



研究交流会 2018年臺日五校藝術史研究生研討會 参加報告

著者	古谷 美也子, 大城 杏奈, 黄 士誠, 林 みちこ
雑誌名	藝叢 : 筑波大学芸術学研究誌
巻	34
ページ	49-56
発行年	2019-03-01
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2241/00160042

2018年 臺日五校藝術史研究生研討會 參加報告

Proceedings of Taiwan-Japan Art History Graduate Students' Symposium 2018

2018年11月10日 (土) 午前9時~午後4時30分 國立台灣大學 博雅教學館103

序文

本研究交流会は、美術史を学ぶ大学院生の研究能力、外国語による発表能力、国際的な場におけるコミュニケーション能力の陶冶を目的としている。國立臺灣大學藝術史研究所、國立中央大學藝術學研究所、國立臺灣師範大學藝術史研究所、九州大学大学院人文科学研究院藝術学講座、筑波大学人間総合科学研究科博士前期課程芸術専攻・後期課程芸術専攻により組織され、2011年から台湾と日本を交互に会場として開催し、今回で8回目となった。

本年は台湾・台北市の國立台灣大學を会場として11月10日(土)に開催された。プログラムは下に示した通りで、本年は20名の発表があった。この交流会での口頭発表はすべて英語によるものであり、質疑応答もアナウンスも英語で行われる。司会進行や各セッションのチェアは会場となった大学の学生が担うこととなっているが、今回も時間管理を含めた見事なオペレーションと、格調高い言葉を選んだ滑らかな語りが印象的であった。国際学会やシンポジウムの運営や進行についても学ぶことのできる場であることは参加学生にとって貴重な体験となるだろう。

交流会ではアブストラクトを収録した冊子が配布されたため、ここに収録する本学発表者の論文は口頭発表の全文として初めて公刊されるものである。なお本誌掲載にあたり各論文には若干の修正を加えた。

最後に、本年の研究交流会開催に尽力された國立台灣大學藝術史研究所の邱函妮先生をはじめ関係各位に心より御礼を申し上げます。

(林みちこ)

【各大学略号】NCU：国立中央大学、NTU：国立台湾大学、NTNU：国立台湾師範大学、KU：九州大学、UT：筑波大学

当日プログラム

Taiwan-Japan Art History Graduate Students' Symposium 2018

Date: November 10, 2018

Location: Liberal Education Classroom Building, Room 103, National Taiwan University, Taiwan

Program

9:00-9:10 Opening Remarks

9:10-9:50

1) East Asian Art and Appreciation

Miyako FURUYA (UT)

The *Bugaku* Screens at Rinnoji Temple: A Study of General Authority of Tokugawa Family

Anna OSHIRO (UT)

Aspects of Statues of Zen Masters in Japan : Focusing on *Muso Soseki*

Ting-Yueh CHEN (NTU)

A Discussion on the Eastern Han Pottery Jar in Green Glaze in the National Palace Museum : Emperor Qianlong's Connoisseurship of Ceramics.

Yi-Chun HSIEH (NCU)

The Illustrations in Christopher Dresser's *Japan: its Architecture, Art and Art Manufactures (1882)*

9:50-10:10 Discussion

10:10-10:20 Tea Break

10:20-11:10

2) Modern Asian Art I

Yi-Ting TIEN (NCU)

Study of Yu Ming's Social Activities from 1910 to 1920

Chao-Ting KU (NCU)

Art Exhibition in 1929 *West Lake Exposition*

Yu-Shan TENG (NTNU)

Kouno Michisei's *Hsiang Yu and Liu Pang (1922)* : Iconography and Image Analysis

Yi-Chieh WANG (NTU)

The Image of Taiwanese Geisha: A study of the Female Image Created in Taiwan by Fujishima Takeji

Shih-Cheng HUANG (UT)

Tokyo Visions: The Photomontages of Horino Masao in *Hanzai Kagaku (Criminology)*

