

(日本語文)

2 人形と彫刻をめぐる造形史再考—人形的具象性にまつわる造形の歴史的課題

(1) 人形小史

そもそも「彫刻」「人形」といった分類は有効なのだろうか。歴史を紐解けば、少なくとも言葉のうえで人形は彫刻に先行する。国語学者山田俊雄によれば、文字としての「にんぎょう」は『伊呂波字類抄』(1147-81 頃)にまで溯ることができるという。ヒトの形象の起源は、古代の埴輪、土偶、土面などに始まり、平安時代の文献は、ひとがた・くさひとがた・かたしろ・あまがつ・ひいな(雛)・ひとのかた・偶人・土偶人・木偶人・人像・艾人・傀儡など、既に多様な素材の人形的な像が存在したことを伝えている(註4)。

人形はその後にも民間信仰と結び付き、縁起物や玩具として、また人形劇や年中行事など生活の隅々にまで浸透して発展した。江戸時代には、各地に特色のある人形が発達し、細工人や人形師が、一つの盛期を迎えている。幕末には生き人形(活人形)が見世物としてもはやされ、大正の終わり頃にはマネキンの試作なども始められている。さらに昭和に入ると創作的な人形研究が盛んになり、本格的な人形の個人作家、人形作家といわれる人々が活躍するようになっていくのである。

こうした人形にかかわる造形史を顧みるとき、埴輪や土偶は、今日、人形史のみならず、陶磁史や彫刻史の冒頭でもしばしば触れられるヒトや生きもののかたちをした像である。また、久野健は、江戸時代に発達した御所人形、風俗人形、木目込人形(加茂人形)、衣装人形を「人形彫刻」として、彫刻史の上で取り上げている(註5)。また、江戸時代、人形細工を含め広く「細工」という言葉が今日でいう「造形」に相当するものとして様々な素材、領域を包括していた。つまり、少なくとも近世までのヒト的な形象—日本における人形的なもの—と彫刻的なもの—は混然と存在していたのである。

註4『伊呂波字類抄』上中下、橘忠兼著、早稲田大学図書館所蔵、享保8年日野資時書写本の写本(初出は平安時代)

註5: 久野健『日本の彫刻』吉川弘文館、昭和34、79頁

(2) 彫刻と工芸—素材と技術をめぐる

既によく知られているように、「彫刻」という概念は明治期の産物である。「彫刻」誕生に際しては、まず1873(明治6)年開催のウィーン万国博への出品を呼びかける博覧会規約の区分において、*sculpture* や *Bildhauerkunst* が「像ヲ作ル術」と訳され、次いで1876(明治9)年に工部美術学校が開校し「画学」と「彫刻学」が置かれたことで「彫刻」が公式に使われるようになった。同校の教育内容であるところの塑像から石膏取りする西洋的な造像技術の習得に伴い、肉付けや量塊といった塑像的な造像観に基づく西洋の「彫刻」概念は、その後「近代彫刻」の主流となっていくが、一方で東京美術学校の「彫刻科」を中心に伝統的な木彫(カーヴィング)を基本とした「彫刻」もまた、日本彫刻のもう一つの系譜を形成していく。1894(明治27)年、大村西崖はまさにそのカーヴィングとモデル

ングを包括する意味で「彫塑」を「彫刻」よりも相応しい語である旨主張し、「彫塑」はその後教育機関をはじめかなり広く使われるようになったが、1907（明治40）年、文展に「彫刻」部門が開設されると、両方を視野に入れた「美術」としての「彫刻」が概ね定着するようになった。

この文展創設に際し「工芸」部門は除外されている。しかし、文展開始までの「彫刻」の内容、定義を顧みるとき、例えば内国勸業博覧会の出品規定を参照するならば、彫刻と工芸や人形との概念区分は必ずしも明確ではない。1977の第1回展では「金石粘土或は亜土を以て製する物類偶像等」としての「彫像術」であり、1881（明治14）年の第2回展では「金土木石陶磁の彫像及び鑄造並に石膏模型」「金属木石牙甲の彫鏤物及び雜嵌並に刻碑」としての「彫鏤」、1890（明治23）年第3回展で「木竹彫刻、牙角甲彫刻、金属彫刻、塑像」としてようやく「彫刻」となっている。素材や技術に注目した以上のような定義は、「彫刻」と「工芸」や「人形」を明確に分かつものではなかった。しかし、むしろこの素材や技術を基準とすることにこそ、日本造形の工芸的な性格を嗅ぎ取ることもできる。ただし、素材の限定よりは、具象性をむしろそのアイデンティティとする人形については、「置物」や「細工物」、工芸作品の部分に、人形的なものが見られるものの、領域としての意識は定かでない（註6）。

