

Okakura Kakuzō and India: The Trajectory of Modern National Consciousness and Pan-Asian Ideology Across Borders

Inaga Shigemi

Translated by Kevin Singleton

This paper focuses on Okakura Kakuzō (1863-1913), alias Tenshin, and his immediate historical contexts.¹ I shall argue the following two points. First, that *The Ideals of the East* (*Tōyō no risō*, 1903), one of the most pronounced manifestations of Asian self-expression during the early twentieth century, was cultivated within the diasporic environment that characterized Okakura’s life. Second, that the conceptualization of “Eastern Art” (*Tōyō bijutsu*)² as a means of expressing the cultural identity of a modern Asia was intrinsically predicated on a departure from a narrowly defined nation-state consciousness. What lies behind the notion of “Asia is one” (*hitotsu no Ajia*)—that is to say, of Asia (*Tōyō*) as a cultural concept, and furthermore of the fictive framework that is “the East” (*Tōyō*) along with its fabrication and actualization—without which a notion of a universal history of world art would be inconceivable, is the border-crossing inscribed in Okakura’s life. Recognizing this forces us radically to reexamine, from an Asian perspective, the simplistic praise of diaspora and orientation toward border-crossing in the tenor of recent scholarship on modernism.

As recent scholarship has made clear, the formation of the history of modern art in Japan was intimately related to the establishment of the Meiji state.³ If we broaden our purview to extend from the latter half of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century, we see that various Asian ethnic groups, under the colonial domination of Western imperial powers, “invented” or reestablished a national or cultural identity in order to resist “the West.” This identity was also pursued as an objective of the state. The framework of “Eastern art history” (*Tōyō bijutsushi*) was likewise an idea or notion that emerged in unison with such movements. One case worth reexamining from an international perspective is that of Okakura, who has not been given sufficient attention by Japanese historians in this context, until recently. During the period of Japan’s overseas expansionism in the 1940s, the writings of “Tenshin” (especially the seditious text *The*

Awakening of the East [1901-2], first published in Japanese translation in 1938 as *Tōyō no kakusei*) were appropriated by the militaristic ideology of the time and mobilized as propaganda for the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. Satō Nobue and especially Asano Akira were representative of this interpretation in the footsteps of Yasuda Yōjūrō, who headed the Nihon Roman-ha (Japan Romantic School). Perhaps in reconsideration of or reaction to this, until the late 1960s, studies of “Okakura Tenshin” were premised on postwar values and trapped in a form of argumentation that decried his Asianism through a retroactive reading of his works. Herein, we can descry an atmosphere in which postwar Japanese intellectuals, in order to demonstrate their own innocence, felt obliged to declare “Tenshin” guilty of this or that crime.

If we turn our gaze abroad, we see in the Anglophone world that *The Book of Tea* (1906) is still available today in paperback editions and that excerpts from it are occasionally included in anthologies of art theory. To take a contrasting example from a different region, in the Francophone world, though French translations of *The Ideals of the East* and *The Awakening of Japan* appear in a single volume in 1917 and *The Book of Tea* appeared in 1922, few French intellectuals or even art historians today, with the exception of Japan specialists, know Okakura Kakuzō’s name. However, this paper neither seeks grounding in the “people’s history” (*minshūshi*) perspective, as represented by the work of the historian Irokawa Daikichi, which would reevaluate “Tenshin” as the expounder of an aesthetic pan-Asianism; nor, on the other hand, does it complacently label “Tenshin” as a pernicious ultra-nationalistic thinker, along the lines of recent postcolonial critiques in North America, which could be considered an extension of the critique of modern Japanese thought initiated by the art historian Miyakawa Torao and the cultural critic Takeuchi Yoshimi.

Rather, this paper proceeds in tandem with the empirical archival research of Horioka Yasuko and Okakura Koshirō, while touching on recent scholarship from India, with an aim to resituate Okakura’s writings in the environment in which they were written, which is to say the historical and geographic space of India at the beginning of the twentieth century. Doing so will also shed light on aspects heretofore still insufficiently examined, despite the work carried out from the 1970s by the art historian Takashina Shūji and the literary critic Ōoka Makoto, as well as in the succeeding generation by the literary scholar Ōkubo Takaki, the art historian Kinoshita Nagahiro, and others.

First, I will explore the border-crossing characteristics and diasporic qualities noticeable in Okakura’s engagement with national consciousness and identity formation in India. Next, I pursue the trajectory along which Okakura, one of the most eloquent international expounders of Eastern art as a basic principle, that is, of an Asian cultural self-expression, later came to be eradicated as anathema from the community of experts who constituted the world of the academic discipline of art history. Okakura’s border-crossings and diasporic character may also be related to this trajectory. Thus, this paper examines one small piece of the cultural conditions of East Asia in the early twentieth

century that formed the prehistory to modernism and the repercussions such conditions had on world history, and thereby raises questions about the premises underlying “border-crossing modernism.”

National Unification and *The Ideals of the East*

The introduction to *The Ideals of the East* (1903), Okakura’s first work in English, was written by “Nivedita, of Ramakrishna-Vivekānanda,” born Margaret Elizabeth Noble in Ireland. At the time, she was the closest foreign-born disciple of Swami Vivekānanda, the reformer of modern Hinduism in India and a disciple of Ramakrishna. I have written elsewhere about the details of her relationship to Okakura.⁴ To judge from a letter she wrote to Josephine MacLeod,⁵ Nivedita was essentially Okakura’s partner, correcting his manuscript and facilitating the publication of *The Ideals of the East* in its present form. It might be more accurate to say that Okakura saw the younger woman as a “good mother” and indulged in his own boyish role. Furthermore, Nivedita helped with the manuscript that would be published after Okakura’s death as *The Awakening of the East* (1938), which was written during his stay in Calcutta. It is known, through the recollections of Surendranath Tagore, that during the process of writing this work, Okakura engaged in vigorous debate with the youths who gathered around the Tagore siblings, and the remaining unpublished manuscript shows Nivedita proposing several stylistic modifications by pencil annotations. We can assume here the existence of a joint effort comparable to the relationship of trust obtained between Okakura and Isabella Gardner in Boston, or his correspondence in his later years with the Indian poet Priyambada Devi Bannerjee. Nivedita refers in her letters to the publication of *The Ideals of the East*, which she situated between her *Kali the Mother* (1901) and *The Web of Indian Life* (1903), as an event that was equally important to her as her individual publishing efforts. In her preface, she writes: “Therefore it is of supreme value to show Asia, as Mr. Okakura does, not as the congeries of geographical fragments that we imagined, but as a united living organism, each part dependent on all the others, the whole breathing a single complex life.”⁶

As Tapati Guha-Thakurta and other Indian scholars have shown⁷, for Nivedita, the view of Asia, as outlined by Okakura, helped direct and provide the ideological support for Indian national unity. The “oneness” of the declaration that “Asia is one” clearly owes much to Advaita thought, which Okakura heard from Vivekānanda. Nivedita conceptualized this as an “all pervasive syncretic force” and saw therein the opportunity for an “Indian synthesis” to be reached through orthodox Hinduism (the form the “creation of modernity” took at the time). In India, which suffered under the encroachment of the British Empire, the “Asia is one” slogan was interpreted as the political message “India is one,” in resistance to the imperial policy of divide and rule.