11:10 – 11:30 Discussion

11:30 – 11:40 Break

11:40 – 12:10

3) Modern Asian Art II

Moeko USHIROSHOJI (KU)

Artist in the WWII : Matsumoto Shunsuke's Introduction of *Guernica in Zakkichō*

Fumi KUWABARA (KU)

Bui Xuan Phai's *Series of Cheo* : Hanoi, 1960s

Pei-Yu WU (NTU)

From *Anecdotes about Spirits and Immortals to Body Image*, the Change in the Bodily Images in Hou Chun Ming Artworks

12:10 – 12:30 Discussion

12:30 – 13:30 Lunch

13:30 – 14:20

4) Western Art

Hiro KATSUKI (KU)

Inherited Imagery: *The Triumph of Death* by Three Brueg(h)els

Yui MORI (KU)

Orvieto as Papal States: Rethinking the frescoes of the San Brizio Chapel in Orvieto Cathedral

Misato KAWANO (KU)

The Biblical Episode in the Kitchen Scenes of *Christ in the house of Martha and Mary* by Beuckelaer

Sara Aroca ROSAS (NTNU)

Jean-Honoré Fragonard's 'Portraits de Fantaisie': Facial Representation beyond Portraiture

Chien-WEN YU (NTNU)

The Role of the Figures in Hubert Robert's Four Architectural Capricci for the Château de Méréville

14:20 – 14:40 Discussion

14:40 – 15:00 Break

15:00 – 15:30

5) Art and Architecture

Yen-Tzu PAI (NTU)

The Spatial Transformation of the Early Caisson from East Han Tombs to Six Dynasties Buddhist Caves

Yu-Tsung CHIANG (NCU)

From Supreme Court to Art Gallery: Studies on the Curatorial Space of National Gallery Singapore

You WU (NTNU)

The Southern Branch of the National Palace Museum by Kris Yao (2015-2016): Programmatic Concepts and Architectural Expressiveness

15:30 – 15:50 Discussion

15:50 – 16:00 Break

16:00 – 16:20 Comprehensive Discussion

16:20 – 16:30 Closing of Symposium

The *Bugaku* Screens at Rinnoji Temple:

A Study of General Authority of Tokugawa Family

FURUYA Miyako

Keywords: *Bugaku* screens, Rinnoji Temple, Tokugawa Shogun, dedication

Introduction

In the seventeenth century, several types of *bugaku* screens were popular at the Imperial court and among samurai. *Bugaku* is a form of Japanese traditional music and dance performed at the Imperial court and in ceremonies of temples and shrines. A picture which *bugaku* is depicted is called *bugaku-zu*. As this time, *bugaku* screens were produced by many painters, particularly those of the Kano school.

The *bugaku* screens at Rinnoji temple (the Rinnoji screens) are Kano school *bugaku* screen and were dedicated to Rinnoji Temple in 1636. That year, a major rebuilding of the Toshogu shrine, dedicated to Tokugawa Ieyasu, founder of the Tokugawa shogunate, was completed and the Buddhist memorial services commemorating the twenty-first anniversary of his death were carried out.

In this article, I focus on *bugaku* in the shogunate's Buddhist memorial services and the relationship between it and the *bugaku* screens and examine the background of the Rinnoji screens.

1. *Bugaku* Screens at Rinnoji Temple

The Rinnoji screens are a pair of six-panel folding screens, 161 by 360 centimeters each. Twenty-four sets of *bugaku* dancers are painted in colors on a gold-leaf background. Dancers pose in a characteristic posture for each piece of music and wear beautiful costume. On the far left and right of those screens are musicians' booths. In front of the booths are musical instruments symbolizing *bugaku*; musicians are playing instruments inside. There are no motifs indicate the season or setting.

