber is called Ōhiroma, painting by brush of Sanraku.

The small bed chamber is called Kohiroma, painting by brush of Sansetsu.¹⁷

Fortunately, a sketch of this painting (figure 2. 2) has survived and is now housed in a private collection.¹⁸ It is executed in ink on paper, and mounted as a handscroll, measuring 34.84 x 334.20 cm. At the end of scroll, there is an inscription stating: 唐絵之図七條門跡公新御座間之下画山雪真筆 (An authentic draft by Kano Sansetsu, Chinese painting for the new room at the Shichijō *monzeki*).¹⁹ Unlike the Zuishin-in version, every individual name and military title of the participants in the gathering is inscribed on cartouches in this sketch, which is one of the characteristics of the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing. The original intention of producing this type of illustration was to record the names and poems of the participants in the gathering at the Orchid Pavilion.²⁰ Although they are absent in the case of the Zuishin-in version, Sansetsu included the cartouches with the names and political titles of the participants in this handscroll draft of the Higashi Honganji *fusuma-e*, which relates more closely to the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing than the Zuishin-in version. He probably painted the Higashi Hongan-ij *fusuma*, based on this draft, earlier than the production of the Zuishin-in *byōbu*, since more extensive modification and rearrangement of composition and iconography are apparent in the later version.

The Mainstream Aesthetic: Orchid Pavilion Paintings by the Edo-Kano

For a better understanding of how the Kyō-Kano workshop – led by Kano Sansetsu – was positioned in the Kano School system at the time he produced his Orchid Pavilion, it is necessary to reexamine Kano family dynamics. The examination of this school in the Muromachi period clarifies the nature of the Edo-Kano under the leadership of Kano Tan'yū Morinobu 狩野探幽守信 (1602-1674), who was often considered a rival

of Sansetsu.²¹ In the seventeenth century the Kano School was already far from a monolithic entity. Their private face, which emphasized their hereditary line and blood connections, and their public aspect, in relation to highly politicized patronage, were intricately woven into a complicated institution. Later, I will explicate the mainstream Kan'ei aesthetic – invented by Tan'yū – which Sansetsu resisted, through my examination of the Orchid Pavilion paintings executed by Edo-Kano painters.

Because of their military background, hierarchy, hereditary line and blood connections were extremely important for the Kano School.²² In contrast to the founder of the Kyō-Kano painters, who was a disciple of Kano Eitoku, the leading members of the Edo-Kano were the biological descendants of Kano Masanobu 狩野正信 (1434-1530), the founder of the school in the Muromachi period. Masanobu was appointed *goyō-eshi* 御用絵師 (the official painter) to the Ashikaga *bakufu* by the eighth Ashikaga Shōgun Yoshimasa 足利義政 (1436-90) after his precursor Oguri Sōtan 小栗宗湛 (1413 -1481) died in 1481. The origin of the Kano family was traditionally identified with Izu Kamo-gun 伊豆加茂郡 (present day Shizuoka 静岡 Prefecture), but more recently with Shimotsuke 下野 (present day Tochigi 栃木 Prefecture), according to newly discovered records, such as the *Honkabetsutōbutsu sotōki* 本化別頭仏祖統記, as suggested by Yamaoka Taizō. In either case, they were originally from a provincial warrior clan.²³ Masanobu's son Motonobu 元信 (1476-1559) is credited with synthesizing *kanga* 漢画 ("Han painting," or Japanized Chinese-style painting) and *yamato-e* やまと絵 (pictures of Yamato, or Japanese-style painting), and played a major role solidifying the dominant position of the Kano School. Shōei 松栄 (1519-92), a son of Motonobu, continued the

family line, which was inherited by Eitoku 永徳 (1543-1590), who is considered the greatest master of Momoyama art. Eitoku was favored by the unifiers, Oda Nobunaga and Toyotomi Hideyoshi, receiving numerous commissions to paint the interiors of their estates. He adopted his best disciple, Sanraku, into his family. However, Eitoku died, apparently as a result of overworking, at age 47 in 1590. Eitoku's eldest son, Mitsunobu 光信 (1565-1608) also died young at age 44 in 1608. Consequently, his son Sadanobu 貞信 (1597-1623) took over the leading position of the family when he was only 12 years old.²⁴

The year 1623 is a remarkable turning point in shaping the direction of the Kano School. It was the year Sadanobu died at age 27 without leaving an eligible heir. For the purpose of saving the hereditary line, the Kano family had to find the successor who had the closest blood connection within the family. The most eligible candidates were the three sons of Takanobu, a younger brother of Mitsunobu. They were born in Kyoto but moved to Edo, and lived in the houses that were bestowed by the Tokugawa *bakufu*.²⁵

In 1623 the eldest of the three sons, Tan'yū, was 22. At this time, he had already established his own family line, which was called the Kajibashi-Kano 鍛冶橋狩野 workshop. Naonobu 尚信 (1607-1650), at age 17, inherited the house of their father Takanobu, which was the Takekawamachi-Kano 竹川町狩野 (later transferred to be the Kobikimachi-Kano 木挽町狩野) workshop, and his descendants also established the Hamamachi-Kano 浜町狩野 workshop. Consequently, the Kano family decided that the youngest, Yasunobu 安信 (1613-1685), at age 20, would be adopted by Sadanobu and inherit the line of the main Kano house, which continued from Masanobu, and was called

Nakabashi-Kano 中橋狩野.²⁶ The “oath” signed by the Kano School painters a day before the death of Sadanobu was a commitment to solidify the family-oriented school by supporting Yasunobu as the head of the main house. Sanraku was excluded, despite his recognized ability to execute the grand style of Eitoku in a manner surpassing the biological sons Mitsunobu and Takanobu 孝信 (1571-1618).²⁷

The three sons of Takanobu – Tan’yū, Naonobu and Yasunobu – became the founders of the core of four Edo-Kano workshops, which were alternatively called *oku-eshi* 奥絵師 (the inner painters), who were allowed to enter the shogun’s private chamber and see him directly. They enjoyed the privilege of receiving the highest ranking commissions from the Tokugawa *bakufu*. Positioning the *oku-eshi* painters on the top, the secondary official painters among the Kano School were called *omote-eshi* 表絵師, the outer painters.²⁸ They assisted the *oku-eshi* and held the prestige of military status, but received less salary and were not allowed to see the shogun directly. They were usually headed by the second or third sons of Kano heirs or their disciples. Consequently, the Kano School grew into a huge institution, and further institutionalized its disciples. The schools consisting of disciples coming from outside of the Kano family were called *machi-Kano* 町狩野, since their studios were located amongst the major cities (or *machi*). While taking advantage of the military system, the Kano School built an unchallengeable structure that continued until the end of Edo period.²⁹ Although being a part of and stemming from the Kano School, the Kyo-Kano was counted as neither *oku-* nor *omote-eshi* groups. They were seen as outsiders.

Among the three sons, Tan’yū was the most active member of the Kano family. He began to demonstrate his talent in painting at a young age, and was recognized as a

child prodigy. At age 11, he accompanied his father to meet the first and second shoguns Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康 (1542-1616) and Hidetada 秀忠 (1579-1631), and at 16, was appointed *goyô eshi* to the Tokugawa *bakufu*.³⁰ After moving to Edo, he traveled between Kyoto and Edo over twenty-four times to conduct painting projects.³¹ He reinvented the *meppitsutai* 滅筆体 (reduced brush method) of his forefather Masanobu and developed a new spacious and elegantly plain style, the so-called *shôsha-tanrei* 瀟洒 淡麗, which was obviously different from Momoyama paintings. Tan'yû's epitaph Hoin Tan'yû Kano Morinobu Hishiheimei 法印探幽斎狩野守信碑誌并銘, which was written by Hayashi Gahô and commissioned by Tan'yû's sons Tanshin 探信 and Tansetsu 探雪, observes that "Tan'yû's painting was extraordinary, and it was independent from other styles of his contemporary, yet nobody disagreed with him" (探幽斎丹青之妙、当時独歩固無異論).³² Thus, Tan'yû changed the Kano style, and established a new and accepted canon.

He also strove to recreate a new type of unification between *kanga*, which was traditionally the Kano specialty, and *yamato-e*, which was the expertise of the Tosa-*ha* and the Sumiyoshi-*ha*, in an attempt to have a total control over both areas. As a result, he is also credited as responsible for inventing "*shin-yamato-e*" 新やまと絵 (neo *yamato-e*).³³ Takeda Tsuneo summarizes Tan'yû's contributions as follows:

1. Innovation of a new *kanga* style that expresses updated Japanese aesthetic values, conscious about spacious and elegantly plain composition and soft and gently applied brushstrokes; e.g., the murals in Nagoya Castle.

2. Revision of traditional *yamato-e* to fit more contemporary taste, and invention of the “neo yamato-e” style; e.g., *Four Seasons Pine Tree byôbu*.
3. Authentication of the paintings of the past by compiling study sketches such as *Tan'yû shukuzu*.³⁴
4. Development of naturalistic painting through sketching directly from nature.³⁵

Tan'yû's style was favored by the Tokugawa shoguns and the prominent *daimyô* of the time because it appeared to be humble and modest, and thus, considered to convey the aesthetic value of Tokugawa policy that was based on the Neo-Confucian value system. Establishing the new *bakufu*, the Tokugawa family attempted to justify their right to rule based on Neo-Confucianism, originally taught by the Chinese philosopher Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130-1200). This teaching emphasized the proper conduct of human affairs manifested in a strict hierarchy of the classes, with an emphasis on loyalty to the lords. In this particular sense, it seemed to serve Japanese feudal rulers. However, the Chinese ideology was not exactly workable in the Japanese sociopolitical system. The largest conflict concerned issues of the position of the military and heredity. In China, the military was a subject of disdain, but in Japan, it ranked at the top of the social structure. Furthermore, China's governance was conducted by scholar-officials who were recruited through an examination system, but the Japanese samurai positions were strictly based on birthright, marriage, or adoption into families. In order to solve these problems, the Tokugawa *bakufu* officially appointed the Hayashi-ha 林派 (the Hayashi School of philosophy) to modify the Chinese teachings to fit the military clan's right to rule by explaining that they were a military aristocracy who should cultivate the arts of peace in the same manner as Chinese bureaucrats.³⁶ Thus, the *bakufu* employed the Edo-

Kano led by Tan'yū to produce the heavily Japanized *kanga* as the perfect vehicle of the Japanized Chinese ideology, in order to propagate the authority of their rulership.

A painting depicting the Orchid Pavilion (figure 2. 3), painted by Tan'yū, reveals his typical *shōsha-tanrei* style. According to the inscription, this work was painted in 1670 when Tan'yū was 69 years old, twenty years after the death of Sansetsu.³⁷ It is executed with ink on paper and remounted in a hanging-scroll format. Its horizontal composition suggests that this work was originally mounted as a handscroll, and the picture read from right to left accords with the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing – the pavilion is located on the right and the meandering water runs from there to the left. However, unlike the version by Sansetsu, the visual representation is extremely minimized, and blank space is emphasized in this work. For instance, the mountains are represented by a thin wash of ink crossing down diagonally from the upper right to the lower left. All the pictorial elements are located on the lower right, and the upper left is kept blank. Only one pine tree stands at the right side of the pavilion (a few more pines are suggested in the background by dim silhouettes), and one lonesome willow tree is at the lower left of the riverbank. The bamboo grove described in *Lantingxu* is absent. Only seven poet-scholars, including Wang Xizhi who is seated in the pavilion, are depicted seated by the meandering stream, instead of forty-two.³⁸

In the center of composition, there is a figure holding a paper scroll to compose poetry. The pose of this figure is recognizable from the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing, possibly Xi Tan 郗曇 or Xie Gui 謝瑰, which means that Tan'yū must have owned the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing – the same material Sansetsu did. Tan'yū also modified the architectural form of the Orchid Pavilion by showing that it rests on an arched foundation,

which is completely different from the post and lintel system used by the conventional images canonized by the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing. Tan'yū got the idea of this arched foundation from the *Juguncibu* 拒関賜布 section (figure 2. 4) of the *Teikan-zu* 帝艦図.³⁹ During his Uneme phase, Tan'yū painted this scene for a collaborative project with other Kano painters, *Teikanzu oshie hari byōbu* 帝艦図押絵貼屏風, which is now housed in the Tokyo National Museum. It was based on the image that he adapted from *Teikanzusesu* 帝艦図説 (figure 2. 5), a woodblock illustrated book, that provided the source of this new look of the Orchid Pavilion. Tan'yū probably sought a new visual inspiration from the *Nanban byōbu* 南蛮屏風 (southern barbarian screens) that illustrated this type of foundation as well. Nonetheless, Tan'yū's intention was not a demonstration of his knowledge of the original account. Rather, he satisfied the shogunal patrons' taste by using his soft and gentle brushstrokes to construct an artificial peacefulness through the combined poetic modes of Japanese and Chinese expressions; an approach that characterizes the mainstream Kan'ei aesthetic.

This design of the Orchid Pavilion by Tan'yū was circulated among the *oku-eshi* or inner circle of the Edo-Kano, and continued to be reproduced for more than a century. The Orchid Pavilion (figure 2. 6) painted in 1767 by Kano Eisen-in Michinobu 狩野栄川院典信 (1730-1790), the founder of the Kobikimachi Kano 木挽町狩野家, displays an almost identical composition and pictorial scheme to the work by Tan'yū.⁴⁰ This work is housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston today. Blank space and plainness is also the major concern. Vivid colors are added to increase the *yamato-e* sensibility in the Chinese subject. The positioning of figures was slightly modified; one person is added to the foreground, but two have disappeared at the other side of riverbank. The names of

figures are inscribed and a bridge is added at the lower left of composition, which suggests that Michinobu was more conscious of the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing than Tan'yū, as much as he cared for the *yamato-e* aesthetic of his generation.

Tan'yū's brother Yasunobu also favored the Orchid Pavilion theme, and painted it a number of times. The right screen of a pair of six panel *byōbu* is one of the surviving examples by Yasunobu representing this theme. It is titled *Rantei Kyokusui* 蘭亭曲水 図 (*Lanting Pavilion by the Winding Stream*, figure 2. 7), produced in the later half of the seventeenth century, with ink and light color on paper; it is now housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.⁴¹ The left screen has been lost, but the composition with its drastic reduction is similar to that of Tan'yū. The Orchid Pavilion structure is resting on an arched foundation, an innovation made by Tan'yū. A pair of six panel *byōbu* (figure 2. 8) housed at the Tochigi Prefectural Museum is another example, executed in ink, colors and gold on paper. This work seems more decorative than Tan'yū's hanging scroll. However, it exhibits the formal characteristics of Edo-Kano, which emphasizes elegant plainness. Gold powder and thin ink wash are lavishly applied to create an atmospheric effect to cover the large blank areas of this composition. Yasunobu reduced the total number of figures from forty-one to twenty-eight on the both sides of riverbank. He also painted a dancing Yang Mo in a manner similar to the ink rubbing.⁴²

As the leader of the main Kano House, Yasunobu is famous for his authorship of *Gadō yōketsu* 画道要訣 (*Secret Keys to the Way of Painting*) of 1680, setting down the Kano principle that distinguished two types of artists: painters who produced by means of their natural talent (*shitsuga* 質画) and those who produced through systematic training using the *funpon* copying technique (*gakuga* 学画).⁴³ The Kano School valued

training above talent because innate talent could not be reproduced, whereas methods learned through training could be transmitted for generations. This perpetuation of painting styles and training systems stemmed from the need to sustain its elite patronage and to maintain its large family-based business enterprise. The Kano value system is materialized in immense volumes of *funpon* 粉本 (study sketch or copy book). *Tan'yū Shukuzu* 探幽縮図 is a type of *funpon* by Tan'yū and the painters around him that functioned as manuals of paintings for many generations.

Kano Shōun Kishin 狩野昌運季信 (1637-1702) produced his handscroll version (figure 2. 9) of the Orchid Pavilion theme, which is closely connected to both the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing and Yasunobu's *byōbu*. Shōun moved to Edo and became a disciple of Yasunobu, and was adopted by Ryōshō Anki 了昌安季 (?-1686). As a trusted disciple, he sometimes painted in place of Yasunobu. He compiled and published *Hyakuryū no ekagami* 百流之絵鑑 (*Mirror of One Hundred Modes*, ca. 1690-1702), a canonical tool of Song and Yuan Chinese paintings 宋元中国絵画, which the Edo-Kano painters used for reimagining China.⁴⁴ The Orchid Pavilion depicted in a handscroll format allows the artist to create a similar effect to the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing, which was the canonized model. At the same time, it exhibits the narrative and decorative quality of *emaki* (picture scrolls) from the *yamato-e* tradition. The shapes of the Orchid Pavilion and the trees in this handscroll are very similar to the Tochigi version of Yasunobu's *byōbu*, especially his consciousness of space and elegant plainness, originally invented by Tan'yū.⁴⁵

Kano Sansetsu: Eccentricity Reconsidered

The Zuishin-in version of the Orchid Pavilion *byôbu* exhibits the typical mode of Kano Sansetsu, which is characterized by a complex combination of Momoyama retrospective and Chinese eccentric painting styles, and with obsessively decorative craftsmanship, highly calculated geometrical forms, and nervously meticulous precision. It is almost the antithesis of the mainstream Edo-Kano tradition, and is thus considered to be an expression of nonconformity, or alternative beauty.⁴⁶ Sansetsu's artistic style provokes the viewer's imagination to construct his personality, a trait heavily identified with eccentric master "geniuses." At a same time, Tan'yû's personality has likewise been characterized as a mainstream "genius," which sets him as a rival of Sansetsu. I will analyze how and why the eccentric image of Sansetsu was constructed in his lifetime and in our contemporary time.

Modern study focused on Sansetsu started with the pre-war efforts of Doi Tsugiyoshi 土居次義 in the 1940s and continued up to the 1980s.⁴⁷ In 1970, Tsuji Nobuo 辻惟雄 inaugurated a new direction by setting up Sansetsu as a forerunner of the lineage of *kisô-ha eshi* 奇想派絵師 or "eccentric painters," a group of Edo-era painters, whom Tsuji vaguely categorized and bundled in his *kisô no keifu* 奇想の系譜 (lineage of eccentrics). This became the most influential image of Sansetsu up to today.⁴⁸ In 1986, Yamato Bunkakan 大和文華館, a museum in Nara Prefecture, devoted its effort to portray Sansetsu in the exhibition titled, "Kano Sansetsu: Senkyô he no izanai" 狩野山雪—仙境への誘い (Invitation to the world of Immortals).⁴⁹ Three years later, the same museum issued a special edition of studies on Sansetsu.⁵⁰ Being stimulated by Tsuji and

Yamato Bunkakan, numerous studies have been produced on Sansetsu.⁵¹ In these studies, Sansetsu had been portrayed as an eccentric and highly learned recluse, who was extremely talented but unfairly marginalized.

Book-length studies of a work by Sansetsu housed in the Chester Beatty Library in Dublin were recently published in Japan (2006) and in the UK (2009).⁵² The focus of these books is *Chôgonka gakan* 長恨歌画卷 (The Song of Everlasting Sorrow Scrolls, figure 2. 10) by Sansetsu. Among the contributors to *Chinese Romance from a Japanese Brush*, Matthew McKelway explores how Sansetsu was understood during his lifetime and the years after, and reveals the environment of Sansetsu's workshop at the time this scroll was produced, and Li-chiang Lin demonstrates the Chinese sources that were possibly consulted by Sansetsu.⁵³ Although undated, this scroll and the Orchid Pavilion display considerable stylistic similarities, and thus the relationship between them should be carefully examined. With these studies in mind, I would like to attempt to recontextualize the position of Sansetsu in Kan'ei society. What were the political problems that drove him to produce the Orchid Pavilion *byôbu* in a manner that conveys certain aesthetic values and tastes? Why and how was the personality of Sansetsu as a "highly sophisticated eccentric, learned Sinophile" constructed during his lifetime and after?

The political downfall of the Kyô-Kano started both Sansetsu and his teacher and father-in-law, Kano Sanraku 狩野山楽 (1559-1635), were not connected with the Kano family by blood. In order to understand Sansetsu, it is unavoidable to examine how Sanraku, the founder of the Kyô-Kano, was portrayed in Edo-period texts. A brief biography of Sanraku is included in *Kano Einô kaden gajiku jo* 狩野永納家伝画軸序

(Preface to the Scroll Painting Relating the Family of Kano Einô) authored by Hayashi Gahô 林鷺峰 (1618-80) in 1669.⁵⁴ Einô requested that Gahô write this preface, when Einô compiled the works by Sanraku and Sansetsu to produce a painting scroll for Kyô-Kano descendants.⁵⁵ According to this preface:

Sanraku was a native of Ōmi 近江, his given name was Kimura Mitsuyori 木村光頼 and his pseudonym Heizô 平三. He was a son of Kimura Nagamitsu 木村永光, who served Asai Nagamasa 浅井長政 (1545-73). After the fall of the Asai family, the Kimura clan worked for Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉 (1537-98). His mother was from the Masuda clan 益田氏. Sanraku was discovered by Hideyoshi, when he was drawing a picture of horse in the sand using a stick while serving as his page boy. Hideyoshi brought him to the studio of Kano Eitoku. Sanraku learned painting from Eitoku, and worked alongside him. He was adopted by Eitoku, and received the Kano surname and art name Shuriryô 修理亮. ... When Hideyoshi died, Sanraku continued to work for his son Hideyori 秀頼 (1592-1615). When Osaka Castle was destroyed, Sanraku escaped Tokugawa persecution. He was pardoned by the merciful Tokugawa and went back to Kyoto.

Soon after this incident, he took the tonsure and changed his name to Sanraku.⁵⁶ Gahô explains that Sanraku was discovered and brought to Eitoku's workshop by Toyotomi Hideyoshi. Eitoku, who trained Sanraku, immediately recognized his talent, which was even better than that of his own sons. He adopted him into the family and bestowed on him the family name. After Eitoku's death in 1590, Sanraku continued to

work for the Toyotomi clan, while maintaining the grand Momoyama style developed by Eitoku.

When the political situation became increasingly unstable after the death of Hideyoshi in 1598, the Kano School used “*sanmen sakusen*” 三面作戦 (a three-dimensional strategy for survival) to secure their family line.⁵⁷ The school divided up their leading painters and offered them to the three potential rulers who were competing against each other: Kano Naganobu 長信 (1577-1654), the youngest brother of Eitoku, and Sadanobu provided their services to the Tokugawa clan; and Takanobu to the Imperial court. Sanraku and Naizen 内膳 (1670-1616), outsiders of the Kano biological line, were sent to the declining Toyotomi clan, for whom they had been working since early on. In this way, regardless of the political situation, the Kano School would survive.

In 1612, the conflict between the Tokugawa and the Toyotomi worsened, and in 1615, Osaka castle was destroyed by the Tokugawa clan, who severely punished and hunted down the Toyotomi loyalists. Being considered one of the loyalists, Sanraku escaped to where Shōkadō Shōjō 松花堂昭乗 (1584-1639) offered him lodging.⁵⁸ Shōjō was a Shingon priest at Iwashimizu 岩清水 Hachimangū 八幡宮 in Otokoyama 男山 south of Kyoto. Later in the mid-eighteenth century, Shirai Kayō 白井華陽 recorded this incident in *Gajō yōryaku* 画乗要略 (*Abbreviated Essentials of Painting*) as followings:

According to Baisen 梅泉 (another name of Shirai Kayō), when Osaka Castle was destroyed, Sanraku escaped and hid himself in the house of Shōjō. The Tokugawa *bakufu* hunted down the Toyotomi loyalists. Shōjō went up to the *bakufu* and swore, “Sanraku was a mere painter, not a warrior retainer for the Toyotomi.”⁵⁹

In this episode, Shōjō argued for Sanraku's position as a harmless painter, who did not provide his services in martial action against the Tokugawa *bakufu*. Sanraku was almost killed but was pardoned and went back to his studio. I will elaborate on this incident later in this chapter. Sansetsu, who was only 25 and working closely with Sanraku, must have felt vulnerable and insecure due to this event. Then how was Sansetsu portrayed by Gahō in the preface of the *Kano Einō kaden gajiku jo*?

Sansetsu was born in Hizen 肥前 province in Kyushu in 1590 as a son of Chiga Dōgen 千賀道元 of the Hata 秦 clan. His mother was a daughter of the Matsu'ura clan. His given name was Hikozaō 彦三. Since early on, Sansetsu took pleasure in painting. Despite his father's discouragement, he did not stop painting. When his father moved to Naniwa 浪速 in present-day Osaka, for some reason, Sansetsu came along with him. His father died there when Sansetsu was 16.⁶⁰ His uncle took him to the painting studio of Kano Sanraku to be his disciple. During this apprenticeship, he made great progress. Soon after, Sansetsu was adopted by Sanraku, who recognized his talent in painting.⁶¹ Sanraku had him marry his daughter Take 竹 and appointed him to be his successor.⁶² He then changed his name to Heishirō 平四郎, was called Nuinosuke 縫殿助, received the Kano surname and took the art name, Sansetsu (Snow Mountain).⁶³ Sansetsu was a native of Kyushu and moved to Kyoto via Osaka, and became an apprentice of Sanraku, who recognized his talent in painting. He was absorbed into Sanraku's family first by adoption, and then by marriage to Sanraku's daughter Take (1601–62) before 1619. When Sanraku died in 1635, Sansetsu was 46 years old, and succeeded to the leadership of the Kyō-Kano.⁶⁴

The early career of Sansetsu is recorded when he collaborated with Sanraku in the production of *Shôtoku taishi eden* 聖徳太子絵伝 (*Illustrated Biography of Prince Shotoku*) in 1623, and this was followed by the project of *Taima-dera engi emaki* 当麻寺縁起絵巻 (*Miraculous Founding Story of Taima-dera*, figure 2. 12) before 1627.⁶⁵ The original *Taima-dera scroll* was painted in 1531 by Tosa Mitsumochi 土佐光茂, but only its Kano reproduction, called the Noshi Family version 熨斗家本, which is located in the Nara National Museum, survives today. In this project, the prime members of the Kano School from the various houses were involved: Sanraku, Mitsutaka, Sansetsu, Naganobu, Kou'i, Tan'yū, Naonobu, Yasunobu, Tomochika 友親, as well as members of the Tosa 土佐 and the Kasuga 春日 Schools. This indicates that there was no tangible conflict or even separation between the Edo- and Kyō-Kano yet, and interestingly, the Kyō-Kano members, led by Sanraku, took the lead of this project. Sanraku was a highly respected painter who was appreciated by the entire school. However, after this project, the Kyō-Kano painters were forced to play a marginalized role, despite their remarkable talent.

Starting in the mid-1630s Sansetsu began to be excluded from prestigious projects conducted by the Edo-Kano team. When the Edo-Kano painters, for instance, received a commission to paint the interior of the imperial palace in Kyoto in 1642, they included their disciples; however, Sansetsu was completely excluded from the project. He must have felt humiliated. Consequently, in the following passage, Gahō speculates about Sansetsu's inner state, and constructs his personality as a scholar-recluse:

Sansetsu preferred solitude and was displeased by vulgarity. His mind was totally immersed in painting. He was skillful at distinguishing fakes from authentic ancient paintings. He took the following art names for himself, Dasokuken 蛇足

軒 (Legged Snake Studio), Tōgenshi 桃源子 (Master of the Peach Blossom Spring) and Shōhaku Sanjin 松伯山人.⁶⁶

These art names are meant to sound like those of a literati recluse. Dasokuken means a person who does things people usually think needless. Tōgenshi is someone who has left this world and stays in the idealistic world of the immortals, and is derived from a poem composed by Tao Yuanming 陶淵明 (376-396), a poet-recluse from the end of the Eastern Jin dynasty. Shōhaku Sanjin is a recluse who keeps virtue just as a pine tree retains its greenness all year around.⁶⁷

Being a Toyotomi loyalist, Sansetsu must have seen himself in the “*yimin*” 遺民, the Chinese loyal to the previous dynasty at the time of foreign conquest.⁶⁸ The *yimin* were scholars who despite the fact that their academic excellence promised them a high position at court, decided not to serve the new, foreign rulers, because the Confucian moral code discouraged scholars from serving more than one ruler. The scholars protested and removed themselves from the cities to mountains to become recluses. Some of the *yimin* painted to express their resentment and discontent against the new regime. Famous examples of *yimin* painters are the Song loyalists, such as Qian Xuan 錢選 (c.1235-before 1307), Gong Kai 龔開 (1222-1307), and Zheng Sixiao 鄭思肖 (1241-1319) in the beginning of Yuan dynasty; and the Ming loyalists, such as Shitao 石濤 (1642-1707), and Bada Shanren 八大山人 (1626-1705) in the Qing dynasty. Gahō provides a description of part of Sansetsu’s social life:

He once met Kassho Dōen 活所道円, and was very taken with Confucian studies, and asking many questions about the classics. Sansetsu then painted *Seiko jukkei*

西湖十景 (*Ten Views of West Lake*) on fans and gave them to Dōen, who composed poems and a preface in appreciation, thus “making indigo out of blue.” Master Fujiwara Seika 藤原惺窩 saw this painting and inscribed its title and a poem, which described how Sansetsu had grasped the process of transformation. Gahō mentions that Sansetsu had an intellectual exchange with Kassho Dōen, whose other name was Nawa Kassho 那波活所 (1595-1648). In 1619 at age 30, Sansetsu painted the West Lake theme, which conveys the notion of political discontent and exile in a manner similar to the Orchid Pavilion, for Kassho.⁶⁹ Kassho was born as a son of a wealthy farmer family in Harima 播磨, Himeji 姫路 (present-day Hyōgo 兵庫 Prefecture). After learning the art of medicine and Confucianism, he moved to Kyoto and studied under Fujiwara Seika 藤原惺窩 (1561-1619).⁷⁰ He was called one of the Four Celestial Kings of the Seika School along with Hori Kyōan 堀杏庵 (1585-1642), Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657) and Matsunaga Sekigo 松永尺五 (1592-1657). Sansetsu developed friendships with these prominent Confucian scholars, and learned about the Chinese *yimin*, whom he perceived himself to be conceptually.

The maltreatment of Sansetsu intensified even more towards the end of his life. Not only was he ostracized by the mainstream painters’ community, but he was also accused and incarcerated. A letter (figure 2. 13) addressed to Einō was written from Sansetsu in prison in 1649.⁷¹

In the passing nights I regret having put myself in this dishonorable situation like a nightmare, from which I suffer. Honesty is the source of spiritual repentance; at last, the compassion of Sun and Moon has been bestowed. This letter is addressed to the three divine alters. What are the divine alters? While I am confused, I ask

you to pay homage to those three alters, and bring them my gratitude. One is for the Goddess Amaterasu, another is for Hachiman Bodhisattva, and the other is the Great Light of Kasuga. If it is Amaterasu, you should go to Awataguchi Myōjin 粟田口明神, if it is Hachiman, Otokoyama Hachiman shrine could be substituted. If it is Kasuga, you must visit the residence of Majesty Kujō. Since being imprisoned, I have been dedicating my prayers every morning to the order of the universe, and then to Buddha. Because the compassion of the Sun and Moon are omitted from the order of universe, I am pardoned this time. Since I am completely innocent, honesty has prevailed. The reverences are so reliable; we can rely on them in the future as well. So, please be sure to give them homage! Please recite this letter in front of the divinities. Also, please tell your mother about this letter for me.

The fourth day of the tenth month

To Einō

Shōhaku (Sansetsu)

This gives us a glimpse of how Sansetsu struggled with his difficult situation. He wrote to express his innocence and regret that he had fallen into his present situation. The reason for his imprisonment is a mystery up to today, and whether or not he was released is also unknown. This letter was preserved by the Kyo-Kano family to prove his innocence as well as providing evidence of the injustice and humiliation he felt. Sansetsu seems to have been pardoned and probably returned to his home; however, he died two years after the date of this letter. During the Edo period, there are other examples of artists who were imprisoned and had their lives shortened as a result. Kitagawa Utamaro 喜多川歌麿 (1753-1806) was arrested for producing an image mimicking a political

event, and Ukita Ikkei 浮田一蕙 (1795-1859) was accused of involvement with the *yamato-e* revival movement at the time of the Ansei Purge 安政の大獄 in 1859.

Because of the misery of imprisonment, they both became sick and died immediately after their release. Watanabe Kazan 渡辺崋山 (1793-1841) also committed *seppuku* 切腹 (ritual suicide) two years after his release from prison. Hence, it is easy to imagine that sensitive Sansetsu's life was shortened due to his harsh treatment in the prison.

Yukio Lippit points out that "Sansetsu's social milieu and literary interests are more documentable than those of his father, and as a result, his works can be read more convincingly against the cultural and intellectual climate of his time."⁷² As it is recorded in various textual materials, Sansetsu was a scholar who established his own method of learning, as well painting. Gahō, for instance, introduces examples of Sansetsu's sources for Chinese and Japanese paintings.

Sansetsu was a proficient writer, and often studied such Chinese sources as *Xuanhe huapu* 宣和画譜 and *Tuhui baojian* 图画宝鑑, or studied the masterpieces of painters famous in history. He studied the pedigree of great ink paintings in Japan as well.⁷³

Besides those listed above, there are seventy-two titles of textual materials collected by Sansetsu and inherited by Einō. The titles of these texts survive as a part of the Suzuka Family Archive.⁷⁴ Surprisingly, the seventy-two titles include not only *Bazhong huapu* 八種画譜 (J. *Hasshu gafu*, *Primer on Eight Varieties of Painting*), *Jieziyuan huazhuan* 芥子園画伝 (J. *Kaishien gaden*, *Mastered Seed Garden Manual of Painting*), but also *Huashuo* 画説 (J. *Gasetsu*, *Painting Theory*) by Mo Shilong 莫是龍, *Hualung suoyan* 画

論瑣言 (J. *Garon sagen, Painting Theory Trivia*) by Dong Qichiang 董其昌, *Huachen* 画塵 (J. *Gajin, Painting Dust*) by Shen Hao 沈顥, and other painting manuals that were particularly appreciated by those who were active in the so-called literati movement of the eighteenth century, who were critical of the Kano School.⁷⁵ *Bazhong huapu* was published between 1621 and 1628, and must have been brought early to Japan through a special route to be owned by Sansetsu and Einō before their deaths. Only Einō might have been able to see the imported version of the first edition of *Jieziyuan huazhuan* (1679 in China) but not Sansetsu. It should be noted it was a time when the trading policy with foreign countries was increasingly restricted by the Tokugawa *bakufu*. Thus, Chinese sources were not easy to obtain and must have been treasured.

Gahō concludes the preface by listing the art treatises written by Sansetsu:

He also copied paintings of the 72 seasonal days and in his free time he wrote *Tokai hōkan meiroku* 図絵宝鑑名録 (*List of Names in the Tuhui baojian*), *Genji monogatari zu* 源氏物語図画記 (*Illustrated Tale of Genji*), *Buryō zakki* 武陵雜記 (*Miscellaneous Notes on the Peach Blossom Spring*), *Gadan* 画談 (*Discourses on Painting*), and more. He thus planned to pass this on his descendants. On the twelfth day of the third month of Keian kanoto-u 慶安辛卯 (1651), he died at age sixty-two.⁷⁶

Although we cannot locate these treatises today, the titles indicate that the scholarship of Sansetsu covered classical subjects of both Japan and China. Due to political reasons, Sansetsu faced harsh treatment, being excluded from important commissions of the *bakufu*, despite his extraordinary talent as a painter. He was not accepted, and thus, turned against the mainstream, and as a result he sought the way of “eccentricity.”

Alternatively, he turned against the mainstream since he had to create something new, and produced paintings depicting new Chinese themes which no other Japanese painters had produced before. Under such circumstances, his shelter was his scholarship. He had to immerse himself in learning and knowledge. In 1669, approximately twenty years after his death, Hayashi Gahō, who was an important Confucian scholar, and who was a close friend of both Kyō- and Edo-Kano painters, recorded Sansetsu as an “eccentric, Sinophile, highly educated scholar-painter.” Since then, this image has been confirmed by historians and theorists.

Nevertheless, there are a few accounts about Sansetsu that depicted the more amiable side of his personality, showing him able to develop close friendships in a more seemingly relaxed manner.⁷⁷ His friend, Chōsen 張川, was a scholar-painter, and one of Sesshū’s followers in Kyushu. In *Honchō gashi*, Sansetsu’s son Einō describes Chōsen as “a pure and elegant person,” and notes how “every time he saw him, my father Sansetsu discussed painting.”⁷⁸ Sansetsu moved to Osaka and Kyoto when he was already a teenager, so he must have spoken with his native Kyushu accent the rest of his life. When Sansetsu spent time with Chōsen, whom Sansetsu trusted intimately, he could forget the pressure and severe problems that he had to deal with on a daily basis, and enjoy Chōsen’s company. Under different political circumstances, Sansetsu would probably have been portrayed with a different personality. When we pay close attention to his Orchid Pavilion, within the nervously calculated meticulous landscape and architecture, the figures are illustrated in a forthcoming and pleasant fashion, interacting among one another. Sansetsu might have projected his wish to join a community such as

this. However, it was a way of survival for Sansetsu to depend on his connection with intellectuals, especially the groups of Sinophile scholars who held high social positions.

Sansetsu's craftsmanship and his ornamental configuration of paintings are far from that of the literati, and he claimed the orthodox lineage of the Kano professional painters. Yet, his attitude toward painting, and toward life, reveal that he represents the dawn of the literati movement that occurred in the mid-eighteenth century. It must be noted that the Orchid Pavilion theme, which was favored by Kano painters, became one of the most prominent and frequently painted themes among the painters of a newly developed literati movement, who severely criticized Kano pedagogy. This indicates the complexity of the Kano School system, and why the Orchid Pavilion theme was well received by the patrons of the Kyō-Kano workshop.

Although the Kano family originally derived from a military clan and remained so, they were the children who were raised and trained as painters. In contrast, both Sanraku and Sansetsu were not raised to become painters from childhood but born into a standard military family, which means that their education was focused on the Confucian based *kangaku* 漢学 (Chinese Studies). It made them conscious of the proper execution of Chinese knowledge, which is reflected in their painting attitude and choice of subjects. When we revisit Sansetsu's biography, we see that his father tried to stop Sansetsu from becoming a professional painter, since he felt it was not appropriate for a military man, a cultural aristocrat playing the role of Chinese literati. The statements made by the Kyō-Kano, such as *Ganboku yûgi setsu* 翰墨游戲説 encouraging painting only as a pastime and not as professional painters, for instance, are closely related to the literati manifesto

of the next generation. Sansetsu's social environment and political situation enhanced this tendency.

Political Discontent Embodied in a Kyō-Kano Text

In order to decipher the visually coded message of discontent from the painted representation of the Orchid Pavilion *byōbu* by Kano Sansetsu, it is important to examine the political intention of *Honchō gashi* 本朝画史 (*History of Japanese Painting*) authored by his son Einō. This text has been thoroughly studied by Igarashi Kōichi in his doctoral dissertation.⁷⁹ Hence, instead of repeating his study, I will highlight only a few points made in this material to help us understand the political discontent felt by the Kyō-Kano family in relation to the production and the reception of the Orchid Pavilion painting. *Honchō gashi* has been a guidebook for many readers – from the seventeenth century to today – to give an idea of the background of four-hundred seven Japanese painters from the sixth to seventeenth century.⁸⁰ Although there is no biography of Sansetsu, four accounts related to him are included in the volumes. This history was initially compiled by Sansetsu in the Kan'ei era, but after his death, his son Einō inherited his mission and added more artists. In his Epilogue, Einō gives credit to Sansetsu and explains how he decided to continue his father's mission:

My predecessor [father] Master Tōgen recorded over a hundred skilled painters of our realm, prepared biographies of them, and had already completed a draft. However, he died before he could complete this effort. Ah, how tragic! I attempted to complete the editing in my free time from painting, but was unable to due to my lack of knowledge. Moreover, from the past there have been

accounts of painting in our realm that one could investigate. This made things even more difficult. At last I was able to assemble what I had seen and heard and continue my father's will.⁸¹

The first edition consisting of five volumes was published in wood-block print, titled *Honchô gaden* 本朝画伝 in 1691. Then, two years later, the second edition added another volume of seals, which was convenient for artists and collectors, and was published with a new title *Honchô gashi* in 1693. Although *Honchô gashi* was published posthumously, Sansetsu's idea of reimagining the artistic lineage for the sake of survival is the starting point of this text. Earlier in 1623, Kano Ikkei 狩野一溪 (1599-1662), who was a son of Naizen 内膳 (1570-1616), a disciple of Eitoku, compiled and published *Kôsoshû* 後素集 (*Collection of Chinese Painting Titles*).⁸² He also authored *Tansei jakuboku shû* 丹青若木集 (*Collection of Young Trees Painting*) in 1624. This is the oldest extant study of Japanese painters and an important precursor to *Honchô gashi*, even though their choice of painters was different from one another. Interestingly, Einô and Ikkei, who were involved in the authorship of history, were outsiders of the Kano biological line, and also the descendants of Toyotomi loyalists. Hence, reimagining the artistic lineage and renewing their familial and stylistic genealogy was extremely important for the survival of the family school.

In the chapter of “*Senmon kazoku*” 専門家族 (Professional Family Painters), Einô constructed the episodes about painters and compiled them to construct a Kano familial lineage in order to authenticate the Kyô-Kano as the real descendants of their masters, Motonobu and Eitoku, through orthodox stylistic transmission. He started with the biography of Kano Masanobu, the founder of the Kano School. According to Einô,

Masanobu was admired and discovered by Sesshū 雪舟.⁸³ He emphasizes that the Zen monk Sesshū's stylistic lineage was continued by the secular Kano line.⁸⁴ Then he glorifies the second generation leader Motonobu for his achievement of unifying *yamato-e* and *kanga* styles bringing them under the Kano umbrella.⁸⁵ Einō compares the quality of his paintings with that of the author of *Lantingxu*, Wang Xizhi, whose calligraphy was admired as the highest artistic accomplishment.

Einō even fabricated an episode about a daughter of Tosa Mitsumochi 土佐光茂 (1496-?), a leader of the Tosa family of *yamato-e* specialists who held the position of *Edokoro azukari* 絵所預 (Head of the Imperial Painting Bureau). Once married to Motonobu, this daughter brought with her Tosa School painting secrets notably the method used to produce brilliant color pigments, an essential technique of *yamato-e*.⁸⁶ However, the historicity of this marriage has been disproved by a number of scholars. Quitman E. Phillips specifically argued that the unification of Japanese and Chinese painting styles (*wakan yūgo* 和漢融合), the “Kano Myth,” was constructed by Einō, to narrate an image of his school taking control over the entire painting world.⁸⁷ According to Einō, Motonobu's style was transmitted and further developed by his grandson Kano Eitoku 狩野永徳 (1543-90) into a more ostentatious and bold style, which was suited to the prominent *daimyō*, who wanted to display their wealth and power during the Momoyama period.

Einō ends his narrative of *Honchō gashi* with a glorious biography of Sanraku. Kawamoto Keiko 川本桂子 has pointed out that this biography was heavily constructed to locate Sanraku as the official successor of Eitoku.⁸⁸ Einō attempted to elevate his marginalized social position within the Kano family system from a mere line of disciples

into the orthodox descendant of the masters, Motonobu and Eitoku, through stylistic transmission rather than heredity. Kawamoto actually recognizes that Sansetsu made a conscious effort to create a close tie with Eitoku in his painting style and method.⁸⁹ Although works of Sansetsu have been often described as hyper-sinophilic, he included prominent Japanese elements into his Orchid Pavilion, which I will demonstrate later in this chapter, and modified them into a version that satisfied his agenda and his patron's request to subtly resist the Tokugawa hegemony.

Einō was 21 years old when Sansetsu passed away in 1651. After that, Einō's frustration continued. The Edo-Kano team allowed Einō to work with them for the project to paint the Imperial Palace in 1655, 1662, and 1675.⁹⁰ However, they gave him only a minor role to play in those projects.⁹¹ Furthermore, Tan'yū's disciple, Tsurusawa Tanzan 鶴沢探山 (1658-1729) was sent to Kyoto to establish the Tsurusawa-ha 鶴沢派 (the Tsurusawa School), a branch of the Edo-Kano, to take some of the important commissions from the imperial court and religious institutions, which were otherwise enjoyed by the Kyō-Kano.⁹²

Consequently, it was natural that Einō expressed resentment against the Edo-Kano led by Tan'yū. In the first edition in 1621, Einō excluded the biography of Tan'yū. However, Hayashi Gahō 林鷺峰, who also wrote *Kano Einō kaden gajiku jo* later in 1669, and wrote its preface, the so-called *Honchō gaden jo* 本朝画伝序, advised Einō through their mutual friend Kurokawa Dōyū 黒川道祐 (?-1691), to include the biography of Tan'yū.⁹³ Moreover, Gahō suggested that Einō should refer to his writing, the "Epitaph of Tan'yū," mentioned earlier, when producing his biography. Without any choice, Einō agreed to add Tan'yū in the second edition in 1623; however, he refused to use the

Epitaph and wrote his own idea of Tan'yū. In his biography, Einō stated that Tan'yū was responsible for the *ippen* 一変 or “transformation” of the Kano painting style. He affirmed that “he changed the nature of the Kano family style, and established a new line of his own house” 自然一変狩野氏自成一家 [independent from the Kano masters in the past]. A painter-theorist of a later generation, Nakabayashi Chikutō 中林竹洞, adapted Einō's account and also stated that “Tan'yū changed the style of the old Kano School” in his *Chikutō garon* 竹洞画論 in 1802.⁹⁴ Chikutō added that “because Tan'yū could not bear the possibility of the Kano style becoming vulgar, he reduced his brush strokes and used ink economically.”⁹⁵ Another art treatise, *Kinsei meiga shaga dan* 近世名画書画談, from the end of Edo period, emphasized the same point.⁹⁶ At first, Einō accepted that “Tan'yū was extremely popular; everyone wanted to learn from him and nobody would disagree with his established position,” but interestingly he shifted his narrative and concluded with a criticism that “none of the followers of Tan'yū is capable of understanding his high attitude, and they lost track of the ancient style [as result of this transformation].”⁹⁷

Reading *Honchō gashi*, Kano Hiroyuki 狩野博幸 in “The Edo-Kano and the Kyō-Kano” noted that Sansetsu was the prime person who conceived of anti-Tan'yū sentiment. Sakakibara Satoru 榊原悟 further discusses that Einō was the one who theorized and formulated his father's idea.⁹⁸ Igarashi also suggests that it was Sansetsu who decided the direction of *Honchō gashi*, to connect the origin of the Kano and the Sanraku line, which was inherited by Einō.⁹⁹ By placing the biography of Sanraku at the end of “Professional Family Painters,” and constructing him as rightful successor of Eitoku, Einō claimed that Sansetsu and he were the legitimate successors of the Kano

family line. This was done so successfully that Sansetsu became overshadowed by Sanraku and the authorship of many works painted by Sansetsu, such as the *Orchid Pavilion*, was erroneously attributed to Sanraku for many centuries.

Einō inherited his scholastic aptitude from Sansetsu, and completed his father's mission to publish a history of Japanese painters. His association with intellectual networks also continued from his father's into his own generation. For instance, Einō's best friend, Kurokawa Dōyū, who played an intermediate role between Gahō and Einō when Gahō advised Einō to include Tan'yū's biography in *Honchō gashi*, was the grandson of Hori Kyōan to whom Sansetsu taught painting. Their mutual friend, Igarashi Bai'an 五十嵐梅庵 (1612-1673), was another Confucian doctor. Einō often participated in poetry gatherings with him. Bai'an was a close friend of Gahō as well.

The Possible Patronage of the *Orchid Pavilion* Painting

There is no document that records the patronage behind Sansetsu's *Orchid Pavilion*, but one possibility has been suggested by a number of scholars. The Kyō-Kano founders, Sanraku and Sansetsu, both encountered a life-threatening situation, but were pardoned shortly after the accusation.¹⁰⁰ Sanraku was accused of being a Toyotomi loyalist, and Sansetsu was arrested and incarcerated by the *bakufu* for an unknown reason but one that most likely involved a political problem.¹⁰¹ The question remains how they saved themselves from extreme adversity. In the case of Sanraku, did Shōkadō Shōjō, a Buddhist priest, really have enough influence over the *bakufu* to save Sanraku's life? *Butoku hen'nen shūsei* 武徳編年集成 (*Compiled Tales of the Tokugawa Victorious Years*) describes the aftermath of the Osaka Castle Campaign.¹⁰² According to this

source, the Toyotomi vassals, Yamakawa Kenshin 山川賢信 and Kitagawa Nobutoki 北川宣時, sought shelter at Otokoyama Hachiman shrine, as Sanraku had done. When the Tokugawa *bakufu* learned about it, they dispatched Akimoto Tanba no kami Yasutomo 秋元但馬守泰朝 to arrest them. At the time Yasutomo reached Otokoyama, they had already escaped. Instead of Yamanaka and Kitagawa, Yasuhiro arrested the priest Takimoto 瀧本坊住職 and his disciple Shikibukyō 式部卿 for the crime of harboring the loyalists.¹⁰³ Unquestionably, Priest Takimoto and his disciple were severely punished, and Otokoyama shrine was enveloped in a tense atmosphere.

It is also helpful to grasp a sense of the harshness of military persecution of that time, which is revealed in another document, *Tokugawa jikki* 徳川実記 (*the Veritable Records of the Tokugawa*). It records that “many Osaka retainers fled to the Hachiman shrine, and then the harsh revenge exacted upon them was extended to their women and children as well.”¹⁰⁴ These episodes make us wonder if Shōkadō Shōjō, although established in his cultural accomplishments, was able to save Sanraku as written by Hayashi Gahō or Shirai Kayō. Likewise, how did Sansetsu get himself out of prison? Their actual savior was someone who held higher social status, and who might also have links to the patronage of their paintings, including the Orchid Pavilion.

In 1989, Wakisaka Jun 脇坂淳 introduced a set of documents that were kept by the Kyō-Kano. He found an account written in the beginning of the Meiji period, *Goyōdome* 御用留 (*Recorded Affairs*), from the first day of the first month in 1869 to the third month in 1871), stating;

全九条家之御召思二て出来候事二有之旁、初代山楽徳川二代将軍へ之助命、
慶安年中当家二代目山雪関東被召橘氏之一例之由二て清水寺絵馬之事件よ
り事発、一命窮候件も九条家之御恩二て助命ト相成、当度二て三度二及候

The entire matter turned out well only because of the Kujō family's support; the
life of Sanraku the founder was saved by the Kujō family pleading with the
second Shogun; during the years of Kei'an, Sansetsu, the second generation
leader, was pardoned from his Kanto incarceration. At the time of the Votive
Panel incident of the Kiyomizu-dera temple, which occurred because of the
Tachibana clan, it was again the Kujō family that was their savior. Including this
time, we (the Kyō-Kano family) were saved altogether three times.¹⁰⁵

According to this information, the Kujō family went to the second shogun Tokugawa
Hidetada to plea for the life of Sanraku in 1615, and the same family saved Sansetsu from
his imprisonment later in 1649. The Kujō family was one of *gosseke* 五摂家, the most
powerful five aristocratic families who had monopolized the positions of *Kanpaku* 関白
(Regent) and *Sesshō* 摂政 (Chancellor) since the Kamakura period 鎌倉時代 (1192-
1333).¹⁰⁶ In 1615 and 1649, the Kujō family was headed by Kujō Yuki'ie 九条幸家
(1586-1665), the biological heir of Kujō Kanetaka 九条兼孝 (1553-1636), who was
appointed to be *Kanpaku* in 1608 and again in 1619 for the rest his life. What then was
the reason for Yuki'ie to save the lives of the Kyō-Kano twice? What was the connection
between them?

The answer goes back to when Sanraku began his career. As recorded in the
biography by Gahō, Sanraku was discovered by Toyotomi Hideyoshi, and had worked for

the Toyotomi clan closely. Hideyoshi brought him to Eitoku, who recognized his talent and adopted him into the Kano family. When Eitoku died suddenly, Hideyoshi ordered Sanraku to complete Eitoku's mission to restore the Dragon painting on the ceiling of Tōfuku-ji 東福寺 in 1590. After Hideyoshi's death in 1598, Sanraku continued to provide his services to Hideyori. In 1604, Hideyori at age 12, with his mother and a widow of Hideyoshi, Yodo-dono 淀殿 (1569-1615), commissioned Sanraku to paint the interior of a new mansion, which they prepared for the newly-married couple Kujō Yuki'ie and Sadako 完子 (1592-1658), who was the adopted daughter of Yodo-dono.¹⁰⁷ Sanraku painted the scene of *Kuruma arasoi* 車争い ("Carriage battle," figure 2. 11) from the Aoi 葵 (Heartvine) chapter of *The Tale of Genji*.¹⁰⁸ This work was originally painted on a *fusuma*, but was later remounted to be a pair of a four-panel folding screens, and is housed in the Tokyo National Museum today.

Sadako was the biological daughter of Oeyo お江与 (1573-1626), whose parents were Asai Nagamasa (1545-73) and Oichi お市 (1547-83), a sister of Oda Nobunaga 織田信長 (1534-82). It was the Sengoku 戦国 (Warring States) era: Nagamasa was killed by his brother-in-law Nobunaga at the Campaign of Kotani Castle 小谷城 in 1573. Sadako's father was Toyotomi Hidekatsu (1569-92) 豊臣秀勝, a biological nephew and adopted son of Toyotomi Hideyoshi. Sanraku must have been acquainted with Oeyo when she accompanied Hidekatsu to see Hideyoshi, since Sanraku was working for Hideyoshi. From time to time, Sanraku received commissions to paint the inner chambers of the Toyotomi residence. In this way, it was common for *goyō-eshi* to develop a personal connection with political personages.¹⁰⁹ Sadako was born the year

Hidekatsu died in the Bunroku Campaign 文禄の役 in 1592. As soon as Hidekatsu died, an arrangement was made for the widowed Oeyo to remarry the second shogun Tokugawa Hidetada becoming his official wife. Consequently, the new-born baby Sadako was adopted by Yodo-dono, who actually was a biological sister of Oeyo, and was raised at Osaka Castle. Sadako must have been brought up seeing Sanraku there often. There was another connection between Sanraku and these sisters, Yodo-dono and Oeyo; Sanraku's father Kimura Nagamitsu 木村永光 was a vassal of their father Nagamasa. In this way, Sanraku was actually a trusted vassal of Sadako through many layers of connection. Hence, it was natural for Yodo-dono and Hideyori to send Sanraku to produce the "Carriage battle" painting at Sadako's residence in 1604. We can imagine how delighted Sadako was to see Sanraku again in her new environment. While working for this project, Sanraku became acquainted with Yuki'ie who became a major patron of his workshop thereafter.

In addition, Kawamoto identifies the political affiliations in this "Carriage battle" painting. The figures are wearing costumes with the crest marks of Tokugawa family *mitsuba aoi* 三つ葉葵 (Three-leaved Heartvine) and Asai family *mitsu kikkô* 三つ亀甲 (three turtle shells); also the cultural authority inherent in the subject matter and its symbolic chapter title, "Aoi" is evident.¹¹⁰ Lady Aoi was the official wife of Prince Genji, the protagonist of the *Tale of Genji*. The carriage attendees of Lady Aoi get into a battle against and pushed away those of the Rokujô Haven, one of the mistresses of Genji, on the day of Kamo Festival.¹¹¹ Sanraku was probably instructed to visually imply a positive message in this "Carriage battle" painting. This is evident in the double image of Heian classical literature and the political situation of the early Tokugawa period,

especially emphasizing the improvement of the relationship between the Tokugawa *bakufu* and the Kujō family after the marriage of Yuki'ie and Sadako. This was one of the strategies Sansetsu learned from Sanraku and applied in his Orchid Pavilion painting.

Because of this connection, Yuki'ie asked Hidetada to pardon Sanraku. At the same time, Sadako's mother Oeyo must have asked her husband Hidetada to save him as well. Hidetada ordered that charges against Sanraku be dropped immediately. Moreover, Sanraku began to receive commissions from Hidetada after this incident. When Hidetada restored the Sumiyoshi Shrine in Settsu in 1618, Sanraku was appointed to paint Monju Bodhisattva on a part of the murals. Other examples of Sanraku receiving commissions from Hidetada and Oeyo are: *Kara jishi-zu* 唐獅子図 for Yōgen-in 養源院, Kyoto (1621); and *Shōtoku taishi eden* 聖徳太子絵伝 for Shiten'nō-ji 四天王寺 temple, Osaka (1623). Interestingly, Kano Takanobu, father of Tan'yū, a major player of the Edo-Kano, who once excluded the Kyō-Kano members, invited Sanraku for his projects after this incident.

According to a record in *Nijō-jō gyōkō no gotten e osashizu* 二条御城行幸之御殿絵御指図 (*Instruction of Imperial Visiting to Nijō Castle*), in 1626, Sanraku participated in the Nijō Castle project headed by Tan'yū. Around 1631, a prominent daimyo, Ikeda Terumasa 池田輝政, built two temples: one for his sister, Tenkyū-in 天球院, a sub-temple of Myōshin-ji 妙心寺; and the other for his wife, Ryōshō-ji 良正寺, a sub-temple of Chion-in 知恩院. Terumasa's wife Tokuhime 督姫 was a daughter of Tokugawa Ieyasu, and a half sister of Hidetada who gave permission to renovate these temples. The paintings in Tenkyū-in were executed by Sanraku and Sansetsu.¹¹² The authorship of specific paintings in this subtemple has been disputed, but in any case, they

indicate the transition of the Kyô-Kano leadership, as well as the stylistic transmission and transformation from Sanraku to Sansetsu.

As shown in the instances above, while Hidetada was alive, Sanraku was able to participate in *bakufu*-commission projects conducted by the Edo-Kano. However, after his death in 1632, the Kyô-Kano lost access to shogunal projects. Sanraku died in 1635, and Sansetsu became the leader of the workshop at age 46. Unlike Sanraku, there is no record of Sansetsu directly receiving commissions from the *bakufu*. The only way for Sansetsu and his Kyô-Kano workshop to survive was by depending on the Kujô family's support while consulting with his intellectual networks.

In 1632 Sansetsu's career briefly improved, when Hayashi Razan commissioned him to paint *Seireki daiju zu* 聖歴大儒図 (*A Series of Twenty-One Portraits of Chinese Confucian Masters*) in ink and color on paper on hanging scrolls. At first, Razan asked Shôkadô Shôjô to take this job; however, Shôjô was already elderly and concerned about taking up such a large project.¹¹³ He recommended Sansetsu to take his place. Razan then offered Sansetsu this project.¹¹⁴ Sansetsu communicated with Shôjô by exchanging letters in which Shôjô praised Sansetsu's painting. In 1639, Sansetsu painted *Fujiwara Seika kankyozu* 藤原惺窩閑居図 (*Fujiwara Seika live in seclusion*), which was inscribed by Hori Kyôan and Hayashi Razan. He also collaborated with Nawa Kassho to paint *Bankokuzu* 盤谷図 (*Pangu Valley*) about the same time. Besides, Sansetsu still received commissions from Buddhist temples, such as *Rôbai-zu* 老梅図 (*the Old Plum Tree*) for Tenshō-in 天祥院 in 1645, and *Unryûzu* 雲龍図 for Senyō-ji 泉桶寺 in 1647 through his connections inherited from Sanraku. Meanwhile, Sansetsu continued to receive support from Kujô Yuki'ie.

The paintings of Thirty-Three Kannon 三十三観音像 in Tōfuku-ji are by Minchō 明兆, but two scrolls had been lost. Former Regent Kujō Yuki'ie 九条幸家 (1586-1665) commissioned Sansetsu to produce replacements for the lost scrolls, which they planned to donate to the temple. As a reward for this achievement, Sansetsu received the rank of Hokkyō.¹¹⁵

Here Hayashi Gahō records in the *Preface to Honchō gaden* Yuki'ie's commission to replace two missing paintings of Minchō 明兆 (1352-1531) in Tōkoku-ji 東福寺, which led Sansetsu to receive the title of Hokkyō 法橋, a Buddhist rank rewarded to distinguished painters from the imperial court in 1647. Sansetsu painted two hanging scrolls representing *Kan'non tenryūyasha zu* 観音天龍夜叉図 (*Goddess of Mercy in the Realm of the Heavenly Dragon*, figure 2. 14).

Sansetsu must have been ecstatic at this moment. Nevertheless, Sansetsu was 57 years old at the time. His contemporary and younger, Tan'yū, on the other hand, had already ascended to the rank of Hōgan 法眼, higher than Hokkyō, at age 36 in 1638, that is, nine year earlier.¹¹⁶ Tan'yū was eventually promoted to the highest rank of Hō'in 法印 in 1662 after the death of Sansetsu, who never received this rank.¹¹⁷

Ironically, only two years after this moment, Sansetsu was arrested. According to *Goyōdome*, which elaborates the incident as revealed by the letter Sansetsu addressed to Einō claiming his innocence, Sansetsu was taken to Kantō (or Edo) at the institution of the Tachibana family. This account also reveals Kujō Yuki'ie's involvement in saving Sansetsu.

In the seventeenth century, the relationship between the Tokugawa *bakufu* and the imperial court was nervously complex. The *bakufu* established and enforced a new policy, the so-called *Kinchû narabi ni kuge shohatto* 禁中並公家諸法度.¹¹⁸ This policy ensured *bakufu* control over the imperial family and the aristocracy. For instance, the *gosseke* were not allowed to be appointed without the recommendation of the *bakufu*. As a shogunal son-in-law, Kujô Yuki'ie seemed to do well by strategically playing the go-between role for the imperial court and the Tokugawa *bakufu*. However, the overall situation was not pleasant for the aristocracy at that time. Yuki'ie must have enjoyed looking at the eccentric pictures painted by Sansetsu as an expression of resistance. Also, as an educated, discontented aristocrat himself, Yuki'ie must have appreciated painting themes such as the Orchid Pavilion, and possibly this was a reason for patronizing Sansetsu.

According to *Michifusa-kô ki* 道房公記, a diary of Kujô Michifusa, a son of Yuki'ie, Sansetsu was commissioned to paint the portraits of the Kujô family from Hôshô-ji 法性寺 (Kujô Tadamichi 九条忠通) to Tôkô-in 東光院 (Kujô Tanemichi 九条植通 1507-94). This project continued from 1635 to 1641, in the middle of the Kan'ei era.¹¹⁹ Yuki'ie's support was extended and Sansetsu received commissions from people related to the Kujô family. Although the actual works that survived are scarce, numerous works painted by Sansetsu are recorded. Konoe Naotsugu 近衛尚嗣, who was Kujô Yuki'ie's granddaughter's step-brother, wrote in his diary *Naotsugu-kô ki* 尚嗣公記 on the twenty-ninth day of the tenth month in 1644 that "Kano Sansetsu came by and painted the wall of the room" (狩野山雪来、画座敷之絵). This entry indicates that

Sansetsu made his visit on the thirtieth day of the same month, and the first, third, sixth and tenth day of the eleventh month to paint Naotsugu's residence.

Sansetsu's Orchid Pavilion paintings were housed at the three locations: Zuishin-in, Higashi Hongan-ji, and Ken'nin-ji. Therefore it is necessary to see how the Kujô family was connected to those Buddhist temples. Kawamoto Keiko speculates about the relationship between the Kujô family and the Orchid Pavilion *byôbu* of the Zuishin-in, while she articulates the production background of Sanraku's work in depicting the theme of the Competing Carriages, a scene from the *Tale of Genji*.¹²⁰

The patronage of the Orchid Pavilion *byôbu* has also been suggested by Matthew McKelway in his chapter concerning the *Chôgonka* scroll. He points out that Kujô Yuki'ie's brother Zôkô 増孝 (1644-?) and son Eigon 栄厳 (1622-64) served as abbots of Zuishin-in.¹²¹ The relationship between the Kujô family and Zuishin-in is recorded in *Zuishin-in kiroku* 随心院記録 (*Records of Zuishin-in*) as well. *Ono kagami* 小野鑑, which is part of *Zuishin-in kiroku*, records events that occurred between 1664 and 1667, and *Gobansho nikki* 御番所日記 records events in 1669 and after 1676.¹²² These diaries record how frequently Einô visited there for various reasons.¹²³

Zuishin-in is a Zentsû-ji temple of the Shingon sect 真言宗善通寺派, which was established by Ninkai 仁海 (951-1046) in 991.¹²⁴ It received imperial support in 1229 but fell into ruin during the Muromachi period. However, it was revived when Kujô Masutaka 九条増孝 (1589-1644), a son of Kujô Kanetaka 九条兼孝 (1553-1636), became its abbot in 1599. It was a part of a project for Kanetaka's brother Gi'en 義演 (1558-1626) to reestablish Daigo-ji 醍醐寺 with the support of Toyotomi Hideyoshi.

According to Igarashi, Kanetaka and Gi'en were both originally from the Nijô family. Kanetaka was adopted into the Kujô family who were childless at that time. Then the Nijô and Kujô families, who were both members of the *gosseke*, made an alliance to offer a deal to Hideyoshi to exchange the title of Kanpaku (Regent) for his support in rebuilding Zuishin-in and Daigo-ji. It seemed to work out well; from then, Zuishin-in became a *monzeki* 門跡 (Buddhist temple of imperial and aristocratic lineage), more specifically the Kujô family temple. Yuki'ie, the supporter of the Kyô-Kano, was a brother of Kujô Masutaka. It is natural that Yuki'ie's son Eigon inherited the position of abbot. In 1664, *Ono kagami* reports that Einô visited Zuishin-in on the twenty-first day of the fifth month and received a commission to paint the portrait of the abbot Eigon, ten days after his death. This portrait is still extant in the Zuishin-in collection. In this way, Einô received commissions from the Kujô family for the Zuishin-in. There is no record of Sansetsu's visit to Zuishin-in, since the *Ono kagami* starts from 1664 after the death of Sansetsu in 1650. However, it is not difficult to speculate that he also produced paintings for Zuishin-in based on his relationship with the Kujô family. He must have received commissions from the Kujô family to produce paintings, such as the Orchid Pavilion, to be donated to Zuishin-in.

Similarly, the Kujô family also was connected to Higashi Hongan-ji in multiple ways. For instance, Yuki'ie's daughter Seitô-in 成等院 was married to the thirteenth abbot of Higashi Hongan-ji Sennyô 宣如 (Mitsushige 光従, 1602-58), and gave birth to his successor Taku'nyô 琢如 (1625-71). Taku'nyô later became an adopted son of Kujo Michifusa 道房, the successor of Yuki'ie. It should be noted that Sennyô commissioned Ishikawa Jôzan, who inscribed the Orchid Pavilion by Sanraku (probably Sansetsu), to

design the garden that was constructed on the land, which was newly bestowed by the third shogun Tokugawa Iemitsu 徳川家光 (1623-51). This indicates how the close circles of cultured people were connected. Further, Yuki'ie's granddaughter, Kôô-in 光応院 became the wife of Jônnyo 常如 (Mitsuharu 光晴), the abbot of the later Higashi Hongan-ji.

The Kyô-Kano family had a special connection with Higashi Hongan-ji temple. Although Sansetsu's grave is located at Senyû-ji 泉桶寺, the Kano family's mortuary temple was Jôkei-ji 浄慶寺, a branch temple of Higashi Hongan-ji. They belonged to the Ôtani sect 大谷派 of Pure land Buddhism. In addition, Einô's second son, Eishô 永梢, became a member of the Higashi Hongan-ji *edokoro* 東本願寺画所 (painting studio). From this connection, Sansetsu painted the Orchid Pavilion, which is recorded in *Miyako meisho zue* discussed earlier, on the mural of *shoin* 書院 in this temple.

Igarashi suggests Einô functioned similar to a *machi-eshi*, who painted diverse subjects and genres receiving commissions from various clients, rather than an official painter, whose projects were constrained. As a consequence, with few restrictions, he expanded his repertory to include Buddhist iconic paintings, traditional narrative, and poetry-based subjects. He worked for Kaiôsan-ji 海王山寺 (1664) and Sugao-gû 菅生宮 (1680). Einô also produced numerous *engimono* 縁起物 (narrative painting scrolls in the service of religious institutions). For instance, he painted *Anato-dera engi emaki* 穴太寺縁起絵巻 (The Miraculous Origins of Anato-dera), donated by Retired Emperor Gomizunoo 後水尾院 in 1678.

Even in the time of Sanraku and Sansetsu, the Kyō-Kano produced *engimono*, such as *Taima-dera engi emaki* and *Shotoku taishi eden*, and *butsuga* 仏画 (religious iconic paintings), which were usually painted by *ebusshi* 絵仏師 or professional Buddhist painters. Einō reintroduced *butsuga* and *engimono emaki* as a new specialty of the Kyō-Kano workshop.¹²⁵ There are many works that were commissioned and donated by high ranking aristocrats on behalf of Buddhist temples and shrines. Judging from circumstantial evidence, the probability of the Kujō family's patronage in donating the Orchid Pavilion painting to Zuishin-in is quite high.

Sansetsu's Production Attitude Recorded in the Texts

Prior to scrutinizing the Zuishin-in version, and to demonstrate the sociopolitical messages of Sansetsu, I will reconsider his production attitude and iconographical choices as explained by Hayashi Gahō and Kano Einō in the early Edo period.

Hayashi Gahō, in the *Kano Eino kaden gajiku jo* of 1669, explained the attitude of Sansetsu towards paintings:

Sansetsu would often say that since the medieval period, it was common that those who painted ancient Chinese themes would not look at original accounts but instead would lose their way in popular explanations. Thus one should investigate their accuracy, make judgments, and correct the falsehoods. From things like not knowing to make Zhang Liang young but painting him with an adult's face in [the depiction of] 'returning shoes at Xiapi'; to giving [Dong] Fangshuo a pair of attendants instead of one when he gazes at [Xi] Wangmu – using fresh ideas as the means to improve the pictures of things; in every case he

[Sansetsu] achieved this. Whether dragons in clouds or human figures, in each case he would study the traces and could master many of them.¹²⁶

Some twenty years later, Kano Einô recorded his father's attitude toward painting in the *Gadai* 画題 (Painting Themes) section of *Honchô gashi* in 1691 and 1693 as follows:

Rivers and mountains of ten thousand *li*, waves and cliffs, or the *Eight Views of Xiao Xiang*, the *Ten Views of West Lake*, and the *Ten Snows and Jinshan* are all subjects of painting. Paintings on these subjects frequently appear today, but there are many who make mistakes in copying and learning from ancient paintings. For example, they depict sailboats on West Lake in Hangzhou because they don't realize how narrow the lake actually is. Or when they paint the 'Song of Lasting Sorrow' they don't realize that the *fuyô* in Taiye Pool are lotuses and depict them as tree peonies. My late father Master Tôgen lamented these ills and sought to correct many mistakes based on older paintings. Those who see these works should make these distinctions.¹²⁷

According to these statements, Sansetsu regretted painters who made mistakes by following popular beliefs of visual representation without consulting original accounts. Although these writers did not include it in their lists of painting themes, the Orchid Pavilion was clearly a typical Chinese theme Sansetsu particularly cared about. In the case of the Orchid Pavilion, the "original account" mentioned by Gahô refers to *Lantingxu*, and the "ancient paintings" that provide the "correct information" refer to the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing that often accompanied the *Lantingxu* scroll. As examined in Chapter One, the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing's pictorial elements do not quite faithfully

illustrate the *Lantingxu* text; it is, nonetheless, the oldest visual representation to establish the canon of this tradition.

It is possible then that Sansetsu was complaining against the attitudes of Edo-Kano painters. Although the Edo-Kano painted the Orchid Pavilion slightly after Sansetsu passed away, he must have been able to guess how they would paint this theme. None of the Edo-Kano painters – Tan’yû, Yasunobu and Shôun – painted Wang Xizhi’s forty-one guests correctly. Instead they reduced their number drastically, and minimized the landscape to increase their trademark “elegantly empty space”. Tan’yû even eliminates the bamboo, which was clearly mentioned in the text. In order to contrast the approach of the Edo-Kano, Sansetsu executed his version with meticulous iconological precision; however, he also created a new iconography, and added it to his Orchid Pavilion, which I will discuss below.

Re-attributing Authorship of the Orchid Pavilion Painting

The Zuishin-in version of the Orchid Pavilion by Sansetsu, which is formatted into two pairs of eight-panel *byôbu*, has been reproduced in numerous publications, including exhibition catalogues.¹²⁸ However, there is no article devoted entirely to this work so far. Previous studies of this work are mainly geared towards three different directions. The earliest study revealed the stylistic differences between the work of Sansetsu and that of his father-in-law Sanraku to reattribute the authorship of this painting.

The Zuishin-in version of the Orchid Pavilion does not include the artist’s signature or seal. It was reattributed to Sansetsu by Doi Tsugiyoshi 土居次義 (1906-

1991) by means of his extensive research based on meticulous stylistic analysis conducted since the pre-war era (1930s and 1940s). However, the Zuishin-in version was believed to be authored by Sansetsu's father-in-law and the founder of the Kyo-Kano Workshop, Kano Sanraku. This belief was passed through the oral tradition of Zuishin-in, who has owned this painting for many generations.¹²⁹ As discussed earlier, this phenomenon mainly resulted from the glorification of Sanraku by his grandson Einô in *Honchô gashi*. Likewise, numerous other important paintings, without a signature and seal, have been thought to have been painted by Sanraku, only to later be reattributed to Sansetsu.

In the early seventeenth century, Sansetsu had a sociopolitical need to avoid the mainstream artistic movement. As a result he actually became the forefront of a growing trend of that time to borrow subjects from imported Chinese paintings, painting manuals and printed materials, and also to invent new methods of painting Japanese subjects.¹³⁰ Sansetsu inscribed on paintings describing other themes, such as *Chogonka* and *Mt. Fuji*, to claim his first authorship of these particular themes or methods of depiction.¹³¹ Although it is not inscribed in this case, Sansetsu is the first artist who produced the Orchid Pavilion's pictorial representation in the *byôbu* format, establishing a Japanese ideal form. It was also a method of demonstrating Sansetsu's knowledge of the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing.

There are, nevertheless, two extant Orchid Pavilion hanging scrolls in horizontal format said intriguingly to be painted by Kano Sanraku. A work housed in the Eigawa Museum 頤川美術館 in Hyogo Prefecture includes two seals on the right, one of which reads "Sanraku" on the lower right of the composition (figure 2. 15). The seals could

have been stamped on by a later generation. This work is characterized by meticulous brushstrokes, as well as the highly calculated and geometrical composition of Sansetsu. The elements in the landscape, especially an upside-down triangular shaped rock located over the caves near the Orchid Pavilion structure in this painting, are almost identical to that of Sansetsu in his Zuishin-in version (figure 2. 16). This rock is repeated in the Higashi Hongan-ji draft (figure 2. 2). This shape of rock was one of the most significant clues for Doi to reattribute the Zuishin-in version to Sansetsu.

The Eigawa Museum version obviously exhibits a knowledge of the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing. It starts with the Orchid Pavilion on the right, followed by the figures seated on both sides of the riverbank, and ends with a bridge. The treatment of the bridge on the left of composition also resonates with that in the Zuishin-in version by Sansetsu. Thus, I would argue that it should be reattributed to Sansetsu. Moreover, this painting is inscribed with *Lantingxu* by Ishikawa Jôzan 石川丈山 (1503-1672), who was a “samurai turned recluse.”¹³² He was known to be Sansetsu’s friend, and engaged in literati conversation with him. This inscription concludes with his seal, and is read “Rokuroku sanjin” 六六山人, which is a studio name he began to use after his return from Hiroshima to Kyoto in 1641. Sanraku died in 1635, so it is natural to think this work was painted by Sansetsu.

The artist structured this painting with a diagonal composition. The upper right is occupied by high mountains with a slope going down to the left. There is the possibility that Tan’yû, who painted his Orchid Pavilion in 1670, might have seen this hanging scroll since it shows a similar diagonal composition to Tan’yû’s scroll (figure 2. 3). The details, however, are totally different. Figures are depicted in crowds and in small scale by

Sansetsu, but when Tan'yû adapted this theme, the number of figures was reduced to only seven scholars.

Another hanging scroll representing the Orchid Pavilion theme attributed to Sanraku was published in an auction catalogue in 1917 but its current location is unknown (figure 2. 17). Although this work is less geometrical and intense than the Eigawa Museum version, its basic composition and pictorial scheme are almost identical. However, the rocks over the cave in this version may resemble the rocks painted in Sanraku's Peony painting (figure 2. 18) on *fusuma* at Daikaku-ji 大覚寺.¹³³ Since the peony painting was produced in the early stage of Sanraku's career, it represents his Keichô 慶長 (1596-1615) style.¹³⁴ It could be a study piece by Sansetsu trying to learn the style of his father-in-law, prior to the stage when he began to take up his own eccentric mode. A hundred years later, Shirai Kayô 白井華陽, an Edo-era painter and theorist, in his *Gajô yôryaku* 画乗要略, noted that Sansetsu learned his painting method from Sanraku but changed it later to his own manner, stating: "Kano Sansetsu was an adopted son of Sanraku. His studio name was Dasokuken. He learned painting from his step-father; however, he changed his style later in his career."¹³⁵ Kohitsu Ryôchû 古筆了仲 examined Sansetsu's works in the early Meiji period and stated in *Fusô gajin den* 扶桑画人伝 that "[Sansetsu's] paintings are drastically different from his father Sanraku's style. Many of his compositions are unpredictable."¹³⁶

The considerable differences between the styles of Sanraku and Sansetsu can be attributed to political differences. Sanraku was the best disciple of Eitoku who was considered the greatest master of the Momoyama painting. Hence, Sanraku had as his agenda to be the best disciple of Eitoku to maintain the Momoyama perspective, in order

to insure his own position. On the other hand, Sansetsu had a drive to create something new as a matter of survival, to contest the mainstream Kano taste as set by Tan'yû. His emphasis on new Chinese painting themes was one of these attempts. While authorship – whether Sanraku or Sansetsu – of some works, such as the murals in Tenkyû-in, still remains under debate, the authorship of the Zuishin-in version of the Orchid Pavilion was proved by Doi Tsugiyoshi and subsequent scholars agree with his reattribution to Sansetsu.

Comparing the Orchid Pavilion Screen by Kano Einô

One of the approaches to studying the Zuishin-in *byôbu* is to compare it to the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing, and with a version (figure 2. 1) by Sansetsu's son Einô. The version by Einô is also painted with ink and intense color pigments over applied gold leaf on paper. It was produced in the second half of the seventeenth century, probably several decades after Sansetsu's death. Einô used a pair of six-panel *byôbu*, measuring 153.5 cm in height and 359.0 cm in width per panel, which is a standard size. This work is currently housed at the Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art. Its provenance is unknown. There is a signature and a seal by Einô located at the first panel of the right screen and at the sixth panel of the left screen.

永納 白文方印

Einô (white square seal)

山静 白文方印

Sansei (white square seal)

Igarashi Kôichi and Tatara (Matsumura) Takiko 多田羅多起子 agree that the version by Einô is more faithfully related to the Ming ink rubbing than that of Sansetsu.¹³⁷ Tatara further suggests as a possible date of this work the first year of Enpô

延宝元年 (1673), which fell on the year of *kichû* 癸丑, symbolized water and ox in Chinese zodiac calendar.¹³⁸ She also proposes that Einô's work shows characteristics that are independent from Sansetsu, although it has been often seen as a modified imitation of the Zuishin-in version by Sansetsu. Igarashi, however, complicates the issue and introduces another Orchid Pavilion *byôbu* painted by Einô located in a private collection in Toyama prefecture (figure 2. 19). Although only the right side of the pair has survived, this *byôbu* is closely related to the right side of the Shizuoka version. The Toyama version has inscriptions and seals indicating Einô's authorship:

永納筆 落款	Einô (inscription)
狩野氏 朱文橢円印	Kano-shi (red oval seal)
山静 白文方印	Sansei (white square seal)
永納 朱文方印	Einô (red square seal)

Keeping *Honchô gashi* in mind and observing the Orchid Pavilion images by Sansetsu and Einô reveals the Kyô-Kano's complicated sociopolitical situation. When Yamashita Yoshiya compared these two Orchid Pavilion paintings, he indicated that Einô's style contains two different characteristics: while inheriting the intense color application and the formal elements of the Kyô-Kano workshop from Sansetsu, he simultaneously inclines towards the space-conscious compositional scheme of the Edo-Kano led by Tan'yû.¹³⁹ Einô's combining these two antagonistic styles in his Orchid Pavilion suggests his responsibility to manage the Kyô-Kano workshop as the third generation leader. Although in a minor role, Einô was invited to work on the Edo-Kano's Kyoto projects. As a survival strategy, Einô adapted Edo-Kano elements, while emphasizing the Kyô-Kano heritage of his painting. Hence, Einô's style appears not only

to be structured on Sanraku and Sansetsu's style, but also on the remains of Tan'yû's new airily and highly abbreviated ink style.

He was aware of conflict and hierarchy within the branches of the Kano School. Hence, he chose specific characteristics of his father to please the Kyō-Kano clients; at the same time he adapted Tan'yû's style to maintain the relationship with the Edo-Kano. The existence of almost identical *byōbu* further indicates that Einō created his new style, resulting from the sociopolitical situation of that time, which in turn, was favored by the clients who requested him to produce the Orchid Pavilion painting more than once. With the tremendous effort made by Einō, who witnessed Sansetsu's humiliation, the Kyō-Kano family survived until the end of Edo period.

Scrutinizing the *Orchid Pavilion* by Sansetsu

I have so far attempted to recontextualize the production and reception of the Zuishin-in version of the Orchid Pavilion painting by Sansetsu. Based on this information, I am striving to decode the messages conveyed in the painted representation. The Orchid Pavilion's visual representation, in general, exhibits three significant motifs: landscape, architecture, and figural representations. Although the works of Sansetsu, represented by the *Orchid Pavilion*, are often identified with a strong Chinese taste and inclination, his work simultaneously contains heavily Japanized elements. This intercultural approach is his strategy to demonstrate that he is continuing the styles of previous Kano masters represented by Motonobu, Eitoku, and Sanraku. In his Orchid Pavilion painting, Sansetsu utilized opaque colors that meticulously fill the outlines of every pictorial element, a technique found in the *yamato-e* tradition of depicting Chinese

themes. It is a time-consuming and labor-intensive technique. The sumptuous use of these expensive materials suggests the financial status of Sansetsu's patrons, powerful aristocrats such as the Kujô family.

The Landscape of the *Orchid Pavilion*

In most of the Orchid Pavilion paintings, including the Zuishin-in version, the landscape elements are extremely important. Since the scholarly gathering was held at Wang Xizhi's retreat, the Orchid Pavilion, which stood in an actual location in the Kuaiji Hills near Shanyin in Zhejiang Province, it presumably depicts that region. In the *Lantingxu* text, Wang Xizhi described the landscape of the gathering as follows:

The area had high mountain ridges, luxuriant woods, and tall bamboo, as well as limpid streams with surging rapids glittering like a jade belt on both sides. The water was channeled to a meandering rivulet for floating the wine cups, with guests seated on both banks.¹⁴⁰

This passage involves mainly three landscape elements: 1) lofty mountains and majestic peaks; 2) luxuriant woods and bamboo groves; and 3) clear streams and rushing currents. Through depicting these elements, Sansetsu strove in his own way to demonstrate his understanding and interpretation of this locale.

Eccentric Rocks and a Mysterious Cave

The lofty mountains in the Zuishin-in version are suggested in the background of the first and the end of last screen but otherwise, they seem to be hidden behind the gold leaf and thus unseen. Sansetsu depicted every landscape detail of his Orchid Pavilion

with meticulously controlled geometrical, yet nervously twisted, forms. This characteristic is most apparent in his depiction of the rocks that are schematically arranged along the stream. These rocks indicate Sansetsu's effort to learn from previous Kano masters and from Chinese paintings, while inventing new visual expressions.

The surface of the rocks is configured with a combination of thin solid lines and angular textured brushstrokes, in order to increase the decorative quality. Since the edges are defined by bold outlines, the rocks are separated from other forms and completely independent from the background. These distinctive, giant rocks are called "Kano rocks," and are part of the *kanga* tradition as explored by Kano founder Masanobu and Japanized by his son Motonobu. Kano's forefathers alluded to the styles of Chinese court painting, but altered them into a more angular and dominant style to cater to the samurai taste of the Ashikaga shoguns. The distinct textured brushwork of the "Kano rocks" was ultimately derived from the *fubi cun* 斧壁皴 (J. *fuheki shun*, axe cut texture stroke) used by the Southern Song 南宋 (1127-1279) Imperial Academy, especially by the Ma-Xia (Ma Yuan 馬遠, active before 1189-after 1225, and Xia Gui 夏珪, active early thirteenth century) Schools, whose style explicitly emphasized solid outlines and angular texture strokes.¹⁴¹ The early development of Kano rocks can be seen in the *Zen Patriarch Kyōgen Chikuan Sweeping with a Broom* (figure 2. 20) painted by Motonobu in 1513. In Motonobu's painting, the Zen patriarch is sweeping the front of a cottage built on a horizontally cut rock table. Sansetsu increasingly depicted his rocks in a more elaborate and geometric style, but he retained the general characteristics of "Kano rocks" to prove his stylistic lineage passed on from the Kano masters.

Further, he modified “Kano rocks” drastically and invented his own forms that are profoundly ornamental yet convey eccentric taste. Sansetsu formulated a very complicated and rather peculiar shape of rock as his own signature, which became a key for Doi to reattribute his authorship from Sanraku’s. The upside-down triangular-like geometric rock located in the third and fourth panels of the third screen of the Orchid Pavilion is a typical one he duplicated in many other paintings. For instance, in his later paintings, two hanging scrolls of the *Goddess of Mercy* of Tofuku-ji in 1647, the white-robed Kannon is seated on this peculiar rock. In *Seiko-zu* 西湖図 (*Xihu*, or the Western Lake, figure 2. 21), Sansetsu also repeated the same rock in the second panel of the right screen. It was a common practice for Sansetsu to repeat his favorite pictorial motifs over and over. Kitano Yoshie suggested that he might have used *Hainei jiguan* 海内奇觀 as its model.¹⁴² In addition, there are traces of landscape pictorial motifs adapted from *Gushi huapu* 顧氏画譜 by Gu Ping 顧炳 published in 1603.

Sansetsu painted caves and vertically standing rocks in the first screen of the Orchid Pavilion. Based on the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing scroll, which simply depicts two arched caves, Sansetsu took some liberties in altering their shapes. He kept only the left arch and depicted one half of the right arch, but let the other half of this cave extend over the water to suggest artificial instability. He placed a type of elaborated triangular rock between two arches to create a purposefully awkward form. Inside the cave, there are layers of triangular arches set to seduce the viewer visually into entering these curious depths. Since the overall composition is profoundly two-dimensional, the depth created only in this cave traps the unwary viewer. Further, it evokes the idea that this cave takes one into the world of immortals or into a utopia aspired to by intellectual hermits.

Naming himself “Tôgenshi” 桃源子 (Master of the Peach Spring), Sansetsu was conscious of the cave that functioned as a tunnel leading to the other side of the world, referred to in *Taohuayuanji* 桃花源記 (Tale of Peach Blossom Spring), a parable written by Tao Yuanming 陶淵明 (365-427), an Eastern Jin-dynasty poet-recluse. In this way, this cave can be said to be the spiritual connection between the vulgar and sacred worlds. It should be noted that the Japanese have long believed that rocks, especially those of an unusual shape, embody sacred powers and serve as temporary residences for deities.¹⁴³ This belief is evident in the building of Shintō shrines in the vicinity of many exceptionally shaped rocks. Sansetsu used such rocks to increase the sense of sacred power in his painting. He reproduced this cave on the mural in the project of Tenkyû-in in Myôshin-ji (figure 2. 22) in 1631.

It is intriguing that the forms of the rocks and the caves of Sansetsu are closely related to those of seventeenth century Chinese painters, such as Wu Pin 吳彬 (early 17th century), Chen Hongshou 陳洪綬 (1598-1652) and Fan Qi 樊圻 (1616-1694), whom James Cahill called “fantastics and eccentrics.”¹⁴⁴ Cahill explains that their “style, seen in such debased imitations of antiquity, either a violent wrench (as in Wu Pin) or a subtle twist (as in much of Chen Hongshou), managed to give them a new, if sometimes galvanic, life.”¹⁴⁵ The “Landscape” handscroll, for instance, painted in 1645 by Fan Qi (figure 2. 23), one of the Eight Masters of Nanjing, opens and closes with a passage obviously based on the fantastic landscape mode of Wu Pin, such as *A Thousand Peaks and Myriad Ravines* (figure 2. 24), a hanging scroll dated to 1617, depicting mysterious caves.¹⁴⁶ The unsettling and somber mood in these paintings is known to be the Ming loyalist-painters’ response to “the shock of the Manchu conquest, and their feeling of

alienation from the new social order.”¹⁴⁷ It was the same way Sansetsu felt as a Toyotomi loyalist-painter.

Through his networks of Sinophile intellectuals, Sansetsu must have had access to these works or something similar, even in printed form, which was almost contemporary to his work. In this way, Sansetsu was able to incorporate “aesthetically valid and unexpectedly moving” styles into his own Orchid Pavilion. Since his audiences were highly educated, he knew that they recognized that “the grotesqueries of these paintings are not the absurdities of ineptitude, although they may at first glance seem to be that, but highly sophisticated distortions and plays on old styles employed for special ends.”¹⁴⁸

Interestingly, a handscroll representing the Orchid Pavilion theme in 1671 by Fan Yi 樊沂 (active ca. 1658-71, figure 2. 25), the elder brother of Fan Qi, was imported to Japan.¹⁴⁹ Although this work was produced slightly after the time of Sansetsu, the concept of this type of Orchid Pavilion would have been available to him. I will discuss more about the provenance of this painting in the next chapter since it is an important transitional influence for the mid-eighteenth century Japanese literati movement. It is, nonetheless, obvious that the seed of literati movement had been to be incubating since the era of Sansetsu.

In the fourth screen of the Zuishin-in version, there are three rocks located in the foreground. Among them, the form of the center – a combination of perpendicular and horizontal lines – is identical to that in another Orchid Pavilion attributed to Sanraku that appeared in an auction catalogue and also in the peony painting by Sanraku housed in Daikaku-ji 大覺寺. This particular rock marks the stylistic shift from Sanraku to Sansetsu, and in turn, it symbolizes the transition from the Momoyama to early Edo.¹⁵⁰

This transition is also the visualization of the Kyō-Kano's claim that they are in charge of the orthodox Kano stylistic authority, which is the hidden message conveyed in the *Honchō gashi*.

Behind these rocks, the composition ends with the high cliff and large rocks. There is a nervously twisting path twining around the cliff, leading the viewer into the golden mist on the left. The forms of this cliff, rocks and path at the end of Orchid Pavilion resonate with those in the *Bangoku zu* 盤谷図 (the *Pangu Valley*, figure 2. 26) by Sansetsu. Kano Eigaku 狩野永岳 (1790-1867), a ninth generation descendant of the Kyō-Kano, recorded that Sansetsu painted this work not for sale, but to be kept in the Kyō-Kano family.¹⁵¹ Hayashi Susumu 林進 explains that the Pangu Valley refers to a place where Li Yuan, a Tang-dynasty scholar, gave up his position at the court and removed himself in idealistic reclusion. Since no visual representation illustrating the Pangu Valley was available at that time, Sansetsu imagined the scene by collecting information from mainly textual materials. Hayashi further demonstrates how Sansetsu used the iconography of woodblock printed manuals such as *Liexian quanzhuan* 列仙全伝 (J. *Retsusen zenden*), *Lienuzhuan* 列女伝 (J. *Retsujo-den*) and *Gujin huapu* 古今画譜 (J. *Kokin gafu*) to develop his own motifs.¹⁵² Among them, the scene from *Xiaoting youjing tu* 小亭幽径図 (Small Pavilion and Deep Path, figure 2. 27) of *Gujin huapu* relates to the landscape depicted in the Tenkyū-in mural, which in turn was incorporated into the landscape of the fourth screen of the Orchid Pavilion. Using this information as a basis, Sansetsu projected in his landscapes his mindscape of being a talented but humiliated artist who tried to find a place of immortality that promised him security and salvation.¹⁵³

Shane McCausland has pointed out the possibility that Sansetsu studied another group of woodblock printed materials, the scenes of “Plank Roads to Sichuan” and “Mount Emei” from *Sancai tuhui* 三才圖會 (figure 2. 28) to produce the landscape in the second volume of *Chôgonka* scrolls. Considering the close connection between the landscapes of both works – the Pangu Valley and *Chôgonka* scrolls- it is also possible that Sansetsu employed the scenes from *Sancai tuhui* as sources for parts of the landscape of the Orchid Pavilion. In any case, the rocks and cave depicted in *Orchid Pavilion* are assembled from many different sources; all of which refer to aspiration towards a reclusive life, because of political discontent.

Waterfalls and the Meandering Stream

Sansetsu used the form of a stream as the most pronounced element to create a distinctive composition in his Orchid Pavilion painting. He depicted an extremely long stream to establish a horizontal composition, which is reemphasized by a long format produced by connecting the two pairs of eight-panel screens. It is a reworking of the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing handscroll on a monumental scale, with the eye of the viewer set to move from right to left along the stream. The narrow band of the stream sluggishly begins from a large bank of water in the first half of the screen, and continues to flow without changing its width or speed and ending at the massive rock in the sixth panel of the last screen. Although Sansetsu modified numerous pictorial elements, its basic composition seems to be traced from the stone rubbing. All the pictorial elements are placed in the fore- and middle ground, which is divided by this stream, except for the waterfalls behind the rock next to the pavilion.

Sansetsu used *kira* 雲母 (mica) dust to paint the water in the Orchid Pavilion.

Kira is a powdered mineral that shines elegantly with a dim light. It is appropriate to represent “limpid streams with surging rapids glittering like a jade belt on both sides,” as described in the *Laningxu*. The nature of ink rubbing makes it impossible to know the color of the water. As stated in *Honchô gashi*, Sansetsu made an effort to demonstrate that he had an accurate understanding of the account. The pattern of the water movement is rhythmically drawn with ink on the surface of the *kira* to increase the design quality of the work. In *Honchô gashi*, *kira* is usually applied economically only to represent the petals of flower in the pictures and to make them shine. In case of the Orchid Pavilion, *kira* is applied densely and lavishly.

There are two waterfalls, in the upper and lower part of the third and fourth panels of the first screen. The upper waterfall is depicted in a complex method with many layers of light ink, gold power, and *kira*. The mist is represented over the waterfall to create a sense of mysterious spatial depth. The shape of this waterfall resonates with that of Tenkyû-in, Myôshin-ji (figure 2. 22).

The lower waterfall is also shown at multiple locations such as the Jin’ô-ji Landscape, *Tendai Shogun-zu*, the Tenkyû-in landscape, and so forth. Sansetsu repeated these motifs, which were recorded in *Sanraku Sansetsu Sansui-jô* 山楽山雪山水帖 (Album of Landscape Paintings by Kano Sanraku and Sansetsu, figure 2. 29).¹⁵⁴ He used this *funpon* to reiterate the same motifs that were appropriate for reused. This album, consisting of forty-eight *funpon* images, was treasured as cultural capital by the Kyô-Kano workshop for many generations.¹⁵⁵

Woods, Bamboo Groves and Orchid

Sansetsu painted his ornamental plants by applying shimmering *rokushô* (green color mineral pigment) against a gold-leaf background. Distinct species of plants stand vertically against the horizontal composition, to create a highly calculated geometric effect. The design of the plants is copied from multiple sources, using the *funpon* technique. For instance, tall tropical-type trees identified as *shuro* 棕櫚 (hemp palm), are standing vertically near the bridge in the fourth screen (figure 2. 30). The form of this plant corresponds to one found in the *Kinkishogazu* 琴棋書画図 (*Four Noble Pastimes of Zither, Go Game, Calligraphy and Painting*, figure 2. 31) painted on *fusuma* by Kano Eitoku, the Momoyama master. It was Eitoku who transformed the Kano style into a more decorative style, in order to display the power and wealth of the prominent *daimyô*, in the Momoyama period. As part of the Japanization process of Chinese painting, Eitoku transformed the Southern Song Chan 禪 (J. Zen) style of Muqi's soft and gentle dots into bristling, angular configurations of rocky shores and plants that dominate the space. It was important for Sansetsu to demonstrate that he had access to the Kano master's style to satisfy a political agenda. At the same time, in order to achieve an accurate transmission of the contents of *Lantingxu* and also in accordance with the ink rubbing images, Sansetsu painted the "luxurious woods and tall bamboo" meticulously, although the pictorial motif is taken from another source.