Only a few years later, on October 16, 1906, Viceroy George Curzon enacted the Partition of Bengal, dividing the province into West Bengal and East Bengal (present

day Bangladesh). This led to a widespread boycott of English manufactures known as the Swadeshi movement. Nivedita was to become a leading female activist for the movement, and it is within the midst of these currents that “Indian art history” was conceptualized from the perspective of national unification. Nivedita’s preface to *The Ideals of the East* is a pioneering work in that respect. In addition, she published in 1907 a treatise titled *The Function of Art in Shaping Nationality*, and rallied to her cause like-minded educators and scholars, of whom we can take Ernest Binfield Havell and Ananda Coomaraswamy to be representative.⁸

The “Indian-ness” of Buddhist Art

Ernest Binfield Havell is remembered for the support he provided Abanindranath Tagore in serving as the principal of the Government School of Art in Calcutta, and for his fierce opposition to Viceroy Curzon over policies to cultivate the arts in India. He established contact with Nivedita shortly after moving from Madras to Calcutta, only one month before Okakura met her. His book *Indian Sculpture and Painting* (1908) supported and defended Indian national unification from a cultural-historical perspective based on ideals from the *Rigveda*.⁹ Though the work has the appearance of an academic textbook, it is heavily imbued with characteristics of a declaration of Indian nationalism. One occasion in which Havell’s view of Indian art history invited fierce opposition was a lecture he delivered at the Royal Society of London in 1910.

Sir George Birdwood is regarded as having been known as a competent colonial administrator who was, in general, favorably disposed toward and understanding of Indian culture, but he was enraged by Havell’s lecture in praise of Indian art and levied the following calumny. “Of fine art, the unfettered and impassioned realization of the ideals kindled within us, I have upon the present, and through an experience of twenty-eight years, found no example in India.” In reference to a statue from Anuradhapura in Sri Lanka depicting the historical Buddha in a sitting position, Birdwood further said, “This senseless similitude, in its immemorial fixed pose, is nothing more than an uninspired brazen image.... A boiled suet pudding would serve equally well as a symbol of passionless purity and serenity of soul.”¹⁰ This rhetoric rejected the notion of there being any creations in India worthy of the name “fine art,” and was tantamount to a desecration of the importance of sitting in the lotus position in Buddhist doctrine.

These comments were apparently sufficient to disturb the conscience of the English, leading Roger Fry, an art critic of the Bloomsbury Group, and others to release a statement condemning Birdwood’s remarks. That year, the very same Fry also organized the exhibit *Manet and the Post-Impressionists* (“postimpressionism” is understood to be Fry’s coinage) at the Grafton Galleries, featuring recent paintings by French artists from Cézanne to Matisse. The consternation that the exhibit produced among English “commonsensical” art aficionados allows us to comprehend the cultural conditions in

London at the time, in which the judgment of recognizing non-Western cultural artifacts as “fine arts” was inseparable from the stance defending fauvism and other avant-garde movements, which rose up against classically informed aesthetic judgments.

Why precisely did Havell’s lecture invoke such a violent reaction? Havell’s argument was founded on a dual strategy that undermined the predetermined value judgments of those like Birdwood. First, Havell convincingly explained, from the perspective of Indian iconography, the importance of the lotus position for meditation (Dhyāna). He argued that this icon bears no connection with Greco-Roman norms, and is wholly grounded in Vedantic philosophy. Second, Havell brings up the notion of an “essential Indianness” unique to Indian art, and rejects all influences external to India as a deviation from original Indianness. In effect, this strategy approached the evaluation of India along exclusively Eastern ideals and eschewed Western norms, and in so doing inverted the standards of aesthetic judgment that privileged the West over the East. In this sense, Birdwood’s reaction can be seen as a defense of Western values that instinctively descried the “poison” of notions of Eastern superiority inherent to Havell’s approach.

Havell’s choice of argumentation was a logical necessity, in order to render ineffective the contemporary standards for value judgments in the Western world at the time. This strategy also calls to mind a statement made by Okakura. *The Ideals of the East* closes with “Victory from within or a mighty death without.”¹¹ In the meanwhile, however, Okakura himself viewed Japanese art as an example of the manifestation of an “Advaitism which welcomes the new without losing the old.”¹² Within this externally originating “new” were included influences not only from India and China, but also the Western world. (For this reason, Okakura highly esteemed the aspects of the history of Japanese art that bore a marked influence from beyond the archipelago, such as the era of Asuka and Nara Buddhism, the age of Kūkai’s importation of esoteric Buddhism, the popularity of tea in the Muromachi period, and Maruyama Ōkyo, who had assimilated European techniques.) In this respect, the above-mentioned final warning in *The Ideals of the East* does not directly apply to Japan, and we must conclude that it rather refers to the political situation in India.

Furthermore, at a 1904 lecture delivered in St. Louis titled “Modern Problems in Painting,” Okakura elaborated a similar thesis, which he formalized in the following way, declaring it to be the position of Japanese conservatives: “true homogeneity [of civilization] must be the result of a realization from within, not an accumulation of outside matter.”¹³ It is clear that Havell’s reasoning is an extension of Okakura’s formulation. According to Vedantic philosophy, which was trumpeted as the core of Indian tradition by Havell, the victory of Indian art would be brought about from within, and all external influence had to be excluded as harmful and dangerous. Such was the basic framework of Havell’s ideology.

The logical conclusion of Havell’s dual strategy manifests most vividly in his negative evaluation of Gandharan Buddhist art. Scholars before Havell, such as James

Ferguson and Vincent Smith placed Gandharan sculpture among the highest achievements of Indian art, but this was because it exhibited irrefutable traces of Hellenistic influence. Even by Greco-Roman aesthetic norms, Gandharan sculpture can be readily acknowledged as “fine art,” as defined in the Western world. However, in *Indian Architecture* (1913), Havell bitterly attacked previous scholarship, claiming that scholars had “ignored the Hindu element entirely,” had reduced Indian art to an accumulation of external influences, and had discoursed about their objects of inquiry as if they were “foreign to India.” In contrast, Havell proposed the notion of “essential Indianness.”¹⁴ This is clearly in concordance with the Swadeshi movement. Havell’s stance on the term “Indianness” was manifestly political, a translation of the boycotting of English manufactures, that is, a campaign to purchase domestic goods, into the world of art.

Touting an ideal and pure “Indianness” in *Indian Sculpture and Painting* (1908), Havell identified a “want of spirituality” in most Gandharan Buddhist imagery, a defect he attributed to “Roman influence.”¹⁵ Turning the table on previous arguments that lauded Gandharan art for its ties to Greece, Havell argued that without such influence “the art has become more Indian, more national, and more spiritual.” I do not here seek to debate the appropriateness of this argument. What I want to consider is why such dogmatic rhetoric was strategically necessary. At the time, Havell could not avail himself of a more suitable line of reasoning than this argument to defend aesthetic values incompatible with Greco-Roman ideals against statements such as Birdwood’s, and this led to his East-West comparativism. Divinity as conceived in India was the idea of a “superhuman, spiritualized body,” “formed by the practice of Dhyāna.”¹⁶ In contrast, the Greco-Roman standard was anatomical and material, irreconcilable with Indian spirituality, and thus categorically excluded as harmful.