In actuality, *bugaku* is not performed as shown in these screens, with several pieces performed at once; one piece is dance at a time. The order in which they are performed is also set. On the screens, the depiction shows the program advancing from the right to the left sequentially, but not in accurate order. Two booths originally form a line. In addition, beside dancers, the title of the piece of music being performed is written in ink. Given the inclusion of multiple pieces and their titles, such compositions are called encyclopedic *bugaku*

screens⁽¹⁾. The screens do not carry the signature of the artist, but they were presumably painted by a top-level Kano-school painter who had painted various picture for shogun and daimyo.

2. *Bugaku* Screens in 17th century

Bugaku-zu, until the early sixteenth century, were painted mainly by members of the Tosa school, which carried on the *Yamato-e* traditional Japanese style of painting. Tosa school artists had produced paintings for the Imperial Court, but, in the late sixteenth century, the Kano school replaced it as painters for the Imperial Court and shogunate. The Kano school first provided paintings for the shogunate after the fifteenth century. Originally Kano school artists worked in ink paintings, *suiboku-ga*. Later they adopted *Yamato-e* techniques.

Here, I want to confirm characteristics of the *bugaku* screens of the Kano school in comparison with the *bugaku* screens of the Tosa School. The only known Tosa school *bugaku* screens from the seventeenth century are the *Tōō* screens. In them, contours are gentle curves, the dancers' heads are small, the eyes and noses are drawn in plain lines. The dancers smile, however, the overall impression is enjoyable and elegant. These screens seem to express *bugaku* as part of Imperial Court culture.

In contrast, in the Kano school *bugaku* screens the dancers have balanced proportions. The dancers are drawn in detail and presented as of different ages. Since fewer pieces of music were included, the dancers are larger than *Tōō* screens and their placement carefully arranged. The Kano school *bugaku* screens were copied, based on a fixed form, and reproduced; eight works are extant. The designs on their costumes are drawn in detail. The Rinnoji screens are said to be the ultimate Kano-school *bugaku* screens, with their luxurious coloring and lavish use of gold. It is known that the one of these eight works were ordered by a daimyo⁽²⁾. That suggests that the Kano *bugaku* screens gained some familiarity among samurai. What would the *bugaku* screens, that present Imperial Court culture, symbolize for samurai?

3. Dedication of the *Bugaku* Screens in 1636

In 1636, when the Rinnoji screens were dedicated, an important Buddhist ceremony was held at Rinnoji

Temple. The first Tokugawa shogun, Tokugawa Ieyasu, founder of the Edo Shogunate, died in 1616. He was buried at Kunozaan, Shizuoka prefecture as he had specified and was moved to Toshogu on Nikkozan in 1617. Having become deified, he was called Toshodaigongen. In 1636, the Buddhist memorial services commemorating the twenty-first anniversary of his death were carried out and the great rebuilding, in the twentieth year since Toshogu was dedicated to Ieyasu, was completed at the same time. This great rebuilding followed the custom of renewing a shrine every twenty years, as performed at historic Shinto shrines such as the Ise Shrine, which enshrines the ancestor of the imperial family⁽³⁾. Toshogu was completely rebuilt and acquired its present splendid, precise, dignified appearance. The Kano school members who were painters by appointment to the shogunate took charge of the Toshogu's exterior coloring, murals, and ceiling paintings. Top-level craftsman consulted about other decorations; the result is a treasure house of the arts and crafts⁽⁴⁾.

For the Buddhist memorial service, *bugaku* costumes for ninety dancers were dedicated by the third shogun, Iemitsu⁽⁵⁾. The shogunate paid for all the expenses in full. During the large-scale Buddhist ceremony, which lasted three days, *bugaku* was performed every day. Then twenty musicians performed *bugaku* at a Buddhist ceremony at Nikkozan, as ordered by Iemitsu, the following year. Iemitsu apparently regarded *bugaku* as indispensable in Buddhist ceremonies for Ieyasu⁽⁶⁾.