Architectural Elements in *Orchid Pavilion*

Sansetsu's Sources of Inspiration

Sansetsu studied the forms of Chinese architecture from Momoyama *byôbu* and woodblock printed manuals imported from China. One of the Momoyama visual representations that Sansetsu heavily relied on was the *Teikan zu* 帝鑑図 (*Illustration of the Didactic Story for Emperors*, figure 2. 32) painted by Sanraku. This is a pair of six-panel *byôbu* depicting examples of (six good and six bad) ancient Chinese emperors who are seated in their terraced palaces. This *byôbu* served as a visual dictionary for Sansetsu, which he consulted regarding all of the details of Chinese buildings. It is known that Sanraku painted his *Teikan-zu* based on a Chinese illustrated *hanpon* 版本 (woodblock printed book), titled *Dijian tushuo* 帝鑑図説 (J.*Teikanzusetsu, Illustrated Arguments in the Mirror of the Emperors*), which was originally authored by Zheng Juzheng 張居正 and Lu Diaoyang 呂調陽 in 1573.¹⁵⁶ Toyotomi Hideyori imported it and had it republished in Japan in 1606. It was obtained and studied first by Sanraku.¹⁵⁷ Sansetsu must have consulted this *hanpon* as well as Sanraku's work. He incorporated the architectural elements – tiled roof, multiple terraces, checkered floor, ornamental walls, and so forth – particularly from the sections of *Zhaoru jiangjing* 詔儒講經 (figure 2. 33), *Binli guren* 賓礼故人 (figure 2. 34), *Xiefeng chuguan* 斜封除官 (figure 2. 35), and *Yushu xinshen* 玉樹新声 (figure 2. 36).¹⁵⁸ As briefly mentioned earlier, Tan'yû also consulted this *hanpon* to paint the *Juguan cibû* 拒関賜布 section of *Teikanzu oshie hari byôbu* 帝鑑図押絵貼屏風 before 1621, and adapted it into his own *Orchid Pavilion* in 1670. Many Kano artists used this material thereafter.

Nanban byôbu 南蛮屏風 (*Arrival of Westerners in Japan*) is another popular painting theme among the Kano painters of the Momoyama period, depicting the scenes of “exotic” places, people, and cultures, from the Japanese point of view. Although this genre was formulated as a result of contact with Westerners, the images painted in *nanban byôbu* are based on imagination. Hence, the motifs of *nanban byôbu* convey a dream-like mood of fantasy which appealed to the Japanese. Among numerous works, Sanraku produced a version (figure 2. 37) now housed in the Suntory Museum of Art. Sansetsu attempted to increase the sense of this dream-like alternative world in his Orchid Pavilion painting, so he incorporated pictorial elements of *nanban byôbu*. The design and green color of the arched foundation of the *nanban* building corresponds to the sides of the bridge (figure 2. 38) in the Orchid Pavilion fifth panel of the fourth screen. Both are decorated with highly stylized ascending, twisted dragon motifs.

The dragon is an extremely important motif used to elaborate the details of architectural forms.¹⁵⁹ Another dragon, more realistically depicted this time, framed in the pointed-arched panel behind the seated sage in the Myôshin-ji *Shôsan shikô zu* (figure 2. 39), is duplicated exactly in the two panels of foundations of Sansetsu’s Orchid Pavilion structure (figure 2. 40). On these panels, Sansetsu depicted two dragons framed by the pointed, arched panels emerging from the water. These dragons are visual allusions to the commemorative event of Kyô-Kano history, the Tōfuku-ji project by Sanraku to paint a dragon on the ceiling in 1588. Kano Einô recorded this event in the glorified biography of Sanraku in *Honchô gashi*:

公修營東福寺法堂。天井有僧明兆画龍。曾逢雷火而損。公使永徳補之、画雲未画龍而永徳罹病危急。乃授其草本於光頼以補成之。明兆所画其紙壞

矣。光頼欲画之、去其紙施粉於板上。龍頭二丈余、身長十八丈。数日而終其功。時光頼三十四余歳。自是禪林法堂天井板必画蟠龍焉。

Lord Hideyoshi decided to repair the Lecture Hall of Tōfuku-ji. There was a painting of a dragon by Minchō the priest-painter, but it was destroyed by fire when thunder struck. Lord Hideyoshi appointed Eitoku to replace this painting. However, Eitoku suddenly came down with a serious illness when he had just painted the cloud and had not begun to work on the dragon. Thereupon, Lord Hideyoshi handed Mitsuyori (Sanraku) a draft of a dragon, and commissioned him to complete this project. The dragon image by Minchō was painted on a sheet of paper and pasted on the ceiling. Because the paper was damaged, Mitsuyori removed it, applied *gofun* onto the ceiling, and painted the dragon directly. The dragon was enormous as its head measured two *jō* [approximately 6.06 meters] and its body was eighteen *jō* [approximately 54.54 meters] in length. He completed his project in a few days. This happened when he was a few years past thirty years of age. Since then, it became a custom for Zen temples to have a dragon image on the ceilings of the Lecture Hall.¹⁶⁰

Hayashi Gahō also summarized this event in his Preface to *Kano Einō kaden gajikujo* as following:

公修營東福寺法堂、堂棟板有僧明兆画龍。嘗逢雷火而損。公使永徳補之画雲未画龍、而永徳罹病危急。乃依公命而授其草本於光頼、以補成之。由是其名顯于世。

Lord Hideyoshi decided to repair the Lecture Hall of Tōfuku-ji, where a painting of a dragon by Minchō the priest-painter was. It was struck by thunder and

burned. Lord Hideyoshi ordered Eitoku to replace this painting, but he fell ill suddenly, when he has just painted the cloud and not yet painted the dragon. Lord Hideyoshi handed Mitsuyori a draft of the painting and commanded him to complete the project. He became famous after this project.¹⁶¹

According to these accounts, the founder of the Kyō-Kano, Sanraku, was promoted when he successfully substituted for Eitoku and replaced the dragon painting originally painted by Minchō. Hideyoshi was the prime patron of Tōfuku-ji. Unfortunately, this enormous dragon painting was burned when a major fire destroyed the Tōfuku-ji Lecture Hall in 1881.¹⁶² A *shukuzu* (figure 2. 41), which was sketched prior to the fire, is however available. Sansetsu also accepted a large commission to paint a dragon (figure 2. 42) for Sen'nyū-ji 泉涌寺, where the Kyō-Kano cemetery is located, immediately after receiving the title of *Hokkyō* in 1647.

Thus, Sansetsu painted a dragon image on the panel on the foundations of the Orchid Pavilion structure, with the hope that this symbol of the Kyō-Kano's glorious past would support the future of their workshop under the difficult political situation of the time. Through the overlapping symbolism of the dragon, he visually claimed the stylistic lineage and the legitimacy that might be communicated with the Kujō family patronage and Zuishin-in support. Such a dragon is also seen on top of Sansetsu's gate and the side panel of the bridge in the forth screen. The arched bridge and the gate located in this last screen are conceived as symmetrical and highly crafted structures.

The Fence Enclosing the Garden Party

The fence is another extremely important architectural element that dominates the middle-ground of screens in Sansetsu's Orchid Pavilion painting. Placed parallel to the slow flowing stream, it reinforces the horizontal composition, and interacts with the verticality of the woods and bamboo. While making occasional angles to create visual accents, this fence encloses the entire gathering in an exclusive and secure space. In contrast to the Ming dynasty ink rubbing that depicts the scholarly gathering in nature, Sansetsu strategically reinterpreted this event to be set in a fully cultivated palace garden. This reinterpretation may suggest Sansetsu's habit of attending poetry competition parties hosted by the elites in Kyoto.

In the first screen, this long fence begins from the massive rock by the pavilion, extends through the second and third screens, and then ends by the gate in the fourth screen. Each section of green fence is elaborated with the *manji* 万字 (C. *wanzu*; swastika) pattern, which is a twisted cross-like design that increases the geometric quality. This symbol originally had a directional and cosmic significance in the Indic tradition.¹⁶³ In East Asia, the cross symbolizes the first of the sixty-five auspicious signs on the footprint of Buddha. The term “*manji*” means the “ten thousand character sign,” and is said to have come from Heaven. It is described as “the accumulation of lucky signs possessing ten thousand efficacies.”¹⁶⁴ It is also regarded as the symbol or seal of the Buddha's heart, and is usually placed on the heart of Shakyamuni Buddha, in which his whole mind is said to be contained.¹⁶⁵ Buddha was considered the “universal spiritual ruler,” therefore Sansetsu incorporated this design to emphasize the auspiciousness and the status of his patrons, Zuishin-in and the regental Kujô family.

Nonetheless, the fence is not a part of the standard pictorial elements for the traditional Orchid Pavilion visual representation. In a variety of Ming dynasty ink rubbings the fence is completely absent. Based on the ink rubbing, numerous Orchid Pavilion paintings in the handscroll format were produced in the Ming and Qing dynasties.¹⁶⁶ The earliest examples include *Lanting shangyong tu* 蘭亭觴詠圖 (figure 2. 43), attributed to Zhao Yuanchu 趙原初, housed in the National Palace Museum 台北故宮博物館院; and *Lanting xiuxi tu* 蘭亭修禊圖 (figure 2. 44) by Yao Shou 姚琰 (1423-1495), housed in the Beijing Municipal Museum of Applied Arts 北京市工藝品進出口公司. They are both modeled after the ink rubbing without much modification,¹⁶⁷ and both reveal the long-established nostalgia among scholar-officials for the event at the Orchid Pavilion that is located in “nature.” Wen Zhengming 文徵明 (1470-1559), a literati-painter and an elite member of Ming society, painted his versions of the Orchid Pavilion on a number of occasions.¹⁶⁸ *Lantingxu shuhua* 蘭亭序書畫 (figure 2. 45) is one of them, housed in the Liaoning Museum 遼寧博物館, representing the scene of a poetry gathering in deep mountains.¹⁶⁹ When it comes to the hanging scroll versions of the Orchid Pavilion, such as *Yingxiuxi tu* 英修禊圖 painted by Qiu Ying 仇英 (1494-1552), housed in the National Palace Museum, the size of architecture and figures are drastically reduced, in order to emphasize the overwhelming landscape.¹⁷⁰ Hence, it is inappropriate and even inconceivable to depict a fence in such a setting.

The fence is not included in Einô’s version of Orchid Pavilion, nor in any other painter’s version. Sansetsu seems to be the only artist who painted a fence in the Orchid Pavilion. How then did Sansetsu conceive of the idea of creating and adding this extra

iconographic detail to his Orchid Pavilion? As discussed by Einô and Gahô, Sansetsu lamented painters who made mistakes without consulting the original accounts, and suggested “one should investigate their accuracy and make a judgment, and correct the falsehoods.” Why then did he add this extra iconography, knowing that it is not faithful to the original account?

Similar to the way Sansetsu sought a source of inspiration for his gem-like terraced palace, he studied Momoyama paintings, especially those of his father-in-law Sanraku, and printed materials imported from China. In the Zuishin-in version, a small pillar is placed at every corner of the fence elevating the visual accent. Sansetsu’s whole pictorial scheme is laid out within the space confined by the fence enclosing the scene. This form, with *manji* designs, the color, and the layout of this fence are duplicated from another work of Sanraku, *Genshiryô zu* 嚴子陵図 (*The Sage Yan Ziling Advising an Eastern Han Emperor*, figure 2. 46). This is one of a pair of two panel *byôbu* in Myôshin-ji temple.¹⁷¹

A pair of six panel *byôbu* of Momoyama paintings identified as *Fûryûjin zu* 風流陣図 (figure 2. 47) was another episode derived from the Minghuang/Yang Guifei romance, which depicted the imperial palace of Minghuang in the far right of the right screen, and that of Yang Guifei in the far left of the left screen.¹⁷² Between these structures, the fence, which is identical to that of the Orchid Pavilion, runs through horizontally. This fence also dominates the middleground of the screens. Each screen is lavished with the urban fantasy of courtly life that centered around these palaces. During his research for the *Chôgonka* project, Sansetsu must have studied this work and incorporated it into the Orchid Pavilion.

In her study of the *Chôgonka* scroll, Li-Chang Lin examines the Ming woodblock printed books imported to Japan in the early seventeenth century as possible sources for Sansetsu.¹⁷³ One of these is titled *Tang Minghuang Qiuye Wutongyu* (*Tang Minghuang Listening to the Rain Falling on Chinese Parasols on an Autumn Night*). This book (*Wutongyu* for short) illustrates a Yuan drama, which was popular in the Ming dynasty. It was compiled in anthologies and published in 1619 (*Gu zaju* version) and in 1633 (*Leijiang ji* version). The section depicting Minghuang's dream of Yang Guifei in the *Leijiang ji* version of this book (figure 2. 48) exhibits a fence identical with *manji* shown in the Zuishin-in *Orchid Pavilion*. The earlier, *Gu zaju* version, shows a similar fence in the section of Yang Guifei's dancing scene (figure 2. 49).

As another Ming woodblock printed book source, Sansetsu, of course, looked at *Teikanzusetsu* as well to seek examples of fences. The two sections in this source that exhibit a fence similar to the Orchid Pavilion are: Queqianlima 却千里馬 (figure 2. 50), Zhaoru jiangjing 詔儒講經 (figure 2. 33) and Chongxin lianren 寵信怜人 2. 51).¹⁷⁴ In all of which the fence functions to enclose the palace garden and to create an exclusive and secure space.

Sansetsu added the fence to his Orchid Pavilion to show the poetry gathering of his own community. According to Okudaira Shunroku, the Zuishin-in *byôbu* were actually displayed around the room, surrounding it like an indoor fence to create an atmosphere for the guests to feel as if they were participating in Wang Xizhi's Orchid Pavilion Gathering, when the temple hosted poetry composing parties.¹⁷⁵ As discussed earlier, Sansetsu was a part of the exclusive community of Confucian scholars in Kyoto. His associates, Shôkadô Shôjô, Fujiwara Seika, Kinoshita Chôshôshi 木下長嘯子,

Ishikawa Jôzan, Nawa Kassho, Hori Kyôan, Matsunaga Sekigo, Hayashi Razan and Gahô, were all poet-scholars. There is no record extant to prove the attendance of Sansetsu at a poetry gathering, but his attendance at such gatherings is easily imagined.

His son Einô's participation in poetry gatherings is richly recorded.¹⁷⁶ Einô was an active member of *haikai* 俳諧 associations. *Renchi seiryôzu* 蓮池鶺鴒図, painted by Einô, was inscribed by Kitamura Kigin 北村季吟 (1634-1705), a poet and *haikai* master.¹⁷⁷ He also developed a close relationship with Yamamoto Shunshô 山本春正 (1610-1682), an elite *waka* poet of the seventeenth century. Since Einô met Shunshô in 1657 at a poetry party, they often frequented similar gatherings.¹⁷⁸ Shunshô gave a lecture on *The Tale of Genji* at Einô's residence, and asked Einô's collaboration in his publication, *Eiri Genji monogatari* 絵入源氏物語 (*Illustrated Tale of Genji*) in 1660 and 1666.¹⁷⁹ More importantly, the most prominent patron of the Kyô-Kano, the Kujô family, was closely connected with *waka* poetry since the medieval period.¹⁸⁰ Therefore, Sansetsu strategically alluded to the Orchid Pavilion theme to satisfy his contemporary agenda. While knowing that the fence contradicts the iconographic accuracy, he painted it to mark that this gathering was held not in nature, but in a palace garden. The fence creates an exclusive space for the social elite, such as the Kujô family, to host poetry gatherings at Zuishin-in.

The Representation of Human Figures

Among the forty-two figures, the postures of sixteen figures shown in the Zuishin-in version of the Orchid Pavilion are identical, another sixteen are recognizable, and ten are unrecognizable when they are compared with those in the Ming dynasty ink

rubbing.¹⁸¹ Nevertheless, the unrecognizable figures can also be identified since their positions in the composition correspond to those in the ink rubbing. As a scholar of Chinese art and culture, Sansetsu was conscious that the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing was engraved in 1417 as a princely project of Zhu Youdun based on the Northern Song original, which was attributed to the literati painter Li Gonglin 李公麟 (c.1049-1106). In the section “The Method of How to Paint the Human Figure” in *Honchô gashi*, Einô admired Li Gonglin as the best painter of the human figures in the Song dynasty, above other Chinese masters, such as Muqi 牧溪, Yu Jian 玉澗, Liang Kai 梁楷, and Yan Hui 顏輝.¹⁸² Einô concluded this section by stating that the Kano painters, such as Sanraku and Sansetsu, were as good at rendering the human figure as Li. Compared to Sanraku’s vigorous and dynamic human figures, Sansetsu’s depiction of human figures are more static and tranquil.

At a glance one can see that the participants in the Orchid Pavilion by Sansetsu are executed with a great sense of formality that is expressed by the static treatment of facial features, postures and garments. Each face is drawn in a realistic yet idealized manner. The drapery is angularly outlined, and filled in with opaque colors. Some are in profile, but most of the faces of the figures are depicted in three-quarter profile, which is another characteristic of formal portraiture. Such a formal representation of portrait painting relates to Sansetsu’s earlier work, *Seireki daiju zu* 聖歷大儒図 (*A Series of Twenty-One Portraits of Chinese Confucian Masters*, figure 2. 52). As discussed earlier, this work was commissioned by Hayashi Razan of the Hayashi Neo-Confucian School in 1632. In relation to that, Sansetsu produced another work, *Shishinden kensei zukan* 紫宸殿賢聖図卷, a handscroll that portrays the thirty-two Confucian masters as traditionally

painted in the mural of the official space of the imperial court.¹⁸³ The standards of such formal portraiture were already established during the Tang-dynasty (618-907) by such court painters as Yan Liben (died in 673). The handscroll titled *Thirteen Emperors*, a series of portraits of ancient Chinese emperors, is attributed to the style of Yan.¹⁸⁴

The formal costumes called *jūnishō* 十二章 (*shi'erzhang* in Chinese, meaning the twelve emblems), worn by Wang Xizhi and the forty-one scholars by the riverbank, suggest that they are officials who hold specific ranks at court. The Emperor's *jūnishō* included all of the twelve symbolic designs: sun, moon, stars, dragon, mountain, pheasant, fire, ritual vessel, water plant, rice powder, axe, and bow and arrow. Wang's guests wear the same costume, but show fewer symbols. This type of costume with symbols was established around the Warring States period (c.450-221 B.C.E.).¹⁸⁵ *The Portrait of Confucius* painted by Sansetsu registers a number of these symbols, which signify Confucius's status as an emperor-like figure. By having the costume of Wang Xizhi and his guests resemble that of Confucius, Sansetsu communicated the high-ranking official status held by the members of gathering.

In the Confucian master scrolls, all the figures are standing, and there is no interaction among the figures. In the Orchid Pavilion, they are seated, except the dancing Yang Mo, on their individual mats spread out by the stream. In the case of the Ming dynasty ink rubbing scroll, some of them are engaging in conversation but the interactions among the participants are minimal. Thus, they are configurable as a series of individual portraits of Confucian scholars in a way similar to the Confucian master scrolls. Although the Zuishin-in version by Sansetsu is based on the ink rubbing scroll, it profoundly departs from it by adding the aspect of narration. Some scholars are

composing poetry, having conversation, dancing, while others are picking up wine cups from the winding stream.

Narrative Elements in the *Orchid Pavilion*

Kohara Hironobu 古原宏伸 explicates the differences between Chinese (*gakan* 画卷) and Japanese (*emaki* 絵巻) picture scrolls.¹⁸⁶ On one hand, the Chinese picture scroll chooses a theme that transmits the teachings of Confucianism without narrating a story that has a sequence, and also, because of their respect for the Classics, it takes up a subject from the past.¹⁸⁷ On the other hand, the Japanese picture scroll narrates a story that develops along the passing of time, and includes contemporary subjects as well as the classics.¹⁸⁸ For instance, *Saigyô monogatari emaki* 西行物語絵巻 or *Obusuma Saburô ekotoba* 男衾三郎絵詞 narrates the stories with a beginning and an end, and also these subjects involve ordinary people in a contemporary setting.

In his *Orchid Pavilion*, Sansetsu added this progressive narrative aspect of Japanese *emaki* to the Chinese *gakan*. He depicted the congenial and pleasant atmosphere of the gathering by visually telling a story of the activities of the participants, and establishing a time sequence. Based on the ink rubbing, Sansetsu interpreted the figures and created a story to resurrect them from the past. For instance, Yu Yun 庾蘊 is shown to be too drunk as a result of over consumption, and has to be supported by a pageboy in the Ming dynasty ink rubbing. Yun composed one poem, so he had to drink up two cups but there are three empty cups depicted with him in the ink rubbing (figure 2. 53). Knowing this scene, and also expecting that his audiences would know this scene as well, Sansetsu portrayed Yu Yun (figure 2. 54) reaching out his arm to pick up the wine cup

floating on the stream in his *Orchid Pavilion*. Yun's big smile reminds the viewer of the consequences of drinking too much wine, and reinforces the cause and effect created by Sansetsu.

The attendants and pageboys are represented in a much more lively fashion than the poet-scholars. They are portrayed in a less formal manner, and their actions are depicted in a clear fashion. Some of them are standing and preparing the wine, some are carrying it to the stream, and others are assisting their masters. By engaging in labor, the lesser social status of attendants is reflected, in order to clearly contrast with the higher status of their masters. The activities of the figures in Sansetsu's work are depicted with absolute clarity, and are thus visually intelligible. Inside a cave in the Ming ink rubbing, there is a scene of a pageboy sipping wine, and being pointed at by another boy. This scene was duplicated in Einō's version. Sansetsu moved this scene to the end of stream in the fourth screen. He exaggerated the gestures of the boys to create visual drama.

Sansetsu incorporated the applied arts and furniture into the interior of the Orchid Pavilion to express the high status of Wang Xizhi, who is seated on a raised dais. Behind him there is a screen called a *zabyôbu*, and a flat fan. The *zabyôbu* is a freestanding, single-panel screen enclosed in a footed wooden frame.¹⁸⁹ The fan, which has a long stem, is formal in style.¹⁹⁰ The *zabyôbu* and fan were originally imported from China and signified the high social position of the owner. The Ming Chinese painting, *Spring Morning in the Han Palace* (figure 2. 55) by Qiu Ying presents a *zabyôbu* and fan to signify royal status.¹⁹¹ Wang Xizhi is surrounded by many pageboys who serve him. A standing attendant holds a fan with a long stem. Three attendants are located at the corner of the balcony, four at the entrance, and five work in the corridor to prepare rice-

wine for the event. The great number of attendants signifies Wang's lofty position and aristocratic life-style.

As discussed in Chapter One, the Ming dynasty ink rubbings convey two distinct painting themes both related to Wang Xizhi. One is the *Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, and the other is *Wang Xizhi Observing Geese*, which depicts the scene where he developed a fluid movement of his brush by observing the graceful movement of water birds. A well-known example of *Wang Xizhi Observing Geese* is represented in a handscroll by Qian Xuan, housed in the Metropolitan Museum of Arts. The theme of *Wang Xizhi Observing Geese* is depicted in the beginning of the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing version of the *Orchid Pavilion*. As a result, the portrait of Wang Xizhi appears twice in the entire composition. This representation led to the miscalculation of the number of attendees. When Ōhara Tōno 大原東野 published *Meisū gafu* 名数画譜 (*Painting Manual of Renowned Numbers*) in a woodblock printed book in 1809, he counted Wang Xizhi twice, and listed forty-three *Orchid Pavilion* participants (figure 1. 24).

Sansetsu also followed the model of the ink rubbing, and portrayed Wang Xizhi twice in the first screen.¹⁹² He must have been conscious of this combination of two themes since he was so sensitive to iconographic accuracy. One of the portraits of Wang Xizhi is seated in the *Orchid Pavilion*, and the other one is seated next to Wei Bang 魏滂 at the riverbank. Sansetsu painted the faces of the two Wang Xizhi in detail to show that he is aware of the problem. Kano Einō, on the other hand, cleverly used an innovative method to solve this problem. He painted the *Orchid Pavilion* structure without Wang seated inside. So, his dais is empty. In his version, Wang Xizhi, seated at the riverbank,

appears only once. Moreover, Einô made a pageboy hold a goose, while two other geese are swimming, to have Wang Xizhi watch them for the inspiration for his calligraphy.

Dancing Yang Mo in the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing (figure 2. 56) is a favorite figure that appears in the Orchid Pavilion painted by nearly every artist, since he is the only one who is standing, while all others are seated motionless. The iconography of this dancing figure appears in different previously painted themes, such as the *Eight Immortal Drunken Sages* or *Seven Sages in the Bamboo Grove*, as well as the *Twenty-four Examples of Filial Piety*. Sansetsu took the liberty of depicting his back instead of profile (figure 2. 57). He duplicated this image in *Karako kinki shogazu* 唐子琴棋書画図 (*Four Noble Pastimes of Chinese Boys*, figure 2. 58) located in one of the four panels of *tsukeshoin* 付書院 at the Tenkyû-in 天球院, Myôshin-ji.¹⁹³

Japanese Tea Ceremony

Sansetsu included a scene of the Japanese tea ceremony (figure 2. 59) in the Zuishin-in version of the Orchid Pavilion gathering. In so doing, he duplicated this scene from another scene of a tea ceremony (figure 2. 60) painted by Sansetsu on a *fusuma* of Tenkyû-in, Myôshin-ji in 1631. As discussed, in the Kyô-Kano pedagogy written in *Kano Einô kaden gajiku* and in the section on painting themes in *Honchô gashi*, Sansetsu was the one who encouraged others to be faithful to the original account of painting themes. He must have been aware that the Japanese whisked tea ceremony was not appropriate to be depicted in a supposedly Chinese gathering. What was the purpose of transgressing his own rule?

During the Kan'ei cultural upheaval of the early seventeenth century, when Tokugawa authority was still in its infancy, the tea ceremony remained a key means of sociopolitical intercourse between military men, aristocrats, priests and even merchants.¹⁹⁴ Sansetsu's involvement with tea can be traced from his social life. In *Honchō gashi*, there is an account of Shōkadō Shōjō, a priest who learned ink painting from Kano Sanraku in 1615 when Sanraku took refuge at his monastery. In the year 1626, Shōkadō hosted a tea gathering to create a cultural alliance between the courtier Konoe Nobuhiro (1599-1649) and the warrior Tokugawa Yoshinao (1600-1650).¹⁹⁵ In this way, the tea ceremony facilitated a meeting between leaders of the feuding military and noble factions. Besides sharing an interest in tea with these two men, Shōkadō had a personal connection to both of them. His status as a respected *chajin* 茶人 (tea master) helped him gain this important role as a go-between.

Sansetsu painted numerous ceramics that were imported from China, and also that were fired in Japan. Many of these ceramics were used in the tea ceremony. Inside the cave, there are collections of Longquan celadon 龍泉青磁 from Zhejiang province and blue-and-white ceramics from Jiangxi province. These tea wares represented the aesthetics of *kirei sabi* 綺麗さび (refined rusticity) of Kobori Enshū 小堀遠州 (1579-1647) and Furuta Oribe 古田織部 (1544-1615). They were produced in the Ming-dynasty, and brought to Japan about fifty years later. They represent the newest and highest quality imported tea wares that were available among Sansetsu's cultural circle. Sansetsu included Kan'ei material culture in this painting and successfully recorded the life of his contemporaries. For Sansetsu, the original account of the Orchid Pavilion was in a passage from *Lantingxu*:

When the people of the future investigate us, it is the equivalent of our looking back at people from the past. Alas, I have no choice but to pay attention to my contemporaries and record their words. The world will change and events will differ, but perhaps future generations will achieve pleasure in the same way we do.

Reading this prose, they will experience some sense of identification.¹⁹⁶

In this sense, Sansetsu was faithful to the “philosophy” of the original account of the painting’s theme. He strategically alluded to the classical Orchid Pavilion’s gathering theme, but his purpose was also to illustrate his contemporaries, who were the dominant patrons and aesthetic leaders of tea ceremony.

The Orchid Pavilion and Kan’ei Aesthetics

This study has focused on the Orchid Pavilion painted by Kano Sansetsu, the second generation leader of Kyō-Kano workshop. During a time of political instability in the early seventeenth century, Kan’ei culture gave birth to various art movements. Sansetsu, who was extremely talented in painting but excluded from major projects due to his sociopolitical circumstances, chose purposefully an antagonistic style to resist the mainstream aesthetic value that was established and promoted by Tan’yū and the Edo-Kano. Sansetsu’s overtly Sinophile and eccentric paintings were set against the Tan’yū’s elegantly plain style. As a result of political struggle, Sansetsu formulated a geometrical and intellectual mode of the Orchid Pavilion. Sansetsu’s intellectual mode for the painting might come from his association with his literati network.

Through a detailed examination of Sansetsu’s life, I have realized the importance of genealogy in the painting circles of premodern Japan. In the case of Sansetsu, who

was a son-in-law's disciple of the school and not connected by blood, he had as to create an "artistic genealogy" or "style genealogy" to secure his own position. Sansetsu also inaugurated the first art history published in Japan. After a series of humiliations, Sansetsu died without completing this project. His son Einō completed it and published *Honchō gashi*. Keeping this literature in mind, the Orchid Pavilion by Einō, besides that by Sansetsu, indicates the complexity of the Kan'ei period. Einō combined his father's style and Tan'yū's style to create his own. As a third generation leader of the Kyō-Kano, Einō felt his responsibility to continue his family line, which prospered until the end of the Tokugawa-period.

Notes:

¹ *Kan'ei bunka* 寛永文化 (Kan'ei culture) refers to a phase that extended approximately two decades before and after the Kan'ei era (1624-1644), roughly the first half of the seventeenth century. Elizabeth Lillehoj, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Classicism in Japanese Painting, 1600-1700* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2004), 219.

² See Karen M Gerhart, *The Eyes of Power: Art and Early Tokugawa Authority* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999), ix.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Mieke Bal, "Response: Ariel Dorfman's Quest for Responsibility," in *The Art Bulletin* XCI, no. 1 (March 2009): 46.

⁵ These quotes are cited by Bal from Adorno's *Can One Live after Auschwitz?* (1962; Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), 240-58.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Other important parts of Adorno's opus—his complicated defense of modernism in the form of negative dialectics, how Adorno was hopeful for atonal music in a political sense, and what theoretical work one might require to make atonal music have a kind of political significance—are omitted here as they are beyond the scope of this study.

Theodor W. Adorno, *Aesthetic Theory*, trans. Robert Hullot-Kentor (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press: 1997; first published in Germany in 1970).

⁸ The relationship between Japanese art and politics that resonates with Adorno was also thoroughly discussed by Marra and Brown. See Michele Marra, "The Aesthetics of Reclusion: Kamo no Chōmei and the Last Age," in *The Aesthetics of Discontent* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 70-100; and Kendall H. Brown, *The Politics of Reclusion* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1997).

⁹ Some scholars suggest that the Tokugawa or Edo period began in 1600 when the first Tokugawa Shogun Ieyasu became ruler of Japan by overcoming his opponents at the battle of Sekigahara 関が原の合戦, while others, such as Sasaki Jōhei 佐々木丞平, determine that the first year of Gen'na 元和 (1615) is more appropriate to mark the beginning of this period. The Summer Campaign of 1615 is significant, especially in an art historical perspective, because it saw the complete destruction of Toyotomi's Osaka castle that was lavishly decorated with Momoyama paintings. Sasaki Jōhei, ed., *Edo kaiga I*, 江戸絵画 *Nihon no bijutsu* 日本の美術 (Shibundō 至文堂, 1987), 17.

¹⁰ See Fujioka Sakutarō 藤岡作太郎, *Kinsei kaigashi* 近世絵画史 (Tokyo: Perikansha ペリカン社, 1983; first published in 1903). See also Lillehoj, *Critical Perspectives on Classicism in Japanese Painting, 1600-1700*, 1-19.

¹¹ At this stage, the official painters, especially those who were employed by the Tokugawa family, focused on the creation of symbolic and complex images to legitimate the power of shogunate and to give its rule “an aura of cultured sophistication.” See Gerhart, *The Eyes of Power*, iv-xv.

¹² This tendency is also a continuation from the previous Momoyama period; as Kendall Brown states, “Aristocrats and priest patrons certainly desired to connect themselves with a prestigious past, as well as to display their own erudition and virtue. Moreover, because aristocrats made some claims to political power in the Momoyama period, it is possible that their commissioning of the same themes (often in the same style and by the same artists) as the samurai was a means of competing with the military hegemons.” Kendall Brown, *The Politics of Reclusion: Painting and Power in Momoyama Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997), 8.

¹³ The terms “Kyō-Kano” and “Edo-Kano” in binary were never used in the Tokugawa-era literature, but were coined after the Meiji period. See Yamashita Yoshiya 山下善也, “Fugû na jitsuryokusha tachi,” 不遇な実力者たち *Kanoha ketteiban* 狩野派決定版, *Bessatsu Taiyô* 別冊太陽 131 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2004), 104-5; Kawamoto Keiko 川本桂子, *Yûshô/Sanraku* 友松・山楽, *Shôgakkan gallery* 小学館ギャラリー, *Meihô Nihon no bijutsu* 名宝日本の美術 vol. 21 (Tokyo: Shôgakkan, 1991), 125. See also

Yukio Lippit, “The Birth of Japanese Painting History: Kano Artists, Authors, and Authenticators of the Seventeenth Century” (PhD Diss., Princeton University, 2003), 462.

¹⁴ Rin Rôen was an artist active in Osaka during the Bunka 文化 period (1804-1818). He was called Shin 新, Matashin 又新, Shûzô 秀蔵 (or Shûzô 秋蔵). His studio names were Shôrei 章齡 Banryûdô 蟠龍洞. He was a student of Fukuhara Gogaku 福原五岳. *Gaki* was recorded when Rôen studied paintings located in neighboring temples while lodging at Shôkoku-ji 相国寺 between 1773 and 1775. He visited thirty-three temples including Nanzen-ji 南禅寺, and recorded 210 titles comprising approximately six hundred pieces. The original copy of *Gaki* is located at Kyushu University Library 九州大学文学部図書室, and other Edo-period copies are at the Diet Library 内閣文庫 and Seikadô Bunko 静嘉堂文庫. See Iwasa Shin'ichi 岩佐伸一, “Kara-eshi/Rin Rôen no sakuhin yori,” 唐絵師・林閨苑の作品より in *Bijutsu Forum* 21, vol. 17 (2008): 4-9.

¹⁵ Rin Rôen, “*Gaki*” reproduced in *Bijutsushi kenkyû* 美術研究 vol. 85 (Bijutsu kenkyûsho 美術研究所, 1939).

¹⁶ “The Great Fire of Tenmei Era” 天明の大火 burned Kyoto city, including the Imperial Palace and Nijo Castle, in 1788.

¹⁷ This work was authored by the *yomihon* 読本 writer and *haikai* 俳諧 master Akisato Ritô 秋里籬島, illustrated by Takehara Shunchôsai 竹原春朝斎, and published by the Shorin Yoshino-ya 書林吉野屋 in Kyoto in 1780.

¹⁸ This sketch was a part of the collection of the family of Count Hirohashi 広橋伯爵家 in 1943. A segment of the sketch was introduced by Doi Tsugiyoshi 土居次義 for the

first time in *Sanraku to Sansetsu* 山楽と山雪 (Tokyo: Kuwana bunseidō 桑名文星堂, 1943), 126; and another segment was reproduced by Doi in *Kano Sanraku/Sansetsu* 狩野山楽・山雪, *Nihon bijutsu kaiga zenshu* 日本美術絵画全集 vol. 12 (Tokyo: Shueisha, 1976), 138; also see Doi Tsugiyoshi, ed., “*Sanraku to Sansetsu*” *Nihon no bijutsu* 日本の美術 172 (Shibundō, September 1980): 68.

¹⁹ “*Shichijō monzeki*” refers to Higashi Honganji temple; Doi, *Sanraku to Sansetsu* (1943), 131.

²⁰ Satō Yasuhiro 佐藤康宏, “*Ike no Taiga-hitsu Rantei kyokusui zu kaisetsu*” 池大雅筆 蘭亭曲水図解説 *Genshoku Nihon no bijutsu* 原色日本の美術 27 在外美術 絵画 (Tokyo: Shōgakusan 小学館, 1980), 193, 209; Kitano Yoshie 北野良枝, “*Sansetsu to shōrai hanpon*,” *Chugoku shokei* 中国憧憬 (Tokyo: Machida City Museum of Graphic Art 町田市立国際版画美術館, 2007), 106-113.

²¹ Yamashita Yoshiya, “*Taishōteki sonzai toshite no Sansetsu to Tan’yū: Edo shoki Kano-ha no nidai kyoshō ni kanshite*” 対照的存在としての山雪と探幽—江戸初期狩野派の二大巨匠に関して *Kano-ha no kyoshō tachi* (Great Masters of Kano School), Shizuoka kenritsu bijutsukan kaikan sanshūnen kinenten 静岡県立美術館開館三周年記念展, *The Third Anniversary Exhibition*, 1989), 22-32.

²² Takeda Tsuneo 武田恒夫, *Kano-ha kaigashi* 狩野派絵画史 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kobunkan 吉川弘文館, 1995), 7. Matsuki Hiroshi 松本寛 *Goyō eshi Kano-ke no chi to chikara* 御用絵師狩野家の血と力 [Blood and Power of the Kano Family Official Painters] (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1994).

²³ According to *Inryoken nichiroku* 蔭涼軒日録 (*Daily Record of Inryoken Subtemple*), the long history of the Kano School began when founder Kano Masanobu 狩野正信 completed a commission from Kikei Shinzui 季瓊真蘂, abbot of the Unchô-in 雲頂院 Shôkokuji 相国寺 Zen Buddhist temple, to paint a *Kannon-zu* 観音図 and a *Rakan-zu* 羅漢図 in 1463. After the official appointment, he became increasingly active in the Muromachi painting world. See Yamamoto Hideo 山本英男, “Sengoku no yo wo ikinuku: Masanobu/Motonobu kara Eitoku/Mitsunobu made” 戦国の世を生き抜く—正信・元信から永徳・光信まで *Kano-ha kettei ban, Bessatsu Taiyô* 131 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2004), 23.

²⁴ Yamashita, “Taishôteki sonzai toshite no Sansetsu to Tan’yû,” 23.

²⁵ The mother of the three sons was a daughter of Sassa Narimasa 佐々成政, who was a vassal of Oda Nobunaga 織田信長. Yasumura Toshinobu 安村敏信, *Kano-ha: Tan’yû to Edo Kano-ha* 狩野派—探幽と江戸狩野派 (Tokyo: Tokyo bijutsu 東京美術, 2006), 18.

²⁶ The names of workshops were determined by the name of their location in Edo, where they received their residence/studio from the Tokugawa *bakufu*. These names therefore refer to their lineage position, or house/family.

²⁷ The content of the pledge was to support the three houses in Edo, especially the main house inherited by Yasunobu. This pledge was signed by Naganobu, Jin’nojô 甚之丞 (a son of Motohide 元秀 (1551-1601), a younger brother of Eitoku), Genshun 元俊 (a great-grandson of Hideyori 秀頼, a brother of Shôei, 1588-1672), Kano Kô’i 狩野興以, a

trusted disciple of Mitsunobu who raised the three sons of Takanobu, and Shin'emon 新右衛門, the son-in-law of Mitsunobu. See Tajima Shi'ichi 田島志一, ed., *Toyo bijutsu taikan* 東洋美術大観 vol. 5 (Tokyo: Shinbi shoin 審美書院, 1909).

²⁸ There were fourteen or fifteen *omote-eshi* families. Yasumura, *Kano-ha: Tan'yû to Edo Kano-ha*, 62-63; Yamashita, “Ketteiban: Kano-ha keizu” *Kano-ha ketteiban*, Appendix, 174.

²⁹ Kano Hiroyuki 狩野博幸 discusses the Tokugawa military regime and the Kano School. “Edo zenki gadan no chōbō” 江戸前期画壇の眺望 *Kanoha to fūzokuga* 狩野派と風俗画, *Edo no kanga* 江戸の絵画 II, *Nihon bijutsu zenshū* 日本美術全集 vol. 17 (Tokyo: Kodansha 講談社, 1992), 146.

³⁰ Yasumura, *Kano-ha: Tan'yû to Edo Kano-ha*, 18.

³¹ Yamashita Yoshiya, “Fūkeiga ni miru Tan'yû no miryoku to senkusei – shasei to hongā o tōshite” 風景画にみる探幽の魅力と先駆性—写生と本画をとおして *Kano Tan'yû ten* 狩野探幽展 exhibition catalogue (Tokyo: Tokyo Metropolitan Art Museum, 2002), 208.

³² For the entire passage of the Tan'yû's epitaph, see Appendix 4.

³³ Takeda Tsuneo, *Kano-ha Shōhekiga no kenkyū* 狩野派障壁画の研究 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbun-kan, 2002), 195.

³⁴ For *kiwame* 極め (authentication of paintings) of Chinese goods, Tan'yû used manuals such as *Kundaikan sochoki* 君台觀左右帳記 (Manual of the Attendants of the Shogunal Collection), compiled for the Ashikaga shoguns in the Muromachi period.

³⁵ Takeda Tsuneo, *Kano Tan'yû, Nihon kaiga bijutsu zenshû* 日本絵画美術全集 vol.15 (Tokyo: Shûeisha 集英社, 1978).

³⁶ The Hayashi School was established by Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657), a student of Fujiwara Seika (1563-1619) who left Zen Buddhism to establish a new Confucian sect in Tokugawa Japan. Prior to Razan's visit to Ieyasu, Seika was invited to attend court by Ieyasu in 1593, and wore his Confucian robe to make a public appearance at the castle of Ieyasu again in 1600. This event symbolized his departure from Buddhism and conversion to Confucianism. See Maeda Tamotsu, *Kinsei Nihon no Jugaku to Heigaku* 近世日本の儒学と兵学 (Tokyo: Perikansha, 1996), 86. Wang Chia-hua, "Nitchû jugaku no hikaku 日中儒学の比較 (Tokyo: Rikkyô Shuppan, 1988).

³⁷ Inscription: 法印探幽六十九歳筆. This work shows the typical style of Tan'yû's *Gyonen gaki jidai* 行年書き時代 (Old Age Signature phase, 1661-74). His production periods are divided into three stages: the *Saisho/Uneme* phase 宰相・采女時代 (1602-34), the *Saigaki* phase 斎書き時代 (1635-60) and the *Gyonengaki* phase. In 1670, Tan'yû was afflicted by paralysis, but was still prolific, producing a number of important works such as the *Hatô gun'enzu* 波濤群燕図, housed in the Tokiwayama Bunko 常盤山文庫. See Yasumura, *Kano-ha: Tan'yû to Edo-Kano-ha*, 18-37.

³⁸ One Kano text, *Kôsoshû* 後素集 (Collection of Chinese Painting Titles) by Kano Ikkei 狩野一溪, compiled and published in 1623, lists "*Rantei yonjû-ni kenzu*" 蘭亭四十二賢図 (the Forty-Two Scholars at the Orchid Pavilion), so Tan'yû was knowledgeable about the proper number of attendants.

³⁹ *Teikan-zu* illustrates the episodes of six good and six bad examples of the historical rulers: Renxiantuzhi 任賢罔治, Jiegushiren 解網施仁, Queqianlima 却千里馬, Zhaorujiangjing 詔儒講經, Baoliguren 賓禮故人, Jujuecibu 拒闕賜布, Xijufenghuo 戲拳烽火, Xidiyujue 西邸鬻爵, Hualinzongyi 華林縱逸, Weicheaoyan 羊車遊宴, Xiefengchuguan 斜封除官, and Yushuxinsheng 玉樹新聲. Tan'yû painted the episode of *Juguan cibi*, in which Guangmudi 光武帝 of the Han dynasty rewarded his vassals who remonstrated him by closing the palace gate. See *Chugoku shôkei*, 198.

⁴⁰ Kano Eisen-in Michinobu was *oku-eshi* and a son of Hisanobu 古信 (1696-1731), a descendent of Naonobu. Michinobu was adopted by the elder brother of Harunobu 玄信 (1716-1731), and inherited the leading position of the Takekawamachi 竹川町 workshop. Later, Michinobu was rewarded with a larger house at Kobikimachi 木挽町 in 1777, and was called Kobikimachi-Kano thereafter for his contribution to reviving a strong *kanga* tradition. He received the Buddhist title of Hô'in, which was the highest rank awarded to painters of that time. Tani Shin'ichi 谷新一 and Noma Seiroku 野間清六, eds., *Nihon Bijutsu jiten* 日本美術辞典 (Tokyo: Tokyo-do shuppan 東京堂出版, 1952), 171.

⁴¹ This Orchid Pavilion painting by Yasunobu is mounted as a *byôbu* measuring 150.4 x 353 cm (59 3/16 x 139 in).

⁴² In this work Yasunobu added another architectural structure besides the Orchid Pavilion located on the right end of the right screen. A simple post and lintel structure with an A-frame roof is built over the bridge located at the left end of the left screen. There is a signboard under the eave of this extra structure with two characters reading "Rantei" (Orchid Pavilion), as if Yasunobu needed to tell his audience, who might not

realize otherwise, what his subject was. A similar extra structure appears in some of the late-Ming Orchid Pavilion paintings, such as *Lanting xiuxi tu* 蘭亭修禊図 by Wei Jujing 魏居敬 in 1606. This work is executed in ink and color on paper and is housed in the Tianjin City Museum of Art 天津市芸術博物館. There is a possibility the Edo Kano painters may have had access to not only the ink rubbing engraved by Zhu Youdun, but also to different types or modified versions of the Orchid Pavilion paintings, or to the painting manuals newly imported from China among their archives. Many of the late Ming- and Qing-dynasty painters painted fewer participants instead of depicting Wang Xizhi and his forty-one guests in their Orchid Pavilion paintings. The reduction of participants in these models might have swayed Tan'yû and Yasunobu to express their *shôsha-tanrei* aesthetic preference for more space in the composition.

⁴³ Kano Yasunobu 狩野安信, *Gadô yôketsu* 画道要訣 (*Secret Keys to the Way of Painting*) 1680 in vol. 5 of *Nihon kaigaron taikei* 日本絵画論大成, Sakazaki Tan 坂崎坦編, ed., (Tokyo: Meicho Fukyûkai, 1979); *Teihon Nihon Kaigaron Taisei: Gadô yôketsu, Gadô Denju Kôketsu, Yôsai Gai, Kyôsai Gadan* 定本日本絵画論大成 第4巻 画道要訣・画道伝授口訣・容斎画意・暁斎画談 [*Authentic Scholarly Works on Japanese Paintings Volume 4*], Yasumura Toshinobu, ed. (Perikansha ペリカン社, 1997), 9-110. See also Karen Gerhart, "Issues of Talent and Training in the Seventeenth-Century Kano Workshop," in *Ars Orientalis* 31 (2001): 103-128.

⁴⁴ Shôun became a *goyô-eshi* to the Kuroda Family 黒田家, a daimyo in Fukuoka 福岡. He also authored *Shôun hikki* 昌運筆記. See Asaoka Okisada 朝岡興禎, *Koga bikô* 古

画備考, Ôta Kin 太田謹, ed. (Kyoto: Shibunkaku 思文閣, 1970); see also Lippit, *The Birth of Japanese Painting History*, 74 and 184.

⁴⁵ Kitano Yoshie points out that the Edo-Kano as *oku-eshi* were exposed to many painting manuals for the purpose of authentication of the shogunal collection as a part of their job. Consequently the attitude of Tan'yû towards Chinese materials was rather careless. On the other hand, the Kyô-Kano had limited resources of Chinese goods, and thus Sansetsu appreciated them due to their scarcity. Kitano, "Sansetsu to shôrai hanpon," 78.

⁴⁶ Adorno, *Aesthetic Theory*, 44-45.

⁴⁷ Doi, *Sanraku to Sansetsu* (1943); Doi, *Kano Sanraku/ Sansetsu, Nihon bijutsu kaiga zenshû* (1976); Doi, ed., "Sanraku to Sansetsu" *Nihon no bijutsu*, 12-13, 66-67; *Kangakei jinbutsu* 漢画系人物, *Nihon byôbu-e shûsei* 日本屏風絵集成 vol. 4 *Jinbutsuga* 人物画 (Tokyo: Kôdansha 講談社, 1980), 67-70, 114; *Kanôha no Kaiga* 狩野派の絵画 (Tokyo: Tokyo National Museum, 1981), 76-77, 224-225.

⁴⁸ Tsuji Nobuo categorized Kano Sansetsu along with Iwasa Matabei 岩佐又兵衛, Ito Jakuchû 伊藤若冲, Soga Shôhaku 曾我蕭白, Nagasawa Rosetsu 長沢芦雪, and Utagawa Kuniyoshi 歌川国芳 as eccentric painters of the Edo-period in *Kisô no keifu*. Tsuji Nobuo, *Kisô no keifu* (Tokyo: Chikuma Gakugei bunko ちくま学芸, 2004; first edition: Bijutsu shuppansha 美術出版社, 1970). The academic concern for *kisô* (eccentrics) was developed in a study of the Late Ming and Qing Chinese paintings by James Cahill exploring "individualism" in certain social conditions. See James Cahill, *Fantastics and Eccentrics in Chinese Painting* (Berkeley: The Asia Society, Inc, 1967). Tsuji even questions whether Sansetsu could be really considered (stylistically) a Kano

painter in “Sansetsu no kiso – mondo fu ni” 山雪の奇想—問答風に *Kano Sansetsu tokushû* 狩野山雪特輯, in *Yamato bunka* 大和文華 vol. 82 (1989): 2.

⁴⁹ *Kano Sansetsu: Senkyo he no izanai* 狩野山雪—仙境への誘い (Invitation to the world of Immortals), exhibition catalogue (Nara: Yamato Bunkakan, 1986).

⁵⁰ Yamato bunka kan, ed., *Kano Sansetsu tokushû*.

⁵¹ Itakura Masa’aki 板倉聖哲 identifies how Sansetsu’s eccentricity resulted from his connection with the literati network in Kyoto, and suggests Chinese visual materials as his source of inspiration. Itakura Masa’aki, “Kano Sansetsu Gunsen zuzō no ichigensen ni tsuite” 狩野山雪群仙図像の一源泉について *Bijutsushi ronsō* 美術史論叢 vol. 8, (2007): 79-85; Itakura, “Myōshin-ji Tenkyū-in Hōjō Shōhekiga nitsuite no ichikaishaku: Kano Sansetsu ni okeru Chugoku zo no ichidanhen” 妙心寺天球院方丈障壁画についての一解釈—狩野山雪における中国像の一断片 *Kano-ha wo chushin tosuru Kangaku-ha no kenkyu* 狩野派を中心とする官学派の研究 (2004):15-25; Itakura, “Jūshichi-seiki Nihon kaiga ni okeru Chugoku imeji: Kano Sansetsu ‘Fujiwara Seika kankyo zu’ (Nezu Museum) wo rei ni” 17 世紀日本絵画における中国像—狩野山雪藤原惺窩閑居図(根津美術館)を例に” *Kashima bijutsu kenkyu* 鹿島美術研究 vol. 23 (2006): 178-188; Kitano Yoshie speculates on Sansetsu’s motives to take up certain painting themes. Kitano, “Kano Sansetsu-hitsu Rōkaku sansuizu byōbu,” 狩野山雪筆楼閣山水図屏風 in *Kokka* 1176 (1993): 33-35; Kitano, “Kano Sansetsu hitsu Jussetuzu byōbu no seisaku keiki ni tsuite,” 狩野山雪筆十雪図屏風の制作契機について in *Kokka* 1272 (2001): 19-25; Kitano, “Kano Sansetsu hitsu Seikozu byōbu,” 狩野山雪筆

西湖図屏風 in *Kokka* 1227 (1998): 29-31. Yukio Lippit thoroughly discusses the Kano School in the seventeenth century, and gives extensive attention to Sansetsu. Lippit, “The Birth of Japanese Painting History,” (PhD diss. Princeton: Princeton University, 2003). Igarashi Kōichi 五十嵐公一 gives detailed information on Sansetsu and his environment in his dissertation concerning *Honchō gashi*, which was authored by Sansetsu’s son Einō. Igarashi, “Kano Einō Honchō Gashi no kenkyū” 狩野永納 本朝画史の研究 (PhD diss., Tokyo: University of Tokyo, 2006). Yamashita Yoshiya provides expert knowledge tracing Sansetsu’s process of conceiving new pictorial approaches: Yamashita, “Kano Sansetsuhitsu Fuji Miho Matsubarazu byōbu: Zuyō no genryū to kakushinsei ni tsuite” 狩野山雪筆富士三保松原図屏風—図様の源流と革新性について *Shizuoka kenritsu bijutsukan kiyō* vol.2 静岡県立美術館紀要 (1984); Yamashita, “Fugū na jitsuryokusha tachi,” 95-122.

⁵² Kamitaka Tokuharu 神鷹徳治, et al., *Kano Sansetsu-ga Chōgonka gakan* 狩野山雪画長恨歌画卷, *Yomigaeru emaki/ehon* 甦る絵巻・絵本 2, *Chester Beatty Library* (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan 勉誠出版, 2006); Shane McCausland and Matthew P. McKelway, eds., *Chinese Romance from a Japanese Brush: Kano Sansetsu’s Chōgonka Scrolls in the Chester Beatty Library* (London: Scala Publishers, 2009).

⁵³ McKelway, “Kano Sansetsu and Kano Workshop Paintings of ‘The Song of Lasting Sorrow,’” 106-149; Li-chiang Lin, “Ming Paintings and Prints: Possible Sources for Kano Sansetsu’s *Chōgonka* Scrolls,” 150-163.

⁵⁴ Hayashi Gahō (1618-1680) was a Neo-Confucian scholar, a son of Hayashi Razan and second generation leader of the Hayashi Confucian Academy that provided official

ideological service to the Tokugawa bakufu. His given name was Matasaburô 又三郎, Harukatsu 春勝, and his pseudonyms were Shiwa 子和 and Koremichi 之道. His studio names were Shunsai 春斎, Gohô 鷺峰, and Kôyôken 向陽軒. After studying under Nawa Kassho, Gahô worked for the Tokugawa *bakufu* alongside his father. In 1657, he inherited the headship of the Hayashi family, and became more involved in the administration of the *bakufu*. In 1663, Gahô lectured on Gokyô 五経, the Five Classics of Confucianism, to the fourth shogun, Tokugawa Ietsuna 徳川家綱, and was awarded the *Kôbun-in gakushi-gô* 弘文院学士号, a distinguished academic rank. He was also an expert in Japanese history, and compiled a number of histories: *Nihon odai ichiran* 日本王代一覽, *Honchô tsukan* 本朝通鑑, and *Kan'ei shokakei zuhō* 寛永緒家系図法.

See Appendix 4 for the entire passage of *Kano Eino kaden gajiku jo*. Hayashi Gahô, *Kano Einô kaden gajiku jo* 狩野永納家伝画軸序, 鷺峰先生林学士文集 第八六卷 is reprinted by Doi Tsuguyoshi in *Kano Sanraku/Sansetsu*, 122. See also Ozawa Sei'ich, "Kinsei shigaku no keisei to Hayashi Gahô" 近世史学の形成と林鷺峰 (Formation of historical study under the shogunate regime and Gahô Hayashi), in *Bulletin of Tokyo Gakugei University Series III: Social Sciences* 22 (September 1970): 129-158.

⁵⁵ Doi, *Sanraku to Sansetsu* (1943), 5-6.

⁵⁶ Hayashi Gahô, *Kano Einô kaden gajiku jo*.

⁵⁷ The term "*sanmen sakusen*" was coined by Kobayashi Tadashi 小林忠 in his article titled "Akademizumu no kôzai: Edo jidai Kano-ha no ba'ai," アカデミズムの功罪—江戸時代狩野派の場合 in *Kikan geijutsu* 季刊芸術 (Oct. 1989): 116-131.

⁵⁸ Shôkadô Shôjô was credited as one of the Three Brushes of Kan'ei era, together with Hon'ami Kôetsu 本阿弥光悦 and Konoe Nobutada 近衛信尹. Shôjô combined the Kûkai's *karayô* 空海唐様 and Heian *wayô* 平安和様 to establish the Shôkadô style, which was widely appreciated in the cultural salons of the early Edo period. See Watanabe Kiyoshi 渡部清, "Shôkadô Shôjô" Koresawa Kyôzô 是澤恭三, *Ka'nei no Sanpitsu* 寛永の三筆, ed. *Nihon no bijutsu* 11 (Tokyo: Shibundô, 1978): 59-80; Satô Torao 佐藤虎雄, *Shôkadô Tôyô bijutsu bunko* 美術文庫 37 (Tokyo: Atorie-sha アトリエ社, 1939); Shôkadô Shôjô, *Tankô textbook chajin-hen* 淡交テキストブック茶人編 (Kyoto: Tankô shinsha 淡交新社, 1966).

⁵⁹ Shirai Kayô, *Gajô yôryaku* (1832), Kimura Shigekazu 木村重圭 ed., *Nihon kaigaron taisei* (Tokyo: Perikansha ペリカン社, 1997), 148.

⁶⁰ It was in the year 1605.

⁶¹ Sanraku had a biological son named Shuri Mitsunori 修理光教 (also known as Mitsutaka 光孝), but he died at age 21.

⁶² According to *Kassho ikô* 活所遺稿, this was in the year 1619. Doi and others suggest Sansetsu was married to Take before that year. Doi, *Sanraku to Sansetsu* (1980), 24.

⁶³ Hayashi Gahô, *Kano Einô kaden gajiku jo*.

⁶⁴ Doi, *Sanraku to Sansetsu*, 204.

⁶⁵ Tanaka Ichimatsu 田中一松, "*Taima-dera engi ni tsuite*" 当麻寺縁起について *Tanaka Ichimatsu kangashi ronshu* 田中一松絵画史論集 (Tokyo: Chuo kôronsha 中央公論社, 1985), 334-339; Doi, *Sanraku to Sansetsu* (1981), 104; Lippit, *The Birth of*

Japanese Painting History, 468. One of the collaborators, Reizei Tameyori, died in 1627, so that the production of this *emaki* has to be before this date. Kawamoto, *Sanraku/Yūshō*, 163-4.

⁶⁶ Kano Eino 狩野永納 *Honcho gashi* 本朝画史 (1693), Kasai Masaaki 笠井昌昭 /Sasaki Susumu 佐々木進 and Takei Akio 竹居昭男 訳注 本朝画史, eds. (Kyoto: Dohosha shuppan 同朋社出版, 1985).

⁶⁷ Hayashi Susumu 林進, “Senkyō heno izanai –Kano Sansetsu hitsu Bankoku zu wo megutte,” 狩野山雪筆盤谷図をめぐって *Kano Sansetsu: Senkyō heno izanai*, exhibition catalogue (Nara: Yamato Bunka-kan, 1986), 12.

⁶⁸ Tsuji recalls that Okudaira Shunroku 奥平俊六 suggested Sanraku must have had empathy towards the Chinese *yimin* from his own situation. Tsuji, “Sansetsu no kisō,” 4.

⁶⁹ See Doi, *Sanraku to Sansetsu*, 24.

⁷⁰ Kitano, “Kano Sansetsu hitsu Jussetuzu byōbu no seisaku keiki ni tsuite,” 23.

⁷¹ For the entire account of the letter, see Appendix 4. This letter is housed among the inventory of the Kyo-Kano Documents of the Suzuka Family Archive 鈴鹿家蔵京狩野古文書, which was introduced by Suzuka Sanshichi 鈴鹿三七 in 1917. In the Meiji period, the Suzuka family purchased a set of eight documents that had been inherited by the Kyo-Kano family. Suzuka Sanshichi, “Kyo-Kanoke no komonjo 京狩野家の古文書,” in *Geibun* 芸文 10-11 (1917): 80-81. The letter was reprinted in the exhibition catalogue of the Yamato Bunka-kan, *Kano Sansetsu: Senkyō heno izanai*, 100.

⁷² Lippit, *The Birth of Japanese Painting History*, 470.

⁷³ Hayashi Gahō, *Kano Einō kaden gajiku jo*.

⁷⁴ For the entire list of the book collection, see Appendix 4. As discussed in Note 71, in the Meiji period, the Suzuka family purchased a set of eight documents that had been inherited by the Kyo-Kano family. Although the author of the list is unknown, Suzuka suggests those titles became the sources of information for Sansetsu and Eino to compile *Honchô gashi* 本朝画史, their history of painters, since its rhetorical structure was borrowed from Chinese aesthetic texts. Suzuka Sanshichi, “Kyo-Kano-ke no komonjo,” 76-86.

⁷⁵ *Hasshu gafu* 八種画譜 consists of eight painting manuals. It was compiled and published in the end of the Ming dynasty 天啓年間 (1621~28). It was imported to and reprinted in Japan in 1710. On the other hand, *Kaishien gaden* 芥子園画伝 was named after the garden where Ming loyalist Li Yu 遺臣李漁 spent his life as a recluse. The first edition was published in 1679 (康熙 18), and the second and third editions in 1701 (康熙 40). The fourth edition includes human figures, but some scholars consider it a forgery; it was reprinted in Japan in 1748. Sansetsu died in 1650 and Einô in 1697, and thus neither of them saw the *Bazhong huapu* printed in Japan but only a version imported from China. In the list of Suzuka Sanshichi, only seventy titles of textual materials are listed, while *Bazhong huapu* and *Mingshou hualu* 名手画録 are added in the Yamato Bunka-kan’s catalogue, *Kano Sansetsu: Senkyo heno izanai*, 101.

⁷⁶ Hayashi Gahô, *Kano Einô kaden gajiku jo*.

⁷⁷ Doi, “Sanraku to Sansetsu,” 26.

⁷⁸ Kano Einô, *Honchô gashi*, 392, 393.

⁷⁹ The historiography of the studies on *Honchô gashi* is succinctly summarized as follows:

Tanaka Kuruko 田中倉琅子, “Honchô gashi no shuchô” 本朝画史の主張, in *Bijutsushigaku* 美術史学 73 (1943); Doi, “Honchô gaden ni tsuite,” in *Bijutsushi* 13 (1954); Sakakibara Satoru 榊原悟, “Edo shoki kanoha wo meguru mondai: Hocho gashi to kanrenshite,” 江戸初期狩野派をめぐる問題—本朝画史と関連して in *Museum* 343 (1979); Kasai Masa’aki, “Honchô gashi ni tuite no ni san no mondai” 本朝画史についての二、三の問題, in *Bunkashigaku* 文化史学 37 (Ritsumeikan University, 1981); Sakakibara, “Tan’yû no oya baka: Kano ha soshiki no ichimen” 探幽の親バカ—狩野派組織の一面, in *Kobijutsu* 75 (July 1985): 66-78; Kasai, “Kaidai Honchô gashi” 解題本朝画史 (1985); Sakakibara, “Ippen Kano-shi: Edo shoki Kano ha wo megutte,” 一変狩野氏—江戸初期狩野派をめぐって— in *Kobijutsu* 96 (1990); Quitman E. Phillip, “Honchô gashi and the Kano Myth,” in *Archives of Asian Art* (1994): 46-57; Sakakibara, *Honcho gashi saiko* 本朝画史再考 (Reconsidering ‘Honchô gashi), in *Kokka* (1997); Kamei Wakana 亀井若菜, “Muromachi jidai no Tosa ha wo meguru gensetsu: jenda no shiten kara no bunseki,” 室町時代の土佐派をめぐる言説—ジェンダーの視点からの分析 in *Gakushuin University*, vol. 43 (1997): 1-20; Matsumoto Naoko 松本直子, “Honchô gashi no senryaku — souwa ni miru gajin no imeji,” 本朝画史の戦略挿話にみる画人のイメージ in *Dôshisha University Aesthetics* 同志社大学文学部 美学・芸術学 vol. 13 (1997): 58-73; Lippit, *The Birth of Japanese Painting History*. All of the above discuss the political intention of *Honchô gashi* from different angles.

⁸⁰ *Honchô gashi* consists of a preface and six volumes. Volume One consists of seven short essays about painting: *Gagen* 画伝 (Origins of Painting), *Gakan* 画官 (Administration of Painting), *Gasho* 画所 (Bureau of Painting), *Gakô* 画考 (Thoughts on Painting), *Ga'un* 画運 (Development of Painting), *Gashiki* 画式 (Ceremony of Painting), *Gadai* 画題 (Painting Themes). Volume Two: *Jôko garoku* 上古画録 (Record of Ancient Painting); Volume Three: *Chûsei meihin* 中世名品 (Masterpieces of the Mediaeval Period); Volume Four: *Senmon kazoku* 専門家族 (Professional Painter-Families); *Kano-ke ruise shoyô gaho* 狩野家累世所用画法 (Painting Methods of Successive Generations of the Kano House; Volume Five: *Zatsu den* 雑伝 (Miscellaneous Biographies), *hoi* 補遺, *furoku* 附録, (*Honchô gashi batsu* 本朝画史跋); Volume Six: *Honcho ga'in* 本朝画印 (Seals of Japanese Painters); (*Honchô gain batsu* 本朝画印跋); (*Honchô gashi batsu* 本朝画史跋).

⁸¹ Kano Eino, *Honcho gashi* English translation by McKelway, *Chinese Romance from a Japanese Brush*, 112.

⁸² Ikkei inherited the line of Naizen, and also was called Naizen. He briefly studied under Mitsunobu. Unlike the Kyô-Kano family, he moved to Edo in 1616 and was allowed to see the third shogun Tokugawa Iemitsu in 1625. Later in his career, he was active as a *goyô-eshi* to take commissions from the *bakufu* in Edo. Sakazaki Shizuka 坂崎坦, *Nihon kaigaron taikan* 日本絵画論大観 vol. 2 (Tyoko: Arusu アルス, 1927), 923-950; see also Lippit, 421, 424.

⁸³ In the time of Masanobu, the style of Zen monk-painters was seen as a sign of power by alluding to the paintings of the Chinese Imperial Academy of the Song dynasty (970-1279), such as those by Ma Yuan and Xia Gui. During a time of tremendous political instability, Shogun Yoshimasa established the Higashiyama (Eastern Hill) culture that stood against the pre-existing Kitayama (Northern Hill) culture, in order to display his power over cultural institutions. During the reign of Shogun Yoshimasa, a civil war broke out. Known as the *Ônin no ran* 応仁の乱, or the Ônin War (1467-1477), it lasted for many years and inaugurated the Sengoku 戦国時代 or Warring States period.

Matsuki, *Goyo-eshi: Kanoke no chi to chikara*, 12-13.

⁸⁴ Just as Emperor Huizong (1082-1135, r. 1101-1125) at the end of Northern Song China (twelfth century) attempted to propagate his political message, in hopes of achieving long-lasting prosperity for his court society by institutionalizing the painting Academy, Yoshimasa ordered Masanobu to produce works that conveyed positive messages for the Ashikaga *bakufu*. This emperor became extremely famous for his participation in the activities of the Academy as a taste-maker, collector, painter, and calligrapher. At the same time, he established the court examination system to recruit painters based on stated, ranked criteria, which was called the “Training and Examination of Court Artists.” See Robert L. Thorp and Richard Ellis Vinograd, *Chinese Art and Culture* (New York: Abrams and Prentice Hall, 2001), 254-255.

⁸⁵ Tsuji Nobuo, *Sengoku jidai Kanoha no kenkyū: Kano Motonobu o chūshin ni shite* [Study on the Early Kano School: Motonobu and his Family of Painters] (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1994), 1-26. Further, Einô added another episode of Motonobu

ignoring the young Oda Nobunaga, who visited him unofficially. Matsumoto, “*Honchô gashi no senryaku*,” 69-71.

⁸⁶ The fabrication of this story might have been caused by the fact that Tosa Mitsumoto 光元 (1530-69), a son of Mitumochi 光茂, joined the Toyotomi camp and was killed in the battle. As he left no successor, Mitsumoto’s death discontinued the Tosa workshop, until a disciple of Mitsumochi, Mitsuyoshi 光吉 (1539-1613) reestablished the workshop in Sakai. The Tosa workshop, in the generation of Mitsuoki 光起, was reappointed as *Edokoro azukari*, and went back to Kyoto. Matsuki, *Kano-ke no chi to chikara*, 205-206.

⁸⁷ Phillip, “Honchô gashi and the Kano Myth,” 46-57.

⁸⁸ Kawamoto, “Sanrasku no gahô to sono tenkai” 山楽の画法とその展開, *Sanraku to Yûshô*, 121-169.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Igarashi, *Honchô gashi no kenkyû*; Lippit, *The Birth of Japanese Painting History*.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Tsurusawa Tanzan was also called Tansen 探川 earlier in his career. He was awarded the title of *Hokkyô* 法橋 in 1700, and *Hôgen* 法眼 in 1724. He received many imperial commissions, such as the murals of Prince Keijin 慶仁親王御所障壁画. See Asaoka Okisada 朝岡興禎 and Ôta Kin 太田謹, eds. (1913), *Koga bikô* 古画備考 (1848-1853); his other names were: Ryôshin 良信, Kenshin 兼信, and another studio name was *Tanshun* 探春. See also Kohitsu Ryôchû 古筆了仲, *Fusô gajin den* 扶桑画人伝, 1888.

⁹³ Kurokawa Dôyû was a Confucian scholar, a historian and also a medical doctor. He was born in Aki (present-day Hiroshima prefecture) as a son of the official doctor of the

Hiroshima fief, Kurokawa Jukan. His mother was a daughter of Hori Anri, who was another famous Confucian. His given name was Gen'itsu 玄逸, his pseudonym was Dôyû 道祐. His studio names were Sei'an 静庵 and Enpekiken 遠碧軒. He studied medicine under his father and Confucian teachings under Hayashi Razan and Gahō as well as Hori Anri. While practicing medicine he authored *Geibi no kuni gunshi* 芸備国郡志 and *Honcho ikô* 本朝医考 (published in 1663). After his retirement from medicine, he moved to Kyoto and focused on writing books and travelogues, including *Uzumasa mura koki* in 1681. Dôyû was close to Kaibara Ekiken 貝原益軒, Kano Einō's best friend, and wrote *Kano Einō monogatari* 狩野永納物語. See Takahashi Masahiko 高橋昌彦, "Kurokawa Dôyû den hokō", in *Nakamura Yukihiro chojutsushu* vol. 11.

⁹⁴ Sakakibara Satoru, "Ippen Kano-shi: Edo shoki Kano ha wo megutte" (1990).

⁹⁵ Nakabayashi Chikutō 中林竹洞, "*Chikutō garon*" 竹洞画論 (1802), *Nihon kaigaron taisei* 日本絵画論大成 (Tokyo: Perikansha ペリカン社, 1997), 217-290.

⁹⁶ Anzai Un'en 安西雲煙・於菟 *Kinsei meiga shaga dan* 近世名画書画談 (Edo: Izumiya Kin'uemon, et.al. 和泉屋金右衛門等, 1844).

⁹⁷ Kano Einō, "Honcho gashi," 351.

⁹⁸ Kano Hiroyuki, "Edo-Kano to Kyō-Kano," 江戸狩野と京狩野 *Kano-ha no Kyoshō tachi ten* 狩野派の巨匠たち展 (symposium proceeding), Shizuoka Prefectural Museum; Igarashi, *Honchō gashi* no kenkyū, note.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ For the following account in this section I am indebted to the University of Tokyo doctoral dissertation by Igarashi Kôichi.

¹⁰¹ Doi Tsugiyoshi suggested that Sansetsu was involved in a financial condition. However, he did not publish the document that revealed what the problem was. Tsuji speculates that the competition to receive a commission from the imperial court was fierce. See Tsuji, “Sansetsu no kisô,” 6.

¹⁰² Its author was Kimura Taka'atsu 木村高敦, a historian employed by the *bakufu*. One of the biographies of Ieyasu was compiled in 1740, and dedicated to the eighth shogun Tokugawa Yoshimune in 1741. A copy is housed in the National Diet Library.

¹⁰³ See Igarashi, *Honchô gashi no kenkyû*.

¹⁰⁴ Narushima Tomonao 成島司直, ed., *Tokugawa jikki* 徳川実記 (The Veritable Records of the Tokugawa), included in *Zoku Kokushi taiki* 続国司大系, completed in 1868. Cited in Lippit, *The Birth of Japanese Paintings*, 467.

¹⁰⁵ Wakisaka Jun 脇坂淳, “Kyô-Kano no kenkyû, Kyô-Kanoke shiryô 京狩野の研究 京狩野家資料,” *The Journal of the Osaka Municipal Museum* 大阪市立美術館紀要 九 1989.

¹⁰⁶ Gosekke 五摂家 are prime descendants of the Fujiwara family.

¹⁰⁷ Yodo-dono prepared the magnificent wedding set for Sadako, under the name of Hideyori. In 1604, both Hideyori and his step-sister Sadako were twelve years old.

¹⁰⁸ This work is recorded in one of the diaries of the Kujô family, *On nikki sonae wasure* 御日記備忘. See Kawamoto Keiko, “Kujô-ke denrai no Kuruma Arasoi zu wo megutte sono seisaku jijo to kaishaku wo chûshin ni 九条家伝来の車争い図をめぐって-その

制作事情と解釈を中心に, in *Nihon kaigashi no kenkyû* 日本絵画史の研究 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbunkan, 1989).

¹⁰⁹ While working closely with their patrons, trusted *goyô-eshi* often acquired top-secret political knowledge and sometimes engaged in espionage. Matsumura Norimasa 松村乗昌, “Goyo-ehi to sono jidai,” 御用絵師とその時代 *Shirarezaru goyo-eshi no sekai ten* 知られざる御用絵師の世界展, exhibition catalogue (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1998), 6-12.

¹¹⁰ Kawamoto, *Sanraku to Yûshô*, 114.

¹¹¹ Murasaki Shikibu, “Heart-to-Heart,” in *The Tale of Genji*, trans. Royall Tyler (New York: Penguin Classics, 2001), 163-167.

¹¹² These paintings have been extensively studied by Tanaka Ichimatsu 田中一松, Yamane Yûzô 山根有三, Doi Tsugiyoshi, and Tsuji Nobuo, *Myôshin-ji Tenkyû-in* 妙心寺天球院 *Shôhekiga zenshû* 障壁画全集 (Tokyo: Bijutsu shuppansha 1967).

¹¹³ The letters that they exchanged (狩野山雪宛松花堂昭乗書簡) survive and are currently housed in the Nezu Museum.

¹¹⁴ This work is currently housed in the Tokyo National Museum.

¹¹⁵ Hayashi Gahô, *Kano Einô kaden gajiku jo*.

¹¹⁶ Narushima Tomonao 成島司直, ed., *Tokugawa jikki* 徳川実記 (*The Veritable Records of the Tokugawa*), included in *Zoku Kokushi taiki* 続国司大系, completed in 1868.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁸ *Kinchû narabi ni kuge shohatto* 禁中並公家諸法度 was signed by Tokugawa Ieyasu, Hidetada, and Nijô Akizane 二条昭実 (1556-1619) at Nijô Castle on the seventeenth day of the seven month in 1615. Hashimoto Masanobu 橋本政宣, *Kinsei kuge shakai no kenkyû* 近世公家社会の研究 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbun-kan, 2002).

¹¹⁹ Information regarding the Kujô family is recounted in the article by Igarashi Kôichi. “Kano Einô to Zuishin’in Hyôgo kenritsu rekishi hakubutsukan kiyô,” in *Ningai* 16 (March 2005): 3-8.

¹²⁰ Kawamoto, “Kujôke denrai no Kuruma Arasoï zu wo megutte sono seisaku jijo to kaishaku wo chushin ni,” 54.

¹²¹ McKelway, “Kano Sansetsu and Kano Workshop Paintings of *The Song of Lasting Sorrow*,” 149. Eigon was one of the offspring born to Yuki’ie and Sadako, Igarashi.

¹²² *Zuishin-in kiroku* from 1670 to 1675 were lost.

¹²³ *Zuishin-in kiroku* are divided between the Kyoto Prefectural Library 京都府立総合資料館 located in Kitayama 北山 and the Kyoto National Museum.

¹²⁴ *Ningai Shôjô ontanjô 1050 nen kinen* 仁海僧正御誕生一〇五〇年記念 (Kyoto: Zuishin-in, 2005).

¹²⁵ These religious genres, *butsuga* and *engimono emaki*, were frequently produced by the Tosa workshop, specialists of secular paintings led by Tosa Mitsunobu (1434-1525). See Melissa McCormick, *Tosa Mitsunobu and the Small Scroll in Medieval Japan* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009).

¹²⁶ Hayashi Gahô, *Kano Einô kaden gajiku jo*, English translation by Matthew McKelway, *Chinese Romance from a Japanese Brush* (2009), 110.

¹²⁷ Kano Einô, *Painting Themes, Honchô gashi*, English translation by McKelway, “Kano Sansetsu and Kano Workshop Paintings of ‘The Song of Lasting Sorrow,’” 112.

¹²⁸ Doi, “Shohekiga to Sansetsu,” in *Sanraku to Sansetsu* (1943), 125-165; Doi, *Kano Sanraku/Sansetsu* (1976), 44-47, 138; Doi, ed., “Sanraku to Sansetsu” (1980), 12-13, 66-67; *Kangakei jinbutsu* (1980), 67-70, 114; *Kanôha no Kaiga* 狩野派の絵画 (Tokyo: Tokyo National Museum, 1981), 76-77, 224-225, *Chûgoku shôkei*, 106-113; *Kano-ha kettei-ban*, 104-105.

¹²⁹ Doi, “Sanraku to Sansetsu,” 126.

¹³⁰ Lippit, *The Birth of Japanese Painting History*, 475.

¹³¹ The inscription on the Mt. Fuji by Sansetsu reads: “Sansetsu is the first one to paint Mt. Fuji in this way” (山雪始図之 富士山). The inscription on the *Chôgonka* scroll reads: “Kano Sansetsu is the first one to paint the *Chôgonka* theme for successive generations” (狩野氏累世山雪始図之、長恨歌). Sansetsu reaches his apogee with the production of Mt. Fuji. Yamashita Yoshiya also identifies that Sansetsu’s signature in Mt. Fuji echoes that in the *Chôgonka* scrolls. See Yamashita, “Kano Sansetsuhitsu Fuji Miho Matsubarazu byôbu”

¹³² Jôzan was born as a son of Ishikawa Shigeyuki whose family served the Tokugawa clan for many generations. In 1600 he established his name as a warrior at the battle of Sekigahara 関ヶ原の合戦. However, his ascendance in the Tokugawa hierarchy stalled when he refused an invitation to tutor one of Ieyasu’s sons. In 1615 he defeated one of the Toyotomi captains at the Summer Campaign of Osaka Castle. However, instead of being rewarded he was punished, since the Tokugawa law prohibited scrambling for

victory among vassals. With much disappointment towards the military system, he left shogunal service and joined the literati. For the purpose of supporting his mother, he served the Asano 浅野 family in Hiroshima, but after her death he quit his job, returned to Kyoto, and lived in a hut near the Shôkoku-ji. He studied Chinese poetry and befriended the Neo-Confucian scholars Hayashi Razan and Fujiwara Seika. He inscribed on *Kan Magai hizu* 観磨崖碑図, painted by Kano Einô. This indicates the close relationship between Jôzan and the Kyô-Kano family. He also collaborated with Tan'yû and the members of Edo-Kano. Kendall Brown, *The Politics of Reclusion* (1997), 166.

¹³³ Kawamoto, "Sanraku no gahô to sono tenkai," 76-77, 107.

¹³⁴ Kawamoto has divided Sanraku's styles into three different stages: Keichô (1592-1615); Gen'na 元和 (1615-1624); Kan'ei 寛永 (1624-1635). Ibid.

¹³⁵ Shirai Kayô, *Gajô yôryaku*, 149.

¹³⁶ Kohitsu Ryôchû, *Fusô gajin den* (1883).

¹³⁷ Igarashi, *Kano Einô: sono tasai naru gagyô* 狩野永納—その多彩なる画業 (Hyogo: Hyogo Prefectural History Museum 兵庫県立歴史博物館, 1999).

¹³⁸ The Chinese zodiac calendar combines ten celestial stems and twelve earthly branches that create cycles of sixty years. The primordial gathering at the Orchid Pavilion was held in the year 353, which corresponds with the sign of *kichû* that is the same as the year 1673. Matsumura Takiko 松村多起子, "Kano Einô hitsu Rantei Kyokusuien zu byôbu ni tsuite 狩野永納筆<蘭亭曲水宴図屏風>について, in *Bijutsushi* 美術史 156 (2004): 488-489.

¹³⁹ Yamashita, “Fugû na jitsuryokusha tachi,” 104-5, 114-115; Yamashita, “Hakkei-zu o megutte: Fuji-san to Biwako no ba'ai,” *Nihon-ga no jôkei: Fuji-san/ Biwa-ko kara* 日本画の情景—富士山・琵琶湖から exhibition catalogue (Shizuoka: Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art/ The Museum of Modern Art, Shiga, 2000), 136-137.

¹⁴⁰ Wu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, 44-45; See Chapter One of this dissertation for the entire text of *Lantingxu*.

¹⁴¹ In the Southern Song Dynasty period (1127-1279), Xia Gui and Ma Yuan were the leaders of *daizhao* and members of the Imperial Academy of Painting at Hangzhou, which was re-established by the refugee court led by Emperor Gaozong (reigned 1127-1162) while his elder brother's son, who also claimed legitimacy, was still alive. Hence, the political agenda of Gaozong's Imperial Academy was to encourage themes of retrospection, legitimization, and restoration of the Southern Song ruling position through culturally legitimating that they were the successors of the Northern Song court. For this reason, Xia Gui's painting employs the formal characteristics of Song landscape painting, with its clear structure of foreground, middle-ground, and background, which suggest the macro-cosmic order of the universe to justify the rulership of emperor over his subjects. Also, he incorporated the traditional depiction of rocks and foliage in order to depict the cultural continuation of Northern Song taste. Xia Gui uses the final form of Northern Song artist Li Tang's ax-cut brush stroke, now icy and wet chips of the brush that sculpt mountains. See Richard Barnhart et al., *Three Thousand Years of Chinese Painting* (New Haven: Yale University press, 1997), 133.

¹⁴² Kitano, “Kano Sansetsu hitsu Seiko-zu byôbu,” 29; Kitano, “Sansetsu to shorai hanpon,” 78.

¹⁴³ Baird, *Symbols of Japan: Thematic Motifs in Art and Design*, 37.

¹⁴⁴ James Cahill, *Fantastics and Eccentrics in Chinese Painting*, exhibition catalogue (The Asiatic Society, distributed by Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1967).

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 28.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 63.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 64.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ See Wai-kam Ho, et al., *Eight Dynasties of Chinese Painting: The Collections of the Nelson Gallery-Atkins Museum, Kansas City, and the Cleveland Museum of Art* (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1980), 287-290. See also Patricia J. Graham, *Tea of the Sages: The Art of Sencha* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1998), 48-52.

¹⁵⁰ Yamashita, “Kano Sanraku niyoru Daikaku-ji no shohekiga” 狩野山楽による大覚寺の障壁画 in *Daikakuji Kotojunrei* 大覚寺古都巡礼 vol. 28 (Kyoto: Tankosha 淡交社, 2008), 127-136.

¹⁵¹ This work stayed within the Kyô-Kano family for two hundred years until Kitakaze Sadatada 北風貞忠 obtained it from the head of the ninth generation Eigaku. See Hayashi, “Kano Sansetsu no Bankoku zu ni tsuite” 狩野山雪の盤谷図について (Nara: Yamato Bunka-kan, 1989), 8.

¹⁵² See, Hayashi Susumu, *Nihon kinsei kaiga no zuzôgaku: shukô to shin'i* 日本近世絵画の図像学—趣向と深意 (Tokyo: Yagi shoten, 2000), 100-110.

¹⁵³ Hayashi, “Senkyô heno izanai –Kano Sansetsu hitsu Bankokuzu wo megutte”, 10-15.

-
- ¹⁵⁴ See Okudaira Shunroku, “Sanraku Sansetsu Sansui-jô ni tsuite” (Nara: Yamato Bunka-kan, 1989), 38-56.
- ¹⁵⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁶ Suzuki Hiroyuki 鈴木廣之, *Kangakei jinbutsu* 漢画系人物, *Nihon byôbu-e shusei* 日本屏風絵集成 Vol.4 *Jinbutsu-ga* 人物画 (Tokyo: Kôdansha 講談社, 1980), 114.
- ¹⁵⁷ Doi, Sanraku/ Sansetsu (1980), 134.
- ¹⁵⁸ *Chûgoku shokei*, 90-101.
- ¹⁵⁹ For the ancient Chinese, the dragon was linked with water (ocean, rivers, mist, rain, thunder, and clouds), symbolizing dark, wet, and nurturing (*yin*) feminine qualities. By the second century B.C.E., dragons with different numbers of claws identified rank within the Chinese imperial household. With the transmission of Buddhism from India to China, the dragon also assumed the powerful roles played by Indian serpent naga deities, which were viewed as protectors of the Buddhist faith. China influenced Japan in the association of the dragon with the imperial institution, Buddhism, and the virtue of vigilance. In the late seventh century, the *Nihonshoki* 日本書紀 (*Chronicles of Japan*) indicates that the dragon was a popular painted image to express the power of Buddhist temples. See Baird, *Symbols of Japan: Thematic Motifs in Art and Design*, 132.
- ¹⁶⁰ Kano Einô, *Honchô gashi*, Kasai, ed., 358-360.
- ¹⁶¹ Hayashi Gahô, *Kano Einô kaden gajiku jo*, Doi, Sanraku/Sansetsu (1981), 122.
- ¹⁶² Doi, *Sanraku/Sansetsu* (1981), 102.
- ¹⁶³ C. A. S. Williams, *Chinese Symbolism and Art Motifs: An Alphabetical Compendium of Antique Legends and Beliefs, as Reflected in the Manners and Customs of the Chinese* (Redlined, Vermont & Tokyo, Japan: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1974), 381.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ See Appendix 1 for the list of the Orchid Pavilion paintings in the Ming and Qing dynasties.

¹⁶⁷ Zhao Yuanchu, *The National Palace Museum Catalogue* 故宮博物院書畫圖錄, vol. 18 (Taipei: National Palace Museum 台北故宮博物館院, 1997), 73-78; Yao Shou, *Zhongguo gudai shuhua tumu* 中国古代書畫圖目, 京 10-6, Vol. 15 (Beijing: Wenwu 文物出版社, 1986), 43, 144-145.

¹⁶⁸ Craig Clunas, *Elegant Debts: The Social Art of Wen Zhengming* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2004), 89.

¹⁶⁹ *Zhongguo gudai shuhua tumu* 中国古代書畫圖目, vol. 15, 遼 1 – 107 (Beijing: Wenwu 文物出版社, 1986).

¹⁷⁰ The National Palace Museum Catalogue, vol.15 (Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1995), 275-276. The fence often appears in another tradition of painting, *Seien gashu zu* 西園雅集圖 (*Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden*). The tradition is that the sixteen noble-scholars assembled to enjoy poetry, calligraphy, painting and music, but it has been proved fictional since this scholarly gathering was held at the Western Garden in Kaifeng owned by Wang Shen, a son-in-law of Emperor Yingsun (r.1064-7) in the Northern Song dynasty. It is enclosed by an elaborate fence when it was illustrated. While this theme was painted by many Ming artists, it was one of the specialties of Qiu Ying, who also specialized in the Orchid Pavilion theme.

¹⁷¹ *Genshiryō zu* was thought for many centuries to have been painted by Kaihō Yūshō, but it was reattributed to Sanraku by Doi Tsuguyoshi. Doi, *Sanraku Sansetsu* (1980), 132-133.

¹⁷² The *Fūryūjin zu* 風流陣図 *byōbu* is housed in the Okayama Prefectural Museum. Takeda Tsuneo, ed., *Momoyama hyakusō* 桃山百雙 (Kyoto: Fuji Art, 1974).

¹⁷³ Li-chiang Lin, “Ming Painting and Prints: Possible Sources of Kano Sansetsu’s Chōgonka Scrolls,” in *Chinese Romance from a Japanese Brush* (London: Scala, 2009), 155.

¹⁷⁴ *Chūgoku shōkei*, 90-101.

¹⁷⁵ Entry of the Orchid Pavilion *byōbu* in *Kano Sansetsu: Senkyō heno izanai*, 53; also personal communication by Okudaira Shunroku on June 20, 2009.

¹⁷⁶ Igarashi, *Honcho gashi no kenkyū*.

¹⁷⁷ *Kigin Nikki* 季吟日記. See Igarashi, *Hyogo Prefectural Museum*, 65; Igarashi, *Honcho gashi no kenkyū*.

¹⁷⁸ Yamamoto Shunshō was an accomplished *waka* poet and a lacquer artist by profession. Lippit, *The Birth of Japanese Painting History*, 485.

¹⁷⁹ Igarashi, *Honcho gashi no kenkyū*; Lippit, *The Birth of Japanese Painting History*, 485.

¹⁸⁰ Tani Tomoko 谷知子, “Kujō-ke to *waka* 九条家と和歌,” in *Chūsei waka to sono jidai* 中世和歌とその時代 (Tokyo: Kasama shoin 笠間書院, 2004).

¹⁸¹ See Appendices 5 and 5a for a comparison between those representations.

¹⁸² Kano Einō, Kasai Masa’aki, *Honchō gashi*, 369

¹⁸³ Doi, *Sanraku/Sansetsu* (1980), 108-9.

¹⁸⁴ Thorp and Vinograd, *Chinese Art and Culture*, 210.

¹⁸⁵ *Asia rekishi jiten* (Heibonsha, Tokyo, 1959), 679.

¹⁸⁶ Kohara considers that ideological differences—for the Chinese, transmission of Confucian, and for the Japanese the dissemination of Buddhist teachings—may have been one of the reasons for this phenomenon. Kohara Hironobu 古原宏伸, *Chûgoku gakan no kenkyû* 中国画卷の研究 (Tokyo: Chûôkôron Bijutsu Shuppan 中央 公論 美術 出版, 2005), 15-21.

¹⁸⁷ Besides the Confucian masters, such a Buddhist scroll as *Damo liudai zushi tu* 達磨六代祖師図 displays the portraits of Zen Masters to suggest their episodes. *Xiyuan yaji tu* 西園雅集図 (*The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden*) also depicts the portraits of sixteen scholars in a party setting, but its narration does not develop along the passing of time. According to Kohara, Gu Hongzhong's *Night Revels of Han Xizai* is the only work that exhibits narrative development. Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Baird, *Symbols of Japan: Thematic Motifs in Art and Design*, 271.

¹⁹⁰ Baird, *Symbols of Japan: Thematic Motifs in Art and Design*, 250.

¹⁹¹ Thorp and Vinograd, *Chinese Art and Culture*, 313.

¹⁹² In the Zuishin-in version, three geese are depicted; two are swimming in front of the Orchid Pavilion structure and one is resting under the balcony. The number of geese indicates the rubbing studied by Sansetsu was probably the Huangnan 潢南本 large

version (approx. 34cm in height) with three geese. The smaller version (approx. 22cm in height) of the ink rubbing depicts four geese.

¹⁹³ The image of Chinese boys is reproduced in *Shôhekiga zenshû* 障壁画全集 *Myôshin-ji, Tenkyû-in* 妙心寺天球院 (Tokyo: Bijutsu shuppansha 美術出版社, 1967), 65.

¹⁹⁴ Brown, “Symbolic Virtue and Political Legitimation: Tea and Politics in the Momoyama Period,” in *The Politics of Reclusion*, 162.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 164.

¹⁹⁶ Wu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, 44-45. I have replaced Pinyin with Wade-Giles for the pronoun of the text.

Chapter Three: The Orchid Pavilion as an Alternative “Classical” Theme: Performing Literati for Identity Construction

In the second half of the Tokugawa-period, between around 1750 and 1868, the Chinese classical theme of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering became immensely popular, provoking a new type of visual tradition in Japan.¹ In particular, a Japanese version of the “Cult of the Orchid Pavilion” arose out of the tremendous contributions of a rising group of men and women encompassing various classes and diverse social backgrounds, loosely identified as “*bunjin*” 文人 (most commonly translated as literati).² After the cultural heights of the Genroku era 元禄 (1688-1709) had passed, *bunjinga* 文人画 (literati painting), together with a number of other nonconformist art movements, developed as a reaction against the socially dominant but artistically restricted Kano 狩野 School, the official painters to the Tokugawa *bakufu* 徳川幕府.³ It was a period in which a kind of counterculture that was inspired by, once again, the Chinese cultural model began to be created out of the discontent of both the samurai 侍 (military class), who failed to fit in the overly constrained *bakuhatsu taisei* 幕藩体制 (*bakufu*-domain system), as well as the newly emerging *chōnin* 町人 (townspeople), who accumulated significant wealth but continued to be socially oppressed.⁴ In order to construct a unique identity, the Japanese *bunjin* imagined themselves as aligning with the artistic lineage of the Chinese *wenren* (or literati); the *bunjin* did not slavishly imitate the Chinese model, however, added to it cultural elements of their own.

This chapter aims to articulate how and why the boom in the Orchid Pavilion theme occurred in Japan from the mid-eighteenth through the nineteenth century. What

visual sources did the *bunjin* artists adapt from Chinese sources to establish a new canon of Orchid Pavilion imagery? What motivated the *bunjin* community to produce and to consume diverse versions and copies of the Orchid Pavilion during this period? How and why did they seem to purposely combine the iconographies of similar painting themes? How did they contextually interpret and idealize the Orchid Pavilion event of the remote past in order to critique their present situation? In order to investigate these issues, I will exam a selected group of visual representations by Ike Taiga 池大雅 (1723-1776), Nakayama Kōyō 中山高陽 (1717-1780), Fukuhara Gogaku 福原五岳 (1730-1799), and Nakabayashi Chikutō 中林竹洞 (1776-1858). These artists shared similar ideological interests, yet their diverse social backgrounds motivated them to communicate distinct issues and agendas through Orchid Pavilion imagery.

The Orchid Pavilion Theme as an Alternative “Classicism”

In the early seventeenth century, when political turbulence had just ended and a period of peace had arrived, it was necessary for the newly established Tokugawa regime to invent new “classical” themes in order to suggest a sense of cultural continuity.⁵ Nonetheless, the notion of “classicism” became more multifaceted as society became more complicated by the mid-eighteenth century. Since the literati painter-authors of this period frequently discussed artistic lineage and the canonization of past artists in their numerous texts, I propose that “classicism” is one of the most important keys to understanding the Orchid Pavilion visual tradition within the dynamism of the so-called *bunjinga* movement. Essentially, the Orchid Pavilion theme, which featured the idealistic literati gathering of fourth-century China, was perceived as an alternative, rather than

conventional, “classical” theme by the *bunjin* community as it tried to separate itself from the existing social structure.

In order to better make sense of the complexity found in the term “classicism,” I draw on the work of Melanie Trede in “Terminology and Ideology: Coming to Terms with ‘Classicism’ in Japanese Art-Historical Writing,” in which she deconstructs Japanese artistic “classicism” and canon formation.⁶ Trede explains that the role of “classicism” in Western culture is closely related to the social and ideological notions of cultural value. The ancient Roman term “classic” refers to the upper or elite class and implies the value system of that class. The origins of “classicism” show it to be a powerful ideological construct and that historical context must be examined in order to identify who shapes the term in the past and who uses it today. In light of this, I will show how the Japanese *bunjin* community, which included a body of non-elite members, sought to elevate their status through an alternative “classic” theme in the Orchid Pavilion. Further, the *bunjin*’s use of a form of cultural power to contest their position in a social world that was controlled by military force was, in turn, appealing to some of the members of the samurai elite as well.