The contrast between Greco-Roman plasticity and Indian spirituality is rather schematic, but was likely an effective explanation for a Western audience at the time. Let us examine “Nature in East Asiatic Painting,” a 1911 lecture given in English by Okakura during his later years in Boston. Okakura begins by dismissing the simplistically assumed contrast that saw spirituality in Eastern idealism and materialism in Western realism. Nonetheless, in the lecture’s conclusion, he discusses the differences between the representations of the concept of divinity in the East and the West, noting that in contrast to the West, which idealizes the human form, the East tends toward the “non-man” in defining a “superhuman divinity.” In the “airy style of beauty” of the Han-period images of Avalokitesvara, Okakura identifies the influence of Indian idealism.¹⁷ As shown above, Okakura and Havell are both seen to employ methods of East-West comparativism. However, this was but one of the commonplaces of the comparative aesthetics of the time, and there would be little meaning in asking whether it was initiated by Okakura or by Havell.

The Idealism of “One”

In developing his theories, Havell found support in the early research of Ananda Coomaraswamy. Born in Ceylon, Coomaraswamy spent his youth in England and attended University College in London. He was initially interested in the natural sciences and studied chemistry and mineralogy. Under the influence of William Morris, he returned to India during the height of the Swadeshi movement and found an interest in social reform. In later years, he would devote himself to the study of grammar and aesthetics, but in 1908 he published an essentializing and idealist inquiry into the unifying principles of Indian art. In this work, titled “The Aims of Indian Art,” Coomaraswamy references Okakura’s *The Ideals of the East* while making the following claim:

But just as through all Indian schools of thought there runs like a golden thread the fundamental idealism of the Upanishads, the Vedanta, so in all Indian art there is a unity that underlies all its bewildering variety. This unifying principle is here also Idealism, and this must of necessity have been so, for the synthesis of Indian thought is one, not many.¹⁸

We scarcely need to note that this orientation toward “one” resonates with Okakura’s claim that “Asia is one” and also shares something with both Nivedita’s preface as well as the Advaita thought of Vivekānanda. Let us cite here one of Okakura’s own notes. “*Adwaita* idea. – The word *adwaita* means the state of not being two, and is the name applied to the great Indian doctrine that all which exists, though apparently manifold, is really one. Hence all truth must be discoverable in any single differentiation, the whole universe involved in every detail. All thus becomes equally precious.”¹⁹ This *kegon* view of the universe, in which all things are mutually exposed to each other, in which the whole is reflected in the parts while at the same time the parts are possessed by the whole, shifts freely according to the context. For Okakura, this ideology of “one” becomes a metaphor for the entirety of Asia, while in Coomaraswamy it can be seen as the key to Indian unification.

Making use of Coomaraswamy’s idealistic view of India found in *The Aims of Indian Art*, Havell published a book titled *The Ideals of Indian Art* in 1911. The direct influence of Okakura’s *The Ideals of the East* can be seen even in the title itself. In this work, Havell further clarifies his ideological stance. His basic aim was to eradicate the “archaeological approach,” which he saw as the prime culprit behind denigrations of Anuradhapurant Buddhist imagery as a “debased imitation of a Greco-Roman model.” In contrast, Havell sees within classic Indian literature both “the origin of the Buddhist and Jain divine ideal and its derivation from the old Aryan heroic ideal as described in Indian epic poetry.” Additionally, Havell writes that he “endeavors to indicate the inspiration of Vedic thought” in Indian art, and how this Vedic thought “still permeates the whole atmosphere of Indian life, as the originating impulse of Indian art.”²⁰ Havell’s book is less a study in art history than an ideological manifesto.

In the preface to this idealist theory of Indian culture, Havell declares that he was of the same opinion as Okakura, insofar as preferring a method of direct perception. He notes:

The distinguished Japanese art-critic, Mr. Okakura, author of 'The Ideals of the East,' has rightly insisted that, in the domain of art-philosophy, all Asia is one. But if we apply Western analytical methods to the exegesis of Asiatic aesthetics, we shall never form any just or complete conception of them until we have learnt to discard all our Western academic prejudices, and realized the paramount importance of Indian philosophy and religion among the great creative forces which moulded Asiatic art.²¹

However, Havell is here shaping the situation to suit his own interests, which becomes clear in light of an ironic observation made by Okakura himself.

It happened that in that same year, 1911, during a lecture given in Boston titled "The Nature and Value of Eastern Connoisseurship," Okakura noted that the idealistic qualities of Indian thought and its emphasis on direct perception presented a barrier to the historical research of art. He expressed an opinion in favor of the "Western analytical methods" Havell attacked, saying, "In India, there is a tendency for people to prefer philosophy over history and perceptions over facts, and for this reason the English, in place of the Indians, took the initiative in constructing the field of the historical construction of Indian art."²² Accordingly, the question we should ask, in reference to the notions of Eastern art that Okakura conceptualized during his stay in India, is: Did Okakura place an emphasis on ideas or on facts, on philosophy or on history?

The Claim for Asian Ideals and Its Limitations

To answer this question, I will now introduce a third scholar of Indian art. Vincent Smith, once again in 1911, published *A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, a voluminous scholarly work. Despite the unassuming indefinite article in the title, the work is a definitive consummation of the author's lifelong devotion to academic study. In prior works, Smith had identified a marked Greco-Roman influence in Gandharan sculpture, which he evaluated as the "best specimens of the plastic art ever known to exist in India." However, with this 1911 *History*, he modified his previous views and adjusted his trajectory with an eye to contemporary nationalistic trends. As a result, he attempted a reconciliation and integration with the views of Coomaraswamy and Havell.

However, interestingly (and against expectations), although Smith appears to give ground to a nationalistic reevaluation of Indian art in this book, he does not view Okakura's position in this genealogy in a positive light. On the contrary, he clearly stands in direct opposition to *The Ideals of the East*. What should we make of this? It is my opinion that the core of what Okakura accomplished in the construction of the idea

or ideals of “the history of Eastern art” – its possibilities as well as its limitations – lies precisely within this antagonism.

In order to clarify this point, let us first examine Smith’s criticism of Okakura. “A Japanese author has come to the strange conclusions that ‘a deeper and more informed study of the works of Gandhara itself will reveal a greater prominence of Chinese than of so-called Greek influence.’”²³ (Okakura is referring to the Han Dynasty). As Smith aptly points out, this “rash assertion” of Okakura’s can only be evaluated as “an attempted vindication of the claims of Asiatic as against European art ideals.” The somewhat neurotic “claims for the East,” which Okakura occasionally exhibited while abroad, emerge here as an overzealous insistence, as a groundless and obstructing distortion.

A Spiritual History of the Hōryūji (Hōryūji e no seishinshi, 1994) by the architectural and cultural historian Inoue Shōichi is a pioneering study that retraces the historical evaluation of Gandharan art. Inoue deems Okakura’s above remark to be “ridiculous” (*mucha*), an “inadvertent slip of the pen.”²⁴ Should we not rather see this, as Smith suggests, as a sort of conditional reflex, almost mechanical in nature, formed from an Asian perspective in opposition to prejudices particular to European artistic ideals? It is certainly a gross anachronism to explain Gandharan sculpture through similarities to images produced later in China, and scholars give less and less cred to the theory that Han China (first century CE) influenced Gandharan art (first and second century CE). However, Okakura, as discussed earlier, assumed in 1904 that not only Buddhism but also Buddhist statues were transmitted to China during the Han dynasty. Thus, we might instead see this “error” of Okakura’s as a telling example of how the academic discipline made progress in determining the chronological date of Buddhist imagery in the decade following the publication of *The Ideals of the East*.