That was not, however, the only time the Tokugawa shoguns sponsored *bugaku*. Ieyasu had *bugaku* in Kyoto performed in 1616 and donated the *bugaku* costumes to the Imperial Court. When Ieyasu's corpse was moved to Nikkozan in 1617, *bugaku* costume was donated by Hidetada, the second Tokugawa shogun, for a *bugaku* performance accompanying the Buddhist ceremony, establishing a precedent. The Tokugawa shoguns were demonstrating their authority, economically and culturally, through *bugaku* performances that were part

of Imperial Court. And these Rinnoji screens, dedicated in 1636, provided a visual record of the Buddhist ceremony held by the Shogunate.

Concluding Remarks

While the Buddhist ceremony in the Rinnoji Temple of 1636 was the memorial service for Emperor, actually, the Shogunate financed in full, demonstrating the power of the Shogunate. The Rinnoji screens present *bugaku* at the court, but, to the daimyo and court nobles who attended the Buddhist ceremony, it probably symbolized the authority of the Tokugawa clan to inherit the shogunate.

In actuality, copies of these screen paintings were ordered by the daimyo who participated in the Buddhist ceremony of these shoguns and became widespread among in the samurai. Furthermore, it is thought that the Rinnoji screens' function of spreading the authority of the shogunate was fostered by the repetitive production method of painters of the Kano school.

- (1) Tsuji Nobuo, "Bugaku-zu no Keifu to Sôtatsu-hitsu Bugaku-zu Byôbu" [The Genealogy of Bugaku-zu and Bugaku Screens by Sôtatsu], *Rimpa Kaiga Zenshû: Sôtatsu-ha 1*, Nihon Keizai Shimbun, 1977, pp. 69-80.
- (2) Miriam Wattle, "The Daimyo Commission of Hanabusa Itcho's Bugaku Dancers": Profligate Waste or Ennobling Taste." *Kokusai-Tohogakusha-Kaigi Kiyô*, vol.47, 2002, pp. 63-81.
- (3) Sonehara Osamu, "Nikkozan-Gosinjiki" [The Note of the Ceremony at Nikkozan in 1636], *Toshogu*, 2004, pp. 1-57.
- (4) Okawa naomi, "Toshogu Zoeishi Gaiyo" [A Summary of Building History of Toshogu], *Dainikko* vol.19, 1962, pp. 10-15.
- (5) Yamabe Tomoyuki, "Rinnoji no Bugaku Shozoku", [*Bugaku* Costume at Rinnoji], *Nikkozan-Rinnoji* vol.7, 1957, pp. 24-42.
- (6) Ikegami Muneyoshi, "Nikko-Gakushiki-Shoshi", [The Short History of Japanese Court Musician at Nikko], *Dainikko* vol.30, 1968, pp. 58-63.

Aspects of Statues of Zen Masters in Japan:

Focusing on *Muso Soseki*

OHSHIRO Anna

Keywords: *Muso Soseki*, Zen master, *Chinso* portrait sculpture, clay figure

Introduction

In the mid-6th century, Buddhism was introduced into Japan. It is said that, in Japan, the first portraits were drawn from the end of 6th century to the mid-7th century. Later portraits and portrait sculptures became gradually more popular as Buddhism developed ⁽¹⁾.

In the Kamakura period (1185–1333), Japanese portraits and portrait sculptures reached their peak in Japanese art history. The Japanese in this period were more interested in human beings, and had sharp eyes for them; the result was a new culture. That background gave portraits and portrait sculptures realistic representations. Portrait sculptures in the Kamakura period, in particular, surpass other periods in number and quality.

1. *Chinso* portrait paintings and sculptures

There are several types of portrait sculptures in the Kamakura period. One is the Zen Buddhist 頂相 *Chinso* sculpture. Zen Buddhism had two sects, 臨濟宗 *Rinzaiyu* and 曹洞宗 *Sotosyu* introduced into Japan in the Kamakura period. *Chinso* refers to portrait paintings transmitted from Zen master to disciple as a symbol of dharma transmission, of enlightenment. *Chinso* portrait sculptures were made for worshipping Zen masters. *Chinso* portrait paintings and sculptures were required to express the masters' personalities perfectly, because their personalities are important in Zen Buddhism. In *Chinso* portrait sculptures, the master is usually seated on a type of chair called the 曲泉 *kyokuroku* (curved chair or Buddhist priest's chair), and his robes hang down ⁽²⁾.