For pre-modern Japan, “China served as a classical antiquity, a Renaissance Italy, and an eighteenth century France all in one,” and thus most of high culture in Japan is actually derived from China.⁷ Particularly, the Japanese literati borrowed three basic concepts related to “classicism” from Chinese texts: 1) *gudian* 古典; J: *koten* for “classic”; 2) *gui* 古意; J: *ko’i* for “archaic idea” “idea of the ancient” “antique, old spirit” “evoking the past, turning to the past”; and 3) *guzhou* 古拙; J: *kosetsu* for “antique simplicity” and “ancient clumsiness.”⁸

These three concepts were often discussed by the Kogaku-*ha* 古学派 (School of Ancient Study) Confucians, whose impact on the *bunjin* establishment was tremendous.⁹ The reaction of nonconformist *bunjin* painters against the Kano painting School paralleled that of the Kogaku-*ha* Confucians against the orthodox Hayashi 林 School, which was officially supported by the Tokugawa *bakufu*. The Hayashi School advocated the *Shushi-gaku* 朱子学 (C. *Zhuzixue*; Neo-Confucianism) of Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130-1200) of the Song dynasty. Among Kogaku-*ha* scholars, Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠 (1666-1728) offered a radically new approach to Confucian studies, by rejecting the Neo-Confucian orthodoxy and looking directly back the ancient *Liu Jing* 六經 (the *Six Classics*): the *Books of History, Odes, Changes, Rites, and Music* (later lost), and the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, which were written before 300 B.C.E.¹⁰

Sorai began his career as a Neo-Confucian scholar employed by Yanagisawa Yoshiyasu 柳沢吉保 (1658-1714), the favored and principal retainer of the fifth Shogun Tokugawa Tsunayoshi 徳川綱吉 (1646-1709).¹¹ In 1709 when Tsunayoshi died, Sorai left his position at Yoshiyasu's office and became a *machijusha* 町儒者 (town Confucian). He established independence by opening his own private school in Edo called the Ken'en 護園 (reclusive garden), and thereafter was able to extend his scholarly pursuits in a liberal manner similar to the hillside province retreat of the legendary Wang Xizhi.¹² Stemming from Kogaku 古学, the Ken'en School was alternatively called Kobunjigaku 古文辞学 (School of Ancient Classical Texts) and placed an emphasis on the study of ancient texts. Ironically this encouraged the later ideological movement of *kokugaku* 国学 (National Learning), which promoted Japanese consciousness based on

native ancient texts, such as *Kojiki* 古事記 (*Record of Ancient Matters*).¹³ Sorai looked back to ancient Chinese works for reliable cultural and historical sources and argued that “the ultimate form of scholarly knowledge is history.”¹⁴

Sorai advised the first generation of *bunjinga* artists, such as Hattori Nankaku 服部南郭 (1783-1859) and Yanagisawa Kien 柳沢淇園 (1704-1758), to study ancient Chinese painting in order to bypass the Japanization of that painting tradition at the hands of the Kano painters and to learn the Chinese philosophy imbedded in the ancient painting. In other words, Sorai rejected the Song interpretations of Confucianism and called for a return to the classical Confucian texts using a kind of philological method, while the first-generation *bunjin* painters did the same thing by rejecting Kano versions of ancient subjects. Both moves were clearly contrary to the ideology of the Tokugawa *bakufu*. Further, Sorai promoted the Confucian principal of “educability” — the ability of all people to be educated — and argued that through education everyone has the opportunity to contribute to a better society. He also showed his disrespect for militarism and regarded cultural affairs prior to the rise of military rulership with great idealism.¹⁵ This approach of avoiding convention, while relying on an alternative “classicism,” functioned as a backbone ideology in the production and reception of the Orchid Pavilion theme and thereby served to construct “*bunjin* self-consciousness.”

Chinese *Wenren*/ Japanese *Bunjin*

The Orchid Pavilion paintings of the Japanese *bunjin* and the formation of *bunjin* identity involved layers of irony and confusion. The Japanese *bunjin* painters formulated the new Orchid Pavilion visual tradition in a time of restricted trading policy. Despite

this, they borrowed styles and motifs from various Chinese models. However, most of these models consisted of non-literati materials. Although the Japanese adaptation of Chinese painting and theory is unquestionable, differences in the respective sociopolitical backgrounds of the Japanese *bunjin* and the Chinese *wenren* make comparison of the two groups difficult.

In China, the concepts and status of literati and literati art have changed according to social, political, and economic conditions. Prior to the Tang 唐 dynasty (618-907), the literati class consisted of educated aristocrats, such as the family of Wang Xizhi in the Eastern Jin 東晉 (317-420). In the Tang period, they required local recommendation to serve in a governmental post. An official examination system was established by Emperor Huizong in the Northern Song 北宋 dynasty (960–1127). After that, men from all classes could register to take the exam and be given a chance to receive an official position. Literati art was produced by amateur-artists of this class who engaged in cultural pursuits as a pastime.¹⁶

In the Yuan 元 dynasty period (1279-1368), the Chinese *wenren* often refused to serve rulers whom they regarded as illegitimate. As a consequence, the most valued painters often adopted the role of a hermit living in seclusion. Under the harsh political and economic conditions during the Mongol occupation, the Chinese *wenren* formed networks of mutual support.¹⁷ Literati painting functioned as an important means of communication among those who were educated and could read a common visual language to share the experiences and feelings associated with their class position.¹⁸

In 1368, China was brought back under the native rule of the Ming 明 dynasty (1368-1644). The early Ming emperors sought to restore the cultural glory of the Song

dynasty by reinstituting the Song Academy of Painting, which was discontinued by the Mongol rulers. Later, however, the imperial court lost its enthusiasm for promoting academic painters. At the same time, the literati returned to serving in privileged governmental positions, and literati painters in Suzhou become prominent. The status and situation of the literati under the Song/Yuan, however, changed drastically in the late Ming context. The availability of official governmental posts became extremely restricted, and a great number of well-prepared candidates for higher education had no chance of winning official recognition. Consequently, a large population of wealthy gentry spent more time in cultural and artistic pursuits rather than serving in governmental posts. This situation motivated the Ming *wenren* to creatively express their subtle resentment against the political system using the officially promoted visual vocabulary of the Song and the Yuan.¹⁹

By the late Ming period, the distinction between literati and professional had been largely eroded. Professional painters mainly produced works for commercial purposes, and since literati-related art had become successful in evoking consumer desire, their work was mostly in the more valuable literati style.²⁰ Hence, the themes that portrayed the social gatherings of literati, such as the “Orchid Pavilion,” “Visiting the Red Cliff,” and the “Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden,” were barely produced by literati but were instead favored by the professional painters in the late Ming and Qing dynasties.²¹ Most notably, the Suzhou 蘇州 commercial painters specialized in these themes during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.²² Most of the Orchid Pavilion paintings imported to Japan in the eighteenth century were commercially produced by the Suzhou painters.

In response to the eroded distinction between literati and professional, the late Ming literati-artist Dong Qichang 董其昌 (1555-1636) sought to reinvigorate the scholar-amateur tradition and to reestablish the literati aesthetic canon.²³ The significant social, political and economic agendas that this entailed are found in his theoretical division of painters into two opposing lineages – *nanzonghua* 南宗画 (J: *nanshûga*; the southern school painting) and *beizonghua* 北宗画 (J: *hokushûga*, the northern school painting) – in *Nanbeizonglun* 南北宗論 (*The Southern and Northern Schools Theory*), which was most frequently cited by the Japanese *bunjin* authors.²⁴ The concept of “southern and northern” schools was derived from Zen 禪 or Chan Buddhism, which had also split into “northern and southern” schools. While the northern Chan school’s religious practices led to gradual enlightenment, the southern Chan school promoted the idea of sudden enlightenment. Dong Qichang artificially employed this distinction to distinguish among various approaches to painting: the Wu School 吳派 of the literati were set into the southern school painting, which was characterized as freer, less realistic, more spontaneous and individualistic, and usually showed a preference for ink monochrome and calligraphic brushwork, as well as the repetition and distortion of forms; whereas the imperial academicians and professionals of the Zhe School 浙派 were set into the northern school painting, which was considered to be skillful, polished, detailed and descriptively realistic, and was often executed in a colorful and decorative manner.²⁵ Dong fabricated the literati artistic lineage from “classical” antiquity and positioned Wang Wei 王維 (701-761) of the Tang dynasty as the founder of the southern school painting.²⁶

Unlike in China, the history of the literati and literati art in Japan is rather short and only began in the early modern period. Yoshizawa Chū discusses the formation of the Japanese literati as the result of a social, economic and ideological reaction to the Tokugawa system.²⁷ Although the issue of *bunjin* identity is extremely important in a study of the Orchid Pavilion visual tradition, I will not try to capture all the historical changes in the definition of Japanese *bunjin* here. As discussed in Chapter Two, however, it is important to recall that Sansetsu, a Kano School painter, ironically was often identified as a “literati” artist in the seventeenth century. He also collaborated to produce a hanging scroll version of the Orchid Pavilion (figure 2. 16) with Ishikawa Jōzan 石川丈山 (1583-1672), who was considered “the spiritual founder of the Edo-period literati painting movement.”²⁸ Despite some basic similarities with the Chinese *wenren*, the Japanese *bunjin* faced different social and political issues and dealt with them according to their own interests. Because they were newly comprised groups of people that sought to gain stronger social positions under the militarily oriented Tokugawa regime, the *bunjin* needed to construct images relating to the artistic and cultural lineage of Chinese literati classicism.

Bunjinga was often also called *nanga* (literally, southern painting), an invented term and abbreviation of Dong Qichang’s *nanzonghua* (southern school painting). However, the *bunjinga* or *nanga* “school” was a type of community that was not institutionalized in the way that family-based studios, such as the Kano or Tosa School, were. There were masters and pupils among the *bunjin* communities but these were rather loosely bound networks of cultured people, who shared the ideology and aesthetics derived from Chinese scholarly values.²⁹ These values entailed a Daoist appreciation for

nature and an aspiration for reclusion along with the Confucian moral obligation to critique corrupted government.³⁰

In order to criticize oppressive Tokugawa sociopolitical conditions, the Japanese *bunjin* painters attempted on a theoretical level to imitate the “southern school” literati painting and deliberately avoided the Kano professional style, which was equated with the “northern school” academic painting. In this sense, more than “style,” what the *bunjin* aspired to was the “attitude” of the Chinese literati artists who deliberately avoided using the “northern school” style. Only as a matter outside their stated aims did they establish their own style, which separated them from the mainstream painters, especially those who served the *bakufu*.

This preference for the theoretical distinction between styles over the substance of stylistic imitation may be found in *Kaiji Higen* 絵事鄙言 (*Commentary on paintings*) of 1799 by the Edo painter-theorist Kuwayama Gyokushū 桑山玉洲 (1746-1799). This text is effectively the Japanese version of Dong Qichang’s *The Southern and Northern School Theory*. In it Gyokushū aligns all of the official painters to the ruling class — the Kanō painters, as well as the Zen Buddhist painters such as Josetsu 如拙 (active early fifteenth century), Shūbun 周文 (active 1423-58), and Sesshū Tōyō 雪舟等楊 (1420-1506) — with the “northern school painting” (*hokushūga*), while labeling as Japan’s “southern school painting” (*nanshūga*) all of the literati painters and other non-official or nonconformist painters, including the Rinpa painters, Tawaraya Sōtatsu (died in 1643) and Ogata Kōrin (1658-1716).³¹ Unquestionably, the colorful and decorative design-like style of Rinpa does not fit stylistically into the southern school painting category. Just as Dong Qichang emphasized the social background of artists and their paintings,

Gyokushū's main concern in categorizing artists obviously rested on the sociopolitical issues surrounding a painting rather than style. Consequently, the *bunjinga* or *nanga* style of the Orchid Pavilion paintings developed through the absorption of various elements and characteristics of Chinese literati and professional painting, printed painting manuals, traditional Japanese style painting, and also Western style painting.

While the Chinese *wenren* were a prestigious elite belonging to the class of *shidafu* 士大夫 (bureaucratic government officials) which was, in most cases, associated with power and wealth, the Japanese *bunjin* were men and women of varied backgrounds, social classes, and occupations. Although some of the Japanese *bunjin* held positions of *jukan* 儒官, Confucian officials who were employed by a shogun or daimyo to teach in their schools and to perform Confucian rituals, their status and salaries were considerably low. Unlike the Chinese *wenren* who aspired to be amateur-painters and barely engaged in commerce, most of the Japanese *bunjin* were professional-painters and were generally frank about the fact that they earned their living by selling paintings, calligraphy, and poems.³² Hence, most of the paintings depicting the Orchid Pavilion theme in the Tokugawa period were produced as commodities.

Diverse Sources for the *Bunjin* Orchid Pavilion Images

In order to understand the development of the Orchid Pavilion visual tradition, it is necessary to examine the availability of Chinese pictorial sources under the restricted trading policy of eighteenth-century Japan. The most widely distributed sources for Orchid Pavilion imagery were certainly the Ming-dynasty ink rubbings, which I discussed in Chapter One. Since Kano Sansetsu's version of the Orchid Pavilion was

clearly based on one of these rubbings, that rubbing must have been imported to Japan at the end of the Momoyama period or, at the latest, by the beginning of the seventeenth century. At this time, the rubbings were well distributed and formed a canon that was studied mostly by the Kano painters. Although the *bunjinga* versions of the Orchid Pavilion theme may have been manifested as a reaction against the canon of imagery that the rubbings formed, *bunjin* painters were always conscious of the composition and iconography of the rubbings.

The most important sources of Chinese culture in the mid-Tokugawa period were the Ōbaku Zen 黄檗禅 (C: Huangbo Chan) monks, who immigrated to Japan after the fall of the Ming dynasty.³³ By that time, China had become a difficult place for the Ming loyalist-literati to continue their cultural and intellectual pursuits, due to persecution by the Manchu (the semi-nomads from the northern area who established the Qing dynasty that replaced the Ming). At the beginning of the Qing 清 dynasty (1644-1911), the Ming loyalist community followed the model of the Yuan hermits who had refused to serve the foreign court that followed the Mongol conquest, removing themselves to mountain monasteries where they became monks.

Accompanied by twenty monks and ten artisans, Ōbaku priest Ingen 隱元 (C: Yinyuan, 1592-1673) fled to Nagasaki in 1654.³⁴ Four year later, he was allowed to travel to Edo where he met the fourth shogun Tokugawa Ietsuna 徳川家綱 (1641-1680), who granted his wish to settle and construct a temple in Uji 宇治, Kyoto. With the support of the fifth shogun Tsunayoshi 綱吉, a monastery at Manpuku-ji 萬福寺 (a branch of the mother temple in Fuzhou) was first established by Ingen in 1663. Although the Tokugawa *bakufu* did not have an official relationship with the Qing dynasty, their

promotion of Neo-Confucianism encouraged people to expand their knowledge of all things related to China. In Japan the *bakufu*, as well as the *bunjin* community, paid great respect to the Ming loyalists. Ōbaku cooperation was more egalitarian than other Zen sects since it embraced the worship of the Amida Buddha, a belief that appealed to all types of people regardless of their class.³⁵

Although the Ōbaku monks were more interested in *dōshakuga* 道釈画, or Zen subjects such as “bamboo and pine tree,” and *chinsō* 頂相 portraits of Zen masters, they also brought with them Ming paintings and calligraphy of a high standard. Japanese visitors to Manpuku-ji were fascinated with the Ōbaku collection, including a handscroll (figure 2. 25) representing the Orchid Pavilion theme painted by Fan Yi 樊沂 (active ca.1658-1671). A native of Jiangsu 江蘇 Province and active in Jinling (present-day Nanjing 南京), Fan Yi was the elder brother of Fan Qi 樊圻 (1616-1694), one of the Eight Masters of Jinling (*Jinling Ba Jia* 金陵八家), a group of Ming-loyalist painters.³⁶ This handscroll, dated 1671, was painted in ink and color on silk. The compositional order of this painting is the reverse of the standard Ming-dynasty ink rubbing: it begins with a bridge and ends with the pavilion. Apart from this reversal, however, the emphasis on horizontality resembles the standard ink rubbing. In this painting, the figures are rather rigidly seated by the riverbank, but they are not labeled nor seated according to the seating order set out in the Ming-rubbings, thus making their identities unrecognizable.

Housed in the Cleveland Museum today, this handscroll’s Japanese provenance is long and interesting.³⁷ According to the frontispiece inscription and colophons, in 1707 it was in the possession of Yueshan (Jp. Gensan, 1629-1709), a Ōbaku monk, who

immigrated to Japan in 1657 to join the religious community in exile.³⁸ Later, this work became the property of Tomioka Tessai 富岡鉄斎 (1836-1924), a Meiji *bunjin* master who collected numerous Orchid Pavilion images and painted the theme himself many times.³⁹ The Orchid Pavilion narrative that so evoked the melancholy of life in exile and the community of noble hermits appealed not only to the Ming-loyalists in exile, but also to the Japanese *bunjin*, who aspired to perform the role of the Chinese literati while visiting Manpuku-ji. This scroll had a tremendous impact on the development of Japanese Orchid Pavilion paintings.

Apart from this scroll, the vast majority of the information regarding Chinese painting in the eighteenth century came from non-literati sources. Another influential source of Chinese painting used in formulating new Orchid Pavilion imagery came from Chinese traders who were conducting business in the port city of Nagasaki 長崎. Shen Nanpin 沈南蘋 (also known as Shenquan 沈銓; Jp: Chin Nanpin; ca.1682-1780), a Qing dynasty professional bird-and-flower painter was the most prominent figure among them.⁴⁰ His meticulous style was far from the literati tradition, yet its influence over Japanese *bunjinga* was enormous. Yi Fujiu 伊孚九 (Jp: I Fukyū) was another merchant-painter active in Nagasaki between 1720 and 1747.⁴¹ Although Yi Fujiu was not a scholar-official painter, in Japan he was perceived as an amateur-artist who transmitted the landscape of the Yuan literati-masters, Huang Gongwang 黄公望 (1269-1354) and Ni Zan 倪瓚 (1301-1374), both of whom had refused to serve the foreign regime at the time of Mongol conquest. His works were available to a number of *bunjinga* painters and had an especially strong impact on Ike Taiga.⁴²

Through Nagasaki, many actual Chinese paintings were imported for commercial purposes. Because the Japanese were prohibited from traveling to China, Chinese merchants had the choice of what to import for profit. Thus, James Cahill suggests that these paintings must have been rather “cheap, easily available, and reasonably attractive” works in China.⁴³ These works fall into a few categories. One consists of the professional paintings by the little-known or unknown painters of the Zhe School, which were out of fashion in China at that time. A second is comprised of the copies and forgeries of the Ming literati Wu School masters, the most favorable among them were those of Shen Zhou 沈周 (1427-1509), Wen Zhengming 文徵明 (1470-1559), Qiu Ying 仇英 (1494-1552) and Tang Yin 唐寅 (1470-1524). A copy of Qiu Ying’s Orchid Pavilion handscroll by an anonymous painter (figure 3. 1), which is housed in the Tokyo National Museum and was produced in the seventeenth century and imported to Japan shortly thereafter, is such an example. This work obviously exhibits a different style from Qiu’s original (figure 3. 2) housed in the National Palace Museum. A third group that was also extremely desirable in Japan at that time consists of work by the late Ming masters of Suzhou, the major center of commercial painting production: Lan Ying 藍瑛 (1585-1664), Li Shida 李士達 (1550-1660), and Sheng Maoye 盛茂燁 (date unknown).⁴⁴ The subject matter of these paintings was mainly landscape or figure-in-landscape, which included the Orchid Pavilion Gathering theme, a subject that was particularly appreciated and studied by the Japanese *bunjinga* painters. A handscroll (figure 3. 3), painted in ink and color on silk by Sheng Maoye in 1621, was imported to Japan shortly after its production. This painting was copied by Nakabayashi Chikutō. It stayed in Japan until

1973, when it was purchased by the American dealer James Freeman, who sold it to the University of Michigan Museum of Art.⁴⁵

Finally, the Japanese *bunjin* painters learned from a group of manuals with model illustrations for depicting landscape, architecture, and figure-in-landscape elements, all of which were necessary components of Orchid Pavilion imagery. However, the illustrations for these manuals were woodblock prints, which meant that the ink tones of the original paintings were configured in single lines and flat colors that stood out in sharp contrast to the white background of the printed paper. In addition to the many examples of Ming and Qing paintings (mostly by little- or unknown painters, the copies and forgeries discussed above), these manuals were used as supplements for the Japanese *bunjin* painters who sought new artistic expressions.⁴⁶ *Bazhong huapu* 八種画譜 (Jp: *Hasshu gafu*; *Primer on Eight Varieties of Painting*) published in China between 1621 and 1628, and imported and reprinted in Japan in 1710; *Jieziyuan huazhuan* 芥子園画伝 (Jp: *Kaishien gaden*; *Mustered Seed Garden Manual of Painting*) compiled and published by Wang Kai 王槩 (active 1670-1700) in China between 1679 and 1701, and reprinted in Japan in 1748; and *Gushi huapu* 顧氏画譜 by Gu Ping 顧炳, published in 1603, were the most significant sources for the formation of Japanese literati painting, although many other woodblock-printed painting manuals were imported from China to Japan.⁴⁷

Conceptualizing a New Taste for the Orchid Pavilion

Among the first generation of Japanese literati were Gion Nankai 祇園南海 (1677-1751) and Yanagisawa Kien, and although they did not produce Orchid Pavilion visual imagery, they wrote texts that helped later generations to conceptualize the

theme's visual representation, directly or indirectly. Nankai and Kien shared similar backgrounds and experiences. Both belonged to the samurai class, had many scholarly pursuits, and were especially interested in Confucian philosophy. Both were employed by feudal lords, but both experienced dismissal and exile for offenses that appear not to have been documented. Early in their careers they had received the Kano school training appropriate to their samurai class; however, their alienation from the dominant ideology appears to have encouraged them to seek new and unconventional sources in Chinese painting history, in contradistinction to the government-approved Kano style.⁴⁸ There is no extant Orchid Pavilion painting produced by either of them. However, their texts clearly communicate the desire for social change that is essential to the Orchid Pavilion narrative.

Gion Nankai was a native of Ki'i 紀伊 Province (present-day Wakayama Prefecture) and was the eldest son of a medical doctor and Confucian scholar. At a young age he accompanied his father to Edo, where he studied Confucian texts and *kanshi* 漢詩 (Japanese Chinese poetry) with Kinoshita Jun'an 木下順庵 (1621–1698). Nankai returned to Ki'i in 1697 but in 1700 was banished for some unspecified offence. Because Nankai was highly regarded as the finest poet and *karayō* 唐様 (Chinese style) calligrapher of his day, he was pardoned in order to participate in receptions for the Korean mission of 1710. Three years later he was appointed the official teacher in the fiefdom's Confucian academy.

In the essay *Shōun sango* 湘雲瓚語 (*Xiang-River Clouds, Jeweled Words*), which was published posthumously in Edo in 1846 by Sumimaruya Jinsuke 角丸屋甚助, Nankai comments on a variety of Chinese painting themes that are based on classical

literature, including the Orchid Pavilion Gathering.⁴⁹ Nankai criticizes the Ming-dynasty ink rubbings for lacking the feeling of *wachō* 和暢 (harmonious spontaneity), which he thought to be the most important element in illustrating Wang Xizhi's classical gathering. Nankai's approach — to construct a new pictorial design using ancient materials — resonates with the Kogaku ideal as stated by Ogyū Sorai.

The passage in *Shōun sango* dealing with the Orchid Pavilion image reads:

The image of the *Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering* was engraved in stone, the ink rubbings of which have been widely circulated among painters. However, it is extremely vulgar and has no “*omomuki*” 趣 (artistic taste). As a pastime, I have been hoping to produce a new version of the Orchid Pavilion image, but I have still not done it. At last, I have the chance to write down for later reference how I want to paint an Orchid Pavilion.

In the ink rubbing, a large ostentatious building is located at the beginning of the scroll. The person leaning on his desk writing must be Wang Xizhi. Three page boys are attending him at each side. In my opinion, Wang Xizhi avoided the capital and aspired to live in a mountain hut. The representation of a residence such as in this scroll does not appropriately express the characteristics of an elegant hermit. His residence should be a humble hut standing by the water, surrounded by luxurious woods and tall bamboo.

In the ink rubbing, there are two stone tables located in the two caves. Wine cups and bottles are placed next to two large wine vases. Page boys are pouring wine in the cups, placing them on lotus leaves, and floating them on the stream. However, placing all the wine cups on lotus leaves is too boring, so

different types of plants, such as paulownia, banana, and heart vines should be used.

In the ink rubbing, forty-two guests participate in the event. Everyone is seated rigidly on both sides of the riverbank. Each of them has a brush, ink-stone, and a scroll of paper. They are all silently seated and seem to be struggling. The only interesting figures are Yu Yun, who is supported by a page boy since he has drunk too much wine, and Yang Mo, who is standing up and dancing. The Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion during the years of Yonghe is supposed to have been attended by the elegant scholar-officials of that time. How can they struggle to compose their poems? When I look at their poems, they are not spectacular verses but rather collections of short, ordinary works to satisfy a temporary event. Why, then, are all the guests struggling to compose poems? Why are they so bothered by the punishment of three cups of wine?

When I think about the [historical] Orchid Pavilion Gathering, the host and the guests enjoyed their conversations, and appreciated the atmosphere of the event. Why must they drink and not enjoy the poetry? They should drink for enjoyment and should compose poetry. If one cannot compose poetry, one should drink a cup in a playful manner. This elegant gathering is a temporary event. If the image portrays a scene of suffering, there is no *wachō* (spontaneous harmony). How can we be entertained by listening to and watching this event?

Now, this is how I would improve this image: there are forty-two participants in this gathering; three to five are freely strolling around in nature, some are leaning their heads on the shoulders of others, some are holding hands,

some are appreciating the flowers and bamboo. Six or seven are engaging in pleasant conversation; one waves his fan, one stretches, and one holds his legs. One scholar lifts the wine cup from the water, one leans on the tree and watches the event, and one sits on the grass and fishes from the clean stream. One offers a drink to others, and one refuses the offer. One watches the event, while another scholar drinks too much wine and is supported by others, and one leaves behind many cups after drinking. One conceives a poem and writes it down, one recites it aloud, and one enjoys listening. The poetry-composing and drinking party should not be forced in one pattern. This type of elegant event is not enough even when depicting a thousand ancient parties.

In the ink rubbing, a long, uninteresting stream of water runs through the pictorial composition from the beginning to the end. There are four or five bamboo in the middle and two willows over the bridge at the end of the scroll, but none of them shows interesting taste.

In the ink rubbing, the railing on the bridge is extremely vulgar. Now, I would give the water more dynamic movement. Sometimes, it runs through the bamboo, and sometimes through the woods it appears and disappears. There should be high and low parts to the riverbank, and fast and slow parts to the stream, or a strange stone placed in the middle of stream, or a flat platform created for dancing. As for the wine cups, one floats with the flow of the water, one stops at the stone, and one rushes too fast and sinks into the water. Some cups are colliding with each other; some are turning around and not flowing. The bamboo and woods should be depicted densely and sporadically, large and small.

The bridge should be a flat panel without a railing. The water stream runs into the willow and never seems to stop.

In the ink rubbing, a water spring runs into the stream.

Eleven scholars composed two poems; fifteen composed only one poem; and sixteen could not compose any poems at all. Those who could not compose drank three cups of wine.

[In my ideal,] Wei Bang's, figure is observing the rock.

Wang Bingzhi's, figure is depicted fishing.

Wang Fengzhi, is shown soaking his foot in the water.

The names of participants should be recorded separately.⁵⁰

According to this passage, Ming-dynasty ink rubbings were thoroughly distributed among artistic communities in eighteenth-century Japan and those representing the Orchid Pavilion were considered to be the conventional visual representations of that theme. Needless to say, most of the Orthodox Kano painters had produced their Orchid Pavilion images based on the ink rubbings. Nankai repeatedly claimed that these works appeared *zoku* 俗 (vulgar). His passion was to create new Orchid Pavilion imagery, replacing vulgarity with “*omomuki*” 趣 (artistic taste), which was different from the conformist approach and entailed a demeanor usually expressed as *ga* 雅 (elegance) in *gazokuron* 雅俗論 (theory of elegance and vulgarity). Satō Yasuhiro suggests that in order to be able to describe so meticulously the image he imagines in minute detail, Nankai probably had seen actual Ming or Qing paintings depicting the Orchid Pavilion Gathering and based his ideal image on a description of these.⁵¹

Yanagisawa Kien did not write directly about the Orchid Pavilion, but his commentaries on art helped shape the ideological understanding of the later literati movement. Kien was born in 1706 into an influential family that ruled their domain in Koriyama 郡山 (in today's Nara prefecture).⁵² Like Nankai, he received a Confucian education in Edo at a young age. One of his teachers was the Kogaku-*ha* scholar and calligrapher Ogyū Sorai. Kien also received painting lessons from a minor master of the Kano School but soon became dissatisfied and began to study Chinese painting and calligraphy of the Ming period, which were available to him in the form of imported originals and woodblock-printed manuals. He became directly acquainted with Chinese culture by studying with Chinese monks of the Ōbaku sect and was taught Chinese-style calligraphy by Hosoi Kōtaku 細井広沢 (1658-1735).⁵³ Kien also mastered the “Sixteen Noble Accomplishments” that were expected of a samurai, which included the military arts, poetry and the tea ceremony, but his amateur-artistic pursuits seem to have interested him more than his political and military duties.⁵⁴

In 1725, at age twenty-one, Kien expressed his anti-Kano views in the essay, *Hitorine* ひとりね (*Sleeping alone*). In this essay, he mostly discusses how to play with women in the pleasure quarters but also comments on art and art practice.⁵⁵ In another essay, *Fukueki ikkansho* 復盆一幹書 (*Multiple Benefits in a Single Brushstroke*), Kien describes how, when he turned twelve or thirteen, he suddenly realized that “the professional artists of the Kano School never got below the ‘skin’ (or surface), and none of them reach the ‘bone’ (or essence of the subject).”⁵⁶ Kien also wrote that “one must study painting from Chinese antique paintings,” because “the best Japanese artists have always imitated Chinese antique paintings.”⁵⁷ This statement certainly indicates his

mentor Ogyū Sorai's teaching which emphasized looking back to Chinese classical antiquity to find an alternative style.

Constructing a New Canon for His Community: Ike Taiga

Ike Taiga (1723-1776) has been considered the second generation *bunjin* painter who pursued the mission set out by Nankai and Kien. He was also credited with formulating the “Japanese *bunjinga*” style, along with Yosa Buson 与謝蕪村 (1716-1784), and was arguably the first artist to paint the Orchid Pavilion theme in *bunjinga* fashion.⁵⁸ Taiga produced numerous Orchid Pavilion images in various formats, such as the votive panel, *byōbu* screens, hanging scrolls, and picture albums.⁵⁹ Both Taiga's style and the pictorial program he used to depict this theme set a new standard, which was followed by contemporary *bunjinga* artists and later generations of artists. In order to reveal how Taiga sought artistic inspiration from classical Chinese (and also Japanese) models in working out his version of the Orchid Pavilion, it is important to trace his early education.

Taiga's highly constructed biography has been recorded in numerous texts by the *bunjin* circle, especially by his disciples who created the impression, suitable for a leader of a nonconformist art movement, of an eccentric genius. One such text is the *Taigadō kafu* 大雅堂家譜 (*Records of the Taiga Lineage*), which was edited and compiled by Sekkyo 石居, the adopted son of Taiga's disciple, friend and patron Kimura Kenkadō 木村兼葭堂 (1736-1802), a wealthy Osaka merchant.⁶⁰ According to the *Taigadō kafu*, Taiga was born in the city of Kyoto to a lower-middle class family and was given the name Matajirō 又次郎. His father Ikeno Kazaemon 池野嘉左衛門 was a peasant who

moved from Kitayama Mizorogaike 北山深泥池 in the outskirts of Kyoto to the inner district of Nishijin 西陣 and became a *chōnin*, working as a money exchanger at the silver mint.⁶¹

At the age of three, Taiga had already demonstrated his calligraphic abilities by writing the two characters “*kinzan* 金山 (referring to mint).” When he was only four years old, his father died, leaving only his mother to care for him. Continuing with his education, Taiga studied under many famous teachers. In 1729, Taiga began to study Chinese Classics and then calligraphy with Monk Issei 一井 (1673-1740) at Seikō-in 清光院, a subtemple of the Pure Land sect temple Dan’nō-ji 壇王寺.⁶² A calligraphic inscription of two verses from the *Kokinshū* 古今集 (*A Collection of Poems Ancient and Modern*) was executed by Taiga when he was eleven years old, under the instruction of Issei.⁶³ At this early stage, Taiga had already experimented with a new art form - using *karayō* calligraphy in the execution of *waka* poetry - which showed how he could imitate Ming models while attempting to recreate these models in a form that was more likely to be accepted by Japanese audiences. Since Taiga was surrounded by *karayō* calligraphers, his exposure to the *Lantingxu* must have come early, as it was often employed as a model of Chinese calligraphy for students to copy and learn.

Because of his talents and intellectual curiosity, Taiga received support from the cultural and intellectual circles gathered around the Ōbaku Zen Buddhist community, which hosted Chinese scholar-monks. In 1730, Taiga was introduced to the Ōbaku Zen temple of Manpuku-ji at Uji where “real” Chinese culture was radiating outward. Taiga executed his calligraphy there and was immediately recognized as a child prodigy by the two principal Chinese Ōbaku monks, the twelfth abbot, Kōdōgenchō Zenshi 杲堂元昶禪

師 (1666-1753) and Daibai Jōsan 大梅浄璨 (date unknown). Zenshi and Jōsan composed poetry praising Taiga's artistic ability, calling him "*shindō*" 神童 (the divine child) in their verse.⁶⁴ This adoration made Taiga always feel close to Manpuku-ji, and his association with the Ōbaku community continued throughout his life. Suzuki and Sasaki suggest that, for Taiga, Chinese art and culture were never perceived as foreign, but rather as natural forms of expression.⁶⁵ Hence, when he painted his *Orchid Pavilion*, Taiga incorporated Ming painting style to visualize an ideal utopia where people could live in peace and harmony, which he based on his experience in the Ōbaku Zen Buddhist monastery. While spending time at Manpuku-ji, he must have seen and studied the *Orchid Pavilion* handscroll by Fan Yi discussed earlier. It should be noted that Taiga studied the Ming painting style diligently but never was a slavish copier. For Taiga, the Ming painting style was a tool to express nonconformist messages, which he shared with the Japanese *bunjin* community and other networks. It is ironic that Taiga's *bunjin* taste was desired by his upper class samurai patrons and clients, who often also considered themselves "*bunjin*."⁶⁶

In 1737, at the age of fourteen, Taiga opened his painted-fan shop, called Shūki-dō 袖亀堂, in Nijō Higuchi 二条樋口 in Kyoto, to earn a living for his mother and himself. A common design format for fans painted during the Tokugawa period was *yamato-e* やまと絵 (Japanese style painting) or Kano style painting. Taiga, however, employed Chinese styles drawn from the *Hasshu gafu*, a Ming painting manual.⁶⁷ *Kinsei kijinden* 近世畸人伝 (*Records of Early Modern Eccentrics*), written by Ban Kōkei 伴蒿蹊 (1733-1806) and published in Kyoto in 1790, records that Taiga received his early training at the Tosa *yamato-e* school.⁶⁸ Although the veracity of this text is questionable,

Taiga was capable of producing fan painting in more popular styles and themes.⁶⁹

According to *Kijinden*, Taiga traveled throughout Ōmi 近江 (present-day Shiga), Mino 美濃 (Gifu), and Owari 尾張 (Aichi prefectures) provinces to peddle these fans. Chinese painting, nonetheless, was still unfamiliar to most of the population of that time and was difficult for them to accept. On his way back to Kyoto, the young peddler threw his unsold fans into the immense water of Lake Biwa in order to dedicate them to the dragon god. These accounts of Taiga, recorded in *Kinsei Kijinden*, should not be treated as facts. However, his eccentricity was closely linked to Nankai's discussion "On Eccentricity" in *Shōun Sango*: "Conformists prefer propriety and consistency, and nonconformists favor eccentricity."⁷⁰ It was necessary to construct the image of a *bunjinga* founder as a nonconformist in order to establish a new identity for the group.

The *Taigadō kafu* states that in the following year, 1738, Taiga made the acquaintance of Yanagisawa Kien, who had heard of Taiga's talent and visited his fan shop. Kien recognized Taiga's painting ability and invited him to move into Kien's estate in Yamato Kōriyama for three years to pursue further education in Chinese painting. From Kien, Taiga learned the painting technique from China called *shitōga* 指頭画, or fingertip painting, which Taiga frequently used in his twenties.

The *Taigadō kafu* also records that Taiga met Gion Nankai in 1738; however, their meeting did not actually take place until 1750, when Taiga visited him in Ki'i.⁷¹ According to the *Kafu*, Nankai discussed with him the theory of Chinese painting and bestowed on him an antique Chinese ink stick and an illustrated Chinese woodblock-printed book called *Hanshanxian bashan tu* (Jp. *Gansanken Hassan zu*, *Pictures of the eight mountains of Hanshan county*). This book is lost today, but Taiga must have

learned a great deal about Chinese landscape painting from Nankai, who died a year after Taiga's visit. Nevertheless, Taiga continually aimed at stylistic innovation based on what he learned from the Ming and Qing models in order to establish a new cultural and ideological experience. Although Taiga was never exiled or directly punished by the *bakufu*, his close association with various nonconformists - the first generation *bunjin* circle and the Ming Manpuku-ji loyalists - made him aware of Tokugawa ideology.

Taiga's Votive Panel and Its Draft

Taiga's earliest visual representation of the Orchid Pavilion theme was painted on *ema* 絵馬 (wooden votive panel, figure 3. 4) and was dedicated to the Gion Shrine 祇園社 in 1754. Taiga was thirty-two years old when he received this commission.⁷² The dedication of the votive panel was sponsored by ten prominent local merchants of the Gion 祇園 district in Kyoto.⁷³ Yabumoto Kōzō 藪本公三 agrees with the earlier studies of Hitomi Shōka 人見小華 and Yoshizawa Chū 吉澤忠, which said that the names of the donors were inscribed by Taiga himself.⁷⁴ This inscription provides important evidence of the relationship between Taiga and his patrons. In addition to the ten merchants, Raku 羅く, a female donor, is mentioned on this panel.

This indicates a demand for Taiga's work among the rising merchant class. Yabumoto suggests that it was probably Taiga himself who chose the Orchid Pavilion theme to be depicted on the votive panel since this theme was not yet well known by the townspeople in the early 1750s. Taiga provided a perfect vehicle to satisfy patrons seeking to employ the cultural authority of a classical theme in the newly developed Japanese *bunjinga* style to represent their own identity and to elevate their social status.

Taiga's choice was received extremely well by the people who commissioned him to produce numerous works of the Orchid Pavilion theme thereafter.

Kinsei kijinden, for instance, includes an episode of a Buddhist priest from the northeast region to indicate how widely known Taiga's Orchid Pavilion votive panel was and how popular it became among commoners:

Taiga took a trip to the northeast region via Edo. In the middle of nowhere, there was a Zen monastery. Taiga went into the monastery and asked for lunch. The chief priest was absent, but the monks treated him in a congenial manner offering him a meal and tea. To express his gratitude, Taiga inscribed a phrase of a sutra, and left the monastery. The chief priest returned and recognized the calligraphic excellence of the sutra inscribed by Taiga. He was deeply moved by this sutra, and ran after Taiga. He came all way to Kyoto but could not find him. The priest looked for a person named "Ike Mumei," which was what was signed on the sutra. However, nobody knew this name. When the priest was about to give up finding him, people suggested that he make a visit to the temples and shrines in Higashiyama, since he was in Kyoto. First of all, he visited the Votive Panel Hall of the Gion Shrine. The priest immediately found the famous votive panel representing the Orchid Pavilion theme, which was inscribed with Taiga's signature "Ike Mumei." He asked the monks at the shrine and found Taiga's residence. After seeing Taiga, the priest didn't have anything to do in Kyoto, so he left for the northeast region on the same day. He had traveled many hundred *li* to Kyoto to just find the author of the sutra. How eccentric he was! I heard this story from Taiga's pupils after he passed away.⁷⁵

As described in *Kijinden*, Taiga's votive panel was casually available to anyone who visited the Gion Shrine and would certainly have helped the townspeople familiarize themselves with the Orchid Pavilion theme.

Taiga had painted a draft (private collection; figure 3. 5) for the votive panel in 1751. This draft might have also functioned as a sample for Taiga to show to prospective clients for business purposes.⁷⁶ In contrast to the votive panel, which is painted with meticulous brushwork and rich colors, the draft is a rough representation executed in ink with subtle and light color applications. Whereas Taiga depicted less than thirty scholars in the draft (29 scholars and 8 page boys), he expanded that number to forty-one in the votive panel. In the upper left of the composition, Aoki Shukuya 青木夙夜, one of Taiga's disciples, who inherited the Taigadō 大雅堂 studio upon Taiga's death, added his inscription which reads:

昨大雅翁画蘭亭図

揚之祇園社頭是其

草稿而寶希世物也

餘夙夜

The Orchid Pavilion Painting by the late master Taiga

Dedicated to the Gion Shrine

Its draft is such a rare treasure!

Yo Shukuya

The draft was posthumously reformatted into a six-panel *byōbu* in 1804; the composition is fixed to four panels, and a panel on either side is added. On the added panels the entire passage of the *Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering* was inscribed

by the monk-calligrapher from Satsuma 薩摩 (present-day Kyushu), Ryōyū Kōzen 良雄 浩然 (1746-1815).⁷⁷ Hoshino Suzu 星野鈴 suggests that this draft was reformatted into a *byōbu* as a part of a project to organize Taiga's remaining works, when Aoki Shukuya, Taigadō II, passed away in 1802, and the leadership of Taigadō studio was inherited by the monk-painter Geppō 月峯.⁷⁸

The Alternative Canon of the Orchid Pavilion

Since it had been exposed to semi-outdoor conditions in the Ema-dō 絵馬堂 (Votive Panel Hall) of the Gion shrine for over two centuries, the votive panel is heavily damaged.⁷⁹ Fortunately, its pictorial program (composition and iconography) was clearly recorded on two facing pages in a woodblock-printed painting manual, entitled the *Hengaku kihan shukuzu* 扁額軌範縮図 (*Miniaturized Model of Altarpiece Painting*; figure 3. 6a). This book was published in 1819 through the joint efforts of Aikawa Minwa 合川珉和 and Kitagawa Harunari 北川春成, who compiled the votive panel designs in various themes dedicated to the Kiyomizu temple 清水寺 and the Gion shrine.⁸⁰

The pictorial program of the votive panel was preserved in the draft and in *Hengaku kihan*, and it played an important role in shaping the later visual tradition of this theme. It functioned as the first Japanese *bunjinga* adaptation of the Orchid Pavilion, which was liberated from the canon of the Ming-dynasty ink rubbings. Tanaka Toyozō 田中豊蔵 has pointed out that Taiga successfully visualized in his votive panel the description of the Orchid Pavilion image in *Shōun sango* by Gion Nankai.⁸¹ Although

Taiga visited Nankai only once, Nankai's ideal obviously had a tremendous impact on his production.⁸²

Hence, in Taiga's votive panel, all the figures are depicted as though they are taking great pleasure: two to four figures are grouped together and placed along a winding stream. Wang Xizhi is seated in a humble hut, accompanied by two scholars. Three page boys are preparing the wine near them. The figures seem to be engaging in conversation; some are strolling in nature; some are drinking wine and composing poems for their enjoyment. In *Shōun sango*, Nankai complained that the rigidly seated figures in the ink rubbing were vulgar. However, he paid special attention to the iconography of Yu Yun, who drank too much wine and was supported by a page boy, and that of Yang Mo, a dancing figure.⁸³ Nonetheless, the *Lantingxu* text does not mention any drunken or dancing figures, while it clearly states that all "the guests [were] seated on both banks".⁸⁴ As an expert of Chinese studies, Nankai highlighted these two figures in an effort to prescribe a new canon, since he was aware of these iconographic elements from other classical themes and felt that they added extra meanings to the Orchid Pavilion image. In this sense, Taiga understood the ideal of Nankai and reconsidered what kinds of iconographic elements should form a standard for representing the theme.

The earliest extant images of dancing figures, the pictorial motif of Yang Mo, in the Orchid Pavilion ink rubbings appeared in *Kōkyōzu* 孝經図 (the *Classic of Filial Piety*) by Li Gonglin, the "creator" of the canonical Orchid Pavilion image.⁸⁵ These images of dancing figures were produced to illustrate the seventh and tenth chapters, "Filial Piety in Relation to the Three Powers" (figure 1. 26a) and "An Orderly Description of the Acts of Filial Piety" (figure 1. 26b). In Chapter 7, the image of a dancer corresponds to the text:

“The ancient kings --- led them by the rules of property and by music; and the people were harmonious and benign.”⁸⁶ In Chapter 10, Li Gonglin illustrates the phrase, “in his nourishing of them, his endeavor is to give them the utmost pleasure.”⁸⁷ In this image, elderly people, seated in armchairs on a raised platform, enjoy the entertainment performed for them by their children. Neither of these illustrations has direct reference to the Orchid Pavilion episode; educated viewers, however, were able to identify the Confucian-based didactic meaning of the motif.

Richard Barnhart suggests that the dancer’s iconographic parallel can be found in another popular story, “Lao Laizi” 老莱子 (Jp: Rō Raishi; Old Master), one of the episodes from *Nijūshikō-zu* 二十四孝図 (the *Twenty-four Paragons of the Twenty-four Examples of Filial Piety*). In order that his parents would not realize that they were aging, the seventy-year old Lao Laizi acted as his younger self, dressing and dancing like a child.⁸⁸ In Japan, the story of Lao Laizi was iconographically introduced in the Muromachi period, and was painted by Kano Motonobu 狩野元信 (1476-1559), the second-generation head of the Kano School. His grandson and Momoyama master, Kano Eitoku 狩野永徳 (1543-1590), continued this visual tradition, depicting a similar costume and the same posture to represent Lao Laizi in many different formats: such as the hanging scroll housed in the Kikuya-ke Jūtaku Hozon-kai 菊屋家住宅保存会; the six-panel *byōbu* of 1566 in the Fukuoka City Museum (figure 3. 7); and the mural in the Nanzen-ji 南禅寺 Temple (figure 3. 8) of 1586.⁸⁹ In each case, the depiction of Lao Laizi is almost iconographically identical to that of Yang Mo: they are both dancing, lifting one arm and one leg.

The iconography of Yu Yun, on the other hand, is derived from a different literary source. According to the early Ming writer Song Lian 宋濂 (1310-1381), who recorded a description of the Orchid Pavilion painting by Li Gonglin, Yu Yun was portrayed as a very old man. Having sat down for a while, Yun begins to rise: “his right hand rests on the ground as a boy tries to help him up, holding on to his left arm.”⁹⁰ However, in Zhu Youdun’s stone rubbings, Yun, still needing support from a page boy, is turned from an “old man” into a “drunken man.”

The pictorial motif of a “drunken man” was derived from representations of Li Bai 李白 (701-762), who is portrayed as excessively drunk and is often supported by a page boy. Li is regarded as one of the greatest poets of the Tang dynasty. In Japan, the iconography of the drunken Li Bai was an established theme and had been painted by numerous artists, such as Kano Hideyori 狩野秀頼 (active in 1565-1576), one of whose works is housed in the Itabashi Municipal Museum (figure 3. 9). This iconography is often included in another theme: *Inchū Hassen-zu* 飲中八仙図 (*Eight Immortals of the Wine Cups*), which is based on a poem written by Du Fu 杜甫 (712-770), another great Tang poet. Nankai must have been aware of the cultural and intellectual authority that the iconographies linked to classical literary themes had. Taiga repeatedly used the iconographies of Yu Yun and Yang Mo to realize Nankai’s ideal Orchid Pavilion painting. After Taiga, these two iconographies became a part of a new canon and were included in many *bunjinga* versions of the Orchid Pavilion of later generations.

While the stream of water in the handscroll-format Ming-dynasty ink rubbings was always horizontal, which Nankai criticized as vulgar, Taiga took the liberty to transform it into a dynamically angled configuration in order to create spatial recession.

Miyajima Shin'ichi 宮島新一 explains the differences between the Orchid Pavilion images by Kano Sansetsu and Ike Taiga: in contrast to Sansetsu's use of a low and horizontal perspective that gave a precise yet severe quality, Taiga composed the scene from a high vantage point, creating a dynamic effect.⁹¹

The compositional effect of the meandering stream and the *byōbu* format are key elements in the pictorial configuration initiated by Taiga. The S-shape of the stream suggests that Taiga was drawing on the standard composition of landscape hanging scrolls, which are vertically conceived. As a result of superimposing the composition of the vertical hanging scroll onto the horizontal *byōbu* format, the shape of the river is set in diagonal motion. Further, the angle of the river is transformed into a steeper diagonal, and the sense of movement is increased. Taiga seems to be fascinated by the depiction of the powerful force of water running through the wildly winding stream.⁹² He later produced many other versions of the Orchid Pavilion in the hanging scroll format, such as the one located at the Clark Center for Japanese Art in Hanford (figure 3. 10).

Taiga's visual sources for the hanging scroll versions of the Orchid Pavilion must have included Ming models. Contrary to the primary purpose of handscrolls, which is to record the activity of human figures, in hanging scrolls heavy emphasis is placed on the elements of landscape. The landscape is similar to the style developed in the Song and Yuan dynasties – the upper part is occupied with massive mountains, and overwhelming nature is depicted. Thus small figures sitting along the river with floating wine cups are depicted in an immense landscape. An Orchid Pavilion (figure 3. 11), housed in the Munthe Collection of the West Norway Museum of Applied Art, was painted by an anonymous painter, and is a typical example of a fifteenth-century mid-Ming hanging

scroll.⁹³ The pavilion has been moved to the left edge, and because of the extremely small scale it is difficult to recognize any of the human activities.

Similar to the Munthe Orchid Pavilion, *Yingxiuxi tu* 英修禊图 (figure 3. 12; ink and color on paper) by Qiu Ying 仇英 (1494-1552) is comprised of an immense landscape and small figures, whose activities are likewise minimized.⁹⁴ However, this work is related to the *Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden*, which is another subject that Qiu Ying painted frequently. Although the figures are depicted on a much larger scale, the basic composition, which locates the pavilion in the middle ground with figures placed below the pavilion, echoes the other. Most of the vertically composed hanging scrolls are copies and forgeries of the Ming masters that were imported to Japan via Nagasaki, and functioned as important inspirations for Japanese *bunjin* paintings. They set the standard for Japanese versions of the hanging scroll and also inspired a new *byōbu* format composition when it was combined with the horizontal handscroll versions.

Iconography of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering

The most intriguing and significant issue of the Orchid Pavilion image is its iconographical program, which seems to fluently invite pictorial motifs from other literary themes that portray the elegant gatherings of the Chinese literati. The Orchid Pavilion image began as the visualization of a text, the *Lantingxu*. However, Taiga's Orchid Pavilion votive panel, for instance, is decidedly unfaithful to the contents of the *Lantingxu*. In turn, the exchangeable iconography of the Orchid Pavilion often provokes profound interpretations through the cultural and historical understandings for its viewers. In *Hengaku kihan*, pictorial ensembles of human figures on this panel are cut out from the

background and placed on another two facing pages for a clear deciphering of their activities (figure 3. 6b).⁹⁵ The two groups of figures from another theme are obviously added to the Orchid Pavilion theme.

According to the *Lantingxu*, all the participants at the Orchid Pavilion are rigidly “seated on both banks.”⁹⁶ Despite the textual description, Taiga painted a figure that is “standing and lifting up his right arm to inscribe on the wall of rock.” This is an established iconography that identifies Mi Fu 米芾 (1051-1197) from the *Western Garden*. Taiga also added the image of Wang Qinchen 王欽臣, who stands by Mi Fu and attentively watches him inscribing a rock.

It is also explicitly stated in the *Lantingxu* that “although there was no music from string or wind instruments, the drink and the recitation of poems were more than enough to cheerfully express our exquisite feelings.”⁹⁷ Intriguingly, Taiga included two musicians playing string instruments, the *ruanxian* 阮咸 (Jp. *genkan*, ancient Chinese lute) and the *qin* 琴 (Chinese zither) in the bottom center of the composition. The *ruanxian* player is generally identified as Chen Jingyuan 陳景元, who belongs iconographically to another theme, *Xiyuan yaji tu* 西園雅集圖 (Jp. *Seien gashu zu*; the *Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden*), especially when it is juxtaposed with the image of Mi Fu inscribing the surface of the rock.⁹⁸ As exemplified in a pair of six-panel *byōbu* (figure 3. 13) housed in Kōsetsu Museum of Art, Ike Taiga favored this painting theme and often combined it with the Orchid Pavilion theme. In this version, the *genkan* player and the figure writing on the rock are depicted on either side of the screen.⁹⁹

This musician theme refers to an elegant gathering of sixteen famous literati at the Western Garden of the imperial clansman Wang Shen 王詵 during the eleventh-century

Northern Song period. The pictorial motifs correlate with a text entitled *Xiyuan yaji tuji* 西園雅集図記 (Jp. *Seien gashū zuki*; the *Record of the Painting of the Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden*), which was said to have written by Mi Fu on the rock in the garden during the gathering:¹⁰⁰

Su Shi 蘇軾 wears a black hat and faces the inkstone, while Wang Shen (active c.1069), the host of the event, observes him. Cai Zhao 蔡肇 (?-1119) leans against a stone table. Li Yuanyi 李元儀 looks at mint flower and Jiaji 家矩 stands behind him. Another figure seated at the table is Li Gonglin 李公麟 (1049-1106), who is supposedly painting the image of *Tao Yuanming Returning Home* 陶陽明歸去來圖. Su Zhe 蘇轍 (1039-1112) is seated by the stone table observing the handscroll, and Huang Tingjian 黃庭堅 (1045-1105) holds the banana leaf fan, while Huang Buzhi 晁補之 (1053-1110) strokes another's shoulder. Zheng Lei 張耒 (1054-1114) leans toward the stone and looks at the painting, and Zheng Jiachen 鄭嘉臣 does so as well. Mi Fu lifts his arm to inscribe the surface of a large rock, and Wang Qinchen 王欽臣 looks up. Qin Guan 秦觀 (1049-1100) listens to the *ruanxian* lute played by Chen Jingyuan 陳景元. Riu Wen 劉涇 (1043-1100) listens to a sermon (*mushōron* 無生論) given by Priest Yuantong 円通大師 (?-1090), who wears a Buddhist robe.¹⁰¹

Although the *Record of the Painting of the Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden* has been verified to have been fabricated later in the Ming period, and this episode of the gathering is a fiction, all sixteen literati are historical and were connected by a close network.¹⁰² Whether or not the gathering depicted in the painting is fictional, a playful

spirit of friendship and a notion of harmonious community are the most crucial characteristics of this literati theme.

The *qin* player is not included in the *Record of the Western Garden*. The image juxtaposing a *qin* player with a *ruanxian* lute player may overlap with another established iconography: that of the lute player Ruanxian (230-281), the person from whom the name of the instrument is derived, and Rong Qiqi 荣啓期, a *qin* zither player and semi-mythological recluse of the Han dynasty. The iconography of this pair of musicians was derived from the *Chikurin shichiken* 竹林七賢, or the *Seven Sages in the Bamboo Grove*, who were eccentric hermits of the Wei-Jin period (220-419).¹⁰³ A visual representation of the *Seven Sages* appears in the Eastern Jin-dynasty *senga* 磚画 (ink rubbing reproduced from a tomb wall engraving, figure 1. 24), which was excavated in Nanjing in Zhejiang Province and is housed in Nanjing Provincial Museum 南京博物院 today. Rong Qiqi was not one of the original Seven Sages but is often portrayed as the eighth figure belonging to the visual representation of this group.¹⁰⁴ Borrowing such a powerful image as the *Seven Sages at the Bamboo Grove*, Taiga drew on its cultural meaning, conveying how a harmonious relationship among people could be achieved through the harmony of music.

More interestingly, the interpretation of this musical instrument as a sign of Taiga's vision for a harmonious community may be manifested in his marriage to Tokuyama Machi 徳山町 (c. 1727-1784), whose studio name was Gyokuran 玉蘭.¹⁰⁵ She was a student of Yanagisawa Kien and an accomplished Nanga painter herself. Taiga and Gyokuran were commonly regarded as a happy couple. Taiga's friend Rai San'yō 頼山陽 (1780-1832) wrote in his *Yuri den* 百合伝 (*Record of Yuri*), that together they

engaged in all kinds of cultural pursuits, such as painting, playing music, composing poetry and drinking rice wine. According to *Kinsei kijinden*, Taiga often played the *shamisen* 三味線 (a string instrument that resembles the *ruanxian* lute) accompanying Gyokuran who played another traditional instrument, the *tsukushi goto* つくし琴 (similar to the *qin* zither).¹⁰⁶ An illustration of *Kinsei kijinden* by Mikuma Katen 三熊花顛 (1730-1794) depicts Taiga and Gyokuran tuning their instruments (figure 3. 14).¹⁰⁷ Later in the Meiji period, the *bunjin* master Tomioka Tessai also portrayed Taiga and Gyokuran with stringed musical instruments (figure 3. 15) in Taiga's happily cluttered household.¹⁰⁸ Using the images of the *ruanxian* lute and the *qin* zither, Taiga overlapped an image of himself and Gyokuran in his Orchid Pavilion image with that of Chen Jingyuan and Qin Guan of the *Western Garden*, as well as with that of Ruanxian and Rong Qiqi of the *Bamboo Grove*.

Taiga and Gyokuran have often been compared to the Yuan scholar-artist Zhao Mengfu 趙孟頫 (1254-1322) and his wife Guan Daosheng 管道升 (1262-1319), who form the foremost model of literati marital-artistic union. Another instance of married painters in the *bunjin* painting circle was Taiga's close friend Kō Fuyō 高芙蓉 (1722-1784) and his wife Ōshima Raikin 大島来禽 (died c. 1830-1844). Both Fuyō and Raikin were prominent *bunjin* artists of the time. This phenomenon indicates how the *bunjin* painters' social network was receptive and welcomed everyone regardless of his or her class or even gender. In self-portraits and group portraits, Taiga represented himself and his community through Chinese *wenren* figures.

It is important to examine Taiga's cultural and intellectual environment, in order to understand how his way of combining iconographies of the Orchid Pavilion and other

themes was received. Second generation literati, such as Minagawa Kien 皆川淇園 (1734-1807) and Shibano Ritsuzan 柴野栗山 (1736-1807), socialized with Taiga and agreed with his treatment of pictorial motifs. In a colophon to Taiga's Orchid Pavilion painting, reproduced in the *Ritsuzan bunshū* 栗山文集 (*Collected writings of Ritsuzan*), Ritsuzan noted that the *ruanxian* lute and *qin* zither players do not appear in the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing based on Li Gongling's treatment of the theme.¹⁰⁹ Knowing that these figures were not conventional to the Orchid Pavilion, Ritsuzan admired their inclusion as an innovation of Taiga's. Moreover, he recorded how his friend Minagawa Kien was dissatisfied with the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing, which circulated widely at that time. Ritsuzan asserted that Kien's discontent was also based on what Nankai wrote in *Shōun Sango*.¹¹⁰

This was a time when Wang Xizhi's calligraphic style was being revived and becoming extremely popular among cultured people, and when the Kogaku-ha Confucians encouraged their students to look back to the "uncontaminated" past and the era of Wang Xizhi.¹¹¹ Taiga's best friends were calligraphers in the Chinese style specializing in style of Wang Xizhi. Kan Tenju 韓天寿 (1727-1795), for instance, worshiped Wang Xizhi's calligraphy and even named himself as Sui Jinsai 醉晉齋 in reference to the Eastern Jin 東晉 dynasty.¹¹² Taiga himself was also an accomplished calligrapher who, among the many styles he studied, particularly appreciated the style of Wang Xizhi, whose *Preface* he copied numerous times.¹¹³ Another of Taiga's best friends, Kō Fuyō, was famous for his knowledge of ancient Chinese seals and seal scripts. Based on this contextual evidence, showing that Taiga received serious education in Chinese studies from various experts, it is impossible that Taiga mistakenly used or

misunderstood historical Chinese iconography. For Taiga and his *bunjin* community, to produce the Orchid Pavilion image was to construct their own image. Therefore, the more they incorporated the different iconographies of Chinese literati painting, the stronger they could communicate their desire to identify themselves with cultural and intellectual power.

Taiga's Chinese poems reveal his desire to construct group portraits of his own community. He was a member of the poetry circle, Kontonshisha 混沌詩社, which met on the fifteenth day of each month. Taiga composed a Chinese poem to express his feeling for his community:

永和三日會群賢	永和三日 群賢を会し
流水桃花幾入篇	流水 桃花 幾か篇に入る
夙夜丹青大年録	夙夜の丹青 大年の録
二公妙蹟壓當年	二公の妙蹟 当年を圧す ¹¹⁴

One the third day of the Yonghe era,
assembled all the sages,
How many of the peach blossoms floating
there were recorded in their poems?
Yet Shukuya's red-and-blue,
and Dainen's inscription thereon;
These superb works of the two gentlemen
are even better than those of that year!¹¹⁵

In this poem, Taiga highly praises the cousins Aoki Shukuya (1737-after 1806), who inherited the position of Taigadō II, and Aoki Dainen 青木大年, later referred to by his

Chinese name, Kan Tenju. Taiga admired them and considered them even superior to the participants of the classical gathering of fourth-century China. This poem indicates that Taiga and his followers were practicing poetry-wine parties in emulation of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering. In effect, they were performing the roles of the Chinese *wenren*. This was considered important for the social elevation of the newly established Japanese *bunjin* community.

Evolution of the Orchid Pavilion *Byōbu* by Taiga

Taiga continued to produce numerous, mostly six-panel, *byōbu* depicting the Orchid Pavilion theme. He kept experimenting and adding new pictorial elements to express his nonconformist views. One such example is the Orchid Pavilion *byōbu* (figure 3. 16) paired with a screen depicting *Shūsha Suiki zu* 秋社酔帰図 (the *Harvest Festival in Autumn*) in the Mary Griggs Burke Collection in New York. A compositional contrast between the two screens is created: whereas the autumnal scene is open and spacious with long, distant views, the Orchid Pavilion Gathering is seen from a close vantage point.¹¹⁶ It depicts a wider stream that flows from the pavilion, reaches the bottom of screen in the second and third panels, and goes back up reaching a peak in the fourth panel. After slightly flowing down in the fifth panel, the stream gushes up to a height greater than where the water begins by the pavilion.

This work was introduced for the first time by Tanaka Ichimatsu 田中一松 (1895-1983) in 1957, and has since attracted serious scholarly attention.¹¹⁷ Yoshizawa Chū 吉沢忠 (1909-1988) discusses two almost identical Orchid Pavilion screens: the one in the Burke Collection and another in a private collection (figure 3. 17).¹¹⁸ While Yonezawa

Yoshiho 米澤嘉圃 (1903-1993) has determined that the later one is a copy of the Burke Collection piece, Yoshizawa asserts that they were both painted by Taiga. Yoshizawa concludes that the existence of these identical pieces indicates the development of a market economy in the mid-Tokugawa period and an extremely heavy demand for Taiga's work from clients who repeatedly commissioned him to produce the same narrative in the same composition, especially that of the Orchid Pavilion. These pieces were produced only a few years after Taiga completed the votive panel. Whether or not these are authentic works by Taiga, the existence of identical paintings suggests the popularity of this theme.¹¹⁹ This immense popularity motivated forgers to produce many fakes of Taiga's Orchid Pavilion as well.

In order to formulate a new and alternative Orchid Pavilion image, Taiga studied a Ming handscroll version of the theme (figure 3. 18) painted in 1560 by Wen Zhengming's follower Qian Gu (1508-1572), now housed in the Metropolitan Museum of Art.¹²⁰ This painting conveys the Wu School-type forms for earth banks, rocks, trees and bamboo. Figures are additionally depicted through the holes of enormous rocks in the foreground. Unlike most other cases, there is no textual evidence for Qian Gu's version having been in Japan. However, we can see that this work, or copies and forgeries of this work, were available for Taiga to study because his Orchid Pavilion records its characteristics, especially its depiction of figures through the holes.

In order to compose a new Orchid Pavilion, Taiga also incorporated the style of Rinpa, one of the revival movements of Japanese "classical" style, in an interesting way. Melinda Takeuchi argues that the natural flowing rhythm of this Orchid Pavilion marks Taiga's maturity, and that its compositional relationship with another of his works is

consciously modeled after the Rinpa style.¹²¹ *Autumnal Tints on the Riverbank* (figure 3: 19) is a representation of the Hozu River 保津川 in Arashiyama 嵐山, a site in northwest Kyoto, and was originally mounted as a set of four *fusuma* (sliding doors) in a temple in Shiga, but was later reformatted into a pair of two-panel *byōbu*. Taiga used the *tsuketate* painting technique to execute the dynamic shape of river, which corresponds with those in the Orchid Pavilion images. His use of delicate brushwork in wet ink and light colors is obviously adapted from the Rinpa approach. The inscription added over his signature reads, “Modeled after Kōetsu,” 倣光悦 a Rinpa master.

Taiga’s father, Ikeno Kazaemon, worked as a lower official of the Nakamura family who controlled the Kyoto silver mint. At one time he may have worked under Nakamura Kuranosuke 中村内蔵助, who became infamous for an illegally garnered fortune and his subsequent expulsion in 1714. Previously Kuranosuke was one of Ogata Kōrin’s 尾形光琳 patrons, and it has been suggested that this indirect connection with Taiga’s family may have resulted in the Rinpa influence seen in his work.¹²² Regardless of personal connections, Taiga’s combining multiple sources based on Chinese and Japanese classical themes and styles demonstrates his effort to invent a unique “classicism.”

In the 1760s, Taiga produced more versions of the Orchid Pavilion in a fashion similar to the *Autumnal Tints on the Riverbank byōbu*. One such (figure 3. 20) was painted in the seventh month of 1763, and is now located in the Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art.¹²³ This work is paired with a screen depicting another Chinese literary theme, the so-called *Ryūzan Shōkai zu* 龍山勝会図 (*Banquet at Longshan Mountains*), and is registered as an Important Cultural Property by the Japanese government. With

this piece, by bringing together the many elements already discussed, Taiga's Orchid Pavilion image reaches its full maturity. In the upper left corner, Taiga inscribed the entire text of *Lantingxu*. Following Nankai's prescription, Taiga incorporated the iconography of Yu Yun from the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing and, in addition, added another drunken figure supported by a page-boy at the lower-left corner. As well, there is a scholar who is dipping his feet into the water. Most of the scholars seem to enjoy their gathering and are engaged in pure talk. Taiga includes again the *ruanxian* string-instrument player, here surrounded by listeners in the lower-middle of the composition, a figure that may be a "tongue-in-cheek self portrait."¹²⁴ In the ninth month of the same year, Taiga painted another version (figure 3. 21) of the Orchid Pavilion now housed in the Shimane Museum of Art. It is another six-panel *byōbu*, which also includes scholars who play the *ruanxian* and hold the *qin*.¹²⁵ In this way, Taiga repeatedly portrayed himself with his entourage to construct images of the *bunjin* community, which were, in turn, extremely desirable to clients from a wide range of social classes.

Possible Trajectories of Iconographical Combinations

As I have shown, Taiga was the dominant innovator of the visual representation of the Orchid Pavilion in the Japanese *bunjinga* style based on Ming painting in the eighteenth century. Nonetheless, Taiga was not singularly responsible for the new iconographical combinations of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering. In Japan, the earliest example of iconographical combinations that I have encountered is a mural (figure 3. 22) depicting the Orchid Pavilion theme that was originally located at Nikkōin 日光院, Mi'i-dera 三井寺 in Ōtsu 大津 (present-day Shiga Prefecture) in the late seventeenth

century.¹²⁶ Although this painting does not bear signature or seals, it is considered, from stylistic analysis, to have been painted by Kano Einō, the third generation leader of the Kyo-Kano School.¹²⁷

In this painting, the artist follows most of the iconography of the Ming-dynasty ink rubbings. The images of Yu Yuan, Yang Mo, and Xie Teng in their recognizable postures are included. However, there are also other motifs that are unrelated to the Orchid Pavilion but similar to those of the *Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden*. For example, a figure is standing in front of a large rock and lifting his arm. Another figure is standing by him with watchful eyes. They are closely related to the Mi Fu and Wang Qianjin portrayals of the Western Garden theme. Another figure is seated in front of a rectangular table inscribing something, resembling Su Shi.

Einō also included the image of a crane, a symbol of longevity, juxtaposed by two literati figures. Neither the *Lantingxu* nor the ink rubbings makes any reference to a crane. The style of the crane is recognizable from the crane painted by Muqi 牧谿 (the late 13th century, figure 3. 23), and that by Kano Eitoku (figure 3. 24) at Daitokuji 大徳寺, and also resembles the work of Hasegawa Tōhaku 長谷川等伯 (1439-1510, figure 3. 25) housed in the Idemitsu Museum 出光美術館.¹²⁸ The pictorial motif of two literati figures and a crane is found in the *Tanyū shukuzu* 探幽縮図 (*Tanyū's Study Sketches*, figure 3. 26), which represents Rin Nasei 林和靖, an immortal Chinese poet. In this way, Einō demonstrates his access to classical painting motifs and at the same time incorporates the mainstream Edo-Kano style, represented by Tan'yū's "elegant plainness," into his paintings. This was a strategy to allow Einō to survive through a time

of a political instability. Early *bunjinga* artists, such as Taiga, may have been inspired by this type of previous work.

The Japanese *bunjin* may have also seen Chinese paintings with fused iconography. In China, the iconography of the Orchid Pavilion had already been combined with other literati themes to create new pictorial possibilities. Wen Zhengming's 文徵明 (1470-1559) version of *Lanting xu shuhua* 蘭亭序書畫 (the Orchid Pavilion; figure 2. 45) in ink and color on paper, housed in Liaoning Museum 遼寧博物館, represents the Wu School-type forms in its landscape and figures.¹²⁹ This handscroll is accompanied by calligraphy of Zhu Yunming 祝允明 (1460-1526). In this painting, multiple pictorial motifs taken from many other visual sources are synthesized and create a new visual effect. The Orchid Pavilion, where Wang Xizhi is surrounded by two scholars and a page boy and is watching two geese, is relocated from the beginning to the middle of the composition. Figures are radically reduced in number, and different attributes are added. For instance, a scholar playing the *ruanxian* that refers to the iconography of the Western Garden is included. Moreover, the handscroll ends with a waterfall watched by a standing figure, which was inspired by the iconography of *Li Bai Watching a Waterfall* 李白觀瀑圖 by the late-Ming and early-Qing painter Shi Tao 石濤 (1642-1707).¹³⁰

Wen was commissioned to paint another Orchid Pavilion handscroll in 1542, when he provided *A Record of the Rebuilding of the Orchid Pavilion*. It commemorates the restorations of the famous historical site in Zhejiang province associated with the greatest of all calligraphers, Wang Xizhi, and carried out under the prefect of Shaoxing, Shen Qi (1501-1568). Craig Clunas considers this about the furthest reach of Wen's

commissions in governmental work. As in the case of earlier paintings of the scene, “it enabled him to show off his erudition about Wang Xizhi, the ultimate model of his own calligraphy, and to muse on the continued fame of the Orchid Pavilion through the fall and rise of empires.”¹³¹

Another Orchid Pavilion (figure 3. 27) painted in ink and color on silk carries the signature of Li Zai 李在 (?-1431) though it was produced in the late 16th century by an anonymous artist. However, this work has tremendous significance in demonstrating how iconography was mixed in late Ming China.¹³² For instance, in the second panel, there is a figure who is seated by a table and inscribing calligraphy. This person is identifiable as Su Shi, who was the foremost member of the literati circle associated with the *Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden*. In the third panel, there is a figure standing in front of a large rock and inscribing calligraphy on it. This is a fixed iconographical element representing Mi Fu. There are also two figures standing and communicating in the middle of the composition. Their postures are borrowed from another painting, *Tao Yuanming Returning Home* 陶淵明歸去來圖 (figure 3. 28), by Chen Hongshou 陳洪綬 (1598-1652). This iconography was published in *Shuihu yeh-tzu* 水滸伝 (*Water Margin Playing Cards*), representing a *Shuihu yeh-tzu* hero, in woodblock prints during the 1630s by Wu Yung and Hsiao Hsiang, and thus distributed widely.¹³³

This type of image, combining the iconographies of different themes, appeared frequently among woodblock-printed media in China. For instance, the *Chengshi moyuan* 程氏墨苑 (figure 3. 29), a late-Ming commercial ink stick catalogue published by Cheng Dayu 程大約 in 1605, depicts an Orchid Pavilion image on two facing pages. On a different page of this catalogue, there is a picture entitled *The Seven Sages of the*

Bamboo Grove, which is comprised of groups of figures playing *go*, playing the *qin*, and admiring a deer. Strikingly, there is a winding stream by these figures, and wine cups are floating in it, as depicted in Orchid Pavilion imagery. The picture demonstrates how well the theme of the Orchid Pavilion was integrated into Ming popular culture.¹³⁴ This catalogue was imported to and distributed in Japan. Thus, these images of fused iconographies from China were available for the Japanese *bunjin* painters to study, becoming a source from which pictorial motifs from diverse themes could be combined.

Taiga's Pointillism in the Orchid Pavilion

In order to produce a new type of image to express his desire to construct a community, it is well-known that Taiga incorporated woodblock printed painting manuals in formulating his style.¹³⁵ In almost all of Taiga's Orchid Pavilion images, he used dots in a quite liberal and unique manner. He applied the most intense dark ink dots on the surface of massive rocks that are already defined by a series of short lines in a variety of ink tonalities, as well as a wash of pale colors. The dots that decorate the surface of the rocks have an organic quality. Although they have a design-like appearance and are not depicted realistically, yet the spirit and energy of the rocks are captured successfully.

Melinda Takeuchi suggests that two important aforementioned painting manuals, —*Hasshu gafu* and *Kaishien gaden* — motivated Taiga to reduce the number of brush strokes as well as to develop his distinctive form of pointillism, which consisted of a mixture of black ink and brilliant color dots.¹³⁶ His earlier work, such as *Daibutsukaku* 大仏閣 (*The Great Buddha Hall*), from *Six Sights in Kyoto modeled after Mi Fu* (figure 3.

30) seems to indicate Taiga's interpretation of Mi Fu represented in *Kaishien gaden* (figure 3. 31).¹³⁷ Previous studies repeatedly stated that the Taiga's pointillism resulted from his weak understanding of the "authentic" Chinese paintings.¹³⁸ However, another work, *Fūun kiryū zu* 風雲起龍図 (*Dragon Rising from Wind and Rain*; figure 3. 32), which was painted by Taiga in 1746 when he was 23 years old, clearly demonstrates his keen understanding of the Mi style. In this work, a series of dark and pale saturated atmospheric ink dots represent sky and mountain surfaces. Hence, Taiga experimented with reconfiguring the Mi dots, and by decisively creating a pattern of solid dots he invented a new style.¹³⁹

In his *Orchid Pavilion Gathering* paintings, as in the Shizuoka version (figure 3. 20) for instance, Taiga lavishly depicts blossoming peach trees placed around the Orchid Pavilion in the first and second panels, as well as amidst other trees and rocks in the third panel and by the bridge in the last panel. He treated his peach trees differently from other trees, representing them without using any black ink to limit their shapes, but employing numerous small color dots. Also no ink line is used to configure the trunks of the peach trees; instead, light brown washes among the color dots suggest the shape of trunks. The color dots emit the energy of spring, while working as a charming visual accent. Chinese literati artists theoretically despised colorful painting, but Taiga effectively used these color dots, as applied in the peach flowers, to communicate human sincerity or a child-like sensibility which was an important characteristic sought by scholar-artists.¹⁴⁰ At the same time, Taiga's choice of decorative color application indicates that he was a professional painter aiming to please his clients by producing *byōbu*, which was a kind of interior furniture meant to be ornamental.

Theory and *Funpon* of the Orchid Pavilion: Nakayama Kōyō

The Orchid Pavilion boom spread not only in Kyoto, but also in other regions. For instance, Nakayama Kōyō, a *bunjin* painter from Tosa 土佐 province (present-day Kōchi prefecture) who founded the Edo *bunjin* tradition, was a near contemporary with Ike Taiga. They both favored and produced numerous versions of the Orchid Pavilion during their lifetimes. Although they shared similar ideological interests in a new social order, their respective backgrounds were completely different. For this reason, the production and reception of Kōyō's Orchid Pavilion were distinct from that of Taiga's. While Taiga was a descendent of farmers openly engaging in commerce, Kōyō never gave up his aspiration to regain samurai status and tried to earn a stipend instead of selling his painting for living.

In order to illuminate one of the contradictory situations of *bunjin* theory and practice, I reconsider *funpon* 粉本, or study sketches, depicting the Orchid Pavilion Gathering theme produced by Kōyō. His use of *funpon* offers a clear example of how eighteenth-century Japanese *bunjin* painters mass-produced their works. This is part of an intriguing development in which the newly established *bunjin* painters relied heavily on *funpon* and systematically copied them, while they at the same time criticized the *funpon* practice of the Kano, the official painters to the Tokugawa shogunate. This phenomenon belies the conventional wisdom says that the professional Kano School overused *funpon*, while the *bunjin* painters spontaneously and freely explored their own styles, ostensibly drawing inspiration from the feeling of the paintings they claimed as sources.

There are the two *funpon* versions of Kōyō's Orchid Pavilion Gathering in the handscroll format in the collection of the Kōchi Municipal Library 高知市民図書館, which contains 358 *funpon* including 11 handscrolls.¹⁴¹ The provenance of this collection is recorded by Wakao Ransui 若尾瀾水 (1877-1961): between 1854 and 1859, about 70 years after Kōyō's death in 1780, these *funpon* were owned by Higuchi Seisai, who was a disciple of Tokuhiko Tōsai.¹⁴² When Seisai passed away, his collection went onto the art market and was purchased by the Nakaya family in Obiyachō. The Nakaya family eventually donated it to the Kōchi Municipal Library. Inscriptions on these *funpon* representing the Orchid Pavilion inform us that one (figure 3. 33) was produced in the summer of 1778, and the undated other (figure 3. 34) was copied after Wen Zhengming, a major Ming literati painter.

Paintings considered “creative” or “original” often become keystones for the discipline of art history, but these fixed definitions have narrowed the selection of art and limited the scope of historical and cultural study. I intend to complicate the concepts of “creativity” or “originality” by using the tradition of East Asian painting theory, and will investigate how alternative historical narratives can be gleaned through attention to copies of paintings while scrutinizing these *funpon*.

According to *A Dictionary of Japanese Art Terms* published in 1990, *funpon* are “the model sketches or notebooks used for reference, in the production of sculptures or paintings.”¹⁴³ I would like to take issue with this definition. *Funpon* include faithful reproductions of originals as well as rough copies in reduced sizes and were traditionally used to transmit the pictorial programs of Buddhist and professional paintings. Thus, the issue of literati copies is an important one that I will uncover through an examination of

Kōyō's example. *Bunjinga* is defined by this same dictionary as “painting not by professional painters but by literary men for whom painting is a hobby.”¹⁴⁴ While some scholars today follow this definition of literati as individual genius, others situate literati practice within a socio-political context.¹⁴⁵ As discussed earlier, serious debate over the redefinition of *bunjinga* continues today, and for this reason, it is important to reexamine how the construct of *bunjin* was formed in Kōyō's time. Hence, my primary purpose in examining Kōyō's *funpon* versions of the Orchid Pavilion is to deconstruct the clichéd dichotomy of Kano versus *bunjin* painting, and to recontextualize Japanese *bunjin* painters.

Kōyō's Theory: Constructing *Bunjinga* Tradition

Besides being a prominent painter, Kōyō was also a prolific theorist who published numerous painting treatises. Among them, the three volumes of *Gatan keiroku* 画譚雞肋 (*Superfluous Jottings on Paintings*), published in 1775, were the most influential for recasting Dong Qichang's theory of Southern and Northern Schools of painting, and for explicitly criticizing the Kano school for the first time in Japan.¹⁴⁶ It was a best seller during Kōyō's time, and has been repeatedly reprinted up to today, influencing our current understandings of Japanese literati.¹⁴⁷ Some recent publications have reproduced the entire text of *Gatan keiroku*.

In this text, Kōyō repeated the idea of dividing painting into professional and literati schools, and stated that:

Landscape paintings were divided into two distinct schools: the painting method of *bunjin* or literati was rooted in Wang Wei 王維; and that of *eshi* 画師 or

professionals began with Li Sixun 李思訓. ... In China, the great masters belong to the school of literati. It is said that great paintings were not painted by professional painters. Works by professionals were inferior to those of the literati.¹⁴⁸

Then, Kōyō adds,

Similar to landscapes, bird-and-flower paintings were also divided into two distinct schools. Works painted in the literati style of Xu Xi 徐熙 convey *ga* 雅 or elegance; and professional works modeled after Huang Quan 黄筌 are *zoku* 俗 or vulgar. ... Huang Quan's work is easy to copy; whereas Xu Xi's is difficult to copy. It is hard to grasp Xu Xi's expansive mind, which goes beyond painted representation, because he was a highly educated official scholar of the Southern Tang dynasty 宋唐朝. In contrast, Huang Quan is an uneducated professional painter, who only cares about how to gain wealth at the imperial court.¹⁴⁹

This argument borrows a passage from Mi Fu's 米芾 (1051- 1107) *Huashi* 画史 (*History of Painting*), and with this authority insures the promotion of literati.¹⁵⁰ Kōyō's argument clearly criticizes the dominant Kano painters, who were equated with the Chinese professionals, and praises the newly established Japanese *bunjin* using the long Chinese *wenren* genealogy. However, Kōyō's emulation of the Chinese literati painters also suggests that their criticism of the Chinese court may have been meant by Kōyō as resembling criticism of the Tokugawa shogunate, which Kōyō otherwise did not articulate.

Kōyō's Anti-Kano Sentiment

Kōyō strongly criticizes Kano pedagogy, and expresses his particular dislike of Kano Tan'yū 狩野探幽 (1602-1674) and his followers for overusing the *funpon* practice.

Although this method of [*funpon*] copying saves time and labor and allows a painter to quickly reproduce antique paintings, those reproductions do not convey *koi* 古意 (or ancient ideas). ... In educating younger artists, the Kano masters enforce the imitation of their own works. They do not permit their pupils to create new ideas or styles. ... Alas all too frequently Kano Tan'yū leads his pupils in the wrong direction.¹⁵¹

Let us briefly review the pedagogy of the Kano School that invited Kōyō's criticism.¹⁵² In *Gadō Yōketsu* of 1680, Kano Yasunobu distinguished between two types of artists — *shitsuga* and *gakuga* — and valued training above talent because innate talent could not be reproduced; whereas methods learned through training could be transmitted for generations. This perpetuation of painting styles and training systems stemmed from the need to sustain the Kano's elite patronage and to maintain the large family-based business enterprise.

We can see in the example of *The Four Hermits* (figure 2. 39) by Kano Sanraku and *Orchid Pavilion Gathering* (figure 1. 2) by Kano Sansetsu, how the Kano School “copied and pasted” pictorial elements, with the shape of a palm tree copied exactly from one painting to another through the use of *funpon*. The prestige of such a *funpon* would be conferred on the painter who had access to it. For instance, the Kano value system is embodied by Tan'yū's sketches, the so-called *Ta'nyū shukuzu* 探幽縮図 (figure 3. 35). While *funpon* usually refer to meticulously done, actual-size copies, *shukuzu* are

abbreviated, reduced-size visual sketches. Although there are considerable differences between these study sketches, they are both used for transmitting the shapes and styles of masterpieces. However, we must explain Kōyō's use of *funpon*, which appears to be very similar to Tan'yū's. This is a question that I will return to in a moment.

Kōyō's *Funpon* Copying Practice

The same practice of “copying and pasting” used by the Kano School was also employed by Nakayama Kōyō himself. The painting entitled *The Eight Immortals of the Wine Cup* (figure 3. 36) illustrates a poetic gathering of the renowned eighth-century Chinese poet Du Fu and seven of his colleagues at court.¹⁵³ In this painting, a young scholar dances and entertains other figures. This dancer motif is repeated in one of Kōyō's painted versions of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering (figure 3. 37) using the *funpon* practice from 1779.

When Kano Sansetsu and his son Einō incorporated the Ming rubbing of the Orchid Pavilion to paint their versions, they included a dancing figure. This motif of a dancer with surrounding figures was in turn copied by Kōyō as though Kōyō himself were practicing the so-called Kano *funponism*. It must be asked, however, how Kōyō could develop such a harsh theoretical condemnation of the Kano use of *funpon*, while he produced paintings that clearly relied on a practice of *funpon* of his own. To answer this question the practice of copying needs to be understood as involving complex socio-political factors. Kōyō used *funpon* NOT for lack of “creativity” or “originality,” but because he had a political motive: he chose to “copy” specific pictorial elements from particular paintings in order to elevate the cultural capital of his paintings.

The apparent contradiction that this involved can be explained by considering the socio-political situation of Kōyō's family. Although the Nakayama family was engaged in commerce for a while, they never gave up their hope of returning to the samurai class. Nojima Umenoya 野島梅屋 recorded in *Kōyō jirin* 高陽事林 (copied in 1904 by Wakao Ransui) that a Nakayama family ancestor was the lord of the Tosa domain, prior to the appointment of the Yamauchi 山内 family. According to a joyous letter Kōyō wrote when he was 45, he was authorized to have a surname and to carry two swords, a privilege restricted to samurai, in recognition of his diligence in the study of poetry, calligraphy and painting. In a letter to Kōyō, his friend and prominent Confucian scholar, Inoue Kinga 井上金峨 (1732-1784), referred to him as "the artist in service of the Lord of Tosa," proving that Kōyō had won the position of official painter.¹⁵⁴ In order to maintain this status, it was necessary for Kōyō to borrow pictorial elements from Kano paintings, which were perceived as symbols of power and status in the Tokugawa social structure.

As an official painter, the local government provided Kōyō with a small annual stipend, beginning from 1760, but it was inadequate.¹⁵⁵ Kōyō received numerous commissions from his native province and from fellow provincials returning home from Edo. Annoyed with his clients, who frequently offered less than the cost of materials, Kōyō finally regulated his fees in 1769 and distributed a price list to people in his native Tosa and Edo.¹⁵⁶ Besides the 1779 version, Kōyō painted several identical versions of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering in the handscroll format, including one in 1778 (figure 3. 38).¹⁵⁷

The colophon of the 1778 painting was posthumously inscribed in 1791 by Sawada Tōe (1732-96), a friend of Kōyō and a renowned calligrapher in Edo.¹⁵⁸ It says that Kōyō painted a second version that same year, which has since been lost. This record of multiple-production indicates the popularity of Kōyō's paintings, especially those representing the Orchid Pavilion Gathering. Due to the boom in Confucian learning that was encouraged by the Tokugawa regime, cultured Japanese of various social backgrounds sought the status of Chinese scholars. According to Melanie Trede, there are two Japanese classicisms: one that honors the Japanese past and another that embraces the past of all of East Asia, particularly the Chinese past. This second classicism was fostered by cultured Japanese who sought social elevation by alluding to the Chinese past.¹⁵⁹

In 1775 Kōyō produced a hanging scroll version of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering. The pavilion in this composition is simply duplicated through the *funpon* practice.¹⁶⁰ According to the theories of literati painting, "spontaneity" is supposed to be one of its most important artistic characteristics. When we look at Kōyō's *funpon* closely, however, we can clearly see traces that he edited numerous pictorial elements. The composition was edited over and over before the desired result was achieved. He even went so far as to paste pieces of paper over unwanted parts of the scroll before painting over them. In this case, the spontaneity so often praised by literati theory was clearly planned and edited by Kōyō for the education of his pupils.¹⁶¹ Moreover, Kōyō's most important pupil was his nephew, Nakayama Hidetane 中山秀種 (b.1745), who was heir to some of Kōyō's *funpon*, a hereditary link that was normally associated with the Kano School

rather than literati painters.¹⁶² Kōyō's interest in extending his status to his heir may be seen as an attempt to recover some of the social influence of his samurai ancestor.

Copying after Wen Zhengming

The second *funpon* of Kōyō is evidently based on the work of the famous Ming literati painter, Wen Zhangming. Kōyō even wrote that his *funpon* is based on Wen Zhengming's model. However, Kōyō's *funpon* does not resemble Wen's Orchid Pavilions, such as those located in the Palace Museum and the Liaoning Provincial Museum, as discussed earlier. In a manner typical of traditional scholarship, Yoshizawa Chū explains that Kōyō improvised the *funpon* as an inspired response to Wen Zhengming's model, and that it was not Kōyō's intention to imitate him exactly.¹⁶³ However, I prefer to suggest that if any copy attributed to Wen Zhengming was available to Kōyō – as the copies of Wen Zhengming or Shen Zhou were extremely popular among Japanese painters who called themselves *bunjin* in emulation of the Chinese *wenren* – then it was quite possible that Kōyō drew directly from it.¹⁶⁴ According to Hosono Masanobu, Kōyō's *funpon* is closely related to a copy of Qiu Ying's representation of the Orchid Pavilion image (figure 3. 1), which was produced and imported to Japan at the time of Kōyō.

In his *funpon*, Kōyō included notes to designate the various colors of his source. The version that he studied must have been quite colorful, as he describes colors such as “indigo blue for upper part,” “dark blue,” “white,” “yellow,” and so forth. Such a practice is counter to the notion of literati “originality.” The signature of Wen Zhengming and the colophon that was attached to his model were both copied by Kōyō.

The colophon was inscribed by Liu Shidao 陸師衛, Wang Tan 王鐸, and Zhao Huanguang 趙宦光.¹⁶⁵ These Chinese names would have been perceived as one today would brand names and would have functioned to increase the value of the painting.

Returning to *Gadan keiroku*, Kōyō's collected commentary, we can locate Kōyō's rationale for using the copy method to produce his Orchid Pavilion Gathering. There, Kōyō used the notion of *guyi* 古意 an ancient idea that distinguishes good paintings from bad ones. Drawing directly from Zhao Mengfu 趙孟頫 (1254-1322), he wrote: "the ancients also respected the ancient idea; if there is no ancient idea; the painting might have been technically perfect but to no avail. If one does not learn by looking at old masters, then the essential ancient idea will be lacking."¹⁶⁶ In his Orchid Pavilion Gathering paintings, Kōyō employs two different types of ancient ideas at once: one is the Chinese past that is represented by the historical Orchid Pavilion Gathering of Wang Xizhi; and the other is the power represented through Kano painting elements, which although originally connected with Chinese professional painting, was now a Japanized past that Kōyō equally sought to tap into.

Bunjin Funponism

Kōyō employed a "cut-and-paste" method using *funpon* as a means of elevating the status of his paintings. As a newly appointed official painter to the Yamauchi clan of the Tosa fiefdom, he received numerous commissions from the Tosa provincial samurai who accompanied Lord Yamauchi to Edo. A system of alternating residency, *sankin kōtai* 参勤交代, was practiced during the Tokugawa period. When these samurai completed their duty and returned their native fiefdom, a much-desired souvenir was a

painting by Kōyō, who came to represent the fact that Tosa province was active in Edo. Kōyō's clients wished to own paintings that included pictorial elements of the Kano School, and were perceived in terms of the refined culture of the capital. In this sense, Kōyō's paintings conveyed both Tosa local pride and aspirations to Edo cosmopolitanism. Hence, Kōyō purposefully adapted Kano paintings using *funpon*, while criticizing their pedagogy, in order to legitimate his official painter status, which depended on a Japanized professional tradition. This served as well as to satisfy his clients' needs, who sought a classical Chinese lineage.

Re-articulation of the Orchid Pavilion: Fukuhara Gogaku

The Orchid Pavilion was one of the most popular themes among the Osaka 大坂 *bunjin* painters. Although Aoki Shukuya 青木夙夜 (?-1802) and Geppō 月峰 (1760-1839) had succeeded to the Taigadō 大雅堂, the competitive Kyoto painting circle was dominated by the leaderships of Maruyama Ōkyo 円山応挙 (Maruyama School), Matsumura Goshun 松村呉春 (Shijō School), and Ganku 岸駒 (Kishi School). Consequently, the *bunjinga* community became more active in Osaka after the passing of Taiga. My study turns to investigate how the Osaka *bunjin* painters in the late eighteenth century rearticulated Chinese classical painting themes that depict elegant literati gatherings – historical or imaginary – to satisfy their localized social and cultural needs.¹⁶⁷

During the Tokugawa period, Osaka was a center, not only of commerce, but also of cultural and intellectual activities. However, the art of Osaka, compared to Edo and Kyoto, has been neglected by modern scholars. Nakatani Nobuo 中谷伸生 explains the

three major reasons for this: 1. in the Meiji context, Okakura Tenshin 岡倉天心 (1863-1914), who disliked *bunjinga*, excluded Osaka art from his narrative of Japanese art history; 2. due to the devastation of the city by air-bombing during WWII, collectors in Osaka were not able to promote local art for a long period of time; 3. in the course of modernization, the policy of *datsua nyuō* 脱亜入欧 (getting out of Asia and joining with Euro-America) was contrary to the nature of Osaka art and its heavy indebtedness to China in the Tokugawa period.¹⁶⁸ However, because of the recent tendency towards globalization and a renewed appreciation of Asia, especially of China, stimulated by its rapid economic growth, the field of Osaka painting has begun to receive serious academic attention lately.

For this approach, I will focus on yet another Orchid Pavilion Gathering (figure 3: 39), a handscroll version painted by Fukuhara Gogaku 福原五岳 (1730-99), a leading figure of the Osaka painting community. This painting is crucial to a study of the cultural and ideological conditions of Osaka, where, as in Kyoto, Tokugawa censorship was relatively lenient and the market economy was well-developed.

The Status of Fukuhara Gogaku, Yesterday and Today

Immediately after WWII, this Orchid Pavilion painting was obtained in Japan by Richard Brown, a Canadian missionary-medical doctor who worked with the US forces in 1945. This piece was acquired in 1985 by Museum of Anthropology (MOA) at the University of British Columbia, and was previously catalogued as a Chinese painting.¹⁶⁹ I, however, have reattributed this work to the Japanese painter, Fukuhara Gogaku.¹⁷⁰

Gogaku was a native of Bigo Onomichi 備後尾道 (present-day Hiroshima 広島 prefecture), who moved to Kyoto where he studied under Ike Taiga, and later settled in Osaka to establish his own residence-studio called Gakuseidō 楽聖堂.¹⁷¹ A number of Tokugawa-era painters and theorists described Gogaku as a prominent disciple of Taiga. Nakao Choken 中尾樗軒, for instance, in his *Kinsei Itsujin Gashi* 近世逸人画史 (*History of Recent Extraordinary Painters*) published in 1824, records that “Gogaku remained loyal to his mentor Taiga, and for all his life was a major proponent of Taiga’s style.”¹⁷² Shirai Kayō 白井華陽, in his *Gajō Yōryaku* 画乗要略 (*Summary of Painting Criticism*) of 1832, notes that Gogaku studied landscape painting with Taiga. Kayō believed that Gogaku’s figure paintings even surpassed the reputation of Sakaki Hyakusen 彭城百川 (1697-1753).¹⁷³ Tanomura Chikuden 田能村竹田 (1777-1835) also states in his *Sanchūjin jōzetsu* 山人饒舌 (*Chatter of a Mountain Dweller*) of 1835 that Gogaku was the most adept successor of Taiga.¹⁷⁴

As suggested by Shirai Kayō, Gogaku was an exceptional painter of human figures, which he could execute in many different styles. As he acquired a high reputation as a calligrapher even before becoming a painter, the styles of his figure paintings correspond to regular, running, and cursive calligraphic scripts. Gogaku’s *Four Noble Pastimes of Chinese Ladies* 唐美人琴棋書画図 (figure 3. 40), housed in the Osaka Municipal Museum of Art 大阪市立美術館, exhibits the controlled brushstrokes of regular script. By contrast, *Landscape with figures* 山水人物図 (figure 3. 41) held in a private collection in the Netherlands, reveals the more bold and speedy brushwork of his cursive script. As for the figures in Orchid Pavilion Gathering painting at MOA, Gogaku

employed fluent calligraphic strokes which resemble his running script. Since Wang Xizhi's preface is famous for its perfect execution in running script, Gogaku may have purposely chosen the brushstroke to represent his knowledge of the theme.