Furthermore, there is a noticeable tendency in both Havell and Coomaraswamy, which we might label “pan-Indianism,” that attempts to explain exhaustively the whole of Asian art as the dissemination of Indian philosophy, in opposition to Greco-Roman norms. The notion of identifying “Vedanta” as the foundation of Indian civilization amounts to the same thing as Okakura’s usage of “China.” Both are part and parcel of the project of the “invention of tradition in modernity.” The actual state of the “spiritual history” of the intellectuals of the time is thrown into relief by the nationalistic sentiments that encouraged such academic rashness.

In any case, we can say that Smith’s rather derisive evaluation below grasps the position Okakura would come to occupy in academe, its political scope, as well as the limitations of his embroilment. “It would not be worthwhile to notice Mr. Okakura’s rash assertions, but for the attention that his book has received in certain quarters.”²⁵ This foresees the manner in which Okakura’s works would be branded as anachronistic and subsequently ignored by the academic world of art history. In his later years, Okakura himself was aware that many of the details in *The Ideals of the East* pertaining to art history were no longer valid. Only the ideological aspects that touted solidarity

among Asian countries were discussed, and these were exposed as almost exclusively negative criticism from the perspective of the history of thought, which took them to be representative of the dangerous implications of modern Japan's Asianism.

Did Okakura's conception of Eastern art actually put ideas before facts, out of an immaturity endemic to the early stages of art historical scholarship? Can we conclude of *The Ideals of the East* that it sacrificed historical accuracy in favor of philosophical assertion and that for this reason the posthumous "Okakura Tenshin" had to outlive the author's importance within the limits of the history of art? I would now like to explore the background of how such interpretations of "Tenshin" emerged and achieved currency as a dominant discourse. How did the image of Okakura as the central figure in the conception of the history of Eastern art shift into the image of him as "Tenshin," i.e. a Pan-Asianist, and what dynamics were at work therein? I will next briefly take up Taki Seiichi, Itō Chūta, and Ōmura Seigai, three scholars of the generation succeeding Okakura. (I shall leave discussion of the manuscript published posthumously in 1938 as *The Awakening of the East* for another occasion).²⁶

Okakura and His Successors

Okakura founded the art journal *Kokka* (Flowers of the Nation) in 1889. In 1900, Taki Seiichi became editor-in-chief and headed the magazine until the year of his death. Appointed the first professor to lecture in art history at Tokyo Imperial University in 1914, Taki established the Department of Art History, and as a member of the Imperial Academy ended his life having obtained the most prominent position in the field of art history in Japan.²⁷ Beginning in 1916, in the pages of *Kokka* and elsewhere, Taki published a series of papers addressing the transformation in modern evaluations of Gandharan art. In particular, "On the Criticism of Gandharan Art" (Gandara geijutsu no hihan ni tsuite) an essay published in the November 1917 issue of *Shoga kottō zasshi* (Journal of Calligraphy, Painting, and Antiques), exercised great influence in the academic world. In the essay, Taki makes reference to the achievements of Coomaraswamy and Havell and states, "There has been vigorous praise of Gandharan art among European scholars, but in recent years the trend has shifted, and it is currently impossible to judge Gandharan art as the finest in India. Some scholars now say that close examination of Gandharan art reveals it to have little value and that India has other fine works of art peculiar to it that are superior."²⁸ Taki labels this trend as "neo-nationalist" and informs the reader that it is replacing the Greco-Romano-centric view that had prevailed previously.

However, we should notice that Taki makes absolutely no reference to Okakura, who was both his forerunner and the founder of *Kokka*. In "On the Influence of Indian Art on East Asia" (Indo geijutsu no Tōa ni oyoboseru eikyō ni tsuite), an earlier essay published in a 1916 issue of *Kokka*, Taki briefly mentions Okakura, rendering the judgment that "Mr. Okakura's rash claims are not worth our attention, but we recognize that his writings are difficult to overlook for their formative influence on the claims of

Orientalism (or East-ism; *Tōyō shugi*).”²⁹ This sentence is a direct citation translated from that of Vincent Smith quoted above. Taki borrowed Smith’s authority and used it as a means of diminishing Okakura’s credibility.

Okakura died of illness in 1913, one year prior to Taki assuming the professorship in art history at Tokyo Imperial University. We would expect the issue of *Kokka* following Okakura’s death to carry an article mourning the loss of its founder, but instead an unsigned article appeared in the miscellany section that could be characterized as slandering the Japan Art Institute (Nihon Bijutsuin). The article makes reference to the “revolutionary thought” of the “post-impressionists in France at the start of the twentieth century” and continues by referring to the establishment of the Japan Art Institute as a similar event in Japan. “To our minds, when the Art Institute was founded, the new movement attempted by this faction caused quite a great stir, but society mockingly labeled it as the hazy form (*mōrōtai*). The marks of its failure are apparent.” The Japan Art Institute was a private institution formed by Yokoyama Taikan, Shimomura Kanzan, Hishida Shunsō and others who followed Okakura after he was expelled from the Tokyo School of Fine Arts (Tokyo Bijutsu Gakkō), and the expounder of the new style of painting that was labeled the hazy form was no other than Okakura himself. This “revolution in Japanese style painting” was described in this article as “a bizarre handshake” with Western style painting. It was severely criticized as “bearing no fruit at all,” a “simultaneous collapse of both *Nihonga* (Japanese-style painting) and *yōga* (Western-style painting).” The article concludes with the view that it was “only natural” that such an experiment should end in “regrettable failure.”³⁰

The printing of this slanderous article would naturally not have been possible without Taki’s permission as editor, and there is ample reason to suspect that Taki himself was the anonymous author. In any case, this article was an extremely deliberate, public declaration in the pages of *Kokka* decrying its founder Okakura. The article Taki published in *Shoga kottō zasshi* on Gandharan art, mentioned above, was a similar attack, and we can clearly see an intention to undermine, in the name of scholarship, Okakura’s credibility as an art historian. Subsequently, the journal *Kokka* gradually paid less attention to events in the contemporary art world and came to take on the form of an authoritative scholarly journal for the appraisal of works of antique art. Though the tale is somewhat odious, the establishment of the study of art history in Japan proceeded in concurrence with Okakura’s posthumous loss of authority.