註6：例えば1925年パリで開催された現代装飾美術・産業美術国際博覧会（アール・デコ展）にはマネキンなども出品されている 井上117頁

（3）造形本能と模擬本能

1907（明治40）年の文部省美術展覧会創設に遅れること20年、1927（昭和2）年の、第8回帝展によりやうく工芸部門が創設された折にも、「人形」の出品は認められなかった。人形は他の工芸作家たちから玩具の如きものと見做され、芸術作品であることを否定されたのである。人形作りを家業とする出自の平田郷陽や、家業とは関係なく自ら表現としての人形を選んだ所謂アマチュア出身の堀柳女ら近代の創作的な人形作家6人が初入選を果たしたのは1936（昭和11）年のことだ。

草創期の人形作家たちの「受難」は工芸作家からの攻撃にとどまらず、既に「美術」の地位を獲得した「彫刻家」たちからも、人形作家は厳しく批判されている。代表的な批判の論客は高村光太郎である。例えば、彫刻は「立体感をその成果とする造形本能」から、人形は「迫真感をその成果とする模擬本能」から生まれると光太郎は主張する（註7）。しかし、創作的な人形作家たちの作品を見れば、「造形本能」なくして人形が生まれ得ないことは明白である。逆に光太郎の「彫刻」についても「模擬本能」なくして鳥や鯨をモチーフにしたあの優れた木彫作品は生まれ得ないであろう。そもそも「彫刻」とは、明治9年に「物形模造」を定義に、日本の作家が西洋的な手法を学び始めたものである（註8）。その後、大村西崖が「彫塑論」のなかで定義したその内容も「実体ヲ具シタル造形術ノ総称」（註9）であった。そこに光太郎の主張する区別を見いだすことは困難である。

批判の際、高村光太郎が具体的に想定したものに生き人形（活人形）がある。幕末から明治にかけて見世物として人気を博した生き人形について光太郎は、「形は彫刻であっても、其の実は彫刻的存在とならなくて、人形に過ぎないといふ場合もあります。（中略）物理学的の立体感安本亀八の活人形にもありますけれど、彫刻的にいふ立体感といふのは遥かに違った性質のものであります。活人形の方に何故立体感が無いかといふと此はもともと製作動機が、生きて動く人間の外観的複写を作る処にあつて、極めて皮相な外面的迫真がその目的」（註10）であるとしている。しかし、この指摘は技術としての写実にとどまりがちな明治初期の外形模写的な彫刻に対しても、ほぼそのまま向けることのできる言葉ではなかろうか。

註7：「彫塑総論」『高村光太郎全集』第四巻、筑摩書房、1957年、304頁。初出は「彫刻総論」『アルス美術大講座』Ⅲ、Ⅳ、1926年

註8：「彫刻学ハ石膏ヲ以テ各種ノ物形ヲ模造スル等ノ諸術ヲ教ユ」とある。『工部省沿革報告』大蔵省内工部省編、1888年、796頁

註9：大村西崖「彫塑論」『京都美術協会雑誌』29号、1894年10月

註10：『高村光太郎全集』第4巻、筑摩書房、1957年、302-303頁

（4）大きさと表面造形

人形と彫刻の違いについて、研究者の中には、サイズをその有力な根拠として挙げる者がいる。「割合小さいもの」が人形で、彫刻は逆に割合「大きい」もの。その点においては彫刻研究者だけでなく、人形研究者もしばしば一致するようだ。人形問屋に生まれた山田徳兵衛は『日本人形史』の中で「人間を模造した、わりあいに小さく、主として子供や婦人の愛玩するもの」（註11）と人形を定義している。確かに、もしサイズの統計を取れば、平均値は人形と呼ばれているものの方が小さいだろう。しばしば工芸の範疇で語られる牙彫にも、その源流である根付のサイズが関与していることが考えられる。しかし、仮に大きさをもって彫刻であるとしたら、それこそ光太郎や中原悌二郎のような近代の重要な彫刻家が、殆ど彫刻を作っていないことになる。工芸と彫刻の違いが寸法ではないように、人形と彫刻の違いにおいてサイズは本質ではない。