In a Chinese poem dedicated to Taiga, Gogaku mentions that he had received artistic guidance for ten years.¹⁷⁵ Based on this poem, Matsushita Hidemaro 松下英麿 suggests that Gogaku entered Taiga's studio, Makuzuhara sōdō 真葛原草堂, in Kyoto when he was about thirty years old and stayed with him until his early forties.¹⁷⁶ Because his style reflects, to some degree, a trace of Kano training, Matsushita also speculates that before Gogaku came to study *bunjinga*-style landscape painting under Taiga, he may have studied figure painting with Ōoka Shunboku 大岡春朴, a Kano trained painter who was then active in Osaka.¹⁷⁷

During the Meiji era, Fujioka Sakutarō 藤岡朔太郎, author of *Kinsei kaigashi* 近世絵画史 (*History of Early Modern Paintings*), admired Gogaku's accomplishment in successfully transmitting the style of Taiga to younger generations.¹⁷⁸ According to Fujioka, after Taiga's death, the center of the *bunjinga* movement shifting to Osaka was partly due to Gogaku's contribution to the painting community.¹⁷⁹ Kaneyasu Gai 兼康愷 also gives credit to Gogaku in *Naniwashiwa* 浪華詩話 (*Lyric Episodes in Osaka*) in 1835 for the important role he played in transmitting Taiga's style, and for successfully training outstanding disciples of his own such as Hamada Kyōdō 浜田杏堂 (?-1814), Rin Rōen 林閬苑 (dates unknown), Kanae Shungaku 鼎春岳 (1768-1811), and Oka Yūgaku 岡熊岳 (?-1833).¹⁸⁰

Due to the academic situation regarding Osaka *bunjinga*, as described by Nakatani, Gogaku has received little modern academic attention. Recently, however, some important research on him has been undertaken. In the spring of 2009, The Osaka Museum of History 大阪歴史博物館 organized an exhibition devoted entirely to Gogaku. From the perspective of “Naniwa-ology” — a term coined for the specialization in the cultural history and development of Osaka — Hida Kōzō 肥田皓三 has described the position of Gogaku in local literary circles, particularly his relation to the lyrical society of Kontonshisha 混沌詩社.¹⁸¹ Kōyama Noboru 神山登 researched Gogaku’s contribution in the Osaka painting world, and Kuorkawa Shūichi 黒川修一 gave lectures on the relationship between Gogaku and his disciples.¹⁸²

Impression and Innovation

Formally speaking, Gogaku’s Orchid Pavilion Gathering displays characteristics of Taiga’s style but also indicates Gogaku’s own stylistic contribution. While much of the brushwork in the paintings by Taiga and Gogaku demonstrates calligraphic emulation, the tree leaves in these paintings are executed in a pattern of dots. The striking stylistic similarity between Taiga’s and Gogaku’s Orchid Pavilion Gathering suggests that Gogaku modeled his version after Taiga.

Although Gogaku copied the style and subject matter of Taiga, he was not a slavish imitator. Gogaku’s own stylistic contribution reflects his knowledge of other Orchid Pavilion Gatherings by Sheng Maoye, such as the one housed in the University of Michigan collection.¹⁸³ Although Sheng was a professional painter from Jiangsu province 江蘇省, his work possesses an elegance and spontaneity that shows a direct

relationship with scholarly Wu School 吳派 painting. For instance, the stream that twists between the foreground and background, is based on his observation of the actual meandering waterways and hilly terrain of the regions surrounding Suzhou 蘇州. Marshall Wu has explained how Sheng Maoye's Orchid Pavilion Gathering combines standard imagery with details based on his own interpretation.¹⁸⁴

Instead of forty-one, as set out in the *Preface*, Gogaku depicted twenty-four scholars and eleven servants in his Orchid Pavilion Gathering. As in the work by Sheng, Gogaku reveals the relative social status of the figures not only through their physical scale but also by their costumes. The servants in both Sheng's and Gogaku's paintings wear blue jackets and pants instead of robes, because they must perform physical tasks. Traditionally, young servants either wore their hair in two tufts or let it loose before they reached adulthood. Because the Chinese regarded beards as a symbol of status suggesting advanced age and wisdom, more men grew beards. Consequently, the scholars in the Orchid Pavilion Gathering painting are bearded.¹⁸⁵ Since a handscroll of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering attributed to Li Gonglin was inscribed on stelae during the fifteenth century and widely distributed, Marshal Wu speculates that Sheng may have used one of these as a model for the Michigan version.¹⁸⁶

Sheng's painting was imported to Japan in the seventeenth century and stayed there until 1974.¹⁸⁷ It is possible that Gogaku had the opportunity to study this work and incorporate its features into his depictions of the pavilion, rocks, trees and stream, as Gogaku's Orchid Pavilion landscape oddly reflects the nature of the Suzhou region, which Gogaku had never seen. The most striking similarity between the works of Sheng and Gogaku is that they attain the spontaneity of the literati Wu School, especially in the

depiction of the rocks and trees while at the same time maintaining the decorative and exquisite composition found in the professional Zhe School paintings. Marshall Wu argues that this unique combination of literati and professional styles generated strong demands in the local market of Suzhou.¹⁸⁸ As Suzhou was an important commercial center, art dealers came there to buy and sell old collectibles. Professional painters who began producing works in order to meet local demand expanded the market. During Sheng Maoye's time, Suzhou paintings attracted foreign interest, including the Japanese art market.

Gogaku's style is also related to that of Sakaki Hyakusen, who was an artist crucial in setting an important direction for later generations. James Cahill has demonstrated that Hyakusen did not depend primarily on woodblock-printed manuals but studied many actual Chinese paintings.¹⁸⁹ Thus, Hyakusen was able to transmit the animated and lively brushwork that was impossible to learn from woodblock manuals. Most intriguingly, for instance, in his hanging scroll, Hyakusen depicts a scholar leaning over the railing of a riverside pavilion, which recalls Sheng's hanging scroll, entitled *River Landscape with Willows* (figure 3. 42). The calligraphic rendering as well as the posture of this scholar are derived from a similar figure image in the Orchid Pavilion handscroll by Sheng Maoye. This was repeated by Gogaku, who also painted a rustic pavilion in his Orchid Pavilion scroll. Although the figure on the right in Gogaku's scroll has his back to viewer, unlike Sheng's and Hyakusen's scholars, the brushwork and mood of his predecessors has been thoroughly transmitted.

Gogaku's experimental efforts are apparent in his reversed placement of the pavilion and the bridge. The standard composition begins with the depiction of the

pavilion and ends with the bridge as shown in the ink rubbing. Gogaku probably attempted to create narrative suspense by holding the climatic event until the last. At the end of the handscroll, Wang Xizhi is seated in front of a red desk inside the pavilion. Gogaku may have also been inspired by the Orchid Pavilion then located in Manpuku-ji by Fang Yi, which exhibits the same compositional reversal. In the midst of poetic improvisation, Wang holds a brush. A scholar and a servant stare intently at the tip of his brush in admiration of his calligraphy. In front of the pavilion, a branch with peach blossoms is suggested through a series of pink and green dots. The means of representing these flowers is obviously inherited from his mentor Taiga. Unlike standard Orchid Pavilion paintings that depict geese, Gogaku excluded them as did Taiga.

The iconographies used in Gogaku's Orchid Pavilion painting are also overlapping with those in Taiga's. One of the most notable features of Gogaku's composition is a group of scholars standing by the large vertical rock in the middle of handscroll. One of them holds a brush and inscribes the surface of the rock while others watch him attentively. As discussed earlier, they belong to the *Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden*.

Performing Chinese Literati

The primary reason that Gogaku painted the Orchid Pavilion Gathering was obviously not to accurately record the various attributes of the theme. Rather, he considered his painting as a social event with a specific goal. This goal, which is similar to Taiga's, could be said to record the world of Gogaku's contemporaries: the elegant gathering of the Osaka artists and intellectuals. As mentioned earlier, Gogaku was an

active member of a *kanshi* 漢詩 (Japanese Chinese poetry) circle based in Osaka, the so-called Kontonshisha 混沌詩社, and he developed an intimate friendship with the Confucian scholar-calligrapher-poet, Rai Shunsui 賴春水 (1746-1813), who represented the Osaka intelligentsia during the An'ei years 安永年間.¹⁹⁰

Gogaku often drank *sake*, which entertained himself and his friends. In his *Shiyūshi* 師友志 (*Accounts on Teachers and Friends*), Rai Shunsui records an episode demonstrating how much Gogaku enjoyed *sake*. In 1761, Taiga received an important commission from a prominent Buddhist temple, Henshōkōin 遍照光院 on Mt. Kōya 高野山, to paint *Landscape and Figures* 山水人物図襖絵.¹⁹¹ Gogaku, who was then staying at Taiga's studio in Kyoto, apparently accompanied him. When they were about to leave for Mt. Kōya, Shunsui visited them; they decided to make a toast, wishing the successful completion of the work. Gogaku, nevertheless, continued to drink *sake* with Shunsui until morning approached. While waiting for Gogaku to empty a barrel of *sake*, Taiga improvised a poem making fun of his uncontrollable drinking habit.¹⁹² Yukawa Genyō 湯川玄洋 comments in his *Kinsei Gajinden* 近世雅人傳 (*History of Early Modern Elegant People*) that "if Gogaku was visited by friends he drank *sake*, and under the influence of intoxication, he composed fabulous poetry as an expression of ultimate leisure."¹⁹³ Gogaku must have empathized with the figures in the *Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, especially with those who emptied a few cups of wine. Notably, he included the iconography of Yu Yun, the intoxicated scholar supported by his peers. In his mind, Gogaku may have overlapped the image of this figure with himself.¹⁹⁴

Many *bunjin* members also engaged in the *sake* brewing industry. Along with Shukuya and Gogaku, Kimura Kenkadō 木村兼葭堂 (1736-1802), a *sake* brewer from Osaka, was one of the most prominent disciples of Taiga. Fujioka Sakutarō notes that Kenkadō was not a talented painter, but his contribution to the cultural and intellectual circle in Kansai, particularly Osaka and Kyoto, was enormous.¹⁹⁵ He used his family wealth to collect antiques and contemporary art, financially supported artists, and published extremely important art theories and accounts.

Kenkadō's wealth, however, was confiscated by the Tokugawa *bakufu* in the second year of Kansei in 1790 when he was at 55 years old. He was accused of brewing more *sake* in his factory than allowed by law. This was part of the restriction placed on wealthy commoners by the *bakufu* as a part of the Kansei Reforms (*Kansei no kaikaku* 寛政の改革, 1787-93). Kenkadō went into self-exile in Ise, being invited there by the lord of Ise Nagashima castle 伊勢長島城. Two years later, Kenkadō returned to Osaka, and opened a new stationary and Chinese antique shop.¹⁹⁶ He was even more successful than before. His cultural salon was a powerful network of art and culture that was constantly filled with artists and intellectuals from Osaka as well as from the rest of Japan.¹⁹⁷ Kenkadō is credited as being an originator of the institution of *shogakai* 書画会 (calligraphy and painting gatherings), which was a cultivated symposium combining an art exhibition and banquet.¹⁹⁸ At *shogakai*, Japanese *bunjin* artists and connoisseurs often dressed in the Chinese *wenren*'s robes.

Gogaku and Kenkadō alike played key roles in the circle of Kaitokudō 懷徳堂, the Confucian institution founded by commoners in Osaka in 1724.¹⁹⁹ In 1726, the Kaitokudō was officially approved by the Tokugawa regime, but its operation was run by

a group of commoners, which did not change until it was dissolved two years after the Meiji Restoration.²⁰⁰ The school manifesto of 1758 states: “all students at the Kaitokudō must be treated equally, regardless of class or economic status.”²⁰¹ Although Matsudaira Sadanobu’s Kansei Reforms restricted the activities of merchants, and consequently refocused their primary ideology on Neo-Confucianism, Kaitokudō tolerated different teachings and ideas.²⁰²

Gogaku’s involvement in the intellectual community is reflected in a number of his works. In 1772 at the age of 42, Gogaku was commissioned to produce a large scale folding screen depicting *Dōteiko* 洞庭湖 (*Dongting Lake*, figure 3. 43) in Osaka. He painted this famous Chinese scene seen from a bird’s eye perspective from his imagination, though basing it on Taiga’s long handscroll version of same theme.²⁰³ On the surface of this screen, poems and signatures were inscribed by a group of fourteen well-known Osaka artists, poets and scholars. Among them are: Nakai Chikuzan 中井竹山, Miyake Shunrō 三宅春楼, Nakai Fukken 中井履軒, Nakamura Ryōhō 中村兩峰, and Hayano Gyōsai 早野仰斎 of the Kaitokudō affiliates, as well as Araki Rikei 荒木李谿, Kuzu Shikin 葛子琴, Hosoi Hansai 細合半斎, Shinozaki Sankō 篠崎三嶋, Rai Shunsui 頼春水, and Tanaka Naruto 田中鳴門, who were members of the Kontonshisha led by Katayama Hokkai 片山北海.²⁰⁴ Inscriptions were added to the painting at the time of a drinking party hosted by Kinzaki Shichiemon 金崎七右衛門 in 1773. Kinzaki Shichiemon is another name for Amagasakiya 尼崎屋 who was a major patron of the Kaitokudō.²⁰⁵ Gogaku and the attendees of this elegant gathering must have been

conscious of the classical Orchid Pavilion Gathering, and likened themselves to Wang Xizhi's guests.

Gogaku also painted *Farewell Sonehara Rokei* (*Sonehara Rokei jobetsuzu* 曾根原魯卿叙別図), when his young friend Rokei 魯卿, who was an affiliate of Kontonshisha studying poetry under the guidance of Katayama Hokkai, departed from Osaka to his home in Yamagata prefecture in 1769.²⁰⁶ The style and composition of this painting resonates with that of *Conversing with Mikami Kōken* (*Mikami Kōken taiwazu* 三上孝軒對話図) painted by Taiga in 1762. Taiga had a close friendship with a Confucian named Kōken, and painted this work to celebrate Kōken's fortieth birthday.²⁰⁷ Taiga also composed and inscribed Chinese poetry in order to commemorate this day. In his poem, he compares his painting with the painting theme of *Nine Elders at Huichang* 会昌九老図, which also belongs to the scholarly gathering genre. Although Taiga mentions the Chinese scholarly congregation in his poem, the figures of Kōken facing toward the viewer and Taiga conversing with him are dressed in Japanese costume. In contrast, Gogaku dressed Rokei and himself in Chinese scholar's costume. These costumes are identical to those worn by the scholars in Orchid Pavilion Gathering painting.

The year 353, when Wang Xizhi held his Orchid Pavilion Gathering, was the year of *kichū* (guichou 癸丑), which means the combination of water and oxen in Chinese astrology. These signs repeat themselves every sixty years. Until recent years, cultured people in Japan have gathered to commemorate Wang's primordial event.²⁰⁸ When the year of *kichū* fell in 1793, the Kansai artists and intellectuals under the leadership of Minagawa Kien 皆川其園 (1734-1807), who had organized *shogakai* twice a year since

1792, also celebrated this event.²⁰⁹ Gogaku, an active participant of this elegant community, was 63 years old on that day. Based on formal and circumstantial evidence found thus far, I speculate that the MOA scroll was painted to commemorate this specific occasion in 1793. Although this will require further investigation to verify, it is nonetheless likely that, through the Orchid Pavilion theme, Gogaku wanted to depict his local cultural community.

After Gogaku, the Osaka *bunjinga* successors continued to produce visual representations of the Orchid Pavilion, mainly in the hanging-scroll format. Many of them are experimental and executed in a variety of ways. The painters who were active during this time often received their training from multiple sources. One of Gogaku's disciples, Rin Rōen 林閨苑 (active 1770-80), for instance, painted his version (figure 3. 44) in a serene and tranquil manner.²¹⁰ It conveys a fantastic mood, which he likely learned from Kakutei 鶴亭 (1722-1785), a Nagasaki Ōbaku painter who came to Manpukuji later in this career. On the other hand, Nakai Rankō 中井藍江 (1766-1830), who studied under Shitomi Kangetsu 蒔閨月 (1747-1797), a pupil of Tsukioka Settei, also received some education in the Shijō school as well. Rankō's Orchid Pavilion (figure 3: 45) is obviously related to the version by Gogaku. These works indicate that Osaka painters had no intention of creating a cohesive style, but shared the ideological goal of creating their own community.

About four decades after the death of Gogaku, poetic gatherings continued to be popular among Tokugawa artists and intellectuals. A gathering held at Siseidō 詩聖堂書画会 in Edo is an example of this elegant pastime.²¹¹ The poster for the event is inscribed with the name of figures including Tani Bunchō 谷文晁 (1763-1840) and

Haruki Nanko 春木南湖 (1859-1939).²¹² Although the figures depicted in this poster are all Japanese, they are clad in the robes of Chinese literati. They were performing as Chinese literati to claim their cultural leadership as a demonstration of power.

In his preface, Wang Xizhi recorded not only the pleasures of the gathering, but also his speculations on the transience of life. For *bunjinga* painters, the practice of imitating the particular styles of masters was a sort of intellectual activity that prominently displayed their knowledge of history.²¹³ Hence, Gogaku investigated his predecessors from a contemporary perspective, recorded his own contemporaries, and attempted to leave us evidence of how they lived through the visual representation of his Orchid Pavilion Gathering painting. While the connection to Chinese calligraphy through the person of Wang Xizhi to some degree always remained, Japanese artists and their patrons tended to view this theme more generally as a symbol of refined scholarly amusement that reflected their own image.²¹⁴

Literati Irony: Nakabayashi Chikutō's Ideology

Because it needs to be understood within its complex ideological and sociopolitical context, I now reconsider the nineteenth-century *bakumatsu* 幕末 (final years of the Tokugawa era) ideological conditions of the *bunjin* community that are behind the production and reception of the Orchid Pavilion (figure 3. 46) by Nakabayashi Chikutō 中林竹洞 (1776-1853). I will argue that Chikutō possessed a “self-consciousness” that was based on proto-nationalism, was affected by *kokugaku* ideology, and was manifested in his aesthetic sensibility. In so doing, I aim to examine how *bunjin* artists and connoisseurs surrounding Chikutō attempted to construct their own identity

using their networking system and Chinese visual vocabulary. In his early career, Chikutō produced an *Orchid Pavilion Gathering* modeled after the seventeenth-century Suzhou commercial painter, Sheng Maoye (active 1594-1640; figure 3. 2).²¹⁵ Although Chikutō copied Sheng's composition in an exact manner, his brushwork and color application are notably distinct from the original.

Chikutō's handscroll was introduced in the art journal *Kokka* by Fujikake Shizuya 藤懸静也 (1881-1958) in 1936.²¹⁶ Although Fujikake mentions that this work was framed at that time, its horizontal composition obviously indicates that the work was initially formatted as a handscroll. In the early twentieth century, it was common for short handscrolls to be framed for easier display. However, after this first appearance the location of this work was unknown for many decades. It was rediscovered by Paul Berry of the Hakutakuan Collection, at a public auction in Kyoto around year 2000.²¹⁷

Chikutō's Painting Style and his Contemporary Reception

Because of the consistently serene and tranquil painting style produced in the 1830s and 1840s Chikutō had been frequently characterized as “uninventive” or “uncreative” in composition by many modern scholars. Recently, Chikutō's paintings have begun to be viewed differently, and roughly four stages of his stylistic transformation are recognized.²¹⁸ In 1802, Chikutō moved to Kyoto, where he joined the circle of influential Confucian scholars, calligraphers, painters, and poets, including Rai San'yō 頼山陽 (1780-1832). From that time on, Chikutō became increasingly influential, both for his quiet painting style and for his exacting theories on painting.²¹⁹ Chikutō was one of the most celebrated artists of his time. He was active both in Owari 尾張 (present-

day Nagoya) and Kyoto. His name appeared in the *Heian jinbutsushi* 平安人物史, or *Who's Who of Kyoto*, five times, among which he was even represented as the first person in the category of *bunjinga* three times, in 1830, 1838 and 1852.²²⁰

A fairly accurate biography of Chikutō is recorded by Kanematsu Romon 兼松蘆門 (1864-1911), a *nihonga* 日本画 (Japanese-style painting) artist who published *Chikutō and Bai'itsu* 竹洞と梅逸 in 1910.²²¹ According to Romon, Chikutō was born in Owari as a son of Nakabayashi Gentō 中林玄棟, a medical doctor. In 1789, Chikutō began his study of painting at age 14 under the guidance of Yamada Kyūjō 山田宮常 (1747-93). Through Kyūjō, Chikutō met Kamiya Ten'yū 神谷天遊 (1710-1802), a wealthy Nagoya merchant and collector. Ten'yū taught Chikutō the best way of learning how to paint was to copy good Chinese paintings.²²² Chikutō studied Chinese paintings, prints, and art treatises from Ten'yū's collection. Hence, the Orchid Pavilion handscroll copied by Chikutō could be a study piece but may also have been requested as a commodity as well.

Chikutō's Painting Theory

For a better understanding of why Chikutō produced an exact copy of Sheng's Orchid Pavilion, it is important to review his painting theory. As a prolific theorist, Chikutō published numerous painting manuals and art treatises, such as *Gadō kongō sho* 画道金剛杵 in 1801, *Chikutō garon* 竹洞画論 in 1802, two different volumes of *Bunga Yūyaku* 文画誘掖 in 1808 and in 1845, and *Gadō Tebikigusa* 画道手引草 in 1845.²²³ In these texts, Chikutō claimed that the proper study of painting begins by copying Chinese

models to gain the technical discipline necessary for the development of an individual style.

In *Gadô kongô sho*, Chikutô constructs an esthetic dichotomy based on the *gazokuron* 雅俗論, one that opposes the antique/elegant/superior to the modern/vulgar/inferior. He encourages painters to look up antique Chinese paintings of literati lineage, specifically those of Wang Wei 王維 (701-761), Mi Fu 米芾 (1051-1107), and Wen Zhengming 文徵明 (1470-1559), but he devalues contemporary Qing paintings. Among Japanese painters, he praises Sesshû as an example of a good landscape painter and Tosa painters as the champions of the coloring method, but he devalues their successors of his generation. Nevertheless, Chikutô's painting theory and practice are filled with irony and dilemmas.

Chikutô opens his argument in *Chikutô garon* with a severe criticism of the Kano by stating, "Kano Tan'yû has simplified the old Kano's vulgarity into a new irrational style."²²⁴ Although both Sesshû and the Kano belong to the Japanese version of northern school painting, according to Chikutô, the works of Sesshû are elegant because he paints in monochrome ink, while the works of the Kano school are vulgar for employing color. Besides the fact that the Kano school also produced numerous monochrome ink paintings, Chikutô's argument does not make sense because he admires the Tosa for their colorful works at the same time he is criticizing the Kano. We can see how the tradition of Kano criticism inaugurated by Nakayama Kôyô is still vital in Chikutô's *bakumatsu* context. Another art treatise, *Kinsei meiga shaga dan* 近世名画書画談, from the end of Edo period, continues to emphasize the same point.²²⁵

It is interesting to see how Chikutō finds “*koi* 古意” in antique Tosa paintings and in Ming works of Shen Zhou 沈周 (1427-1509) and Wen Zhengming. He states that if the painter is not copying from the Tosa, there is no *koi* in his work, and he evaluates the works of Shen and Wen without having seen them directly. Chikutō had seen many antique paintings with signatures of those two artists but they have all been identified as forgeries. Chikutō expresses his desire to look at authentic works of those artists, and encouraged painters to make *funpon* if encountering a good quality Chinese painting. Sheng Maoye’s Orchid Pavilion satisfied Chikutō’s criteria of “worthy” painting to be copied exactly.

Chikutō’s Orchid Pavilion Gathering

Chikutō wished to study authentic Chinese literati painting, but the works available under the trading restrictions of the Tokugawa regime were limited to those of commercial painters, such as Sheng Maoye. Chikutō’s copy is undated, but it must have been made when he studied at the Kamiya Ten’yū estates, since Ten’yū was a great collector of Chinese paintings.

In 1796, while receiving education from Ten’yū, Chikutō was commissioned by Okada Shingawa 岡田新川 (1737-1799), a local prestigious Confucian scholar, to document his sixtieth birthday party. A painting entitled *Birthday Party of Okada Shingawa at the Mamiya Estate* 間宮別邸岡田新川六十賀宴図 (figure 3. 47) is the earliest extant painting by Chikutō with an original composition. The number of guests invited to this party was forty-one, which was exactly same number of scholars at the Orchid Pavilion Gathering. Chikutō made a conscious effort to record this contemporary

event by modeling it after the elegant Chinese classical theme. The group of figures in this painting slightly resembles that in the Orchid Pavilion handscroll. However, these figures are more closely related to woodblock-printed painting manuals, such as *Kaishien gaden*, which Chikutō obtained and entirely copied before 1797.

Chikutō's hanging scroll representing the Orchid Pavilion (figure 3. 48) is dated 1808. A group of four scholars seated together under a cliff is clearly a pictorial motif included in the work by Sheng Maoye. This indicates that the Sheng version was copied by Chikutō sometime after he painted the *Birthday Party of Okada Shingawa* in 1796 and before this hanging scroll was produced.

Although Chikutō's copy appears nearly identical to Sheng's original, the details indicate many differences. The overall quality of Chikutō's is elegantly simple, and plainness is emphasized. Chikutō made a conscious effort to express the Chinese literati quality, which is called *pingdan* 渲淡 (or "elegant simplicity"). The colors of the robes worn by the scholars in the Orchid Pavilion painting were rearranged in Chikutō's copy. Other small details reflect Chikutō's knowledge of woodblock-printed painting manuals. For instance, the stick held by one figure is much longer in Chikutō's painting than that in Sheng's. Chikutō adapted this from his earlier study of manuals. Other seated figures are also inspired by *Kaishien gaden*. Chikutō's depiction of the vegetation is configured as dots of ink, executed with an understanding totally different from Sheng's trees. This manner of executing the woods with dots was also adapted from a painting manual, which was formulated by the forerunner of Japanese *bunjin* style, Ike Taiga.

New Approaches Following Chikutō's Model

Yoshida Kōkin's 吉田公均 (1804-1876) Orchid Pavilion (figure 3. 49) includes many interesting iconographic elements, some of which are obviously copied from works by Chikutō.²²⁶ The dancing figure usually identified as Yang Mo in the Orchid Pavilion Gathering is the easiest figure to identify, since the rest of scholars are seated. Nevertheless, this Yang Mo is represented unconventionally and resembles *Sui Rihakuzu* 酔李伯図 (*Drunken Li Bai*; figure 3. 50) painted by Chikutō, who projected himself in the place of Li Bai, one of the greatest poets in the Tang dynasty. On this painting, Li Bai's poem, *Drinking Alone by Moonlight* 月下獨酌 is inscribed. Asahi Minako 朝日美奈子 argues that not only did Chikutō paint his self-portrait in the image of Li Bai, but he also painted it under the influence of alcohol while attending a drinking party emulating an elegant Chinese gathering.²²⁷

Although he aligned himself with *wenren* artists and aspired to live like a Chinese recluse, as Taiga did, Chikutō was also a professional painter who received commissions from his clients, and thus, produced numerous works representing the Orchid Pavilion theme, which was extremely popular in his time. Chikutō's eldest son and the successor to his studio, Nakayabashi Chikkei 中林竹溪 (1816-1867), painted his version of Orchid Pavilion (figure 3. 51) to transmit Chikutō's style in combination with the Western method, or *shasei* 写生 (copying from nature) style.²²⁸

Another Orchid Pavilion image was produced by Ōkura Ryūzan 大倉笠山 (1785-1850), who was the best student of Chikutō, besides Chikkei. Ryūzan was the eldest son of a wealthy *sake* brewery family from Mt. Kasagi 笠置山, on the outskirts of Kyoto. He

entrusted his family business to his brother and became a follower of Chikutō. Ryūzan piously copied Chikutō's works, and produced *Chikutō shukuzu* 竹洞縮図 (*Study sketches of Chikutō*). These study sketches consist of over four hundred forty copies of Chikutō's works. An album consisting of fifty images by Chikutō was also copied by Ryūzan.²²⁹

Bakumatsu Ideology and Shift in Chikutō's Aesthetic

Lastly, I would like to discuss the ideological environment of the *bakumatsu* period, which flourished when Chikutō was active. While as a literati painter Chikutō admired antique Chinese painting, he also had a strong inclination towards proto-nationalistic thinking. *True View of Mt. Kasagi* (figure 3. 52) was painted by Chikutō when he visited Ōkura Ryūzan's residence. Mt. Kasagi is strongly tied to the proto-nationalism of the end of the Tokugawa period, since there are many historical episodes attached to the place. A son of Emperor Tenchi 天智天皇 (626-672) was saved by the Miroku Buddha 弥勒仏, and marked this place by a *kasa* 笠 or hat. Another famous episode with Emperor Godaigo 後醍醐天皇 (1288-1339) and Kusunoki Masashige 楠木正成 (1294-1336) is associated with this mountain.²³⁰ Thus, Mt. Kasagi was strongly associated with the imperial royalist and *kogugaku* movement.

Rai San'yō 賴山陽, who was the author of the bestseller, *Nihon gaishi* 日本外史, a work important to *kogugaku* ideology, also visited this site. Ryūzan studied painting from Chikutō, and studied poetry from San'yō. Chikutō's association with the scholars of *kogugaku* ideology at this time was prominent. Examples include: Ōdachi Takakado 大館高門 (1776-1839),²³¹ Watanabe Kiyoshi (?-1861), Tanaka Totsugen 田中納言

(1767-1823), Moto'ori Haruniwa 本居春庭 (1763-1828; son of Norinaga), and Suzuki Akira 鈴木朧 (1764-1837).²³² Chikutō collaborated to produce a work entitled *Snow, Moon and Flower* (figure 3. 53), dated in 1822 with Tanaka Totsugen the *fukko yamato-e* 復古大和絵 painter, and Mimurodo Yoshimitsu 三室戸能光 (1805-1886) the poet-calligrapher, *kokugaku* scholar and also prominent aristocrat. Chikutō only painted the moon, being executed in minimal fashion, which was a style newly constructed by Chikutō's circle.

Chikutō's choice of subject matter became explicit as a *kokugaku* promoter. Chikutō copied *Mt. Fuji* (figure 3: 54) by Niwa Yoshinobu (or Kagen) 丹羽嘉言 (1842-1886), who was a founding father of the Owari (Nagoya) literati painting and also had a strong *kokugaku* inclination. After reaching the age of 60 in 1837, Chikutō painted Mt. Fuji, which he entitled *Shinshu kikanzu* 神州奇観図 (*Eccentric views of godly state*). In 1849 Chikuto produced the world map that is shown as a human body as depicted in the first volume of *Konko ichi zushiki* 坤輿位置図式 (figure 3. 55). This map is now located in Kariya Municipal Library 刈谷市立図書館. In this map, Japan is the torso, China is the abdomen, and Europe is the back. In volume two, the domestic map of Japan indicates the locations of Shinto shrines. As Asahi has noted, it is ironic that a *bunjinga* painter, who admired Chinese paintings, expressed so explicitly *kokugaku* ideology as well as proto-nationalism.²³³

Chikutō authored numerous books to share his ideas, based on *kokugaku*. According to his writings, he was dealing with a dilemma: on the one hand, he aspired to the Chinese tradition and tried to be faithful to what he learned from Chinese painting, prints and texts, but on the other hand, he collaborated with *kokugaku* poets and *fukko*

yamato-e painters, and authored and published many *kokugaku* treatises and Shinto related texts.²³⁴ Although Chikutō's *kokugaku* inclination has been mostly identified with his later life (after recovery from eye disease in the 1820s), there is abundant evidence that he had always socialized with other *kokugaku*-inclined people.

The *Kokugaku* Aesthetic in Chikutō's Orchid Pavilion

Chikutō's Orchid Pavilion is more "elegantly plain and quiet" than Sheng Maoye's, as his brushwork is so much more sensitive and delicate. His application of color is also more subtle than Sheng's. While painting this work, Chikutō was in search of his identity, and his *kokugaku* inclination was already undeniable. Of course, none of the *kokugaku* aesthetic, as with "Japaneseness" or "Chineseness," is fixed or inherent but is rather a construct. It is an interesting irony to see how Chikutō finds "*koi* 古意" in antique Tosa paintings and Ming works of Shen Zhou and Wen Zhengming. Shirai Kayō noted in his *Gajō Yoryaku* 画乗要略 that "Chikutō quietly embraced the mood of antiquity, and deeply captured the spirit and bone of ancients" (古気渾穆なり。深く古人の風骨を得たり).²³⁵

At the end of his career, Chikutō often signed his paintings with a new studio name, Chūtan 冲澹 (light and plain).²³⁶ He subtly shifted the cultural basis of his notion of antiquity from Chinese (*pingdan*) to Japanese (*chūtan*), although both aesthetics - elegantly simple and plain - are heavily constructed by the sociopolitical environment. It is certainly noteworthy that it was a time when the *fukko yamato-e* artists, such as Reizei Tamechika 冷泉為恭 (1823-1864), began to produce completely nativized versions of

the Orchid Pavilion Gathering, the so-called “*Kyokusui-en zu* 曲水宴図” or gathering at the meandering water, a development I will discuss in the next chapter.

In addition, the Opium Wars (the first 1839-1843 and second 1856-1860) that occurred near the end of Tokugawa period may have enhanced the *kokugaku* movement and the evolution of Japanese “self-consciousness.” The first Opium War broke out during the lifetime of Chikutō. Although the Tokugawa *bakufu* did not have an official relationship with the Qing dynasty and constantly supported the Ming loyalists, this news of the war must have been shocking for everyone, including Chikutō. Information regarding the Opium Wars was circulated by means of various woodblock-printed books, and other printed media, and thus available to a wide range of people.²³⁷

Therefore, Chikutō chose to “copy” specific pictorial elements from particular Chinese paintings in an effort to articulate a cultural and intellectual “self-consciousness,” which in turn transformed into his own aesthetic sensibility by the end of his career. While using Chinese visual languages at the height of the *kokugaku* movement, Chikutō became more aware of cultural conflict which posed itself as a professional dilemma. This situation made him conscious of distinguishing one’s self from other. Nevertheless, his “self-consciousness” was born earlier when his painting practice consisted largely of copying from Chinese models. Hence, it is important to study works such as the handscroll representing the Orchid Pavilion theme modeled after Sheng Maoye.

As examined in the four examples of Orchid Pavilion images painted by four different painters – Ike Taiga, Nakayama Koyo, Fukuhara Gogaku and Nakabayashi Chikuto — Japanese *bunjinga* were constantly conscious of their identity, and made

direct efforts to construct their images borrowing Chinese visual language. When Japanese literati painters formulated a new version of the Orchid Pavilion visual tradition, they combined diverse sources to construct their unconventional identity, which was different from the identity of the Japanese mainstream and also from that of the Chinese literati. While they shared the main goal —avoiding vulgarity and seeking classicism in paintings —each took profoundly different approaches, which were affected by their social networks.

Notes:

¹ The Orchid Pavilion episode was well-known by aristocratic society in the seventh century Nara period. Nevertheless, visual representation of the Orchid Pavilion was absent until the seventeenth century, when Kano Sansetsu painted his version based on a Ming-dynasty ink rubbing on two pairs of eight-panel *byōbu* (fig. 1. 2). Although some members of the Kano school continued to paint versions of this theme, members of the literati movement played more prominent roles in developing the new Orchid Pavilion visual tradition in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

² The “Cult of the Orchid Pavilion” in late Ming society was noted by Richard Strassberg, *Inscribed Landscape: Travel Writing from Imperial China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 63.

³ Other nonconformist trends include Maruyama, Shijō, Kishi, Hara, Nagasaki, and ukiyo-e workshops. Yoshizawa Chū, *Nihon Nanga Ronkō* 日本南画論攷 (*Investigation of Japanese Literati Paintings*) (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1977), 113.

⁴ Prior to the Genroku era, a limited number of extremely wealthy merchants were involved in shaping town culture by sponsoring artists such as Hon'ami Kōetsu 本阿弥光悦 (1558-1637) and Tawaraya Sōtatsu 俵屋宗達 (c.1570-1643). However, after the Genroku period a large portion of *chōnin* became involved in various cultural activities. The Japanese economy in this period was in the process of being transformed from one based on a feudal and agrarian society to that of an urban society. By the end of the seventeenth century, the prosperity generated by the economic expansion possible in times of peace had resulted in a peculiar kind of imbalance, in which *chōnin* were becoming affluent while many samurai, forced to subsist on fixed incomes—their rice stipend—in a period of economic inflation, were on the verge of bankruptcy. Yoshizawa, *Nihon Nanga Ronkō*, 114.

⁵ The seemingly contradictory idea of constructing new “classical” themes for sociopolitical purposes in the seventeenth century can also be found in *One Hundred Poets, One Poem Each*, discussed by Joshua Mostow in “A New ‘Classical’ Theme: The One Hundred Poets from Elite to Popular Art in the Early Edo Period,” in Elizabeth Lillehoj, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Classicism in Japanese Painting, 1600-1700* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2004), 133-167. See also Shirane Haruo and Suzuki Tomi, eds., *Inventing the Classics: Modernity, National Identity, and Japanese Literature* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001).

⁶ Melanie Trede, “Terminology and Ideology: Coming to Terms with ‘Classicism’ in Japanese Art-Historical Writing,” in Elizabeth Lillehoj, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Classicism in Japanese Painting, 1600-1700* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2004), 21-52.

⁷ See Ellis Tinios, “Context and Career,” *Kawamura Bunpo: Artist of Two Worlds* (London: the University Gallery of Leeds, 2003), 8. See also Marius B. Jansen, *Japan and Its World: Two Centuries of Change* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 11.

⁸ Trede, “Terminology and Ideology,” 28-29.

⁹ Leading scholars of Kogaku-ha were Yamaga Sokō 山鹿素行 (1622-1685), Itō Jinzai 伊藤仁斎 (1627-1705) and Ogyū Sorai (1666-1728). Tsunoda Ryūsaku, *Sources of Japanese Tradition Volume I* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), 413.

¹⁰ Sorai was born the second son of a samurai who served as the physician of Tokugawa Tsunayoshi. He accompanied his father in exile for fourteen years and returned to Edo when he was twenty-five years old. Tsunoda, *Sources of Japanese Tradition Volume I*, 414, 416.

¹¹ While employed by Yoshiyasu, Sorai witnessed numerous cases of misconduct and the failure of the *bakufu*. Noguchi Takehiko 野口武彦, *Ogyu Sorai: Edo no Don Quixote* 荻生徂徠—江戸のドン・キホーテ (Tokyo: Chūōkōron, 1993), 43.

¹² Imanaka Hiroshi 今中寛司, *Soraigaku no kisoteki kenkyū* 徂徠学の基礎的研究 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1966).

¹³ Moto’ori Norinaga 本居宣長 called his scholarship “ancient learning” (*kogaku* or *inishie manabi* 古学).” Mark McNally, *Proving the Way: Conflict and Practice in the History of Japanese Nativism* (Harvard University Asia Center, 2005), 1, 83. I will discuss this direction more in my study of Nakabayashi Chikutō in this chapter and in Chapter Four.

¹⁴ Intriguingly, Sorai's nonconformism involved no great risks for the Tokugawa *bakufu*, since his respect for the rule of law backed by superior force accorded well with the realities of the political situation. See Kojima Yasunori, *Soraigaku to han-Sorai* 徂徠学 と反徂徠 (Tokyo: Perikansha, 1986).

¹⁵ Yoshikawa Kōjiro, *Jinsai; Sorai; Norinaga* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1975), 276.

¹⁶ Susan Bush, *The Chinese Literati on Painting: Su Shih (1037-1101) to Tung Ch'ang-ch'ang (1555-1636)* (Cambridge, Harvard Yenching Institute Studies: 1971).

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ James Cahill, "The Yuan Dynasty (1271-1368)," in *Three Thousand Years of Chinese Painting* (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1997), 140.

¹⁹ Craig Clunas, *Elegant Debts: The Social Art of Wen Zhengming 1470-1559* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2004), 75-81; Zoe Pei-Yu Li, *Consoling Frustrated Scholars: a Copy of a Parting Gift by Wen Zhengming* (MA thesis, University of British Columbia, 2007), 34.

²⁰ Zhu Xuchu, "The Songjiang School of Painting and the Period Style of the Late Ming," 5; Chu-tsing Li and James C.Y. Watt, eds., *The Chinese Scholar's Studio: Artistic Life in Late Ming Period—an Exhibition from the Shanghai Museum* (New York: Asia Society Galleries in association with Thames and Hudson, 1987), 52.

²¹ James Cahill, *Distant Mountains: Chinese Painting of the Late Ming Dynasty: 1570-1644* (New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill Publishing, 1982), 35-36.

²² This development put the status and value of the literati painting tradition in jeopardy. Literati groups wanted to maintain their exclusive and privileged positions and were alert to the encroachment of commercial artists. In order to purify the notions of "literati" and

literati painting, Dong Qichang consolidated a set of artistic ideas explaining who the literati were and why their paintings were superior to those of professionals.

²³ An extremely powerful and wealthy man who owned the most land in this region, Dong Qichang later resigned from his government post and returned home to pursue his artistic and intellectual pursuits. He was known as a prominent scholar-official, calligrapher, painter, collector and connoisseur. Dong Qichang's political apathy has been discussed by Wai-kam Ho in "Tung Chi-chang's Transcendence of History and Art," in *The Century of Tung Ch'i-ch'ang*, 3-42.

²⁴ Dong Qichang based his *Hua Chanshi Suibi* 画禅室随笔 (Jp. *Gazenshitsu zuihitsu*) on a theory by Mo Shilong 莫是龍 (active c.1567-1600), another renowned Ming scholar-painter who sought to incorporate Zen categories into painting theory. Both Dong and Mo were natives of Huating in Songjiang (near present-day Shanghai city), a major art center. See Yoshizawa, *Nihon Nanga Ronkō*, 11-43; see also Yang Xin, "The Ming Dynasty (1368-1644)," in *Three Thousand Years of Chinese Painting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 232-236; Thorp and Vinograd, *Chinese Art and Culture*, 322.

²⁵ The Zhe School included painters from many other regions such as Fujian, which traditionally provided many influential painters to the Ming court. The school was challenged by the Nanjing and Suzhou schools. Richard M. Barnhart, *Painters of Great Ming: The Imperial Court and the Zhe School* (Dallas: Dallas Museum of Art, 1993).

²⁶ Dong Qichang's strong interest in the legacy of Wang Wei seems to have begun in 1589, the year he was admitted to the Hanlin Academy 翰林院 seminar. His search for original works by Wang Wei reached its peak in 1599, when he suddenly discovered the handscroll *Rivers and Mountains after Snow* in the collection of Feng Mengchen. Kohara

records that Dong Qichang spoke excitedly of this work, exclaiming that no other painting by Wang Wei would ever surpass it. Kohara Hironobu, “Tung Chichan’s Connoisseurship in Tang and Sung Painting,” in Ho, Wai-Kam, ed., *The Century of Tung Ch’i-ch’ang* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1992), 81-103.

²⁷ “In Japan, any cultured ideologically oriented people are called literati.” See Yoshizawa, *Nihon Nanga Ronkō* (1977); for further studies of *bunjinga*, see Paul Berry, *Unexplored Avenues of Japanese Painting: the Hakutakuan Collection* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001); Hugh Wylie, “Nanga Painting Treatises of Nineteenth Century Japan: Translations, Commentary, and Analysis” (PhD Diss., University of Kansas, 1991), 1-17; Yōko Woodson, “Traveling Bunjin Painters and Their Patrons: Economic Life Style and Art of Rai Sanyō and Tanomura Chikuden (Patrons, Patronage, Literate Painters: Japan)” (PhD Diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1983), 2; Kōno Motoaki, “Nihon bunjinga shiron: Bunjinga to Nanga,” in *Kokka* 1207 (1996); Anna Beerens, *Friends, Acquaintances, Pupils, Patrons: Japanese Intellectual Live in the Late Eighteenth Century: A Prosopographical Approach* (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2006), 23.

²⁸ See Patricia J. Graham, “Lifestyles of Scholar-Painters in Edo Japan,” in *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* 77, no. 7 (September, 1990): 266 .

²⁹ Regarding the intricate relationships among the *bunjin* networks, see Beerens, *Friends, Acquaintances, Pupils, Patrons*, 17.

³⁰ Graham, “Lifestyles of Scholar-Painters in Edo Japan,” 263.

³¹ Gyokushū was a student of Taiga. Yoshizawa, *Nihon Nanga Ronkō*, 69, 129. Tamotsu Sakazaki, ed., “*Kaiji Higen*” *Ronga Yonshū* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1932), 23-46.

³² James Cahill demystifies the literati artists by revealing how they engaged in commodity production. *The Painter's Practice: How Artists Lived and Worked in Traditional China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).

³³ Helen J. Baroni, *Obaku Zen: the Emergence of the Third Sect of Zen in Tokugawa Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2000), 34.

³⁴ Ōbaku priests had been established in temples in Japan for about a decade before Ingen arrived in the country.

³⁵ Ōbaku is the third sect of Zen Buddhism in Japan. Prior to the development of Ōbaku, there were two sects, Rinzai and Sōtō, which were imported to Japan during the Muromachi period. The Sōtō sect focuses on meditation alone (*shikan taza*), while the Rinzai sect incorporates a complex series of *kōan* integrated into their *zazen* practice. Although Ōbaku is related to the Rinzai sect and they both believe in sudden enlightenment, they are fundamentally different. The Ōbaku combines the recitation of *nenbutsu* (chanting the name of Amida) with meditation, so it is called *nenbutsu Zen*, which is the Ming-dynasty style Zen sect. *Nenbutsu Zen* seeks to incorporate the Pure Land practices. Its belief in Pure Land appealed to literati painters, who sought social harmony. See Baroni, *Ōbaku Zen*, 35.

³⁶ Nie Chongzheng, "The Qing Dynasty (1644-1911)," in *Three Thousand Years of Chinese Painting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 266.

³⁷ See Wai-kam Ho, et al., *Eight Dynasties of Chinese Painting: The Collections of the Nelson Gallery-Atkins Museum, Kansas City, and the Cleveland Museum of Art* (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1980), 287-290; see also Patricia J. Graham, *Tea of the Sages: The Art of Sencha* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1998), 48-52.

³⁸ Nishimura Nangaku 西村南岳, “Ōbaku kōsō no bokuseki wo tankyū shite 黄檗高僧の墨蹟を探求して,” in *Bokubi* 墨美 (Tokyo: Bokubisha 墨美社, 1961), 12.

³⁹ This scroll bears two seals by Tessai, as well as two seals by Fu Shen (20th C). Wai-kam Ho, et al., *Eight Dynasties of Chinese Painting*, 288.

⁴⁰ Shen Nanpin was relatively unknown in his native Zhejiang province 浙江省, but became extremely popular among Japanese art circles in the Tokugawa period. Having been invited to Japan by a high official, Shen arrived in Nagasaki with two disciples in 1731, and stayed there for approximately two years. He taught many pupils while in Japan, and continued to send paintings to Japanese friends and customers after his return to China in 1733. Because numerous paintings with Shen’s signature were also sent by his pupils in China, it is difficult to determine which works are actually by the master’s hand. Among his Japanese pupils, Kumashiro Yūhi 熊代熊斐 (1693 or 1713-1772) played an important role in spreading the Nanpin style throughout Japan. In any case, Shen’s style was based on Ming academic/professional paintings, and thus was remote from the literati mode.

⁴¹ Cahill, *Scholar Painters of Japan: The Nanga School* (New York: The Asia Society, Inc., 1972), 10.

⁴² Felice Fischer, “Ike Taiga, A Life in Art,” in *Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran: Japanese Masters of The Brush* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art; New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007), 16.

⁴³ Cahill, “Phases and Modes in the Transmission of Ming-Ch’ing Painting Styles to Edo Period Japan,” in *Papers of the International Symposium on Sino-Japanese Cultural*

Interchange (Hong Kong: Institution of Chinese Studies, Chinese University of HK, 1985): 71-72.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Marshall P.S. Wu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering: Chinese Painting from the University of Michigan Museum of Art, Volume II* (Michigan: The University of Michigan, 2000), 43.

⁴⁶ Yoshizawa, *Nihon Nanga Ronkō*, 51-70.

⁴⁷ Kobayashi Hiromitsu 小林宏光, “Gu Ping’s ‘Great Synthesis’ of Chinese Painting: A Study of Illustrations to the 1603 Gu shi huapu” 顧炳による中国絵画集大成の試み: 万暦 31 年 (1603) 刊 顧氏画譜の研究, in *Jissen Joshi Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyo* 実践女子大学文学部紀要 30 (1988): 143-173.

⁴⁸ Cahill, *Scholar Painters of Japan: The Nanga School*, 17; Yoshizawa, *Nihon Nanga Ronkō*, 15, 72-78.

⁴⁹ Gion Nankai, *Shōun Sango*, Sumimaruya Jinsuke 角丸屋甚助, Edo 江戸: 弘化三年 (1846), Dōshisha University Library.

⁵⁰ Ibid., my translation. The passage in *Shōun Sango* was reviewed by Satō Yasuhiro 佐藤康宏, “Edo chūki kaigaron danshō: Ogyū Sorai kara Ike Taiga made” 江戸中期絵画論断章—荻生徂徠から池大雅まで, in *Bijutsushi ronsō* 美術史論叢 15 (2003): 41-43; Omura Seigai, *Toyo Bijutsu Taikan* Vol.7, (Tokyo: Sinbi shoin, 1909); Tanaka Toyozō, *Taiga Kamon, Zōhō Nihon bijutsu no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Nigensha, 1981).

⁵¹ Satō, “Edo chūki kaigaron danshō,” 45.

⁵² Yoshizawa Chū, “Hōtō burai no kaiga” 放蕩無頼の絵画 in *Nihon Nanga Ronkō*, 72-76.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ He eventually took the position of head of his family in 1730 and died in Kōriyama in 1758. Ibid.

⁵⁵ Yanagisawa Kien 柳沢淇園: *Hitorine* ひとりね, 1725, Nakamura Yukihiro, ed., 中村幸彦編 *Kinsei Zuisōshū*, *Nihon Koten Daigaku Taikei* 中村幸彦編 近世随想集 日本古典大学大系 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店, 1965).

⁵⁶ Kanō Hiroyuki, “The Philosophical Underpinnings of Eighteenth-Century Kyoto Painting Circle,” in *Traditions Unbound: Groundbreaking Painters of Eighteenth Century Kyoto*, Matthew McKelway, ed. (San Francisco: Asian Art Museum, 2005), 37.

⁵⁷ Yoshizawa, *Nihon Nanga Ronkō*, 65-66; Yanagisawa, *Hitorine*, *Kinsei Zuisōshū*, 5-23.

⁵⁸ In the introductory remarks to a section in *Kaiseki Gawa* 介石画話 (*Kaiseki's Talk on Painting*), Noro Kaiseki 野呂介石 (1747-1828) refers to Ike Taiga as the first patriarch of the Japanese version of the southern school painting. See Wylie, *Nanga Painting Treatises of Nineteenth Century Japan*, 5.

⁵⁹ Intriguingly, Taiga's Orchid Pavilion in the handscroll format is not extant even though that is the most common format for this theme in China. There is a colophon, written by Shibano Ritsuzan, which was said to be attached to Taiga's Orchid Pavilion handscroll. The location of this scroll is unknown.

⁶⁰ “Although it is an important text, the information recorded is fragmentary and often controversial.” Paul Berry, “Ike no Taiga: A biographical study of a Japanese literati

artist of the Edo period” (MA thesis, University of Hawaii, 1977), 6; Sasaki Beigyō, *Ike no Taiga kafu* [Tomiokake-bon] (Kyoto: Ike no Taiga Museum, 1982). Mori Senzō, “Ike no Taiga kafu no kenkyū” in *Bijutsu kenkyū* 89 (May 1939): 178-180.

⁶¹ Little is known about Taiga’s parents and their background. Suganuma Teizō, *Ike no Taiga: hito to geijutsu* (Tokyo: Nigen sha, 1977), 4. Berry, *Ike no Taiga*, 4-5.

⁶² Issei was a disciple of Terauchi Yōsetsu 寺内養拙, who was famous for Ming-style *karayō* 唐様 calligraphy. Berry, *Ikeno Taiga*, 5.

⁶³ Taiga used his studio name Shisei 子,井 which took the character “sei” from his teacher. Ibid.

⁶⁴ The verse is as follows: 七歳神童書大張 筆長身短妙相当 “The seven-year-old divine child inscribed a large paper, his brush is long while his height is short; what an extraordinary balance!” See Matsushita, *Ike Taiga*.

⁶⁵ Suzuki Susumu and Sasaki Jōhei, *Ikeno Taiga (1723-1776)* (Tokyo: Zauhō Kankōkai, Shūei sha, 1980), 99.

⁶⁶ For information of the Taiga’s *bunjin* patrons and clients see Beeren, *Friends, Acquaintances, Pupils, Patrons* (2006).

⁶⁷ Melinda Takeuchi, *Taiga’s True Views: The Language of Landscape Painting in Eighteenth-Century Japan* (California: Stanford University Press, 1992), 1-3; Berry, *Ikeno no Taiga*, 8-9; Kōno Motoaki, “Taiga/Ōkyo hikakuron,” in *Taiga/Ōkyo Meihō Nihon no bijutsu* Vol. 26 (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1991), 114-120. The fan business was a common and popular industry of that time. Decorative and colorful Rinpa and Tosa as well as Kanō painting styles were the best selling on fans.

⁶⁸ Ban Kōkei, *Kinsei kijinden/Zoku Kinsei Kijinden* 近世畸人伝・続近世畸人伝 寛政 2 年刊 (1790) printed in *Nihon gadan taikan*, Kyoto, Munemasa Itsuo, ed. 宗政五十緒校注 Toyobunko 東洋文庫二〇二 (Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社, 1972), 1138-1163.

⁶⁹ Kōno, “Taiga/ Ōkyo hikakuron,” 119. Yoshizawa Chū and Miyagawa Torao, “Ike no Taiga,” in *Kinsei kijinden Nihonshi no jinbutsuzō* Vol. 8 (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1967), 51-69. Mori Senzō and Koide Masahiro, eds., *Shinbashi no Tanuki sensei: watashi no Kinsei kijinden* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1999), 263-341.

⁷⁰ Quoted by Kanō Hiroyuki, “The Philosophical Underpinnings of the Eighteenth-Century Kyoto Painting Circle,” 37.

⁷¹ Fischer, “Ike Taiga, A Life in Art,” 16.

⁷² At the upper left of the composition, the inscription reads:

宝曆四年甲戌夏日寫於

祇園新坊

Summer 1754, painted

at the district in Gion

A seal stamped beside the inscription reads:

茂林脩竹之家

House in the luxuriant woods and tall bamboo

On the lower left, Taiga’s signature reads:

平安池無名

Ike Mumei of Kyoto

Then, there are two seals followed by the signature:

池無名

Ike Mumei

貸成氏

Taiseishi

⁷³ Their names were inscribed on the back of the panel:

Misuya Kihee 三栖屋喜兵衛; Misuya Kichiemon 三栖屋吉右衛門; Ōkuroya Jinbee 大黒屋甚兵衛; Matsukawayaya Chūemon 末川屋忠右衛門; Matsubaya Tahee 松葉屋太兵衛; Kitagawara Kengi 北河原見儀; Many Shobee 万屋庄兵衛; Misuya Tobee 三栖屋藤兵衛; Yamamotoya Uhee 山本屋宇兵衛; and Nanbeya Hichihee 南部屋七兵衛 寄附金子百疋 Raku 羅く 宿坊新坊. Matsushita Hidemaro 松下英麿, *Ike no Taiga* 池大雅 (Shunshusha 春秋社, 1967), 96; Yabumoto, “Taigahitsu ‘Ranteizu’ hengaku to sono sōkō” 大雅筆 蘭亭図 扁額のその草稿 in *Kobijutsu* 古美術 4 (Tokyo: Sanseisha 三省社, April 1974): 52-55.

⁷⁴ Yabumoto, *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ Ban Kōkei, *Kinsei kijinden*, my translation.

⁷⁶ Fisher, “Ike Taiga, A Life in Art,” 25.

⁷⁷ Hoshino Suzu, “Ike Taiga hitsu Rantei zu hengaku sōkō” 池大雅筆蘭亭図扁額草稿, in *Kokka* 1354 (2009): 25.

⁷⁸ During this transition of the leadership from Shukuya to Geppō, Taiga’s paintings were compiled, edited and published in woodblock printed manuals, such as *Taigadō shohō* 大雅堂画法 (Taiga originally produced this manual for his wife Gyokuran); *Taigadō*

gafu 大雅堂画譜, *Taigadō Hōjō* 大雅堂法帖; *I Fukyū/ Ike Taiga Sansui gafu* 伊孚九・池大雅山水画譜; and *Senji monjō* 千字文帖. See Hoshino, “Ike Taiga hitsu Rantei zu hengaku sōkō,” 26.

⁷⁹ It is housed in protective storage at the Gion shrine today.

⁸⁰ The miniaturized models of the eight different votive panels dedicated to the Kiyomizu temple and fourteen panels to the Gion shrine are recorded in this book.

⁸¹ Tanaka Toyozō, “Taiga Sanmon,” in *Kokka* 384 (May 1922); Yabumoto, “Taiga hitsu ‘Ranteizu’ hengaku to sono sōkō,” 55.

⁸² Satō, “Edo chūki kaigaron danshō,” 25-65; “Ike Taiga hitsu Rantei kyokusuizu kaisetsu” 池大雅筆蘭亭曲水図解説 in *Genshoku Nihon no bijutsu*, Vol. 27, *Zaigai bijutsu kaiga* 原色日本の美術 27 在外美術 絵画 (Tokyo: Shōgakukan 小学館, 1980), 209.

⁸³ Nankai, *Shōun sango*, See Appendix E (*Bunjin* Texts).

⁸⁴ For a complete translation of the *Lantingxu* text, see Chapter One and the Appendix.

⁸⁵ This painting is housed in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. “The *Classic of Filial Piety* was requested of Li Gonglin by Mr. Yang in 1085. Three sections of the original eighteen are now lost, but their general character can be seen in early copies of entire composition.” Richard M. Barnhart, “The Classic of Filial Piety in Chinese Art History,” in *Li Kung-lin’s Classic of Filial Piety* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1993): 25.

⁸⁶ Barnhart, “The Classic of Filial Piety in Chinese Art History,” 105-108.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 118.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 119.

⁸⁹ *Kano Eitoku*, exhibition catalogue (Kyoto: Kyoto National Museum, 2007), 249-251, 274-275.

⁹⁰ Translation by Sydney L. Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk: The Creative Personality in Chinese Works of Art* (London: Sydney L. Moss, Ltd., 1984).

⁹¹ Miyajima Shin'ichi, "Fusuma Paintings Formerly in the Hôjô of Syôjyû-ji, and Rosetsu's Design for Them" 正宗寺元方丈襖絵と芦雪画の意想 in *Kokka* 1046, (1981): 35.

⁹² Yobumoto, "Taigahitsu 'Ranteizu' hengaku to sono sôkô," 53.

⁹³ This work was exported by General Munthe at the end of nineteenth century. *Chinese Sculpture and Painting: General Munthe's Collection* (Bergen: West Norway Museum of Applied Art, 1980), 28, 37.

⁹⁴ This work was recorded in the first edition of *Shiqu Baoji* 石渠寶笈 and is housed in the National Palace Museum.

⁹⁵ Taiga depicted forty-one scholars here. According to *Lantingxu*, Wang Xizhi invited forty-one scholars, so that there should be forty-two figures altogether.

⁹⁶ Sydney L. Moss, *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk*.

⁹⁷ Marshall P.S Wu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering: Chinese Painting from the University of Michigan Museum of Art* (Michigan: The University of Michigan, 2000), 44-45.

⁹⁸ Itakura Masa'aki "The Historical Position of Ma Yuan's Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden (The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art): Concerning the Pictorialization of this Theme as Fiction" 馬遠西園雅集図巻 (ネルソン・アトキンス美術館) の史的

位置 —虚構としての 西園雅集 とその絵画化をめぐって—, *Tokyo daigaku*

bungakubu, Bijutsushi ronsō 東京大学・文学部 美術史論叢 [University of Tokyo, Department of Literature, Art History Journal] vol. 16 (1999): 50.

⁹⁹ It is considered to have been painted towards the end of the 1760s. See Kobayashi, “Bunjinga ni okeru gadan no kenkyū,” 327-336.

¹⁰⁰ As the gathering was fictional, Mi Fu did not author this record. See Kohara Hironobu, 古原宏伸, *Chugoku gakan no kenkyū* 中国画卷の研究 (Tokyo: Chûôkôron bijutsu shuppan 中央 公論 美術 出版, 2005), 49. The modern discussion of the iconographical confusion between the *Orchid Pavilion Gathering* and the *Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden* was inaugurated by James Cahill in a study of Sakaki Hyakusen 彭城百川 (1697-1752). Cahill explains that the works of Yosa Buson are for the most part Sinophile during the 1760s, since that was the time when he was learning and absorbing the late Ming Suzhou models through Hyakusen. It also affected a pair of six-paneled *byōbu* (Tokyo National Museum) by Buson in 1766. While this work is entitled the *Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, Buson included the iconography of Mi Fu, Su Shi, and Chen Jingyuan of the *Western Garden* in the left screen. Cahill, “The Style of Sakaki Hyakusen: Their Chinese Sources and Their Effect on Nanga” 彭城百川の絵画様式—中国絵画との関連と日本南画への影響,” in *Bijutsushi* 美術史 93-96 (The Japan Art History Society, March 1976): 16. Kobayashi Yūko 小林優子 argues that Buson did not divide the work into two themes: he painted the Western Garden using both screens and added the floating cups in the composition. Kobayashi Yūko, “Bunjinga ni okeru gadan no kenkyū: Ikeno Taiga/Yosa Buson no *byōbu* wo chūshin ni” 文人画における画壇の

研究、池大雅・与謝蕪村の屏風を中心に, in *Kajima bijutsu zaidan kenkyû hōkoku sho*, Vol. 17 (1999): 327-336.

¹⁰¹ My summary and translation, based on Itakura, “The Historical Position of Ma Yuan’s Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden,” 49-50. For an English translation of the complete Western Garden text, see Paul Berry, “Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden,” in *Literati Modern: Bunjinga from Late Edo to Twentieth-Century Japan* (Honolulu: Honolulu Academy of Arts, 2008), 61. It is included in Appendix 4.

¹⁰² Debate on historicity of this episode has been thoroughly discussed by Ellen Johnston Laing in “Real or Ideal: The Problem of the ‘Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden’ in Chinese Historical and Art Historical Records,” in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88 (1968): 419-35. See also, Fukumoto Gaichi 福本雅一, “Seion gashūzu wo megutte” 西園雅集図をめぐって in *Gakusō* 学叢 Vol. 12 and 13 (Kyoto National Museum, 1990, 1991); and Itakura, “The Historical Position of Ma Yuan’s Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden,” 1999.

¹⁰³ Brown, *The Politics of Reclusion*, 22; see also Chapter One of this dissertation.

¹⁰⁴ Furuta Shinichi 古田真一, *Chūgoku kodai no fukushoku kenkyū* 中国古代の服飾研究 増補版 (Kyoto: Kenbunsha 見聞社, 1995), 166-169.

¹⁰⁵ Kinoshita Kyōko, “The Life and Art of Tokuyama Gyokuran” *Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran: Japanese Masters of The Brush* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007), 33-51.

¹⁰⁶ Yoshizawa, *Ikeno Taiga*, 143-147. Berry, *Ikeno no Taiga*, 14-15. Gyokuran’s grandmother, Kaji, and her foster-mother, Yuri, were both accomplished poets and

published collections of their *waka* (Japanese poems). Taiga was influenced by Gyokuran, who was also a poet, and they composed poems together. Suzuki Susumu, “Taiga to Gyokuran,” in *Kobijutsu* 44 (April 1974): 1-50.

¹⁰⁷ Fischer, “Ike Taiga, A Life in Art,” 25; Takeuchi, *Taiga’s True Views*, 75-76.

¹⁰⁸ In the Tessai’s version, Taiga plays his *shamisen* while Gyokuran paints on fans near her *koto* zither. Takeuchi, *Taiga’s True Views*, 77.

¹⁰⁹ 「跋南部源大夫所蔵池大雅修禊図」 *Ritsuzan bunshū*, Tōin Shoyarokuban 桐蔭書屋録版, Tenpō 天保 13 (1843), 139. For the entire passage, see appendix 6; Hoshino, “Ike Taiga hitsu Rantei zu hengaku sōkō,” 26.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Noguchi, *Ogyū Sorai*, 66.

¹¹² Matsushita, *Ikeno Taiga*, 41.

¹¹³ Matsushita, *Ikeno Taiga*, 102, 157.

¹¹⁴ Cited by Zheng Liyun 鄭麗芸, *Bunjin Ike Taiga kenkyū: Chugoku bunjin shishoga “sanzetsu” no Nihon juyo* 文人池大雅研究—中国文人詩書画「三絶」の日本受容— (Tokyo: Hakuteisha 白帝社, 1997), 314-315.

¹¹⁵ Translation by Jonathan Chaves, “Taiga’s Poems Written in Chinese (*Kanshi*),” in *Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran* (2007): 483.

¹¹⁶ Fischer, *Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran*, 446.

¹¹⁷ Tanaka Ichimatsu, “Ike Taiga hitsu Rantei kyokusui, Gako shabi-zu byōbu,” in *Kokka*, 780 (1957): 89-96; Sato, “Kaisetsu: 103 Rantei kyokusui,” 193-196. Because this work was housed in the Burke Collection for many years, it has been extensively studied

not only by the Japanese but also by scholars from all over the world. James Cahill, *Scholar Painters of Japan: The Nanga School* (New York: The Asia Society Inc., 1972); Melinda Takeuchi, *Taiga's True Views*, 68-74; Christine Guth, *Art of Edo Japan: the Artist and the City 1615 -1868* (New York: Harry N. Adams, Inc., 1996), 70.

¹¹⁸ This version is paired with a *byōbu* that represents the Preface to the Orchid Pavilion inscribed by Rai San'yō 頼山陽 (1780-1832), a *bunjin* painter, poet and calligrapher.

Yoshizawa Chū 吉沢忠, “Onaji zu no aru Ike Taiga hitsu Rantei Kyokusui zu byōbu ni tsuite” 同じ図のある池大雅筆蘭亭曲水図屏風について, in *Kokka* 1096 (September 1986): 29 - 35.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Cahill, *Lyric Journey*, 97.

¹²¹ Takeuchi, *Taiga's True Views*, 68-74; Fischer, *Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran*, 420-421.

¹²² “Ikeno Taiga hitsu Rantei kyokusui zu” 池大雅筆蘭亭曲水図 in *Kokka* 653 (1946).

¹²³ This work is executed in ink and pale color on paper on a six-panel *byōbu* screen. The screen is 158 cm high and 358 cm wide. *Shizuoka kenritsu bijutsukan collection 110 [Museum Selection]* (Shizuoka: Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art, 1991) pl. 35.

¹²⁴ Fischer, *Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran*, 445.

¹²⁵ Kobayashi, “Bunjinga ni okeru gadan no kenkyū” (1999): 327-336. A pair of six-paneled *byōbu* exhibiting the *Orchid Pavilion Gathering* on the right and the *Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden* on the left screen is housed in the Kosetsu Museum in Hyogo Prefecture. In this version, the *genkan* player and the figure writing on the rock

are depicted on either side of the screen. It is thought to have been painted towards the end of the 1760s. By repeatedly portraying himself with his entourage, Taiga was able to construct images of the *bunjin* community, which was, in turn, considered extremely desirable by clients from a wide range of social classes.

¹²⁶ This painting was originally located at the subtemple of Mi'idera (Onjōji 園城寺) Nikkōin Kyakuden 日光院客殿, but transferred to the residence of Hara Rokurō 原六郎 氏邸 in Kita Shinagawa Gotenyama 北品川御殿山 in 1892. The Hara family built the Keichōkan 慶長館, which is a gallery that was used to display the art to guests. It was relocated again to Gekkōin 月光院 in Gokokuji 護国寺 in Otoba, Tokyo in 1928. アルカ シェール美術財団所蔵保管.

¹²⁷ Yamashita Yoshiya, personal communication, June 5, 2010.

¹²⁸ A crane is depicted in another theme, the *Elegant Gathering at the Apricot Garden* 杏園雅集 attributed to Xie Huan (ca. 1370-1450), housed in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Pictorial program of such a work manifested in *funpon* or other formats might have been introduced in Japan at the time of Einō.

¹²⁹ Wen Zhengming, whose birth name was Bi (pseudonyms Zhengming, Zhengzhong, and style name Hao Hengshan Jushi), was a native of Changzhou (present-day Suzhou, Jiangsu province). He was a descendent of Wen Tianxiang, a Song-dynasty prime minister. In Beijing, he obtained the title of *daizhao* 待詔, which was the highest rank in the Hanlin Academy of painting. His Orchid Pavilion painting shows how much he excelled in landscape, having studied with Shen Zhou and having learned from the paintings of the Yuan masters. Also accomplished in poetry, prose and calligraphy, Wen

exerted tremendous influence on contemporary artists and was acclaimed as one of the “Four Masters of the Wu School in the Ming Dynasty”. See Anne de Coursey Clapp, “Wen Cheng-ming: The Artist and Antiquity,” in *Artibus Asiae Supplementum* 34 (1975); Clunas, *Elegant Debts*, 19.

¹³⁰ Based on this observation, it can be concluded that this painting was produced after the time of Wen Zhengming. Personal communication with Kohara Hironobu on July 12, 2008.

¹³¹ Clunas, *Elegant Debts*, 89.

¹³² A seal of the famous collector, Xiang Yuanbien 項元汴 (1525-1590), stamped under Li Zai’s signature, is also a later forgery. Li was a native of Fijian; his style name was Yizheng. He specialized in landscape and figure painting and his style was influenced by Dai Wenjing 戴文進, the founder of the Zhe school.

¹³³ Cahill, *The Painter’s Practice*, 103.

¹³⁴ Park, *Ensnaring the Public Eye*, 179-180.

¹³⁵ Cahill, *Scholar Painters of Japan: The Nanga School*, 15.

¹³⁶ Takeuchi, *Taiga’s True Views*, 25.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Takeda Kōichi thoroughly studied the specific Chinese materials used by Taiga other than *Hasshu gaf* and *Kaishien gaden*. These materials include: *Retsusen zenden* 列仙全伝, *Koshi gafu* 顧氏画譜, *Sansai zue* 三才図会, *Haibunsai kōshoku zu* 楓文斎耕織図, *Meisanshōki* 名山勝藥記, *Wachō meishō gazu* 和朝名勝画図, *Wakan meihitsu ehon tekagami* 和漢名筆画本手鑑, *Honchō gaen* 本朝画苑. However, none of these

represents the pictorial model for the Orchid Pavilion. Takeda Kōichi 武田光一, “Ike Taiga ni okeru gafu ni yoru seisaku” 池大雅における画譜による制作, in *Bijutsu kenkyū* 美術研究 348 (August 1990): 39-41.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 26.

¹⁴⁰ Christine Guth observes that “Taiga’s internalization and synthesis of these influences are evidenced in the spatial structure and richly coloristic patterns of dots and texture strokes characteristic of many of his paintings.” Guth, *Art of Edo Japan*, 70.

¹⁴¹ See Hosono Masanobu 細野正信, “Nakayama Kōyō ron” 中山高陽論, in *Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan Kiyō* 東京国立博物館紀要 no.5 (1969): 79-189.

¹⁴² Wakao Ransui, a local poet, painter and critic of Tosa province, suggests that the large number of paintings were copied by Kōyō’s pupils, but Hosono Masanobu asserts that they were mostly done by Kōyō. Wakao Ransui, “Nakayama Kōyō kō,” Kōchi Municipal Library, 19; Hosono, “Nakayama Kōyō ron,” 196.

¹⁴³ *A Dictionary of Japanese Art Terms: Bilingual Edition* (Tokyo: Tokyo Bijitsu, 1990), 596.

¹⁴⁴ The dictionary continues, “In China, literati paintings were esteemed higher than paintings of professional artists as a more elegant art form. During the Ming dynasty, Wen Zhengming and Dong Qichang advocated *nanshuga* or Southern School Painting together with a genealogical record of *bunjinga* and since then, *bunjinga* have become synonymous with *nanshuga*.” Ibid., 567-8.

¹⁴⁵ For an example of the socio-political considerations surrounding the literati construct, see, Beerens, *Friends, Acquaintances, Pupils, Patrons*, 23.

¹⁴⁶ Melanie Trede translates this title as *Gratuitous Chats on Painting* in “Terminology and Ideology.” According to Hosono Masanobu, *Gadan keiroku* was first published before 1769, and reprinted in 1775, and reproduced numerous times. See Hosono Masanobu, 147; Nakayama Kōyō 中山高陽, *Gatan keiroku* 画譚雞肋 (1775). Sakazaki Tan, ed., 坂崎坦編, *Nihon kaigaron taikai* 日本絵画論大成, Vol. 2 (Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai, 名著普及会, 1980).

¹⁴⁷ Second edition of *Gatan keiroku* (1797); *Kaigasōshi* (1888); *Hyakka setsurin* (1892); *Tōyōgaron shūsei* 東洋画論集成 (1916); *Nihon gadan taikan* (1917); *Nihon garon taikan* 日本絵画論大観 (1927); *Nihon kaiga no seishin* 日本絵画の精神 (1942); *Nihon zuihitsu taisei* 日本随筆大成 (1975); *Nihon kaigaron taisei* (1980); *Nihon kaigaron taisei* (2000).

¹⁴⁸ Nakayama Kōyō, *Gadan keiroku*, 9-10. We had to wait to see the discussion of the Japanese version of Southern/Northern theory until the appearance of Kuwayama Gyokushū 桑山玉洲, *Kaiji higen* 絵事鄙言, written in 1790 and published by Kimura Kenkadō 木村兼葭堂 in Osaka 大坂 1799, in Sakazaki Tan, ed., 坂崎坦編, *Nihon kaigaron taikai*, Vol. 1 (Tokyo: Meicho Fukyū kai, 1980); *Ronga yonshu* 論画四種 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店, 1932).

¹⁴⁹ Nakayama Kōyō, *Gadan keiroku*, 12-14.

¹⁵⁰ Kohara Hironobu 古原宏伸, *Bei Futsu “Gashi” chūkai* 米芾『画史』註解全二卷 (Tokyo: Chūōkōron bijutsu shuppan, Vol. 1 in 2009 and Vol. 2 in 2010).

¹⁵¹ Nakayama Kōyō, *Gatan keiroku*, 46.

¹⁵² See Chapter Two of this dissertation for a discussion of Kano pedagogy and practice.

¹⁵³ The inscription is as follows: 入交太藏氏藏、款「右応求併録旧作 高陽山人廷
沖」白文連印「廷沖」「子和」朱方長方印「松石」画賛「避世由来百醉郷八仙豪
気入詩長尋常為惜杯中物徒爾爛醺俗士腸」 These eight scholars eagerly sought
release from their official government duties, and then fled the capital for the countryside
where they engaged in wildly eccentric behavior and adventuresome creative work, all
fueled by copious amounts of wine.

¹⁵⁴ Hosono, “Nakayama Kōyō ron,” 147

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Kōyō’s Painting Price List

Because there is a heavy demand for my paintings, it costs me so much to buy the
pigments, ink cakes and brushes. I suffer with poverty, so I established the prices of my
paintings as below:

On paper, ink only, two hundred *kon* for a scroll

On paper, light colors, three hundred *kon* for a scroll

On silk, light colors, one *nanryō* or (two pieces of silver) for a scroll

On silk, detailed ink, one *hokin* gold for a scroll

Others, large composition, one *enkin* gold

Those who wish to be painted on paper and silk, please bring it to me,

Gensei Dōjin

高陽 潤筆料規定書

近時拙画御求夥しく絵具墨筆画損じの購求多く旅寓困窘因て画価相定め畢

毛紙 草々墨画 一幅 二百孔

同	浅絳着色	一幅	三百孔	
絹地	浅絳墨画	一幅	南鐐一片	(二朱銀)
同	細巧墨画	一幅	方金一片	
其余	大画		円金一片	
絹紙は御求の方御携へ			玩世道人	

Hosono, “Nakayama Kōyō ron.”

¹⁵⁷ The inscription and colophon read: 「蘭亭流觴図巻」款「安永己亥之春 高陽山人廷沖」朱文方印「仲廷沖印」白文方印「子和氏」朱文遊印「青松山石人家」同「松石」題書「折波浮醴 東江逸氏」跋文「女姪之子勝生来自本藩、頃将帰乞余画、写之贐与焉、因知還家聚觀、歡言叔父老翁仍且為斯塗抹、併識寄遠想云」

¹⁵⁸ The colophon records that this version was owned by Sawada Tōe and that the other one was collected by the Tanaka family.

¹⁵⁹ Trede, “Terminology and Ideology,” 27.

¹⁶⁰ There is a *funpon* depicting this theme in a hanging scroll format collected by the Kawashima family, which includes the dancer in the handscroll version of 1779. Hosono, “Nakayama Kōyō ron,” 147.

¹⁶¹ According to *Kōyō sanjinkō* 高陽山人考 by Wakao Ransui 若尾潤水, Kōyō used his *funpon* to pass down his style to his pupils, especially to his nephew Nakayama Hidetane. In the original Preface to *Gadan keiroku*, Inoue Kinga wrote that “boundless people requested Kōyō’s paintings, and Kōyō could not reject them, and thus, he occasionally employed other painters.” In the epilogue, Kōyō stated that he wrote numerous

commentaries on paintings for his nephew Hidetane, and one of his pupils, Iwakawa Seidai, edited and compiled them into this book.

¹⁶² Shimizu Takayuki 清水孝之, *Nakayama Kōyō* 中山高陽 (Kōchi: Kōchi Municipal Cultural Association 高知市文化振興事業団, 1987), 49-64.

¹⁶³ Yoshizawa Chū “Nakayama Kōyō hitsu Rantei kyokusui zukan” 中山高陽筆蘭亭曲水図巻, in *Kokka* 925 (1970): 20-28.

¹⁶⁴ Cahill, *Sakaki Hyakusen and early Nanga painting* (Berkeley, California: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1983); The Japan Art History Society (March 1976): 1-31; 105 (1978); 107 (1979), and see also “Phase and Modes in the Transmission of Ming-Ch’ing Painting Styles to Edo Period Japan,” in *the International symposium on Sino-Japanese Cultural Interchange* (Hong Kong: Institution of Chinese Studies, Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1985).

¹⁶⁵ Colophon of Kōyō’s Orchid Pavilion Gathering *funpon* reads:

微明 []

絵画之事從來尚美好事家寸紙片幅莫平

深藏秘笈使覽春等之景星慶雲叭得見寫

幸今就中 集累 二十幀使觀者如人座陰

道上應接平暇 寫珍重宜何如成

五湖居士陸師衛識

¹⁶⁶ This statement is taken from Zhao Mengfu’s theory of classicism, in which he states that “a sense of antiquity is essential in painting. If there is no sense of antiquity, then although a work is skillful, it is without value. (...) The fact is that if a sense of antiquity

is lacking, all types of faults appear throughout a work, and why should one look at it?

What I paint seems to be summery and rough, but connoisseurs realize that it is close to the ancients, and so consider it beautiful.” A partial translation from Melanie Trede’s “Terminology and Ideology,” 30.

¹⁶⁷ Besides the Orchid Pavilion, *Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove* 竹林七賢, *Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden* 西園雅集, and *Nine Elders of Mount Xiang* 香山九老, are other popular painting themes that belong to the scholarly gathering genre, which has been vaguely called *gakaimono* 雅会物, or *gashūmono* 雅集物.

¹⁶⁸ Nakatani Nobuo 中谷伸生, “Osaka gadan ha yomigaeruka: kireina mon kara omoroi mon made” 大坂画壇は甦るか—綺麗なもんからおもろいもんまで, in *Bijutsu Forum 21* 美術フォーラム Vol. 17 (2008): 32.

¹⁶⁹ Carol E. Mayer and Anthony Shelton, eds., *The Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2010).

¹⁷⁰ Authenticating its authorship, Gogaku’s signature appears in the left corner of the composition:

五岳福原元素寫

Painted by Gogaku Fukuhara Genso

Two seals, which are identical to those of other works by Gogaku held in private collections, follow the signature:

玉峰山人

Gyokuhō Sanjin (Daoist name for Gogaku)

福原素子絢印

Seal of Fukuhara Soshiken (another name for Gogaku)

Another seal, stamped at the upper right of the composition reads:

聴溪激湍

Chōkei gekitan (listening to the rapid torrent).

¹⁷¹ Gogaku moved to Osaka when he was in his late thirties. Kōyama Noboru 神山登, “Fukuhara Gogaku no hito to sakuhin 福原五岳の人と作品,” in *Nihon bijutsu kōgei* 日本美術工芸 (September 1980): 26.

¹⁷² Nakao Choken, *Kinsei itsujin gashi* (1824), Kimura Shigekazu 木村重圭, ed., *Nihon kaigaron taisei* 日本絵画論大成 (Tokyo: Perikansha, 1997), 281, 305.

¹⁷³ Shirai Kayō, *Gajō Yōryaku* (1832), Kimura Shigekazu, ed., *Nihon kaigaron taisei* (Perikansha, 1997), 56 and 204; “Sakaki Hyakusen was born in Nagoya 名古屋, the son of a druggist, possibly of Chinese ancestry.” He took advantage of his ambivalent background. He was educated in Japan, but had access to many paintings imported from China through Nagasaki. Cahill, “Sakaki Hyakusen no kaiga yōshiki: Chūgoku kaiga tono kanren to Nihon Nanga eno eikyō (The Style of Sakaki Hyakusen: Their Chinese Sources and Their Effect on Nanga),” in *Bijutsushi* 24, nos. 1-4 (Kyoto: The Japan Art History Society, March 1976): 3.

¹⁷⁴ “Gogaku raised accomplished artists, such as Hamada Kyōdō 浜田杏堂, Kanae Shungaku 鼎春岳, and many more.” Tanomura Chikuden 田能村竹田 *Sanchujin jōzetsu* 山中人饒舌. 天保六年 (1835), Takahashi Hiromi ed., *Nihon kaigaron taisei* (Tokyo: Perikansha, 1996), 20, 85.

¹⁷⁵ “In dedication to Master Taiga, I followed you and studied for ten years.” 奇懷大雅先生, 我随君学画十年, Matsushita Hidemaro 松下英麿, *Ike no Taiga* 池大雅 (Tokyo: Shunshūsha 春秋社, 1967), 300-303.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 301.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 300.

¹⁷⁸ Fujioka Sakutarō, *Kinsei kaigashi* (Tokyo: Perikansha, first published in 1903, reprinted in 1983).

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 175.

¹⁸⁰ 五岳人となり、風流瀟洒。磊磊落落、直に神仙中の人也。詩を善くし、書之に次ぐ。画は即ち其の傍伎也。然れども門人閨苑、春嶽、杏堂の若き、皆出藍の称あり。能く数ふる者と謂ふべき也。兼康愷著 浪華詩話 天保6年刊行。

¹⁸¹ Another name for Osaka is Naniwa 浪花. “*Lake Dongting* Screen by Fukuhara Gogaku” 福原五岳筆洞庭湖, *Ikeda bunka to Osaka* 池田文化と大坂, exhibition catalogue (Osaka: Ikeda Municipal Museum of History 池田市立歴史民俗資料館, 1992), 21-25.

¹⁸² Kōyama, “Fukuhara Gogaku no hito to sakuhin,” 24-33; Kurokawa Shūichi, “Osaka no bunjingaka Fukuhara Gogaku 大坂の文人画家福原五岳.” Lecture given at the Osaka Prefectural Library in Nakanoshima 大坂中之島図書館 on October 20, 2001. *Kinsei Osaka gadan* 近世大坂画壇; Osaka Municipal Museum of Art 大阪市立美術館, ed. (Kyoto: Dōhōsha shuppan 同朋舎出版, 1983).

¹⁸³ This work was painted in 1621. See, Wu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, vol. I, 102-109; for information regarding the impact of Sheng’s Orchid Pavilion on Japanese *bunjin* painters, see Cahill, “Sakaki Hyakusen and Early Nanga Painting,” 16.

¹⁸⁴ Wu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, vol. I, 107.

¹⁸⁵ Wu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, vol. II, 45

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 46

¹⁸⁷ A descendant of the original Japanese collector sold it to an American dealer, James Freeman, who then sold it to Professor Richard Edwards of the University of Michigan. Ibid., 109.

¹⁸⁸ Wu, *Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, vol. I, 109.

¹⁸⁹ Cahill, *Scholar Painters of Japan*, 24.

¹⁹⁰ Matsushita, *Ike Taiga*, 300. Rai Shunsui was born in Aki domain 安芸 (present-day Hiroshima prefecture). In 1764, at age nineteen, he visited Osaka for the first time to study for a short term, and three years later returned there permanently to continue his education under Katayama Hokkai 片山北海 (Confucianism and poetry) and Zhao Taoji 趙陶齋 (calligraphy). In 1773, Shunsui opened his own Confucian school, Seizansha 青山社, which attracted many students in Osaka Edobori 大坂江戸堀. In 1781, the feudal lord of Aki domain appointed Shunsui, who was already famous in Osaka, as Head scholar at the Aki Confucian School.

¹⁹¹ Kōyama, “Fukuhara Gogaku no hito to sakuhin,” 24-33.

¹⁹² 樂聖福先生、倒樽日為度、倒樽又倒樽、倒樽終無度. This poem was improvised by Taiga. Quoted by Kamiyama in “Fukuhara Gogaku no hito to sakuhin,” 26-7.

¹⁹³ Yukawa Gen'yō 湯川玄洋 and Yukawa Sumi 湯川スミ, *Kinsei Gajinden* 近世雅人傳 (Kyoto: Geiundō 芸艸堂, first published in 1930 and reprinted in 1977), 95.

¹⁹⁴ Besides a love for *sake* parties among Japanese *bunjin* artists, theorists and connoisseurs, many of them practiced the *sencha* tea ceremony. Tsuga Teishō 都賀庭鐘 (1718-1794), who was an Osaka physician, Confucian scholar, and writer of popular fiction based on Chinese historical events (*yomihon* 読み本), explains the rapid growth in

the popularity of *sencha* among ordinary people, who needed assistance understanding its spiritual associations: “To define the atmosphere for *sencha* appreciation, Tenshō described the Chinese custom of intermittently drinking fragrant tea and wine, although he erroneously connected it with the celebrated the Orchid Pavilion Gathering. Teishō described the otherworldly feelings (*seifū* 清風) of the participants at the Orchid Pavilion by stating that they must have felt as if they had arrived at the Daoist isle of Mt. Hōrai. With this pronouncement, he neatly connected the Orchid Pavilion with the famous poem about drinking seven bowls of tea by Lu Tong.” Graham, *The Art of Sencha*, 85.

¹⁹⁵ Fujioka, *Kinsei kaigashi*, 176.

¹⁹⁶ Hashidzume Setsuya 橋爪節也, “Kinsei Osaka bunjinga no tenkai to mondai: Kimura Kenkadō to sono shūhen wo chushin ni” 近世大坂文人画の展開と問題—木村兼葭堂とその周辺を中心に *Kinsei Osaka gadan no chōsa kenkyū* 近世大坂画壇の調査研究, (Osaka: Osaka Municipal Museum of Art, 1998), 3-10.

¹⁹⁷ His salon was said to be visited by more than ninety thousand people. Wakita Osamu 脇田修, “Kimura Kenkadō” Osaka Museum of History 大阪歴史博物館, ed., *Kimura Kenkadō: Naniwa chi no kyojin* なにわ知の巨人 (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 2003), 5-8.

¹⁹⁸ Andrew Markus, “*Shogakai*: Celebrity Banquets of the Late Edo Period” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 53, no.1 (June 1993): 135-167; Graham, *Tea of the Sages*; see also Graham, “Lifestyles of Scholar-Painters in Edo Japan,” 263.

¹⁹⁹ The Kaitokudō was sponsored mainly by five merchants active in Osaka: Kōnoikeya 鴻池屋; Bizenya 備前屋; Dōmyōjiya 道明寺屋; Funahashiya 舟橋屋; and Sanseiya 三

星屋. See Kamata Kei'ichi, "Chōken Kaitokudō no seiritsu," in *Seishin gakuen kiyō* 19 (March 2005): 1-13.

²⁰⁰ The Kaitokudō was closed in 1869, but restored in 1916 by Nishimura Tenshū 西村天囚 (1865-1924) and Nakai Tsugumaro 中井 木菟麻呂 (1855-1943). The new version is called Chōken Kaitokudō. Its building was burned during WWII, but the organization continues to be active today supported by the Osaka University. Ibid.

²⁰¹ Ibid.

²⁰² Najita Tetsuo, *Visions of Virtue in Tokugawa Japan: the Kaitokudō Merchant Academy of Osaka* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

²⁰³ Idemitsu Sachiko, "Ike Taiga hitsu 'Seiko shunkei/Sento kankō zu byobu' no shudai kōsatsu: Zuyō to bungaku tenkyō wo saguru" 池大雅筆「西湖春景・錢塘觀湖図屏風」の主題考察 ―図様と文学的典拠を探る―, in *Museum* 599 (Tokyo National Museum, December 2005): 49.

²⁰⁴ Kōyama, "Fukuhara Gogaku no hito to sakuhin," 27.

²⁰⁵ "Fukuhara Gogaku hitsu Dōteiko" 福原五岳筆洞庭湖 (*Lake Dongting* Screen by Fukuhara Gogaku), *Ikeda bunka to Osaka* 池田文化と大坂, (exhibition catalogue) (Ikeda Municipal Museum of History 池田市立歴史民俗資料館, 1992), 21-25.

²⁰⁶ Gogaku produced this work as a farewell gift for Kōken. He composed *kanshi* poetry and inscribed it on the top of his painting: 一酌新知亦旧知、即今相別耐相思。明年江上梅開日。再問草堂濁酒卮。送別曾魯卿賢兄五岳元素拜。 See Matsushita, *Ike Taiga*, 302.

²⁰⁷ Some say that Kōken was related to Taiga. Matsushita, *Ike Taiga*, 132.

²⁰⁸ Shōwa kichū (the year of water/oxen sign in the Showa era) that fell in 1973 was celebrated by a large exhibition held at the Matsuzakaya Department Store's museum in Ten'ma-bashi Osaka. See *Shōwa kichū Rantei ten zuroku* 昭和癸丑蘭亭展図録 exhibition catalogue, Nihon shogei-in 日本書芸院 (Osaka: Nigensha 二玄社, 1973). Another exhibition was held at the Gotō Museum of Art. See *Shōwa Rantei ten kinen ten* 昭和蘭亭記念展 (exhibition catalogue), Gotō Museum 五島美術館 (Tokyo: Nigensha, 1973).

²⁰⁹ Minagawa Kien learned Confucianism from his father Seikei. He began the study of painting under Maruyama Ōkyo but later turned to Nanga painting. Tani Shinichi 谷信一 and Noma Seiroku 野間清六, *Nihon bijutsu jiten* 日本美術辞典 (Tokyo: Tokyodō shuppan 東京堂出版, 1952), 583. From the end of the eighteenth century through the first half of the nineteenth century, information regarding imported Chinese paintings became more ample since the works were recorded in the catalogues of *shogakai* organized by *bunjin* circles.

²¹⁰ Iwasa Shin'ichi 岩佐伸一, "Kara-eshi/ Rin Rōen no sakuhin yori" 唐絵師・林閨苑の作品より in *Bijutsu Forum* 21 vol. 17 (2008): 4-9.

²¹¹ This poster was once owned by Edo Yotsuya Genshodō 四谷玄書堂. Kudō Yoroshi 工藤宜, *Edo bunjin no sukurappu bukku* 江戸文人のスクラップ・ブック (Tokyo: Shinchosha 新潮社, 1989), 69-70.

²¹² In many instances this type of poster was produced to introduce imaginary poetic and artistic gatherings. Kudō, *Edo bunjin no sukurappu bukku*, 69.

²¹³ Clunas, *Superfluous Things: Material Culture and Social Status in Early Modern China* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2004).

²¹⁴ Philip K. Hu, “Sail Returning from Distant Shore: Chinese Themes and Styles on Japanese Folding Screens” Janice Katz, ed., *Beyond Golden Clouds: Japanese Screens from The Art Institute of Chicago and the Saint Louis Art Museum* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press), 69.

²¹⁵ The Sheng’s work was painted in 1621. Wu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*; Cahill, *Sakaki Hyakusen and Early Nanga Painting*.

²¹⁶ Fujikake Shizuya, “Nakabayashi Chikuto hitsu Rantei kyokusui zu kai,” in *Kokka* 552 (1936): 3-6.

²¹⁷ At the time of its rediscovery, this work had been restored to the handscroll format. Upon close examination, Berry found a few scattered fly spots on the work, which could have only been acquired if it was mounted in a frame and flies were allowed to walk on it. Fly specks are a very common feature of hanging scrolls but are almost never found on handscrolls. Thus these spots are evidence that the rediscovered work is the same work that was first introduced in 1936. Personal communication with Paul Berry on August 28, 2010.

²¹⁸ Inagaki Tomoko, “Nakabayashi Chikutō no gakyō: Saiban’nen no sansui ga ni miru gafu no henka wo megutte” 中林竹洞の画境—最晩年の山水画にみる変化をめぐって, in *Bijutsushi* 美術史 (July 2009): 35-51.

²¹⁹ Nakabayashi Chikutō 中林竹洞, *Chikutō garon* 竹洞画論 (1802). *Nihon kaigaron taisei* 日本絵画論大成 (Perikansha ペリカン社, 1997), 217-290.

²²⁰ *Teikyō gaka kyuginshi sadame* 帝京画家給銀仕定 also evaluated Chikutō as the best of the best (大極上上吉); see Matsumoto Naoko, “Kano Eigaku no kenkyū: Yōshiki sentaku no ronri” 狩野永岳の研究—様式選択の論理 (PhD Diss., Dōshisha University, 2007).

²²¹ Chikutō used other names, including: Shigemasa 成昌, Hakumei 伯明, Chōtan Chiō 沖澹痴翁, and Tōzan Inshi 東山隱士. Romon interviewed Chikutō’s daughter Seishuku, who was also known as an accomplished literati artist. Kanematsu Romon, *Chikutō to Bai’itsu* (Tokyo: Gahōsha 画報社, 1910); Paul Berry, “Biography of the Artists,” in *Literati Modern: Bunjinga from Late Edo to Twentieth-Century Japan* (Honolulu: Honolulu Academy of Arts, 2008), 284.

²²² Chikutō studied together with Yamamoto Bai’itsu 山本梅逸 (1783-1856), his close friend and another literati painter. See Kanematsu, *Chikutō to Bai’itsu*; see also Patricia J. Graham, “Yamamoto Bai’itsu: His Life, Literati Pursuits, and Related Paintings” (PhD diss., University of Kansas, 1983).