I shall next shift the focus to architectural history. Itō Chūta was a trailblazer in the field of architectural history in Japan and was among the first graduating classes from the Architecture Department at Tokyo Imperial University. He was also one of the founders of what would become the Architectural Institute of Japan (Nihon Kenchiku Gakkai). In preparation for the 1900 World’s Fair in Paris, Itō participated in the writing of *L’Histoire de l’art du Japon*. This book, initially published in French translation by Emmanuel Tronquois, was the first officially commissioned art history of Japan. The

supervising editor was Hayashi Tadamasu, who headed the secretariat that managed matters related to the fair, and the book's preface was penned by Kuki Ryūichi, director of the Tokyo Imperial Household Museum (Tokyo Teishitsu Hakubutsukan). Okakura was commissioned for the first stage of editorial work until he was removed from his position in connection with the incident that precipitated his resignation from his post as principal of the Tokyo School of Fine Arts. Working in the editorial team, Itō was in charge of writing the sections on architecture.³¹

Itō is remembered since the writing of his graduation thesis as among the group who hypothesized a Hellenistic influence in the entases and architectural patterns of Hōryūji. In 1902 he traveled to northeastern China, investigated the Yungang grottoes, and reconfirmed that Hellenistic Greek sculpture influenced Gandharan art and gradually worked its way east through the medium of the Buddhist art of the Northern Wei dynasty (via the Korean Peninsula), finally arriving in Japan. This route stood in opposition to that of the thesis then touted by Ernest Fenollosa that such elements had travelled east via Chang'an.³² Through Okakura's auspices, Itō visited Calcutta in 1902 and met with the Tagore family. Itō wrote the following posthumous impressions of Okakura in "Mr. Okakura Kakuzō as I Saw Him" (Yo no mitaru Okakura Kakuzō-shi, 1913).

Neither Okakura himself nor society appeared to recognize him as a scholar, but his learning was exceptionally broad and his insights were truly among the highest. . . . However, his handling of materials did not seem to be organized scientifically. Of course, he probably had intentions for a greater compiling project in the future. . . . In short, his learning was not of a pure, scholarly sort. His style was not that of a rigorous, thoroughgoing and painstaking examination. His manner of creating consisted merely in integrating a smattering of materials and organizing them into a general outline.³³

It is debatable whether we can consider Itō himself to be purely scholarly. Nonetheless, although he showed some consideration for his forerunner Okakura, it is undeniable that he was obliquely emphasizing his differences.

In 1908, *An Abbreviated Record of the Art of the Japanese Empire* (Kōhon Nihon teikoku bijutsu ryakki), the Japanese version of the above-mentioned history of art first published in French translation, was revised under the supervision of Kino Toshio. Aside from the expansion of certain details, there is one highly noticeable modification. In the 1900 edition, the architecture sections were placed at the end of each chapter, each covering a different time period, after the sections on fine art and decorative crafts. In the 1908 version, these sections on architecture, written by Itō, were removed from each chapter and placed together under a separate heading.

Okakura was the first to incorporate periodization into Japanese art history, and this first official art history also emphasized both the "zeitgeist" schemata, which derived

from the vulgarized Hegelianism via Fenollosa, and the characterization of each distinct age along with the organic relations obtaining within it.³⁴ However, Itō clearly revolted against Okakura's conceptualization and made architectural history independent from other fields. Rather than emphasizing synchronic relationships, Itō privileged a diachronic view along a temporal axis that traced levels of development unique to architecture. To this very day, in Europe and the Americas, art history and architectural history remain closely related fields, but in Japan, since the inception of these two fields, art history has been part of the faculty of letters (*bungaku-bu*) and architecture has been a part of the faculty of engineering (*kōgaku-bu*). It is not going too far to say that Itō's name was thus patently inscribed into the declaration of a separate and independent history of architecture, recognized even in semi-official art historiography. This "separation" or "partition" was maintained even in the popular edition in a smaller format of the same history published by the Tokyo Imperial Household Museum in 1916, three years after Okakura's death.

Finally, we shall touch on the field of the history of Eastern art. Reference must be made to Ōmura Seigai. On the occasion of Okakura's expulsion from the Tokyo School of Fine Arts orchestrated by Fukuchi Mataichi and others in 1898, Ōmura, who was once Okakura's loyal friend, sided with the Fukuchi camp and remained at the school,³⁵ where he would serve in several positions, including dean of students. From 1899 to 1908, Ōmura participated in the compilation of the twenty volume *Selected Relics of Japanese Art* (Shinbi taikan).³⁶ He subsequently served from 1908 to 1918 as the chief editor of the fifteen volume *Masterpieces Selected from the Fine Arts of the Far East* (Tōyō bijutsu taikan), published by the same Shinbi Shobō. The literally monumental scale of publication, combining a colossal number of collotype photographs with high quality color woodblock illustrations, displayed the standard of Japanese scholarship on Eastern (or Oriental) art and, in addition, determined the general outline of works to be examined in the study of Eastern art history (undifferentiated from "Oriental Art History"). The work still wields influence today.³⁷

As a scholar of Oriental studies, Ōmura's fame is legendary. *Chinese Art: The Plastic Arts* (Shina bijutsu chōso-hen, 1915) remains a classic. Art historian and critic Yashiro Yukio told of a rumor that Ōmura was denied a doctoral degree because of Taki's jealousy,³⁸ but the incident may have roused Ōmura to write the five volume *History of the Development of Esoteric Religion* (Mikkyō hattatsu-shi, 1918) in classical Chinese, for which he was awarded the Japanese Academy Prize (Gakushiin-shō). The *History of Eastern Art* (Tōyō bijutsushi, 1925) of his later years was weighted more toward China, and he won laurels for himself when his *A Brief History of Chinese Art* (Chūgoku bijutsu shōshi) and *The Renaissance of Literati Painting* (Bunjinga no fukkō) were published in Chinese translation and quoted by scholars in China. His works retained their value as highly reliable textbooks and reference works and continued to be printed even after World War Two. Thus, especially with respect to his accumulation and management of

information on individual artworks, we cannot deny that Ōmura's life accomplishments—and the prewar academic progress it represented—displaced Okakura's pioneering work, thoroughly rendering it anachronistic.³⁹

The Establishment of the Field of Eastern Art History

Alongside this emergence of the generation succeeding Okakura, a framework for recognizing the history of Eastern art as an academic field was developed, and Okakura's accomplishments were perfunctorily treated as a nuisance. As the cultural historian Tapati Guha-Thakurta has aptly pointed out in the Indian and Bengali context, "The Swadeshi Bengal movement gave Havell and his generation a certain force and resonance, that [however] has little to do with their later validity in art historical scholarship."⁴⁰ This same can be said in the Japanese context of Okakura, who was involved with the Swadeshi movement. I would like to add that Ōmura Seigai and Taki Seiichi's generation played a role in the study of Eastern art in Japan that was comparable to that of scholars like Coomaraswamy in the study of Indian and Sinhalese art. With the ebb of the Swadeshi nationalist movement, Coomaraswamy gradually distanced himself from the idealist and essentialist view of Indian art. He moved to North America three years after Okakura's death, assuming the position of Keeper of Indian art at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston in 1916, and devoted the latter half of his life to the compilation of an enormous catalog of works pertaining to Indian art history as well as the composition of detailed monographs. Okakura, to whom Coomaraswamy sent his writings, did write a letter expressing a desire to meet in London, but at present no other materials have been discovered concerning any further exchange between the two. However, it would not be idle speculation to assume that Okakura's support of Coomaraswamy lay behind his employment at the MFA in Boston. Coomaraswamy's selected works including his masterpiece *History of Indian and Indonesian Art* (1927) was published in India, and apparently several writings from this collection still serve today as essential introductory reading in art history and religious studies courses at North American universities.