2. Outline of *Muso Soseki*

There are many *Chinso* portrait paintings and sculptures representing Zen masters because they had many disciples. One master was 夢窓疎石 *Muso Soseki* (1275–1351). Almost of his *Chinso* portrait sculptures are made of wood, but some are made of clay. Why they are made of clay is still unknown; thus, in this paper, I would like to consider that point.

夢窓疎石 *Muso Soseki* (1275–1351) was a Japanese

Zen master priest who lived from the last years of the Kamakura period to the Nanbokuchō period (1333–1392). Seven emperors revered him. It is said that he accepted 10,000 disciples, and he trained many great Zen masters ⁽³⁾.

There are several *Chinso* portrait paintings that represent him in Buddhist temples related to him. Their representations of him are quite consistent, because they were painted following a standard model of his physical appearance. The *Chinso* portrait representing him in the 妙智院 *Myochiin* in Kyoto is a famous example. This work was painted in the 14th century, in the Nanbokuchō period (1333–1392). I would like to consider his features in this work. He is shown as having a small, sharp head, oval face, wrinkled upper eyelids, bags around his mouth, and long white hair near the ear. These are the main features of *Muso Soseki*'s face. These representations indicate that his image had been depicted strictly during his lifetime and after his death. *Chinso* portrait sculptures representing him also show these features ⁽⁴⁾.

3. Statues of *Muso Soseki*

Of the several statues that represent *Muso Soseki*, only four were made before the Nanbokuchō period (1333–1392), all are made of wood ⁽⁵⁾. The statue in the 瑞泉寺 *Zuisenji* in Kamakura is one example. It is thought that this statue was made in about 1351, the year in which *Muso Soseki* died ⁽⁶⁾.

We also know, however, of about 20 statues that were made of clay in the Nanbokuchō period (1333–1392), including two of *Muso Soseki*. One of them is the statue in the 臨川寺 *Rinsenji* in Kyoto. *Muso Soseki*, who had a connection with the *Rinsenji*, died there, and the *Rinsenji* built his tomb. This statue was put on the tomb.

The other clay statue is in the 惠林寺 *Erinji* in Yamanashi prefecture. Its head is made of clay and body of wood; the head was produced immediately after *Muso Soseki*'s death and the body in the Edo period (1603–1867) ⁽⁷⁾.

Now, I would like to compare three works, the statues in the *Zuisenji* and *Rinsenji* and the portrait painting in the *Myochiin*. All three have small sharp heads and oval faces. But the statue in the *Rinsenji* is not realistic, because it does not have many wrinkles and bags. According to an earlier study, the

Rinsenji statue as we know it was produced after the Nanbokuchō period (1333-1392), and most parts of it were repaired in the Muromachi period (1336-1573). It is also thought, however, that the original statue was made immediately after *Muso Soseki* died⁶⁸.

In the Kamakura period (1185-1333), Japanese sculptures were generally made of wood and rarely of clay; clay figures were not popular. But in the Nanbokuchō period (1333-1392), some clay figures were made under the influence of the China at the time. As a special case, many statues of *Muso Soseki*'s disciples were made of clay in the Nanbokuchō period (1333-1392).

The most important issue is why clay was adopted as the material for the statues that represent *Muso Soseki* and his disciples (Zen masters of the *Muso* school). As an answer, it is possible to consider that there was a close relationship between the *Muso* school and Chinese craftsmen. *Muso Soseki* founded several temples, and the *Muso* school became the most powerful group. At the same period, influences from China were reaching Nara, Kyoto, later Kamakura. It is found that clay statues were produced in the 1280s at the latest⁶⁹. It is natural that *Muso Soseki* had relations with Chinese craftsmen, since he was revered by many, including emperors, nobles, and samurai.