²²³ *Gadō kongō sho* and *Chikutō garon* are reproduced in *Nihon kaigaron taisei* 日本絵画論大成 (Perikansha ペリカン社, 1997); other painting manuals and theory produced by Chikutō are: a copy of *Kaishien gaden* 芥子園画伝 (1797); *Chikuto gako* 竹洞画稿 (1801); *Yūsai reimōfu* 融斎翎毛譜 (1812, 1830); *Yūsai gafu Bird-and-Flower* 融斎画譜 (1804-1818); *Yūsai gafu Landscape* (1818-1830); *Nanga myōketsu* 南画妙訣 (1818); *Bunga yūyaku* 文画誘掖 (1808, 1845); *Kanga shōkyō* 漢画捷経 (1808); *Gadō*

tebikigusa 画道手引草 (1845); *Jinbutsu jūhachi byōshiki* 人物十八描式 (1845);

Kanchū gadai 閑中画題 (1850); *Chikutō shikunshi gafu* 竹洞四君子画譜 (1854).

²²⁴ Nakabayashi Chikutō, *Chikutō garon*.

²²⁵ Anzai Unen 安西雲煙・於菟 *Kinsei meiga shaga dan* 近世名画書画談 (Edo:

Izumiya Kin'ueemon, et.al. 和泉屋金右衛門等, 1844).

²²⁶ Yoshida Kokin studied with Nukina Kaioku 貫名海屋 and Matsumura Keibun 松村景文. He received a commission to paint flower chariots on the cedar doors of the imperial palace. See *Miyako no eshi ha hyakka ryoran* 京の絵師は百花繚乱— 平安人物志 にみる江戸時代の京都画壇 [The Blooming of Hundreds of Flowers: Painters of Edo Period Kyoto in the *Heian-jimbutsu-shi*] exhibition catalogue (Kyoto: The Museum of Kyoto, 1998).

²²⁷ Asahi, *Nakabayashi Chikutō*, 106.

²²⁸ Nakabayashi Chikkei studied painting with his father's best friend, Yamamoto Bai'itsu.

²²⁹ Kamiya Hiroshi 神谷浩 “Nakabayashi Chikutō” 中林竹洞, in *Nagoya shi hakubutsukan kenkyū kiyō* 名古屋市博物館研究紀要 9 (1986): 12-13; Kamiya, “Chikuto shiryō shōkai: “Shukuzu” to Chimeiki, 竹洞資料紹介-縮図と知名記, in *Bigaku bijutsushi kenkyū ronshū* 美学美術史研究論集 5 (1987): 95-97.

²³⁰ Gotō Tanji 後藤丹治, Kamata Kizaburō 釜田喜三郎 and Okami Masao 岡見正雄, eds., *Taiheiki* 太平記 vol. 3, *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 日本古典文学大系 36 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1962).

²³¹ Ōdachi Takakado was the second son of the Kida Family 庄屋木田家, prominent farmers and landowners in Owari 尾張 (Aichi Prefecture). At first, he studied *kokugaku* from Tanaka Michimaro 田中道麿, but later became a disciple of Moto'ori Norinaga and hosted a party to celebrate Norinaga's sixtieth birthday. See *Nagoya-shi shi*, 名古屋市史, Nagoya Municipal Tsurumai Main Library.

²³² Suzuki Akira was a son of Suzuki Juzō 鈴木重蔵, whose family produced many generations of medical doctors in Mikawa 三河 (Aichi prefecture). Akira left medicine to study Confucianism. When Hosoi Heishū 細井平洲 (1728-1801) invited him to study at his school, however, Akira turned down the offer. Akira was deeply moved when he read the texts by Norinaga, and became his disciple in 1792. See *Nagoya-shi shi*, 名古屋市史.

²³³ Asahi Minako, *Nakabayashi Chikutō*, 120.

²³⁴ Examples include: *Tenchūdō* 天中道 (1828); *Chimeiki* 知命記 (1829); *Ugetsuki* 卯月記 (1830); *Jihei kokagami* 治平小鑑 (1832); *Dokushikagami* 読史鑑 (1832); *Shindai keizu* 神代系図 (1832); *Gakuhan* 学範 (1835); *Manzando hikki* 萬山堂筆記 (1840); *Hongenron* 本源論 (1843); *Kokoro no shigarami* 心のしがらみ (1845); *Shinko ichi zushiki* 坤輿位置図式 (1849); *Sansai zusetsu* 三才図説 (1849); *Tenchi sansai yakuchu* 天地三才訳注 (date unknown); *Shimin kokoroegusa* 四民心得草; *Gojo garin chukai* 五常五倫註解; *Sangoku hongenron* 三国本源論. Based on lists compiled by Asahi, *Nakabayashi Chikutō*, 123; and Inagaki, "Nakabayashi Chikutō no gakyō," 51.

²³⁵ Shirai Kayō, *Gajō yōryaku*.

²³⁶ Inagaki, “Nakabayashi Chikutō no gakyō,” 48.

²³⁷ The woodblock printed books regarding the Opium War published during Chikutō’s time were: *Afuyō ibun* 阿芙蓉彙聞 by Shio no ya Tōin 塩谷 宕陰 in 1847; *Kaigai shinwa* 海外神話 by Mineta Fūkō 嶺田楓江 in 1849; and *Shanghai zakki* 上海雜記 by Nōtomi Kaijirō 納富介次郎 in 1846.

Chapter Four: The Nativization of Orchid Pavilion Imagery: Genre Painting Adaptation and the *Kokugaku* Movement

In previous chapters, I described how the *Ranteizu* 蘭亭図 or Orchid Pavilion imagery, from its arrival in Japan, was transformed into different visual representations while going through various nativization processes. In Chapter Four, I explore the impact that this imagery had on an early modern visual “tradition” – the imagery of *kyokusuien* 曲水宴, depicting a Japanese courtiers’ party at a meandering stream, which seems to derive from a classical past. However, this “tradition” was in fact newly invented in the Tokugawa period to satisfy the sociopolitical and ideological agendas of its producers and consumers. In order to explain the circumstances surrounding the birth of the visual tradition inspired by the Orchid Pavilion imagery, I apply the insights of *The Invention of Tradition*, in which Eric Hobsbawm notes that “‘traditions’ which appear or claim to be old are often quite recent in origin and sometimes invented.”¹

The cultural power of the “sinophile” Orchid Pavilion imagery and the “nativized” visual tradition that stemmed from it was not only appreciated among elite circles who aimed to maintain their authoritative positions, but also emerged alongside the development of a market economy in the eighteenth century as the Orchid Pavilion theme was popularized among ordinary townspeople who sought to elevate their social status through cultural capital. This type of cultural power was, in turn, used for proto-nationalist identity construction in the following century when the military-based Tokugawa regime began to lose its authority and, especially, when Japan was finally forced to open in 1854 to the outside world. In this context, I investigate the relationship between the early modern visual tradition and *kokugaku* 国学 (National Learning), a

significant ideological movement in Tokugawa society, which was the driving force behind the production and consumption of nativized *kyokusuien* imagery.² Ralph Linton has defined “nativism” as “any conscious organized attempt on the part of a society’s members to revive or perpetuate selected aspects of its culture.”³ Such a “conscious attempt” in this case was in the imagining of a shared past and common culture, which was useful for the creation of a sense of nationhood.⁴

Kokugaku was a prominent intellectual movement involving people of various backgrounds in the late Edo period. According to Maruyama Masao 丸山真男 (1914-1996), Japanese nativism emerged from Kogaku 古学 (Ancient Study), the Confucian-based private academy of Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠 (1666-1728) discussed in Chapter Three.⁵ Moto’ori Norinaga 本居宣長 also called his scholarship “Kogaku or *inishie manabi* 古学 (Ancient Learning),” and his passion for nativism stemmed from a religious faith in Shintō 神道.⁶ Thus, Norinaga and his followers studied ancient Japanese texts, starting with *Kojiki* 古事記 (*Record of Ancient Matters*).⁷ However, the idea that nativists had to resurrect Shintō against the influence of foreign teachings, especially Confucianism and Buddhism, was transmitted from earlier scholarship, from Kada Azumamaro 荷田春満 (1669-1739) to Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵 (1698-1769), and to Norinaga.⁸

Hence, *kokugaku* ideology was tremendously influential in the development of new approaches to the nativization of artistic activities. Through the study of nativized imagery related to the Orchid Pavilion, I reconsider some of the problems raised by the

term “nativism” and the issues that Mark Teeuwen has shown to arise when *kokugaku* is understood as “nativism.”⁹

Genre Painting Adaptations of *Kyokusuien* Imagery

One of the most significant characteristics of the early modern visual tradition is the allusion to *koten bunka* 古典文化 (classical culture) and *koten shugi* 古典主義 (classicism).¹⁰ In the service of sociopolitical aims, Tokugawa-era artists often sought inspiration from classical painting or literary themes in an effort to invent a new visual tradition. The objective of this chapter is to reconsider Orchid Pavilion imagery as a case of a classical theme that came to be adapted to *fūzokuga* 風俗画 (pictures of customs and manners), which was an emerging early modern genre, and to explore the ideological motivations behind such adaptation.¹¹

In this adaptation process, artists interlaced visual elements – that were often reduced and dissected from a variety of preexisting painting compositions – to construct a nativized pictorial program for the Orchid Pavilion, the so-called *kyokusuien* or “party at a meandering stream.” I attempt to demonstrate the flexibility and multiplicity of painting themes, exemplified by *kyokusuien*, which were unfixed but invited many different interpretations. In so doing, I will investigate the works of Tsukioka Settei 月岡雪鼎 (1726-86) and Kubo Shunman 窪俊満 (1757-1820) as examples of the genre-painting adaptation of the *kyokusuien* theme and will compare them with various other works of Tokugawa-era visual culture.

Fūzokuga is a loosely defined term that has developed various usages. Although the works of Tsukioka Settei and Kubo Shunman illustrate the same subject matter, their

approaches differ. Mounted as one of six-panels in a pair of *byōbu*, Settei's *kyokusuien* image (figure 4. 1) represents a courtly event that directly alludes to classical culture; while Shunman's ukiyo-e woodblock-print triptych (figure 4. 2) represents a pleasure district scene in a contemporary Edo setting. Both Settei and Shunman were commercial town painters who made their livings from client commissions. In order to understand their choice of *kyokusuien* imagery, I will examine their social environment, especially their involvement with the *kokugaku* movement.

***Kyokusuien* as a Painting Theme**

According to the standard reference-work *Kōjien* 広辞苑, *kyokusuien* is described as:

One of the annual events that were performed at the imperial court during the ancient period. Earlier, it was practiced on *jōshi* 上巳 (the first Serpent day of the third month) in the Chinese lunar calendar, but later it was established on the third day of the third month (also the day to celebrate *momo no sekku* 桃の節句, or the Peach Festival). Courtiers sat by a meandering stream and competed with one another by trying to compose poems before a wine cup floated downstream to them. Then they picked up the wine cup, sipped some wine, and set the cup afloat on the water again for the next person. A party at a pavilion followed the poetry competition. This custom originated in China.¹²

Prior to the “original” Orchid Pavilion gathering of 353 CE, an annual custom in China took place on the third day of the third month, in which scholars gathered at a meandering stream and competed in composing poetry. This custom, known as the

“party at the meandering stream,” was called *qushuiyan* 曲水宴 in Chinese and *kyokusuien* in Japanese, and numerous *qushuiyan* episodes have been recorded in various Chinese texts.¹³ Characterized as a type of purification ritual, it was also recorded as *xiuxi* 修禊 (Jp. *shūkei*: practicing the ceremony of purification), or *xiyin* 禊飲 (Jp. *kei'in*: the drinking party of the purification ceremony).¹⁴ None of these episodes of *kyokusuien*, however, was illustrated or developed into a painting theme. The Orchid Pavilion of Wang Xizhi, by contrast, is obviously the most memorable of all *kyokusuien* in history or legend. The tradition of illustrating the Orchid Pavilion theme became extremely popular in East Asia. Upon its arrival in Japan, the visual traditions of the Orchid Pavilion began to be “nativized” by various artists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as discussed in Chapters Two and Three of this thesis.

There were mainly two courses of nativization: one kept the Chinese narrative of the text but Japanized the image by using a “native” visual language; and the other changed the narrative of the gathering from a Chinese to a Japanese setting through *waka* 和歌 (31-syllable verse) poetry. There are also two different types of genre painting representing the *kyokusuien* scene of Japanese context. One depicts *kyokusuien* in the Heian courtly fashion; the other illustrates it in contemporary Edo settings. I will explain how the Orchid Pavilion imagery was first popularized in eighteenth-century Japan, and then describe how it was “nativized.”

Popularization of the Orchid Pavilion Images

In the eighteenth century, the Orchid Pavilion theme kept its Chinese context and was appreciated not only by the elite nobility but was also popular among lower class

commoners. Earlier studies of the Orchid Pavilion theme mainly discuss it as a calligraphy model and closely associate it with the ruling classes. However, it was in the middle of the eighteenth century that this painting theme became no longer exclusive to the elite classes. It was painted by town-painters and was displayed in public spaces that ordinary people had access to. Along with the commercial development of towns, ordinary people sought new forms of cultural expression that would demonstrate their social elevation.

At the same time, the printing industry developed, and Orchid Pavilion compositions were printed in woodblock and published in painting manuals. As these books were affordable they were distributed among an “imagined community” of readers formed out of the sharing of knowledge.¹⁵ In this way, artists and their patrons used the classical Orchid Pavilion painting theme to represent their unique cultural identity in Tokugawa society. At this stage, the stiffness of the stone engraving fades away, and the calligraphy model of the *Preface of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, usually located at the beginning of scroll, disappears. Moreover, the labels indicating the names of the guest-scholars and their poems vanish. However due to the pictorial composition and basic visual elements, viewers could easily recognize that the image referred to the Orchid Pavilion.

As we saw, the literati master, Ike Taiga (1723-1776), popularized the Orchid Pavilion theme by painting it on an *ema* 絵馬 (figure 3. 4), and dedicated it to the Gion Shrine 祇園社 in 1754. That the Gion Shrine was a place where ordinary townspeople gathered indicates how far this theme penetrated popular culture in eighteenth-century Kyoto. About a half century later, a boom of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering escalated,

when newer, more viewer-friendly and easier-to-understand compositions were developed by the Maruyama School 円山派 painters, who had absorbed influences from Western painting.¹⁶ In 1816, Nishimura Nantei 西村楠亭 (1775-1834) was requested to design his version for the woven silk tapestry (figure 4. 3) that was used to decorate the Tsuki-hoko 月鉾, one of the portable shrines of the Gion Festival 祇園祭.¹⁷ When the portable shrine was marched through the major avenues of Kyoto, people understood and enjoyed the theme that was represented on it. In this way, the Orchid Pavilion image was physically carried around everywhere in the city and exposed to townspeople.

Reinventing A New *Yamato-e* Tradition

With knowledge of the Chinese Orchid Pavilion penetrating every corner of Kyoto, a new type of visual expression, the so-called *fūzokuga*, or genre painting depicting the lives and customs of people, emerged in the early Tokugawa period and reimagined the motif of the party at a meandering stream. The visualization of nativized *kyokusuien* was achieved by *machi-eshi* 町絵師 (town painters) at first, instead of by the courtly painters. When artists sought their own expressive means to depict the Orchid Pavilion, they also re-formulated nativized versions of the image. Townspeople sought a way to elevate their social status using the classical painting theme. There thus must have been strong demand for painters to depict the classical events that were performed at the imperial court in the past.

One of the earliest nativized images of *kyokusuien* (figure 4. 4) was painted by, once again, Ike Taiga, who is normally categorized as a “sinophilic” literati painter. The image of *kyokusuien* is situated as an event to represent the third month of the *Annual*

Events of the Twelve Months (*Nenjū gyōjizu byōbu* 年中行事図屏風), a typical *yamato-e* theme. Taiga combines various schools' painting styles and approaches. *Kinsei sōgo* 近世叢語 (*Stories of the Recent Past*) by Tsunoda Kyūka 角田九華, records that Taiga learned the *yamato-e* tradition of the Tosa School from Tosa Mitsuyoshi 土佐光吉 (1609-1772).¹⁸ In this painting, it is remarkable that Taiga also uses *tarashikomi*, a painting technique in which saturated ink is brushed onto a wet area of painting to create an affect of pooled ink with softly blurred edges.¹⁹ Although this technique originated in Chinese ink painting in the eighth century, Tawaraya Sōtatsu 俵屋宗達 (early 17th century) is credited as the first painter in Japan to consistently use this technique, and thus it has been considered as an expression typical of the Rinpa School 琳派, which is often thought to have produced a renaissance in the *yamato-e* classical style.

In his *kyokusuien* imagery, Taiga painted wisteria flowers hanging over the scene of the purification ritual, which is conducted by a man clad in a Heian courtier costume. Along with cherry, peach and willow, wisteria is one of the flowers associated with the third month. Kano Tan'yū 狩野探幽 (1602-1674) painted *Teika-yomi tsukinami kachō uta-e* 定家詠月次花鳥歌絵 (*Poem-Pictures of Birds & Flowers Based on Teika's Poems*), a pair of six-panel folding screens (figure 4. 5) depicting the attributes from the natural world that represent the twelve months according to poems composed by Fujiwara no Teika 藤原定家 (1162-1241).²⁰ The third month is represented in this screen with wisteria flowers hanging over a stream. Possibly inspired by Kano Tan'yū's painting, Taiga produced his *Annual Events byōbu* in the late 1760s when he painted most of his other Orchid Pavilion images.²¹ Taiga's success as a commercial painter

suggests that the public demanded not only the sinified Orchid Pavilion, but also the nativized *kyokusuien*.

From Court Ritual to the Visual Expression of Tsukioka Settei

Fūzokuga or genre-painting versions of *kyokusuien* were produced by Tsukioka Settei 月岡雪鼎 (1726-1786) and were popular with his contemporaries. Settei's contribution to the nativization of the subject was immense. Like Taiga, he painted this image to represent the third panel in a pair of six-panel *byōbu* depicting *Jūnikagetsu-zu byōbu* 十二ヶ月図 (the *Annual Event of Twelve Months*; figure 4. 1).²² However, Settei pioneered a type of “classicism” different from Taiga's by depicting this theme in a more decorative, colorful and meticulous manner, which was much more expressively conscious of the *yamato-e* tradition than the literati approach. Produced around 1785, a few decades after Taiga's, this work is formatted in the *oshie-bari* 押絵張り style, in which twelve individual pictures are painted separately and are each pasted on one of the twelve panels. In what follows, I will discuss the flexibility and multiplicity of this early modern painting theme demonstrated by this example of *kyokusuien*.

Tsukioka Settei was the founding painter of the Tsukioka School in Osaka, which was famous for *bijinga* 美人画, or pictures of beautiful people.²³ Settei is said to have been born in the seventh year of the Hō'ei 宝永 era (1710) and to have died in the sixth year of Tenmei 天明 (1786) at the age of seventy seven.²⁴ According to information recorded in *Onmuro onki* 御室御記 of Ninna-ji 仁和寺 temple, which was introduced by Yamamoto Yukari 山本ゆかり, Settei at the age of forty received the title of Hokkyō

法橋, a Buddhist rank rewarded by the court to distinguished painters, on the twenty-second day of the sixth month in the second year of Meiwa 明和 (1765).²⁵ The same material records that the date Settei received the higher rank, Hôgen 法眼, was the twenty-fifth of the third month in the seventh year of An'ei 安永 (1778), when he was fifty years old.²⁶ When he received the titled Hokkyô, Settei's subjects were predominantly contemporary beautiful women, in the *bijinga* genre. Tanaka Tatsuya 田中達也 and Matsudaira Susumu 松平進 have pointed out that after Settei ascended to the Hôgen rank, his subject matter shifted more towards classical themes such as *kyokusuien*.²⁷

Using *The Ise Stories* illustrations as an example, Nakamachi Keiko 仲町啓子 has shown how early modern painters often used “classical” pictorial motifs by reducing them into basic elements, which allowed them to be combined with the motifs of other painting themes to create new meanings.²⁸ In the case of the *kyokusuien* painting by Settei, the three figures clad in *kariginu* 狩衣, a type of courtier's robes, holding brushes and *tanzaku* 短冊, or poetry paper, are depicted under a peach tree in full bloom. Wine cups float on the meandering water in front of them. Similar to the *tsukuri-e* (built-up picture) method of the *yamato-e* tradition, Settei's sketch is in black ink, to which he applied *gofun* 胡粉, or white mineral pigment, and covered this with colored pigments. He used a thin brush with black ink to make up the details of the faces and costume designs. Following Nakamachi's theory, I want to pay particular attention to how the basic pictorial composition of *kyokusuien* is reduced to the visual elements of “meandering water,” “wine cup,” “courtiers,” and “plants.” Considering these reduced

visual elements as a horizontal axis and their combined representation — *misogi* 禊 or purification ritual — as a vertical axis, I will explore the process of how this painting theme attracts visual elements from other themes, while creating new meanings and freely transforming the original elements.

Nativization of the Orchid Pavilion through *Waka* Poetry

From textual records, we can trace the introduction of *kyokusuien* to Japan to sometime in the ancient period. *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 or *The Chronicles of Japan*, compiled in 720, records that the first Japanese *kyokusuien* was performed as an imperial court ritual in the first year of the reign of Emperor Kenzō 顯宗元年 in 485.²⁹ A passage from it reads:

三月上巳、幸後苑、曲水宴

*Yayoi no kami no mi no hi ni misono ni idemashite megurimizu no toyonoakari
kikoshimesu*

On the first day of the serpent in the third month, a party at a meandering stream was performed at the palace.³⁰

Although the factuality of this entry is historically dubious, *kyokusuien* became an established event on the third day of the third month by the end of the Nara period.³¹ It is documented in *Zoku Nihongi* 続日本紀 that Emperor Shōmu 聖武天皇 (701-756) performed *kyokusuien* on the third day of the third month in the fifth year of Shinki 神龜 (728).³² Because Emperor Kanmu 桓武天皇 (737-806) passed away in the third month,

the *kyokusuien* was interrupted until Emperor Saga 嵯峨天皇 (786-842) restarted it. The event was conducted in the imperial court and in the gardens of aristocrats.³³

At most of the parties poetry, known as *kanshi* 漢詩 (Chinese poems), was composed. *Kaifūsō* 懷風藻 (*Yearnings for the Ancient Chinese Style*), the earliest anthology of *kanshi*, compiled in 751, includes a poem composed at a *kyokusuien*:

五言。三月三日曲水宴。一首。

錦巖飛瀑激。春岫曄桃開。不憚流水急。唯恨盞遲來。

Five stanzas. Composed on the third day of the third month at a *kyokusuien*. One poem.

A waterfall is splashing off the brocade-like cliff,

where peaches are blooming in full to celebrate shining spring.

I am careless about the speed of the water,

but frustrated by the slowness of the wine-cup floating on the stream.³⁴

According to *Saigūki* 西宮記 (*Guidebook of Courtly Events*), authored by Minamoto no Taka'akira 源高明 (914-982), the *kyokusuien* was attended by only male courtiers and scholars (*kuge* 公卿 • *hakase* 博士 • *bunjin* 文人) who composed Chinese poems.³⁵

Some of the members of the Fujiwara clan imitated the Chinese custom and floated boats on a stream. In *Midō kanpakki* 御堂関白記 (*Diary of Fujiwara no Michinaga*), Fujiwara no Michinaga 藤原道長 (966-1028) records that a *kyokusuien* was held in the fourth year of Kankō 寛弘 (1007), and the *Chūyūki* 中右記 (*Diary of Fujiwara no Munetada* 藤原宗忠, 1062-1141) shows that Fujiwara no Moromichi 藤原師通 (1062-1099) organized this

type of party in the fifth year of Kanji 寛治 (1091).³⁶ At the both functions, male courtiers and scholars were invited and composed Chinese poems, not *waka* poems.³⁷

However, there is a record of one event in which instead of the usual Chinese poems *waka* 和歌 poetry was composed. In the *Man'yōshū* 万葉集 (*Collection of Ten Thousand Leaves*), a poem is recorded that indicates Ōtomo no Yakamochi 大伴家持 (718-785) performed a *kyokusuien* at his duty station in Etchū 越中 on the third day of the third month in the second year of Tenpyō 天平 (750). The poem reads:

漢人も ふねを浮べて 遊ぶとふ 今日そわが勢子 花かつらせな

karabito mo

Chinese people, too, are

fune wo ukabete

floating boats

asobu to fu

and playing music.

kefu zo waga seko

Today, my fellow gentlemen,

hana-kadzura sena

let us wear flowered-wigs!³⁸

In the Heian period, the *Nenjū gyōji hishō* 年中行事秘抄 records a gathering on the third day of the third month in the second year of Kanpyō 寛平 (902).³⁹ Another text, *Sangatsu mikka kishishō kyokusuien waka* 三月三日紀師匠曲水宴和歌 (*The Anthology of Kyokusuien Waka of the Third day of the Third Month*) records the three topics given for poems associated with this event, and includes poetry by, among others, Ki no Tsurayuki 紀貫之 (872-945) and Ki no Tomonori 紀友則 (?-907), who are included in the *Sanjūrokkasen* 三十六歌仙 (*The Thirty-Six Immortal Poets*). The topics are: “Flower Petals Floating on the Spring Water” 花浮春水, “Bright Light over the Water Bank” 燈懸水際明, and “the Rapids with Flower Petals Getting Dark as the Moon Sets” 月入花灘

暗.⁴⁰ Appearing in the same anthology, Ōe no Chisato 大江千里 (dates unknown) has this poem:

三日月の われのみをらん ものなれや 花の瀬にこそ 思ひ入りぬれ

mikadzuki no

Is it to be that

ware nomi woran

I will be alone

mono nareya

on the third day of the third month?

hana no se ni koso

The flowers in the shallows

omohi irinure

indeed have captured my heart.⁴¹

Sakanoue no Korenori 坂上是則 (dates unknown) composed:

花流す 瀬をも見るべき 三日月の われて入りぬる 山のをちかた

hana nagasu

The crescent moon by whose light

se wo mo mirubeki

the shallows pushing flowers can be seen —

mikadzuki no

how far the mountain

warete irinuru

behind which it has hidden

yama no wochikata

its silvered form!⁴²

In this way, flower petals floating together with wine cups became a well-known poetic image in *waka* poetry. Seasonal events were extremely important in the pre-existing classical tradition, and at this stage peach blossoms, which served to represent the season, were treated with great significance. Wine cups floating on the water on the third day of the third month are featured in the following poems:

みづなみに ながれてくだる かはらけは 花のかげにも くもらざりけり

midzunami ni

The wine cup

nagarete kudaru

floating down the water waves,

kaharake ha is not clouded over
hana no kage ni mo by the shadow of
kumorazarikeri the flowers.⁴³

(きよくすいのえん)

もゝのはな ひかりをそふる さかづきは めぐるながれに まかせてぞみる

(*kyokusui no en*) (Party at a meandering stream)

momo no hana The wine cup,
hikari wo sofuru that adds the light
sakadzuki ha of peach blossoms,
meguru nagare ni looks like it has been entrusted
makasete zo miru to the meandering stream.⁴⁴

On the third day of the third month in the first year of Juei 寿永 (1182), the priest Shigeyasu 神主重保 of Kamo Wakeikadzurasha 賀茂別雷社 shrine invited guests to a *kyokusuien*. At the party, *waka* poems were recited and among them two poems were later collected in the *Tsuki mōde waka shū* 月詣和歌集 (*Anthology of Waka Composed at the Monthly Rituals*) in 1182:

杯をとる とはみせて たぶさには ながるゝ花を せきぞと べむる

hai wo toru The arm
to ha misete that shows
tabusa ni ha to pick the cup
nagaruru hana wo dams and stops
seki zo todomuru the flowing flowers.⁴⁵

さかづきを 天の川にも ながせばや 空さへけふは 花に酔ふらん

<i>sakadzuki wo</i>	Only if I could float a wine cup
<i>ama no kaha ni mo</i>	on the Milky Way!
<i>nagasebaya</i>	even the sky,
<i>sora sahe kefu ha</i>	today would be
<i>hana niwefuran</i>	drunk with flowers. ⁴⁶

In the early Kamakura period, in the forth year of Kenkyū 建久 (1193), Gokyōgoku no Yoshitsune 後京極良経 (also known as Kujō Yoshitsune, 1169-1206), the compiler of another anthology, *Ropyaku ban uta awase* 六百番歌合 (*The Poetry Match in Six Hundred Rounds*), included a section of poems about “the third day of the third month.” In this section, many poets used the *kyokusuien* theme:

散る花を けふのまとみの 光にて 浪間にめぐる 春のさかづき	
<i>chiru hana wo</i>	The spring wine cup
<i>kefu no matowi no</i>	spinning between the waves,
<i>hikari nite</i>	is adorned with the light
<i>namima ni meguru</i>	of today’s banquet
<i>haru no sakadzuki</i>	with falling flower petals. ⁴⁷

唐人の 跡を伝ふる さかづきの 浪にしたがふ けふも来にけり	
<i>karahito no</i>	As a wine cup
<i>ato wo tsutafuru</i>	follows after the waves
<i>sakadzuki no</i>	in the Chinese way,
<i>nami ni shitagafu</i>	today [and the third moon banquet]
<i>kefu mo kinikeri</i>	has arrived this year, too. ⁴⁸

Tendai Priest Jien 天台僧慈円 (1155-1225) records in *Gukanshō* 愚管抄 that the custom of *kyokusuien* had been discontinued at that time, and that Gokyōgoku no Yoshitsune, the coordinator of *The Poetry Match in Six Hundred Rounds*, attempted to revive it.⁴⁹ Yoshitsune was supported in this endeavor by Fujiwara no Teika 藤原定家 (1162-1241), the compiler of *Hyakunin issu* 百人一首 (*One Hundred Poets*), and the ritualized party would have served his efforts to strengthen his connection with Teika. Their hopes were not fulfilled, however, as Yoshitsune died suddenly at age 38 after planning it, having even prepared *ōmu sakadzuki* 鸚鵡盃, or wine cup floats in a shape of parrots.⁵⁰ In this way, the *kyokusuien* that was introduced from China was nativized through interaction with *waka* poetry and was preserved in the poems of the past.

Drawing on the prestige of the Chinese Orchid Pavilion model, aristocrats and the imperial court attempted to renew the tradition of the purification ritual and poetry competition to demonstrate their own cultural sophistication. The nativized practice of this type of gathering was somehow disrupted in the late Heian period; however it was revived by *daimyō* and wealthy townspeople in the Tokugawa period. In the seventh year of Genroku 元禄 (1694), *Nenjū chōhō ki* 年中重宝記 noted that although *kyokusuien* “began to be practiced in the reign of Emperor Kenzō 顯宗天皇 (450-487), it had been interrupted.”⁵¹

Although the practice of *kyokusuien* became an established event at the imperial court in ancient Japan, visual representations of *kyokusuien* were absent until the first Chinese model of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering was imported. Furthermore, the nativized versions of *kyokusuien* imagery, which illustrated a Japanese courtiers’ party at a meandering stream, were newly invented in the middle of eighteenth century, when the

“sinified” Orchid Pavilion visual tradition reached its maturity in Japan and artists and consumers, who were fully familiarized with this theme, took the liberty of modifying its pictorial schemes and adding their own interpretations. As an imperial event, *kyokusuien* was interrupted in the late Heian period and was never revived officially afterwards. Although the actual event was rarely practiced, *kyokusuien* imagery was widely appreciated not only among the social elite but also among ordinary townspeople. Records of *kyokusuien* in classical texts were studied by the emerging *kokugaku* scholars, and knowledge of the subject was transmitted through their networks. Numerous visual representations of *kyokusuien* in various styles and formats were produced thereafter.

Visualization of the Nativized *Kyokusuien*

The *kyokusuien* as a courtly ritual event was revived as a painting theme in the Edo period as a result of interests in classical culture raised by the *kokugaku* movement. In his screen for the *Annual Events of the Twelve Months*, Tsukioka Settei, for instance, depicts a scene of *kyokusuien* performed by three courtiers gathered under a blossoming peach tree. Peach petals fall and float with wine cups on the surface of the meandering stream. This is a visualization of the poetic image as conceived in Heian *waka* poetry. The pictorial composition of Settei’s work is repeated by his son Tsukioka Sessai 月岡雪斎 (?-1839), who also worked on the same subject matter (figure 4. 6) in his *Annual Events of Twelve Months* screen housed in the Kansai University Library, and in a hanging scroll version of *kyokusuien* (Osaka University; figure 4. 7).⁵²

When Settei produced his *Annual Events* screen, he was actively socializing with the Edo-period intelligentsia. Settei’s artistic activity was directly related to *kokugaku*

ideology and *kōshōgaku* 考証学 (the study of the old documents).⁵³ Settei was a neighbor of Eda Nagayasu 江田世恭 (?-1795), a distinguished connoisseur and *kokugaku* scholar.⁵⁴ He also had a close relationship with Rai Shunsui 頼春水, who was a member of the Kontonshisha 混沌詩社, a literary circle active in Osaka. Settei's deep consideration for the study of classical events and documents is related in an episode recorded in the diary of Shunsui, entitled *Zaitsu kiji* 在津紀事. Inshien 隱子遠, one of the Kontonshisha members, asked Nagayasu to request that his neighbor Settei paint a picture of quails. Settei, however, declined, explaining that when he received a request to paint a quail ten years earlier, he could not paint the subject as well as Tosa Mitsuoki 土佐光起. With practice since then, he had become more capable of the task but still could not attain Mitsuoki's level. "Quail" had the cultural significance of representing a particular season, and with this understanding Settei felt his talents were not up to the demands of the subject matter.⁵⁵

When Settei published a painting manual entitled *Wakan meihitsu kingyoku gafu* 和漢名筆金玉画府 (figure 4. 8), he asked Okuda Mototsugu 奥田元繼 (1729-1807), another *kokugaku* scholar, to write the preface.⁵⁶ Mototsugu was highly respected in Osaka intellectual circles for his interaction with Korean diplomats and published a record of this interaction in *Ryōkō yowa* 両好余話 in 1764.⁵⁷ Owing to his association with *kokugaku* scholars, Settei was heavily influenced by nativist ideology and was well versed in associated texts, allowing him to paint images of classical themes such as *Jūnikagetsu-zu* 十二ヶ月図 (the *Annual Events of Twelve Months*) screen (figure 4. 1) that included the *kyokusuien* imagery.

In Settei's *Annual Events of Twelve Months*:

the first month is represented by the pulling up of young pine trees (*komatsubiki* 小松引き); the second month by cherry and plum blossoms (*kanzakura/ kōbai* 寒桜・紅梅); the third month by *kyokusuien*; the fourth month by deutzia blossoms (*u no hana* 卯の花) and nobles on horses; the fifth month by the Iris Festival (*Tango/ Shōbu* 端午・菖蒲); the sixth month by bonfires in the mountain (*yamanaka no takibi* 山中の焚き火); the seventh month by Tanabata 七夕 or the Weaver Star Festival; the eighth month by the Autumn Moon viewing (*chūshū no meigetsu* 仲秋の名月); the ninth month by the Chrysanthemum Festival (*Chōyō* 重陽); the tenth month by light rain and colored leaves (*shigure/ kōyō* 時雨・紅葉); the eleventh month by the first snow (*hatsu yuki* 初雪); the twelve month by early plum blossoms (*haya ume* 早梅).⁵⁸

Yamamoto Yukari points out that all the motifs depicted in the Settei's Annual Events byōbu are overlapped with the classical *tsukinami-e* motifs, except the *kyokusuien*.⁵⁹ Among these twelve months, only the *kyokusuien* of the third month is an event of human affairs, which is normally a subject belonging to *nenjū gyōji-e* 年中行事絵 (pictures of annual events).⁶⁰ The rest of months correspond to the natural phenomena, or human affairs that involve the natural phenomena, of the seasons, and their representative attributes have been derived from classical *tsukinami-e* 月次絵 (pictures of monthly events).⁶¹ *Tsukinami-e* depict the natural phenomena and human activities that were associated with each month of the year. It was developed from *shiki-e* 四季絵 (picture of the four seasons) but more complex combinations of monthly attributes were possible in

tsukinami-e.⁶² Unfortunately, there is no extant example from the Heian period, but literary works such as *The Tale of Genji* and *Makura no sōshi* 枕草子 (*The Pillow Book*) suggest that *tsukinami-e* were popular in the eleventh century.⁶³ As was made evident in the *tsukinami-e* exhibition organized by the Shiga Prefectural Modern Art Museum in 1995, the events depicted in the *tsukinami-e* produced in the Tokugawa period are of a wide variety.⁶⁴

The tradition of *tsukinami-e* was based on natural phenomena rather than on human activities. Why, then, did Settei include the image of *kyokusuien*, which does not traditionally belong to the *tsukinami-e*? Like *shiki-e*, *tsukinami-e* is related to *waka* poetry and was originally meant to be painted on murals and folding screens. The *kyokusuien* theme is also closely related to the *waka* poetry discussed earlier, and thus it was probably thought appropriate to be included in the *tsukinami-e* themes. Yamamoto explains that Settei's choice of painting motifs indicates his knowledge of the *kokugaku*, and thus reveals his social life with *kokugaku* intellectuals.⁶⁵ In this way, the spirit of the *kokugaku* scholars attempting to reinvent a new classical tradition was hidden behind Settei's nostalgia towards *tsukinami-e*. The notion of classicism is supported by "a powerful ideological construct" that was used by everyone aspiring to elevation in social status.⁶⁶ In this sense Tsukioka Settei, while being a town painter, acted as a bridge between the *kokugaku* movement, which reached its peak in the nineteenth century, and the *fukko yamato-e* 復古大和絵 (*yamato-e* revived) of the late Edo period.

Visualized *Kyokusuien* and Restorationism

About a half century later, *kyokusuien* imagery based on the *yamato-e* tradition – that is, the new canon established by Settei – became a subject with more political overtones. *Kyokusuien* (figure 4. 9) was a favorite painting theme of Reizei Tamechika 冷泉為恭 (1823-1864), who perfected the *fukko yamato-e* style inaugurated by Tanaka Totsugen 田中訥言 (1767-1823).⁶⁷ Totsugen and Tamechika followed the *kokugaku* movement, a native reaction that competed against what was seen as a foreign value system.⁶⁸ At this time, the Tokugawa shogunate's authority was declining, as radical revolutionaries, who sought to overthrow the Tokugawa regime through the restoration of imperial rule, began to increase in number. The revived classical visual representation, which glorified the imperial rule of the past, fueled political enthusiasm for these revolutionaries.

Tamechika was the third son of Kano Eitai 狩野永泰, a younger brother of Kano Eigaku 狩野永岳 (1790-1867), the ninth generation head of the Kyo-Kano family.⁶⁹ Using family connections, Tamechika had access to classical painting themes and copied works such as *Hōnen shōnin eden* 法然上人絵伝 (*Illustrated Biography of Priest Honen*) and *Nayotake monogatari* 奈与竹物語 (*Tale of Nayotake*).⁷⁰ He was not born into an aristocratic family, but he took on the surname Reizei after the family to which his mother was in service prior to her marriage; as he aspired to be a part of the aristocracy, he immersed himself in the courtly cultural tradition.⁷¹

In 1843, at the age of 21, Tamechika painted a *kyokusuien* image for the third month of his *Annual Events of Twelve Months* scroll.⁷² He chose:

gantān sechie 元旦節会, or the New Year Celebration, to represent the first month; *retsuken* 列見, or promotional celebration of courtly rankings for the second month; *kyokusuien* for the third month; *kanbutsu* 灌仏, or the birthday celebration of the Buddha for the fourth month; *kenshōbu* 献菖蒲, or the Iris Festival for the fifth month; *jinnkonjiki* 神今食, or the ritual where the emperor cooks rice himself and dedicates it to Amaterasu for the sixth month; *kikkōten* 乞巧奠 or the festival of the stars for the seventh month; *komahiki* 駒牽, or the Horse Pulling Ceremony, for the eighth month; *chōyō* 重陽 or the Chrysanthemum Festival for the ninth month; *ibahajime* 射場始 or the inauguration ceremony of archery for the tenth month; *gosechi* 五節 or Five Banquets of courtly dance for the eleventh month; and *tsuina* 追儺 or the ceremonial expelling of demons for the twelfth month.⁷³

Although the nature of this scroll is different from that of the *Annual Events* screen (figure 4. 1), the events representing the first, third, fifth, seventh and ninth months are the same.

To bring an understanding of classical events to this scroll, Tamechika studied old documents and demonstrated his thorough knowledge of these matters in great detail. Most notably, the scene depicting flower petals floating with wine cups on the meandering water of the *kyokusuien* is clearly based on his study of the classical *waka* poetry. According to the inscription on the box, the production of this scroll was commissioned by Kano Seisei'in Osanobu 狩野晴川院養信 (1798-1846), the head of the Kobikimachi Kano School 木挽町狩野家.⁷⁴ The inscription on the box reads: “It is

even better if painted in the older painting style” 何れも古射猶更宜敷候。 Nakamura Muzuo suggests that Osanobu, at the time of commission, interestingly, requested Tamechika to paint this scroll in the “old” Tosa School style rather than the “new” Kano style.⁷⁵

Tamechika continued to receive commissions to produce paintings based on classical events not only from imperial and aristocratic households, but also from the Tokugawa shogunate. Because of this practice, the shogunate viewed Tamechika as a revolutionary, while the revolutionaries considered him a Tokugawa loyalist. Soon after Tamechika painted another *kyokusui* on a *tsutate* (single-leaf screen) in 1864, he was assassinated by a group of radicals, whose slogan was *son'nō jōi* 尊王攘夷 (*Revere the Emperor, Expel the Barbarians.*) This *kyokusui*, which is lost today, was painted as a gift for Sakai Tada'aki 酒井忠義 (1813-1873), who was a head of shogunal deputy in Kyoto and was positioned especially to control revolutionary activities.⁷⁶ The radicals were aware of the power of classical visual representation and felt the danger of a shogunal deputy keeping classically oriented paintings in his house.⁷⁷

Tamechika's scroll depicting the *kyokusui* should be compared with another *Annual Event of Twelve Months* scroll (figure 4. 10) which was originally commissioned by Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa 後白河法皇 (1127-1192) to restore the cultural activities at the imperial court, a work that was produced in the studio of Tokiwa no Genji Mitsunaga 常盤源氏光長 (dates unknown) under the supervision of Fujiwara no Motofusa 藤原基房 (1145-1231) in 1157.⁷⁸ Although the original scrolls were lost in a fire that destroyed the Imperial Palace at the beginning of the Tokugawa period, the copy by Sumiyoshi Jokei 住吉如慶 (1599-1670) and Gukei 具慶 (1631-1705) has survived in

the Sumiyoshi family.⁷⁹ Among the sixteen surviving scenes, I will focus on scene three, which represents the event of *kemari* 蹴鞠, or kickball, and scene ten, which represents the event of *minadzuki-barae* 六月祓, or purification ritual, in the sixth month.

These two events, as well as *kyokusuien*, were all performed in ancient times at court as imperial rituals. In scene three (figure 4. 10a), there is a meandering stream adjacent to the figures playing *kemari*. The cherry trees are in full bloom, and their petals fall into the stream. Two figures look on in appreciation of the floating flower petals, and another figure next to them fixes his hair. The poetic image of flower petals floating on the water in the *waka* tradition was reconstructed by Tamechika in this visual image, as it was by Settei. In the scene of *minadzuki-barae* (figure 4. 10c), the meandering stream flows into an artificial pond. It is in a garden that belongs to an aristocrat. Plum and pine trees are planted in this garden, and a temporary small shrine made of white wood is situated underneath the trees. Standing on the top of the shrine is a *heigushi*, a device to perform the purification ritual. One painting depicts the scene of the third month and the other the sixth month, but they are closely linked in visual terms.

In order to understand what information was available for Settei and Tamechika to reconstruct this classical theme, I will briefly examine the *kyokusuien* image (figure 4. 11) by Sakai Hōitsu 酒井抱一 (1761-1828). Housed in the Ōkura Shūkōkan Museum 大倉集古館, this hanging scroll was painted in 1827 as a part of a *Gosseku* 五節句図, or pictures of the Five Seasonal Festivals. The visual elements of Hōitsu's work are related to the ones Settei used to construct the *kyokusuien*, and also to the ancient annual event scrolls. It is a set of five hanging scrolls and each represents an event:

Kochōha i 小朝拝, or a ritual greeting of the emperor by members of the aristocracy, for the first month; *kyokusuien* for the third month; the Iris Festival for the fifth month; the Festival of Stars for the seventh month; followed by the Chrysanthemum Festival for the ninth month.⁸⁰

In a thin book, entitled *Gosseku no koto* 五節句之事 and based on *Kujikongen* 公事根源, which was compiled by Ichijō Kanera 一条兼良 (1402-1481), Hōitsu records in detail how to perform the courtly rituals of the ancient period, indicating how much he was interested in the study of ancient documents and *kokugaku* ideas.

Sakai Hōitsu was the second son of a daimyo and the younger brother of Sakai Tadazane 酒井忠以 (1756-1790), head of the Himeji fiefdom 姫路藩. Hōitsu showed his talent for *haikai* 俳諧 (a popular style of linked verse), *kyōka* 狂歌 (crazy verse) and ukiyo-e from a young age. It should be noted these three cultural forms were intended for the commoners, as opposed to the aristocratic or samurai *renga* 連歌 (linked verse), *waka* and *yamato-e* or the Kano. The cultural circles of *haikai* and *kyōka* often overlapped with the network of *kokugaku* scholars who were dissatisfied with the Tokugawa regime and existing sociopolitical system and supported the movement to restore imperial rule.⁸¹ It is interesting to note that a son of prominent daimyo such as Hōitsu was also a part of this network.

After taking the tonsure, Hōitsu declared himself a disciple of Ogata Kōrin 尾形光琳 (1658-1716). Despite the animosity that filled the relationship between Hōitsu and the Sumiyoshi family over a disagreement in appraising some paintings, Hōitsu must have had, as Tamamushi Toshiko 玉蟲敏子 has pointed out, access to the *Annual Events*

scroll in the Sumiyoshi Collection and must have been inspired by it.⁸² As demonstrated by the exhibition catalogue to *Kyō no goseku* 京の五節句 (*Gosseku in Kyoto*), organized by the Museum of Kyoto in 2000, the custom of depicting the *Gosseku-zu* was established and popular among all classes during the time of Hōitsu.⁸³ However, visual evidence of *kyokusuien* barely remained by his time, so the *Annual Events* scroll should be looked at more carefully. *Kyokusuien* was an especially complicated subject since it was recorded in texts without visual material. Thus the *Annual Events* scroll of the Sumiyoshi family was extremely important in evoking a nostalgic feeling towards the classical past. Another image that may have influenced Hōitsu's artistic innovation was illustrations to episode 65 of *Ise monogatari* 伊勢物語 (*The Ise Stories*), which also involves a purification ritual.

The Fusion between *Kyokusuien* and *Misogi* Imagery

In 1815, twelve years prior to the production of the *kyokusuien* of *Gosseku*, Hōitsu compiled the pictorial motifs of Ogata Kōrin in order to honor his artistic achievement, and published the *Kōrin hyakuzu* 光琳百図. In this work, Hōitsu included *Ise monogatari*, Episode Sixty-Five, *misogi-zu* 禊図 or purification ritual (figure 4. 12). In this episode, the protagonist, thought to be Ariwara no Narihira 在原業平 (825-880), suffers from his infatuation with an imperial consort. He tries to rid himself of his feeling for her and hires a divination priest and priestesses to perform a purification ritual by a meandering stream, but despite this his passion for her increases.⁸⁴

The image by Hōitsu is modeled after Ogata Kōrin's version (figure 4. 13), which was produced at the beginning of the eighteenth century and is housed in the Hatakeyama

Memorial Museum 畠山記念館. Kōrin's version was in turn based on a pictorial composition attributed to Tawaraya Sōtatsu 俵屋宗達 (figure 4. 14) from the beginning of the seventeenth century. Furthermore, this same pictorial composition was inherited in a version (figure 4. 15) by Suzuki Ki'itsu 鈴木其一 (1796-1858), a nineteenth-century disciple of Hōitsu, and is housed in the Gitter Collection.⁸⁵ Interestingly, the pictorial composition of *misogi-zu* is constructed with the same visual elements – “meandering water” “aristocratic figures” “a plant” – that made up those of *kyokusuien-zu*. These reduced visual elements function as metonymic signs, transmitting part of the image's meaning while creating new meanings at the same time.⁸⁶

According to the catalogue of the Nezu Museum 根津美術館 (2005), the work of Kōrin in the Hatakeyama Memorial Museum (listed as Pl. 55) is given the alternate title *Ietaka Misogi* 家隆禊 (*Ietaka's Purification Ritual*), besides being known as the purification from *The Ise Stories*. The composition of this image is identical to that of the *Ise* ritual.⁸⁷ The image of Ietaka's *misogi* also appears among images of *Hyakunin isshu* 百人一首 (*One Hundred Poets*, figure 4. 16). The alternate title refers to the poem from that collection composed by Fujiwara no Ietaka 藤原家隆 (1158-1237) recalling a summer purification ritual performed in the sixth month.

風そよぐ ならの小川の 夕暮れは みそぎぞ夏の しるしなりけり

kaze soyogu

In the evening

nara no ogawa no

when the wind rustles the oaks

yugure ha

At Nara-no-Ogawa,

misogi zo natsu no

it is the ablutions that are

shirushi narikeru

the only sign it's still summer!⁸⁸

Furthermore, the illustration to episode 65, the *misogi* in the *Kaisei Ise monogatari* 改正伊勢物語 (figure 4. 17) published in 1747, is not faithful to the narrative, which reads:

After carrying on for some time in his eccentric manner he saw that he was headed for dismissal and ruin. “What am I to do?” he begged the buddhas and gods, “Please, please rid me of this obsession!”

Unfortunately the obsession only worsened, until he could no longer bear the agony of his longing. He summoned a yin-yang master and a priestess of the gods and took them off to perform the purification against unwanted passion. While the rite progressed, the host of her adorable traits so overwhelmed him that he was now far worse off than before.

恋せじと 御手洗川に せしみそぎ かみは受けずも なりにけるかな

kohi seji to

That most solemn rite

mitarashi-gaha ni

done beside the cleansing stream

seshi misogi

to purge me of love:

kami ha ukezu mo

alas, in the end the gods

narikeru kana

saw fit to reject it all!⁸⁹

This version of *misogi-zu* in the *Ise Stories* is illustrated by Nishikawa Sukenobu 西川祐信 (1671-1751) and does not include the diviners and priestess who are supposed to perform the purification ritual. Instead, the image is also constructed out of reduced visual elements: “meandering water,” “aristocratic figures,” “a plant.” The illustration by Sukenobu was inspired by the earlier version of *The Ise Stories* illustration, the so-called Saga-bon 嵯峨本 version (figure 4. 18), published by Suminokura Soan 角倉素庵 in

1608. It also depicts a meandering stream, aristocratic figures and a tree. The difference between the *Ise* illustrations and the *kyokusuien* is that while the former includes *heihaku*, a purification ritual device, standing by the water bank, the later depicts the wine cup as another purification ritual device floating on the stream.

For a better understanding of the visual fusion among the sinified “Orchid Pavilion,” the nativized *kyokusuien*, and the illustration of *misogi* purification ritual in *The Ise Stories*, I now turn again to Tsukioka Settei. Before Settei established his school he was not famous for his paintings. Yet, he made himself active in the print industry using the name Tange 丹下 between the Hōreki 宝暦 and Meiwa 明和 eras (1751-1771) and worked on the illustrations for the *Ise Stories* in 1755 and 1756.

Settei was a town painter, but was trained in the Kano school under the instruction of Takada Keiho 高田敬輔 (1674-1755), a disciple of Kano Eikei 狩野永敬 (1662-1702), who was the grandson of Sansetsu and the fourth generation head of the Kyo-Kano School.⁹⁰ When Settei received the title of Hokkyō, he compiled *Wakan meihitsu kingyoku gafu* (figure 4. 8), which was published by Nunoya Tadasaburō 布屋忠三郎 in 1770. Inserted in the first five pages of the first volume of this painting manual is an Orchid Pavilion image modeled after the Ming stone rubbing, a specialty of the Kyo-Kano School. At first glance, the pictorial composition of the “Orchid Pavilion” by Settei is similar to that of the Ming stone rubbing, which consists of “Orchid Pavilion as architecture,” “waterfall and caves,” “scholar-poets,” “wine cups,” and the “bridge.” However, when we look at each of the five pages of *Kingyoku gafu* closely, they can be seen as independent pictures, which are also constructed out of the basic visual elements – “a meandering stream,” “wine cup,” “scholar-poets,” “a plant” – that are common to

the nativized version of *kyokusuien*. The only difference is in the figure's clothing – Chinese in one case and Japanese in the other – but the similarities in the painting themes are easily recognized. From this point, we can say that the knowledge of the particular purification ritual at the sinified Orchid Pavilion is always included in the general and nativized *kyokusuien*. In this way, the reduced visual elements construct new meanings by inviting different interpretations depending on the level of the audience's knowledge.

The Cult of *Kyokusuien* in the Tokugawa Period

Even if the courtly figures are replaced by contemporary figures in the Tokugawa period, as long as the pictorial composition includes the visual elements of “a meandering stream,” “wine cup,” “a tree (especially peach),” the viewer can understand that the image refers to the *kyokusuien*.⁹¹ The practice of *kyokusuien* at the imperial court had been discontinued for a long time but was revived by the daimyo and the wealthy merchants all around Japan during the early modern period.⁹² After that, the “cult of *kyokusuien*” in the Tokugawa period was mainly developed in the pleasure quarters in the outskirts of Edo city.⁹³

Slightly earlier in China, during the late Ming, flamboyant merrymaking and floating cups down a running stream modeled after the Orchid Pavilion was exceptionally popular as well.⁹⁴ This type of drinking party (figure 4. 19) was depicted by Qian Geng 錢耕 and an illustration was published in *Huancuitang Yuanjing tu* 環翠堂園景圖 around 1610. The late Ming critic Yuan Hongdao even commented on this craze for the Orchid Pavilion:

The Orchid Pavilion Gathering in the past occurred by a brook in the mountains and wine cups were floated along its winding stream of clear water. Nowadays, people choose plain ground and install an artificial channel. Such posers don't understand things; this is as bad as it gets! ⁹⁵

From this comment, it is obvious that the “Cult of the Orchid Pavilion” was well-represented in popular culture among the leisured class in the Ming society.

Unlike Ming elite society, however, who favored artificial streams for this party-game, Edo townspeople seem to prefer performing it by the rivers in the city. For instance, Kinokuniya Bunzaemon 紀伊国屋文左衛門, a wealthy merchant in the lumber business, threw a *kyokusuien* party at the Asakusa River 浅草川.⁹⁶ Also recorded is another incident in 1819 in which Tomizawachō Koi'ichirō 富澤町鯉一郎 planned to have a *kyokusuien*, hiring twelve male and twelve female geishas 芸者 and chartering boats to bring them to the Sumida River 隅田川.⁹⁷ Reflecting such an atmosphere, Kubo Shunman produced a version (figure 4. 2) of *kyokusuien* in a contemporary setting. It is a large print triptych *nishiki-e* 錦絵 (brocade picture) published at the end of Tenmei 天明 era (1781-1789).

In this image, the figures dressed in contemporary costumes are enjoying a *kyokusuien* by the meandering stream with peach trees in full bloom. In the right picture, a woman is tying a strip of *tanzaku* 短冊 (poem paper) to a peach branch and two women compose poems; in the center picture, a *wakashu* 若衆 (young male) reads the poem written on the strip of paper using his fan, as a woman pulls a wine cup from the stream; in the left picture, in addition to the woman who is composing a poem, a *kamuro* 禿 (a

girl attendant for a *tayū*) is depicted next to the standing *tayū* 太夫, or high ranking courtesan. The *tayū* looks back over her shoulder at the *wakashu* in the center picture, so that this couple forms the protagonists of the triptych. In the background, there are many men and women having a picnic under peach trees.

Multiple layers of meaning can be taken from this scene. These contemporary figures —the courtesans, geishas, and their clients of the pleasure quarters — are performing the fourth-century roles of Wang Xizhi and his guest-scholars at the Orchid Pavilion in China, or the roles of Japanese aristocrats at the Nara or Heian court. Viewing pictures layered in meanings such as this was a kind of intellectual game that expanded the depth of the picture's contents depending on the viewer's level of education and knowledge. In what follows, I investigate the hidden meaning and ideology behind the visual representation of *kyokusuien* by Shunman, while considering the multiple layered structures of the *mitate* 見立て and *yatsushi* やつし systems that were often employed as a strategy in ukiyo-e.

Yatsushi, Mitate and Kubo Shunman's Kyokusuien

To translate the term “*mitate*” into English is almost impossible, but one of its shades of meaning is the “comparing of one thing to something else,” so that codified motifs may be used “to encourage the viewer to look at a present world superimposed on a world of the past.”⁹⁸ The term “*yatsushi*” means the vulgarization and simplification of something that was originally of higher quality or status.⁹⁹ To his triptych Kubo Shunman sought to add depth of meaning by adding three texts related to *kyokusuien* to each image; each text refers to three historical kabuki 歌舞伎 actors who were extremely

popular at the time.¹⁰⁰ These kabuki actors are identifiable by their *kyōka* or *haikai* pennames.

On the right page, a passage from the *Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering* is signed Rokō 路考, the *haikai* 俳諧 penname of Segawa Kikunojō III 三代目瀬川菊之丞 (1751-1810).¹⁰¹ The inscription reads:

雖無絲竹管絃之盛 一觴一詠 亦足以暢敘幽情

shichiku kangen no sei nashi to iedomo isshō ichiei

mata motte yūjō wo chōjo suru ni taru

Though we had none of the magnificent sound of strings and flutes,

a cup of wine and then a poem were enough to stir our innermost feeling.¹⁰²

By directly referencing the *Preface*, Shunman alludes to the gathering of Chinese noble-scholars at the Orchid Pavilion. Thus, on one level this *kyokusuien* may be considered a *yatsushi* or vulgarization of the “Orchid Pavilion” theme. Since the Orchid Pavilion is dated on the third day of the third month, the event in this picture is also assumed to occur on that date, whose significance I discuss later.

In the center page, there is a *kyōka* 狂歌 poem signed by Hanamichi no Tsurane 花道のつらね, the *kyōka* name of another famous kabuki actor, Ichikawa Danjūrō V 五代目市川団十郎 (1741-1806).¹⁰³ It reads:

もの云わぬ 花のにわに ねぢ上戸 川のおもさへ もゝいろの春

mono iwanu

In the garden of flowers

hana no niwa ni

I say nothing

nejijōgo

—the argumentative drunk—

kaha no omo sae

even the surface of stream,

momo iro no haru

peach-colored spring.

Nejijōgo 振上戸 in this *kyōka* is a term that refers to a person who becomes argumentative when affected by alcohol.¹⁰⁴ It appears in the script of the kabuki play *Sukeroku yukari no Edo zakura* 助六由縁江戸桜.¹⁰⁵ Being received by enthusiastic fans, this act became one of the specialties of the Danjūrō lineage.

The picture on the left page includes a *waka* poem signed by Tosshi 訥子, a penname of Sawamura Sōjūrō III 三代目沢村宗十郎 (1752-1800), who was famous for roles in the *wagoto* 和事 (soft style kabuki) plays of the Kansei 寛政 (1789-1799) period. The inscription reads:

さそふ水 あらバきみがもとに いなんことをねがふ

さかつきのながれて 花のいくえ哉

sasofu midzu

I wish there were a stream of water

araba kimi ga moto ni

that leads me

inan koto o negafu

to where you are,

sakadzuki no nakarete

like a wine cup floating down

hana no ikue nari

to join the flower petals.

Though referring directly to *kyokusuien*, these texts and images also suggest an event in the red light district.¹⁰⁶ Under Tokugawa governance, life in the licensed quarters in Japan, especially in the Yoshiwara district, was strictly ordered around calendar events, the so-called *kyokuchū nenjū gyōji* 曲中年中行事, that mimicked Heian courtly calendric events, *kyūchū nenjū gyōji* 宮中年中行事.¹⁰⁷ The construction of such a calendric system required a knowledge of ancient culture. The patrons and clients of

Yoshiwara always included the intelligentsia in shaping its customs. Since 1741 the event in the third month was especially important as it also marked the Cherry Blossom Viewing Festival and the planting of cherry trees.¹⁰⁸

In addition to *nenjū gyōji*, the Yoshiwara residents were obligated to celebrate *monpi* 紋日, or five crested days, which was similar to *gosekku* 五節句, or five seasonal festivals; they are the seventh day of first month; the third of third month; the fifth of fifth month; the seventh of seventh month; and the ninth of ninth month.¹⁰⁹ On those days, courtesans were obligated to have clients, who had to pay extra for them to perform the celebration. If a courtesan could not bring a client on that day, she had to pay the cost of the celebration, which drove her into larger debt to the brothel to which she belonged.¹¹⁰ Of these days, the most important was the third day of the third month, which was also the date on which the original Orchid Pavilion Gathering took place. In this light, Shunman layered the image of courtesans celebrating the Cherry Festival and writing letters to their clients with the image of Chinese scholars or Japanese courtiers attending the poetry competition on the third day of third month.

Kubo Shunman and His Intellectual Environment

Although Shunman clearly included the names and poems of three kabuki actors, he chose not to depict their *nigao-e* 似顔絵 (faces) and *mon* 紋 (crest marks) which were used in the common kabuki actor pictures, called *yakusha-e* 役者絵 — a genre that was extremely popular at that time. One explanation for this avoidance could be Shunman's association with the leaders of the *kokugaku* movement. Born in 1757 to a lacquer-artisan family in Edo, Shunman was raised by his grandfather, Kubota Masaharu 窪田政

春, who studied painting under the guidance of Takebe Ayatari 建部綾足 (1719-74), together with Katō Chikage 加藤千蔭 (1735-1808) and Katori Nabiko 輯取魚彦 (1723-82), who were renowned *kokugaku* scholar-painters.¹¹¹ Thus, from a young age, Shunman studied *kokugaku* and painting from Nabiko, and received the studio name, Shunman 春満 with the character, “spring 春,” taken from his grandfather’s name.¹¹² The Japanese pronunciation of the name “Shunman” is actually “Azumamaro,” as in Kada Azumamaro 荷田春満 (1669-1739), the scholar who passed the study of *kokugaku* on to Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵 (1698-1769), a teacher of Nabiko. In the first edition of his essay *Kyōka kei* 狂歌觴 (*The Wine-cups of Kyōka*), published in 1802, Shunman proudly announced that he received his education from Nabiko.¹¹³

After Nabiko’s death in 1782, Shunman changed the character of his name.¹¹⁴ This may have been because he did not want people to mistake him for a disciple of Katsukawa Shunshō 勝川春章 (1726-1793), who was one of the most popular *yakusha-e* artists.¹¹⁵ Tanaka Tatsuya explains that there was a tendency among artists, including *ukiyo-e* designers, to despise those who earned profits by producing popular *yakusha-e*.¹¹⁶ In 1807 Ōta Nanpo 太田南畝, who closely socialized with Shunman, recorded in *Ichiwa ichigen* 一話一言 (*One Story, One Word*), volume 16:

(前略) 吾友窪俊満易兵衛はじめ魚彦の門に入て、蘭竹梅菊の四君子を学ぶ、後うき世絵を北尾重政花藍に学ぶ、魚彦より春満といへる画名をあたへしが勝川春章といへるうき世絵の門人といふをいとひて、春の字を俊の字に改めしといへり。四月二五日

--- my friend Kubo Shunman Yasubei entered the school of Nabiko, and learned the Four Gentlemen - Orchid, Bamboo, Plum, and Chrysanthemum [which were highly prestigious painting subjects]. Later, he learned ukiyo-e from Kitao Shigemasa. Nabiko bestowed on him the artist name “Shunman” 春満. However, Shunman was afraid of people mistaking him for a disciple of Katsukawa Shunshō, and replaced *shun* 俊 (genius) for *shun* 春 (spring). The 25th day of the fourth month.¹¹⁷

Shunman, who had learned how to paint *shikunshi* 四君子 (the Four Gentlemen), and also received *kokugaku* education from Nabiko, could not bear the possible reputation of being a *yakusha-e* painter. Intriguingly, many *kokugaku* scholars, such as Nabiko or Ayatari, were also famous as “sinophile” *bunjinga* painters.

At the time, Shunman was serving as the core member of a *kyōka* literary circle that was based on *kokugaku* ideology, called Hakurakuren 伯楽連, and was supporting Ichikawa Danjūrō V.¹¹⁸ In 1783, Danjūrō played the role of Ōboshi Yuranosuke 大星由良之助, the protagonist of *Kanadehon Chūshingura* 仮名手本忠臣蔵, a play with a theme potentially seen as anti-*bakufu*. The leaders of Hakurakuren, in order to celebrate his success on the stage, composed *kyōka* in dedication to this kabuki actor.¹¹⁹ These *kyōka* were compiled in a book entitled, *Mina mimasu kyōgen Ōboshi* 皆三舛扮戯大星, and were published the following year.¹²⁰

Among the members of Hakuraku circle, the most active poet was called by his *kyōka* penname, Yadoya no Meshimori 宿屋飯盛 (1753-1830), who debuted in the *kyōka* literary field together with Shunman. However, Meshimori was accused by the *bakufu* of

operating a *kujiyado* 公事宿, a lodging to accommodate commoners who planned to pursue illegal action against the government.¹²¹ He was interrogated at the Minami machi magistrate office in Edo and was sentenced to exile, and all of his fortune was confiscated. After this incident, he left the *kyōka* circle to become a *kokugaku* scholar, using his name Ishikawa Masamochi 石川雅望.

Shunman was also connected with another *kokugaku* scholar, Moto'ori Norinaga (1730-1801) 本居宣長, and composed a poem on *tanzaku* 短冊 paper to pay his respects to him (figure 4. 20).¹²² When scholars gathered in Norinaga's hometown, in the Matsusaka 松坂 district of Ise 伊勢 province (present-day Mie 三重 prefecture) on the thirteenth day of the eleventh month in 1796, Shunman, then 39, traveled especially to see Norinaga. Later, at the age of 67, when he was staying at the Suzuya 鈴屋 Inn, Shuman composed the following:

<i>tsuno moji no</i>	When one speaks of Ise,
<i>Ise to shi ieba</i>	written with horn-like characters,
<i>kamiguni no</i>	it befits the intentions of a man
<i>hito no kokoro wa</i>	of this province of the gods
<i>makezu tamashii</i>	who has an indefatigable spirit ¹²³

In this way, Shunman was committed to the revival of classicism and thus to *kokugaku* expression. Though he avoided producing *yakusha-e*, he included texts by kabuki actors in order to declare his network among the *kokugaku*-related cultural people in this “Orchid Pavilion” image. Shunman thus exemplifies the networks that connected painters of different schools and modes of representation.

The Contemporaneity of Classical Themes

Prior to the activity of Kubo Shunman, during the Meiwa 明和 (1764-71) era, there was a movement among ukiyo-e artists to reconstruct the classical traditions of China and Japan in contemporary settings.¹²⁴ Suzuki Harunobu 鈴木春信 (1725-70), who is known for the establishment of the *nishiki-e* 錦絵 (brocade picture) tradition in 1765, probably contributed to this movement the most.¹²⁵ At that time, Ōkubo Jinshirō 大久保甚四郎, whose *haikai* penname was Kyosen 巨川 (1722-77), was a high ranking samurai who led a circle that exchanged illustrated calendars and supported Harunobu by commissioning him to produce a number of pictures for prints.¹²⁶ The members of Kyosen's circle were wealthy *kōzuka* 好事家, or aesthete-intellectuals. While intimately connected with these intellectuals, Harunobu widened his knowledge of classical themes in order to create images that convey multiple layers of meanings.

Included in Harunobu's series of *Fūzoku shiki kasen* 風俗四季歌仙 (*Immortal Poets in the Customs of Four Seasons*), which was printed in the *nishiki-e* technique, is *Yayoi* 弥生 (figure 4. 21), meaning the third month in the Japanese calendar.¹²⁷ This image is constructed out of our basic visual elements – a meandering stream with floating wine cups, poets, and peach trees in full bloom – and in addition to the title designating the season it is easily understood that this is another *yatsushi* of a *kyokusuien*. Harunobu incorporated a classical *waka* poem composed by Fujiwara no Ari'ie 藤原有家 (1155-1216) that is inscribed on the image:

風俗四季歌仙 弥生

けふといへば 岩間によどむ 盃を 待たぬ空まで 花に酔ふらん

(*Fūzoku shiki kasen Yayoi*)

<i>kefu to iheba</i>	When it says “today,”
<i>ihama ni yodomu</i>	even the sky that does not
<i>sakadzuki wo</i>	wait for the wine cup that
<i>matanu sora sahe</i>	pauses between the rocks
<i>hana ni wefuran</i>	is drunk with flowers. ¹²⁸

In the image there are two young women dressed in contemporary costumes on a vermilion carpet, which is typically used for a flower-viewing picnic. A *wakashu* composing a poem is also included in the background. This composition obviously inspired Shunman in his version of the same theme. More importantly, Shunman was strongly influenced by the classicism of Harunobu, who successfully reconstructed classical themes in contemporary settings.

Nevertheless, Shunman added *kokugaku* ideology to Harunobu’s classicism and created a new aesthetic value system. Besides *kyuokusuien*, Shunman produced the classical theme of *Mutamagawa* 六玉川, or *Six Jewel Rivers*.¹²⁹ A version of *Mutamagawa* (figure 4. 22) housed in the British Museum is executed in *benigirai-e* 紅嫌い絵, a mode of visual expression that uses exclusively subtle colors – purples and greys – and avoids bright colors such as red. The reduced color tone of *benigirai-e*, which contrasts with Harunobu’s bright color application, had been understood by earlier modern scholars as a consequence of the Kansei Reform 寛政の改革 (1787-93) that restricted the conduct as well as the cultural activity of the people.¹³⁰ However, John Carpenter has pointed out that Shunman had produced ukiyo-e prints in the mode of *benigirai-e* prior to the enforcement of the Kansei Reform, and thus his preference for a

subtle color application was developed as an expression of the noble *kokugaku* aesthetic.¹³¹ While depicting contemporary figures, this series indicates his depth of understanding and aspiration for classical subjects.

Shunman's interest in classicism was not limited to Japanese culture but also extended to Chinese culture. For instance, the image of *Gensō Yō Kihi Yūroku zu* 玄宗楊貴妃遊樂図 (*Emperor Xuanzhong and Yang Guifei Enjoying Themselves*; figure 4. 23), now housed in the Museum of Fine Art, Boston and made between the end of Tenmei 天明 (1781-89) and the beginning of Kansei 寛政 (1789-1801) eras, illustrates an episode from Tang Chinese poetry, *Changhengge* 長恨歌 (Jp. *Chogonka* or *the Song of Everlasting Sorrow*) by Bai Juyi 白居易 (Jp. Haku Kyōi; 772–846), which was well known in Japan since the Heian period. In common depictions of this episode, the two main figures are adorned in Tang Chinese costumes and are usually positioned next to each other, as Yang Guifei plays a *yokobue* 横笛, or flute. In this image, Shunman dresses the figures in contemporary Edo attire and has them playing the *shamisen* 三味線, a string instrument, instead of a flute. The palace is depicted in the Chinese style, but there is a sign that reads “Komeikan” 鼓鳴館 (palace of the hand drum's sound) under the eaves. A bamboo blind resembles those that hang at the brothels in the Yoshiwara district, and the background is represented in a style that is a mixture of Chinese and Japanese landscapes. According to Tanaka Tatsuya, Shunman was also a *kibyōshi* 黄表紙 writer who wrote a novel entitled *Ikoku demise Yoshiwara* 異国出見世吉原, in which he reconstructed the palace of Qin Shin Huandi 秦始皇帝 as a Japanese brothel's show window.¹³² The present point is a visualized version of such a *kibyōshi* novel; the great

detail is based on his literary imagination. The examples of *Six Jewel Rivers* and *Emperor Xuanzhong and Yang Guifei* reveal how well Shunman comprehended both Japanese and Chinese classical themes.

Kyokusuien and the Kokugaku Movement

In this chapter, I have examined how the nativized *kyokusuien* visual tradition, which was often thought to have continued uninterrupted after its establishment in the Heian period, was actually reinvented in the mid-eighteenth-century late Edo period, when artists and their patrons were seeking new ways of portraying a social event that was reflective of their own lives. Although the knowledge and practice of *kyokusuien* were imported from China in the Nara period, which was expanded on by those well-versed in *waka* poetry in the Heian period, its visual representation was formulated only after the “sinified” Orchid Pavilion Gathering images became popularized among townspeople. As soon as Orchid Pavilion Gathering images were introduced in Japan, they were modified for a native environment first by the Kano, and then, by the town painters, including the literati and Maruyama painters. Based on these Orchid Pavilion images Tsukioka Settei and Kubo Shunman developed *fūzokuga* adaptations of *kyokusuien*. One type of *fūzokuga kyokusuien* depicts the ritual performance with a Heian classical courtly background, while in the other type it is conducted by Edo contemporaries and patrons of the pleasure quarters.

In both cases, the invention of a nativized *kyokusuien* visual tradition was motivated by the *kokugaku* (National Learning) movement, which reached its peak in the nineteenth century. Although the *kokugaku* idea was derived from Chinese-based *kogaku*

(ancient study), it was resistant to the then-dominant Confucian and Buddhist ideology and focused instead on Japanese classics. The Japanese of that time were increasingly self-conscious and sought self-identification through artistic expression. Their intricately developed networking system made the knowledge of classical texts available to the town painters — both Settei and Shunman associated with *kokugaku* scholars, writers and poets — in order to reconstruct the glory of bygone days that had seen the social elevation of painters and their patrons. Hence, their *kyokusuien* images were made using the combined knowledge of classical literature, *waka* poetry, as well as the annual- and monthly-events paintings that were the major elements of the *yamato-e* tradition. Further, the *fūzokuga* versions of *kyokusuien* encoded the shared ideology of proto-nationalism, which instigated the restoration movement that eventually overthrew the Tokugawa regime.¹³³

Notes:

¹ See Eric Hobsbawm, “Introduction: Inventing Traditions” in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed., Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1.

² There are many different translations of *kokugaku* and definitions of the *kokugaku* movement. In this thesis, I prefer to use “National Learning,” which is the less politically burdened term suggested by John Carpenter. I also make use of a particular definition of *kokugaku*, “study of our country,” employed by Susan Burns to differentiate the new

intellectual practice from *kangaku* 漢学 “Chinese studies.” See John Carpenter, “Textures of Antiquarian Imagination: Kubo Shunman and the *Kokugaku* Movement” *The Commercial and Cultural Climate of Japanese Printmaking*, ed. Amy Reigle Newland, (Amsterdam: Hotei Publishing, 2004), 104; see also Susan Burns, *Before the Nation: Kokugaku and the Imagining of Community in Early Modern Japan*, (New York: Duke University Press, 2003), 2.

³ Ralph Linton, “Nativistic Movements,” *American Anthropology*, XLV, (1943): 230.

⁴ On the conscious attempt to imagine community in order to construct nationhood before the Meiji Restoration, see Burns, *Before the Nation*, which draws on Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

⁵ Maruyama Masao, *Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 143.

⁶ Peter Nosco, *Remembering Paradise* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 230-232; Mark McNally, *Proving the Way: Conflict and Practice in the History of Japanese Nativism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005), 1 and 83.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ McNally, *Proving the Way*, 75; Carpenter, “Textures of Antiquarian Imagination,” 77.

⁹ Mark Teeuwen, “Kokugaku vs. Nativism,” review article, *Monumenta Nipponica* 61:2 (2006): 227.

¹⁰ I follow the definition of “classicism” given by Melanie Trede who suggests that “the very idea of classicism is a powerful ideological construct and that classicism is a veritable twin to cannon formation,” and offer these as the primary reasons for the

adaptation of classical themes. Elizabeth Lillehoj, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Classicism in Japanese Painting, 1600-1700*, (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2004), 22.

¹¹ According to Takeda Tsuneo, *fūzokuga* sprouted from the soil of the *yamato-e* tradition soon after the Ōnin Civil War (1467-77). It flourished as a genre, however, in the early sixteenth-century Momoyama period. Takeda Tsuneo, *Kinsei shoki fūzokuga, Nihon no bijutsu*, no.20 (1967): 20. The term *fūzokuga* was coined by William Anderson (1842-1900), when the entire notion of Japanese art history was constructed based on the framework of Western art historical. At this stage, *fūzokuga* was understood as *ukiyo-e* and was equivalent to “genre painting” in Western art. This definition of *fūzokuga* excluded *kinsei shoki fūzokuga* 初期風俗画 which was found in paintings such as *rakuchū rakugaizu* 洛中洛外. For interpretations of the term, see Princess Akiko of Mikasa, “‘Fūzokuga’ Revisited: Terminological Issues in Japanese Art History,” *Fūzoku kaiga no bunkagaku: toshi wo utsusu media*, (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Press, 2009), 277-300.

¹² *Kōjien* 広辞苑, Fourth edition, Ni'imura Izuru 新村出 ed. (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1991), 681.

¹³ As recorded in *Liyizhi* 礼儀志 (*The Archive of Decorum*) in *Hou Hanshu* 後漢書 (The Book of Later Han Dynasity) and *Jinshu* 晉書 (The Book of Jin) in China, as well as in *Segenmondō* 世諺問答 (1663), published in Japan. The practice of the spring purification ritual on the third day of the third month is said to have originated in the Western Zhou 西周 dynasty (1046-256 BCE), and was already an established event by the Eastern Han 東漢 dynasty (22-195). See “Sangatsu” in *Segenmondō* (Tokyo: Kokugakuin University Press, 1909), 33-36.

¹⁴ See Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋轍次, *Dai kanwa jiten* 大漢和詞典 (*Great Chinese-Japanese Dictionary*) Vol.8 (Tokyo: Daishukan, 1976), 483; and also see *Hanyu dacidian* 漢語大詞典 (*Chinese Terminology Dictionary*), Vol.1 (Shanghai: Hanyu Dacidian Press, 1988), 1379.

¹⁵ Burns, *Before the Nation*, 4.

¹⁶ Yasumura Toshinobu 安村敏信, “Gairai bunka to jūkyū seiki zenki no Kyoto gadan,” 外来文化と十九世紀前期の京都画壇 Sasaki Jōhei 佐々木丞平, ed. *Kyoto gadan no jūkyū seiki*, 京都画壇の十九世紀 vol. 2 *Bunka/Bunsei ki* 文化文政期 (Kyoto: Dōhōsha 同朋社, 1994): 169-177.

¹⁷ Nishimura Nantei was one of the best disciples of Maruyama Ōkyo 円山応挙 (1733-1795): Komai Genki 駒井源琦; Nagasa Rosetsu 長沢蘆雪; Yamaato Kakurei 山跡鶴嶺; Mori tetsuzan 森徹山; Yoshimura Kōkei 吉村孝敬; Yamaguchi Soken 山口素絢; Ō Bunmei 奥文鳴; Nissen 日遷; Nishimura Nantei; and Watanabe Nangaku 渡辺南岳. For more information regarding the Ōkyo’s disciples, see Sasaki Jōhei and Sakaki Masako, *Maruyama Ōkyo kenkyū* 円山応挙研究 (Tokyo: Chuō kōron bijutsu shuppan, 1996), 46.

¹⁸ Whether or not Taiga studied under the guidance of Mitsuyoshi is uncertain, but his painting subjects and techniques indicate that he was once trained in the Tosa School. Tsunoda Kyūka, *Kinsei sōgo* (published in 1868; reproduced in Tokyo: Yunima Shobō, 1988).

¹⁹ Yoshizawa Chu, *Nihon nanga ronkō*, (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1977), 242.

²⁰ This work is housed in the Michigan University Museum. See Takeda Tsuneo, *Nihon kaiga to saiji –keibutsugashiron* 日本絵画と歳時—景物画史論 (Tokyo: Perikansha, 1990), 140-143.

²¹ Idemitsu Sachiko, “Ike Taiga ga egaita toshi keikan to fūzoku hyōgen” *Fūzoku kaiga no bunkagaku: toshi wo utsusu media* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 2009), 153.

²² This painting is housed in the Shiga Biwako Bunka-kan 滋賀県立琵琶湖文化館.

²³ Settei also produced a *shunga* 春画 version of the *kyokusuien* image to illustrate the third month in *Shin dōji ōrai banse takara kagami* 新童児往来万世宝鑑, located in the Kokusai Nihon bunka kenkyū center 国際日本文化研究センター [International Research Center for Japanese Studies].

²⁴ Settei was born in Hino Ōtani 日野大谷 of the Ōmi 近江 region (present-day Shiga Prefecture). His family name was Kida 木田, his given name Masanobu 昌信, his pseudonym Daikei 大溪, and his artist-names were Rojinsai 露仁斎, Tōi 桃漪, Kindō 錦童 and Shinten’ō 信天翁. For a long period early in his career he used the name Tsukioka Tange 月岡丹下.

²⁵ Both records provide evidence that Settei was born in the eleventh year of Kyōhō 享保 (1726). There is no new information found to change his date of death. Hence, as it is recorded in *Keiho gafu* 敬輔画譜, which was compiled by the grandson of Takada Keiho 高田敬輔, Settei died in the sixth year of Tenmei 天明 (1786) at the age sixty one. See, Yamamoto Yukari, “Tsukioka Settei/ Isoda Koryūsai ra he no sōi junin ni tsuite: Onmuro

Onki ni kansuru hōkoku, 月岡雪鼎・磯田湖龍齋等への僧位叙任について— 御室御記に関する報告—, *Ukiyo-e geijutsu* 浮世絵芸術, Vol. 132 (1999): 17-25.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Tanaka Tatsuya, “Tsukioka Settei to sono monha 月岡雪鼎とその門葉,” *Nikuhitsu ukiyo-e 9, Sukenobu/ Settei* (Tokyo: Shūeisha, 1982), 136-9; see also, Matsudaira Susumu 松平進, “Fūzokuga,” *Kinsei Osaka gadan* (Kyoto: Dōhōsha shuppan, 1983).

²⁸ Nakamachi Keiko 仲町啓子 “Ukiyo-e ga kioku shita ‘Ise Monotatari-e’” 浮世絵が記憶した 伊勢物語絵 *Jissen joshi daigaku bungakubu kiyō* 実践女子大学文学部紀要, Vol. 41 (March, 1999), 169. Translated in English by Henry Smith and Miriam Wattles, “Ukiyo-e Memories of *The Tales of Ise*” in *Impressions* (2000).

²⁹ *Nihon shoki, Koji ruien* 古事類苑, *Saijibu* 歳時部 15 (first compiled and published in 1896-1914; reproduced by Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbun-kan, 1981), 1080; the practice of “A Party at a Meandering Stream” is discussed in the *Nenjū gyōji hishō* 年中行事秘抄, which refers to *Kanshoshi* 漢書志, located in International Research Center for Japanese Studies; *Segen mondō* 世諺問答 also mentions a party at a winding stream. *Segen mondō* (Tokyo: Kokugakuin University Press, 1909), 35.

³⁰ *Nihon shoki, Koji ruien, Saijibu* 15, 1080.

³¹ *Nihon shoki* is the second oldest book of classical Japanese history, compiled in 720 under the supervision of Prince Toneri 舍人皇子 with his assistant, Ōe no Yasumaro 大江安万呂 (?-723). Since it starts from mythological accounts of the founding of Japan,

the records included are historically doubtful. See Tōyama Mitsuo 遠山美都男, *Nihon shoki no yomikata* 日本書紀の読み方 (Tokyo: Kōdansha gendai shinsho, 2004).

³² *Shōmu, Zoku Nihongi Vol. 10, Koji ruien, Saijibu 15*, 1081.

³³ *Kanmu, Zoku Nihongi Vol. 40, Koji ruien, Saijibu 15*, 1082.

³⁴ Anonymous, in *Kaifūsō*, Kojima Noriyuki 小島憲之, ed., *Kaifūsō, Bunka shūrei shū* 文華秀麗集, *Honchō bunsui* 本朝文粹 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1964), 120.

³⁵ *Saigūki* (date unknown) is a ritual guidebook compiled and edited by Saigū Sadaijin Minamoto no Taka'aki 西宮左大臣源高明 in the Heian period. It can be also read as *Seikyūki* or *Saikyūki*. See Sekiguchi Chikara 関口力 *Sekkan jidai bunkashi kenkyū* 撰関時代文化史研究 (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 2007), 170-174.

³⁶ *Chūyūki, Koji ruien, Saijibu 15*, 1086.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Ōtomo Yakamochi, *Man'yōshū* 万葉集, Vol.19, 4153: 750, “Ōtomo no Yakamochi no yakata utage uta sanshu” 大伴家持之館宴歌三首, *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, 新日本古典文学大系 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店, 1999).

³⁹ *Nenju gyōji hishō* was anonymously compiled in the Kamakura period and is located in the Waseda University Library. Based on earlier texts, it records various courtly events, such as *kyokusuien*. See Kubota Jun 久保田淳, “Waka/renka ni okeru shiki no funbutsu keibutsu” 和歌・連歌における四季の風物・景物 *Nenju Gyoji* 年中行事, *Kinsei fuzoku zufu* 近世風俗図譜, Vol. 1 (Tokyo: Shogakukan, 1983), 131.

⁴⁰ *Sangatsu mikka kishishō kyokusuien waka* 三月三日紀師匠曲水宴和歌 (The *Anthology of Kyokusuien Waka of the Third day of the Third Month*) compiled in 901, is often considered to be forgery. (Reproduced in *Gun shorui jū* 群書類従, *Waka-bu* 和歌部 Vol. 11 (Tokyo: Zoku *Gun shorui jū kansekai* 続群書類従完成会, 1959); See also Kubota, “Waka/ renka ni okeru shiki no fūbutsu/ keibutsu,” 131.

⁴¹ Composed by Ōe no Chisato included in *Sangatsu mikka kishishō kyokusuien waka*, *ibid.*

⁴² Composed by Sakanoue no Korenori included in *Sangatsu mikka kishishō kyokusuien waka*, *ibid.* It is also collected in *Shin kokin waka shū* 新古今和歌集, 152.

⁴³ Composed by Tachibana no Tamenaka, in *Tachibana Tamenaka ason shū* 橘為仲朝臣集 (Reproduced by Yoshimura Tomoe 好村友江 and Nakajima Mariko 中嶋真理子 in *Tachibana ason shū zenshaku* 橘為仲朝臣集全釈 (Tokyo: Kazama shobō 風間書房, 1998); see also Kubota, “Waka/ renka ni okeru shiki no fūbutsu/ keibutsu,” 131.

⁴⁴ Anonymous, *Gō no Sochi shu* 江師集, See Kubota, “Waka/ renka ni okeru shiki no fūbutsu/ keibutsu,” 131.

⁴⁵ Composed by Chōken shōjō 澄憲僧正 (Chief Priest Chōken, 1126-1203) included in *Tsuki mōde waka shū* (*Anthology of Waka Composed at the Monthly Ritual*); see Kubota, “Waka/ renka ni okeru shiki no fūbutsu/ keibutsu,” 132.

⁴⁶ Composed by Raien Hōshi 頼円法師 (Monk Raien, dates unknown), *ibid.*

⁴⁷ According to footnote given by Yamaguchi and Kubo, a word “*sakadzuki*” is interpreted as “*saka* (third) *dzuki* (moon),” and then, the light is linked to moonlight.

Composed by a *nyōbō* 女房, compiled by Fujiwara no Yoshitsune as poem no.153 in *Six*

Hundred Round Waka Contest. Yamaguchi Akiho 山口明穂 and Kubota Jun, eds.,
Roppyaku ban uta awase 六百番歌合, *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, Vol. 38 (Tokyo:
Iwanami shoten, 1998), 59.

⁴⁸ Composed by Fujiwara no Teika, included as poem no. 147 in *Six Hundred Round Waka Contest*, *ibid*, 58.

⁴⁹ Okami Masao 岡見正雄, ed. *Gukanshō* Vol. 6, *Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, Vol 68 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1977).

⁵⁰ According to *Kokon chomonjū* 古今著聞集 compiled by Tachibana no Narisue 橘成季 (early 13th century), Fujiwara no Teika sent a poem to express his condolences to Fujiwara no Ietaka 藤原家隆. *Kokon chomonjū*, vol. 13, 21, 466, reproduced in *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei* vol. 84; Kubota, “Waka ni okeru shiki no fubutsu/ keibutsu,” 132.

⁵¹ Yamashita Shigetami 山下重民, “*Kyokusuien: Jinji mon*” 人事門 *Fūzoku gahō* 風俗画報 Vol.69 (March 1892): 2-6.

⁵² Like his father, Sessai chose contemporary themes earlier in his career but began to paint classical themes after he received the title of Hōgen. Nishigaki Kaori 西垣香, “Tsukioka Sessai ni kansuru ikkosatsu,” 月岡雪斎に関する一考察—関西大学図書館所蔵の 十二ヶ月図屏風 をめぐって *Kansai daigaku tetsugaku* Vol. 22 関西大学哲学 (March 2003): 195-228; Akita Tatsuya, “Tsukioka Sessai hitsu ‘Kyokusuien-zu’,” *Toyonaka-shi shi* Vol. 6, *Bijutsu*, Toyonaka-City (2005): 281-283; Kazuko Kameda-Madar, “Fūzoku ‘Kyokusuien-zu’ no shisō to henyō: Tsukioka Sessai to Kubo Shunman o rei to shite,” 風俗 曲水宴図 の思想と変容—月岡雪斎と窪俊満を例として—

Fūzokukaiga no bunnkagaku, Matsumoto Ikuyo and Idemitsu Sachiko, eds. (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 2009), 243-273.

⁵³ Yamamoto Yukari 山本ゆかり, “Tsukioka Settei shiron: koten wo meguru kaiga seisaku no saikentō,” 月岡雪鼎試論—古典をめぐる絵画制作の再検討 *Bijutsushi* 美術史 155, Vol.LIII, No.1 (2003): 155.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 164.

⁵⁵ Taji Hitsuo 多治比郁夫, Nakano Mitoshi 中野三敏, ed., *Tōdai Edo Hyakka-butsu; Zaitsu kiji; Kana sesetsu* 当代江戸百化物 ; 在津紀事 ; 仮名世説, *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei* Vol. 97 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2000).

⁵⁶ Yamamoto “Tsukioka Settei shiron,” 164.

⁵⁷ Okuda Mototsugu, *Ryōkō yowa*, published in Osaka by Nishida Rihei, et al., in the first year of Meiwa (1764) 大阪 西田理兵衛等 明和元 刊, Tanimura Collection, Kyoto University Library.

⁵⁸ *Tsukinami-e: jūnikagetsu no fūbutsushi* 月次絵—十二ヶ月の風物詩 [*Tsukinami-e (Picture of Monthly Subjects): Scenes of the Twelve Months*], exhibition catalogue (Kyoto: The Museum of Modern Art, Shiga 滋賀県立近代美術館 and the Kyoto Shinbun Newspaper Co. Ltd. 京都新聞社, 1995), 174-175.

⁵⁹ Yamamoto “Tsukioka Settei shiron,” 166.

⁶⁰ Both *nenjū gyōji-e* and *tsukinami-e* are of the *yamato-e* tradition. Originally, the topics in *nenjū gyōji-e* depicted only human activities without natural phenomena. Examples besides *kyokusuien* include *kemari* 蹴鞠 (kickball), *kake yumi* 賭弓 (archery competition), or *daikyō* 大饗 (great music and dance party). Takeda Tsuneo 武田恒夫, “Tsukinami-e

to sono keifu,” 月次絵とその系譜 *Tsukinami-e: jūnikagetsu no fūbutsushi* 月次絵—十二ヶ月の風物詩 [*Tsukinami-e (Picture of Monthly Subjects): Scenes of the Twelve Months*], exhibition catalogue (Kyoto: The Museum of Modern Art, Shiga 滋賀県立近代美術館 and the Kyoto Shinbun Newspaper Co. Ltd. 京都新聞社, 1995), 9.

⁶¹ Takeda Tsuneo articulates the characteristics of *nenju gyoji-e* and *tsukinami-e*, both of which depict the annual events of twelve months. On one hand, the *nenju-gyoji* were human activities without involving the natural phenomena. For instance, *kyokusuien*, *kemari* (kick ball), and *tori awase* (cock-fighting) were all performed in the third month, but those events could have been performed anytime of the year since things necessary to perform these festivals, meandering stream, ball, chickens are always available regardless to the season. It was people’s choice to designate certain months to perform those festivals. On the other hand, *tsukinami* refer to the natural phenomena, and also human activities that involve natural phenomena. *Komatsu-biki*, for instance, requires the pine shoot, which is available in the first month. Irises blossom only in the fifth month, so that its festival has to be in the fifth month. Chrysanthemums blossom only in the ninth month, so it is celebrated in *chōyō* in that month. People can not decide which months to perform these events, but nature does. In this sense, nature regulates the *tsukinami* events. However, these terms became to be used more interchangeably in the Edo period. See Takeda, “*Tsukinami-e to sono keifu*,” 10.

⁶² Takeda Tsuneo, *Nihon kaiga to saiji: keibutsugashiron*, 135-6.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ *Tsukinami-e: jūnikagetsu no fūbutsushi*, 7-40.

⁶⁵ Yamamoto suggests the Settei's production attitude towards the annual events *byōbu*, especially reflects his relationship with Murata Haru'umi 村田春海 (1746-1811), a *kokugaku* scholar, who was a disciple of Kamo no Mabuchi.

⁶⁶ Melanie Trede, "Terminology and Ideology," 22.

⁶⁷ Tanaka Totsugen was born in Nagoya, and is identified by his given name Toshi 敏, and his artist-names, Chiō 痴翁, Tokuchū 得中, Kafu kyūshi 過不及子. He moved to Kyoto and studied painting under Tosa Mitsusada 土佐光貞. See Nakamura Mizuo 中村 溪男 *Reizei Tamechika to fukko yamato-e* 冷泉為恭と復古大和絵, *Nihon no bijutsu* vol.2 no. 261 (Tokyo: Shibundō, 1988), 17.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Kano Eigaku was an adopted son of Eishun. He is known by his other names, Taisuke 泰助, Kōrei 公嶺, Sanryō 山梁, Bansui 晩翠, and Datsuan 脱庵. See Matsumoto Naoko 松本直子, *Kano Eigaku no kenkyū: Yōshiki shentaku no ronri*, 狩野永岳の研究—様式 選択の論理 (PhD Diss., Dōshisha University, 2007).

⁷⁰ The Kyo-Kano family had a close connection to Buddhist temples and shrines, who were owners of classical works, such as *Hōnen Shōnin eden* 法然上人絵伝 (Nishi Honganji 西本願寺) and *Nayotake monogatari* 奈代竹物語 (Kotohira Shrine 金刀比羅宮). Nakamura, *Reizei Tamechika to fukko yamato-e*, 40-41.

⁷¹ In 1850, Tamechika was adopted by the aristocratic Okada family 岡田家 and thereafter used the surnames of Okada and Sugawara. Thus, he is also known as Okada Tamechika. See Nakamura, *Reizei Tamechika to fukko yamato-e*, 19.

⁷² This handscroll is housed in the Hosomi Museum of Art, *ibid.*

⁷³ *Tsukinami-e: jūnikagetsu no fūbutsushi*, 173.

⁷⁴ Nakamura, *Reizei Tamechika to fukko yamato-e*, 22

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ Sakai Tada'aki was *Kyoto shoshidai* 京都所司代 (a head of shogunal deputy in Kyoto) and a collector of classical arts. Tamechika borrowed the *Ban daïagon ekotoba* 伴大納言絵詞 from his collection for study, and painted the *kyokusuien* as return. Uemura Wadō 植村和堂, "Fukko yamato-e to Reizei Tamechika," 復古大和絵と冷泉為恭 *Works of Reizei Tamechika and revived Yamato-e school from Uyemura Wadō Collection* (Tokyo: Nezu Institute of Fine Arts, 1993), 46-51.