Conversely, what is the situation in Okakura's case? The Japan Art Institute recently published an enormous hundred-year history in celebration of the centennial of its founding. On the other hand, it is quite rare to hear mention of Okakura's name in the world of art history specialists. The art historian Tanaka Hisao, in a critical evaluation of the study of art history as an academic discipline, notes that Japanese art historians have overlooked two aspects of Okakura's original scholarly aims.⁴¹ The first is that research has been conducted on individual artworks and has neglected consideration of the social and historical contexts in which the work was produced and received. This academic tendency, according to Tanaka, was a result of the establishment of the goal of art history to be that of scientific assessment in the designation of cultural assets and the cataloguing of that heritage. The second is attention to the psychological aspects of the reception and appreciation of art, in other words, the conditions bestowing

(trans-)historical life to the work of art, which have been ignored as a result of the rapidly increasing preponderance of technological methods in the field of art history, such as x-ray analysis, ultraviolet and infrared photography, and three-dimensional computer analysis, perhaps because the use of scientific equipment was encouraged as advantageous in applying for research grants.

Concerning this second point, Tanaka advocates the methodology of Matsumoto Matatarō, known as the father of psychology in Japan. Is not this aspect the very essence of the appreciation of Eastern art that Okakura attempted to explain in detail in English in *The Book of Tea* (1906)? Is the royal road to appreciating an artwork to isolate it behind an inorganic glass display case at a museum, rendering it untouchable? For Okakura, this question was answered later in life by Masuda Takashi (also known as Don'ō) and other tea practitioners of modern Japan who had private art collections.⁴² I cannot say anything about courses in aesthetics, but based on what I do know of art history courses in Japanese universities today, I have not heard of *The Book of Tea* being used as a textbook for the analysis and appreciation of works of art. (The author would be most interested to hear of any such cases.)

Heritage and Forgetting

To conclude this short overview, I would like to quote a little-known passage from Henri Focillon. Famous for *The Life of Forms* (1934) among other works, Focillon was an art historian of world renown who lectured at the Sorbonne in Paris in the interwar period. His book placed Hokusai at the pinnacle of not only Japanese, but all Eastern art. Writing in the mid-twenties and probably aware that his former judgments could not escape charges of being more than a little imprudent, Focillon likely felt obliged to defend the book in the face of attacks from scholars in Japan and the West (such as Woldemar von Seydlitz). To that extent, we can detect a highly political ulterior motive behind Focillon's preface.⁴³

From the work of philosophers, poets and artists from all over Asia, the Japanese Okakura rescued a probably fictive but nonetheless structurally ingenious continuity, a continuity of an organic thinking, as a common heritage, constituting the patriotism of the continent, encouraged by races always in tension, holding tightly to their virtues.⁴⁴

Here, "ingenious" (*géniale*) should not be misinterpreted as Focillon praising the genius of Okakura's conceptions but as his discovery of the essence of an Asian ethnos: the notion or ideal of "Asia is one," described by Focillon as "probably fictive but nonetheless structurally ingenious." This is a splendid delineation both of Okakura's range as a speculative thinker and viewer (*voyant*) as well as of the reason he was posthumously excluded, and deliberately so, from the academic field

of the historical study of Eastern art, the field for which he had laid the foundation. In order for a system to achieve independence as a system, it is necessary to erase those responsible for its generation. That essential role of the “vanishing mediator”⁴⁵ was what history had in store for Okakura. With the *fictive* watchword “Asia is one,” Okakura forcibly wrenched open the field of study for Eastern/Oriental (or perhaps more correctly “East Asian”) art history. However, the reification of the empty fictional concept of “Eastern art” (“*Tōyō bijutsu*” as a classificatory category found in the “Eastern art” collections of museums or specialist organizations that are involved in its actual study) cannot be erased or undone.⁴⁶ Though it is unreasonable to attribute all of this to Okakura, it is also difficult to deny that Okakura was the most appropriate figure for bearing the stigma of this “original sin” of initiating the institutional birth of a discipline. As if in fear lest the shadow of that creator should return as a ghost, the following generation of researchers in Eastern art history in Japan, including Ōmura Seigai and Taki Seiichi, had to obliterate symbolically Okakura’s existence. Okakura was fated to be erased, a sacrifice chosen to eradicate the traces of the creation of “the history of Eastern art,” as a *narrative*, which was never anything but *fictive*. The determination that “Mr. Okakura was not a scholar,” the ceremonious patricide conducted in the Japanese “study of Eastern art,” was a magic spell of sorts that removed the birth scars of the discipline.

The three volumes of the “Complete Works of Okakura Tenshin” were published by Seibunkaku in 1935 to 1936, including Japanese translations of his two English books, *The Ideals of the East* and *The Book of Tea*. The previous edition put out by the Japan Art Institute in 1922 only contained translated excerpts of the English writings in its third volume. In other words, the truth is that *The Ideals of the East* and Okakura’s other English writings did not actually influence Japanese readers in the early twentieth century. When the first complete translated edition of Okakura’s English works was published in Japan, the era of militarism that led to the February 26 incident of 1936 had already begun.⁴⁷ “We are one,” a manuscript of Okakura’s that was unpublished during his lifetime, was translated into Japanese twice in 1938: first as *The Rebuilding of the Ideals* (*Risō no saiken*) by Okakura Koshirō, who discovered the manuscript in 1937, and second as *The Awakening of the East* (*Tōyō no kakusei*) by Asano Akira. The extravagant celebrations of the “2600th Anniversary of the Japanese Empire” occurred two years later, and the preparations for creating the image of Okakura (now reverentially named “Tenshin”) as a Pan-Asianist were complete.

Notes

“Okakura Tenshin to Indo. Ekkyō suru kindai kokumin ishiki to han-Ajia—ideorogī no kisū.” This article originally appeared in *Imagining Border Crossing* (Ekkyō suru sōzōryoku), ed. Modanizumu Kenkyūkai (Tokyo:

Jimibun Shoin, 2004), 76-102. An earlier version appeared in the July and August 2000 issues of *Kokubungaku* (National Literature) 45 (8): 11-19 and 45 (10): 114-19 as a Japanese translation of the original English

paper delivered at the 1999 Association of Asian Studies conference held in Boston. A French version has also been published. In the last eight years since the publication of the original paper, many fundamental contribu-

tions have been added to Okakura studies. The following notes do not include references to publications posterior to 2004. This translation includes slight modifications made to the 2004 article at the suggestion of the author.

1.

(Translator's Note) Two related papers by the author are "Okakura Kakuzō's Nostalgic Journey to India and the Invention of Asia," in *Nostalgic Journeys—Literary Pilgrimages between Japan and the West*, ed. Susan Fisher (Vancouver: Institute of Asian Research, University of British Columbia, 2001), 119-32, and "Un destin de pensée," in *Approches critiques de la pensée Japonaise du XXe siècle*, ed. Livia Monnet (Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2001), 329-48.

2.

(Translator's Note) The proper translation of the term *Tōyō* is a complicated issue, but unless otherwise specified it has been rendered here as "the East," or as "Eastern" when it appears as a modifier, as in *Tōyō bijutsushi* (Eastern art history).

3.

Satō Dōshin, *Meiji kokka to kindai bijutsu* (The Meiji State and Modern Art) (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998). Tokyo Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo, ed., *Ima, Nihon no bijutsushi o furikaeru* (Looking Back on Japanese Art History Today) (Tokyo: Tokyo Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo, 1999).