Clay *Muso Soseki* statues are important examples because they indicate facts about *Chinso* portrait sculptures made of clay in the 14th century.

- (1) 毛利久 (Mouri Hisashi), 日本の美術 第10号 肖像彫刻 (Nihon no Bijutsu No.10 *Shozo chokoku* [Portrait sculptures]), 至文堂 (Shibundo), 1967, pp. 56-96.
- (2) Ibid., pp. 56-96.
- (3) 中尾堯 (Nakao Takashi)・今井雅晴 (Imai Masaharu) 編 (ed.), 日本名僧辞典 (*Nihon meiso jiten* [Dictionary of Japanese Famous Priests]), 東京堂 (Tokyodo), 1976, pp. 165-168.
- (4) 梅沢恵 (Umezawa Megumi), 夢窓疎石像 (Muso Soseki zo [Portrait of Muso Soseki]), 國華 (Kokka), vol. 1454, 2016, pp. 20-26.
- (5) 山本勉 (Yamamoto Tsutomu), 日本の美術 第493号 南北朝時代の彫刻 (Nihon no Bijutsu No.493 *Nanbokucho jidai no chokoku* [Sculptures in the Nanbokucho period]), 至文堂 (shibundo), 2007, pp. 91-92.
- (6) 西川京太郎 (Nishikawa Kyotaro), 日本の美術 第123号 頂相彫刻 (Nihon no Bijutsu No. 123 *Chinso chokoku* [*Chinso* portrait sculptures]), 至文堂 (shibundo), 1976, p. 58.
- (7) Ibid., p. 58.
- (8) 山本勉 (Yamamoto Tsutomu), 日本の美術 第493号 南北朝時代の彫刻 op. cit., pp. 92-93.
- (9) 清水真澄 (Shimizu Masumi), 中世塑造に関する二・三の問題—新資料・称名寺弘法大師像にふれて— (Chusei sozo ni kansuru 2・3 no Mondai — Shin shiryō · Shomyoji Kobodaishi zo ni furete [Two or three issues concerning medieval clay sculpture: New materials about the portrait of Kobodaishi at Shomyoji]), 金沢文庫研究 (Kanazawa Bunko kenkyu [Kanazawa Bunko studies]), vol. 269, 1982.

Tokyo Visions:

The Photomontages of Horino Masao in *Hanzai Kagaku* (Criminology)

HUANG Shih-Cheng

Keywords: Horino Masao, *Hanzai Kagaku*, Photomontage, Ero-guro-nansensu

Introduction

As photographers started to move away from Pictorialism and directed their attention to avant-garde styles from Europe, the Great Kantō Earthquake struck Tokyo in 1923. This accident broke down art photography's established praxis of nature contemplation and its aesthetic sense. In *Shinkō Shashin* (New Photography) movement in Japan that arose around 1931, the photographers emphasized the mechanized nature of the camera and eliminated soft-focus glamour and sentimental interpretations of their subjects.

1. The Emergence of Photomontage

In April 1930, Horino followed the Itagaki Takaho's guidance in taking photographs that gradually were released in the magazines *Shinkō Shashin Kenkyū* (New Photography Studies), *Photo Times* and *Chūō Kōron* (Central Review).