⁷⁷ The revolutionary movement to overthrow the Tokugawa shogunate reached a climax when the Satsuma-Chōshū Alliance was formed two years after Tamechika's assassination. Nakamura, *Reizei Tamechika to fukko yamato-e*, 17-18.

⁷⁸ Komatsu Shigemi 小松茂美, *Nenjū gyōji emaki, Nihon no emaki Vol 8*, (Tokyo: Chuo koronsha, 1987), 1.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ *Kisetsu o iwau Kyo no Gosseku: Shinshun, Hina-matsuri, Tango, Tanabata, Chōyō*. 季節を祝う京の五節句—新春・雛祭り・端午・七夕・重陽 [*Celebration of the Seasons the Five Seasonal Festivals in Kyoto*] exhibition catalogue (Kyoto: The Museum of Kyoto, 2000), 162.

⁸¹ Hōitsu interacted with various intellectuals such as Ōta Nampo 大田南畝 (1749-1823); Tani Bunchō 谷文晁 (1763-1841), and Kameda Bōsai 亀田鵬斎 (1753-1826), who were

active members of *haikai* and *kyōka*. See *Edo no bunjin koryuroku, Kameda Bōsai to sono nakamatachi* 江戸の文人交流—亀田鵬斎とその仲間たち, exhibition catalogue (Tokyo: Setagaya-kuritsu kyodo shiryokan, 1998); Beerens, *Friends, Acquaintances, Pupils and Patrons*, 134.

⁸² Tamamushi Toshiko, “Gosseku-zu no shō,” 五節句図の章 *Toshi no naka no e: Sakai Hōitsu no egoto to sono efekuto* 都市の中の絵—酒井抱一の絵事とその遺境^{エフェクト} (Tokyo: Buryukke ブリュッケ, 2004), 469-471.

⁸³ “Exhibition entries,” *Kisetsu o iwau Kyo no Gosseku*, 162-179.

⁸⁴ Joshua Mostow and Royall Tyler, *The Ise Stories: Ise Monogatari* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2010), 138-139.

⁸⁵ Kobayashi Tadashi, ed., *An Enduring Vision: 17th to 20th Century Japanese Painting from the Gitter-Yelen Collection*, (New Orleans: New Orleans Museum of Art, 2003), 160 and 273.

⁸⁶ In this sense, I consider the reduced visual elements function to be signs, and thus, apply the literary theory that articulates that the visual elements do not always transmit the meanings of that picture. While metaphors link with semantic similarity, metonymy corresponds with semantic contiguity. Thus, metaphor relates to elaboration of language, and in contrast, metonymy gives multiple meanings to an expression. The metonymical expression suggests the cause by the effect, the contents by the container, the person by his physical attribution, and so forth. For instance, the crown (= king), the bottle (= wine), fur and feather (= beasts and birds). It can transmit the message properly only on the condition that the receivers of the message share common knowledge with the sender

of message. See Roman Jakobson, “The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles,”

Fundamentals of Language (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1956).

⁸⁷ *Kokuhō kakitsubata-zu* 国宝杜若花図, exhibition catalogue (Tokyo: Nezu Museum of Art, 2005), 107.

⁸⁸ Fujiwara no Ietaka, Tran. Joshua Mostow, *Pictures of the Heart: The Hyakunin Isshu in Word and Image* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996), 431.

⁸⁹ Mostow and Tyler, *The Ise Stories*, 139.

⁹⁰ Takida Tsuneo 武田恒夫, “Kindai Osaka gadan to sono jidai kubun” 近代大坂画壇とその時代区分, *Kinsei Osaka gadan* 近世大坂画壇, Osaka Municipal Museum of Art 大阪市立美術館, ed. (Kyoto: Dōhōsha shuppan 同朋舎出版, 1983). On the Kyō-Kano, see Chapter Two of this thesis.

⁹¹ This idea leads back to the theory of Nakamachi in “Ukiyo-e ga kioku shita ‘Ise Monogatari-e’” (March, 1999): 169-194.

⁹² Shimazu Yoshitaka 島津吉貴, the twenty-first generation head of Shimazu family in Kyushu, for instance, gave orders in 1736 to construct the Sengen-en 仙巖園 garden with an artificial meandering stream based on the Chinese garden style, practicing *kyokusuien* in emulation of Wang Xizhi. See *Kagoshima ken shiryoshu* 鹿児島県史料集 Vol. 34, Kagoshimaken shiryō kankōkai 鹿児島県史料刊行会 (1994).

⁹³ I have chosen the phrase “cult of *kyokusuien*” to echo “Cult of the Orchid Pavilion” as used by Richard Strassberg, *Inscribed Landscape: Travel Writing from Imperial China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 63. The sinified drinking and poetry parties, which were more conscious about the Orchid Pavilion “original,” were also

conducted during the same period mainly among the literati leaders such as Minagawa Kien and the Kontonshisha circle.

⁹⁴ Examples of this type of social gathering modeled after the Orchid Pavilion can be seen earlier in *Posojong* 鮑石亭 of Silla, a Korean Kingdom of 57 B.C.E. to 935 C.E., as well as in the Song dynasty technical manual *Yingzao fashi* 營造法式. Jong Phil Park, *Ensnaring the Public Eye*, 178.

⁹⁵ Yuan Hongdao, translated by Jong Phil Park, *Ensnaring the Public Eye*, 179.

⁹⁶ Suiga koji 醉霞居士, “Sakadzuki nagashi” 盃流し, *Fūzoku gahō* Vol. 137 (Feb. 1889): 11.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁹⁸ See, Asano Shūgō 浅野秀剛, “Fūryū no zōkei, nazoraeru sosa: ‘mitate’ to ‘yatsushi’ to sono shūhen” in *Zuzō no imi* 図像の意味, *Kōza Nihon bijutsushi*, Vol. 3, (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 2005), 205-238; see also Timothy T. Clark, “Mitate-e: Some Thoughts, and a Summery of Recent Writings” *Impressions* no. 19 (1997): 7-28.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ See, Tanaka Tatsuya 田中達也 “Kubo Shunman no kenkyū” 窪俊満の研究, *Ukiyo-e geijutsu* 浮世絵芸術 Vol. 109 (1993): 16.

¹⁰¹ The stage name of Kikunojō was Fujiya 富士屋 or Hamamuraya 浜村屋; his *haikai* pennames, other than Rokō, were Tamagawa 玉川 and Sen’nyo 仙女. He was born in Kyoto the second son of Ichiyama Shichijūrō 市川七十七郎, the founder of the Ichiyama school of Japanese dance. He moved to Edo to join the *kabuki* theater troop led by Segawa Kikunojō II, and inherited his mentor’s name becoming Segawa Kikunojō III in

1773. Although he was an *oyama* 女形, an actor who plays female roles, he became head of the troop in 1808. See Fujita Hiroshi 藤田洋, *Kabuki handbook* 歌舞伎ハンドブック, the third edition (Tokyo: Sanseido, 2006).

¹⁰² Trans. Wu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, 44-45.

¹⁰³ The theater name of Ichikawa Danjūrō V was Naritaya 成田屋, his *haikai* poetry names were Umewarabe 梅童, Danjogawa 男女川, Mimasu 三升 and Shirozaru 白猿, and his crest was *mimasu* 三升 (Three Squares). He was born a son of Ichikawa Danjūrō IV in Edo and was trained by family members. Using the name Ichikawa Yukizō 市川幸蔵, he debuted in 1745 at the age of four, and after training earned great fanfare from the public and eventually inherited his father's name, Danjūrō, in 1757. See Fujita, *Kabuki handbook*, 66.

¹⁰⁴ Nijima Izuru, ed., *Kōjien, The forth edition* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1991), 1988.

¹⁰⁵ The play is based on a true story, which is about the love-induced double suicide of the courtesan Agemaki 揚巻, who resided in Shimabara 島原, a licensed red light quarter in Kyoto, and a merchant, Yorozuya Sukeroku 萬屋助六. This story was adapted as *Sukeroku sinjū kamiko sugata* 助六心中紙子姿 (*Love Suicide of Sukeroku Adorned in the Paper Dress*) and *Kyō Sukeroku shinjū* 京助六心中 (*Love Suicide of Sukeroku in Kyoto*) by *kamikata kabuki* 上方歌舞伎 or Kabuki Theaters in the Kansai region in 1706. It was Ichikawa Danjuro II who brought the act, which was popular in the Kansai region, to Edo and revised its contents to fit more favorably with his own audiences. He moved

the setting of the act from Shimabara to Yoshiwara 吉原, which was the licensed red light quarter in Edo. See Fujita, *Kabuki handbook*, 167-168.

¹⁰⁶ The Tokugawa *bakufu* designated a pleasure quarter in the Nihon-bashi 日本橋 Bridge neighborhood, and issued licenses to operate legal brothels in 1617. This area was called Yoshiwara 吉原 and flourished for many years. After the great fire of 1657, the *bakufu* relocated the licensed pleasure quarter to near Asakusa 浅草, and called it Shin Yoshiwara (New Yoshiwara). By that time, there were approximately three hundred brothels in this district. Yoshiwara was a separate city within a city that supported three-thousand prostitutes as well as brothel owners, madams, geishas (entertainers), cooks and other servants. See Ishi'i Ryōsuke 石井良助, *Yoshiwara: Edo no Yūkaku no jittai* 吉原—江戸の遊郭の実態, *Chūō kōron shinsho no.141* (Tokyo: Chūō kōron sha, 1967); See also, Timothy Clark, *Ukiyo-e Paintings: In The British Museum* (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992), 15-17.

¹⁰⁷ “*Kyokuchū nenjū gyōji*” 曲中年中行事 *Fūzoku gahō* Vol. 69 (March 1892): 8-9.

¹⁰⁸ Chō'emon 長右衛門 of Takada 高田 was in charge of planting cherry trees on the streets of Naka no machi 仲の町 in Yoshiwara. The height of the cherry trees was adjusted so that they could be viewed from the second floor of the tea houses. The trees were planted on the first day and pulled out on the thirtieth day of the third month annually. Ishi'i Ryōsuke points out that the kabuki play *Sukeroku*, which was first staged in 1742, was received with enthusiasm because the stage set was filled with cherry blossoms and this mirrored the actual view of Yoshiwara. Ishi'i, *Yoshiwara*, 42.

¹⁰⁹ See Katsutomi Shōji 庄司勝富, *Hokō Dōbōgoen* 補講洞房語園 (1720) reproduced in *Zuihitsu bungaku senshū* 随筆文学選集 vol. 5, Kusunose Jun 楠瀬恂, ed. (Tokyo: Shosaisha 書斎社, 1927). According to *Yoshiwara daizen* 吉原大全, the first day, the fifteenth day, the seventeenth day, the eighteenth day and the twenty-eighth day are also designated as *monpi*. Ishi'i, *Yoshiwara*, 47.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Tanaka, “Kubo Shunman no kenkyū (I),” 3.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Carpenter, “Textures of Antiquarian Imagination,” 79

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Tanaka, “Kubo Shunman no kenkyū (I),” 7.

¹¹⁶ “役者絵を描いて人気を得ることを卑しむ傾向は画家一般に見られたが、それは浮世絵師自身にもあり、春信・歌麿などは自らの所業を忘れて、役者絵を描かずと公言している” “Among the Edo painters, there was a general tendency to despise those who gain popularity by producing *yakusha-e*. Even some ukiyo-e designers, such as Harunobu and Utamaro, publicly stated that they wouldn't produce them.” Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ōta Nanpo, *Ichīwa ichigen 2* (originally written in 1775-1822), *Nihon zuihitsu taisei* 日本随筆大成別巻, (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbun kan, 1996).

¹¹⁸ Members of Hakurakuren included: Issetsu Senmai 一節千枚, Yadoya no Meshimori 宿屋飯盛, Tsumuri no Hikari つむりの光, Oboku no Tabibito 於保久旅人, Nashio no Sumorikata 奈潮寿盛方, Osorei no Nagara 於曾礼長良, Imafuku Kitaru 今福来留,

Fuguri no Tsurikata 普栗釣方, Kanjō no Hokanari 勘定外成, Ōhara no Zakone 大原ざ

こね, Fusuma no Aketate 襖明立. Tanaka, “Kubo Shunman no kenkyū (I),” 13.

¹¹⁹ Tanaka, “Kubo Shunman no kenkyū (I),” 12.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Ibid., 13.

¹²² Ibid., 28.

¹²³ *Tanzaku* poem card by Kubo Shunman in 1796, translated by Carpenter, “Textures of Antiquarian imagination,” 90.

¹²⁴ Kobayashi Tadashi 小林忠, “Sōsetsu 総説/ Harunobu” *Ukiyo-e taikai* 浮世絵体系 vol. 2, *Harunobu* (Tokyo: Shūeisha 集英社, 1975), 77.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 81.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 79-80.

¹²⁷ This work is housed in the Tokyo National Museum. Retrieved on February 5, 2011, <http://webarchives.tnm.jp/archives/img/14235>

¹²⁸ The poem is composed by Fujiwara no Ari'ie and compiled by Fujiwara no Yoshitsune as poem no.149 in *The Poetry Match in Six Hundred Rounds*. Yamaguchi Akiho and Kubota Jun, ed. *Roppaku ban uta awase, Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikai*, Vol. 38 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1998).

¹²⁹ *Mutamagawa* was a literary theme based on the *waka* poetry tradition. The ancient *waka* are read in order of: Ide no Tamagawa 井手の玉川 by Fujiwara no Shunzei 藤原俊成; Noji no Tamagawa 野路の玉川 by Minamoto no Toshiyori 源俊頼; Chōfu no Tamagawa 調布の玉川 in *Jūishū* 拾遺集; Mishima no Tamagawa 三島の玉川 by

Sagami 相模; Noda no Tamagawa 野田の玉川 by Priest Nōin 能因法師; Kōya no

Tamagawa 高野の玉川 by Priest Kōbō 弘法大師. Mieko Murase, “The Evolution of *Meisho-e* and the Case of the *Mutamagawa*,” *Orientalia* 26.1 (January 1995): 94-100.

¹³⁰ The Kansei Reform was the second of three reforms enforced during the Tokugawa period in order to improve financial problems. It was conducted by Matsudaira Sadanobu, who strictly controlled public life. The government also restricted *ukiyo-e* painters’ activities. Kitagawa Utamaro, for instance, was arrested for producing an *ukiyo-e* that conveyed political criticism and died shortly after his release from jail. Kondō Fumito 近藤史人, *Utamaro: Teikō no bijinga* 歌麿—抵抗の美人画 (Tokyo: Asahi shinbunsha, 2009), 211-221.

¹³¹ *Benigirai* is discussed in the section of “A Palette of Subtle Colours” by Carpenter, “Textures of Antiquarian imagination,” 78-81.

¹³² Tanaka, “Kubo Shunman no kenkyū (I),” 10.

¹³³ Problems with translating *kokugaku* as nativism have been addressed in an article in *Monumenta Nipponica* (2006) by Mark Teeuwen. Since H. D. Harootunian’s *Things Seen and Unseen: Discourse and Ideology in Tokugawa Nativism* has been so influential, it is still common practice to identify *kokugaku* as nativism. However, it is necessary to reconsider the meanings of each term, and each term’s historical context. As Teeuwen explains, “Nativism, classically defined as the ambition to revive or perpetuate aspects of indigenous culture in response to a perceived threat from other cultures, did not originate with the emergence of *kokugaku*, nor did it expire with the demise of this school in the Meiji period.” Mark Teeuwen, “Kokugaku vs. Nativism” review article, *Monumenta*

Nipponica 61: 2 (2006): 227. In the case of the *kyokusuien* event, this type of “nativization” clearly occurred in the Heian period, as it is recorded in the textual evidence and continue to take a place after the end of *kokugaku* movement.

Chapter Five: Images of the Purification Ritual Reinvented: The Orchid Pavilion Gathering and the Doll Festival

The development of the Orchid Pavilion visual tradition in Japan from its beginnings in the early modern period has formed the bulk of my study; in this chapter, I will reconsider the final stage of the theme's nativization and the circumstances under which it has more recently been taken up. As before, I will examine how this tradition was invented and reinvented to satisfy producers' and consumers' cultural and socio-economic interests as they negotiated individual and group identity formation. Here, however, I will describe how women came to be associated with the Orchid Pavilion Gathering, an exclusive social event that was thought to allow only male participants.¹ I attempt to reveal the hidden visual code in Orchid Pavilion imagery that encouraged women's participation, and explore how the *kyokusuien* tradition became overwhelmed by a girl-centered festival. Toward these ends I begin by reexamining the Orchid Pavilion Gathering's core meaning as a spring purification ritual performed on the third day of the third month.

In order to regulate and control cultural activities, the Tokugawa *bakufu* instituted the observation of *gosekku* 五節句, or the Five Seasonal Festivals, on the five overlapping odd-numbered days of the year.² They were celebrated on the following five days: the seventh day of the first month, the third day of third month, the fifth day of the fifth month, the seventh day of the seventh month, and the ninth day of the ninth month. During the Edo period, the festivals observed on each *gosekku* were unfixed, and there were many different events that took place on each *gosekku*. One of these events,

representing the third month, was *kyokusuien*, which was also designated as *momo no sekku* (桃の節句 the Peach Festival).

As discussed in previous chapters, the first Japanese visualization of the Orchid Pavilion was made by Kano Sansetsu in the seventeenth century and was based on Ming-dynasty ink rubbings. The introduction of Chinese Orchid Pavilion images and the invention of nativized imagery led to the birth of *hina-matsuri* 雛祭 or the Doll Festival, which became the most prominent event for young girls in the late Edo and remains the most familiar festival in contemporary Japan. Owing especially to advertisements by the doll industry, it is commonly believed that the origin of *hina-matsuri* is traceable back to the Heian period (794-1185), which because of its long-lasting peace and cultural prosperity, is considered the golden age of Japanese culture.³ Doll advertisements further suggest how the purification ritual of the Heian period that entailed floating a doll down a river or on the ocean on the first Serpent day of the third month turned into the festival of *hina-matsuri*.

While the custom of *hina-asobi* 雛遊び, or playing dolls, was practiced at all times of the year and has existed since at least the Heian period, the celebration of *hina-matsuri* on the third day of the third month is an Edo invention. Contrary to common perception, the transition between the cultures of *hina-asobi* and *hina-matsuri* was not a linear development. Rather, it involved an extremely complex process of multi-axial evolution that was related to the Orchid Pavilion visual tradition. This chapter is particularly focused on the visual fusion of many distinct purification rituals that stem from the Orchid Pavilion Gathering. In order to contextualize this process of evolution, I

will analyze a wide range of early modern visual and material artifacts, including paintings, prints, textiles and dolls.

The Meaning of Purification Rituals in the Third Month

According to *Segen mondō* 世諺問答 (*Questions and Answers on Proverbial Phrases*), published in Japan in 1663, customary performance of the purification ritual was introduced to ancient Japan by the Chinese.⁴ It was documented in numerous texts in China. For instance, *Lizhi* 禮志 (*The Document of Decorum*) in Fang Xuanling's 房玄齡 (578-648) *Jinshu* 晉書 (*History of Jin Dynasty*) records that,

It was the custom of the Han dynasty that on the third day in the late spring season [the third moon], government employees and common people would celebrate the purification ceremony by the East Creek. They rid themselves of evil by washing off the dirt [that had accumulated through the cold winter].⁵

Also in *Jinshu*, *Shuxue-zhuan* 束皙伝 (*The Biography of Shuxue*) describes the third day of the third month as a day related to women's issue.

During the reign of Zhangdi 章帝 of the Han Dynasty, Chu Zhao 徐肇 of Pingyuan 平原 gave a birth to triplet daughters in the beginning of third month but these newborn babies all died on the third day. People felt it was mysterious, and they performed a purification ritual by floating wine cups down a river. Since then the spring purification ritual has been conducted annually in this region.⁶

As related in this episode, the purification ritual on the third day of the third month originated to protect women at childbirth and their newborn daughters.

In Japan, local social and political agendas meant that the Orchid Pavilion Gathering took a different path of development. The episode was probably brought back by *kentōshi* 遣唐使 (official imperial missions) regularly sent to Tang China in the seventh and eighth centuries.⁷ Orchid Pavilion Gatherings in Japan, imitative of those held in China, have been recorded as early as 720 in *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀. Traces of an artificial meandering stream have been excavated at archaeological sites in Asuka 飛鳥 and Heijōkyō 平城京.⁸ The consort of Emperor Shōmu 聖武天皇 (701-756), Empress Kōmyō 光明皇后 (701-760), was a well-known calligrapher and proponent of the Wang Xizhi style.⁹ Seeing it as a sign of power, Empress Kōmyō established an imperial calligraphic standard based largely on the example of Wang Xizhi. Combined historical evidence such as this demonstrates how the Orchid Pavilion Gathering of Wang Xizhi was perceived as a symbol of social status and was already rooted in Japanese soil in ancient times.

Knowledge of the purification ritual along with other *On 'myōdō* 陰陽道 (divination rituals) was brought back to Japan by Haruzono Tamanari 春苑玉成 (dates unknown), a divination priest, or *kentō on 'myōji* 遣唐陰陽師, who went to Tang China in the ninth century.¹⁰ *Nihon sandai jitsuroku* 日本三代実録 (*The True Record of Three Reigns in Japan*) records that on the third day of the eighth month in 859 Tamanari refashioned the Chinese ritual and its manner of performance into a style more conducive to Japanese customs. In order to perform the riverbank purification ritual (*karin harae* 河臨祓), a client rubbed *hitokata* 人形 (a paper, linen or wooden effigy) against his/her body, and he/she ritualistically breathed on (*ichibu ippun* 一撫一吻) it. After that, a

divination priest floated the effigy down a river.¹¹ This type of ceremony became the most well-established purification ritual other than that of floating wine cups on a stream.

The Significance of Peach Blossoms

As discussed in Chapter Four, the Orchid Pavilion text and the practice of the gathering were introduced to Japan in the Nara period and were nativized through *waka* poetry in the Heian period. The poetic image of flower petals and wine cups floating together was adopted from Chinese texts, but being seasonal attributes, which were extremely important to the pre-existing Japanese tradition, cherry and peach flowers were treated with greater significance. At this stage, the Heian court renewed the practice of the purification ritual and the poetry competition associated with it to demonstrate its own cultural sophistication, which it derived from the prestige of the Chinese Orchid Pavilion model. Although the custom of *kyokusuien* was disrupted in the late Heian period, it was revived by daimyo and wealthy townspeople in the Edo era.

Ike Taiga's Orchid Pavilion warrants a great deal of discussion, but here I would like to point out one of his most remarkable visual innovations: the addition of peach blossoms to the pictorial program.¹² Although the peach is an important symbol in China, it is uncommon in Chinese Orchid Pavilion paintings since the setting described in the *Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering* includes "luxuriant woods and tall bamboo" but has no mention of peach trees. By contrast, after Taiga incorporated it, the peach became the most common pictorial motif in Japanese depictions of the gathering. Taiga was exposed to many Chinese examples of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering theme, both textual and pictorial, and was undoubtedly aware that no peach blossom is mentioned in

the *Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. On what grounds, then, did he so prominently introduce this motif to the depiction of the Orchid Pavilion?

The inclusion of peach blossoms reveals Taiga's knowledge of the Heian *waka* poetry that described floating peach petals along with wine cups down the river.¹³ Through the peach symbolism in relation to *waka*, Taiga incorporated a feminine quality into the Orchid Pavilion theme. His wife Gyokuran was famous not only as a literati artist but also as a *waka* poet, a vocation she honed when she, along with Taiga, was invited to study *waka* with the noble Reizei family 冷泉家.¹⁴ Poetic aptitude was passed down through the women of Gyokuran's family: her grandmother Kaji 梶 (early 18th century) and mother Yuri 百合 (1694-1764) were both accomplished *waka* poets whose respective published works are *Kaji no ha* 梶の葉 (1707) and *Sayuriba* 小百合葉 (1729).¹⁵

Without changing the narrative, Taiga's addition of the peach may have suggested women's participation in the Orchid Pavilion Gathering imagery. Patricia Fister describes the intellectual and cultural activities of women artists and poets who were part of the world inhabited by men.¹⁶ Like Gyokuran, many of them were wives, sisters, or daughters of *bunjin* artists who preferred to pursue a nonconformist lifestyle and did not impose domestic labor on their female counterparts. Having support from *bunjin* husbands or fathers, these women were able to cultivate their talents in art and poetry. Other women *bunjin* artists such as Ema Saikō 江馬細香 (1787-1861), a disciple of Rai San'yō, remained unmarried and focused on their art.¹⁷ Women *bunjin* communities were formed elsewhere and developed talents in different fields. Yanagawa Kōran 梁川紅蘭 (1804-1879) was another *bunjin* poet, who was married to the *bunjin* Yanagawa

Seigen 梁川星巖 (1789-1858) and collaborated with Saikō to publish a *kanshi* anthology.¹⁸ Both Saikō and Kōran were active members of the poetry society Hakuōsha 白鷗社, and were socially well connected with like-minded people. Women's participation in men's literary gatherings have been clearly documented, as in the hanging scroll entitled *Hakuōsha Poetry Society* 白鷗社集会図 (figure 5. 1).¹⁹

Fister also points out that these women's activities were supported by *kokugaku* scholars like Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵 (1697-1769), who instructed forty female disciples.²⁰ *Kokugaku* scholars paid special respect to female prose writers and *waka* poets, since Heian women authors like Murasaki Shikibu were of major importance in establishing the Japanese classical literary tradition, and since women poets had been included in the official *waka* anthologies, starting from the oldest, *Man'yōshū* 万葉集 (*Collection of Ten Thousand Leaves*) of the eighth-century Nara period.²¹ The image of women poets such as Ono no Komachi 小野小町, Ise 伊勢, Akazoemon 赤染衛門, and many more were often represented in ukiyo-e prints in the Edo period. Although most *waka* poems were composed by male poets, knowledge of *waka* was often associated with femininity.²² Nevertheless, many contemporary Edo *waka* poets were high-ranking courtesans of the licensed pleasure quarters, such as Ōhashi 大橋 (dates unknown) of Shimabara 島原.²³ Because of the nature of their profession, they often participated in their clients' literary gatherings. Hence, there may have been demands for adding women's participation to the Orchid Pavilion imagery, and the representation of peach blossoms may have functioned to suggest their presence.

Another aspect of peach symbolism that allowed it to be read as part of a visual code is its use as a sign of longevity and its reference to Xiwangmu 西王母, the Mother Goddess of the West in the Daoist tradition. According to Daoist legend, Xiwangmu dwells in the mythical paradise of the Kunlun Mountains 崑崙山 in a palace surrounded by fairy peach trees that bear fruit once every three thousand years – on the third day of the third month, which is also Xiwangmu’s birthday – and confer immortality upon those who eat the fruit.²⁴ To celebrate this occasion, all the immortals would gather by the meandering water of the Yaochi 瑤池 (Jasper Lake) and celebrate the coming of spring. This festival is called *Pantao Hui* 蟠桃会 (Feast of Peaches).²⁵ Stories of King Mu of Zhou 周穆王 (r. 976-922 BCE, figure 5. 2) and Emperor Wu of Han 漢武帝 (156-87 BCE) visiting Xiwangmu to receive her peaches formed another major painting subject in Japan. The inclusion of peach blossoms in Orchid Pavilion paintings suggests, through a kind of visual code, the presence of Xiwangmu and the unseen participation of women in the gentlemen’s gathering. In this way, Japanese painters after Taiga could include representation of femininity in the Orchid Pavilion without changing the original narrative.

***Kyokusuien* in the Annual Events and the Five Seasonal Festivals**

As mentioned earlier, in the early Edo period neither *kyokusuien* nor the Peach Festival was yet a fixed event celebrated on the third day of the third month. In the *yamato-e* やまと絵 (Japanese painting) tradition each season was represented by many different events; these were depicted in *shiki-e* 四季絵 (pictures of the four seasons), *tsukinami-e* 月次絵 (pictures of monthly events) and *nenchūgyōji-e* 年中行事絵

(pictures of annual events). Among seasonal events on the third day of third month *tori awase* 鶏合せ (or cockfighting) was from the twelfth-century Kamakura period the most commonly depicted (figure 4. 10). Images of cockfighting are included in the *Annual Events* scrolls from the Momoyama (figure 5. 3) and early Edo (figure 5. 4) periods. Although *kyokusuien* was known in classical *waka*, its visual representation did not appear before the eighteenth century.

Fūzokuga versions of *kyokusuien* (figure 4. 1) were pioneered by Tsukioka Settei (1710-1787), the founder of Tsukioka School active in Osaka, including an image produced around 1785 as a part of a folding screen depicting the *Annual Events*. Because there were no existing pictorial models, Settei invented his *kyokusuien* image by drawing from the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing (figure 1. 1) version of the Orchid Pavilion, the same source that inspired Kano Sansetsu a hundred-fifty years earlier. Settei reduced the ink rubbing to a few visual elements – meandering water, poets, and a tree – which then formed the basic pictorial composition of nativized purification rituals in the *Annual Events* screen. This process, in which Settei's association with *kokugaku* scholars inspired him to use classical knowledge in formulating a nativized version of *kyokusuien*, was discussed in Chapter Four.

Earlier in his career, Settei had been actively engaged in the printing industry. In the 1750s, he published a few different illustrated book versions of *The Ise Stories*. Although none of these include the ritual scene of purification, Settei must have been aware that the scene is represented in episode 65. The story tells of how the protagonist hired diviners to perform a purification to rid himself of his passion for a lady.²⁶ Settei

combined this ritual scene from the *Ise* and the Chinese Orchid Pavilion, both of which include the performance of purification, in order to invent a new type of image.

Settei's version provided a model for nineteenth-century painters to reinvent purification ritual imagery. We can see how Sakai Hō'itsu (1761-1828), the leading figure of the Rinpa tradition, was also inspired by Settei's composition. In 1827, Hō'itsu painted the purification ritual theme (figure 4. 12) to represent the third day of the third month, or Peach Festival, in the Five Seasonal Festivals, which was a new cultural phenomenon. When Hō'itsu compiled the *One Hundred Kōrin Pictures* in 1815, he included a picture (figure 4. 13) that again illustrates episode 65, the *Purification Ritual*, from *The Ise Stories*. This image had been derived from Kōrin, who was inspired by Tawaraya Sōtatsu's depiction (figure 4. 15) of the same subject in the seventeenth century.

The work by Kōrin (figure 4. 14) housed in the Hatakeyama Memorial Museum, however, is titled *Ietaka's Purification Ritual*.²⁷ Although, the composition is identical to that of the *Ise* ritual, the title refers to another poem composed by Fujiwara no Ietaka that recalls *minadzuki-barae* 六月祓 or "Six Month Purification" (figure 4. 17).²⁸ This poem also has links to a woman's important event, since it "was written for a screen depicting activities of the twelve months (*tsukinami byōbu*) taken by Fujiwara no Michi'ie's 藤原道家 daughter Junshi 尊子, when she entered court as a consort to Emperor GoHorikawa 後堀河天皇 in 1229."²⁹ The transfer of one composition to another narrative suggests that the image has the potential for many different interpretations. In each of the images just described we can identify the device used for the purification ritual. The paper object standing by the water bank is called *heihaku* 幣帛, and it functioned to purify the

practitioner and to ward off bad spirits.³⁰ The *heihaku* was often replaced by a *katashiro* 形代 (or representative figure), which is also used as a *hitokata* 人形 (effigy).³¹ This type of purification ritual, established by Haruzono Tamanari in the ninth century, involved transferring the disruptive influence into an effigy that was then sent floating down river or out to sea.³²

Purification Rituals with Dolls

When the nativized *kyokusuien* imagery was supported by classical literature, which was promoted by *kokugaku* scholars in the late eighteenth century, it increasingly revealed a conscious reflection on the purification rituals that protected young girls. In *The Tale of Genji*, Chapter 12, *Suma* 須磨, Genji performs a purification ritual (figure 5.5):

On the first day of Serpent that fell on the third day of the third month, an officious companion observed, ‘My lord, this is the day for someone with troubles like yours to seek purification,’ so Genji did ---. He felt a sense of kinship as he watched a large doll being put into a boat and sent floating away.³³

The doll floated by Genji is referred to as “*hitokata*” but instead of a paper or wooden effigy the type of doll described in the text is closer to *amagatsu* 天児.³⁴ Kitamura Tetsurō 北村哲郎 explains that since ancient times dolls were used in magic as effigies for casting a spell or curse on someone or to take impurity away from oneself.³⁵ Because of this common use, *amagatsu*, *hinakata* 雛形, *hitokata* 人形 and *katashiro* 形代 were terms used almost interchangeably.³⁶ However, *amagatsu* and *hōko* 這子 were used to protect young girls from bad luck.³⁷ These dolls were placed near the girl’s pillow in

order to expel evil spirits believed to cause sickness. *Amagatsu* appears more explicitly in the *Usugumo* 薄雲 (Wisps of Cloud) chapter of the *Tale of Genji* to protect little daughter of Lady Akashi 明石の姫君.³⁸

The nurse and an elegant gentlewoman known as Shōshō were the only ones to get in, and they brought the dagger, the godchild [*amagatsu*], and so on with them.

Various nice, younger gentlewomen and page girls rode in the accompanying carriages.³⁹

Amagatsu were usually rubbed against a girl's body, and after she breathed on them, they were floated down a river or to the ocean.⁴⁰ In the Heian period, this purification ritual was most often performed on the third day of the third month as it appears in *The Tale of Genji*, but was also performed at other times of the year.

Because they were meant to be floated away, the dolls were made from wood and linen and had a simple appearance. Although medieval texts record their existence, the only surviving examples of *amagatsu* (figure 5. 6) and *hōko* (figure 5. 7) come from the Edo period.⁴¹ According to *Ruiju meibutsu kō* 類聚名物考, an Edo encyclopedia, a pair of *amagatsu* and *hōko* was set together to form *tachi-bina* 立ち雛 (figure 5. 8).⁴² When *tachi-bina* were formed, they were no longer floated away and they began to be made of more elaborate materials such as silk, brocade, and gold.⁴³ It must be noted that the object that was floated away at the purification ritual in *The Tale of Genji* was an *amagatsu*, and not a *hina*-doll of the *hina-asobi*. Hence, the *tachi-bina* of the Tokugawa period cannot be traced back to the *hina-asobi* of the Heian period.

From Purification Ritual to *Hina-matsuri*

Because of the factors discussed above, *amagatsu* and *hōko*, which were used in purification rituals to protect girls, evolved into *tachi-hina*, and also into *hina*-dolls in the seated position (figure 5. 9). These dolls were arranged into a set to celebrate the *hina-matsuri* on the third day of the third month when the Tokugawa *bakufu* established *gosseku* in the beginning of seventeenth century. The manner of displaying the *hina*-dolls on a stepped platform was an even more recent development and is recorded in various publications for the first time in the eighteenth century. *Hōei karaku hosomi zu* 寶永花洛細見図 (*An Illustrated Guide to Seeing Sites in Kyoto*, figure 5. 10) was published in 1704 and illustrates each of the *gosseku*.⁴⁴ The illustration of the third day of the third month is represented by the scene of the *hina-matsuri*. Behind a pair of seated *hina*-dolls, a pair of *tachi-bina* is depicted on a platform, indicating that those *hina*-dolls, in standing and seated positions, were invented at almost same time. *Ehon yamato warabe* 絵本大和童 (*The Picture Book; Japanese Children*, figure 5. 11), published in 1731,⁴⁵ and *Jokun eiri hina-asobi no ki* 女訓絵入雛遊之記 (*Edifying Story for Women with Illustrations of Hina-dolls at Play*, figure 5. 12), in 1749,⁴⁶ were both illustrated by Nishikawa Sukenobu 西川祐信 (1670-1751) and also depict a scene of the *hina-matsuri*. The third day of the third month increasingly turned from *kyokusuien* into a day of festivals centered on women and girls.

Purification Ritual as a Commodity

What, then, is the *nagashi-bina* and how is it related to the invention of the *hina-matsuri* tradition? *Nagashi-bina* 流し雛 (figure 5. 13) is an event in which dolls are

floated down rivers to wash away bad luck.⁴⁷ A study by Ishizawa Seiji 石沢誠司 reveals that it does not have a direct link with the development of *hina-matsuri* but is rather a new tradition found in the Mochigase 用瀬 area of Tottori 鳥取 prefecture dating from the end of Edo period.⁴⁸

The development of *nagashi-bina* is related to the Awashima cult 淡島信仰, which is based in Shintō 神道 and originated in Kishū 紀州, or present day Wakayama 和歌山, in the late Edo period.⁴⁹ According to legend, when the sixth daughter of Amaterasu 天照 turned sixteen, she married the god Sumiyoshi 住吉. Because she was affected by “female sickness,” however, she was sent off to Awashima 淡島 with divine treasures. When she performed a purification ritual on the third day of the third month, she was cured. Following this incident, women began to float *katashiro* or *hitokata* down a river to cure or to prevent sickness. Women who were not able to go on pilgrimages to the river bank but could afford a *hitokata* bought one from *Awashima ganjin* 淡島願人, sacred-peddlers who lived by the river bank and conveniently showed up on the street.⁵⁰ In the *bakumatsu* era, the purification ritual had already become a commodity.

Although the *nagashi-bina* is a late Edo invention, a proto-type of it existed earlier. *Awashima ganjin* are visually recorded in volume 7 of *Jinrin kinmo zui* 人倫訓蒙図彙 (*Categories of Occupations*; figure 5. 14), published in 1690,⁵¹ and in *Ehon otogi shina kagami* 絵本御伽品鏡 (*Illustrated Encyclopedia of Occupations*; figure 5. 15), published in 1730.⁵² The dolls carried by *Awashima ganjin* were purchased by women and parents of daughters and were floated down a river on the third day of the third month. Later on, the development of a market economy brought about the *nagashi-bina*,

a more elaborate version of *hitokata*. After the end of the Pacific War in 1945, the practice of the *nagashi-bina* had spread all over modern Japan as a tourist attraction.

Women's Participation in *Kyokusuien*

I have suggested that female participants are secretly coded and represented through peach blossoms in Orchid Pavilion imagery. Along with the idea of women's participation in the Orchid Pavilion, the nativization of its visual representation in the early modern period gave rise to *hina-matsuri*, which overlapped with the Peach Festival on the third day of the third month. I would like to point out another interesting phenomenon: the depiction of a female participant in the *kyokusuien* imagery of a late-eighteenth century work of Tsukioka Settei (figure 5. 16). As recorded, the participants of the Orchid Pavilion event were all male, and the *kyokusuien* in Nara and Heian Japan were also exclusively attended by male participants.⁵³ Undoubtedly aware of this, Settei nevertheless included a female poet enjoying the *kyokusuien*. The work may have resulted from a commission from clients wanting a 'feminized' image of *kyokusuien* that could be hung in an alcove used in their daughter's celebration of *hina-matsuri*.

This tradition of depicting female attendees is followed by ukiyo-e adaptations of the purification ritual imagery. Tekisei Hokuba 蹄斎北馬 (figure 5. 17) and Utagawa Toyokuni 歌川豊国 (figure 5. 18) produced images of rituals performed by women only. It is a sort of *yatsushi*, that is, the vulgarization and simplification of something that was originally of higher quality or status, in which women were positioned lower in the social hierarchy; but when considering the original meaning of the third day of the third month as a celebration of Xiwangmu as well as the Awashima cult, the depiction of women as

performers of purification rituals may be viewed as a natural direction. At the same time, female *waka* poets were the symbol of *miyabi* (elegance) since in the Heian period the canon of Japanese classical prose was comprised of women authors. By adding the figure of a lady in the *kyokusuien* imagery, Settei created a sense of courtly elegance that he learnt from his *kokugaku* associates. Furthermore, the image of the *kyokusuien* was even turned into a lady's *kimono* design (figure 5. 19) at the end of Edo period.

The March issues of *Fūzoku gahō* 風俗画報, a Meiji publication that reconstructs Edo culture, celebrated the *hina-matsuri* with cover page illustrations (figure 5. 20).⁵⁴ At the end of Edo and the early Meiji, *hina-matsuri* was a well established event, while other events seem to disappear. In 1911, *kyokusuien* is briefly remembered on the back cover of *Fūzoku gahō* (figure 5. 21). But as shown in a 1915 issue (figure 5. 22), for the third day of the third month only *hina-matsuri* was celebrated.

Events to Represent the Third Day of the Third month in *Haikai*

By way of summary, I now turn to the chart of *kigo* 季語, or seasonal words, used in the *haikai* 俳諧 during the Edo period. *Kyokusuien*, or spring purification festival, and *hina-asobi* are consistently used in *haikai* to represent the third day of the third month. *Nagashi-bina* and *hina-matsuri* appear only later in the Edo period.

Table 5. 1 Events of the Third Day of the Third month in *Haikai*

Title	Date	Events of the Third Day of the Third month in <i>Haikai</i>
Hanahi gusa はなひ草 Haikai shogaku shō 俳諧初学抄	1636 1641	Peach, yomogi-mochi, cockfighting, Sumiyoshi shellfish gathering, kyokusuien, hina-asobi Kyokusuien, planting chrysanthemums, peach wine, yomogi-mochi, hina-asobi, cockfighting, shellfish gathering
Kefuki gusa 毛吹草	1645	<i>Kyokusuien</i> , peach wine, <i>yomogi-mochi</i> , cockfighting, Sumiyoshi shellfish gathering
Yamanoi 山之井	1648	<i>Kyokusuien</i> , willow, peach, princess peach, wall peach, peach wine, <i>yomogi-mochi</i> , cockfighting, <i>hina-asobi</i>
Masuyamai 増山井	1667	<i>Kyokusuien</i> , peach, peach wine, <i>yomogi-mochi</i> , cockfighting, <i>hina-asobi</i> , willow
Kokkei zatsudan 滑稽雑談	1713	<i>Kyokusuien</i> , floating wine cup, <i>yomogi-mochi</i> , peach wine, <i>hina-matsuri</i> , peach, cock-fighting, Sumiyoshi shellfish gathering
Haikai te- chōchin 俳諧手挑灯	1744	Peach, hina-dolls, <i>dairi-hina</i> , paper <i>hina</i> , decorating <i>hina</i> , <i>hina-asobi</i> , <i>hina-kazura</i> , <i>asatsuki</i> , peach wine, <i>Yomogi-mochi</i> , <i>kusa-mochi</i> , <i>kyokusuien</i> , shellfish gathering, cockfighting
Haikai shiki burui 俳諧四季部 類	1780	Peach, peach festival, <i>hina-matsuri</i> , <i>hina-asobi</i> , decorating <i>hina</i> , <i>tachi-hina</i> , paper- <i>hina</i> , <i>dairi-hina</i> , willow, shellfish gathering, <i>kyokusuien</i>
Hanami- toshinami 華実年浪草	1783	Peach festival, peach wine, white-sake, <i>kusa-mochi</i> , <i>yomogi-mochi</i> , <i>hishi-mochi</i> , cockfighting, <i>hina-asobi</i> , <i>hina-matsuri</i> , decorating <i>hina</i> , <i>hina-goto</i> , <i>tachi-hina</i> , <i>kyokusuien</i> , willow, shellfish gathering
Haikai saijiki 俳諧歳時記	1803	<i>Kyokusuien</i> , willow, shellfish gathering, peach festival, peach wine, white-sake, <i>kusamochi</i> , <i>yomogimochi</i> , <i>hishimochi</i> , <i>hina-asobi</i> , <i>hina-matsuri</i> , <i>hinagoto</i> , paper <i>hina</i> , <i>nagashi-bina</i> , decorating <i>hina</i> , <i>hina</i> markets, <i>hina-giving</i>
Ki'inseki yōshū 季引席 用集	1818	<i>Nagashi-bina</i> , <i>hina-matsuri</i> , <i>hina-asobi</i> , decorating <i>hina</i> , <i>hina-goto</i> , <i>hina</i> markets

From this chart, we can easily see that *kyokusuien* was considered almost continuously as representing the third month. The term *hina-asobi* was also often included in *haikai*; by contrast, *hina-matsuri* appears only toward the end of the Tokugawa Period.

The Reinvention of Spring Purification Rituals as Tourist Attractions

Today, annual spring purification rituals based on the Orchid Pavilion gathering have again been revived, this time reinvented as tourist attractions. They are held at various locations; one is performed, for example, at Jōnangū 城南宮, twice a year on April 29th and November 3rd. It was started in the 1970s and attracts approximately two thousand attendees, both men and women, per event. In this ceremony, participants use a wine cup in the shape of bird, called *ushō* 羽觴 (figure 5. 23). The ritual at Jōnangū derived this type of wine cup from an Orchid Pavilion painting (figure 5. 24) on the cedar-sliding-door at the Kyoto Imperial Palace painted by Okamoto Sukehiko 岡本亮彦 (1823-1883) at the end of the Edo period.⁵⁵

There are many other places where the ritual is performed. Kamigamo Shrine 上賀茂神社 started it once in 1960, and after a period of disruption resumed it in 1994 to commemorate the Heiankyō 1200 year anniversary. Dazaifu Tenjin Shrine 大宰府天神社 began the practice in 1962, Mōtsū-ji 毛越寺 in Iwate Prefecture in 1986, and the Sengan'en 仙巖園 garden in 1992.⁵⁶ The tradition is invented and reinvented according to the religio-cultural and socio-economic situation of each generation. It demonstrates the continued practice of constructing a Japanese identity that, interweaving political and economic interests, is crucially dependent on Chinese heritage.

During the Tokugawa period, all cultured people were well informed about the Orchid Pavilion theme and understood its core meaning as a purification ritual party. Artists and their patrons were connected by networking systems that allowed them to

exchange necessary information for coding and decoding images. Moreover, because of these networks, artists were often affected by ideology and reshaped their visual representation accordingly. In the seventeenth century, Kano Sansetsu aspired to take part in the Chinese gentlemen's gathering and identified himself and his clients as Orchid Pavilion participants in order to criticize the newly established Tokugawa *bakufu* and the mainstream Kano School. Taiga and his *bunjin* circle developed an even wider networking system in the eighteenth century. Literati from all different classes, regions and schools communicated with one another, sharing in the idea of constructing a nonconformist community through Orchid Pavilion imagery.

In the nineteenth-century *bakumatsu* era, artists, patrons and consumers became increasingly self-conscious and sought to construct a newer identity based on proto-nationalism. Their heavy reliance on *kokugaku* ideology turned them to Japanese classical literature and a preference for feminine expression. As I showed in my study of the social networks of artists and their association with *kokugaku* scholars in Chapter Four, the driving force behind this nativizing activity was the *kokugaku* movement. However, although the Orchid Pavilion theme was nativized, it was impossible to separate it from Chinese culture since many aspects of the nativized theme still referred to a Chinese origin.

There are many more visual representations of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering that due to space I have not been able to consider in this thesis. Painted by the various Maruyama, Shijō, Kishi and Hara painters, as well as eccentric individual artists such as Soga Shohaku, Nagasawa Rosetsu and so on, are extremely important in the development of this tradition. They organically interacted with one another as they invented and

reinvented this painting theme. The works I have not had a chance to consider possibly suggest some other, as yet unexplored, aspect to the problems I have been studying. The study of these visual representations is my future agenda.

Notes:

¹ The names and identities of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering participants are clearly recorded, for instance, in the Ming-dynasty ink rubbing, and are exclusively male.

² *Tokugawa kinreikō* 徳川禁令考 was compiled by Kikuchi Shunsuke 菊池駿助 in early Meiji period. It records customs and events that were regulated by the Tokugawa regime during their reign. Kikuchi Shunsuke, ed., *Tokugawa kinreikō* (Tokyo: Shihōshō 司法省, 1894, reprinted in 1959).

³ This type of advertisement connecting the *hina-matsuri* and the Heian classical culture is printed elsewhere in commercial flyers. See, *Hina ningyo no shiori* 雛人形のしおり, Association of the Doll Wholesalers in Osaka 大阪府人形問屋協同組合; see also internet source, <http://www.jp-guide.net/manner/ma/momo_sekku.html> Accessed on February 15, 2011.

⁴ *Segen mondō kōshō kan chū* 世諺問答考證卷中 (Tokyo: Kokugakuin University Press, 1909), 33-36.

⁵ Earlier, this ritual was performed on the first day of the Serpent of the third month. Marshall P.S. Wu, *the Orchid Pavilion Gathering: Chinese Painting from the University of Michigan Museum of Art, Volume II* (Michigan: The University of Michigan, 2000), 43.

⁶ Ōhira Kei'ichi 大平桂 一, “Kyokusui no en saikō: Ō Gishi ga Rantei de kyokusui no en wo moyo'osu made, soshite sono go” 曲水の宴再考—王羲之が蘭亭で曲水の宴を催すまで、そしてその後, *Hyōfū* 飄風 vol. 41 (2004): 99.

⁷ Furuse Natsuko 古瀬奈津子, *Kentōshi no mita Chūgoku* 遣唐使の見た中国 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kobun-kan, 2003).

⁸ Tōyama Mitsuo 遠山美都男, *Kenshō Heijokyō no seihen to nairan* 検証 平城京の政変と内乱 (Tokyo: Gakken 学研, 2010).

⁹ John M. Rosenfield, “Buddhist Texts” *Masters of Japanese Calligraphy: 8th-9th Century*, (New York: The Asia Society Gallery and Japan House Gallery, 1985), 35.

¹⁰ Kosaka Shinji 小坂真二, “Misogi harae girei to on'myōdō: gishiki shidai seiritsu katei wo chūshin to shite” 禊祓儀礼と陰陽道—儀式次第成立過程を中心として— *Waseda Daigaku Daigakuin Bungaku Kenkyūka Kiyō* 早稲田大学大学院文学研究科紀要, *bessatsu* 3 (1977): 222.

¹¹ Kosaka, “Misogi harae girei to on'myōdō,” 211.

¹² There is an example of a blooming peach tree represented in the *byōbu* of Kano Yasunobu (figure 2. 8) and a red plum in that of Kano Einō (figure 2. 1). However, these representations did not become part of a canon continued by others as Taiga's did.

¹³ See the examples of poems incorporating the flower petals in Chapter Four of this dissertation.

¹⁴ Kinoshita Kyōko, “The Life and Art of Tokuyama Gyokuran,” *Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran: Japanese Masters of the Brush* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007), 65-74.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Patricia Fister, *Kinsei josei gaka tachi: bijutsu to jendā* 近世の女性画家たち—美術とジェンダー [Japanese Women Artists of the Kinsei Era] (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 1994), 21-22.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Kōran Ikō 紅蘭遺稿, in *Seigen zenshū* 星巖全集 Vol. 5 (Gifu: 1985). See also Mari Nagase, “Women Writers of Chinese Poetry in Late-Edo Period Japan” (PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 2007), 160-166.

¹⁹ Fister, *Kinsei josei gaka tachi*, 22.

²⁰ Fister, *Kinsei josei gaka tachi*, 33.

²¹ Ibid.

²² So as feminine *yamato-e* versus masculine *kara-e*, *waka* was perceived within the paradigm of the feminine. In the rules of medieval Japanese aesthetics, “femininity” was linked with “*miyabi* 雅 or courtliness, *senren* 洗練 or refinement and *johin* 上品 or elegance,” but unlike contemporary Western court traditions, this value system is that of the “ruling class,” while its subjects are specifically coded as masculine. Chino Kaori, “Nihon bijutsu to jendā,” *Bijutsushi* (1994), translated as “Gender in Japanese Art,” in *Gender and Power in the Japanese Visual Field*. eds., Joshua Mostow, Norman Bryson, and Maribeth Graybill (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2003), 17-34. This perception continued in the time of Taiga in Edo period. See also Mostow, “‘Genji monogatari’ to *jokunsho*” 『源氏物語』と女訓書 [*The Tale of Genji* and Women’s Instructional Manuals], *Kashika sareru gazoku: Genji monogatari to Edo bunka* 可視化

される雅俗—源氏物語と江戸文化 [*The Tale of Genji and Edo Culture*], Kojima

Naoko 小嶋菜温子, et al. eds. (Tokyo: Shinwasha 森話社, 2008), 337-346.

²³ Fister, *Kinsei josei gaka tachi*, 33.

²⁴ See, E.T.C. Werner, *A Dictionary of Chinese Mythology*, New York: The Julian Press, Inc., 1961, 163-164. See also, C. A. S. Williams, *Chinese symbolism and art motifs*, 227.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Joshua Mostow and Royall Tyler, *The Ise Stories: Ise Monogatari* (Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 2010), 138-142.

²⁷ *Kokuhō kakitsuabata zu* 国宝杜若花図, exhibition catalogue, (Tokyo: Nezu Museum of Art, 2005), 107.

²⁸ Joshua S. Mostow, *Pictures of the Heart: The Hyakunin Isshu in Word and Image*. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1996), 430.

²⁹ Ibid., 431.

³⁰ Kuroita Katsumi 黒板勝美, ed., *Shintei zōho kokushi taiki* Vol. 26 新訂増補国史大系 *Engishiki* 延喜式 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbun-kan, 1974).

³¹ Kosaka, “Misogi harae girei to on’myōdō,” 211; Yamashita Shigetami 山下重民 “Hina-asobi kigen kō” 雛遊起源考, *Fūzoku gahō* 風俗画報 Vol. 3 (March, 1889): 8.

³² Ibid.

³³ Murasaki Shikibu, Chapter 12 Suma, *The Tale of Genji*, trans. Royall Tyler, (New York: Penguin Classics, 2001), 251-253.

-
- ³⁴ Baba Junko 馬場淳子 “Surimono/ Ryūryū Kyoshinsai ga “Amagatsu-zu” ni tsuite” 刷物・柳ノ居辰斎画「天児図」について, *Kashika sareru gazoku: Genji monogatari to Edo bunka*, Kojima Naoko, et al. eds. (Tokyo: Shinwasha 森話社, 2008), 279-283.
- ³⁵ Kitamura Tetsurō 北村哲郎, *Ningyō* 人形, *Nihon no bijutsu* No. 11, Vol. 3, Shibunkaku (1967): 28.
- ³⁶ Ibid.
- ³⁷ Baba, “Surimono/ Ryūryū Kyoshinsai ga ‘Amagatsuzu’ ni tsuite,” 280.
- ³⁸ Baba, “Surimono/ Ryūryū Kyoshinsai ga ‘Amagatsuzu’ ni tsuite,” 281.
- ³⁹ Chapter 19 “Wisps of Cloud,” *The Tale of Genji*, trans. Royall Tyler, (New York: Penguin Classics, 2001), 350
- ⁴⁰ Kitamura, *Ningyō*, 28-29.
- ⁴¹ Kitamura, *Ningyō*, 31.
- ⁴² *Ruijū meibutsu kō* 類聚名物考 was an Edo encyclopedia compiled between 1753 and 1779 by Yamaoka Matsuake 山岡浚明 (?-1780), a *kokugaku* scholar who studied under Kamo no Mabuchi. *Ruijū meibutsu kō* is reprinted by Rekishi toshosha 歴史図書社 in 1974.
- ⁴³ Kitamura, *Ningyō*, 39.
- ⁴⁴ *Hōei karaku saiken zu* originally published in 1704 (元禄 17 年) is a guidebook to Kyoto. <<http://archives.bukkyo-u.ac.jp/archives/kichosho/index.html>>, accessed on June 12, 2009. Kyoto Prefectural Library and Archives (Sōgō Shiryōkan)

⁴⁵ Nishikawa Sukenobu, *Ehon yamato warabe*, published in 1731, reproduced in *Kinsei Nihon Fūzoku ehon shūsei* 近世日本風俗絵本集成 ed. Suzuki Jūzō 鈴木重三編 (Kyoto: Rinzei shoten 臨川書店, 1980).

⁴⁶ Nishikawa Sukenobu, *Jokun eiri hina-asobi no ki*, published in 1749, 東京都立中央図書館蔵 (寛延 2 年 (1749) 2 月刊 江戸京都大阪 3 書肆刊), reproduced (Tokyo: Ōzorasha 大空社, 1995).

⁴⁷ *Hina-ningyō to hina-matsuri*, Yomiuri shinbunsha (1980): 36.

⁴⁸ Isizawa Seiji 石沢誠司, “Awaji sinkō to nagashi-bina: nagashi-bina ha hina-ningyō no genryū ka 淡路信仰と流し雛上—流し雛は雛人形の源流か—” Retrieved on June 12, 2009, <http://www.geocities.jp/seijiishizawa/NewFiles/hina-okuri.html>

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ 蒔絵師源三郎刊記「元禄三庚午載七月吉旦/書林 平樂寺〈開板〉/大坂高麗橋一丁目 村上清三郎/江戸日本橋南平松町 村上五郎兵衛」, 元禄 3 刊, 7 冊. Retrieved June 12, 2009, <<http://edb.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/exhibit/i101/i101cont.html>> Kyoto University Library.

⁵² Hasegawa Mitsunobu 長谷川光信 wrote and illustrated *Ehon otogi shina kagami*. Its preface was written by Taiya 鯛屋 (Yuensai 油煙齋) Teiryū 貞柳 and published in 1730. It was edited by Kurokawa Masamichi 黒川真道 and reprinted in *Nihon fūzoku zue* 日本風俗図絵 in 1914 (Tokyo: Nihon Fuzoku zue kankokai 日本風俗図絵刊行会, 1914), 46.

⁵³ Sekiguchi Chikara 関口力 *Sekkan jidai bunkashi kenkyū* 撰関時代文化史研究 (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 2007), 170-174.

⁵⁴ *Fūzoku gahō* 風俗画報 was published by Tōyōdō 東洋堂 in Meiji period, and reprinted by Kokusho kankokai 国書刊行会 in 1975 and 1976.

⁵⁵ *Miyako no eshi ha hyakka ryōran: Heian jinbutsu-shi ni miru Edo jidai no Kyoto gadan* 京の絵師は百花繚乱 平安人物史にみる江戸時代の京都画壇 [*The Blooming of Hundred of Flowers: Painters of Edo Period Kyoto in the Heian-Jinbutsu-shi*], exhibition catalogue (Kyoto: The Museum of Kyoto, 1998), 271. See also, Jōnangū website, <<http://www.jonangu.com/kyokusuinoutage.htm>> Accessed on July 21, 2009.

⁵⁶ See Ishizawa Seiji, “Joshi 上巳,” in *Kisetsu wo iwau Kyo no gosekku* 季節を祝う京の五節句 [*Celebrating the Seasons: The Five Seasonal Festivals in Kyoto*], exhibition catalogue (Kyoto: The Museum of Kyoto, 2000), 16.

<<http://www.motsuji.or.jp/matsuri/data03.html>> Accessed on February 15, 2011.

<<http://www.senganen.jp/spring/event04.html>> Accessed on February 15, 2011.

<http://www.kamigamojinja.jp/event/04_apr.html> Accessed on February 15, 2011.

Conclusion

This thesis examined the cultural networks that connected people holding common ideological values in the Tokugawa period by surveying a range of visual representations of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering. It explored the Tokugawa social phenomena that gave rise to the sudden boom in the Orchid Pavilion motif and how painters of different classes, belonging to different schools, came to develop variations of this theme in order to establish cultural identity and to negotiate stronger positions in the relations of social power. Probing the social environment of artists and their patrons, I have demonstrated how distinct types of Orchid Pavilion imagery were invented and reinvented to advance different political agendas.

Sources for this project may be divided into two categories: publications that explore the broader issues concerning Tokugawa art and society, and those that specifically concern illustrations of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering. Several scholars have briefly discussed the Orchid Pavilion, mainly in the exhibition catalogues. However, these approaches are focused on stylistic issues, and thus fail to discuss important historical concerns. There is no book-length study on the subject of the Orchid Pavilion images.

The examination undertaken in this thesis considered a number of questions: What accounts for the surprising popularity of Orchid Pavilion imagery in Japan between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, especially considering its absence earlier? What social, economic and political forces shaped the transformation of the Chinese model of Orchid Pavilion illustrations into nativized Japanese versions during this

period? How did the increasingly diverse production and consumption of Orchid Pavilion imagery contribute to the dynamism of identity formation in Edo society? And how does the tracing of a network connecting scholars, artists, and consumers of all classes help us understand the breadth and nature of resistance to the oppressive Tokugawa regime? These questions are formulated based on the methodological and theoretical concerns addressed by Michele Marra's *Aesthetic of Discontent*; Kendall Brown's *Politics of Reclusion*; and Theodore Adorno's *Aesthetic Theory*.

As a way of conceptualizing the tradition of Orchid Pavilion paintings and exploring their historical relations, I organized my study into five chapters, each with its own thematic and methodological concerns.

Chapter One introduced the Origin of the Orchid Pavilion Pictorial Tradition. The gathering at the Orchid Pavilion in China took place in 353 CE, when Wang Xizhi invited forty-one scholars to participate in the annual Spring Purification Festival. At this event, Wang Xizhi improvised a short text that has come to be known as the *Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. In this preface, Wang Xizhi highlights several of the themes that are most important to this study, including the writing of history, the strategic re-interpretation of the past, and the political necessity of identity formation. Numerous studies have been produced to explore the calligraphic excellence of this work. However, I treated this preface as a textual source of iconography since it describes the scene of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering: high mountain ridges, luxurious woods, and tall bamboo; a meandering rivulet for floating the wine cups, with guests seated on both banks; with no music from string or wind instruments.

The message of cultural authority and political discontent was inherent in the

Orchid Pavilion theme since the legend of its protagonist is that Wang Xizhi experienced a tragic incident during the war and thus rejected militarism. He aspired to be a scholar-recluse at a time of political instability. This message was emblemized when Prince Zhu Youdun, who utilized it to express his own situation, had the work engraved in stone and ink rubbings printed in the mid-Ming dynasty. The ink rubbing, which was based on a version by Li Gonglin, a literati-painter of the Northern Song Dynasty, records the name and official titles of Wang Xizhi and his forty-one guests. The scroll starts from the pavilion with Wang Xizhi watching geese, a waterfall, and caves, followed by the scholars seated by the riverbank. Wine cups on the lotus leave are floating down the stream. Since this rubbing was copied and recopied, it was widely distributed and became the canonical imagery of this theme both in China and Japan.

Chapter Two investigated how this Chinese theme was transformed by a Japanese approach when Kano School artists of the early Tokugawa period adapted the Ming-dynasty ink rubbings of the Orchid Pavilion. I complicated the process of this particular transformation by explaining the political struggle of the Kano School in Kyoto, the so-called Kyō-Kano, which was marginalized under the military state, and which used the Orchid Pavilion to express resentment and resistance. I examined the *Orchid Pavilion* painting by Kano Sansetsu to demonstrate how aesthetic resistance was formulated through interaction within the Kyō-Kano workshop and their cultural networks.

For a better understanding of how the Kyō-Kano workshop – led by Kano Sansetsu – was positioned in the Kano School system at the time he produced his *Orchid Pavilion*, it was necessary to reexamine the nature of the Edo-Kano under the leadership of Kano Tan'yū, who was often considered a rival of Sansetsu. Because of their military

background, hierarchy, hereditary line and blood connections were extremely important for the Kano School. In contrast to the founder of the Kyō-Kano painters, who was a disciple of a Kano master, the leading members of the Edo-Kano were the biological descendants of the founder of the school in the fifteenth century Muromachi period.

Tan'yū reinvented the reduced brush method of his forefather and developed a new spacious and elegantly plain style, which was deemed the mainstream Kano style. In contrast, Sansetsu's Orchid Pavilion painting is characterized by a complex combination of Momoyama retrospective and Chinese eccentric painting styles, with obsessively decorative craftsmanship, highly calculated geometrical forms, and nervously meticulous precision. It is almost the antithesis of the mainstream Edo-Kano tradition, which was supported by the Tokugawa regime, and is thus considered to be an expression of nonconformity. In 1970, Tsuji Nobuo set up Sansetsu as a forerunner of a lineage of "eccentric painters," because Sansetsu was ostracized by the mainstream Edo-Kano. This became the most influential image of Sansetsu up to today. However, more recent scholars, such as Igarashi Kōichi, Yamashita Yoshiya, and Itakura Masa'aki have reconsidered how this image was constructed through examining Sansetsu's social environment.

Although Sansetsu was excluded from the Edo-Kano projects to paint Tokugawa properties, he was supported by the prominent aristocrats and Buddhist temples in Kyoto, who were oppressed by the Tokugawa regime. Sansetsu received commissions from the Kujō family, and the Zuishin-in Buddhist temple. A number of textual sources record the evidence of their relationship, and the Orchid Pavilion painting visually documents the Kujō family's patronage. The sumptuous use of the expensive materials suggests the

financial status of Sansetsu's patron, powerful aristocrats. In short, Sansetsu took up this new visual theme of reclusion and its political nuance what appreciated by his Kyoto patrons who had previously supported the Toyotomi clan and remained resistant to the new Tokugawa hegemony.

Sansetsu included a scene of the Japanese tea ceremony in the Orchid Pavilion painting. He must have been aware that the Japanese whisked tea ceremony was not appropriate to be depicted in a supposedly Chinese gathering. What was the purpose of this? During the Kan'ei cultural upheaval of the early seventeenth century, when Tokugawa authority was still in its infancy, the tea ceremony remained a key means of sociopolitical intercourse between military men, aristocrats, priests and even merchants. Sansetsu's involvement with tea can be traced from his social life.

Chapter Three explored issues around the literati painting movement, which was developed in the mid-eighteenth century. It was a time when unhappy samurai, who failed to fit in the overly constrained political system, and the newly emerging townspeople, who had accumulated wealth but continued to be excluded from political participation, began to create a kind of counterculture that was inspired by Chinese cultural models. Under such circumstances, cultured people from various classes developed social networks to engage in the production of paintings, calligraphy, art treatises, poetry, and so forth to transmit their messages of social frustration. In this chapter, I focused on the Orchid Pavilion by Ike Taiga, who was a lower-middle class town-dweller, and is credited as the founder of Japanese literati movement.

Taiga's earliest visual representation of the Orchid Pavilion theme was painted on a wooden votive panel and was dedicated to the Gion Shrine in 1754. The dedication of

the votive panel was sponsored by ten prominent local merchants of the Gion district in Kyoto. This indicates a demand for Taiga's work among the rising merchant class. Yabumoto Kōzō suggests that it was probably Taiga himself who chose the Orchid Pavilion theme to be depicted on the votive panel since this theme was not yet well known to townspeople in the early 1750s. Taiga provided a perfect vehicle to satisfy patrons seeking to employ the cultural authority of a classical theme in the newly developed Japanese literati style to represent their own identity and to elevate their social status. Taiga's choice was received extremely well by people who commissioned him to produce numerous works of the Orchid Pavilion theme thereafter.

Intriguingly, most of Taiga's Orchid Pavilion paintings include the pictorial motif of musicians, although it is written in the *Preface* that there were no musical instruments at the gathering. Taiga was known to be highly educated by the community of various scholars, such as samurai-class Confucian scholars, and the Ming loyalist Zen monks living in the temple established in Kyoto. Hence, Taiga must have known the contents of the Orchid Pavilion very well. Why did he include these pictorial motifs? Taiga incorporated the pictorial motifs of another painting theme depicting a Chinese scholars' assembly, entitled the *Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden*. It indicates that the purpose of Taiga's Orchid Pavilion paintings was not to illustrate the contents of the preface faithfully, but to portray his own community in the place of noble Chinese scholars.

In Chapter Four, I explored the impact that this imagery had on another early modern visual "tradition" – the imagery of *kyokusuien*, depicting a Japanese courtiers' party at a meandering stream, which seems to be derived from the classical past.

However, this “tradition” was in fact newly invented in the Tokugawa period to satisfy the sociopolitical and ideological agendas of its producers and consumers. The cultural power of the “Sinophile” Orchid Pavilion imagery and the “nativized” visual tradition that stemmed from it was not only appreciated among elite circles who aimed to maintain their authoritative positions, but also emerged alongside the development of a market economy in the eighteenth century as the Orchid Pavilion theme was popularized among ordinary townspeople who sought to elevate their social status through cultural capital. This type of cultural power was, in turn, used for proto-nationalist identity construction in the following century when the military-based Tokugawa regime began to lose its authority and, especially, when Japan was finally forced to open in 1854 to the outside world. In this context, I investigated the relationship between the early modern visual tradition and the *kokugaku* (National Learning), a significant intellectual and ideological movement in Tokugawa society, which was the driving force behind the production and consumption of nativized *kyokusuien* imagery.

Kokugaku was a prominent intellectual movement involving people of various backgrounds in the late Edo period. It was a native reaction that competed against what was seen as a foreign value system. However, according to Maruyama Masao, Japanese nativism emerged from Kogaku (Ancient Study), a Confucian-based private academy. Moto’ori Norinaga also called his scholarship “*kogaku* or *inishie manabi* (ancient learning),” but his passion for nativism stemmed from a religious faith in Shintō. In this adaptation process, artists interlaced visual elements – that were often reduced and dissected from a variety of preexisting painting compositions – to construct a nativized pictorial program for the Orchid Pavilion, the so-called *kyokusuien* or “gathering at a

meandering stream.” I investigated the works of Tsukioka Settei and Kubo Shunman as examples of the genre-painting adaptation of the *kyokusuien* theme.

Tsukioka Settei was the first painter who depicted the nativized Orchid Pavilion image in *fūzokuga* or pictures of customs and manners, which was an emerging early modern genre, and I explored the ideological motivations behind such adaptation. Settei painted this image to represent the third month of the *Annual Events of the Twelve Months*, which was one of the most important genres of *yamato-e*, or the native Japanese painting tradition. Furthermore, Settei produced the image of female participation in the *kyokusuien* despite the fact that it was known to be an exclusively male event. This calls to mind the female participation in the poetry gatherings that was often recorded at the time of Settei.

Even if the courtly figures are replaced by contemporary figures from the Tokugawa period, as long as the pictorial composition includes the visual elements of “a meandering stream,” “wine cup,” “a plant (especially peach),” the viewer can understand that the image refers to the *kyokusuien*. The practice of *kyokusuien* at the imperial court had been discontinued for a long time but was revived by the *daimyō* and the wealthy merchants all around Japan during the early modern period. Since then, the “cult of *kyokusuien*” in the Tokugawa period was mainly developed in the pleasure quarters in Edo. Reflecting such an atmosphere, Kubo Shunman produced a version of *kyokusuien* in a contemporary setting. It is a large print triptych *nishiki-e* (brocade picture) published in the late eighteenth century.

Prior to the activity of Shuman, Suzuki Harunobu inaugurated a reconstruction of classical painting subjects of China and Japan in contemporary settings (*mitate-e*). While

intimately connected with a group of intellectuals, Harunobu widened his knowledge of classical themes in order to create images that convey multiple layers of meanings. Nevertheless, Shunman added *kokugaku* ideology to Harunobu's classicism and created a new aesthetic value system.

Besides *kyokusuien*, Shunman produced the classical theme of *Six Jewel Rivers*, which is executed in *benigirai-e*, a mode of visual expression that uses exclusively subtle colors – purples and greys – and avoids bright colors such as red. The reduced color tone of *benigirai-e*, which contrasts with Harunobu's bright color application, had been understood by earlier scholars as a consequence of the Kansei Reforms (1787-93) that restricted the conduct as well as the cultural activity of the people. However, John Carpenter has pointed out that Shunman had produced *ukiyo-e* prints in the mode of *benigirai-e* prior to the enforcement of the Kansei Reforms, and thus his preference for a subtle color application was developed as an expression of a *kokugaku* aesthetic.

About a half century later, *kyokusuien* imagery based on the *yamato-e* tradition – that is, the new canon established by Settei and Shunman – became a subject with more political overtones. *Kyokusuien* was a favorite painting theme of Reizei Tamechika, who followed the *kokugaku* movement. At this time, the Tokugawa shogunate's authority was declining, as radical revolutionaries, who sought to overthrow the Tokugawa regime through the restoration of imperial rule, began to increase in number. The revived classical visual representation of the *Annual Events* painting, which glorified the imperial rule of the past, fueled the political enthusiasm of these revolutionaries. The *fūzokuga* versions of *kyokusuien* encoded the shared ideology of proto-nationalism, which instigated the restoration movement that eventually overthrew the Tokugawa regime.

In Chapter Five, I reconsidered the final stage of the theme's nativization. The introduction of Chinese Orchid Pavilion images and the invention of nativized imagery led to the birth of *hina-matsuri* or the Doll Festival, which became the most prominent event for young girls in late Edo and remains the most familiar festival in contemporary Japan. In order to regulate and control cultural activities, the Tokugawa regime instituted the observation of the Five Seasonal Festivals, on the five overlapping odd-numbered days of the year. The third day of the third month was designated as *kyokusuien*, and also as the Peach Festival, since it was the day Wang Xizhi's Orchid Pavilion Gathering was performed and was also believed to be the birthday of Queen Mother of the West of the Daoist mythology.

On this day, the dolls were floated to repel evil spirits. These dolls were used to protect young girls since the Heian period. After the establishment of Five Festivals, and the invention of the Doll's Day celebration, these protective dolls, the so-called *hōko* and *amagatsu*, turned into a set of *hina*-dolls. The way of displaying the dolls in stepped shelves was established in the eighteenth century, as recorded in a book illustrated by Nishikawa Sukenobu.

To conclude this dissertation, I go back to the *Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering* once more. As Wang Xizhi in the fourth century predicted that future generations would study about him and his gathering just as the scholars of his generation examined the people of past, I have explored how artists and scholars of the Tokugawa period viewed the Orchid Pavilion Gathering from the perspective of our own time. Crossing time and space, this is a part of on-going dialogue between Wang Xizhi and scholars of the future, including myself.

Figures

1. 1 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Prince Yi. *Lanting (Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion)*, Xianyuan version, 1592. Handscroll, ink rubbing compilation on paper, 32.7 x 100.9cm. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 2 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Rantei kyokusuien (Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion)*, early seventeenth century. Two pairs of eight-panel folding screens, ink, color, and gold leaf on paper. 107.4 x 355.8 cm. Zuishin-in, Kyoto.

1. 3 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Attributed to Wang Xizhi. *Lantingxu* (*Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering*). Dingwu
version. Ming-period copy. Album leaves, ink rubbing on paper. Kyoto National Museum.

1. 4 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Prince Yi.
Lanting Huangnan version, 1592. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Colophon: 32.5
x 107cm; Calligraphy model: 32.1 x 1675cm; Illustration: 31.9 x 628.5cm. Palace Museum,
Beijing.

1. 5 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Prince Yi. *Lanting*, Xianyuan version. 1592. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Colophon: 32.5 x 107cm: 32.1 x 1675cm; Illustration: 31.9 x 628.5cm. Palace Museum, Beijing.

1. 6 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Prince Yi. *Lanting*, Huangnan version. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. 32.3 x 62.3cm. Henanxinxiang Municipal Museum.

1. 7 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Lanting xiuxu*. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Height 34cm. Exhibition catalogue, Shôwa kichû Rantei-ten, 28-37.

1. 8 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Lanting*. Huangnan version. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
<http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/preface-to-the-orchid-pavilion-23150>

1. 9 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Lanting*. Huangnan version. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. 22.2 x 574cm. Gotō Museum, Uno Sesson Collection.

1. 10 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Lanting*. 16th -17th Century. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. 22.6 x 326.4cm. Inscription by Tomioka Tessai. Harn Museum, Florida.

1. 11 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Lanting*.
1616. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper.
31.0 x 1482.5cm. Private Collection.

1. 12 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Lanting*. Qing dynasty. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. 22.1 x 489.0cm; illustration section: 17.9–18.1 x 329.1 cm. National Library of China.

1. 13 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Lanting*. 1780. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Formerly Qianlong Collection. Palace Museum, Beijing.

1. 14 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Prince Yi. Colophon of *Lanting*. 1592. He Yanzhi. *Lanting ji*. Mid-Tang dynasty. Xianyuan version Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 15 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Attributed to Yan Liben. *Zhuan Lanting (Seizing the Preface to the Orchid Pavilion)* Handscroll.
Ink and color on silk. Taipei National Palace Museum.

1. 16 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Attributed to Juran. *Zhuan Lanting (Seizing the Preface to the Orchid Pavilion)*. Hanging scroll.
Taipei National Palace Museum.

1. 17 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Li Gonglin. *Dwelling in the Longmian (Sleeping Dragon) Mountains*.

c.1049 - 1106. Handscroll mounted as an album leaf. Ink and color on silk.

Cleveland Museum of Art.

<http://amica.davidrumsey.com/luna/servlet/detail/AMICO~1~1~37200~76374:The-Lung-mien-Mountain-Villa?qvq=w4s:/what/Paintings/;lc:AMICO~1~1&mi=200&trs=14440>

1. 18 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: A section of Wang Xizhi seated in the Orchid Pavilion, detail, *Lanting*, Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 19 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Qian Xuan. *Wang Xizhi Observing Geese*, c.1295. Handscroll. Ink, color and gold on paper. Metropolitan Museum of Arts, New York.
<http://www.metmuseum.org/special/Dillon/4.r.htm>

1. 20 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: A section of page boys in the cave, detail, *Lanting*. Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 21 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: The first group of participants, detail, *Lanting*. Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 22 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ōhara Tōno, *Meisū gafu* (Painting Manual of Renowned Numbers). 1809. Woodblock book. Osaka Museum of History.

1. 23 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: The second group of participants, detail, *Lanting*. Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 24 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Chikurin Shichiken (Seven Sages in Bamboo Grove)*. Eastern Jin dynasty. Ink rubbing reproduced from the tomb wall engraving. Nanjing Museum.

1. 25 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: The third group of participants, detail, *Lanting*. Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 26a This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Li Gonglin, *Classic of Filial Piety*, Chapter 7, detail of the dancing figure. C.1085. Handscroll. Ink on silk. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
http://www.metmuseum.org/works_of_art/collection_database/all/the_classic_of_filial_piety_li_gonglin/objectview.aspx?page=1&sort=6&sortdir=asc&keyword=LiGonglin&fp=1&ddl=0&dd2=0&vw=1&collID=0&OID=60006952&vT=1&hi=0&ov=0

1. 26b This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Li Gonglin, *Classic of Filial Piety*, Chapter 10, detail of the dancing figure. C.1085. Handscroll. Ink on silk. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
http://www.metmuseum.org/works_of_art/collection_database/all/the_classic_of_filial_piety_li_gonglin/objectview.aspx?page=1&sort=6&sortdir=asc&keyword=LiGonglin&fp=1&ddl=0&dd2=0&vw=1&collID=0&OID=60006952&vT=1&hi=0&ov=0

1. 27 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: The forth group of participants, detail, *Lanting*. Xianyuan version.
Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 28 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: The fifth group of participants, detail, *Lanting*. Xianyuan version
Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 29 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: The sixth group of participants, detail, *Lanting*. Xianyuan version.
Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 30 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: The seventh group of participants, detail, *Lanting*. Xianyuan version.
Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 31 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: The eighth group of participants, detail, *Lanting*. Xianyuan version.
Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 32 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: A section of two willows and a stone bridge, detail, *Lanting*. Xianyuan version.
Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 33 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Zhu Youdun. A colophon. 1417. Detail, *Lanting*. Xianyuan version. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 34 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Zhu Youdun. A colophon. 1592. Detail, *Lanting*. Huangnan version. At the end of the scroll. Palace Museum, Beijing.

1 . 35 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Prince Yi. A detail of *Lanting*. Huangnan version. 1592. Handscroll.
Ink rubbing compilation on paper. Colophon: 32.5 x 107cm; Calligraphy model: 32.1 x 1675cm; Illustration: 31.9 x 628.5cm. Palace Museum, Beijing.

1. 36 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: A detail of *Lanting*. Huangnan version. 22.2 x 574cm, Gotō Museum, Uno Sesson Collection.

1. 37 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Prince Yi. A detail of *Lanting*. Xianyuan version. 1592. Handscroll.
Ink rubbing compilation. Colophon: 32.5 x 107cm; 32.1 x 1675cm, Illustration: 31.9 x 628.5cm. Palace Museum, Beijing.

1. 38 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Prince Yi. A detail of *Lanting*. Xianyuan version. 1592. Handscroll.
Ink rubbing compilation. 32.7x1400.8 + 100.9cm.
Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

1. 39 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Prince Yi. A detail of *Lanting*. 1602. Handscroll. Ink rubbing compilation. 22.4 x 66.5cm; 22.4 x 522cm. Palace Museum, Beijing.

2. 1 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Einō. *Rantei kyokusuien* (*Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion*). A pair of six panel *byōbu*, Ink and color on paper. 153x359 cm. Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art.

2. 2 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. A section of handscroll. Ink on paper. A draft for fusuma-e at Higashi Honganji Temple, Kyoto. Private Collection.

2. 3 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Tan'yū. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Hanging scroll. Ink on paper. Private Collection.

2. 4 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Tan'yū. "Bestowing Cloth for Resisting at the Gate" section of *Teikanzu*. Before 1621. From a scroll remounted as byōbu. One of six-panel *byōbu*. Ink, light color and gold on paper. 82.9x31.5cm. Tokyo National Museum.

2. 5 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: "Bestowing Cloth for Resisting at the Gate" section of *Teikanzusetsu*. Woodblock printed book. 26.6x18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo.

2. 6 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Eisei-in Michinobu. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. 1767. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on paper. 57.9 x 116.5 cm. Museum of Fine Art, Boston.
<http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/lanting-pavilion-by-the-winding-stream-25971>

2. 7 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Yasunobu. *Lanting Pavilion by the Winding Stream*. Right of a pair of six panel byōbu. Ink on paper. 150.4 x 353 cm. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

2. 8 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Yasunobu. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. A pair of six panel byôbu. Ink and color on paper. Tochigi Prefectural Museum.

2. 9 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Shō'un. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Ink and light color on paper. Handscroll. Private Collection.

2. 10 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Chôgonka (The Song of Everlasting Sorrow)*. Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. Chester Beatty Library, Dublin.

2. 11 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sanraku, *Kuruma arasoï* (the Carriage Battle). *The Tale of Genji*. Originally *fusuma*, remounted into a four-panel folding screen. Tokyo National Museum.

2. 12 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Painters. *Taima-dera engi emaki*. Before 1627. Handscroll. Noshi Collection, Nara National Museum.

2. 13 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: A letter addressed to Einō by Sansetsu. Suzuka Family Archive.

2. 14 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Kannon tenryūyasha-zu (The Goddess of Mercy in the Realm of the Heavenly Dragon)*. 1647. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. 116.0 x 55.0 cm. Tōfuku-ji, Kyoto.

2. 15 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Signature: Kano Sanraku; Painter: Sansetsu. Calligraphy: Ishikawa Jōsan. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Hanging scroll. Ink on silk. Eigawa Museum of Art, Hyōgo Prefecture.

2. 16 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. Details of rock in *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering byôbu*, Zuishin-in, Kyoto.

2. 17 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Attributed to Kano Sanraku. *Rantei kyokusui yokomono (Horizontal Orchid Pavilion)*. Ink and color on paper, hanging scroll. Isaac Douman Auction Catalogue (1919).

2. 18 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sanraku. *Peony. Fusuma*. Ink, color and gold on paper. 184 x 98.6 cm. Daikaku-ji, Kyoto .

2. 19 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Einō. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Ink and colors with gold on paper. Six panel byōbu, Private collection.

2. 20 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Motonobu. *Soshi-zu (Zen Patriarch Kyōgen Chikuan Sweeping with a Broom)* 1513. Ink and light color on paper. 175.7x137.5cm. Tokyo National Museum.

2. 21 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Seiko-zu (C. Xihu; The Western Lake)*. A pair of Six-panel *byōbu*. Ink and light color on paper. 153.7x357.0 cm. Private Collection.

2. 22 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Landscape. Haritsuke*. Ink on paper. 1631. Tenkyū-in, Myōshin-ji, Kyoto.

2. 23 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Fan Qi.
Landscape. 1645. Handscroll. Ink and light color on paper.
31.8 x 411.7cm. M.H. De Young Memorial Museum, San Francisco.

2. 24 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Wu Pin.
A Thousand Peaks and Myriad Ravines. 1617. Hanging scroll. Ink and light color on paper.
306.5x98.5cm. Richard Lin Collection, London.

2. 25 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Fan Yi. *The Purification at the Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. 1671. Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. 28.1 x 392.8 cm. Cleveland Museum of Art.
<http://www.clevelandart.org/collections/collection%20online.aspx?type=refresh&searchoption=1&csearch=Artist/> Maker:Fan Yi (Chinese)

2. 26 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Bangoku-zu (Pangu Valley)*. Yūgensai Museum of Art.

2. 27 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Xiaoting youjing tu* in the *Gujin huapu*. Musashino Art University, Tokyo.

2. 28 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: “Plank Roads to Sichuan” and “Mount Emei” from *Sancai tuhui*. 1609. Woodblock printed book. 20.8 x 13.8cm. Ming Wanli edition. Shanghai Library.

2. 29 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Kanbaku-zu* in *Sanraku Sansetsu Sansuijô* (*Album of landscape paintings by Kano Sanraku and Sansetsu*). Private Collection.

2. 30 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. Detail in the fourth screen of *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, *shuro* (hemp palm). Zuishin-in, Kyoto.

2. 31 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Eitoku. *Kinkishoga-zu* (*Four Noble Pastimes of zither, go game, calligraphy and painting*). *Fusuma*. Ink on paper. Daitokuji, Kyoto.

2. 32 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sanraku. *Teikan-zu* (*Illustrations of the didactic stories for emperors*)
A pair of six panel *byōbu*. Tokyo National Museum.

2. 33 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Zhaoru jiangjing*. Section of *Teikanusetsu*. Woodblock printed book.
26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo.

2. 34 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Binli guren*. Section of *Teikanzusetsu*. Woodblock printed book.
26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo.

2. 35 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Xiefeng chuguan*. Section of *Teikanzusetsu*. Woodblock printed book.
26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo.

2. 36 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Yushu xinshen*. Section of *Teikanzusetsu*. Woodblock printed book. 26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo 431

2. 37 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sanraku. *Nanban byôbu (Arrival of Westerners in Japan)*. Suntory Museum of Art, Tokyo.

2. 38 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. A detail of *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*.
Dragon bridge foundation. Zuishin-in, Kyoto.

2. 39 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sanraku. *Shōsan shikō zu (Wen-wang and Lu-shang, and the four hermits at Shang-shan)*.
Myōshin-ji, Kyoto.

2. 40 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. Detail, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, dragon panels. Zuishin-in, Kyoto.

2. 41 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Dragon*. A *shukuzu* sketch of the Lecture Hall. Tōfuku-ji, Kyoto.

2. 42 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Dragon*. Ceiling painting. 1647. 630 x 1450 cm. Sen'nyū-ji, Kyoto.

2. 43 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Zhao Yuanchu. 1364. *Lanting shangyong tu (Drinking wine and composing poetry at the Orchid Pavilion)*. Ink on paper. 17.5 x 432cm. Colophon: 26 x 75.4cm. Palace Museum, Beijing.

2. 44 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Yao Shou. *Lanting xiuxi tu (Purification Ritual at the Orchid Pavilion)* Ink on silk. Beijing Municipal Art and Craft Museum.

2. 45 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Wen Zhengming. Calligraphy by Zhu Yunming. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Ink and color on paper. Image: 22.9 x 48.7cm; calligraphy: 20.8 x 77.8cm. Liaoning Provincial Museum.

2. 46 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sanraku. *Genshiryō-zu (The Sage Yan Ziling Advising a Eastern Han Emperor)*. Two-panel *byōbu*. Ink and color on paper. 178 x 172.1 cm. Myōshin-ji, Kyoto.

2. 47 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Anonymous Kano painter, *Fūryūjin zu (Minghuang and Yang Guifei)*.
Momoyama period. A pair of six-panel *byōbu*. Ink and color on paper.
Private Collection.

2. 48 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
“Minghuang’s dreams of Yang Guifei.” *Leijiang ji* version. *Tang Minghuang*
Qiuye Wutongyu (Tang Minghuang Listening to the Rain Falling on Chinese
Parasols on an Autumn Night). 1633. Woodblock-printed book.
Private Collection.

2. 49 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: “Yang Guifei’s dancing” scene. *Gu zaju* version. *Tang Minghuang Qiuye Wutongyu* (*Tang Minghuang Listening to the Rain Falling on Chinese Parasols on an Autumn Night*). 1619. Woodblock-printed book.
Private Collection.

2. 50 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Queqianlima* section of *Teikanzusetsu*. Woodblock-printed book.
26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo.

2. 51 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Chongxin lianren* section of *Teikanzusetsu*. Woodblock-printed book.
26.6×18.4cm. National Diet Library, Tokyo.

2. 52 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Seireki daiju zu (A Series of Twenty-One Portraits of Chinese Confucian Masters)*. 1632. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. 129.5 44.5cm. Tokyo National Museum.

2. 53 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Prince Yi. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. depicting the image of Yu Yun, detail. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

2. 54 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, depicting the image of Yu Yun, detail. Zuishin-in, Kyoto.

2. 55 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Qiu Ying, *Spring Morning in the Han Palace*. Detail of handscroll. Ink and color on silk. 30.6 x 574.1cm. Taipei National Palace Museum.

2. 56 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Prince Yi. The section of dancing Yang Mo. A detail of *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Former Robert van Gulik Collection.

2. 57 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. The section of dancing Yang Mo. A detail of *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Zuishin-in, Kyoo.

2. 58 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Karako kinki shogazu (Four Noble Pastimes of Chinese Boys)* located in one of the four panels of tsukeshoin at the Tenkyû-in, Myôshin-ji, Kyoto.

2. 59 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: A scene of tea ceremony. Detail of *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Zuishin-in, Kyoto.

2. 60 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: A scene of tea ceremony. 1631. Detail of *fusuma* of Tenkyû-in, Myôshin-ji, Kyoto.

3. 1 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: A copy of Qiu Ying, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. 17th Century. Handscroll. Ink and color on paper. Tokyo National Museum.

3. 2 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Qiu Ying. *Yingxiuxi tu (the Orchid Pavilion Gathering)*. Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. 29.7 x 207.5cm. Taipei National Palace Museum.

3. 3 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Sheng Maoye. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. 1621. Handscroll. Ink and color on silk. 31.1 x 214.7cm. University of Michigan Museum of Art.
http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/i/image/image-idx?rgn1=&c=musart&type=boolean&view=thumbnail&q1=sheng+Maoye&sel1=ic_all&rgn9=musart_iod&sel9=ic_exact&op9=And

3. 4 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. 1754. *Ema* (votive wooden panel). Gion Shrine, Kyoto.

3. 5 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. A draft of the votive wooden panel at the Gion Shrine. 1751. A six-panel byōbu, Private Collection.

3. 6 a. b. This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, reproduced by Aikawa Minwa and Kitagawa Harunari. 1819. *Hengaku Kihan Shukubaku zu*. Woodblock-printed painting manual. Art Research Center, Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto.

3. 7 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Eitoku, The Story of Lao Laizi (Old Master), one of *the Twenty-four Paragons of the Filial Piety*. Fukuoka City Museum.

3. 8 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Eitoku. Twenty-four Paragons of the *Twenty-four Examples of Filial Piety*. Nanzen-ji, Kyoto.

3. 9 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Hideyori. *Drunken Li Bai*. 1566. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on paper. 94.8 x 31.6 cm. Itabashi Municipal Museum of Art, Tokyo.

3. 10 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, ink on paper, hanging scroll. Ruth and Sherman Lee Institute for Japanese Art at the Clark Center, Hanford.

3. 11 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Anonymous. *Landscape*, one of a pair of hanging scrolls. The 15th Century. Ink on silk, 148 x 92cm. West Norway Museum of Applied Art, the Munthe Collection.

3. 12 Qiu Ying. *Yingxiuxi tu (The Orchid Pavilion Gathering)*. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on paper. Taipei National Palace Museum.

3. 13 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering and the Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden*. A pair of six-panel *byōbu*. ink and color on paper. Kōsetsu Museum.

3. 14 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Mikuma Katen. Portrait of Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran, an illustration of *Kinsei kijinden* (*Biographies of Extraordinary Persons*). 1790. Woodblock printed book. International Research Center for Japanese Studies, Kyoto.

3. 15 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Tomioka Tessai. Portrait of Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran, from *Ike Taiga kafu* (*Records of the Taiga Lineage*). Holograph manuscript. Private Collection.

3. 16 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering* (*Rantei Shūkei zu*). A six-panel *byōbu*, paired with Shūsha Suisō zu (Harvest Festival in Autumn). ink and color on paper. 162.8 x 359.1cm. The Mary and Jackson Burke Collection, New York.
http://www.flickr.com/photos/agerie_icat/93992897/in/photostream

3. 17 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Attributed to Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, a six-panel *byōbu*, paired with *Ranteijo*
(calligraphy inscribed by Rai Sanyo). Ink and color on paper, Private Collection.

3. 18 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Qian Gu.
The Orchid Pavilion Gathering. Handscroll. Ink on paper. 1560.
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
http://www.metmuseum.org/works_of_art/collection_database/all/gathering_at_the_orchid_pavilion_qian_gu/objectview_zoom.aspx?page=1&sort=6&sortdir=asc&keyword=QianGu&fp=1&dd1=0&dd2=0&vw=1&collID=0&OID=60019531&vT=1&hi=0&ov=0

3. 19 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *Autumnal Tints on the Riverbank (Arashiyama in the Style of Kōetsu)*. A pair of two-panel screens. Ink, colors, and silver flecks on paper. 171.5 x 209.1cm. Private Collection.

3. 20 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, paired with *Ryūzan Shōkai-zu (Banquet at Longshan Mountains)*. A pair of six-panel *byōbu*. 1763. Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art.

3. 21 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. A six panel *byōbu*. 1763. Ink and color on paper. Shimane Prefectural Museum of Art.

3. 22 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Einō. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. *Fusuma* and *shōhekiga*.
Ink on paper. Hara Museum of Art, Tokyo, originally located at Nikkō-in, Mi'i-dera, Shiga.

3. 23 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Mu Qi. *The Crane* (from the triptych of the *White Robed Kannon*). Hanging scroll. Ink on silk. Daitokuji, Kyoto

3. 24 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Eitoku. *The Crane*. Daitoku-ji, Kyoto.

3. 25 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Hasegawa Tōhaku. *The Crane*. Idemitsu Museum of Arts, Tokyo.

3. 26 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Tan'yū and others. *Tan'yū Shuku-zu (Tanyū's Study Sketches)*. Handscroll. Ink on paper. Kyoto National Museum.

3. 27 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Attributed to Li Zai (?-1431). *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Ink and light color on silk.
Handscroll reformatted into a folding screen.
Private Collection.

3. 28 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Chen
Hongshou. *Tao Yuanming Returning to Home*. Handscroll. Ink and color on silk.
Honolulu Academy of Arts.

3. 29 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Cheng Dayu. *Chengshi moyuan*. 1605. Woodblock printed catalogue of Ink-sticks. Gotō Museum of Art.

3. 30 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *Daibutsukaku* (*The Great Buddha Hall*), from Six Sights in Kyoto modeled after Mi Fu. Private Collection.

3. 31 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Wang Kai, “Mi Fu” in the *Kaishien gaden*’s woodblock-printed model Private Collection.

3. 32 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *Fūu kiryū zu (Dragon Rising from Wind and Rain)*. 1746. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on paper. Private Collection.

3. 33 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Nakayama Kōyō. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering, funpon*. Handscroll. Ink on paper. 1778. Kōchi Municipal Library.

3. 34 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakayama Kōyō, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, *funpon* copied after Wen Zhengming, date
unknown. Handscroll. Ink on paper.
Kōchi Municipal Library.

3. 35 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano
Tan'yū, *Tan'yū Shukuzu (Tan'yū Study Sketches)*, detail
Kyoto National Museum.

3. 36 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakayama Kōyō. *Inchu hassenzu (The Eight Immortals of the Wine Cup)*. Handscroll. Ink and
color on silk. Private collection.

3. 37 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakayama Kōyō. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. 1779. Handscroll. Ink and
color on silk. Private Collection.