(Translator's Note) Satō's book has been published in English as *Modern Japanese Art and the Meiji State: The Politics of Beauty*, trans. Hiroshi Nara (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011).

4.

Inaga Shigemi, "Okakura Tenshin's Disciples and Their Contemporaries in India," paper presented at the "Re-thinking Okakura Tenshin" workshop,

Los Angeles, 22 December 1998.

5.

Nivedita of Vivekānanda Ramakrishna, *The Letters of Sister Nivedita* (Calcutta: Nababharat Publishers, 1982).

6.

Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East* (London: John Murray, 1903), xx.

7.

Tapati Guha-Thakurta, *The Making of A New Indian Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), Chapter 5.

8.

Partha Mitter, *Art and Nationalism in Colonial India 1850-1992* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), Chapter 4.

9.

(Translator's Note) *Rigveda*, an ancient collection of Sanskrit hymns and one of the four sacred texts of Hinduism.

10.

Pramod Chandra, preface to *The Art Heritage of India*, by Ernest Binfield Havell (Bombay: D.B. Taraporevala Son & Company, 1966), iv.

11.

Okakura, *Ideals of the East*, 244.

12.

Ibid., 8.

13.

Okakura Kakuzō, *Collected English Writings* (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1984), vol. 2, 77.

14.

Ernest Binfield Havell, *Indian Architecture* (London: J. Murray, 1913), 13.

15.

Ernest Binfield Havell, *Indian Sculpture and Painting* (London: J. Murray, 1908), 43.

16.

Ibid., 49-50.

17.

Okakura Kakuzō, *Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 154.

18.

Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, "The

Aims of Indian Art," *Fundamentals of Indian Art* (Jaipur: The Historical Research Documentation Program, 1908), 1.

19.

Okakura Kakuzō, *Collected English Writings*, vol. 1, 128.

20.

Ernest Binfield Havell, *Ideals in Indian Art* (London: J. Murray, 1911), xiii-xiv.

21.

Havell, *Ideals in Indian Art*, 3.

22.

Okakura, *Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 132.

23.

Vincent A. Smith, *A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), 129-30. Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*, 78, 92.

24.

Inoue Shōichi, *Hōryūji e no seishinshi* (A Spiritual History of the Hōryūji Temple) (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1994), 177-78.

25.

Smith, *Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, 129.

26.

Concerning the reevaluation of Okakura's thought, see Inaga Shigemi, "Okakura Tenshin's Disciples and Their Contemporaries in India." There, I analyze the manuscript published in 1938 as *The Awakening of the East* in light of the time and place of its composition, Calcutta in 1902. This paper was originally delivered at the Okakura Tenshin workshop held at the University of California, Los Angeles in December of 1998. I would like to thank Professor Fred Notehelfer for extending me an invitation. The Japanese translation of this paper was published in Hirakawa Sukehiro, ed., *Ikoku e no dōkei to sokoku e no kaiki* (Longing for Foreign Countries and Return to the Fatherland) (Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 2000): 61-101.

27. (Translator's Note) Teikoku Gakushuin, an academy of sixty members established by imperial statute in June 1906 from the old Tokyo Academy (Tokyo Gakushuin), which was created in 1879. Revised and renamed the Japan Academy (Nihon Gakushuin) in 1947.

28. Taki Seiichi, "Gandāra geijutsu no hihan ni tsuite" (Concerning Criticism of Gandharan Art), *Shoga kottō zasshi* (Journal of Calligraphy, Painting, and Antiques) 103 (1917): 1-6.

29. Taki Seiichi, "Indo geijutsu no tōa ni oyoboseru eikyō ni tsuite (Concerning the Influence of Indian Art on East Asia)," *Kokka* (Flowers of the Nation) 311 (April 1916): 314.

30. "Zatsuroku" (Miscellany), *Kokka* (Flowers of the Nation) 281 (1913): 116.

31. Concerning the *Histoire* at the 1900 World's Fair in Paris, see Inaga Shigemitsu, "The Cognition Gap in the Recognition of Masters and Masterpieces in Modern Japanese Historiography (1880-1900)" (paper presented at "Masters and Masterpieces in Japan and the West" symposium, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom, 1-3 September 1997). [(Translator's Note): see also Inaga, "Cognitive Gaps in the Recognition of Masters and Masterpieces in the Formative Years of Japanese Art History, 1880-1900, Historiography in Conflict," in Japanese Hermeneutics: Current Debates on Aesthetics and Interpretation, ed. Michael Marra (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002), 115-26.] See also Kojita Yasunao, *Nihon-shi no shishō* (Thought in Japanese History) (Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobō, 1997) and Mabuchi Akiko, "1900 nen Pari bankoku hakurankai to *Histoire de l'art du Japon* o megutte (On the 1900 Paris

World's Fair and *Histoire de l'art du Japon*), in *Ima, Nihon no bijutsushi o furikaeru* (Looking Back on Japanese Art History Today) (Tokyo: Tokyo Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo, 1999), 43-55. Kojita formulates the fascinating hypothesis that once editorship shifted from Okakura to Fukuchi Fukuichi, Okakura's Pan-Asianist conception of history was changed to a sort of nationalism (*kokusui-shugi*) resembling that of the Mito school. [(Translator's Note): The Mito school (*Mitogaku*) was a school of historic thought and "native studies" (*kokugaku*) that began in the seventeenth century in what is present-day Ibaraki Prefecture. The school exercised a great influence on the "revere the emperor, expel the barbarians (*sonnō jōi*)" movement in the late Tokugawa period.] However, in places the paper retroactively projects the debates, which occurred a decade later, in the context of the authorized history textbook and regarding which imperial lineage should be considered legitimate from the split between the Northern and Southern courts, and although the comparisons between the thought of Vivekānanda and Okakura are interesting, there are many unsupported jumps in logic. My view on and objections to Mabuchi's essay can be found in "'*Ima, Nihon no bijutsushi o furikaeru*' o kiite" (After Listening to "Looking Back on Japanese Art History Today"), *Aida Extra* 25 (1998): 2-15, and "Kansei *Nihon teikoku bijutsushi no tanjō*" (The Birth of a Government-Produced *History of the Art of the Japanese Empire*), *Toho shimbun* (14 March 1998).

32. (Translator's Note) Ernest Fenollosa (1853-1908), American art historian of Japanese art and professor of philosophy and political economy at Tokyo Imperial University was a key figure in the preservation of traditional Japanese art.

33. Itō Chūta, "Yo no mitaru Okakura Kakuzō-shi" (The Okakura Kakuzō I Knew), *Kensei bijutsu* (Detailed Studies of Fine Art) 79 (15 October 1913).

34. Kinoshita Nagahiro, "Okakura Tenshin-ron no keisei to sono hihan" (The Formation of Okakura Tenshin Studies and a Critique Thereof), in *Nihon ni okeru bigaku, geijutsu-gaku no ayumi to kadai* (The Progress and Problems of Aesthetics and the Study of Art in Japan), ed. Bigakkai (Tokyo: Bigakkai, 1999), 27-35. Mutō Michio, "Tenshin no yūtsu – sono biishiki no mumeisei" (Tenshin's Hypochondria—The Anonymous Quality of His Consciousness of Beauty), in *Nihon no geijutsu-ron* (The Theory of Japanese Art), ed. Kanbayashi Tsunemichi (Kyoto: Minerva Shobō, 2000), 218-41.