むしろ「人形は顔が命」というかつてのCMのコピーの方が、より真実に迫るだろう。顔の表情、衣装など、表面のディテールにまで妥協なく向き合うこと。整理するにせよ、付け加えるにせよ、“表面造形”に手を抜かないのが、人形という造形の姿勢である。フォーラムの「概要」だけでなく、表面における「詳細」をも決定していく姿勢が人形にはある。細部にこだわってはならない、大づかみなフォーラムによって内面、本質を表現するのだとする、ロダニズム以降の日本の美大、芸大の彫刻（彫塑）教育の考え方とは、その点で対極である。それは人体表面の細かな凹凸や皺、肉体表現とは関わりのない衣紋などを表現することは避けるべきであるとする西洋彫刻の古典的規範にも通ずる（註12）。しかし、60年代以降、特にイタリアに学んだ作家たちを中心に「工芸的な」あるいは「人形的な」

表面への拘りを示す彫刻家、造形作家は着実に増えている。3章で紹介する本展の中村義孝や北川弘人らもそうした作家の例である。

もともと日本の彫刻的表現は、仏師、宮彫師、能面師を問わず、細やかに彫り刻むという表面造形を重視する姿勢をとってきた。日本の彫刻的な造形物の中心が彩色木彫であったとすれば、日本の「彫刻」以前の造形が当初から人形的であった、ということさえできるであろう。「細工」が「造形」を意味した時代には、仏像、人形、能面、根付など様々な造形がいずれも「細工場（さいくば）」や「工場（こうば）」と呼ばれる彼らの仕事場で生み出されていたのである。高村光雲が、息子光太郎とは違い、人形に対して必ずしも否定的でないことも頷ける（註13）。昨年、宮川香山のデコラティブな陶磁器、高村光雲の木彫、鈴木長吉の金工作品が同じ展覧会に出品されていたが、それはいずれも広義の細工技術の粋を示すものであり、極めて妥当な判断であったといえよう（註14）。

以上のように、「彫刻」以前から日本の造形家たちは総じて“表面造形”を重視し、「細工的」精神を発揮してきたのである。かつての「細工」という語は、今日でいう「造形」に相当する言葉である。表面を整えるという次元ではなく、表面[までも]「造形」という感覚。引きで見たフォルムの美しさは勿論、その表面にまで責任を持つという姿勢。それは人形だけでなく染織、漆、金工、陶芸など、素材と技術を駆使する、様々なジャンルに通じる日本的とっていい造形へのアプローチでもある。

註11：先代の山田徳兵衛『新編日本人形史』（角川書店、昭和36年1961）を定本として書かれた山田徳兵衛『日本人形史』講談社学術文庫、昭和59年、18頁

註12：ヨハン・ヨアヒム・ヴィンケルマン著、澤柳大五郎訳『ギリシア美術模倣論』座右宝刊行会、1976年、25-35頁。原書は1755年。

註13：高村光雲『光雲懐古談』萬里閣書房、1929年

註14：『日本彫刻の近代』宮城県美術館ほか、2007年

（5）仏像と人形—精神性の所在をめぐって

彫刻史を語る時、大抵の文献は自明の事のように仏像をその歴史の範疇に入れていく。また日本美術史を辿るとき、仏像はおおよそ躊躇なく「彫刻」の項目で扱われる。多くの研究者たちが当然のように仏像を彫刻史で取り上げ、人形（的なもの）を美術史の本流から排除するという姿勢も、一つにはサイズという根拠にならない根拠に由来するところもあるのだろう。前述のように、久野は「人形彫刻」（註15）という括りで、江戸時代の御所人形や衣装人形を「人形彫刻」として彫刻史の範疇に取り上げているが、これもいわば「彫刻」を「人形」の上位概念と捉えた言い方である。