3. 38 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakayama Kōyō. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, 1778, detail, Handscroll.
Ink and light color on paper. Tokyo National Museum.

3. 39 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Fukuhara Gogaku. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Handscroll. Ink and
colors on paper. Museum of Anthropology, UBC.

3. 40 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Fukuhara Gogaku. *Four Noble Pastimes of Chinese Ladies*. Hanging
scroll. Ink and color on silk. Osaka Municipal Museum of Art.

3. 41 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Fukuhara Gogaku. *Landscape with figures*. Hanging scroll. Ink on paper.
Private collection in the Netherlands .

3. 42 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Shen
Maoye. *River Landscape with Willows*. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk.
University of Michigan Museum of Art.

3. 43 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Fukuhara Gogaku. *Dōteiko (Dongting Lake)*. 1772. A pair of six-panel *byōbu*. Ink and light color on paper. Osaka Museum of History.

3. 44 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Rin Rōen. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Hanging scroll. Ink on silk. Osaka Museum of History.

3. 45 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Nakai Rankō. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Osaka Museum of History.

3. 46 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakabayashi Chikutō. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, modeled after Sheng Maoye.
Handscroll. Ink and color on silk.
Hakutaku-an Collection, Kyoto.

3. 47 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakabayashi Chikutō. *Birthday Party of Okada Shingawa at the Mamiya Estate*. 1796.
Hanging scroll. Ink and color on paper.
Private collection.

3. 48 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakabayashi Chikutō. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Hanging scroll.
Ink and color on silk. Private collection.

3. 49 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Yoshida
Kōkin. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Hanging scroll.
Ink and color on silk. Private Collection.

3. 50 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakabayashi Chikutō. *Sui Rihakuzu (Drunk Li Bai)*. Hanging scroll. Ink on paper.
Nagoya Municipal Museum.

3. 51 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakabayashi Chikukei. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. Hanging scroll.
Ink and color on silk. Indianapolis Museum of Art 459

3. 52 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakabayashi Chikutō, *True View of Mt. Kasagi*. Hanging scroll.
Ink and light color on paper.
Private collection.

3. 53 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakabayashi Chikutō, Tanaka Totsugen, Mimurodo Yasumitsu.
Snow, Moon and Flower. 1822. Hanging scroll. Ink and light ink on paper.
Private collection.

3. 54 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakabayashi Chikutō. *Mt. Fuji (Shinshū kikan-zu)*, modeled after Niwa Kagen. After 1837.
Handscroll. Ink and light color on silk.
Nagoya Municipal Museum.

3. 55 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nakabayashi Chikutō. *Konko ichi zushiki*. 1849. Woodblock printed book.
Kariya Municipal Library.

4. 1 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Tsukioka Settei. *Kyokusuien zu* in the *Annual Events of Twelve Months*. A Pair of six-panel *byōbu*. *Oshie-bari* style. Color on silk. each painting 100.3 x 37.6 cm. 1773- 1787. Biwako Bunkakan, Shiga.

4. 2 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kubo Shunman. *Kyokusui no en, nishiki-e* triptychs. 1786-1789. left: Tokyo National Museum; center and right: British Museum.

4. 3 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Designed by Nishimura Nantei. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*. 1816. Silk Tapestry of the Tsukihoko portable shrine, Kyoto.

4. 4 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ike Taiga. *Kyokusuien* in the *Annual Events of Twelve Months*. A pair of a six-panel *byōbu*. Ink and light color on paper. Private collection.

4. 5 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Tan'yū. *Teika yomitsukinami kacho utae (Poem-Pictures of Birds & Flowers Based on Teika's Poems)*. A pair of six-panel folding screen. Ink and light color on paper. Michigan University Library.

4. 6 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Tsukioka Sessai. *Kyokusuien in the Annual Events of Twelve Months*. A pair of six-panel *byōbu*. Ink and color on paper. Kansai University Library.

4. 7 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Tsukioka Sessai. *Kyokusuien*. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Osaka University, Dept of Literature.



4. 8 Tsukioka Settei. *Kyokusuien* in *Wakan Meihitsu Kingyoku gafu*, published by Nunoya Tadasaburō, 1770. Woodblock print book. Owned and photographed by Kazuko Kameda-Madar.

4. 9 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Reizei Tamechika. *Kyokusuien* in the *Annual Events of Twelve Months*. 1843. Handscroll. Ink and color on paper. Hosomi Museum of Art, Kyoto.

4. 10 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: a. Kemari and b. toriawase *Annual Event of Twelve Months* scroll, originally painted by Tokiwa Genji Mitsunaga with supervision of Fujiwara Motofusa in 1157. Copied by Sumiyoshi Jokei and Gukei in the 17th century. Private Collection.

4. 11 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Sakai Hōitsu. *Kykusuien zu*. Hanging scroll, one of five scrolls of *Gossekuzu*. Ink and color on silk. Ōkura Shūkokan Museum.



4. 12 Sakai Hōitsu. *Ise monogatari* episode 65, *misogi-zu* or purification ritual scene in *Kōrin Hyakuzu*. 1815. Woodblock print book. Owned and photographed by Kazuko Kameda-Madar.

4. 13 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Ogata Korin. *Ise monogatari* episode 65, *misogi-zu* or purification ritual, (also titled as Ietaka's misogi), early 18th century. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Hatakeyama Museum.

4. 14 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Attributed to Tawaraya Sotatsu. *Ise monogatari-zu byōbu*. 17th century. A six panel folding screen. Ink and color on paper. Idemitsu Museum of Arts, Tokyo.

4. 15 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Suzuki Ki'itsu. *Ise monogatari* episode 65, *misogi-zu* or purification ritual, 19th century. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Yelen-Gitter Collection, New Orleans.

4. 16 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Anonymous. *Ietaka Purification Ritual*, from A Hundred Verses from Old Japan. Atomi Gakuen Tanki Daigaku Library. Woodblock print. After Joshua Mostow, *Pictures of the Hearts* (1996) 430 figure 98-3.

4. 17 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Nishikawa Sukenobu. *Kaisei Ise monogatari*. 1747. Woodblock printed book.
Kansai University Library.

4. 18 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Ise monogatari*, Saga version. 1608. Woodblock print book. Published by Suminokura Soan.
Kansai University Library.

4. 19 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Illustrated by Qian Geng. Garden Views of the Huang Yingzu Studio.
ca. 1610. Woodblock carved by Huang Yingzu, Huancuitang Yuanjing tu.
24.3 x 1470cm. Private Collection.

4. 20 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kubo Shunman. *Waka* on a *tanzaku* poem card. 1796. Moto'ori Norinaga Memorial Museum.

4. 21 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Suzuki Harunobu. *Kyokusuien* in *Fūzoku Shiki Kasen (Immortal Poets in the Customs of Four Seasons)*. *Cūban nishiki-e*. Woodblock print. Tokyo National Museum.

4. 22 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kubo Shunman. *Mutamagawa (Six Jewel Rivers)*. *Benigirai-e*. Woodblock print. British Museum.
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/search_object_details.aspx?objectid=775979&partid=1&searchText=kubo+shunman&numpages=10&orig=%2fresearch%2fsearch_the_collection_database.aspx¤tPage=1

4. 23 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kubo Shunman. *Gensō Yō Kihi yūrakuzu (Emperor Xuanzhong and Yang Guifei Enjoying Themselves)*. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Museum of Fine Art, Boston.
<http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/emperor-xuanzong-and-yang-guifei-26536>

5. 1 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Hakuōsha Poetry Society*. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on paper. Private Collection.

5. 2 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Kano Sansetsu. *Xiwangmu* (Jp. *Seiōbo*; the *Queen Mother of the West and Mu Wang*). Early 17th century. 152.5 x 350.6 cm. One of a pair of six-panel *byōbu*. Ink on paper.

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

<http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/xiwangmu-seiobo-the-queen-mother-of-the-west-and-mu-wang-bokuo-24787>

5. 3 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Scene of *Tori awase* or Cockfighting from *Jūnikagetsu fūzoku zukan* (*Book of Manners and Customs for Each Month*). Momoyama period. Ink and color on paper.

Yamaguchi Hoshun Memorial Museum.

5. 4 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Tori awase* or Cockfighting from *Jūnikagetsu fūzoku zukan* (*Book of Manners and Customs for Each Month*). Early Edo period. Ink and color on paper. Private Collection.

5. 5 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Iwasa Katsumoto. Chapter 12 Suma, *The Tale of Genji*, 17th-century, Ink and color on paper. Private Collection.

5. 6 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Amagatsu* (Godchild). Mid-Edo period. Tōyama Memorial Museum.
<http://www.e-kinenkan.com/syozouhin-nn195.htm>

5. 7 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Hōko* (Creeping-child). Mid-Edo period. Tōyama Memorial Museum.
<http://www.e-kinenkan.com/syozouhin-nn196.htm>

5. 8 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Tachibina*. Mid-Edo period. Tōyama Memorial Museum.
<http://www.e-kinenkan.com/syozouhin-nn206.htm>

5. 9 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Kyōhobina*. c.1716-1735. Hayashi Family Collection, Kyoto National Museum.
<http://www.kyohaku.go.jp/eng/syuzou/index.html>

5. 10 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Ka'ei hana raku hosomi zu (An Illustrated Guide to Seeing Sites in Kyoto)*. 1704. Kyoto Prefectural Library and Archives.

5. 11 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Nishikawa Sukenobu, *Ehon yamato waranbe (Picture Book of the Japanese Children)*. 1731. Reproduced in *Kinsei Nihon fūzoku ehon shūsei* by Suzuki Jūzō. (Tokyo: Rinzei shoten, 1980).

5. 12 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Nishikawa Sukenobu. *Jokun eiri hin- asobi no ki (Edifying Story for Women with Illustrations of Hina-dolls at Play)*. 1749, reproduced by Ōzora-sha in 1995.

5. 13 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Nagashi bina*. Mochigase area of Tottori Prefecture; retrieved on June 12, 2009.
<http://www.geocities.jp/seijiishizawa/NewFiles/hina-okuri.html>

5. 14 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: An image of *Awashima ganjin*. *Jinrin kinmō zui (Category of Occupations)* Vol.7, 1690, Kyoto University Library, retrieved on June 12, 2009,
<http://edb.kulib.kyotou.ac.jp/exhibit/i101/image/07/i101s0154.html>

5. 15 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: An image of *Awashima ganjin*. *Ehon otogi shina kagami (Illustrated Encyclopedia of Occupations)*. 1730. Osaka Municipal Library

5. 16 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Tsukioka Settei. *Kyokusuien zu*. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Private Collection.

5. 17 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Tekisei Hokuba. *Mitate Kyokusui en (Gathering at the Meandering Water)* c.1804-1830. Hanging scroll. Ink and color on silk. Museum of Fine Art, Boston.
<http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/parody-of-the-elegant-gathering-at-the-orchid-pavilion-26308>

5. 18 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Utagawa Toyokuni. *Kyokusuien-zu (Gathering at the Meandering Water)*.
1792-3. Art Institute of Chicago.

5. 19 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: *Kimono*.
Design of *kyokusuien*. Tokyo National Museum.

5. 20 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Cover page of *Fūzoku gahō*, first published by Tōyōdō Vol. 70 (April 1894) and Vol. 88 (March 1895), reprinted by Kokusho kankōkai in 1975. Asian Library at UBC 476.

5. 21 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Cover page and a page of *Fūzoku gahō*, Vol. 418, Tōyōdō (March 1911), reprinted by Kokusho kankōkai in 1975. Asian Library at UBC

5. 22 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Back page of *Fūzoku gahō*, Vol. 485, Tōyōdō (March 1915), reprinted by Kokusho kankōkai in 1975. Asian Library at UBC.

5. 23 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is: Performing *kyokusuien* using *ushō*. Jōnangū, Kyoto.
http://www.google.co.jp/imglanding?q=%E6%9B%B2%E6%B0%B4%E5%AE%B4&um=1&hl=ja&sa=N&tbm=isch&prmd=ivns&tbnid=Xz3mrK1YaMp9AM:&imgrefurl=http://lucky-river.at.webry.info/201004/index.html&imgurl=http://userdisk.webry.biglobe.ne.jp/011/316/58/N000/000/003/127254747300216407786_SANY4049.JPG&w=2544&h=1666&ei=BvrBTYmoBvDciAKAy5CDAw&zoom=1&iact=hc&page=1&tbnh=134&tbnw=179&start=0&ndsp=18&ved=1t:429,r:10,s:0&biw=1228&bih=555

5. 24 This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. The figure removed is:
Okamoto Sukehiko. *Kyokusuien*. Late 19th Century. Ink and color on cedar sliding doors.
Kyoto Imperial Palace.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Asaoka Okisada 朝岡興禎. *Koga biko* 古画備考, first published in 1904, revised and expanded by Ota Kin 太田謹. Kyoto: Shibunkakku 思文閣, 1970.

Ban Kōkei 伴蒿蹊. *Kinsei kijinden/ Zoku Kinsei kijinden* 近世畸人伝・続近世畸人伝, first published in in Kyoto in 1790, reprinted in *Nihon gadan taikan*, Toyobunko 東洋文庫. Munemasa Itsuo, ed. 宗政五十緒, 1138-1163. Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社, 1972.

Fujioka, Sakutarō 藤岡作太郎. *Kinsei kaigashi* 近世絵画史. First published in 1903 and reprinted by Perikansha ペリカン社, 1983.

Gion Nankai 祇園南海 *Shoun sango* 湘雲瓊語, Sumimaruya Jinsuke 角丸屋甚助 Edo 江戸: 弘化三年 (1846). Dōshisha University Library.

Hayashi Gaho 林鷺峯. *Kano Eino kaden gajiku jo* 狩野永納家伝画軸序, reprinted by Doi Tsuguyoshi 土居次義 in *Kano Sanraku/ Sansetsu* 狩野山楽・山雪, *Nihon bijutsu kaiga zenshu* 日本美術絵画全集 Vol. 12, 122. Tokyo: Shūeisha, 1976.

Hayashi Moriatsu 林守篤. *Gasen* 画筌. Naniwa shoshi 浪花書肆 (1721) reprinted in Sakazaki Tan 坂崎坦, ed., *Nihon garon taikai* 日本画論大系 I, 5-40. Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai 名著普及会, 1980.

Heian Jinbutsushi 平安人物史, 明和五年 (1768) 安永四年 (1775) 天明二年 (1783) 文化十年 (1813) 文政五年 (1822) 文政十三年 (1830) 天保九年 (1838) 嘉永五年 (1852) 慶應三年 (1867)

Kano Einō 狩野永納 *Honcho gashi* 本朝画史 (1693) Kasai Masaaki 笠井昌昭/ Sasaki Susumu 佐々木進/ Takei Akio 竹居昭男 訳注 本朝画史. Kyoto: Dōhōsha shuppan 同朋舎出版, 1985.

Kano Yasunobu 狩野安信. *Gadō yōketsu* 画道要訣 (*Secret Keys to the Way of Painting*) 1680 in Vol. 5 of *Nihon kaigaron taikai* 日本絵画論大系, Sakazaki Shizuka, ed. 坂崎坦編, Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai 名著普及会, 1979; Teihon Nihon Kaigaron Taisei Dai 4 Kan 定本日本絵画論大成 第4巻: *Gado Yoketsu*, *Gado Denju Koketsu*, *Yosai Gai*, *Gyosai Gadan* 画道要訣・画道伝授口訣・容斎画意・暁斎画談 [Authentic Scholarly Works on Japanese Paintings Volume 4], Yasumura, Toshinobu, ed. 安村敏信. Tokyo: Perikansha, 1997.

Kuwayama Gyokushū 桑山玉洲. *Kaiji higen* 絵事鄙言. Written in 1790, published by Kimura

- Kenkadō 木村兼葭堂 in Osaka 大坂 1799. Reprinted in Sakazaki Shiduka, ed. *Nihon kaigaron taiei* 日本絵画論大系, vol. 1. Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai, 名著普及会 1980; *Ronga yonshu* 論画四種 Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店, 1932.
- _____. *Gyokushū gashu* 玉洲画趣 in 1790. Reprinted in Sakazaki Shizuka, ed. *Nihonga no seishin* 日本畫の精神, 163-175. Tokyo: Tokyodō 東京堂, 1942.
- _____. *Shikan garon* 嗣幹画論. 1771. reprinted in the exhibition catalogue of Kuwayama Gyokushu, Kudō Takashi, ed. Wakayama: Wakayama Manucipal Museum, 2006.
- Minagawa Kien 皆川淇園. *Kien bunshu* 淇園文集. 文政元年(1818) 詩集日本漢詩 Vol. 6 Kyoto: Kumiko shoin 汲古書院, 1986.
- Nakao Choken 中尾樗軒, *Kinsei itsujin gashi* 近世逸人画史(copied in 1824), Kimura Shigekazu 木村重圭, ed., *Nihon kaigaron taisei* 日本絵画論大成, 279-351. Tokyo: Perikansha, 1997.
- Nakabayashi Chikutō 中林竹洞, *Chikutō garon* 竹洞画論 (1802). *Nihon kaigaron taisei* 日本絵画論大成. Tokyo: Perikansha, 1997.
- _____. *Gadō kongōsho* 画道金剛杵 (1802). *Nihon kaigaron taisei*, Perikansha, 1997.
- Nakayama Kōyō 中山高陽. *Gadan keiroku* 画譚雞肋 (1775). Kōchi City Library 高知市民図書館. Sakazaki Shiduka, ed., *Nihon kaigaron taiei*, vol. 2. Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai, 1980.
- Ôhara Tôno 大原東野, *Meisu gafu* 名数画譜 (Painting Manual of Renowned Numbers), 1809.
- Sasaki, Beigyō. 佐々木米行, *Taigadōki* 大雅堂記. Kyoto: Ikeno Taiga Museum, 池大雅美術館, 1984.
- Sekkyo 石居, ed. *Ikeno Taiga Kafu* 池大雅家譜 [*Tomiokakebon*]. Reedited by Sasaki, Beigyō. Kyoto: IkenoTaiga Museum, 1982.
- Shibano Ritsuzan 柴野栗山, *Ritsuzan Bunshu* 栗山文集, Toin Shoya rokuban 桐蔭書屋録版, Tenpō 天保 13 (1843).
- Shirai Kayō 白井華陽. *Gajō Yōryaku* 画剩要略 *Summary of Painting Criticism* (1832), Kimura Shigekazu 木村重圭, ed., *Nihon kaigaron taisei*, 277-352. Tokyo: Perikansha, 1997.
- Tanomura, Chikuden 田能村竹田 *Sanchūjin jōzetsu* 山人饒舌 *Chatter of a Mountain Dweller*. 天保六年 (1835), Takahashi Hiromi 高橋博巳 ed., *Nihon kaigaron taisei*, 7-148. Tokyo: Perikansha, 1996.

Tsukioka Settei 月岡雪鼎. *Wakan meihitsu Kingyoku gafu* 和漢名筆金玉画譜, published in Osaka in 1770.

Umezawa, Seiichi 梅澤精一 *Nihon nangashi* 日本南画史, Tokyo: Nanyodo hanten 南陽堂本店, 1919.

Yanagisawa Kien 柳沢其園. *Hitorine*. ひとりね, reprinted by Nakamura Yukihiro 中村幸彦 in *Kinsei zuiso shu*, 近世随想集, *Nihon koten daigaku taikai* 日本古典大学大系. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1965.

Secondary Sources

(English Sources)

Adorno, Theodor. "Aesthetic Theory: On the Relation between Art and Society," originally published in Germany in 1970. The section is translated by C. Lenhardt in *Aesthetic Theory*, 231-237. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.

Addiss, Stephen. *Zenga and Nanga: Paintings by Japanese Monks and Scholars, Selections from the Kurt and Millie Gitter Collection*. New Orleans: New Orleans Museum of Art, 1976.

_____, ed. *Japanese Quest for a New Vision: The Impact of Visiting Chinese Painters, 1600 - 1900*. Selections from the Hutchinson Collection at the Spencer Museum of Art. Lawrence, Kansas: Spencer Museum of Art, 1986.

Baird, Merrily C. *Symbols of Japan: Thematic Motifs in Art and Design*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 2001.

Barnhart, Richard M. *Painters of Great Ming: The Imperial Court and the Zhe School*. Dallas: Dallas Museum of Art, 1993.

_____. "Tung Ch'i-ch'ang's Connoisseurship of Sung Painting and the Validity of his Historical Theories: A Preliminary Study." Proceedings of the Tung Ch'i-ch'ang and International Symposium, ed. Wei-ching Ho, 11-20, Kansas City, 1991.

_____. "Recovering an Old Theme in Ming Painting," *Oriental Art*, xxx1/8 (September 1985): 52-51.

_____ and Yang Xin et al. *Three Thousand Years of Chinese Painting*. New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1997.

Baroni, Helen, J. *Obaku Zen: The emergence of the third sect of Zen in Tokugawa Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2000.

- Beerens, Anna. *Friends, Acquaintances, Pupils, Patrons: Japanese Intellectual Live in the Late Eighteenth Century: A Prosopographical Approach*. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2006.
- Berry, Paul. *Ikeno Taiga: A Biographical Study of a Japanese Literati Artist of the Edo Period*. MA Thesis, University of Hawaii, 1977.
- _____. and Michiyo Morioka. *Literati Modern: Bunjinga form Late Edo to Twentieth-Century Japan*. Honolulu: Honolulu Academy of Arts, 2008
- _____. *Unexplored avenues of Japanese painting: the Hakutakuan Collection*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001.
- Brown, Kendall H. *The Politics of Reclusion: Painting and Power in Momoyama Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997.
- Burkus, Anne G. "Between Representations: The Historical and the Visionary in Chen Hongshou's Yaji." *The Art Bulletin* 84, no2 (June 2002): 315-333.
- Burns, Susan, L. *Before the Nation: Kokugaku and the Imagining of Community in Early Modern Japan*. North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Bush, Susan. *The Chinese Literati on Painting: Su Shih (1037-1101) to Tung Ch'i-ch'ang (1555-1636)*, Cambridge: Harvard Yenching Institute Studies, 1971.
- Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory", *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*, ed., Case, Sue-Ellen, 270-282. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Originally published as *La Distinction: Critique Sociale du Judement* in Paris, 1979. Translated and published in Harvard College, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.
- Cahill, James. *The Lyric Journey: Poetic Painting in China and Japan*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- _____. *The Painter's Practice: How Artists Lived and Worked in Traditional China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- _____. "Tung Chi-chang's Painting Style: Its Source and Transformations" in Ho, Wai-Kam, ed., *The Century of Tung Ch'i-ch'ang*, 55-79. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1992.
- _____. "Phases and Modes in the Transmission of Ming-Ch'ing Painting Styles to Edo

- Period Japan.” Papers of the International Symposium on Sino-Japanese Cultural Interchange. Hong Kong: Inst. of Chinese Studies, Chinese University of HK, 1985: 65-98.
- _____. *Sakaki Hyakusen and early Nanga painting*. Berkeley, Calif.: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Center for Japanese Studies, 1983.
- _____. “Yosa Buson and Chinese Painting.” *Faculty Reprint Series* no. 8. Berkeley: University of California, Institute of East Asian Studies, 1982.
- _____. *Distant Mountains: Chinese Painting of the Late Ming Dynasty: 1570-1644*. New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill Publishing, 1982.
- _____. *Parting at the Shore: Chinese Painting of the Early and Middle Ming Dynasty, 1368-1580*. New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill Publishing, 1978.
- _____. *Scholar Painters of Japan: The Nanga School*. New York: The Asia Society Inc., 1972.
- Carpenter, John, T. “Chinese calligraphic models in Heian Japan: copying practices and stylistic Transmission.” *The Culture of Copying in Japan: Critical and historical perspectives*. Ed. Rupert Cox, 156-196. London and New York: Routledge, 2008.
- _____. “Textures of Antiquarian Imagination: Kubo Shunman and the *Kokugaku* Movement,” *The Commercial and Cultural Climate of Japanese Printmaking*. Ed. Amy Reigle Newland, 77-114. Amsterdam: Hotei Publishing, 2004.
- Chance, Frank. “Tani Buncho’s Eight Views of Xiao and Xiang: Origins, Ideas, Implications.” *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* 76.8 (October 1989): 266-279.
- Chai, Chu and Winberg Chai, *A Treasury of Chinese Literature: A New Prose Anthology Including Fiction and Drama*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1974.
- Chino, Kaori. “Nihon bijutsu to jendā,” *Bijutsushi* (1994). Translated as “Gender in Japanese Art.” In *Gender and Power in the Japanese Visual Field*. Ed. Joshua Mostow, Norman Bryson, and Maribeth Graybill, 17-34. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2003.
- Clapp, Anne de Coursey, “Wen Cheng-ming: The Artist and Antiquity,” *Artibus Asiae Supplementum* vol. 34 Ascona, 1975.
- Clark, Timothy T. “Mitate-e: Some Thoughts and a Summery of Recent Writings,” *Impressions* 19 (1997): 7-27.
- _____. *Ukiyo-e Paintings: In The British Museum*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992.

- Clunas, Craig. *Elegant Debts: The Social Art of Wen Zhengming 1470-1559*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2004.
- _____. *Superfluous Things: Material Culture and Social Status in Early Modern China*. (first published by Polity Press in 1991) Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2004.
- Cox, Rupert, ed., *The Culture of Copying in Japan: Critical and Historical Perspectives*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Fister, Patricia. "Female Bunjin: The Life of Poet-Painter Ema Saiko," in *Recreating Japanese Women, 1600-1945*. Ed. Gail Lee Bernstein. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Fischer, Felice. "Ike Taiga, A Life in Art" *Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran: Japanese Masters of The Brush*, Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Fong, Wen, et al. *Images of the Mind: Selections from the Edward L. Elliott Family and John B. Elliot Collections of Chinese Calligraphy and Painting at the Art Museum*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- _____, ed. *Words and images: Chinese poetry, calligraphy, and painting*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Gerhart, Karen M. *The Eyes of Power: Art and Early Tokugawa Authority*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.
- _____. "Honchogashi and Painting Programs: Case Studies of Nijo Castle's Ninomaru Palace and Nagoya castles' Honmaru Palace," *Art Orientalis* 27 (1997): 67-97.
- Graham, Patricia J. "Chinese Scholarly Imagery in Edo Period Paintings at the Indianapolis Museum of Arts." *Orientalism* 32.3 (March, 2001): 78-92.
- _____. "Early Modern Japanese Art History: An Overview of the State of the Field," *Early Modern Japan: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 10(2) 2002: 2-21.
- _____. "Lifestyles of Scholar-Painters in Edo Japan." *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* 77.7 (September 1990): 262-283.
- _____. *Tea of the Sages: The Art of Sencha*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1998.
- Groemer, Gerald. "Elite Culture for Common Audiences: Machiiri No and Kanjin No in the City of Edo. *Asian Theater Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 2. (Autumn, 1998): 230-252.
- Guth, Christine. *Art of Edo Japan: the artist and the city 1615 -1868*. New York: Harry N. Adams, Inc., 1996.

- Hickman, Money. "Shohaku the 'Eccentric' and his Paintings in the Indianapolis Museum of Art." *Oriental Art* 32.3 (March 2001): 93-102.
- Ho, Wai-Kam. "Tung Chi-chang's Transcendence of History and Art," in *The Century of Tung Ch'i-ch'ang*. Ed. Wai-Kam Ho, 3-42. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1992.
- Holzman, Donald. "On the Authenticity of the 'Preface' to the Collection of Poetry Written at the *Orchid Pavilion*" in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 117, No.2 (Apr.-Jun., 1997): 306-311.
- Hobsbawm, Eric and Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Hyland, Alice R. M. *Deities, Emperors, Ladies and Literati: Figure Painting of the Ming and Qing Dynasties*. Birmingham: Birmingham Museum of Art, 1987.
- Hu, Philip K. "Illustration of the Spring Purification Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion" *Visible Traces: Rare books and special collections from the National Library of China*, 150-154. New York: Queen Borough Public Library and Beijing: National Library of China, 2000.
- _____. "Sail Returning from Distant Shore: Chinese Themes and Styles on Japanese Folding Screens." Ed., Katz, Janice, *Beyond Golden Clouds: Japanese Screens from the Art Institute of Chicago and the Saint Louis Art Museum*, 57-72. Chicago: The Art Institute of Chicago, 2009.
- Jansen, Marius B. *China in the Tokugawa World*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Jordan, Brenda G. and Victoria Weston, eds. *Copying the Master and Stealing His Secrets*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2003.
- Katz, Janice, ed., *Beyond Golden Clouds: Japanese Screens from the Art Institute of Chicago and the Saint Louis Art Museum*. Chicago: The Art Institute of Chicago, 2009.
- Kobayashi, Tadashi, ed. *An Enduring Vision: 17th to 20th Century Japanese Painting from the Gitter-Yelen Collection*. New Orleans: New Orleans Museum of Art, 2003.
- Kohara, Hironobu. "Tung Chichan's Connoisseurship in Tang and Sung Painting" in *The Century of Tung Ch'i-ch'ang*, Wai-Kam Ho, 81-103. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1992.
- Kōno, Motoaki. "The Kano School: The Japanese 'Academy' and Its Literature." *Bijutsushi ronsō*, 5 (1989): 125-9.
- Laing, Ellen Johnston. "Real or Ideal: The Problem of the 'Elegant Gathering in the Western

- Garden,' in Chinese Historical and Art Historical Records," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88 (1968): 419-35.
- Lillehoj, Elizabeth, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Classicism in Japanese Painting, 1600-1700*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2004.
- Lippit, Yukio. "The Surrogate Signature in Seventeenth-Century Japan," in *The Transactions of the International Conference of Eastern Studies* Tōhō Gakkai 44 (1999): 70-97.
- _____. *The Birth of Japanese Painting History: Kano Artists, Authors, and Authenticators of the Seventeenth Century*, PhD Dissertation, Princeton University, 2003.
- Ledderose, Lothar. "Chinese Calligraphy: Its Aesthetic Dimension and Social Function', *Oriental Art*, 17.10 (October 1986): 35-50.
- _____. *Mi Fu and the Classical Tradition of Chinese Calligraphy*, Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Li, Zoe Pei-Yu. *Consoling Frustrated Scholars: a Copy of a Parting Gift by Wen Zhengming*. MA thesis, University of British Columbia, 2007.
- Liscomb, Kathlyn. "The Role of Leading Court Officials as Patrons of Painting in the Fifteenth Century." *Ming Studies* 27 (Spring 1989): 34-62.
- Madar, Kazuko Kameda. *Two Visions of the Orchid Pavilion Gathering: A Reconsideration of the Socio-political Significance of the Paintings by Kano Sansetsu and Ike Taiga*. MA thesis, University of Hawaii, 2002.
- Marra, Michele. *The Aesthetic of Discontent: Politics and Reclusion in Medieval Japanese Literature*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991.
- Markus, Andrew. "Shogakai: Celebrity Banquets of the Late Edo Period" *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, Vol. 53, No.1. (June 1993): 135-167.
- Marc F. Wilson. "Composing Poetry on a Spring Outing," *Eight Dynasties of Chinese Painting: The Collections of the Nelson Gallery-Atkins Museum, Kansas City, and The Cleveland Museum of Art*, 66-69. Cleveland: The Cleveland Museum of Art, 1980.
- Mason, Penelope. "Seisen-in and His Sketches: A Kano Master and Edo Castle," in *Monumenta Nipponica*, vol. 43, no.2 (Summer 1988): 187-196.
- McCausland, Shane and McKelway, Matthew P., ed. *Chinese Romance from a Japanese Brush: Kano Sansetsu's Chōgonka Scrolls in the Chester Beatty Library*. London: SCALA Publishers, LTD, 2009.
- McCormick, Mellissa. *Tosa Mitsunobu and the Small Scroll in Medieval Japan*. Seattle:

- University of Washington Press, 2009.
- McKelway, Matthew. "Autumn Moon and Lingering Snow: Kano Sansetsu's West Lake Screens." *Artibus Asiae* LXII, no.2 (2002): 33-80.
- _____. *Capitalscapes: Folding Screens and Political Imagination in Late Medieval Kyoto*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2006.
- _____. ed. *Traditions Unbound: Groundbreaking Painters of Eighteenth Century Kyoto*. San Francisco: Asian Art Museum, 2005.
- McNally, Mark. *Proving the Way: Conflict and Practice in the History of Japanese Nativism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005.
- Moss, Sydney L. *Emperor, Scholar, Artisan, Monk: The Creative Personality of Chinese Works of Art*. London: Sydney L. Moss, LTD., 1984.
- Mostow, Joshua S. "A New 'Classical' Theme: The One Hundred Poets from Elite to Popular Art in the Early Edo Period." *Critical Perspectives on Classicism in Japanese Painting, 1600-1700*. Ed., Elizabeth Lillehoj, 133-167. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2004.
- _____. "Court Classics and Popular Prints: Poetry and Parody in Ukiyo-e," *Masterful Illusions: Japanese Prints from the Anne van Biema Collection*. Ed. Ann Yonemura, 36-51. Washington, D.C.: The Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, 2002.
- _____. "Canonization and Commodification: Illustrations to the Tales of Ise in the Modern Era," Stephen D. Miller, ed., *Issues of Canonicity and Canon Formation in Japanese Literary Studies*; Proceedings of the Association for Japanese Literary Studies, vol. 1 (Summer 2000): 89-119.
- _____. "Modern Constructions of *Tales of Ise*: Gender and Courtliness," in *Constructing the Past: Canon Formation, National Identity, and Japanese Literature*. Ed., Haruo Shirane and Tomi Suzuki, 96-119. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- _____. *Pictures of the Heart: The Hyakunin Isshu in Word and Image*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1996.
- _____. "Painted Poems, Forgotten Words: Poem-pictures and Classical Japanese Literature," *Monumenta Nipponica* 47.3 (1992): 323-346.
- _____ and Tyler, Royall, trans. *The Ise Stories: Ise monogatari*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2010.
- Murasaki, Shikibu. *The Tale of Genji*. Translated by Royall Tyler. New York: Viking Penguin, 2001.

- Murase, Mieko. "The Evolution of Meisho-e and the Case of the Mutamagawa," *Orientations* 26.1 (January 1995): 94-100.
- Murck, Christian, ed. *Artists and Traditions: Use of the Past in Chinese Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University, 1976.
- Murray, Julia. "What is Chinese Narrative Illustration?" *Art Bulletin*, vol.80, no.4 (1998): 602-616.
- Nagase, Mari. *Women Writers of Chinese Poetry in Late-Edo Period Japan*. PhD Dissertation. University of British Columbia, 2007.
- Najita, Tetsuo. *Visions of Virtue in Tokugawa Japan: the Kaitokudo Merchant Academy of Osaka*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Nakai, Kate Wildman. "Tokugawa Confucian Historiography: The Hayashi, Early Mito School and Arai Hakuseki." In Nosco, ed., *Confucianism and Tokugawa Culture*.
- Nakamachi, Keiko. "The Patrons of Tawaraya Sotatsu and Ogata Korin." In *Critical Perspectives on Classicism in Japanese Painting, 1600-1700*. Ed. Elizabeth Lillehoj, 79-98. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2004.
- Nosco, Peter. *Remembering Paradise: Nativism and Nostalgia in Eighteenth-Century* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- _____, ed. *Confucianism and Tokugawa Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Onishi, Hiroshi. "Chinese Lore for Japanese Spaces." *Immortals and Sages: Paintings from Ryōanji-Temple*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art in NY, 1993.
- Ooms, Herman. *Tokugawa ideology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Owyoung, Steven P. "The Orchid Pavilion Gathering," *Entry 10 in Eighty Works in the Collection of University of Michigan Museum of Art*, 104-109. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1979.
- _____. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering by Shen Mao-yeh*. MA thesis, University of Michigan, 1973.
- Park, Jong P., *Ensnaring the Public Eye: Painting Manuals of Late Ming China (1550-1644) and the Negotiation of Taste*, PhD dissertation, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2007.
- Phillips, Quitman E. "Honcho gashi and the Kano Myth." *Archives of Asian Art* 47 (1994): 46-57.

- Qian, Nanxiu, "An Alien Analogue: The Japanese Imitation Daito seigo" *Spirito and Self in Medieval China: The Shih-shuo hsin-yu and its Legacy*, 319-338. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001.
- Screech, Timon. *The Shogun's Painted Culture: Fear and Creativity in the Japanese States 1760-1829*. London: Reaktion Book, Ltd., 2000.
- _____. *The Western Scientific Gaze and Popular Imagery in Later Edo Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Scott, Joan Wallace. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis" in *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 91, No. 5 (Dec., 1986): 1053-1075.
- Shirane, Haruo and Suzuki, Tomi, ed., *Inventing the Classics: Modernity, National Identity, and Japanese Literature*. California: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Stanley-Baker, Joan. *The Transmission of Chinese Idealist Painting to Japan: Notes on the Early Phase (1661-1799)*. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, the University of Michigan, 1992.
- _____. *Nanga, Idealist Painting of Japan*. Art Gallery of Greater Victoria, 1980.
- Takeuchi, Melinda. *Taiga's True Views: The Language of Landscape Painting in Eighteenth-Century Japan*. California: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- _____. "Tradition, Innovation, and 'Realism' in a Pair of Eighteenth-Century Japanese Landscape Screens," Register. Spencer Museum of Art, University of Kansas, 6.1 (1984): 34-66.
- Trede, Melanie. "Terminology and Ideology: Coming to Terms with "Classicism in Japanese Art-Historical Writing" Lillehoj, Elizabeth, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Classicism in Japanese Painting, 1600-1700*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2004.
- Tsunoda, Ryusaku, et al., "The Tokugawa Peace" *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol.1. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.
- Wheelwright, Carolyn. "Kano Painters of the Sixteenth Century AD: The Development of Motonobu's Daisenin-Style." *Archive of Asian Art* 34 (1981): 6-31.
- Whitefield, Roderick. "Chien Ku: Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion," *In Pursuit of Antiquity: Chinese Paintings of the Ming and Ch'ing Dynasties from the Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Morse*, 76-82. The Art Museum, Princeton University, 1969.
- Wilson, Marc F. "Composing Poetry on a Spring Outing," *Eight Dynasties of Chinese Painting: The Collections of the Nelson Gallery-Atkins Museum, Kansas City, and The Cleveland Museum of Art*, 1980, 66-69.

Woodson, Yoko. *Traveling Bunjin Painters and Their Patrons: Economic Life Style and Art of Rai Sanyo and Tanomura Chikuden (Patrons, Patronage, Literate Painters: Japan)*, PhD Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1983.

Wu, Marshall P.S. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering: Chinese Painting from the University of Michigan Museum of Art*. Seattle: The University of Washington Press, 2000.

Wylie, Hugh. *Nanga Painting Treatises of Nineteenth Century Japan: Translations, Commentary, and Analysis*. PhD Diss., University of Kansas, 1991.

(French Source)

Berliner, Nancy. *Jardins, coupes flottantes et autres evocations de Wang Xizhi, Le Pavillon des Orchidees L'art de l'écriture en Chine*. Bruxelles: Europalia International, 2009.

(Japanese Sources)

Asano, Shūgō. “Fūryū no zōkei, nazoraeru sosa: ‘mitate’ to ‘yatsushi’ to sonoshuhen” in *Zuzo no imi* 図像の意味, *Kōza Nihon bijutsushi* 講座日本美術 3. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 2005.

Shirarezaru “Goyoeshi no sekai” 知られざる 御用絵師の世界 (Unknown World of the “Official Painters”). Tokyo: Asahi shinbunsha, ed. 朝日新聞社, 1998.

Bunjinga shuihen 文人画粹編. Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha 中央公論社, 1972-1976.

Cahill, James. “The Style of Sakaki Hyakusen: Their Chinese Sources and Their Effect on Nanga” 彭城百川の絵画様式—中国絵画との関連と日本南画への影響 *Bijutsushi* 美術史 Vol.93-96 (March 1976): 1-31; Vol. 105 (1978): 1-17; and Vol. 107 (1979): 36-53.

Cheng, Liyun (Tei Reiun) 鄭麗芸. *Bunjin Ike Taiga kenkyū: Chūgoku bunjin shishoga “sanzetsu” no Nihonteki juyō* 文人池大雅研究—中国文人詩書画三絶の日本的受容 Tokyo: Hakutei sha, 1997.

Chino, Kaori 千野香織. “Kano ha to funpon” 狩野派と粉本 *The Third Anniversary Exhibition: Great Masters of the Kano School*, 33-38. Shizuoka: Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art, 1989.

Doi, Tsuguyoshi 土居次義. *Kinsei Nihon kaiga no kenkyū* 近世日本絵画の研究. Tokyo: Bijutsu shuppansha 美術出版社, 1970.

_____. *Sansetsu to Sanraku* 山楽と山雪 Kuwana bunseido 桑名文星堂, 1943.

_____, ed. *Sanraku to Sansetsu* 山楽と山雪 *Nihon no bijutsu* 日本の美術 9 Vol. 172.

Shibundō 至文堂, No.172, (Sep. 1980).

_____, ed. *Kano Sanraku to Sansetsu* 狩野山楽と山雪. *Nihon bijutsu kaiga zenshū* 日本美術絵画全集 Vol.12. Tokyo: Shueisha 集英社, 1976.

Fukumoto, Gaichi 福本雅一. “Seion gashuzu wo megutte” 西園雅集図をめぐって *Gakusō* 学叢. Kyoto National Museum. Vol. 12 (1990): 73-86; Vol. 13 (1991): 81-95.

_____. “Ranteikō 蘭亭考” *Sho no shūhen 2 Sobokushū*. 書の周辺 Vol. 2 瘦墨集. Tokyo: Nigensha 二玄社, 1984.

_____. “Rantei girai 蘭亭嫌い” *Sho no shūhen 2 Tanhitsushū*. 書の周辺 Vol. 1 類筆集 Tokyo: Nigensha 二玄社, 1981.

Fujioka, Sakutarō 藤岡朔太郎. *Kinsei kaigashi* 近世絵画史. First published in 1903 Tokyo: Perikansha, 1983.

Hayashi, Susumu 林進. *Nihon kinsei kaiga no zuzōgaku: shukō to shin'i* 日本近世絵画の図像学—趣向と深意. Tokyo, Yagi shoten, 2000.

_____. “Senkyō heno izanai –Kano Sansetsu hitsu Bankokuzu wo megutte” *Senkyō heno izanai*, Nara, Yamato Bunka-kan, 1986.

Hoshino, Suzu 星野鈴. “Ike Taiga hitsu Rantei zu hengaku soko.” 池大雅筆蘭亭図扁額草稿 *Kokka* 国華 Vol. 1354 (2009): 23-28.

Hosono, Masanobu 細野正信. “Nakayama Kōyō ron” 中山高陽論 *Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan Kiyō* 東京国立博物館紀要 No.5 (1969): 79-189.

_____. “Nakayama Kōyō.” *Kokka*, vol. 925 (1970): 5-12.

_____. *Edo no Kanoha* 江戸の狩野派. *Nihon no bijutsu* Vol.3 日本の美術, No.262 Shibundo, 1988.

_____. *Ikeno Taiga, Bunjinga Suihen* 池大雅文人画粹編, vol. 12, Chuo Kōronsha, Tokyo 1974.

Idemitsu, Sachiko 出光佐千子. “Ike Taiga hitsu Saiko shunkei/ Sento kanko zu byōbu no shudai kosatsu” 池大雅筆 西湖春景・銭塘觀潮図屏風の主題考察—図様と文学的典拠を探る. Ed. Tokyo National Museum. *Museum* Vol. 599 (Dec. 2005.): 4-5, 33-55.

Iijima, Isamu 飯島勇 and Suzuki Susumu 鈴木進. *Taiga/Buson* 大雅・蕪村. *Suiboku bijutsu taikei* 水墨美術大系 Vol.12. Tokyo: Kōdansha 講談社, 1973.

Ike Taiga 池大雅 *Suibokuga no kyosho* 水墨画の巨匠. Tokyo: shogakukan 小学館, 1991.

“Ikeno Taiga hitsu Rantei kyokusuizu” 池大雅筆蘭亭曲水図 *Kokka* Vol.653 (1946): 15-18.

Igarashi, Kôichi 五十嵐公一, *Kinsei Kyoto gadan no nettowaku: Chumon'nushi to eshi* 近世京都画壇のネットワーク—注文主と絵師. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbun-kan, 2010.

_____. *Kano Einô Honchô Gashi no kenkyû* 狩野永納 本朝画史の研究, PhD diss, University of Tokyo, 2006.

_____. *Kano Einô: sono tasai naru gagyô* 狩野永納—その多彩なる画業, Hyogo: Hyogo Prefectural History Museum, 1999.

Imanaka, Hiroshi 今中寛司. *Soraigaku no kisoteki kenkyû* 徂徠学の基礎的研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kôbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1966.

Inagaki, Tomoko 稲墻朋子. “Nakabayashi Chikutô no gakyô: Saiban'nen no sansui ga ni miru gafu no henka wo megutte” 中林竹洞の画境—最晩年の山水画にみる変化をめぐって *Bijutsushi* (July 2009): 35-51.

Ishikawa, Kuyô 石川九楊. *Chûgokushoshi* 中国書史. Kyoto: Kyoto University Press, 1996.

Itakura, Masa'aki 板倉聖哲. Myôshin-ji Tenkyû-in Hôjô Shôhekiga ni tsuite no ichi kaishaku: Kano Sansetsu ni okeru Chûgoku zô no ichidanhen” 妙心寺天球院方丈障壁画についての一解釈—狩野山雪における「中国」像の一断片 *Kano-ha wo chushin to suru kangaku-ha no kenkyu* 狩野派を中心とする官学派の研究 (2007): 15-25.

_____. “Jûshichi seiki Nihonkaiga ni okeru Chûgokuzô: Kano Sansetsu Fujiwara Seika kankyozu (Nezu Museum)” 十七世紀日本絵画における中国像—狩野山雪 藤原惺窩 閑居図 を例に— *Kashim bijutsu kenkyû* Vol. 23 (2006): 178-188.

_____. “Kano Sansetsu ‘To Ho Sôdô zu’ ni tsuite” 狩野山雪 杜甫草堂図 について *Bijutsushika ooini warau* 美術史家、大いに笑う Tokyo: Buryukke ブリュッケ, 2006.

_____. “Kano Sansetsu ga kaita Chôgonka zu: Itan kara koten he” 狩野山雪が描いた長恨歌図—異端から古典へ *UP* Vol. 35-6 No. 404 (June 2006): 6-12.

_____. The Historical Position of Ma Yuan's Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden (The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art): Concerning the Pictorialization of this Theme as Fiction 馬遠西園雅集図巻の史的位罫—虚構としての西園雅集とその絵画化をめぐって— *Bijutsushi ronso* 美術史論叢 Vol.16 (Dec. 1999): 49-78.

_____. “Kano Sansetsu gunsenzuzo no ichigensen ni tsuite” 狩野山雪筆群仙図像の—源泉

- について, *Bijutsushi ronso* Vol. 8 (March 1992): 79-85.
- _____, ed., *Keitai no denshō* 形態の伝承, *Kōza Nihon bijutsushi* 講座日本美術史 2, Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 2005.
- Iwasa Shin'ichi 岩佐伸一, "Kara-eshi/ Rin Rōen no sakuhin yori 唐絵師・林閨苑の作品より" *Bijutsu forum* 21, Vol. 17 (2008): 4-9.
- _____. "Kishiha no keisei to keisho ni kansuru kenkyu 岸派の形成と継承に関する研究" *Kashima bijutsu zaidan kenkyu hokokusho* 鹿島美術財団研究報告書, vol. 21, (2004): 227-238.
- Kamitaka Tokuharu 神鷹徳治, et al., *Kano Sansetsu-ga Chōgonka gakan* 狩野山雪画長恨歌画卷, *Yomigaeru emaki/ehon* 甦る絵巻・絵本 Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan 勉誠出版, 2006.
- Kamiyama, Noboru 神山登. "Fukuhara Gogaku no hito to sakuhin 福原五岳の人と作品" *Nihon bijutsu kōgei* 日本美術工芸 (Sept. 1980): 24-33.
- Kameda (Madar), Kazuko. "Fūzoku 'Kyokusuien-zu' no shisō to henyō: Tukioka Sessai to Kubo Shunman wo rei to shite" 風俗曲水宴図の思想と変容—月岡雪斎と窪俊満を例として— (Ideology and Transformation of 'Kyokusui-en' Theme in Genre Painting: Study of Tukioka Sessai and Kubo Shunman) *Fūzokukaiga no bunnkagaku* 風俗絵画の文化学. Ed. Ikuyo Matsumoto and Sachiko Idemitsu, 243-273. Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 2009.
- Kamei Wakana 亀井若菜. "Muromachi jidai no Tosa ha wo meguru gensetsu: jenda no shiten kara no bunseki." 室町時代の土佐派をめぐる言説—ジェンダーの視点からの分析 in *Gakushūin University*, Vol. 43 (1997): 1-20.
- Kanbayashi Tsunemichi, ed. 神林恒道編. *Nihon no Geijutsuron: dento to kindai* 日本の芸術論—伝統と近代. Kyoto: Mineruva shobō ミネルヴァ書房, 2000.
- Kanematsu Romon 兼松蘆門, *Chikuto to Bai'itsu* 竹洞と梅逸. Tokyo: Gahōsha 画報社, 1910.
- Kangakei jinbutsu, Nihon byōbue shūsei* Vol. 4, *Jinbutsuga* 漢画系人物 日本屏風絵集成 Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1980.
- Kanō-ha no Kaiga* 狩野派の絵画. Tokyo: Tokyo National Museum, 1981.
- Kanō, Hiroyuki. *Soga Shōhaku: Araburu Kyo no eshi* 曾我蕭白 荒ぶる京の絵師. Kyoto: Rinsei Shoten 臨川書店, 2007.
- _____. "Edo zenki gadan no chōbō", Kobayashi, Tadashi, ed. *Kanōha to Fūzokuga*:

Edo no kaiga I, Nippon bijutsu zenshū Vol.17. Tokyo: Kōdansha 狩野博幸、「江戸前期画壇の眺望」小林忠編『狩野派と風俗画』日本美術全集第十七巻、講談社、1992, 146 - 159.

_____, ed. *Soga Shōhaku. Nihon no bijutsu* 日本の美術 No. 258. Tokyo: Shibundō, 1987.

Kano Sansetsu 狩野山雪: *Senkyō heno izanai* 仙境への誘い. Nara: Yamato Yamato bunkakan 大和文華館, 1986.

Kawamoto Keiko 川本桂子, “Kujō-ke denrai no Kuruma Arasoī zu wo megutte: sono seisaku jijo to kaishaku wo chūshin ni 九条家伝来の車争い図をめぐって-その制作事情と解釈を中心に, *Nihon kaigashi no kenkyū* 日本絵画史の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1989.

_____. *Sanraku/ Yūshō* 山楽/友松, Tokyo: Shōgakukan 小学館, 1991.

Kinsei Kyoto no Kanoha ten 近世京都の狩野派展 [Kano-School and the art world of the first half of the 18th century in Kyoto.] Kyoto: The Kyoto Museum, 2004.

Kitano Yoshie. “Kano Sansetsu hitsu Jussetuzu byōbu no seisaku keiki ni tsuite 狩野山雪筆十雪図屏風の制作契機について” *Kokka* Vol. 1272 (2001): 23.

Kobayashi, Hiromitsu 小林宏光. *Chugoku kaigashi ni okeru hanga no igi: Koshi gafu* (1603) 中国絵画史における版画の意義 顧氏画譜にみる歴代名画複製をめぐって *Bijutsushi* 39: 2 (March 1990): 123-135.

_____. Gu Ping's “Great Synthesis” of Chinese Painting: A Study of Illustrations to the *Gu shi huapu* (1603) 顧炳による中国絵画集大成の試み- 顧氏画譜の研究 The Faculty of Letters in Jissen Women's College annual reports of studies 30, (March 1988): 143-173.

Kobayashi, Tadashi 小林忠. *Ukiyo-e no rekishi* 浮世絵の歴史. *Bijutsu shuppansha* 美術出版社, 1998.

_____. “Bunjinga to Nanga: Ikeno Taiga hitsu Wang Wei shiizu sōfuku 文人画と南画池大雅筆王維 *Kokka* Vol. 1207 (June 1996): 22 - 23.

_____, ed. *Taiga to Ōkyo: Edo no kaiga III.* 大雅と応挙- 江戸の絵画 *Bijutsu zenshu* 美術全集 Vol. 19. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1993.

_____, ed. *Edo no Kaiga* 江戸の絵画 II, *Nihon no bijutsu* 日本の美術 Vol. 10, No. 210 Tokyo: Shibundō, 1983.

- Kobayashi, Yuko 小林優子. “Bunjinga ni okeru gadai no kenkyu: Ikeno Taiga/ Yosa Buson no byobu wo chushinni 文人画における画題の研究、池大雅・与謝蕪村の屏風を中心に” *Kajima bijutsu zaidan kenkyu hokokusho* 鹿島美術財団研究報告書, Vol. 17 (1999): 327-336.
- Kohara Hironobu 古原宏伸. *Bei Futsu “Gashi” chukai* 米芾 画史 註解. Tokyo: Chūōkōron bijutsu shuppan, 2009 (Vol. 1) and 2010 (Vol. 2).
- _____. *Chugoku gakan no kenkyu* 中国画卷の研究 Tokyo: Chūōkōron bijutsu shuppan 中央 公論 美術 出版, 2005.
- _____. *Chugoku garon no kenkyū* 中国画論の研究 Tokyo: Chūōkōron bijutsu shuppan, 2003.
- _____. *Jo I/ To Kisho* 徐渭, 董其昌 *Bunjinga shuihen* 文人画粹編. Vol.8, Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha 中央公論社, 1978.
- _____. *Garon* 画論. Tokyo: Meitoku Shuppansha 明德出版社, 1973.
- _____ and Akai Tatsuo 赤井達郎. *Cha no yu kaiga shiryō shusei* 茶の湯絵画資料集成, Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1992.
- Kojima, Yasunori. *Soraigaku to han-Sorai* 徂徠学と反徂徠. Tokyo: Perikansha, 1986.
- Komada, Shinji 駒田信二. *Chūgoku shojinden* 中国書人伝. Tokyo: Geijutsu shinbunsha 芸術新聞社, 1985.
- Kōno, Motoaki 河野元昭. “Maruyama Ōkyohitsu Ranteikyokusuisu” 円山応挙筆蘭亭曲水図 *Kokka*, 国華 Vol. 1214 (1997): 31-34.
- _____. “Nihon bunjinga shiron” 日本文人画試論 *Bunjinga to Nanga* 文人画と南画, *Kokka* Vol.1207 (1996): 3-7.
- _____. “Tanyu to Nagoyajō Kaneido zōei goten.” *Bijutsushi ronso*, 2 (1985): 91-11 6; 4 (1988): 131-153; 6 (1990): 99-124.
- _____, and Aiga, Tetsuo. *Taiga/ Ōkyo* 大雅・応挙. *Meihō Nihon no bijutsu* Vol.26. Tokyo Shōgakukan, 1991.
- Kubota, Jun 久保田淳. “Waka renka ni okeru shiki no fūnbutsu keibutsu” 和歌・連歌における四季の風物・景物 *Nenju Gyoji* 年中行事, *Kinsei fūzoku zūfu* 近世風俗図譜, Vol. 1 Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1983.

- Kudō, Takashi 工藤壮. *Kuwayama Gokushū* 桑山玉洲. Wakayama: Wakayama Municipal Museum 和歌山市立美術館, 2006.
- Kudo, Yoroshi 工藤宜. *Edo bunjin no sukurappu bukku* 江戸文人のスクラップ・ブック. Shinchōsha 新潮社, 1989.
- Kurimoto, Kazuo 栗本和夫, ed. *The Works of Ike-no Taiga* 池大雅作品集. Tokyo: Chūōkōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1960.
- Kurokawa Shuichi 黒川修一. “Nakayama Koyo to Gadan keiroku 中山高陽と画譚雞助.” *Teihon Nihon Kaigaron Taisei* Vol. 6. Eds. Kurokawa Shuichi 黒川修一/ Kamiya Hiroshi 神谷浩, 298-322. Tokyo: Perikansha, 2000.
- “*Lake Dongting Screen* by Fukuhara Gogaku 福原五岳筆洞庭湖” *Ikeda bunka to Osaka* 池田文化と大坂, 21-25. Ikeda Municipal Museum of History 池田市立歴史民俗資料館, 1992.
- Landscape Painting in the East and West Inaugural Exhibition*. Shizuoka: The Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art, 1986.
- Matsuki, Hiroshi 松木寛. *Goyō eshi Kanōke no chi to chikara* 御用絵師 狩野家の血と力. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1994.
- Matsushima, Hidemaro 松下英麿. *Ike no Taiga* 池大雅. Tokyo: Shūnshusha 春秋社, 1967.
- Matsumoto Naoko 松本直子 Kano Eigaku no kenkyū: Yoshiki shentaku no ronri, 狩野永岳の研究—様式選択の論理, PhD Dissertation, Dōshisha University, 2007.
- . “Honchō gashi”no senryaku — sōwa ni miru gajin no image” 本朝画史の戦略挿話にみる画人のイメージ *Dōshisha University Aesthetics* 美学・芸術学 Vol. 13 (1997): 58-73.
- Matsumura Shōfū 松村稍風. *Honchō gajinden* 本朝画人傳. Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1972.
- Matsumura Takiko 松村多起子. “Kano Einō hitsu Rantei Kyokusuien zu byōbu ni tsuite.” 狩野永納筆 蘭亭曲水宴図屏風について *Bijutsushi* Vol. 156 (2004): 488-489.
- Miyako no eshi ha hyakka ryoran* 京の絵師は百花繚乱— 平安人物志 にみる江戸時代の京都画壇 [The Blooming of Hundreds of Flowers: Painters of Edo Period Kyoto in the Heian-Jimbutsu-shi]. Kyoto: The Museum of Kyoto 京都文化博物館 1998.
- Momoyama Hyakusō*. Kyoto: Fuji Art Shuppan, 1970.

- Mori, Senzō 森銑三. “Ikeno Taiga kafu no kenkyū” 池大雅家譜の研究 *Bijutsu kenkyū* 美術研究 Vol. 89. (May 1939): 172-180.
- Murase, Mieko 村瀬実恵子. “Shūsha suikizu, Rantei shūkeizu 秋社酔帰図/ 蘭亭修禊図” In *Nihon shohekiga meihinsen zaibei korekushon* 日本障壁画名品選在米コレクション, 94-96. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店, 1992.
- Museum of Modern Art Shiga, The. *Tsukinami-e* (Pictures of Monthly Subjects): Scenes of the Twelve Months. Kyoto: the Kyoto Shinbun, 1995.
- “Rantei Kyokusuisu” 蘭亭曲水図 in *Nagasawa Rosetsu ten* 長澤芦雪展, Osaka: Toyohashi Municipal Museum of Art 豊橋市美術博物館, 1990.
- Nakamachi, Keiko 仲町啓子 “Taiga no gakyō to sono haikai: Rantei shūkei/ Ryūzan shōkaizu wo megutte” 大雅の画境とその背景—蘭亭修禊・龍山勝会図をめぐって *Sumi* 墨 Vol. 154 (2002): 132-133.
- . “Ukiyo-e ga kioku shita ‘Ise Monotatari-e’” *Jissen joshi daigaku bungakubu kiyō*, Vol. 41 (March, 1999). Translated in English by Henry Smith and Miriam Wattles, “Ukiyo-e Memories of *The Tales of Ise*” in *Impressions* (2000).
- Nakata, Yūjirō 中田勇次郎. *Chūgoku shodōshi* 中国書道史 Vol.4 *Tōjin* 東晋 [*History of Chinese Calligraphy, Eastern Jin Dynasty*] Ed. Shimonaka Naoya 下中直也 Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社, 1954.
- Nakayama Koyo gafu* 中山高陽画譜. Kochi kyoiku iinkai 高知教育委員会, 1971
- Nishibayashi, Sho’ichi 西林昭一. *Ranteijo [goshu] Tojin Oh Gishi* 蘭亭叙 五種 東晋 王羲之 [*Five versions by the Eastern Jin Dynasty period Wang Xi-zhi.*] *Chugokuhoshosen* 中国法書選 Vol. 15. Tokyo: Nigensha 二玄社, 1988.
- Ōbaku no bijutsu – Edo jidai no bunka wo kaetamono* 黄檗の美術—江戸時代の文化を変えたもの. Kyoto: Kyoto National Museum, 1993.
- Ōhira Kei’ichi 大平桂一, “Kyokusui no en saikō: Ō Gishi ga Rantei de kyokusui no en o moyōsumade, soshite sonogo” 曲水の宴再考—王羲之が蘭亭で曲水の宴を催すまで、そしてその後 (Reconsideration of Kyokusui: Before and after the Wang Xizhi’s event of Orchid Pavilion Gathering). *Hyōfū* 颯風, Vol. 41 (November 2004): 97-110.
- Osaka Municipal Museum of Art 大阪市立美術館, ed. *Kinsei Osaka gadan* 近世大坂画壇, Kyoto: Dōhōsha shuppan, 1983.
- Reizei Tamehito 冷泉為人, ed. *Kanei bunka no Network*. 寛永文化のネットワーク

Shibunkaku, 1998.

Shōwa Rantei ten kinen ten 昭和蘭亭記念展 Goto Museum of Art 五島美術館, Tokyo: Nigensha 二玄社, 1973.

Shōwa Kichu Rantei ten zuroku 昭和癸丑蘭亭展図録 Nihon shogei-in 日本書芸院, Osaka: Nigensha, 1973.

Sakamoto, Mitsuru 坂本満. *Ōgon to Kurusu* 黄金とクルス (*Gold and Cross*). *Ningen no Bijutsu* 人間と美術 Vol. 8. Tokyo: Gakushū kenkyūsha 学習研究社, 1990.

_____. *Nanban byōbu*. Chūōkōron bijutsu shuppan, 2008.

Sakakibara, Satoru 榊原悟. “Edo shoki Kanoha o meguru mondai: Honcho gashi to kanren shite 江戸初期狩野派をめぐる問題—本朝画史と関連して.” *Museum* 343 (October 1979): 14-25.

_____. “Tanyu no oyabaka: Kanoha soshiki no ichimen,” *Kobijutsu* 古美術 75 (July 1985): 66-78.

Sakazaki Shiduka, ed. 坂崎坦 *Nihonga no seishin* 日本畫の精神, Tokyo: Tokyodo 東京堂, 1942.

_____. *Ronga Yonshū* 論画四種. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店, 1932.

Sasaki Jōhei 佐々木丞平. *Edo no Kaiga* 江戸の絵画, *Nihon no bijutsu* 日本の美術 Vol. 10, No. 209. Tokyo: Shibundo, 1983.

_____. *Bunjinga to shaseiga* 文人画と写生画, *Nihon bijutsu zenshū*, 日本美術全集, Vol. 24, 1979.

Satō Yasuhiro 佐藤康宏 “Soga Shōhaku hitsu Ranteikyokusui zu Kuriburando bijutsukanzobon 曾我蕭白筆蘭亭曲水図 クリーブランド美術館蔵本” *Kokka* Vol. 1107 (2005): 21-23, 25-26.

_____. “Edo chuki kaigaron dansho: Ogyu Sorai kara Ike Taiga made 江戸中期絵画論断章—荻生徂徠から池大雅まで” *Bijutsushi ronso* 美術史論叢 Vol. 15 (2003): 25-65.

_____. “Jūhasseiki no zeneishinwa 十八世紀の前衛神話.” *Edo no bunka henyū: Jūhasseiki Nihon no keiken* 江戸の文化変容—十八世紀日本の経験, 119-162. Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社, 1994.

_____. “Ike Taiga hitsu Rantei kyokusui zu kaisetsu 池大雅筆蘭亭曲水図解説” *Genshoku*

- Nihon no bijutsu*, Vol. 27, *Zaigai bijutsu (kaiga)* 原色日本の美術 27 在外美術絵画 (Tokyo: Shogakkan 小学館, 1980), 193-196, 209.
- _____, et al. *Mono kara kotobae* 物から言葉へ *Kōza Nihon bijutsushi* 講座日本美術史 1, Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai 東京大学出版会, 2005.
- Shimonaka, Naoya 下中直也. *Chugoku shodoshi* Vol. 4 *Tojin* 中国書道史東晋. *Shodō zenshū* 書道全集. Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社, 1954.
- Shimizu Takayuki 清水孝之. *Nakayama Kōyō* 中山高陽. *Kochishi bunka shinko jigiyodan* 高知市文化振興事業団, 1987.
- _____. “Nakayama Kōyō no sansui kaigan: *oyu nichiroku wo chuushin toshite*.” 中山高陽の山水開眼 - 奥游目録 を中心として *Museum* vol. 225 (December 1969): 4-13.
- _____. *Nakayama Kōyō kikōshū* 中山高陽紀行集. *Kōchishi bunkasai shikkō iinkai* 高地市文化祭執行委員会, 1957.
- Sumai no myūjiamu 住まいのミュージアム, ed. “*Gōami hitsu Rantei kyokusuizu*” 江阿弥筆 蘭亭曲水図 *Machi ie no shitsurai to kazari: Kinsei Osaka no sumai* 町家のしつらいと飾り - 近世大阪の住家. Osaka: Sumai no myujiamu, 2001.
- Suzuka Sanshichi 鈴鹿三七, “Kyo-Kanoke no komonjo 京狩野家の古文書 *Geibun* 芸文 No.10-11, (1917): 76-86.
- Takeda, Kōichi 武田光一. *Ike Taiga niokeru gafu niyoru seisaku* 池大雅における画譜による制作. *Bijutsu kenkyū* 美術研究 Vol. 348 (1990): 1-22.
- _____. “Nanga ni okeru mokuhan gafu no riyo: Tani Buncho no ba’ai wo chushinnishite” 南画における木版画譜の利用—谷文晁の場合を中心にして Ed. Itakura, Masa’aki, 板倉聖哲 *Keitai no densho* 形態の伝承, *Kōza Nihon bijutsushi* 講座日本美術史 2, Tokyo: University of Tokyo, 2005.
- _____. *Ikeno Taiga* 池大雅. *Shinchō Nihon bijutsu bunko* Vol. 11. Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1997.
- Takeda Tsuneo 武田恒夫. *Kanoga kaigashi* 狩野派絵画史. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1995.
- _____. *Nihon kaiga to saiji: keibutsugashiron* 日本絵画と歳時—景物画史論 Tokyo: Perikansha, 1990.
- Tanaka, Toshio. “Edo jidai shoki no Kanoha no doko.” *Osaka geijutsu daigaku kiyo* 12

(November 1989): 5-17.

Tanaka, Yuko 田中優子. *Edo hyakumu: kinsei zuzogaku no tanoshimi* 江戸百夢: 近世図像学の楽しみ Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 2000.

_____. *Edo wa nettowāku* 江戸はネットワーク Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1993.

Taniguchi, Tetsuo and Sasaki, Takeru 谷口鉄雄・佐々木猛 *Ranteijo ronsoyakuchu* 蘭亭序論争訳注 Chūōkōron bijutsushuppan 中央公論美術出版, 1993.

Tani Shinichi 谷信一 and Noma Seiroku 野間清六. *Nihon bijutsu jiten* 日本美術辞典, Tokyo: Heibunsha 平文社, 1952.

Tokuda Takeshi 徳田武 and Kobayashi Tadashi 小林忠, ed. *Edo bungaku* 江戸文学 Vol.17, 18. *Bunjinga to kanshibun* 文人画と漢詩文 I and II. Tokyo: Perikansha ペリカン社, 1997.

Tokunaga Hiromichi 徳永弘道. “Matsuzaki Kendō hitsu *Rantei shukei rin Ranteijo*” 松崎慊堂筆蘭亭修禊臨蘭亭序 *Kokka*, *Kokkasha* (1977): 23, 25-28.

Tomioka Tessai 富岡鉄斎. Kyoto: Kyoto Shinbunsha/ Benrido, 1991.

Toda, Sadasuke, et al. *Kangakei Jinbutsu* 漢画系人物. *Nihon byōbue shūsei* 日本屏風絵集成 vol. 4. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1978.

Toyonakashi shi hensan i'inkai, ed. 豊中市史編纂委員会編 “Tsukioka Sessai hitsu Kyokusuien-zu” 月岡雪斎筆 曲水宴図 Shinshu *Toyonakashi shi*, vol.6, *Bijutsu*, 281-283. Osaka: Toyonaka city, 2005.

Tsuji, Nobuo 辻惟雄. *Kiso no keifu* 奇想の系譜. Tokyo: Perikansha, 1988.

_____. *Sengoku jidai Kanōha no kenkyū [Study on the Early Kanō School]: Kanō Motonobu o chūshin ni shite [Motonobu and his Family of Painters]*. 戦国時代狩野派の研究: 狩野元信を中心にして Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1994.

_____. “Matuyama Ōkyo hitsu *Rantei kyokusui zu gako* 円山応挙筆 蘭亭曲水図画稿” *Bijutsushi*, 美術史 Vol. 59 (Dec. 1965): 21-22.

Tōyō bijutsu ni okeru fūzoku hyōgen 東洋美術における風俗表現 [*The Representation of Genre in East Asian Art.*] International Symposium on Art Historical Studies 4, (Department of the Science of Arts, Faculty of Letters) Osaka: Osaka University, 1985.

Wakisaka Jun 脇坂淳, “Kyō-Kano no kenkyū, Kyō-Kanoke shiryō 京狩野の研究 京狩野家資料” *The Journal of the Osaka Municipal Museum* Vol. 9 大阪市立美術館紀要 1989.

_____. *Kyō-Kano no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Chūōkōron bijutsu shuppan, 2011.

Wang, Chia-hua. “Nicchū Jugaku no hikaku 日中儒学の比較 [A Comparative Study between Japanese and Chinese Confucianisms.]” *Higashi Ajia no nakano Nihon rekishi Vol. 5 [Japanese History in East Asia]*. 東アジアの中の日本歴史 Vol.5 Tokyo: Rikkyō shuppan 陸教出版, 1988.

Yabumoto, Kōzō 藪本公三. “Taigahitsu ‘Ranteizu’ hengaku to sono sōkō.” 大雅筆 蘭亭 図 扁額のその草稿 *Kobijutsu* No. 4. Tokyo: Sanseisha 三彩社 (Apr. 1974): 52-55.

Yamane Yūzō 山根有三. *Kōrin kenkyū* 光琳研究. Tokyo: Chūōkōron bijutsu Shuppan, 1995 (Vol. 1) and 1997 (Vol. 2).

Yamaoka, Taizō. “Kaigashi ni okeru Chūgoku to Nihon no bunjinga ni tuite” 絵画史における中国と日本の文人画について *Kansai daigaku Tozaigakujutsu kenkyujokiyo* 関西大学東西学術研究会紀要 32 (1999.3): 33-48.

Yamashita, Yoshiya 山下善也. “Kano Sanraku niyoru Daikaku-ji no shohekiga” 狩野山楽による大覚寺の障壁画 *Daikakuji Kotojunrei* 大覚寺古都巡礼, Vol.28 (Kyoto: Tankosha 淡交社, 2008), 127-136.

_____. “Fugū na jitsuryokusha tachi” 不遇な実力者たち *Kanoha ketteiban* 狩野派決定版, *Bessatsu Taiyō* 別冊太陽 131 Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2004, 104-5.

_____. “Fūkeiga ni miru Tan’yū no miryoku to senkusei – shasei to honga o tōshite” 風景画にみる探幽の魅力と先駆性—写生と本画をとおして *Kano Tan’yū ten* 狩野探幽展 Tokyo: Tokyo Metropolitan Art Museum, 2002, 208.

_____. “Hakkei-zu o megutte: Fuji-san to Biwako no ba’ai,” 八景図をめぐって—富士山と琵琶湖の場合 *Nihon-ga no jōkei: Fuji-san/ Biwa-ko kara* 日本画の情景—富士山・琵琶湖から (exhibition catalogue, Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art/ The Museum of Modern Art, Shiga, 2000), 136-137.

_____. “Taishōteki sonzai toshite no Sansetsu to Tan’yū: Edo shoki Kano-ha no nidai kyoshō ni kanshite” 対照的存在としての山雪と探幽—江戸初期狩野派の二大巨匠に関して *Kano-ha no kyoshō tachi* (Great Masters of Kano School), Shizuoka kenritsu bijutsukan kaikan sanshunin kinenten 静岡県立美術館開館三周年記念展 (The Third Anniversary Exhibition), 1989, 22-32.

_____. “Kano Sansetsuhitsu Fuji Miho Matsubarazu byōbu 狩野山雪筆富士三保松原図屏風: Zuyō no genryū to kakushinsei ni tsuite” 図様の源流と革新性について *Shizuoka kenritsu bijutsukan kiyō* Vol.2 静岡県立美術館紀要, 1984.

Yamato bunka Vol. 82, Kano Sansetsu tokushū 狩野山雪特輯, Nara: Yamato Bunka-kan, 1989.

Yasumura, Toshinobu 安村敏信. “Kanoha to gajō” 狩野派と画帖 Eds. Kobayashi Tadashi 小林忠 and Kono Motoaki 河野元昭. *Tanyu, Morikage, Iccho* 探幽・守景・一蝶: *Edo meisaku gajo zenshū* 江戸名作画帖全集 IV. Tokyo: Shinshindo 駸々堂, 1994.

_____. “Bakumatsu Edo Kanoha no ibun 幕末江戸狩野派の遺文.” *Nihon no bijutsukan* 日本の美術館 3, Tokyo I (August 1987): 100-105.

_____. “Funpon to mosha 粉本と模写: Edo Kanoha no baai 江戸狩野派の場合.” *Nihon no bigaku* 日本の美学 Vol.13 (January 1989): 25-39.

_____. *Kano-ha: Tan'yū to Edo Kano-ha* 狩野派—探幽と狩野派. Tokyo: Tokyo bijutsu 東京美術, 2006.

Yoshikawa, Kojiro 吉川幸次郎. *Jinsai; Sorai; Norinaga* 仁斎・徂徠・宣長 Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1975.

_____. “Ranteijo o megutte” 蘭亭序を巡って *Ranteitenzuroku* 蘭亭展図録 Kyoto: Nigensha, 1973.

Yoshizawa, Chu 吉沢忠. “Onaji zu no aru Ike Taigahitsu Rantei Kyokusui byōbu ni tsuite” 同じ図のある池大雅筆蘭亭曲水図屏風について *Kokka* Vol. 1096 (Sep. 1986): 29 - 35.

_____. *Nihon Nanga Ronkō* 日本南画論攷 [*Investigation of Japanese Literati Paintings*] Tokyo: Kōdansha 講談社, 1977.

_____. “Nakayama Koyo hitsu Ranteikyokusui-zukan” 中山高揚筆蘭亭曲水図巻 *Kokka* vol. 925 (1970): 20-28.

_____. “Okada Beisanjin hitsu Ranteikyokusui-zu 岡田米山人筆蘭亭曲水図” *Kokka* 国華, 775, (1968): 28-29.

_____, and Kōno, Motoaki 吉沢忠・河野元昭. “Nanga sansui” 南画山水 *Nippon byōbueshūsei* 日本屏風絵集成 Vol.3. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1979.

Yukawa, Genyo 湯川玄洋 and Yukawa, Sumi 湯川スミ. *Kinsei Gajinden* 近世雅人傳 Kyoto: Geiundō 芸艸堂, first published in 1930 and reprinted in 1977.

(Chinese Sources)

- Chen, Shaoling 陳小凌. “Muchun Xiuxi Yunshi” 暮春脩禊韻事 *Bahui Monian* 八徵耄念 *Looking back 80 years of National Palace Museum* 国立故宫博物院八十年的點滴懷想, 2007, 85-92.
- Guo, Moruo 郭沫若. “You wang xie mu zhi de chu tu lun dao Lantingxu de zhenwei” 由王謝墓志的出土論到蘭亭的真偽 [From Reading of the Newly Excavated Wang Xie and His Wife’s Epitaph to Authenticating of the Preface of Orchid Pavilion Gathering] *Wenwu* 文物 Vol.6, 1965, 1-25.
- _____. “Lantingxu yu Lao Zhuan sisiang” 蘭亭序 与老庄思想 *Wenwu* 文物 Vol.9 (1965): 9-11.
- Paintings of the Ming Dynasty from the Palace Museum*. Hong Kong: Palace Museum, and The Art Gallery, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1988.
- Shi, Shuqing 史樹青. “Cong xiao yi zhan Lantingtu” 從簫翼賺蘭亭圖 談到 蘭亭序 的偽作問題 (1965): 14-18.
- Wang, Lianqi 王連起. “A Consideration on *the Preface of Orchid Pavilion Gathering* Copied by Lu Jishan of Yuan dynasty” 元陸繼善摸 蘭亭序 考 *Wenwu* 文物 (2006): 87-92.
- Wang Yi 王禕, “The Ming Dynasty Fanfu (Princely Mansion) Block Editions of Lanting xu (Illustration of Orchid Pavilion) and its Evolution” 明代藩府刻《蘭亭圖》卷及其變遷 in *Journal of Palace Museum* 132, no. 4 (30 July, 2007): 141-155.
- Yao Shou, *Zhongguo gudai shuhua tumu* 中国古代書畫圖目, 京 10-6, Vol. 15, Beijing: Wenwu 文物出版社, 1986
- Zheng, Liyun (Tei Reion) 鄭麗芸. 「從『蘭亭圖』看日本江戸文人的蘭亭情緒」 『對外漢語教學與中國文化』 中國・漢學出版社, 2003, 248-253.
- Zhao Yuanchu, *The Palace Museum Catalogue* 故宮博物院書畫圖錄, Vol. 18, Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1997, 73-78.

Appendices

Appendix A: Chinese Texts

蘭亭序

永和九年，歲在癸丑，暮春之初，會于會稽山陰之蘭亭，修禊事也。群賢畢至，少長咸集。此地有崇山峻嶺，茂林修竹，又有清流激湍，映帶左右，引以為流觴曲水，列坐其次。雖無絲竹管絃之盛，一觴一詠，亦足以暢敘幽情。

是日也，天朗氣清，惠風和暢，仰觀宇宙之大，俯察品類之盛，所以游目騁懷，足以極視聽之娛，信可樂也。

夫人之相與，俯仰一世，或取諸懷抱，悟言一室之內，或因寄所託，放浪形骸之外。雖趣舍萬殊，靜躁不同，當其欣於所遇，暫得於己，快然自足，不知老之將至。及其所之既倦，情隨事遷，感慨係之矣。向之所欣，俛仰之間，已為陳跡，猶不能不以之興懷。況修短隨化，終期於盡。古人云：「死生亦大矣。」豈不痛哉！

每覽昔人興感之由，若合一契，未嘗不臨文嗟悼，不能喻之於懷。固知一死生為虛誕，齊彭殤為妄作，後之視今，亦猶今之視昔，悲夫！故列敘時人，錄其所述，雖世殊事異，所以興懷，其致一也。後之覽者，亦將有感於斯文。

《蘭亭序（らんていじょ）書き下し文》

永和九年、歲（とし）は癸丑（きちう）に在り。暮春の初め、会稽山陰の蘭亭に會す。禊事（けいじ）を脩（をさ）むるなり。群賢（ぐんけん）畢（ことごと）く至り、少長（せうちやう）咸（みな）集まる。此の地に、崇山（すうざん）峻嶺（しゅんれい）、茂林（もりん）脩竹（しうちく）有り。又、清流（せいりう）激湍（げきたん）有りて、左右に映帶（えいたい）す。引きて以て流觴（りうしやう）の曲水と為（な）し、其の次（じ）に列坐す。糸竹管弦の盛（せい）無しと雖（いへど）も、一觴一詠、亦以て幽情を暢叙（ちやうじよ）するに足る。是の日や、天朗（ほが）らかに氣清く、惠風（けいふう）和暢（わちやう）せり。仰いでは宇宙の大を觀（み）、俯しては品類の盛んなるを察す。目を遊ばしめ懷（おも）ひを騁（は）する所以（ゆゑん）にして、以て視聽の娛しみを極むるに足れり。信（まこと）に楽しむべきなり。夫（そ）れ人の相与（あひとも）に一世（いつせい）に俯仰（ふぎやう）するや、或いは諸（これ）を懷抱（くわいはう）に取りて一室の内に悟言（ごげん）し、或いは託する所に因寄（いんき）し

て、形骸の外（ほか）に放浪す。趣舎（しゆしや）万殊（ばんしゆ）にして、静躁（せいさう）同じからずと雖も、其の遇ふ所を欣び、暫（しばら）く己（おのれ）に得るに当たりては、快然（かうぜん）として自（みづか）ら足り、老（おい）の将（まさ）に至らんとするを知らず。其の之（ゆ）く所既に倦（う）み、情（じやう）事（こと）に随ひて遷（うつ）るに及んでは、感慨（かんがい）之（これ）に係（かか）れり。向（さき）の欣ぶ所は、俛仰（ふぎやう）の間（かん）に、以（すで）に陳迹（ちんせき）と為（な）る。猶（な）ほ之（これ）を以て懷（おも）ひを興（おこ）さざる能はず。況んや脩短（しうたん）化（か）に随ひ、終（つひ）に尽くるに期（き）するをや。古人云へり、死生も亦（また）大なりと。豈（あ）に痛ましからずや。毎（つね）に昔人（せきじん）感を興（おこ）すの由（よし）を攬（み）るに、一契（いつけい）を合（あは）せたるが若（ごと）し。未（いま）だ嘗（かつ）て文に臨んで嗟悼（さたう）せずんばあらず。之（これ）を懷（こころ）に喩（さと）ること能はず。固（まこと）に死生を一（いつ）にするは虚誕（きよたん）たり、彭殤（ほうしやう）を斉（ひと）しくするは妄作（まうさく）たるを知る。後（のち）の今を視るも、亦（また）由（な）ほ今の昔を視るがごとくならん。悲しいかな。故に時人（じじん）を列叙し、其の述ぶる所を録す。世（よ）殊に事（こと）異（こと）なりと雖も、懷（おも）ひを興（おこ）す所以（ゆゑん）は、其の致（むね）一（いつ）なり。後（のち）の攬（み）る者も、亦（また）将（まさ）に斯（こ）の文に感ずる有らんとす。

During the tenth oxen annum, the ninth year of the Yonghe reign (353), people assembled at the end of late spring to participate in the purification gathering at the Orchid Pavilion, which is located on the north side of a hill in the prefecture of Kuaiji. All of the social elite, young and old, attended. The area had high mountain ridges, luxuriant woods, and tall bamboo, as well as limpid streams with surging rapids glittering like a jade belt on both sides. The water was channeled to a meandering rivulet for floating the wine cups, with guests seated on both banks. Although there was no music from string or wind instruments, the drink and the recitation of poems were more than enough to cheerfully express our exquisite feelings. On that day, the sky was bright and clear with a gentle, soothing breeze. We gazed up to comprehend the vastness of the universe. We looked down and observed the numerous species of plants and creatures. Our eyes explored freely and our minds raced unbridled. This was the utmost enjoyment for our senses of sight and sound. What a pleasure! Associating with other people is a joy that endures over the whole span of our lives. It may be in the form of an intellectual discussion in a room that draws upon our own hearts and minds or may come from outside stimulation to which we abandon ourselves in unrestrained happiness. The preferences of each individual may be opposite, just as quietude and rowdiness are vastly different. However, when one is exhilarated by something, even if it is ever so fleeting, he often feels so satisfied that he forgets that old age lurks before him. But enthusiasm wanes and emotions fluctuate as situations change, and this occasions our laments! In the blink of an eye, past pleasures become mere traces in history. Despite its ephemeral nature, pleasure is something everyone seeks. Our short lives are in constant flux and eventually come to an end. The ancients used to say, "Birth and death are truly the two grimmest events of life!" It pains one greatly to even think of such a saying! Whenever I examine the manifold reasons for the pleasure of our predecessors, I find they seem to be

concordant. Sometimes, I regret that when I read others' writings, I do not share their expressed feelings. I know that the idea [of philosopher Chuangtzu] that life and death are the same is ridiculous. To claim that the thousand-year-old Pengtsu died young and unexpectedly is inaccurate and untrue. When the people of the future investigate us, it is the equivalent of our looking back at people from the past. Alas, I have no choice but to pay attention to my contemporaries and record their words. The world will change and events will differ, but perhaps future generations will achieve pleasure in the same way we do. Reading this prose, they will experience some sense of identification.

English translation by Marshall P.S. Wu, *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, (2000), 44-45. I have replaced Pinyin with Wade-Giles for the romanization of the text.

西園雅集圖記

李伯時放唐小李將軍。為著色泉石雲物艸木花竹。皆絕妙動人。而人物秀發。各肖其形。自有林下風味。無一点塵埃氣。不為凡筆也。其烏帽黃道服。執筆而書者。為東坡先生。仙桃巾紫裘而坐觀者。為王晉卿。幅巾青衣。據方几而凝竚者。為丹陽蔡天啓。捉荷而視者。為李端叔。後有女奴。雲鬟翠飾倚立。自然富貴風韻。乃晉卿之家姬也。孤松盤鬱。上有凌霄纏絡。紅綠相間。下有大石案。陳設古器瑤琴。芭蕉圍繞。坐於石盤傍。道帽紫衣。右手倚石。左手執卷而觀書者。為蘇子由。团巾繭衣。手秉蕉簞而熟視者。為黃魯直。幅巾野褐。據橫卷画。「淵明歸去來」者。為李伯時。被巾青服。撫肩而立者。為晁无咎。跪而捉石觀画者。為張文潛。道巾青衣。按膝而俯視者。為鄭靖老。後有童子。執靈寿杖而立。二人座於盤根古桧下。幅巾青衣。袖手側聽者。為秦少游。琴尾冠紫道服摘阮者。為陳碧虛。唐巾深衣。昂首而題石者。為米元章。幅巾袖手而仰視者。為王仲至。前者鬚頭頑童。棒古研而立。後有綿石橋。竹徑繚繞於清溪深处。翠陰茂密中。有袈裟座蒲团。而說「無生論」者。為円通大師。傍有幅巾褐衣而諦聽者。為劉巨濟。二人並坐怪石之上。下有激湍。淙流於大溪之中。水石潺湲。風竹相吞。爐烟方裊。艸木自馨。人間清曠之樂。不過於此。嗟乎。洵湧於名利之域。而不知退者。豈易得此乎。自東坡而下。凡十有六人。皆以文章議論。博學弁識。英辭妙墨。好古多聞。雄豪絕俗之資。高僧羽流之傑。卓然高致。名動四夷。後之攬者。不獨因画之可觀。亦足彷彿其人耳。

(歷代画家詩文集本)

Li Gonglin (d. 1106) made a landscape in colors representing water, rocks, clouds, grass, flowers, and bamboo, which was really impressive and wonderfully done after the style of Li Zhaodao (c. 670-730). The figures were charmingly rendered and all with striking likenesses; they had the air of enjoying themselves among the trees as if they were quite free from the dust of the world. It was indeed a most interesting painting.

The man with a black cap and a yellow Daoist robe, holding a brush in the act of writing, was master Su Dangpo (Shi, 1036-1101); the one with a peach-colored turban and a purple garment, who sat looking on, was Wang Jinqing (Shen, 1036-1089); the msn in dark blue clothes,

who stood upright holding a square instrument, was Cai Tianqi (Zhao, fl. C. 1090) from Tanyang; and the man who grasped his chair and stood looking on was Li Duanshu (Zhiyi, fl.c.1073). Behind him stood a female servant whose hair was done up with jade trinkets and who had a rich and noble appearance; she was one of Wang Jinqing's courtesans. Under a large shady pine, on which some creeping plants with purplish flowers were entangled, stood a stone table with some antique objects and a lure with jade mounts. Close by was Su Ziyu (Che, 1039-1112), seated by a stone under a banana plant with a Daoist cap on his head, wearing a purple garment, supporting himself with his right hand on the stone and holding in his left a scroll he was reading. The man in a garment of coarse silk with a turban on his head, holding a palm-leaf fan in his hand and looking on very attentively, was Huang Luzhi (Tingqian, 1045-1105); and the man with a strangely shaped cap of coarse cloth on his head, holding before him a scroll on which he was illustrating Tao Yuanming's (363-442) "Homecoming" [Guei chu lai], was Li Gongli (Longmian, c. 1040-1106). Standing at his side holding a hand on his shoulder, was Chao Wujiu (Buzhi, 1053-1110) in a blue robe with a loose cap on his head, while Zhang Wenqian (Lei, 1054-1113) knelt at his side with a stone in his hand, looking at the picture, and Zhen Jinglao (n.d.) in a Daoist cap and a white robe stood with his hands on his knees looking on. Behind him stood a boy holding a staff of immortality in his hand. Two men were seated on the coiling roots of an old juniper tree; the one with the cap on his head and his hands in the sleeves of his blue garment was Qin Shaoyu (Guan, 1049-1100); he was listening attentively to Chen Bixu (Qingyuan, n.d.), who wearing a high hat in the shape of a lute-tail and purple-colored Daoist garments, was playing a lute. But Mi Yuanzhang (Fu, 1051-1107), wearing a cap and a dark garment of Tang fashion, was standing with raised head and his hand in his sleeves, was Wang Zhongzhi (Qinzen, n.d.). In front of him stood a boy with short hair, holding an inkstone, and behind them could be seen an ornamented stone bridge. Bamboo growing along a clear stream formed a cool and shady place of luxuriant verdure. Here a Buddhist priest was seated on a straw cushion discussing the Discourse on Nonexistence (Wu shen lun). This was the great scholar Yuan Tong (d. 1090). At his side was a man in a robe of coarse cloth, listening attentively; that was Liu Zhiji (Jing, c. 1043-1100). The two men sat on strangely shaped stones, and below their feet was a rushing torrent, which flowed into a bigger stream. The water was murmuring among the stones, and the sound of the wind could be heard in the bamboo. A light smoke was curling in the air, and the plants and the trees exhaled sweet fragrance. The peaceful solitude of this scene could not be surpassed. Alas, those who cover fame and wealth do not know how to withdraw from the world. How could they ever reach this state of contentment?

Including Dongpo, there were sixteen men in all, experts in literature, poetry, calligraphy, painting, and antiquities, real heroes of their kind, besides great Buddhist and Daoist priests. They all stood high above the common level, and their fame has even reached foreign countries all over the world. People of future generation may find it worthwhile not only to look at this painting but also to imitate these men.

Translation by Paul Berry, "Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden" in *Literati Modern: Bunjinga from Late Edo to Twentieth-Century Japan* (Honolulu: Honolulu Academy of Arts, 2008), 61.

米庵墨談続編卷之二

西園雅集圖記

世ニ所傳ノ李伯時西園雅集圖ハ、米元章記ヲ作ル、ソノ蠅頭行楷精妙、イマ王烟戲鴻諸帖ニ載ス、但宋時其名ヲミス、金ノ劉祖□始テ題ニ雅集圖ニ一七絶アリ、其後元ノ于立姚文煥張天英等長編ノ題詩アリ、明時嚴氏書畫記ニミヘ、葉向高蒼霞集中ニモ題詩數首ヲノス、□其昌容臺集ニ云、昔李伯時西園雅集圖有二兩本一、一作ニ於元豐ノ間王晋卿之第二一、一作ニ於元祐初趙德麟之第二一、余從ニ長安一買ニ得團扇上ノ者ヲ一、米襄陽細楷極精、但不レ知ニ何ノ本ヲ一ト、按スルニ西園ハ定テ王晋卿ノ賜第ナラン、實ニ蘭亭以後ノ盛事ト云ヘシ、但シラス雅集ノコト何年ニアリシヤ、明ノ范明泰襄陽志林ニハ、圖記ヲ載レトモ、東坡兄弟魯直少游諸公詩文ナト集中一首ヲミス、且東坡晚歲惠州□州ヘ謫セラレ、京師ニアルハ僅ノ間ニテ、子由元章□多互ニ外補ス、竊ニ意フニ伯時胸臆丘壑ヲ取り、一時交遊ノ盛ナルヲ圖シ、元章記ヲ作り、蔡京章□ノ權勢ニ與セサルヲ後ニ示シタルモノナランカ、記中十六人、當時ノ名賢履歷ミナ考フヘシ、タタ圓通大師ノミ傳ヲミス、石林避暑錄云、伯時喜レ畫レ馬ヲ、法雲圓通秀禪師、衆生流浪轉□皆自ニ積劫習氣中一來、今君胸中無ニ非レ馬ニ者一、得レ無ヲニ與レ之俱ニ化スコト一乎、伯時懼、乃教レ之ヲ使レ為ニ佛像ヲ一、以変ストニ其意ヲ一アリ、意フニ此人ナランカ、楊文公談苑云、釋寂照號ニ圓通大師ト一、日本僧ノ習ニ王右軍ノ書ヲ一、頗得ニ其筆法ヲ一、章艸特ニ妙、景德三年入貢ス、上召見賜ニ紫衣束帛ヲ一ト、又書史會要ニモミユ、或人ノ云、此方大江定基為レ僧ト名ニ寂照ト一、遊ニ学ス宋國ニ一宋帝賜ニ號ヲ圓通大師ト一、コレ其人ナリト、然レトモ景德年間ヨリ元豐ニイタルマテ、其間七八十年ナリ、恐クハ別人ナラン、又王□州四部稿ヲ見ルニ、題スルニ仇實父臨西園雅集圖ノ後ニ一ノ跋アリ云、余嘗見ニ楊東里所レ題西園雅集ノ圖ヲ一、乃臨ニ李□法伯時ノ筆ヲ一、有崇ニ山絶壑雲林泉石之致一、與ニ此圖一略不レ同、此圖僅ニ一古檜一怪石一立□捉レ筆ヲ書スル者為ニ子瞻學士一、從レ傍喜觀スル者王晋卿、按レ卷對峙スル者蔡天啓、倚レ樹睨スル者李端叔、彼圖則有ニ張文潜一、而無ニ李端□一、此圖據ニ方石ニ一畫ニ淵明歸去来□ヲ一者即伯時、握ニ麈尾ヲ一觀者蘇子由、握ニ蕉扇ヲ一者黃魯直、撫レ肩ヲ立者晁元咎、捉レ石ヲ者張文潜、按レ膝ヲ者鄭靖老、彼圖有ニ端□一、而無ニ靖老一、益ニ以ニ陳元巳ヲ一、若下摘レ阮碧□、與ニ聽レ阮之秦少游一、說レ法之圓通大師、與ニ聽レ法之劉巨濟一、題レ□之米元章、與上ニ傍觀之王仲至一、則所レ同也、彼圖有ニ名姬二一、曰ニ雲英春鶯ト一、而此皆削レ之ヲ、楊先生又云、曾見ニ劉松年臨本ヲ一、無ニ文潜端□□咎一、器物小ク異ナリ、而僧梵隆趙千里□嘗□レ之ヲ、此圖吾吳郡仇英實父臨ルニ千里本ヲ一也、余竊謂諸公ノ踪跡不三恒ニ聚ニ大梁ニ一、其文雅風流之盛、未三必盡ク在ニ此一時ニ一、盖晋卿合下其所ニ與ニ遊一長者ヲ上而圖レ之ヲ、諸公又各以ニ其意ヲ一而傳ニ寫ス之ヲ一、以レ故ヲ不レ無ニ牴牾耳一、實父視レバニ千里ヲ一、大ニ有ニ出藍之妙一、其運筆古雅彷彿長康探微ニ一、元祐諸君子人々有ニ國士ノ風一、一展レ卷ヲ間覺ニ金谷富家兒ノ形穢一、因為レ之識レ尾ニトアリ、コノ王□州ノ跋ヲミレハ、余カ所見ト頗相似タリ、又清初ノ林誌カ別ニ撰スル雅集記、黃晋良書スル真跡ヲ見シニ、其仲ニ原ト圖記ハ、石林鄭天民ノ作トアリ、何ノ據コトナルヲ知ラス

Appendix B: Selected List of Orchid Pavilion Images (China)

Ink Rubbing Scrolls

Huangnan version 潢南本 (Large)

Lanting tu 蘭亭圖(Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion), Huangnan version 潢南本, first engraved by Prince Zhou based on Li Gonglin's original and reproduced by Prince Yi, Colophon: 32.5 x 107cm; Calligraphy model: 32.1 x 1675cm; Illustration: 31.9 x 628.5cm, 万歷 20 (1592)
National Palace Museum 故宮博物院

Lanting tu (large), Huangnan version, produced by Prince Yi
32.3 x 62.3cm (全長約 9 米) 中国美術全集 絵画編 19 石刻綫画
Henanxinxiang Municipal Museum 河南新鄉市博物館

Lanting tu (large), after the Huangnan version, Produced by Prince Yi
measuring 32.3 x 62.3cm (全長約 9 米)
高島菊次郎氏寄贈 東京国立博物館

Lanting xiuxu tu (large) 蘭亭修禊圖墨拓
34cm heights
日本書芸院, 昭和癸丑蘭亭展図録

Lanting tu (large), after the Huang Nan version
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

Xianyuan version 仙原本 (Large)

Lanting tu (large), Xianyuan version 仙原本 Produced by Prince Yi 別本益王刻大卷
Title page 引首 32.5 x 107cm; 32.1 x 1675cm, Illustration 図 31.9 x 628.5cm
万歷 20 (1592) National Palace Museum 故宮博物院

Lanting tu (large), Xianyuan version 仙原本 Produced by Prince Yi 益王刻大卷
Ink rubbing compilation
32.7 x 1400.8 + 100.9cm, (1592)
Paul Moss, Robert van Gulik Collection

Xianyuan version 仙原本 (Small)

Lanting tu, 万歷 44 年 (1616)
中国憧憬図録 Private Collection

Lanting tu (small), Produced by Prince Yi 益王刻小卷

引首 22.4 x 66.5cm; 22.4 x 522cm, 万歷 30 (1602)

National Palace Museum 故宮博物院

Lanting tu (small) 蘭亭圖卷,

22.2 x 574cm

Goto Museum 五島美術館, Uno Sesson Collection 宇野雪村

Qing dynasty versions

Lanting tu (Xianyuan small)

22.1 x 489.0cm; illustration section: 17.9–18.1 x 329.1 cm

Printed during Qing dynasty (1644–1911)

National Library of China

Lanting tu (Xianyuan small)

22.6 x 326.4cm (8 7/8 x 128 1/2 in.), 16th -17th Century, Inscription by Tomioka Tessai

Harn Museum

Lanting tu (small), Emperor Qianlong 乾隆 Collection, Ink rubbed on paper;

乾隆 45 (1780)

National Palace Museum 故宮博物院

Attributed to Li Gonglin 李公麟, The Orchid Pavilion 蘭亭圖, ink on silk, baimiao 絹本白描,

Private Collection in Osaka

Anonymous, Lanting tu 蘭亭圖, A Ming copy of Song Dynasty, ink on paper, 34 x 557cm,

Beilongjiang Provincial Museum 黑龍江省博物館, 『中国古代書画図目』 (十六) 黒 1 –5, 1997

Zhao Yuanchu 趙原初 (?-?) Ming Dynasty, Dated in 1364 Lanting shangyong tu 蘭亭觴詠圖,

ink on paper 白描紙本, 17.5 x 432cm, 引首 26 x 75.4cm, recorded in 石渠寶笈初編. 『故宮博物院書画図録』 (十八) 73-78, 1997

Yao Shou 姚琰 (1423-1495) Lanting xiuxi tu 蘭亭修禊圖, ink on silk, 30.5 x 610 cm Beijing

Municipal Applied Art Museum 北京市工芸品進出口公司, 『中国古代書画図目』 (一) 京 10-6, 1986

Attributed to Guo Zhongshu 郭忠恕 (ca. 910-977) copied after the Gu Kaizhi' s (345-406)

Lanting tu 顧愷之蘭亭讌集圖, ink and light color on silk 淡着色絹本. 23.5 x 711.8cm+

153.4cm, recorded in 石渠寶笈初編. 台北故宮博物館院, 『故宮博物院書画図録』 (十五) 183–190, 1995

Wen Zhengming 文徵明 (1470-1559), Lanting xu shuhua 蘭亭序書畫, ink and color on paper, image: 22.9 x 48.7cm; calligraphy: 20.8 x 77.8cm. Calligraphy by Zhu Yunming 祝允明 (1460-1526). Liaoning Museum 遼寧博物館, 『中国古代書畫圖目』 (十五) 遼 1 – 107, 1997

Attributed to Zhao Mengfu 趙孟頫 (1254-1322), Lanting tu 蘭亭圖, ink and color on silk, 18.8 x 158.8cm. A late Ming copy. National Palace Museum 台北故宮博物館院, 『故宮博物院書畫圖錄』 (十七) 107–110, 1998.