35. Yoshida Chizuko, "Ōmura Seigai no bijutsu hihyō" (Ōmura Seigai's Art Criticism), *Tokyo Geijutsu Daigaku Bijutsu Gakubu kiyō* (Bulletin of the Faculty of Fine Arts, Tokyo University of the Arts) 26 (1991): 25-53, and "Ōmura Seigai to Chūgoku bijutsu" (Ōmura Seigai and Chinese Art), *Tokyo Geijutsu Daigaku Bijutsu Gakubu kiyō* 29 (1994): 1-35.

36. Selection of images by Imaizumi Yūsaku, Japanese commentary by Fujii Senshō, and foreign language commentary by Takakusu Junjirō.

37. Murakado Noriko, "Shinbi shoin no bijutsu zenshū ni miru Nihon bijutsushi no keisei" (The Formation of Japanese Art History as Seen in the Multi-Volume *Complete Works of Art* published by Shinbi Shoin), *Kindai gasetu* (Studies in Modern Painting) 8 (1999): 33-51.

38. Yashiro Yukio, "Wasurenu hitobito, sono ichi, Ōmura Seigai" (Unforget-

table People, Part 1: Ōmura Seigai), *Yamato bunka* (Yamato Culture) 14 (June 1954): 64-76.

39.

Kishiro Shūichi, "Bijutsushi" (Art History), in *Meiji ikō ni okeru rekishigaku no hattatsu* (The Development of Historical Study since the Meiji Period), ed. Rekishi kyōiku kenkyūkai (Tokyo: Shikai Shobō, 1932), 247-323.

40.

Tapati Guha-Thakurta, *The Making of A New Indian Art*, 183.

41.

Tanaka Hisao, "Nihon bijutsushigaku no keisei to genjō hihan" (A Critique of the Formation and Current State of the Study of Japanese Art History), *Bigaku* (Aesthetics) 167 (1991): 63.

42.

Concerning art collecting by tea practitioners and the link to industrial capitalism in modern Japan, see Kumakura Isao's classic study, *Kindai Sadō-shi no kenkyū* (A Study of the History of Modern Tea Ceremony) (Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai, 1980). Christine M. E. Guth, *Art, Tea, and Industry: Masuda Takashi*

and the *Mitsui Circle* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993) is a study of art collecting by Japanese tea practitioners centered on Masuda Takashi. See also Inaga Shigemi, "The Formation of Public Museums and Private Collections in Modern Japan" (paper presented at the workshop "Interpreting Asian Cultures in Museums: Displays, Activities, Strategies," London, 15-17 March 2000); Japanese translation in *Kigōgaku kenkyū* (Studia semiotica) 21 (2001): 75-101.

43.

For changes in the French evaluation of Hokusai prior to Focillon, see Inaga Shigemi, "The Making of Hokusai's Reputation in France" (paper presented at the Third International Hokusai Conference, Obuse, Nagano, April 19-23, 1998). A modified version is in *Japan Review* 15 (2003): 77-100. A Japanese translation of this paper appeared in *Bijutsu fōramu* 21 (Art Forum 21) 23 (2000): 32-36.

44.

Henri Focillon, *Hokusai* (Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1925), iii.

(Translator's Note) The English translation is a slightly modified

version from the author's notes.

45.

Slavoz Žižek, *For They Know Not What They Do: Enjoyment as a Political Factor* (London and New York: Verso, 1991) 185. Pierre Bourdieu, *Les Règles de l'art* (Paris: Edition du Seuil, 1998) 118.

46.

For the relationship between Okakura and the establishment of the Eastern Art department of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, see the exhibition catalogue *Okakura Tenshin to Bosuton Bijutsukan* (Nagoya-Boston Museum of Fine Arts, 1999), especially Anne Nishimura Morse, "Promoting Authenticity: Okakura Kakuzō and the Japanese Collection of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston," 138-60.

47.

(Translator's Note) On February 26, 1936, radical junior officers from the Imperial Japanese Army led over 1,400 troops in an attempted coup d'état, assassinating several leading politicians and briefly occupying the center of Tokyo before the insurgency was suppressed. The incident resulted in the tightening of military control over the government.

REVIEW OF JAPANESE CULTURE AND SOCIETY
城西大学国際学術文化振興センター紀要

Vol. XXIV (DECEMBER 2012)
BEYOND TENSHIN: OKAKURA KAKUZŌ'S MULTIPLE LEGACIES

Editor in Chief:

Mizuta Noriko (Comparative Literature, Women's Studies)
Director, Jōsai International Center for the Promotion of Art and Science, Jōsai University

Guest Editors:

Noriko Murai (Modern Japanese Art History), Sophia University
Yukio Lippit (History of Art and Architecture), Harvard University

Managing Editor:

Miya Elise Mizuta (Modern Japanese Literature and Art), University of Southern California

Assistant Editor:

Koichi Haga (Contemporary Japanese Literature), Jōsai International University

Production:

Natta Phisphumvidhi (Graphic Design)

Editorial Committee:

Marilyn Yalom (Comparative Literature, Women's Studies), Stanford University
E. Ann Kaplan (Comparative Literature, Film Studies), State University of New York at Stony Brook
Eiji Sekine (Japanese Literature), Purdue University
Kobayashi Fukuko (American Literature, Women's Studies), Waseda University
Jared Lubarsky (Comparative Cultures), Jōsai International University
Yagi Kimiko (Sociology, Women's Studies), Jōsai International University
Wachi Yasuko (Cultural Anthropology, Women's Studies), Jōsai International University
Kitada Sachie (Japanese Literature), Jōsai International University
D. Cuong O'Neill (Japanese Literature), University of California, Berkeley

Editorial and Business Office:

Jōsai International Center for the Promotion of
Art and Science, Jōsai University
1-1 Keyakidai, Sakado-shi
Saitama-ken, Japan 350-0295
Tel. 049-271-7731 FAX: 049-271-7981
email: rev-jou@josai.ac.jp
homepage: www.josairjcs.com

Tokyo Office:

3-26, Kioichō
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan 102-0094
Tel. 03-6238-1000
FAX: 03-6238-1299

Price per Issue:

Inside Japan: ¥2,000. Please pay by postal transfer (Tokyo 6-62423)
All other countries: U.S. \$20.00 plus handling and postage \$5.00. Allow up to 21 days for delivery.
Send check or international money order to:

Jōsai International Center for the Promotion of Art and Science, Jōsai University,
1-1 Keyakidai, Sakado-shi, Saitama-ken, Japan 350-0295

Make all checks payable to "Review of Japanese Culture and Society."

The *Review of Japanese Culture and Society* is an annual English-language journal dedicated to the critical analysis of Japanese culture using thematic and interdisciplinary approaches. Please direct all correspondence to the editorial and business office (Saitama, Japan).

Graphic design: elle+elle, Los Angeles

Cover: design based on Utagawa Hiroshige II (1826-69), *Matsuchiyama in Winter* (Matsuchiyama sekkeizu), colors on paper, late Ansei-Genji period (ca. 1864), Mizuta Museum of Art, Josai University.

© 2012 by Jōsai University. All rights reserved. No part of the contents of this volume may be reproduced without the written permission of the publisher.

Printed in Tokyo, Japan.

ISSN 0913-4700