That also led to publications such as *Yūshūsen to Geijutsu Shakaigaku teki Bunseki* (Excellent Vessel: An Artistic-Sociological Analysis) in 1930 and *Kamera me x Tetsu Kōsei* (Camera, Eye x Steel, Composition) later in 1932.⁽¹⁾ The outset of their collaborative experiments indicated the ideal of mechanical beauty, as Horino praised 'New Realism' and 'New Way to Camera.'⁽²⁾ As Itagaki mentioned, however, the emphasis on realism had the potential to decline into stereotyped mannerism.⁽³⁾

2. The Development of Photomontage

When their collaborations ended in the summer of 1931, Itagaki and Horino prepared a new project that was published as *Dai Tokyo no Seikaku* (The Character of Greater Tokyo) in *Chūō Kōron* in October 1931. It not only was the first example of Horino using photomontage to express the personality of the city, but also demonstrated that their concerns had shifted from an urban perspective to mass culture. *Dai Tokyo no Seikaku*'s focus on modern constructions and entertainment sites perfectly illustrated this tendency. At first, the abstract beauty of shapes formed by

intersecting power cables and train tracks highlighted the visual appeal of the contemporary landscape.⁽⁴⁾

Later, the camera lens turned to bar, theatre, cabaret revue, and café, which presented the lure of the city. These two-page layout with free typography spread as their design unit to offer a hymn to the brilliance of urban modernism, and reflected the difference in the realism of photography between form and content.⁽⁵⁾

3. The Practice of Photomontage

Horino later progressed to in his ultimate experiment in the magazine *Hanzai Kagaku*, while publishing theses about photomontage in the magazine *Kōga* (Light Painting). *Hanzai Kagaku*, one of the iconic *ero-guro* mass culture circulation journals in the period, published 37 issues from 1930 to 1932. *Ero-guro* referred to a broad trend that focused on dark and sexually charged subjects and tended toward criminality, horror, or other so-called "deviant" topics.⁽⁶⁾ *Hanzai Kagaku* was a decadent publication that favored stories of bizarre incidents and the variety of the chaos of urban life. As a regular contributor to the magazine, Horino created, with other critics, eleven marvelous photomontages.

Shutokanryū - Sumidagawa no Arubamu (Flowing Through the Capital: Sumida River Album), published in December 1931, was contributed by Horino and Murayama Tomoyoshi (1901-1977). The audience can identify the figure of Horino as he walked beside the Sumida River from Senjū to the river's mouth in Tokyo Bay, collecting his subject as he went, and discern his movement from an aesthetic that glorified the city toward one that examined life on its periphery.⁽⁷⁾

Horino and Ōya Sōichi (1900-1970) designed *Getto Setto Don* (Get Set Go), which was published in February 1932. It was first photomontage in which they appropriated a sports phrase for the title; they also used work by John Heartfield (1891-1968) for the cover. Through the combination of Horino's photographs and other images from non-Japanese magazines, he attempted to underline a proletarian expression of the social structure of exploitation.⁽⁸⁾

In the scenario *Shūten* (Tserminus) in the March 1932 issue of *Hanzai Kagaku*, one can surely perceive the influence of Cinéma Pur such as the stills of *Berlin: Symphony of a Great City*. Under the background of Japan's restoration from the Great Kantō Earthquake and the impact of the Great Depression, Horino

was also attracted to marginal spaces lurking in the shadows behind the city.

Coinciding with the topic of film, Horino and Senda Koreya (1904–1994) went further in *Fēdo In / Fēdo Auto (Fade In / Fade Out)*, released in the next month. It was a montage meditation on Hollywood culture and the global film industry that rendered filmgoers as uncanny. Their photomontage culminated in the genre of erotic and war movies as the embodiment of the commingled pleasure and anxiety that permeated public visual culture in 1930s Japan.⁽⁹⁾

In other scenario *Tamakawa Beri (The Banks of the Tama River)*, published in May 1932, Horino and Kitagawa Fuyuhiko (1900–1990) turned their attention from panoramic cityscapes to the lives of the impoverished Koreans who lived along the riverside. The photographs as well as the accompanying captions amounted to an indictment.⁽¹⁰⁾