仏像の登場は、勿論、仏教伝来に伴うものだが、仏像を「彫刻」の範疇とするきっかけの一つは1880（明治13）年、上野で開催された観古美術会で運び込まれた多くの仏像が「彫刻」と分類されたことであろう。それらの仏像が近代の木彫作家に制作のモチベーション

を与えたことや、高村光雲をはじめ仏師の系統の者が東京美術学校のような教育機関に迎えられ、「彫刻」の指導にあたったことなどが、仏像を彫刻の領域に入れる下地となっていたものと思われる。

ところで、素材や技術、制作方法とは別に、仏像のもつ精神性をもって、彫刻とする考え方がある。人間の精神のより所、「精神的必要性」のために、「彫刻」以前に同様の役割を果たしたものは仏像であったというものである（註16）。

確かに近代の「彫刻」概念は、素材・技法等の物理的な造形条件以外に、内容についての精神性を意図してきた。写実や模倣から肖像彫刻を経て、ヒューマンイズムの時代を迎える明治末から大正にかけての「彫刻」は、内面、精神面を重視したものだ。荻原守衛が、彫刻の本旨を「内的な力」（インナーパワー）の表現である旨と述べている（註17）のも、像の「外観的描写」に対する像の「精神性」の重要性に通じる。像が在ることと、それを見ることの間を生じる精神的交歓への期待という意味で、仏像は彫刻と類似の性格をもつといえよう。

しかし、そうした精神的な交信は、多くの日本人が人形との間にも行ってきたものではなかろうか。仏像が仏教を背負っているが故にその精神的交信が像優位の関係において行われるという特殊性はあるにしても（例えば「拝む」というような感覚）、日本人の信仰は、仏教を背景にした仏像だけでなく、もっと幅広い対象に対して向けられてきたはずだ。八百よろずの神々を信じ、アニミズムに肯定的な日本人にとって、人形もまた民間信仰の対象であり得、個人の精神的より所であり得たはずである。本展出品の藪内佐斗司が、仏教から民間信仰、伝説や言い伝えまで幅広く造形の対象としているのは、そうした方向を今日に表したのもであらう。人形は精神的よりどころとなりえるキャラクターであり、仏像もまた人々にとって重厚なタイプの人気「キャラクター」であったとさえいえるのである。

註15：久野健『日本の彫刻』吉川弘文館、1959昭和34、79頁

註16：中原佑介『現代彫刻』美術出版社、1987年、25頁。

註17：荻原守衛「予が見たる東西の彫刻」『藝術界』1908年明治41、8月号

(英語訳)

2. Reconsidering the History of Visual Expressions Concerning Dolls and Sculptures—Historical Themes of Creation Involving Doll-like Personified Shapes

(1) A Short History of Dolls

Are classifications such as “sculpture” and “dolls” valid? In the light of history, at least so far as language is concerned, dolls preceded sculpture. According to YAMADA Toshio, a scholar of the Japanese language, the written term *ningyo* (doll) goes back to *Irohajuruisho* (c. 1147-81). The origin of human figures goes back to ancient times, to *haniwa*, *dogu* (clay figures), clay masks, and the like, and it is evident from the literature of the Heian Period that there were already doll-like figures made from many materials: *hitogata*, *kusahitogata*, *katashiro*, *amagatsu*, *hiina* (*hina*), *hitonokata*, *gujin*, *dogujin*, *mokugujin*, *gaijin*, *kairai*, and so on. (Note 4)

Dolls continued to be connected with folk religion and infiltrated and were developed in many aspects of life, such as in puppet dramas, in ceremonies held as annual events, and as good luck charms and as toys. The Edo Period saw the development of dolls in various places, reflecting local characteristics. Doll makers and puppeteers were in their heyday. At the end of the Edo Period, life-sized figurines became popular as exhibits and toward the end of the Taisho Period, there were experiments at manufacturing mannequins. Further, with the beginning of the Showa Period, the study of creative dolls flourished, serious individual doll artists, or so-called doll makers, becoming active.