Qiu Ying 仇英 (1494-1552), Yingxiuxi tu 英修禊圖, ink and color on paper, 57.3 x 31.0cm, recorded in 石渠寶笈初編, National Palace Museum

Copy of Qiu Ying, Lanting tu, ink and light color on paper, handscroll, Tokyo National Museum

Qui Ying, Baimiao tan Lanting tu 仇英筆白描賺蘭亭圖 國華 708 國華社, 1951

Qian Gu 錢穀 (1508-1578?) Lanting xiuxi tu 蘭亭修禊圖, 1560, ink and light color on paper, ht. 23.8cm, Metropolitan Museum 『中国繪画総合図録 (続編)』 (一) A 1 – 198, 1998

唐伯虎 蘭亭圖卷 縱 31.4cm 蘭亭序展圖錄

Sheng Maoye 盛茂燁, University of Michigan Museum of Art, 31.1 x 214.7cm, ink and color on silk, 1621

Zhang Hong 張宏 (1577- c.1652) Lanting tu 蘭亭圖, ink and color on silk, 30.0 x 408cm. Shoudou Capital Museum 首都博物館 『中国美術分類全集 中国繪画全集』浙江人民美術出版社文物出版社, 2000, 38-41

Huang Chen, Lanting tu, ink on paper, handscroll, 29.8 x 252.4 cm, Beijing Palace Museum

Qian Xuan 錢選 (c.1235-before 1307), Lanting tu 蘭亭圖, ink on paper, private collection in Osaka

Wei Jujing 魏居敬 Lanting xiuxi tu 蘭亭修禊圖 萬曆 34 (1606), 24.7 x 138.8cm, ink and color on paper, 天津市藝術博物館 津 7-0400

Shen Shi 沈時, Lanting xiuxi tu 蘭亭修禊圖 Qing Dynasty 北京故宮博物館院、 『中国古代書畫圖目』 (二二) 京 1 – 4003、2000

Zhang Dunli 張敦禮, Nine Sages at Mt. Xiang 香山九老圖卷, Northern Song dynasty, ink and color on silk, 29.3 x Hosokawa Morisada Collection 細川護貞, Suzuki Kei

Liu Songnian 劉松年 (1174-1224) Qushui liushang tujian 曲水流觴圖卷, ink and color on silk, 28 x 134.8cm 台北故宮博物院, 『故宮博物院書畫圖錄』 (16) 239-242、1997

Fanyi 樊沂, (active ca. 1658-71), Chiang-ning, Chiangsu Province
Handscroll, 1671, ink and color on silk, 28.1 x 392.8 cm, colophon inscribed by the Manpuku-ji Obaku monk Yueshan (J: Gensan 1629-1709); and seals of Tomioka Tessai.
The Cleveland Museum of Art; Gift of Junior Council of the Cleveland Museum of Art and of Mrs. Wai-kam Ho in the name of the Junior Council, 1977.47.

Attributed to Li Zai 李在 (?-1431), ink and light color on silk, handscroll reformatted into a folding screen, Honolulu Academy of Art

Attributed to Zhao Mengfu, Lanting xiuxi tu, 至生癸丑 (1313) 198 x 98.2 cm, ink and color on silk, recorded in 石渠寶笈續編, National Palace Museum

Anonymous, Lanting tu, the 15th Century, ink on silk, 148 x 92cm, West Norway Museum of Applied Art, the Munthe Collection

Qiu Ying 仇英 (1494-1552), Yingxiuxi tu 英修禊圖, ink and color on paper, 57.3 x 31.0cm, recorded in 石渠寶笈初編, National Palace Museum

The Fan format

Liu Tanwei 陸探微, Lanting tu tuanshan 蘭亭圖團扇, color on silk, Yale University Art Gallery

Qiu Yin (c.1495-1552), Lanting tu shanhua, color on gold paper, 21.5 x 61.4cm, National Palace Museum

Wang Shi 王式, Lanting tu shanhua 蘭亭圖扇面, ink on gold paper, 17.1 x 51.5, Taitsu Hashimoto 橋本大乙 Collection, 中国絵画総合図録

List of Orchid Pavilion paintings recorded in textual materials

Li Gonglin 李公麟 (ca. 1041-1106) Lantingtu 蘭亭圖 the Orchid Pavilion
Qinghe Shuhuafang 清河書畫舫, 9: 46; Peiwenqi shuhuapu 佩文齋書畫譜 Vol, 98, 8;
Shigutang huagong 式古堂畫攷, Vol. 32, 2; Jiangchu shuhuamu 江村書畫目, 1069; Zhenze rilu 真蹟日錄, 3: 10; Zhujacang huabu 諸家藏畫簿, 10: 5; Shanhuiwang hualu 珊瑚網畫錄, Vol. 47, 23.

Chen Paochen 喬仲常 (active early 12th century), Lantingtu
Qinghe Shuhuafang 1:16; Zhujacang huabu 7:14.

Tang Baiju 趙伯駒 (active early 12th century), Lantingtu
Peiwenqi shuhuapu 84:1.

Tang Bai 趙伯驪 (active early 12th century), two scrolls of Lantingtu 蘭亭圖二卷
Shanhuwang hualu 珊瑚網畫錄 23: 38; Peiwenqi shuhuapu, 98: 26),

蘭亭圖卷 (天水, 192)

Zhao Xiao 趙孝穎 (active early 12th century), Lantingtu
Baohua 寶繪 13: 15.

The Orchid Pavilion Paintings in the 歷代著錄畫目

唐

荆浩
山陰讌蘭亭三 宣和畫譜、10、9

五代

董源
蘭亭圖軸 退菴金石書畫跋、12、14

關
山陰讌蘭亭四 宣和畫譜、1011

宋

李公麟			
蘭亭圖	清河書畫舫、9、49	蘭亭圖	汪璠、23、46
蘭亭圖	式古、2、117	蘭亭圖	江目、3
蘭亭圖	吳、3、10	蘭亭圖	諸家、10、5

喬仲常		
蘭亭圖	畫舫、1、16	蘭亭圖 諸家、7、14

趙伯駒
蘭亭圖 佩文、84、1

趙伯驪		
蘭亭圖二卷	汪璠、23、38	蘭亭圖二卷 佩文、98、26
蘭亭圖卷	天水、192	

趙孝穎

蘭亭図 寶絵、13、15

明

丁雲鵬

蘭亭修禊図卷 古縁、6、3

仇英

蘭亭会図一軸 石初、8、50 蘭亭修禊図卷 石三、乾清宮

蘭亭修禊図卷 西清、4、40 蘭亭修禊卷 十百、16、38

蘭亭図卷 古芬、15、77 蘭亭図卷 古芬、15、78

蘭亭図卷 眼初、11、10 蘭亭図 眼三、7、13

蘭亭図 同上

文伯仁

蘭亭修禊図卷 穰續、7、12

文嘉

蘭亭図 汪珊、18、7 蘭亭図 佩文、100、41

蘭亭修禊図軸 石初、38、59 蘭亭修禊図卷 穰梨、18、7

曲水流觴図 自恰、4、25

宋旭

蘭亭図 臥菴、19

唐寅

蘭亭図 画舫、7、26 蘭亭紀図 汪珊、23、40

蘭亭図 鈴山、16 蘭亭記図 佩文、98、29

曲水流觴卷 十百、5、22 蘭亭図卷 古芬、14、58

蘭亭図文詩詔 蘭亭詩合卷 古芬、14、59

蘭亭記図 諸家、9、15 蘭亭図卷 眼初、10、23

蘭亭圖 眼三、7、6 蘭亭卷 天水、240

張路 (明)
蘭亭圖冊 石初、12、50

黃夢龍
蘭亭圖卷 江目、3

清

徐源
蘭亭修禊圖卷 古芬、17、108

張宗蒼
蘭亭修禊圖卷 石二、寧壽宮 蘭亭修禊圖一卷 國院、下、1

趙衷
白描蘭亭圖 鈴山、13 白描蘭亭 汪珊、23、39
白描蘭亭圖 画舫、7、25 蘭亭圖一卷 石初、36、11
白描蘭亭 諸家、9、15 白描蘭亭卷 天水、236

錢穀
蘭亭修禊圖卷 石二、乾清宮 蘭亭 佩文、81、9

戴進
蘭亭并納涼圖 汪珊、23、31 蘭亭并納涼圖 佩文、98、48

蘭亭并納涼圖
顧昉
蘭亭圖軸 麓雲、43

Appendix C: Selected List of Orchid Pavilion Images (Japanese)

Kano Jin'nojô 狩野甚之丞 (active 1601-43), Drunken Sages 酒仙図屏風 probably Rantei-zu, early 17th century, two-fold screen, ink, color and gold foil on paper. 142.7 x 142.1cm, Rinka' in 隣華院 Myôshin-ji 妙心寺.

Reattributed to Kano Sansetsu, formerly considered as Kano Sanraku, Rantei kyokusui yokomono 蘭亭曲水横物, ink and color on paper, hanging scroll, 1 尺 3 寸 4 分 x 2 尺 3 寸, Isaac Douman Auction catalogue 目録 (Osaka: Osaka Bijutsu Club, 1919), 5.

Attributed to Kano Sanraku 狩野山楽 but probably by Sansetsu, Rantei zu, inscribed by Ishikawa Jôsan 石川丈三, hanging scroll, Eigawa Museum of Art.

Kano Sansetsu 狩野山雪, Rantei Kyokusui zu 蘭亭曲水図 [The Winding Water of the Orchid Pavilion] Early Tokugawa period (the seventeenth century), ink, color, and gold leaf on paper, two pairs of eight-panel byôbu, 107.0 x 355.4cm each panel, in Zuishin-in in Kyoto, from Doi Tsuguyoshi, "Kanô Sanraku/ Sansetsu," Nihon bijutsu kaiga zenshû vol. 12. (Tokyo: Shueisha, 1976) pl. 67 and 68.

Kanô Sansetsu The ink sketch version of Rantei in Higashi Hongan-ji, Early Tokugawa period, ink on paper, Private Collection, from Doi Tsuguyoshi, "Sanraku to Sansetsu", Nihon no bijutsu vol.172 (Tokyo: Shibundô, 1980), p.68, pl73.

Kano Einô 狩野永納, Rantei Kyokusui zu, the late 17th century, ink, color, and gold leaf on paper, a pair of six-panel byôbu, 六曲一双, 153.5 x 359.0 cm each panel, Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art 静岡県立美術館.

Kano Einô, Rantei Kyokusui zu, the late 17th century, ink, color, and gold leaf on paper, a six-panel byôbu 六曲一隻, Private Collection in Toyama Prefecture.

Anonymous Kano painter probably Kano Einô, the seventeenth century, ink on paper, murals (fusuma and walls) Nikko-in 日光院 Mi'idera Temple 三井寺.

Kano Tanyu 狩野探幽, ink on paper, hanging scroll, Private Collection.

Kano Yasunobu, Rantei kyokusui zu, the seventeenth century, ink and color on paper, a pair of six-panel byôbu, Tochigi Prefectural Museum 栃木県立博物館.

Kano Yasunobu, Rantei kyokusui byôbu (Lanting Pavilion by the Winding Stream), latter half of the 17th century, 150.4 x 353 cm, One of a pair of six-panel folding screens; ink and light color on paper, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Kano Shôun Suenobu 狩野昌運季信 (1637-1702), handscroll, ink and color on paper, Private Collection.

Kano Toshun Hidenobu 狩野洞春秀信, Rantei kyokusui zu 蘭亭曲水図, ink and light color on silk 絹本墨画淡彩 122.17 x 51.2cm, hanging scroll 軸装一幅 リンデン州立博物館 ベルツコレクション.

Kano Eisen-in Michinobu 狩野栄川院典信 (1730-1790) 57.9 x 116.5 cm, Hanging scroll; ink and color on paper, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Anonymous, Kano School, Rantei zu, ink and color on paper, hanging scroll, the Richard Lane Collection.

Ishida Yutei 石田友汀. Rantei kyokusui zu byobu 蘭亭曲水図屏風 [Feast on the curve of a river bank]. A pair of six panel folding screen. 六曲一双

Nakajima Antai 中島安泰. Rantei kyokusui zu byobu 蘭亭曲水図屏風 [Feast on the curve of a river bank]. A pair of six panel folding screen. 六曲一双

Okuhara Seiko, the Orchid Pavilion, 1883, hanging scroll.

Ike Taiga, a draft of the altarpiece of the Yasaka Shrine 八坂神社, in 1751, six-panel byōbu, Private Collection.

Ike Taiga, Ranteizu, 1754, ema 絵馬 (Votive Panel) of the Gion Shrine 祇園社

Ike Taiga, Ranteizu, reproduced by Aikawa Minwa 合川珉和・Kitagawa Harunari 北川春成 Hengaku Kihan Shukubaku zu 扁額軌範 version of Rantei zu, woodblock-printed painting manual
Private Collection

Ike Taiga, Rantei Shūkei zu, a six-panel byobu, paired with Shūsha Suisō zu 秋社酔歸図 [Harvest Festival in autumn], ink and color on paper, 162.8 x 359.1cm, Mary and Jackson Burke Collection.

Ike Taiga, Rantei Shūkei zu, a six-panel byobu, paired with Ranteijo (calligraphy inscribed by Rai Sanyo 頼山陽), ink and color on paper
Tessaido 鉄斎堂

Ike Taiga 池大雅, Rantei Shūkei zu 蘭亭修禊図 [The Orchid Pavilion Purification Gathering], 1763, ink and color on paper, a six-panel byōbu paired with Ryūzan Shōkai zu 龍山勝会図 [Banquet at Longshan Mountains]
Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art 静岡県立美術館

Ike Taiga, The Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion, 1763, ink and color on paper, six-fold screen 六曲一隻, 143.5 x 356.8 cm
Shimane Art Museum 島根美術館

Ike Taiga, Rantei Shūkei zu, a six-panel byōbu, paired with Seien Gashū zu 西園雅集図 [The Literary Gathering at the Western Garden], ink and color on paper, 175.6 x 391.7cm
Kōsetsu Museum 香雪美術館

Ike Taiga, the Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭図, ink on paper, hanging scroll,
The Clark Center of Japanese Art

Ike Taiga, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink on paper, hanging scroll, 39.1 x 55.7 cm, Private
Collection

Ike Taiga, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink on paper, hanging scroll, 134.8 x 57.2 cm, Private
Collection

Ike Taiga, section of Wang Xizhi, Shi-koshi zukan 四高士図卷, ink and light color on silk, 15.9
x 91.5 cm, Horeki 12 (1762)
Kōsetsu Museum of Art 香雪美術館

Yosa Buson 与謝蕪村, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 「蘭亭図」 六曲一双
Tokyo National Museum 東京国立博物館

Aoki Shukuya 青木夙夜, Rantei zu, inscriptions by Ike Taiga and Kan Tenju, ink on paper,
hanging scroll, 39 x 58 cm

Gessen 月僊, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 紙本墨画 二曲一双
Marui Gasendō 圓井雅選堂

Gessen, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 絹本著色 軸装一幅
Marui Gasendō

Gessen, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭図 絹本著色 119.1 x 39.9 cm 「月＊」朱文方形
「＊＊主人」
Kyoto National Museum 京都国立博物館

Gessen, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 王羲之蘭亭之図, ink and color on paper 絹本著色, hanging
scroll 軸装一幅, 137.0 x 66.0 cm
Mie Prefectural Museum 三重県立博物館

Gessen, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink and color on silk 絹本著色, hanging scroll 軸装
一幅, 127.0 x 54.5 cm 文化3年 (1806)
Mie Prefectural Museum, Gift of the Ozu Family

Yoshida Kōkin 吉田公均, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink and color on silk, hanging scroll,
Private Collection

Mikuma Katen 三熊花類, Rantei kyokusuisu 蘭亭曲水図, ink and colors on silk 絹本着色,
hanging scroll, 38.0 x 65.5 cm
Private Collection

Hoshi Gyokusen, Rantei kyokusui zu 蘭亭曲水図, ink and color on silk 絹本著色, hanging
scroll, 131.8×45.3 cm,
Chion-ji 智恩寺, Amano hashidate 天橋立

尚郁 蘭亭曲水図卷
京都工芸繊維大学図書館

Nakabayashi Chikutô 中林竹洞, Poetry Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion, ink and color on paper,
handscroll,
The Hakutaku'an Collection

Nakabayashi Chikutô, Poetry Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion, Bunka 5 (1808)
Private Collection

Nakabayashi Chikutô, Poetry Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion 蘭亭曲水図
絹本著色縦幅
上総古美術研究会

Nakabayashi Chikkei 中林竹溪, Poetry Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion
ink, color and gofun on silk, 85 1/2 x 30 in. (overall)
Indianapolis Museum of Art

Ogawa Kōjō 小川鴻城 (1884-1973), Rantei Kyokusui, ink and color on silk, hanging scroll, 51.5
cm height
private collection

Maruyama Ōkyo 円山応挙, Literary Gathering in the Orchid Pavilion
six-fold screen; ink and slight color on paper, late 1700s
83.cm x 191.8cm, Overall: 95.7cm x 204.5cm, Closed: 95.7cm x 43.8cm x 9.5cm
John L. Severance Fund 1977.1
The Cleveland Museum of Art

Maruyama Ōkyo, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭曲水図, Ink and color on silk 絹本着色,
hanging scroll 軸装一幅, 98.8cm x 40.3cm, Kansei-era 寛政期
Private Collection T10.9.27

Maruyama Ōkyo, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭曲水図
Meiwa 5 (1768), fusuma sliding door, ink and light color/gold on paper

Maruyama Ôkyo, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭曲水図
fusuma sliding door, ink and light color/gold on paper,
Daitsu-ji 大通寺

Maruyama Ôshin 円山応震, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭曲水図
Jonan-gu Shrine

Nishimura Nantei 西村楠亭, Tsukihoko 下水引の蘭亭曲水宴図 文化 13 年(1816)下絵

Goshun 呉春, 蘭亭曲水屏風 六曲一双
昭和十二年売り立て目録、京都美術倶楽部

Matsumura Keibun 松村景文 蘭亭曲水屏風 六曲一双
Tokyo National Museum 東京国立博物館

Azuma Tōyō 東東洋 Ranteijo 蘭亭序/ Rantei kyokusui zu 蘭亭曲水図屏風, folding screen,
Bunsei 文政 10 (1827) Tokyo National Museum 東京国立博物館

Soga Shōhaku 曾我蕭白 (1730-1781) The Elegant Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion
山水蘭亭曲水図 Sansui rantei kyokusui zu
Hanging scroll; ink on paper, 18th–19th century
Image: 132.6 x 57 cm (52 3/16 x 22 7/16 in.)
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: KJM2-Shohaku-22

Soga Shōhaku, 蘭亭曲水宴
絹本墨画 122.5x55.5cm 安永六年 (1777)
Cleveland Museum of Art

Soga Shōhaku, 蘭亭曲水宴
絹本墨画 117.1x58.7 安永七年 (1778)
N 家蔵本

Soga Shōhaku, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭曲水図
紙本墨画 100.8x118.5 明和元年(1764)
Private Collection, 京都国立博物館図録

Nagasawa Rosetsu 長沢芦雪 Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭曲水図
紙本淡彩 八幅 188.5x137.6(4 幅) 172.8x105.1(4 幅)
Shōsōji Temple 正宗寺

Ganku 岸駒, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭曲水図 文政 7 年 (1824)
Ink on silk 絹本墨画淡彩 83.7 × 114.1cm 軸装一幅
I'ida Municipal Museum of Arts 飯田市美術博物館

Gantai 岸岱 (1785-1865) Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion 蘭亭ノ図
Six of sixteen sliding door panels
192.0 x 116.5cm, 177.1 x 136.8cm From Gedan-no-ma (Middle level room) of Ogakumonjo 御
学問所 (The Imperial Study)

Yokoyama Kazan 横山崋山, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭図 六曲一隻
The Clark Center of Japanese Art

Yokoyama Kazan, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭図 Hanging scroll,
Takatsu Bunka kaikan 京都・高津古文化会館

Yokoyama Kazan, Landscape painting after the style of Soga Shohaku 倣曾我蕭白山水図, ink
on paper 紙本墨画
The British Museum

Fukuhara Gogaku 福原五岳, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭図
Handscroll, ink and color on silk
Museum of Anthropology, University of British Columbia

Okada Beisanjin 岡田米山人, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭図 ink and color on silk,
hanging scroll,

Okada Rankô 岡田藍江, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭図
Osaka Museum of History

Rin Rôen 林閨苑, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭図
Osaka Museum of History

Saitô Kyûen, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭図
Private collection

Kaneko Sessô 金子雪操, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭曲水之図
縦 151.0／横 57.0 江戸時代 (1850)
吹田市立博物館 気比泰男氏寄贈

Mashiyama Sessai 増山雪斎, Rantei kyokusui zu 蘭亭曲水図, 1850, ink and color on paper,
hanging scroll, 151.0 x 57.0 cm, Suita City Museum 吹田市立博物館

Gôami 江阿弥 (Ôoka Harunobu 大岡春信), ink and color on paper, fusuma sliding door, 延享
元年以前, Sumai no museum 住まいのミュージアム

Noguchi Shôhin 野口小蘋, The Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion, 1900, pair of six-panel screens,
ink and color on silk, 182.5 x 391 cm, The Art Institute of Chicago

Hirose Taisan 廣瀬臺山, Rantei kyokusui-zu, ink and color on paper, hanging scroll, 121.8 x 55.2 cm, private collection (exhibited at the Okayama Prefectural Museum)

Ki no Baitei 紀樸亭, Rantei kyokusui zu, ink and light color on paper, hanging scroll, Private Collection, from Baitei/ Kinkoku: Ômi buson to yobareta gaka, Ôtsu Municipal Museum of History

Ki no Baitei, Rantei kyokusui zu, Bunka 2 (1805), ink and light color on paper, hanging scroll, Private Collection, from Baitei/ Kinkoku: Ômi buson to yobareta gaka, Ôtsu Municipal Museum of History

Yokoi Kinkoku 横山金谷, Rantei kyokusui zu, Bunka 1 (1804), ink and light color on paper, hanging scroll, Private Collection, from Baitei/ Kinkoku: Ômi buson to yobareta gaka, Ôtsu Municipal Museum of History

Yokoi Kinkoku, Rantei senkai zu, ink and light color on paper, hanging scroll, Kusatsu City Collection, from Baitei/ Kinkoku: Ômi buson to yobareta gaka, Ôtsu Municipal Museum of History

Yokoi Kinkoku, Rantei kyokusui zu, ink and light color on paper, hanging scroll, Private Collection, from Baitei/ Kinkoku: Ômi buson to yobareta gaka, Ôtsu Municipal Museum of History

Yokoi Kinkoku, Rantei kyokusui zu, 1815, ink and color on paper, hanging scroll, British Museum

Tani Buncho 谷文晁, Lightly Colored Orchid Pavilion Gathering 淡彩蘭亭曲水之図
111cm×横 41cm, ink and light color on silk 著色絹本
Private Collection

Tani Bunchō, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink and color on silk, a set of three hanging scrolls 軸装 3 幅, Fukuoka Municipal Museum

Fukuda Hanko 福田半香, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink and color, hanging scroll, 渡辺崋山と弟子たちー静岡・常葉美術館コレクション

Tubaki Chinsho 椿椿彰, Rantei zu, ink and color, hanging scroll, Private Collection
Tachibara Anjo 立原杏所, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 「蘭亭図」
113.2 c m × 48.5 c m

Takaku Aigai 高久靄崖 Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭図 絹本著色 軸装一幅
127cm × 148cm The Lingnan School of Painting Collection: 嶺南画派

Takaku Aigai, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink and color on silk 絹本著色, hanging scroll 軸装一幅, Tochigi Prefectural Museum 栃木県立博物館

Takaku Ryuko 高久隆古 Orchid Pavilion Gathering 「蘭亭図」 絹本著色 軸装一幅
Tochigi Prefectural Museum

Matsuzaki Kôdô 松崎慊堂, Rantei shukeizu, ink and light color on paper, hanging scroll, 136.4 x 57.2 cm, Private Collection

Attributed to Uragami Shunkin 浦上春琴, ink and color on paper, hanging scroll, the Richard Lane Collection

Haruki Nanmei 春木南溟, Ranteien zu, ink and color on silk, Private Collection (Tochigi Prefecture 塩谷郡藤原町大原) <http://www.tochigi-edu.ed.jp/center/bunkazai/bunkazai/list/409.htm>

Suzuki Hyakunen 鈴木百年 Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭図 六曲一双
鉄斎堂

Suzuki Fuyô 鈴木芙蓉 Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭曲水図, ink and color on silk, hanging scroll, Tokushima Castle Museum 徳島城博物館

Suzuki Fuyô, Orchid Pavilion Gathering 蘭亭曲水図, ink and color on silk, hanging scroll, Honolulu Academy of Art

Nakayama Kôyô 中山高陽, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink and colors on paper, handscroll, 1778, Private Collection

Nakayama Kôyô, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink and colors on paper, handscroll, 1779, Private Collection

Nakayama Kôyô, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink and colors on paper, hanging scroll, 1775, Private Collection

Nakayama Kôyô, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink on paper, study sketch handscroll, 1778 Summer, Kochi City Library

Nakayama Kôyô, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink on paper, study sketch handscroll after Wen Zhengming, Kochi City Library

Nakahama Ryu'en 中濱龍淵 (1828-? 加賀), Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink and color on silk, hanging scroll, 56.7 x 123.0 cm, Private collection

Taki Katei 瀧和亭, Orchid Pavilion Gathering, ink and color on silk, hanging scroll, 1872, British Museum

Kyokusuien zu

Tsukioka Settei 月岡雪鼎, *Kyokusuien zu*, in the Annual Event of Twelve Months 十二ヶ月屏風, 1785, Biwako bunka kan, Shiga Prefecture

Tsukioka Settei, 曲水宴図, Private Collection

Tsukioka Sessai 月岡雪斎, Osaka University 大阪大学文学部

Nakajima Raishō 中島来章, Suruga Municipal Museum 敦賀市立博物館

Okamoto Sukehiko, Kyoto Imperial Palace sugido-e 京都御所杉戸絵

仙田雪山子 / 水無瀬忠政 京都御所小御所東廂襖絵 Imperial Palace

Hara Zaishō 原在照, *Kyokusuien zu fusuma draft* 曲水宴図襖下絵, Imperial Palace

Ike Taiga, Tsukinami fuzoku-zu byōbu 月次風俗図屏風

Reizei Tamechika 冷泉為恭, *Kyokusuien in Nenchu gyoji zukan*, 1843 Hosomi Museum 細見美術財団

Reizei Tamechika, *Kyokusuien-zu*, fusuma-e, Kyoto Imperial Palace, 1855

Reizei Tamechika, *Kyokusuien-zu*, ink and color on silk, hanging scroll, Auction catalogue

Sakai Hoitsu, *Kyokusuien*, Gosseku zu, ink and color on silk, hanging scroll, 1827 Okura shukokan 大倉集古館

Suzuki Ki'itsu, *Kyokusui zu*, 十二ヶ月図扇 19th Century Ōta kinenkan 太田記念館

Suzuki Ki'itsu, *Kyokusuien zu*, Hatakenaka Museum

Ukiyo-e

Teisai Hokuba 蹄斎北馬, *Miate kyokusui no utage* 曲水宴図 (Parody of the Elegant Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion), Bunka era (1804-18) to Bunsei era (1818-1830), ink and color on silk, Hanging scroll: 91.6 x 35.7 cm (36 1/16 x 14 1/16 in.), Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

Kubo Shunman, *Kyokusui no en* 曲水の宴, Polychrome print, triptych 大判三枚刷り

Suzuki Harunobu, Gathering at the Meandering Water Tokyo National Museum, 1765

Utagawa Toyokuni 歌川豊国, Kyokusui no en 曲水の宴, Chicago Institute of Arts

Gafu, Hanpon, Surimono, Shunga

Tsukioka Settei 月岡雪鼎, Wakan Meihitsu Kingyoku gafu 和漢名筆金玉画府

Tsukioka Settei, Shin dōji orai banes hôkan 雪鼎新童児往来万世宝鑑

Kawamura Bunpō 河村文鳳, Bunpō gafu 文鳳画譜 (Book of Drawings by Bumpō), 1807

Ōhara Tōno 大原東野, Meisu gafu 名数画譜
(Painting Manual of Renowned Numbers), published in 1809

Appendix D: Textual Materials related to the Kyo-Kano Family

狩野永納家伝画軸序（『鷺峰先生林学士文集』卷第八六）

洛人狩野永納、以丹青為業既及三世。其父祖遺囑、以為一軸。憑五十川梅庵、遙需序於余、且寄其家譜。譜曰、

狩野山樂、近江國蒲生郡人也。本字木村、名光賴、小字平三。蓋其佐佐木氏余裔乎。其祖曰善通、父曰永光、後改善了。母益田氏。永光初事淺井氏。既而謁豐臣秀吉公。公嘗伏見城屢監臨。光賴持公之杖從其後。而以其杖、画沙画馬、不顧傍觀。公見而奇之曰、汝好丹青乎。乃附當時画工長狩野永德。學習而約父子之義、冒狩野氏号修理亮。然猶接士林之列。公修營東福寺法堂、堂棟板有僧明兆画龍。嘗逢雷火而損。公使永德補之画雲未画龍、而永德罹病危急。乃依公命而授其草本於光賴、以補成之。由是其名顯于世。公嘗興復天王寺。令光賴初画聖德太子緣起於堂壁。及秀吉薨而事秀賴、侍浪速城下。浪速陷後、得恩赦拜東照大神君於駿城。而歸休洛陽、剃髮改号山樂。元和年中、天王寺罹災、堂壁繪焦土。及其重興、山樂復蒙鈞命囑之。其余禁裏緣洞二条城之後素、無不預。且洛中畿内寺院、多遺墨痕。偶画並帶蓮於浪速仏閣。未畿河内江南池蓮一茎生兩花。時人以為奇。又聞古老所語初囑犬追物式。凡龍虎鷹馬花鳥山水木石等、共有所倣慕而無不尽心。最長鍾馗、病者求之貼壁間。又見張氏帝鑑圖說、始模写之。又以知馭術、故画騎法七段。皆流播於世。其子光教繼家業。先山樂卒。故以其婿山雪、為嗣讓附画本遺墨。寬永十二年八月十九日、山樂終于家。歲七十七。

山雪者、秦姓千賀氏。幼名彦三。父曰道元。母松浦氏。生于肥前國。有故移居浪速。彦三幼好設色。道元抑之不止。元沒時彦三僅十六歲。叔父僧某、携之附山樂為弟子。繪事稍進。山樂以長女妻之。改名平四郎、授狩野氏。山樂老而喪嗣。乃令平四郎繼家業。稱縫殿助、号山雪。預禁裏仙洞二条城丹青之事。山雪頗知文字。常見宣和画譜、圖繪寶鑑等。校歷代名画良工事跡。且通本朝墨妙之來由。嘗逢活所道円氏、慕儒風問故事。而囑西湖十景於扇面、贈道円。円作詩序謝之。以青藍稱之。惺窩藤先生亦見其囑。為之題詠、有奪化工之語。東福寺所藏三十三觀音像者、明兆筆也失其二幅。九条前関白幸家公、命山雪補囑之、以寄附於寺。乃執奏以叙法橋位。山雪性好隱淪、不悅接俗。唯潜心於後素、善弁古画真贋。自号蛇足軒、又称桃源子、号松柏山人。山雪常謂、中葉以来画中華故事者、不見本伝而惑俗説、誤囑式者不少。故審其実、訂正其偽。至若下進履、不知張良為孺子而囑壯夫貌、方朔見王母時、不知其為童兒而為対偶之樣之類、則悉出新意以改囑之。皆有所拋也。龍雲也、人物也、山水也、花鳥也、各倣慕宋元明名画之痕、而特異惟多。又模七十二侯之囑行于世。暇日著囑繪寶鑑名録、源氏物語囑画記、武陵雜記、画談等。以貽厥孫謀。慶安辛卯三月十二日沒。歲六十二。

其子永納繼家。字伯受、号山静、又称素絢軒。其譜所載大概如此。

寬永年中、我先人羅山叟、創營聖堂於武州忍岡、時欲囑歷聖大儒像、以納於聖堂文庫。與杏庵正意識扞堪其技者。男山僧昭乘者、以此藝鳴一世者也。與先人有方外之交。以身老不能自筆、故推举山雪曰、狩野縫殿助扞扞而可也。乃請之囑伏羲至文宣王十一聖、顏曾思孟及周子二程張邵朱子總二十一幅。今傳存於忍岡文庫、每有枳菜陳設於聖堂之兩廡、人人所觀也。余、幼時在洛、侍先人遇山雪兩三回、其後東來三十余年、雁帛絕而不通、鯉素而不達。故與永納未相面。戊申之春、梅庵滯留武城屢及永納事。請記其家伝。余

以山雪有旧縁、故不能峻拒之。既而梅庵帰洛、寄永納所畫西湖十景及山水花鳥兩軸。而頻請不止。余日勤史館事、朝夕之暇加賀於兩軸。以作坐我湖中之想、而按良止坎亨之象、於是披彼家譜、所叙件件如右。聞山樂、山雪畫式図様、永徳悉傳受之。若以是弁於其卷端、亦所不辞也。嗚呼、京師者余郷也。幸保余年、則豈不顧喬木哉。武陵者天下之大会也。永納亦豈不觀勝地而已哉。然則所寄之兩軸応需之一序、其為会面之符節乎已酉春正月

(和訳)

洛人狩野永納、丹青を以て業を為す既に三世に及ぶ。其の父祖の遺図を師、以て一軸を為す。五十川梅庵に憑き、遥かに序を余に需(もと)む。且に其の家譜に寄らんとす。譜曰く、

狩野山樂、近江の國蒲生郡の人也。本の氏は木村、名は光頼、小字は平三。蓋し其れ佐佐木氏の余裔か。其の祖善通と曰ふ、父永光と曰ふ、後に善了と改む。母は益田氏。永光初め浅井氏に事(つか)ふ。既にして豊臣秀吉公に謁す。公伏見城を営み、屢々監臨す。光頼公の杖を持ちて其の後に従ふ。而して其の杖を以て、画馬を沙に畫き、傍らに觀るを顧みず。公見て之を奇として曰く、汝丹青を好むかと。乃ち當時の画工の長狩野永徳に附かしむ。學習して父子の義を約し、狩野氏を冒し、修理亮と号す。猶お士林の列に接す。公、東福寺法堂を修營す、堂棟の板に僧明兆の畫龍有り。嘗て雷火に逢ひて損ず。公、永徳をして之を補わしむ。雲を畫き未だ龍を畫かずして永徳病に罹り危急す。乃ち公の命に依りて其の草本を光頼に授け、以て之を補成す。是に由りて其の名世に顯わる。公嘗て天王寺を興復す。光頼をして始めて聖徳太子縁起を堂壁に畫かしむ。秀吉薨るに及び秀頼に事(つか)ふ、浪速の城下の侍。浪速陥ちて後、恩赦を得て東照大神君を駿城に拝す。而して洛陽に帰休す。剃髮改めて山樂と号す。元和年中、天王寺災に罹り、堂壁の絵焦土す。其の重興に及び、山樂復た鉤命を蒙り之を図す。其の余、禁裏、緑洞、二条城の後素、預からざる無し。且つ洛中畿内の寺院に、多く墨痕を遺す。偶々並帶蓮浪速の仏閣に畫く。未だ幾つかの河内江南の池蓮一茎を両花に生ける。時の人以て奇と為す。又古老の語る所を聞くに初めて犬追物式を図す。凡そ龍虎、鷹馬、花鳥、山水、木石等、共に倣慕する所有りて心を尽くさざる無し。最も鍾馗に長ず。病者之を求めて壁間に貼る。又張氏帝鑑図説を見て、始めて之を模写す。又馭術を知るを以て故に騎法七段を畫く。皆世に流播す。其の子光教家業を継ぐ。山樂より先に卒す。故に其の婿山雪を以て嗣と為し畫本遺墨を譲付す。寛永十二年八月十九日、山樂家に終わる。歳七十七。

山雪秦姓千賀氏。幼名は彦三。父は道元と曰ふ。母は松浦氏。肥前の國に生る。故有りて居を浪速に移す。彦三幼にして設色を好む。道元之を抑えんとするに止まず。元、没す時彦三僅かに十六歳。叔父僧某、之を携へて山樂に附して弟子と為す。絵事稍く進む。山樂長女を以て之の妻とす。名を平四郎と改む。狩野氏を授く。山樂老いて嗣を喪す。乃ち平四郎をして家業を継がしむ。縫殿助と称し、山雪と号す。禁裏仙洞、二条城の丹青の事に預かる。山雪頗る文字を知る。常に宣和畫譜、図絵宝鑑等を見る。歴代の名画、良工、事跡を校す。且つ、本朝墨妙の来由に通ず。嘗て活所に道円氏に逢う、儒風を慕ひ故事を問ふ。而して西湖十景を扇面に図し道円に贈る。円詩並びに序を作り之に謝す。青藍を以て之を称す。惺窩藤先生亦其の図を見て之の為に題詠す。化を奪い工

の語有り。東福寺蔵する所の三十三観音像は、明兆の筆なり。其の二幅を失す。九条前の関白幸家公、山雪に命じ之を補図せしむ。以て寺に寄附す。乃ち執奏を以て法橋位に叙す。山雪の性隠淪を好み、俗と接するを悦ばず。唯後素に潜心し、善く古畫の真贋を弁ず。自ら蛇足軒と号し、又桃源子と称し、松柏山人と号す。山雪常に謂う、中葉以来中華の故事を畫く者、本伝を見ずして俗説に惑ふ。図式を誤る者少なからず。故に審（つまびらか）に其の実を検じ、其の正に其の偽を訂（ただ）すべし。下の履を進み、張良が孺子の為すを知らずして壯夫の貌を図し、方朔が王母を見る時、其の童児が為すを知らずして対偶の様を為すの類の若きに至りては、則ち悉く真意を出し、以て之を改図す。皆抛る所有るなり。龍雲、人物、山水、花鳥、各々宋元明の名画の痕を倣慕して意を得ること惟だ多し。又七十二侯の図を模し、世に行う。暇日図繪宝鑑名録、源氏物語図画記、武陵雜記、画談等を著す。以て厥孫謀を貽（のこ）す。慶安辛卯三月十二日没。歳六十三。

其の子永納家を継ぐ。字は伯受、号は山静、又、素絢軒と称す。其の譜に載す所の大概此の如し。

寛永年中、我が先人羅山叟、聖堂を武州忍岡に創營し、時に歴聖大儒像を図し、以て聖堂文庫に納めんと欲す。杏庵正意と議（はか）り其の技に堪へる者を択（えら）ぶ。男山僧昭乗は、此の芸を以て一世を鳴く者なり。先人と方外の交有り。身老いて自筆能はざるを以て、故に挙げて山雪を推して曰く、応に狩野縫殿助択ぶべし。乃ちこれに請ひて伏羲文宣王に至る十一聖、顔曾思孟周子二程、張 朱子総二十一幅を図す。今存りて忍岡文庫に伝春、釈菜有る毎に聖堂の兩廡に陳設し、人人觀る所なり。余、幼時洛に在りて、先人と侍るに山雪と遇す兩三回、其の後東來して三十余年、雁帛（がんばんく）絶へて通じず、鯉素（りそ）（しず）みて達せず。故に永納と未だ相面さず。戊申の春、梅庵武城に滞留し、屢々永納の事に及ぶ。其の家伝を記すを請う。余山雪と旧縁有るを以て、故に之を峻拒する能はず。既にして梅庵洛に帰し、永納が畫する所の西湖十景及び山水花鳥兩軸に寄す。而して頻（しきり）に請うを止まず。余、日（ひる）は史館の事を勤め、朝夕の暇に賛を兩軸に加ふ。以て我が湖中に坐するの想いを作す。而して艮止坎亨の象を按じ、是に於いて彼の家譜披（ひら）く、叙する所の件件右の如し。聞くに、山樂、山雪の畫式、図様、永徳悉く之を伝授す。若し是を以て其の巻端に弁ず。亦辞さざる所なり。嗚呼、京師は余の郷なり。幸いにも軸を儒に応ずるの一序、其の会面の符節を為すや。巳酉春正月

(Kano Einô 狩野永納 Honchô gashi 『本朝画史』 (1693) Kasai Masaaki 笠井昌昭/Sasaki Susumu 佐々木進/Takei Akio 竹居昭男 『訳注「本朝画史」』 Dôhōsha shuppan 同朋社出版、1985 年)

Kano Eino kaden gajiku jo (Sansetsu)

Sansetsu was of the Hata clan and of the Chiga family; his father was called Dogen, and his mother was of the Matsumura family. He was born in Hizen Province and for some reason moved to Naniwa (Osaka). From the time he was a child Hikoza liked to paint, and although Dogen discouraged this, he did not quit. Hikoza was only sixteen when his father died, and his

uncle, a priest named so-and-so entrusted him to Sanraku, who made him apprentice. He gradually progressed in the art of painting, and Sanraku had him marry his daughter, he then changed his name to Heishiro and received the Kano surname. When the aged Sanraku's designated successor died, he ordered Heishiro to succeed him in his family's art. He took the name [go] Sansetsu. He produced paintings for the Imperial Palace, the Retired Emperor's Palace and Nijo Castle. Sansetsu was adept at writing, and often read such works as the Xuanhe buapu and Tuhui baojian, or studied the masterpieces of famous historical painters. He also studied the origins of the wondrous inks of our realm. He once met Kassho Doen [Nawa Kassho] and came to prize Confucian learning and enquire about the classics. He then painted Ten Views of West Lake on fans and gave them to Doen, who composed poems and a preface in appreciation, thus 'making indigo out of blue' [attesting to his accomplishment as a painter]. Master Fujiwara Seika also saw this painting and composed a title and poem for this work, which described how he [Sansetsu] had grasped the process of transformation. The paintings of Thirty-Three Kannon in Tofukuji are by Mincho, but two scrolls had been lost. Former Regent Kujo Sachiie [1586-1665] ordered Sansetsu to produce replacement for the lost scrolls and they were given to the temple. He was then promoted to the rank of Hokkyo. Sansetsu's character was such that he preferred solitude and disliked associating with vulgarity. He would immerse his heart only in painting and was adept at distinguishing fakes from authentic works of ancient paintings. He took as his other artist's names Jasokuken, Togenshi and Shohaku Sanjin. Sansetsu would often say that since the medieval period, those who painted ancient Chinese themes who would not look at original accounts but instead lose their way in popular explanations were not few. Thus one should investigate their accuracy and make a judgment, and correct the falsehoods. From things like not knowing to make Zhang Liang young but painting him with an adult's face in (depiction of) 'returning shoes at Xiapi'; to giving [Dong] Fangshuo a pair of attendants instead of one when he gazes at [Xi] Wangmu – using fresh ideas as the means to improve pictures of things; in every case he [Sansetsu] achieved this. Whether dragons in clouds, human figures, in each case he would study the traces and could master many of them. He also copied paintings of the 72 seasonal days and in his free time he wrote Tokai hokan meiroku (List of Names in the Thui baojian), monogatari zu (Illustrated Tale of Genji), Huaji (Digest of the Historical Record of Famous Painters), Buryo zakki (Miscellaneous notes on the peach-blossom spring), Gadan (Discourses on painting), and so on. He thus planned to pass this to his descendants. On the twelfth day of the third month of Keian kanoto-u (1651), he died at age 62.

This English translation is by Mathew McKelway, "Kano Sansetsu and Kano Workshop Paintings of 'The Song of Lasting Sorrow' in Chinese Romance from a Japanese Brush: Kano Sansetsu's Chogonka Scrolls in the Chester Beatty Library (London: Scala Publishers, 2009), 110-111.

本朝画史

Accounts of Sansetsu in *Honchō gashi*

画題

万里江山図、波与岸両図、或瀟湘八景、西湖十景、金山十雪図、皆命題也。此図今往々有焉。習写之者誤古図者多。譬杭州西湖上泛符舶掛布帆、不知其湖狭小矣。又画長恨歌、

太液芙蓉不知為荷花、而画木芙蓉。我先考桃源主人嘆有此病、以古図改之者粗多。見之者拓焉。

Painting Titles

Rivers and mountains of ten thousand li, waves and cliffs, or the Eight Views of Xiao Xiang, the Ten Views of West Lake, and the Ten Snows and Jinshan are all subject of painting. Paintings on these subjects frequently appear today, but there are many who make mistake in copying and learning from ancient paintings. For examples, they depict sailboats on West Lake in Hangzhou because they don't realize how narrow the lake actually is. Or when they paint the 'Song of Lasting Sorrow' they don't realize that the fuyo in Taiye Pool are lotuses and depict them as tree peonies. My late father Master Togen lamented these ills and sought to correct many mistakes based on older paintings. Those who see these works should make these distinctions.

雜伝

僧漲川

一名氷海。九州人也。天性工画。元和年中游于権貴之家。蓋予先考山雪翁、每会面相与談画事。其筆法出自雪舟更有新意。而清雅可愛。

Priest Chosen

Another name was Hyokai, a native of Kyushu. He was skillful in painting. During the years of Gen'na (1615-1624), he stayed in Kyoto and received painting commissions from the noble and powerful aristocrats. Every time when seeing him, my father Sansetsu discussed about painting. His brush method derives from that of Sesshu, but added a new approach to it. He is a pure and elegant person, who should be appreciated.

付録

図画器

紙

唐紙 以官紙為上品也。先考桃源子云、唐紙者先舐之、不取舌者善紙也。而其面厚重、其地濃者尚之矣。

本朝画史跋

吾先考桃源主人、手録国朝古今能画者百余人、以為之伝。草稿已成。然不終其功而卒矣。嗚呼痛哉。予設色之余暇、雖欲繼此編、短才薄知。不堪成之。且本朝自古無画記之可徵。是亦難奈之何。今其所聞所見、租集成之。繼先考之志。

Epilogue

My predecessor [father] Maser Togen recorded over a hundred skilled painters of our realm, prepared biographies of them, and had already completed a draft. However, he died before he could complete this effort. Ah, how tragic! I attempt to complete the editing in my free time from painting, but was unable to due to my lack of knowledge. Moreover, from the past there have been accounts of painting in our realm that one could investigate. This made things even more difficult. At last I was able to assemble what I had seen and heard and continue my father's will.

延宝二年甲虎十月七日、法印探幽斎狩野守信、病にて家に没す。寿七十三。池上本門寺に葬る。明くる年乙卯、小祥忌、其の子探信、探雪、非慕に耐えず、碑を墓畔に立てる。而して辞を弘文院学士林叟に請う。叟未だ成童にあらざる時、探幽を京師の宅に於いて知る。東来の後、或いは當中に於いて遇い、或いは侯伯の家に於いて遇い、晤語頻々たり。今は既に永訣す。豈に之を哀惜せざるや、乃ち家譜に拠りて之の為に辞を作り曰く、夫れ一芸に名をなし、闔国に敵無きを称するはまた艱からずや。狩野探幽斎の丹青の妙、当時独歩にして固より異論無し。容易ならざると謂うべし。狩野氏の先、藤氏南家の支流遠江助為憲より出づ。其の孫維景伊豆の國に住し狩野介と号す。傳に茂光宗光に至り、鎌倉幕府に仕ふ。枝葉連綿、其の末裔祐清豆州より京都に移り、足利幕府に陪（したが）ふ。時に左僕射源義政、職を辞し東山に閑居す。祐清をして畫図の事を監（み）さしむ。性癖設色を好み、遂に其の名を得たり。剃髪して法眼位に叙し、絵を以て業とす。祐清の子元信、益々声価を揚ぐ。其の子祐雪、祐雪の子松栄、亦法眼に叙し、世に家業を伝ふ。俗に元信を称して古法眼と曰ふ、其の図する所を珍藏す。松栄永徳を生む。其の技元信に垂（つ）ぎ進みて法印に叙す。二男有り、伯を光信と曰ふ、叔を孝信と曰ふ。乃ち是探幽斎守信が父なり。守信慶長七歳壬寅、某月某日を以て京師に於いて産まる。母は佐々成政の娘也と云ふ。二歳の時、孝信戯れに筆を執りて授くに、其れ泣くを忽ち止むる。屡これを試す毎々皆然り。見る者これを異とす。四歳にして自ら筆を執り、墨を持つ。其の図殆ど習熟者の如しと云ふ。十七年壬子、守信始めて東行し、駿府に到り東照宮大神君を拝し奉る。而して後、江府に赴き台徳公を拝し奉る。十三歳の時、猫を海棠の花の下に画く。殆ど永徳の為すかと疑う。十五歳にいたり龍を紅葉山の神廟に画く。爾来日光山三縁山東叡山宮廟に経営有り。則ち龍を図して例を為す。元和丁巳、台徳公諸画工の図する所を御覧になるに、守信の筆勢の殊に旨に協い、官物と為す。時に十六歳にして既に拔群の誉れを得たり。九年癸亥難波城殿屋に畫す。此より以降、江城改造の素功施さざる無し。寛永三年丙寅、二条城に行幸す。其の儲ける御所の高壁、守信に命じて之を畫く。監司小堀氏之の為に重架を連設し、故に殿内明からず運筆に碍あり。守信其の架を撤し焦箸を竿頭に結約し運足の間縦横自在なり、仮に点畫して之を修飾し日ならずして亟（すみやか）に成る。僉曰く、実に尋常の畫者の及ぶ所に非ず。時に二十五歳、声名籍甚だなり。十三年丙子、大猷公の鈞命を奉りて東照宮縁起を図す。殊に旨あり、剃髪して法眼に叙す。守信を改め探幽斎と号し、辱（かたじけなく）も神影を寫し奉る。此より齋名を以て行ふ。絵所の号を蒙る、時に三十五歳なり。十九年壬午、禁裏の改造。探幽紫宸殿賢正障子を図す。此巨勢金岡以来、歴朝殊に精選する所なり。此の後皇居改營二度、探幽皆之に勤める。且つ仙院長信宮、亦後素に預からざる無し。朝鮮国信使来貢有る毎に、命を蒙り屏風を図し、彼の国王の聘（へい）に報ずる。信使館に留まるの間、屡々往きて筆を走らす。彼の画工其の写生傳神の真に 見るを見て、歎服せざる無し。其の進士の請うを以て己の像を描く。自珍して曰く、某国未だ嘗て此の如きの妙技を見ず。化僧隱元曰く、中朝亦斯くの如きの芸者稀なるべし。乃ち啻（ただ）我が邦にて卓立するのみに匪（あら）ず、其の異域に於ける称亦大なるを知る。乃ち今大君幕下の治世、其の墨痕英覧に入り、而して感賞を蒙る者数々なり。寛文二壬寅の歳、法印に昇進す。是の年、亦省中仙院の絵事を務どる。時に太上法

皇宸筆を賜ふ。其の後、明暦上皇亦 翰を賜ふ。傳家の家宝何を以て加うるや。四歳甲辰季冬始、河内国内に采地二百石を賜ふ。達芸無双の效此に弥（いよいよ）顕わる。凡そ探幽の畫幅、貴無く、賤無く、競い求め蔵貯す。或いは床壁に掛け、或いは席珍と為し、闔國に遍し。其の価金玉に抵（いた）る。幼弱より家芸に留心し、古畫を見る毎に、和漢を限らず悉く之を模す。勝境を経過す則ち之の為に少留す。其の氣象を熟視し、心に認得して去る。亦珍禽奇獸の某所に在るを聞く則ち自ら往きて之を寫す。花草異品に至りては亦然り。故に畫品式様、積蓄丘の如し。試みに古来の名畫を倣贍（こうとう）す則ち殆ど真と。常に自ら談じて曰く、曾て馬遠を夢に画法を談ず、此因り筆力の進を覺ゆ。其の徒言有りて曰く、古き者畫師各々長ずる所有り、亦短ずる所有り、探幽の如きは則ち人物山水草木鳥獸等、諸品皆意得ざる無し。鼠を畫けば則ち猫来たりて窺い、菊を畫すれば則ち蝶が舞う、鷺を畫蒲則ち其の類集下に至る。大龍の絵に其の睛を点ずれば、必ず雷雨に到る。心手通神の妙を得ると謂うべし。齡古希を過ぎ病に罹り起居快からず、右手痛痺。然れども勉強筆を秉（と）り、其の芸益々精なり。此に至り訃を聞く者皆曰く、嗚呼、昔鍾期去りて伯牙絃を絶つ、猷の歿して人琴 一に亡し今斯の人に於いて人畫 一に亡しと謂う。詞既に成る此に係りて銘を以てす。銘曰く、

伝芸奕葉	立門惟專	幼齡卓異	工夫 研
思寓物外	意在筆前	無声以静	有象而連
図山之絶	超越鄭虔	写花之妙	压倒黄筌
再生僧	龍飛上天	喚起韓幹	馬躍揚鞭
巾笥深蔵	装 成編	海内独秀	五十余年

延宝三歳乙卯十月七日 孝子狩野探信立

白井華陽 画乗要略

梅泉曰坂城滔後山樂潜匿惺惺翁家 覇府索坂城之浪士甚急翁懇請 覇府曰光頼画匠耳非武人也乃以東福寺法堂仰板画龍傍有大谷刑部少輔吉次命画工図之之字證之 覇府赦之

According to Baisen, when the Osaka Castle was destroyed, Sanraku escaped and hid himself in the house of Shôjô. The Tokugawa bakufu hunted the Toyotomi loyalists in haste. Shôjô went up to the bakufu and pledged, "Sanraku was a mere painter, not warrior retainer for the Toyotomi."

山雪

狩野山雪為山樂義子傲號蛇足軒受父法後自變更人物山水花艸魚龍鳥獸皆雅率可重山雪始稱縫殿助後子孫世以縫殿助後子孫世以縫殿通稱

Sansetsu

Kano Sansetsu was an adopted son of Sanraku. His studio name was Jasokuken. He learned the painting method from his step father; however, he changed his style later in his career. He emphasized on elegant execution of figures, landscape, flowers and weeds, fish and dragon, bird

and animals. Sansetsu called himself Nuinosuke for the first time. Thus, his descendants addressed him as Nuidono.

Shirai Kayo, Gajo yoryaku (1832), Kimura Shigekazu 木村重圭, ed., Nihon kaigaron taisei 日本絵画論大成 (Tokyo: Perikansha ペリカン社, 1997), 148.

The Suzuka Family Archival Kyo-Kano Documents (鈴鹿家蔵京狩野古文書)

狩野永納宛山雪書簡

At night that is passing, I regret about dishonorable dream, which I suffer.
Although it is saying that honesty is not enough for the spiritual repentance, at last, I have received the compassion of sun and moon.

The right is a letter bestowed by the three divine alters; this letter comes from which divine shrine? While I am disappointed, I ask you to pay homage to those three alters, and bring them my gratitude.

One is for Goddess Amaterasu, another is for Hachiman Bodhisattva, and the other is the Greater Light God Kasuga. If it is Amaterasu, you should be heading to Asataguchi 粟田口, if it is Hachiman, Yawata 八幡 could be substituted, only if staying in Kyoto.
If it is Kasuga, you must visit alter of Majesty Kujo.

Since I was imprisoned, I have been making my prayer every morning to the order of universe, and then to Buddha. Compassion of sun and moon omitted from the order of universe, and because of that I am pardoned this time. Since I am completely innocent, the honesty has revealed. The reverence is so reliable, so we can rely on them in the future as well. So, please be sure to bring them homage! Front of divinity, please read this letter around.
Also, please have your mother hear about this letter.

The fourth day of the tenth month

Dear Einô

Shôhaku (Sansetsu)

過シ夜おもハさるにかたしけなき御夢想ヲかうむり候
シヤウシキハータンノエカウニアラストイヘトモツイニハ
日月ノアワレミヲカウムル

右是ハ三社ノタクセンニ有之候文也、此文ハ何ノ御神
ノ御タクセンニエテ候哉失念申候間、其方ニテ三社ノタク
センヲ拜見申、其御社へ爲御禮ノ御参可有候

一、天照大神、八幡大菩薩、春日大明神此三社ニテ候、然者天照大神

宮ナラハアワタクチ、八幡ナラハヤハタヘ代参カ、但京中ニ御座候社ヘ参候カ、春日ハ
九条大御所様ノ御社ヘ御参可有候
我等獄ニ入り候てヨリ毎朝天道ヲ拝奉、次ニハ念仏ノツトメ申候、
日月ノアワレミハ則天道ニテ候、一タン如此シテ罷免候
共イサ々カモワタクシノ心無之候故、ツイニハ正直ノ徳
アラワセテ給リ候御タクセンナルヘシト末タノモシク思
申候、必御参リ可有候、神前ニテハ右ノ文ヲトナヘ可被申候、
又ハ々にも此事ヲキカセ可被申候

十月四日

松柏

永納殿

Suzuka Sanshichi 鈴鹿三七, Kyo-Kanoke no komonjo 京狩野家の古文書, Geibun 芸文 no. 10-11 (1917): 76-86: reprinted in Kano Sansetsu (exhibition catalogue) Yamato Bunka-kan (1986): 99-102.

京狩野画書目録

古画品録	南斎謝赫
続画品	陳姚最
後画品	唐釋彦悁
貞觀公私画史	前人
歴代名画記	同張彦遠
歴代画評	前人
山水論	同王維
梁朝画目	宋胡嶠
画品	同李＊
続画品	梁蕭繹
続画品録	唐李嗣眞
画品録	唐裴孝源
画拾遺	同竇蒙
画評	同顧況
名画獵精録	前人
四時設色	陸探微
盆州名画録	宋王休復
唐朝名画録	同朱景眞
五代名画記	宋劉道醇
海獄画史	宋米元章
画繼	同鄧椿
図画歌	沈括

画繼補遺	
続画記	同陳德輝
宣和画譜	
画譜雜評	
韓氏山水純全集	
林泉高致	宋郭淳夫
廣川画跋	董道
董宋画録	
山水純全集	宋韓純全
廣画録	僧仁
翰林画録	
画山水訣	李澄叟
山水賦	荊活
墨竹記	張退之
丁巳画録	劉道醇
宋名画評	同人
五代名画拾遺	劉道成
歷代画断	
合画筆訣	
(名手画録)	
山水論	吳恬
不絶筆図	王叡
画筆法記	荊浩
古今名画記	
画史	朱芳
紀芸	郭思
竹譜詳録	李衍
図絵寶鑑	元夏文彦
同続編	韓昂
図絵要畧	朱凱
画鑒	湯君戴
画論	同人
画禪	僧蓮儒
(八種画譜)	
画説	莫是龍
画史	明陳繼儒
画金湯	同人
画苑	明王世貞
画塵	沈顧
絵妙	茅一相
竹派	僧蓮儒

丹青志	明王釋登
論画瑣言	明董其昌
図絵宗*	
絵事指譜	鄒徳中
劉子梅譜	明劉世儒
集雅齋画譜	明茶仲寰
古今画譜	明唐泊虎
芥子園画伝	
鴻鳳堂画譜	清顧炳謹

Suzuka Sanshichi 鈴鹿三七, Kyo-Kanoke no komonjo 京狩野家の古文書, Geibun 芸文 no. 10-11 (1917): 76-86: reprinted in Kano Sansetsu (exhibition catalogue) Yamato Bunka-kan (1986): 99-102. The two titles in () are only listed in the Yamato Bunka-kan.

Kyo-Kano Documents 京狩野古文書

Goyodome 御用留 (recorded from the first day of the first month in 1869 to the third month in 1871)

九条様御用席へ被召出府士族被 仰候上者、向後進退届不及、尤式日 季旬御礼等勝手次第、自今御親敷 被遊候由二て金五両被下候事、右之通被仰付候得共、外貫族之家者、別段旧冬御改正之次第、全九条 家之御召思二て出来候事二有之旁、初代山楽徳川二代將軍へ之助命、慶安年中当家二代目山雪関東被召 橘氏之一例之由二て清水寺絵馬之事件より事発、一命窮候件も九条家之御恩二て助命ト相成、当度二て三度二及候 事二て当家相續之者者子孫二至りても九条之御厚者九牛之一毛二て仕度事也

Wakisaka Jun 脇坂淳, “Kyo-Kano no kenkyu, Kyo-Kanoke shiryo 京狩野の研究 京狩野家資料” The Journal of the Osaka Municipal Museum 『大阪市立美術館紀要』 九 1989.

Diary of Michifusa 道房公記 (東京大学史料編纂所)

寛永十年 (1641) 7 月 14 日条

六ヵ年以前、命絵師 狩野山楽法師 従法性寺殿至東光院 入道殿麗図之 後月輪殿御影末令図之 前殿下御方有之、遂可乞図之也

扶桑画人伝 古筆了仲 (明治十六年)

山雪

其遺蹟ヲ見ルニ父山楽ト画体遥ニ異ニシテ世人ノ意表ニ出タル図多シ

Sansetsu

His paintings are drastically different from his father Sanraku's style. Many of his compositions are unpredictable.

幸家公記 （宮内庁書陵部）元和六年（1620）閏十二月十七日条

一、又米合参十石者、加乃三楽へ道之候、左衛門督謁之、折紙相渡、明日可渡約束也、但屏風尅双代也

御日記備忘 信濃小路季重 承応四年 （1655）六月三日条

狩野山楽、同山雪、同永納、是三代當家出入之者也、因茲、當御所震殿、常御殿、源氏之間百馬、悉令画山楽山雪畢

Diaries of Zuishin-i 随心院記録（随心院）

Ono kagami 『小野鑑』寛文四年 （1664）

閏五月二十一日「本浄院様之御影、狩野縫殿助方江被仰」

Kano Einō painted the portrait of Honjō-in.

Diary of Gobansho 『御番所日記』寛文9年 （1669）

二月二十八日「一、絵貳枚、狩野縫殿助進上」

Kano Einō brought two paintings.

三月一日「一、狩野縫殿助弟子小村六兵衛来、表具師平兵衛与申者、右之仁同道也、」
Kano Einō's pupil Komura Rokubei came with Heibei the mounter.

三月二十一日「一、南都八景絵八枚出来、狩野縫殿助方より被持来」

A set of eight paintings depicting the Eight Views of Nara was completed and was brought from the studio of Kano Einō.

三月二十五日「一、狩野縫殿助来、小書院ノ絵為被仰付也」

Kano Einō came to receive a commission to paint the Koshoin room.

三月二十八日「狩野縫殿助、御暇申請、帰京」

Kano Einō asked to take a day off and went back to Kyoto.

四月二十六日「一、狩野縫殿助方、御小書院御棚之八枚フスマ障子絵出来」

At the Kano Einō's studio, eight fusuma paintings for the shelf of the Koshoin room were completed.

Appendix E: *Bunjin* Texts

Shōun Sango (Xiang-River Clouds, Jeweled Words) by Gion Nankai

The image of the Preface to the Orchid Pavilion Gathering was engraved on the stone, and its ink rubbings are circulating among many painters. However, it is extremely vulgar and has no “omomuki 趣 (interesting taste).” I have been hoping to produce a new version of the Orchid Pavilion image as a pastime, but I have still not done it. At last, I have a chance to write down how I want to paint an Orchid Pavilion for later reference.

In the ink rubbing, a large ostentatious building is located in the beginning of the scroll. A person who leans on his desk writing must be Wang Xizhi. Three page boys are attending his left and right sides. In my opinion, Wang Xizhi avoided the capital and aspired to live in a mountain hut. The representation of such a residence is not appropriate to express the characteristics of an elegant hermit. His residence should be a humble hut standing in the water, surrounded by luxurious woods and tall bamboos.

In the ink rubbing, there are two stone tables located in the two caves. Wine cups and bottles are placed next to two large wine vases. Page boys are pouring the wine in the cups, placing them on the lotus leaves, and floating them on the stream. However, placing all the wine cups on the lotus leaves is too boring, so different types of plants, such as paulownia, banana, and heart vines should be used.

In the ink rubbing, forty-two guests participate in the event. Everyone is seated rigidly on the both sides of the riverbank. Each of them has a brush, ink-stone, and a scroll of paper. They are all silently seated and seem to be struggling. The only interesting figures are: Yu Yun, who is supported by a page boy since he drank too much

wine, and Yang Mo, who is standing up and dancing. The Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion during the years of Yonghe is supposed to have been attended by the elegant scholar-officials of that time. How can they struggle to compose their poems? When I look at their poems, they are not spectacular verses but rather collections of short, ordinary works to satisfy a temporary event. Then, why are all the guests struggling to compose poems? Why are they so bothered by the punishment of three cups of wine? When I think about the Orchid Pavilion Gathering, the host and the guests enjoyed their conversations, and appreciated the atmosphere of the event. Why must they drink and not enjoy the poetry? They should drink for enjoyment, and should compose poetry. If one cannot compose poetry, one should drink a cup in a playful manner. This elegant gathering is a temporary event. If the image portrays the scene of suffering, how can we find spontaneous harmony? How can we be entertained by listing and watching this event? Now, this is how I would improve this image: there are forty-two participants in this gathering; three to five are freely strolling around the nature, some are leaning their head on the shoulders of others, some are holding hands, some are appreciating the flowers and bamboos. Six or seven are engaging in pleasant conversation, one waves his fan, one stretches and one holds his legs. One scholar pulls out the wine cup from the water; one leans on the tree and watches the event; and one sits on the grass and fishes from the clean stream. One offers to drink others, and one refuses the offer. One watches the event; while another scholar drinks too much wine and is supported by others to stand up; and one leaves many cups after drinking. One conceived a poem and writes it down; one recites it aloud; one enjoys listing. The poetry-composing-drinking party should not

be forced in one pattern. This type of elegant event is not enough even when depicting with a thousand ancient parties.

In the ink rubbing, a long, boring stream of water runs through the pictorial composition from the beginning to the end. There are four or five bamboos in the middle and two willows over the bridge at the end of scroll, but none of them has interesting taste.

In the ink rubbing, the railing on the bridge is extremely vulgar. Now, I give the water more dynamic movement. Sometimes, it runs between the bamboos, and sometimes between the woods it appears and disappears. There should be high and low parts in the riverbank, and fast and slow parts of the stream. Or, a strange stone is placed in the middle of stream. Or, a flat platform is created for dancing. As for the wine cups, one floats with the flow of the water; one stop at the stone; one rushes too fast and sinks into the water. Some cups are colliding with each other; some are turning around and not flowing. Its bamboos and woods are depicted densely and sporadically, large and small. The bridge should be a flat panel without railing. The water stream runs into the willow and never seems to stop.

In the ink rubbing, a water spring runs into the stream.

Eleven scholars composed two poems; fifteen composed only one poem; and sixteen could not compose any poems at all. Those who could not compose, drank three cups of wine.

Wei Bang's, figure is observing the large rock.

Wang Bingzhi's, figure is depicted fishing.

Wang Fengzhi, is shown soaking his foot in the water.

The names of participants should be recorded separately.

祇園南海『湘雲瓊語』

世有蘭亭序圖。其製甚俗。且板刻無趣。余將暇日新製一圖而未果。姑記其概。以備後日。舊圖卷首。畫一大水亭。規模宏麗。一人倚案弄筆。蓋右軍也。三童子侍其左右。按右軍嘗厭市中。居於山陰。想其堂宇。必是粗率。縱令內史第宅舊壯麗。既非文雅之畫景。況復可以污東床坦腹之雅量哉。今換以一草亭清素者臨水。四圍茂林脩竹圍之。

舊圖畫二洞於上頭。洞中石案二個。置酒盞碟瓶。傍置二大甕。數童子荷葉上置盞盛酒。以浮流水。此製可也。但置盞。悉皆用荷葉甚板。今換之。以広様木葉數種。梧蕉梯葵等。舊圖會者四十二人。各坐一席。鱗次兩涯。亦具筆硯。各一楮一卷。或弄筆曳楮。呻吟默坐。有苦吟之態。獨穎川庚蘊。童子扶起。有酩酊之趣。參軍楊模。起席隔水。似欲語者。按永和勝會。皆一時文雅士。主人亦稱清真。豈有招客以詩苦之者哉。今觀其所成詩。亦非奇崛艱澁。大篇鉅作類。實平平小詩。一時寄興之作耳。坐客何必曳白舐墨。甘取辱於三觥乎。想當時天和地勝。主客歡娛。玩景遣情。豈必督責酒令詩興哉。但其一觴一詠。信客所欲為耳。興已熟。歡呼交起。酒客談士。各自恣其所好。終不成一詩。主人戲議罰觥。亦一時雅事耳。若夫圖畫。則嗚呼苦楚。有何暢和幽情乎。有何娛視聽乎。今所改換作。四十有二人。或三五逍遙緩步。凭肩携手。以弄花看竹。或六七歡呼謔談。揮塵搖扇。展足抱膝。機鋒森森咲語之狀。或臨水引觴。或凭樹觀望。或籍芳艸而坐。臨清流而釣。有勸酒者。有困而辭者。有傍觀者。有酩酊扶起者。有飲畢放盞者。有詩成而書者。有朗詠遣興。詩興酒態。不一而足。若此則庶乎不辱千古之雅會耳。

舊圖長流一帶。悉見首尾。雖中間有四五竿竹。卷尾二大柳。低干橋上。未見高致。

舊圖橋有欄亦俗。今以流水縈紆曲折。有時遶竹間。有時流樹裡。半露半隱。岸有高低。流有遲速。或作怪石。置干中流。或作平灘。而舞淪漪。其觴亦有逐流而下者。有觸石而止者。有過急流而沒者。前後相逐而相觸。廻旋不能流者。其竹樹。或密或疎。或小或大。橋亦用平板。不施欄楯。水流還入柳樹間。不見其所止。

舊圖卷首。画壺泉。以入溪流。有致。

十一人詩兩篇成。十五人詩一篇成。十六人詩不成。各飲酒三觴。

郡功曹魏滂。此像可画望巖狀。

王彬之。此像可画釣魚狀。

行參軍王豐之。此像可画濯足狀。

會者姓名及詩。別記。

世に蘭亭の序の図有り。其の製甚だ俗也。且つ板刻にして趣無し。余將に暇日新たに一図を製らんとすれど未だ果たさず。姑く其の概を記し、以て後日に備ふ。旧図は卷首に一大水亭を画く。規模宏麗。一人案に倚り筆を弄ぶ。蓋し右軍なり。三童子其の左右に侍る。按ずるに右軍嘗て市中を厭ひ、山陰に居す。其の堂宇を想ふに、必ず是れ粗率なるべし。縦令内史第宅の旧壯麗なるとも、既に文雅の画景に非ず。況んや復以て東床坦腹の雅量を汚すべきや。今換へるに一草亭の清素なる者を以てし、水に臨ましめん。四圍は茂林脩竹之を圍む。

旧図は二洞を上頭に画く。洞中に石案二個。酒盞碟瓶を置き、傍に二大甕を置く。数童子荷葉上に盞を置き酒を盛り、以て流水に浮かぶ。此の製り可なり。但し盞を置くに悉く皆荷葉を用ふるは甚だ板なり。今之に換へるに、広様木葉数種、梧蕉梯葵等を以てす。

旧図は会する者四十二人。各一席に坐し、両涯に鱗次す。亦筆硯を具し、各一楮一卷。或ひは筆を弄び楮を曳き、呻吟黙坐、苦吟の態有り。独り潁川庚蘊のみ、童子扶け起こす。酩酊の趣有り。参軍楊模、席を起ち、水を隔つ。語らんと欲する者に似たり。按ずるに永和の勝会は、皆一時の文雅の士なり。主人も亦清真を称す。豈客を招き詩を以て之を苦しむ者に有らんや。今其の成る所の詩を觀るに、亦奇崛艱澁なる大篇鉅作の類に非ず。実に平平たる小詩、一時の興を寄するの作のみ。坐客何ぞ必ずしも白を曳き墨を舐め、三觥を取辱するに甘んぜんや。想ふに当時天和し地勝れ、主客歡娛し、景を玩で情を遣る。豈必ずしも酒を督責し詩を興さしめんや。但其の一觴一詠は、客の為さんと欲する所に信すのみ。興已に熟し、歡呼交ごも起こる。酒客談士、各自其の好む所を悉にす。終に一詩成らずんば、主人戯れに罰觥を議す。亦一時の雅事のみ。若し夫図画、即ち嗚呼苦楚ならば、何ぞ幽情を暢和する有らんや。何ぞ視聽を娛しむ有らんや。今改換して作る所、四十有二人、或ひは三五逍遙緩歩し、肩に凭れ手を携へ、以て花を弄び竹を看る。或ひは六七歡呼謔談し、塵を揮ひ扇を揺らし、足を展し膝を抱く。機鋒森森、咲語の状なり。或ひは水に臨み觥を引く。或ひは樹に凭れ觀望す。或ひは芳艸を籍みて坐し、清流に臨みて釣る。酒を勧むる者有り。困しみて辞す者有り。傍觀する者有り。酩酊し扶け起こさるる者有り。飲み畢りて盞を放つ者有り。詩成りて書す者有り。朗詠し、興を遣る有り。詩興酒態、一ならずして足る。此の若きは即ち千古の雅会を辱しめざらんとを庶ふのみ。

旧図は長流一帯、悉く首尾を見す。中間に四五の竿竹有り、卷尾に二の大柳橋上に低ると雖も、未だ高致を見ず。

旧図は橋に欄有るも亦俗なり。今流水の縈紆曲折なるを以てす。時有りて竹間を遶り、時有りて樹裡を流れ、半ば露れ半ば隠る。岸に高低有り、流れに遅速有り。或ひは怪石を作りて中流に置く。或ひは平灘を作りて淪漪を舞はしむ。其の觴も亦流れを逐ひて下る者有り。石に触れて止まる者有り。急流を過ぎて没する者有り。前後相逐ひて相触れ、廻旋し流るる能はざる者有り。其の竹樹或ひは密、或ひは疎、或ひは小、或ひは大。橋も亦平板を用ひ、欄楯を施さず。水流は柳樹の間に還入し、其の止まる所を見ず。

旧図の卷首、晷泉を画き以て溪流に入らしむ。致有り。

十一人は詩兩篇成る。十五人は詩一篇成る。十六人は詩成らず。各酒三觴を飲む。

郡功曹魏滂。この像は巖を望む状に画くべし。

王彬之。此の像は魚を釣る状に画くべし。

行参軍王豊之。此の像は足を濯ふ状に画くべし。

会者の姓名及び詩は別に記す。)

Taiga's Chinese poem on the Orchid Pavilion

“On the third day of the Yonghe era assembled all the sages”

One the third day of the Yonghe era,

assembled all the sages,

How many of the peach blossoms floating

there were recorded in their poems?

Yet Shukuya's red-and-blue,

and Dainen's inscription thereon;

These superb works of the two gentlemen
are even better than those of that year!

Taiga praises cousins Aoki Shukuya (1737-after 1806) and Aoki Dainen, the later referred to by his Chinese name Kan Tenju (1727-1795). Upon Taiga's death, Shukuya succeeded him as Taigado II, taking on the responsibility of preserving his master's legacy by copying his paintings, transmitting his teachings, and so on. Tenju did the calligraphy of the monk Daiten's epitaph for Taiga's memorial stele.

The cousins are hyperbolically praised as superior to the sages who assembled for the famed Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion (Lanting), which took place in China in the year 353. One that occasion, Wang Xizhi (303-361), considered the greatest of all calligraphers, and his friends floated wine cups on a serpentine canal while writing poems that were later recorded in Wang's calligraphy, with Wang's famous preface to the collection.

Translation and notes by Jonathan Chaves, "Taiga's Poems Written in Chinese (Kanshi)" Ike Taiga and Tokuyama Gyokuran (2007): 483.

永和三日會群賢	永和三日 群賢を会し
流水桃花幾入篇	流水 桃花 幾か篇に入る
夙夜丹青大年録	夙夜の丹青 大年の録
二公妙蹟壓當年	二公の妙蹟 当年を圧す

永和三日に群賢が集会して、流水桃花を詠み、或いは画いた作品が残っている。しかし、夙夜が画き大年が賛をしたこの妙蹟は、その時のものにも勝るではないか。

現代語訳 鄭麗芸 (Zheng Liyun) 文人池大雅研究—中国文人詩書画「三絶」の日本受容一、白帝社 (1997): 314-315.

Yanagisawa Kien

柳沢淇園 『復盆一幹書』

余昔年八、九歳、花鳥を画くを好み。十二、三歳におよび、当時専門の狩野氏の画、その務むる所、皆皮膚に在りて絶えて骨髓を得る者無きを見、画は顧、陸、張、呉、を以て法と為すべきを深く悟れり、是に於いて長崎の英元章を師として三祖の真訣を聞くを得たり

Kinsei Kijinden by Ban Kōkei

Taiga took a trip to the Northeast region via Edo. It was a middle of nowhere, there was a Zen monastery. Taiga went into the monastery and asked for lunch. The chief priest was absent, but the monks treated him in a congenial manner, and offered him meal and tea. To express his appreciation, Taiga inscribed a phrase of sutra, and left the monastery. The chief priest returned and saw the sutra inscribed by Taiga. He was deeply moved by this sutra, and run after Taiga. He came all way to Kyoto to find Taiga, but missed him. The priest looked for Ike Mumei, which was signed on the sutra. However, nobody knew his name. The priest almost gave up finding him. Then people suggested him to make a visit to the temples and shrines in Higashiyama, since he is in Kyoto. At first, he visited the Votive Panel Hall of the Gion Shrine. The priest found the Orchid Pavilion painting that was inscribed with Taiga's signature "Ike Mumei." He asked the monks at the shrine and found the Taiga's residence. After finding Taiga, the priest didn't have anything to do in Kyoto, so he left for the Northeast region on a same day. He traveled many hundred li to Kyoto for finding the author of a sutra. How eccentric he was! I heard this story from Taiga's pupils after he passed away.

近世奇人伝

大雅、江戸より奥州にあそびしかへるさ、いづこにてか、禅刹に入て午飯を乞に、住僧は他に行てあらざりしかども、こゝろよくもてなして飯茶を進めたり。されば大雅卒に一偈をとゞめて去ぬ。住僧帰りてその偈を看て甚賞し、これが和を作り、跡を追て京のかたに越しに、道路の間、あはず。つひに京まで来りてこゝかしこ尋れども、彼偈に池無名と書るまゝにとひたれば、其名をしる人なし。もとめわびて空しく帰らんとせしに、せめて東山の寺社拝みたまへと人の勧るにつきて、まづ祇園の社に詣たるに、絵馬殿に掲し蘭亭図に、池無名と記したるを見つけて、やがて坊に入てとひて、はじめて其所をしり、到りてたいめに及びしが、今は本意とげたり、京に用なしとて、其日旅立けりとかや。一偈の為に数百里を追て、事遂てまた他意なき酒落、いとも奇也。大雅歿後に此話を門人に聞しかば、其奥州の地名、僧名ともに洩しぬ。をしむべし。

Ban Kōkei 伴蒿蹊. *Kinsei kijinden/ Zoku Kinsei kijinden* 『近世奇人伝・続近世奇人伝』寛政2年刊(1790) printed in *Nihon gadan taikan*, Kyoto, 1138-1163. Munemasa Itsuo, ed. 宗政五十緒校注 Toyobunko 東洋文庫二〇二、Heibonsha 平凡社 1972.

柴野栗山 『栗山文集』 卷五 「跋南部源大夫所藏池大雅脩禊図」

南部永根元鼎、袖其源大夫博夫所藏池大雅脩禊図、来就彦審定。彦固昧画法。安得而定其真贋焉。然其摘阮横琴人物、位置於李伯時舊図外、別出機軸。意匠所至、韻度超逸、有非大雅則不能辨者矣。獨至于坐右軍於亭上、則仍不能李図脱圈套者何哉。戲立此難以叩大雅於九源。

Nakabayashi Chikutō

Chikutō Garon

The Southern School of painting has developed, and was not same theme that they painted as well. First, the landscape is good subject, and ink bamboo, ink orchid, ink plum blossom, ink chrysanthemum; or the Orchid Pavilion Gathering, or the Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden.

南宗の画開けて、又ゑがくところの物同じからず。第一、山水を旨として、墨竹、墨蘭、墨梅、墨菊之類、或は蘭亭之図、或は西園雅集図、人物は関羽の像、或は美女之図等也。これ三たび変じてゑがく所之図又三変也。

Appendix F: Kyokusuien-related Texts

Koji ruien 古事類苑

雛遊 1077

三月三日ハ、節日ニシテ上巳ト稱ス、支那ニテハ、初メ三月第一ノ巳日ヲ以テセシガ、曹魏ノ時ヨリ直ニ三日ヲ用ヰ、觴ヲ流水上ニ流シ、不祥ヲ祓除シ、仍ホ上巳ト稱セリ、我朝廷ニ於テモ、上世ヨリ之ニ倣ヒ、水邊ニ宴ヲ設ケ、此ヲ曲水宴ト云フ、後世ニ至リ、其儀ハ自ラ止ミタレド、仍ホ禊祀ヲ行ヒ、是ヲ上巳祓ト稱ス、此祓ノ事ハ、神祇部祓禊篇ニ載セタリ、

名稱

下學集〈上時節〉

上巳〈初作二三月三日之遊一時、日適當二上巳一、故至レ今呼二此時一云二上巳一也、〉

月令廣義〈三月〉

初三日 上巳〈癸辛雜志、上巳當レ作二十干之己一、古人用レ日例、如二上辛下戊之類一、無二用レ支者一、如二首午尾卯一、則上旬無レ巳矣、〉上巳〈古雋略、毛人曰、陽氣生二于午一、終二于巳一、巳者、巳也、俗以下有二鈎挑一者上爲二終巳字一、無二鈎挑一者爲二辰巳字一、未レ知二字義一也、正字千文、辰巳之巳、其口合、人己之己鈎從レ口下、巳止之巳、少出二鈎首一、其義明矣、〉元巳〈暮春之禊、元己之辰、元己必戊己之己也、〉重三〈月令通攷、今言二五月五日一曰二重五一、九月有二重九日一、則三月三日亦宜レ曰二重三一、張說詩、暮春三月日重三、魏元忠詩、三月重三日、可レ據也、○中略〉三日爲二上巳一、〈○註略〉上巳節〈唐德宗以二上巳一爲二令節一、翰林志、貞元四年勅、晦日、上巳、重九節賜レ錢、〉

續齊諧記

上巳曲水 晉武帝問二尚書郎摯虞仲冶一、三月三日曲水、其義何旨、答曰、漢章帝時、平原徐肇以二三月初一生二三女一、至二三日一俱亡、一村以爲レ怪、乃相與至二水濱一盥洗、因レ流以濫レ觴、曲水之義、蓋自レ此矣、帝曰、若如レ所レ談便非二嘉事一也、尚書郎束皙進曰、仲冶小生不レ足二以知一レ此、臣請說二其始一、昔周公成二洛邑一、因二流水一泛レ酒、故逸詩云、羽觴隨レ波流、又秦昭王三月上巳置二酒河曲一、有二金人一、自レ河而出、奉二水心劍一曰、令下君制二有西夏及秦一霸中諸侯上、乃因二此處一立爲二曲水一、二漢相緣、皆爲二盛集一、帝曰善、賜二金五十斤一、左二遷仲冶一爲二城陽令一、

荊楚歲時記 1078

三月三日、士民並出二江渚池沼間一、爲二流レ杯曲水之飲一、〈○中略〉按、韓詩云、唯溱與レ洧方洄洄兮、唯士與レ女方秉レ簡兮、注謂、今三月桃花水下、以二招魂續魄一祓二除歲穢一、周禮女巫歲時祓除釁浴、鄭注云、今三月上巳水上之類、司馬彪禮儀志、三月三日、宮民并禊二飲於東流水上一、彌驗二此日一、南岳記云、其山西曲水壇、水從

二石上一行、士女臨二河壇一、三月三日所二逍遙一處、周處吳徵注二吳地記一、則又引下郭虞三女並以二元巳日一死、故臨レ水以消上レ災、所レ未レ詳也、張景陽洛禊賦、則洛水之遊、傳長虞神全文、乃園池之宴、孔子云三暮春浴二乎沂一、則水濱禊祓、由來遠矣

宋書〈十五禮志二〉

舊説、後漢有二郭虞者一、有三女一、以二三月上辰一產二二女一、上巳產二一女一、二日之中而三女並亡、俗以爲二大忌一、至二此月此日一不レ敢止一レ家、皆於二東流水上一爲二祈禳一自潔濯、謂二之禊祓一、分流行レ觴、遂成二曲水一、史臣案、周禮女巫掌二歲時祓除釁浴一、如レ今三月上巳如二水上一之類也、釁浴、謂以二香薰草藥一沐浴也、韓詩曰、鄭國之俗、三月上巳之二釁洧兩水之上、招魂續魄、秉二蘭草一拂二不祥一、此則其來甚久、非レ起二郭虞之遺風一、〈○中略〉自レ魏以後、但用二三日一、不レ以レ巳也、

羅山文集〈七十隨筆〉

桃花佳節、用二季春上巳日一、蓋古人此日赴二東流水畔一、祓二禊不祥一、見二後漢志一、且曲水之事、晉束皙説二武帝一、以二周公營レ洛羽觴隨一レ波、此爲二權輿一、自レ魏以後用二三月三日一不レ拘二巳日一、月令廣義謂、上巳十幹之巳也、非二辰巳之巳一、蓋二月晦日、當二於巳午一、則三月上旬不レ有二巳日一、故知十幹之巳而不レ爲二十二支之巳一、雖レ然至レ今推二三日一爲二巳節一者、國俗沿襲因循之習也、

日次紀事〈三三月〉

三日 節供〈俗稱二節供一、年中五節供之一員也、中華元用二上巳一、魏以來但用二三日一不レ復用一レ巳、本朝亦從レ之、〉

日本歳時記〈三三月〉

三日 今日を重三と云、又上巳ともいふ、上は初といふ意也、いにしへは三月初の巳の日を以て上巳とす、三月は辰の月なれば巳を除日とす、不祥を除く意なり、沈約が宋書に、魏より以後三日を用て、巳の日に拘はらずといへり、

雛遊の記〈上〉

三月三日に菟(ひな)祭する事は、唐土にても、鄭の國には溱洧といふ川の上にて、貴賤男女あつまり、蘭といふ草を取て、災難厄難を祓除する儀式有て、文人は盃を流して詩を作り、酒宴して遊ぶ、これを曲水宴といふ、本朝にては、二十四代顯宗天皇の元年三月、巳日の祓とて、花園へ御幸まし、始て曲水宴をなし給ふよし、日本紀に見へたり、我朝にても唐土にても、其むかしは、三月上の巳の日に此事ありしが、唐土にては魏の代の時、上の巳の日を止て、三月三日に定めしと、宋書といふ書に記侍りぬ、我國にても、上巳の節とはいへども、今は三月三日にいとむ事とはなり侍る、

執苑日涉〈六〉

民間歳節上 三月三日謂二之上巳一、以二艾糕一爲二節物一、按三月上巳、見二韓詩外傳一、或曰二三巳一、〈北堂書鈔引二王褒洛都賦一曰、若乃暮春嘉禊、三巳之辰、〉又曰二元巳一、〈張衡西都賦曰、暮春之禊、元巳之辰、〉據二周公謹説一、己字當レ作

二戊己之己一、〈音紀〉今作二辰巳之巳一〈音似〉非、〈癸辛雜識曰、上巳當レ作二十干之己一、蓋古人用レ日、例以二十干一、如二上辛上戌之類一、無二用レ支者一、若首午尾卯、則上旬無レ巳矣、故王季夏嵎上巳詞云、曲水湔裙三月二、〉 宋書禮志曰、魏以後但用二三日一、不二復用一レ巳、

令義解〈十雜〉

凡正月一日、七日、十六日、三月三日、〈○中略〉皆爲二節日一、其普賜、臨時聽レ勅、西宮記〈三月〉

曲水

出御、王卿參上、次置二紙筆文臺一、有レ勅令レ獻レ題、上卿召二當座一博士於砌下一仰、有二公卿博士一者、乍レ在二本座一上卿仰レ之、即題進レ之、上卿插レ笏捧レ筥、進經二御覽一、返給、別書二一通一奏進、〈上卿以二空筥一復座、若付レ韻者付レ之、後重奏覽、〉更書二一通一給二文人座一、〈給レ題之次仰二序事一〉給二肴物三獻一發聲、〈有レ勅〉漸進レ文獻レ序之後取二文臺一、〈上卿依レ仰召二少將一令レ取〉少將二人秉レ燭、諸卿候二御座邊一、有レ勅召二講師一、上卿伏二筥蓋一置二御前一、先披レ序、〈向二御前一〉次々始レ自二下臈一展レ文讀レ之、上卿候二氣色一給二御製一、〈撤二臣下文一置レ之、〉講師或相替讀二御製一、〈仍讀二臣下文一欲レ立レ座、有レ仰之時復座也、〉讀二御製一了上卿取二御製一、諸卿復二本座一、或有レ祿、〈已上八字可レ書レ注之、〉

年中行事秘抄〈三月〉

三日 御節供事〈内膳司〉 内藏寮酒肴事

柱史抄〈上三月〉

三日節會〈用レ杖無二内覽草奏等一、此事絶而不レ被レ行之、〉

今詔〈久、〉今日〈波〉三月三日〈乃〉豐樂聞食〈須〉日〈爾〉在、故是以御酒食〈倍〉惠良岐退〈止奈牟、〉常〈毛〉賜〈布〉御物賜〈波久止〉宣、

某年三月三日

公事根源〈三月〉

曲水宴 三日

是はむかし、王卿など参りて、御前にて詩を作て講ぜられけるにや、御溝水に盃をうかべて、文人以下是をのむよし、康保の御記にのせられたり、又顯宗天皇元年三月上巳日、後苑に幸して、めぐり水のとよのあかりきこしめすと、日本紀に有、曲水宴は、周の世よりはじまりけるにや、文人ども水の岸になみゐて、水上より盃をながして、我前を過ぎるさきに詩を作て、その盃をとりてのみける也、羽觴を飛すなどいふも此事なるべし、又上巳のはらへとて、人みな東流の水上にて、はらへするよし、漢書などにしるせり

厨事類記〈一〉

臨時供御〈内、院、宮儀、○中略〉

三月三日 御節供 赤御飯、御菜、御菓子八種、各居二御臺一、〈○中略〉已上小預給二料米一備二進之一、

禁中近代年中行事〈三月〉

三日 初獻、あづきめし、あいのかわらけに高盛にして、こゝろけにまめの粉を入置、
二獻、常の朔日の御こんに同じ、〈桃の葉をこまかにして、出ル御酒の中へ入ルな
り、〉 三獻、右同じことほり

内院年中行事

三月三日、桃花ヲ用事如レ常、御盃ノ事無ニ指事一、女中皆柳カヅラヲ掛ルナリ、鬪鶏
ノ事不レ知ニ指事一、禁秘抄ニ幼主時常事ナリト有、洞中ニテモ童體、宮ニアル時ナド
ハ御沙汰アリ、此外無ニ指事一

日本書紀〈十五顯宗〉

元年三月上巳、幸ニ後苑一曲水宴、 二年三月上巳、幸ニ後苑一曲水宴、是時盛〈盛、
原作レ喜、據ニ一本一改、〉集ニ公卿大夫臣連國造伴造一爲レ宴、群臣頻稱ニ萬歳一、
三年三月上巳、幸ニ後苑一曲水宴、按ズルニ、顯宗天皇ノ元年ハ、齊ノ武帝永明三年ニ
當レリ、彼土ニ於テモ、既ニ魏以後ハ、三日ヲ以テ上巳ト爲シタリ、故ニ此上巳モ亦三
月三日ナラン