In subsequent collaborative montages such as *Asakusa ni Ikiru Hitobito (People living in Asakusa)* in June, *Suijyōseikatsusha (Water Dwellers)* in August, and *Manen suru Tōkyō, Sono Ichi (Spreading Tokyo, Part 1)* in September, *Sono Ni (Part 2)* in October 1932 with Takeda Rintarō (1904–1946), they presented marginality in the imperial capital. The documentary images on the surface established a bitter message of social reform with captions such as “Injustice.” They also titillated obscene curiosity in the marginal “Others” in these shadowy places. These narratives provided the Japanese public with a sort of pleasurable pain through vicarious experiences of prohibited desires or fantasies.⁽¹¹⁾

The last two photomontages in *Hanzai Kagaku* were *Kamera no Hōkoku (Camera Reports)* in the November issue and the December issue’s *Sōbagai wo Tsuranuku (Go Through the Market Street)* with Kuno Toyohiko (1896–1971). The former still conveyed Horino’s concern for migrants, laborers, and the homeless, while the latter illustrated criticism of capitalism and connected to their intention of performing a social function.

Conclusion

One layout structure in *Hanzai Kagaku* was two-page unit such as *Getto Setto Don* or *Kamera no Hōkoku* that used the abstract titles, the technique of multiple exposures, and symbolic captions, to stress nationalism. The other layout mostly adopted a continuous

narrative with straight photography and descriptive captions, as in *Shutokanryū* or *Suijyōseikatsusha*. All these images revealed underlying tensions between desire and awareness, the vulnerability of the modern that swayed by forces such as individualism, proletarianism, or ultranationalism.⁽¹²⁾

- (1) Kito Sakiko, “Itagaki Takaho to Horino Masao no Kyōdō Jikken [Collaborative Experiments by Itagaki Takaho and Horino Masao],” in Omuka Toshiharu, ed., *Itagaki Takaho: Kurashikku to Modan* [Itagaki Takaho: Classic and Modern] (Tokyo: Shinwasha, 2010), p. 111.
- (2) Horino Masao, “Kikaibi to Shashin [Mechanical Beauty and the Photograph],” *Photo Times*, 7:12, December 1930, p. 105.
- (3) Itagaki Takaho, “Yūshūsen no Seikakuteki Hyōgen ha Ikanaru Geijutsu ni yotte Kanō de aruka? [What Sort of Art Could Express the Characteristic Style of An Excellent Vessel?],” in *Yūshūsen no Geijutsu Shakigakuteki Bunseki* [Excellent Vessel: An Artistic-Sociological Analysis] (Tokyo: Tenjinsha, 1930), p. 128.
- (4) Karen M. Fraser, *Photography and Japan* (London: Reaktion, 2011), p. 128.
- (5) Kaneko Ryūichi, “Gurafu Montaju no Seiritsu—*Hanzai Kagaku* shi wo Chūshin ni [Establishing the Photomontage, Centering on the Magazine *Hanzai Kagaku*],” in Omuka Toshiharu, Mizusawa Tsutomu ed., *Modanizumu / Nashonaruzum* [Modernism / Nationalism] (Tokyo: Serika Shobo, 2003), p. 162.
- (6) Gennifer Weisenfeld, “Gas Mask Parade: Japan’s Anxious Modernism,” *Modernism / modernity*, Volume 21, Number 1, January 2014, p. 181.
- (7) Takeba Joe, “The Age of Modernism from Visualization to Socialization,” in *The History of Japanese Photography*, essays by Iizawa Kōtarō and Kinoshita Naoyuki; John Junkerman ed. and trans. (New Haven: Yale University Press in association with the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, 2003), p. 154.
- (8) Kaneko Ryūichi, op. cit., pp. 165-69.
- (9) Gennifer Weisenfeld, op. cit., p. 194.
- (10) Takeba Joe, op. cit., p. 155.
- (11) Gennifer Weisenfeld, op. cit., p. 194.
- (12) John Clark, “Introduction,” in *Modern Boy, Modern Girl: Modernity in Japanese Art, 1910–1935*, curated by Ajioka Chiaki [et al.]; edited by Jackie Menzies (Sydney: Art Gallery of New South Wales, 1998), p. 19.