Reflecting upon the history of visual expression involving dolls, *haniwa* and *dogu* are figures in the shape of humans or living creatures which are mentioned today, not only in the history of dolls, but in introductions to histories of pottery and histories of sculpture. KUNO Takeshi in his history of sculpture refers to *goshō-ningyo*, *fuzoku-ningyo*, *kimekomi-ningyo* (*kamo-ningyo*), and *isho-ningyo*, which developed in the Edo Period, as “doll sculptures.” (Note 5) The Edo Period word *saiku*, including a wide variety of doll crafting, corresponded to the modern term *zokei*, and encompassed various materials and categories. In short, human-like figures—doll-like figures, and sculptures in Japan—have, at least until the modern period, co-existed without clear demarcations separating them.

Note 4 TACHIBANA Tadakane, ed., *Irohajiruisho* Vol.1-3 (A Copy of the manuscript by HINO Suketoki, 1723). Originally published in the Heian Period. Stored at Waseda University Library.

Note 5 KUNO Takeshi, *Nihon no Chokoku*. Yoshikawa Koubunkan, 1959, p.79.

(2) Sculpture and Crafts—Concerning Materials and Techniques

As is well-known, the concept of “sculpture” is a product of the Meiji Period. When “sculpture” was born, in the categories section of the rules set forth in the invitations to exhibit at the Vienna International Exposition in 1873, sculpture and Bildhauerkunst were translated into Japanese as “the art of making figures” and, further, in 1876, the newly-opened Art School Attached to the Technical College had “Painting” and “Sculpture” departments, with the result that the expression “sculpture” began to be used officially. As a result of the study of Western-style figure-creating techniques, in which a clay statue would be taken from a model, these techniques being a part of the curriculum at the school, the Western concept of “sculpture” became the main current of “modern sculpture.” This Western concept is based upon the idea of making images with models by fleshing them out and giving them volume. At the same time, centering around the Tokyo School of Fine Arts, “sculpture” based on traditional carving formed another line of Japanese sculpture. In 1894, OMURA Seigai claimed that the word *choso* was more appropriate than *chokoku* (sculpture), in that it embraced both carving and modeling. Subsequent to that, the word *choso* was for a while rather widely used in educational institutions and other places, but from 1907 on, the Bunten Exhibition had a division for “sculpture,” which led to “sculpture” becoming more or less established as an “art” embracing both ideas.

With the start of the Bunten Exhibition, the “craft” division was excluded. However, if we examine the contents and definition of “sculpture” found up till then in exhibition regulations, such as those of the Naikoku Kangyo Exhibition, the distinctions between the categories of sculpture, crafts, and dolls were not necessarily clear. For example, at the first exhibition, in 1877, the expression “the art of carved statues” was used with reference to “objects or figures made using gold, stone, clay, or chalky materials.” In 1881, at the second exhibition, the word *choro* was used to refer to “carved images of gold, earth, wood, stone, and pottery, as well as casting and plaster models,” and “carved objects and works of metal, wood, stone, ivory, horn, tortoiseshell as well as carved monuments.” At the third exhibition, in 1890, the word “sculpture” was finally applied to “bamboo and wood sculpture, ivory, horn, and tortoiseshell sculpture, metal sculpture,

and clay statues.” The above definitions, with emphasis on the materials and technique, did not clearly distinguish among “sculpture,” “crafts,” and “dolls.” However, we can sense the nature of Japanese creative crafting in this standard based on materials and techniques. Nevertheless, dolls, whose identity depended upon figurativeness rather than their materials, were not specifically recognized as a separate category, in spite of the fact that doll-like objects could be seen in the category of craft products as “ornaments” or “handiwork.” (Note 6)

Note 6 For example, mannequins were shown at the Art Deco Exhibition held in Paris in 1925. Inoue, p.117.

(3) The Image-Creating Instinct and the Imitative Instinct

In 1927, when there was finally a crafts section provided at the Eighth Teiten Exhibition, twenty years after the start of the art exhibitions hosted by the Ministry of Education (1907), the entry of “dolls” was not yet solicited. Artists in other crafts regarded “dolls” as toys, and denied them the status of works of art. It was not until 1936 that the first HIRATA Goyo, who made doll making the family business, and six modern creative doll artists, amateurs such as HORI Ryujo, who chose dolls as their own personal mode of expression, rather than as a profession, entered their works in an exhibition.

The “suffering” of artists in the pioneering days of doll making was not limited to the attacks of craftsman artists; they were also severely criticized by “sculptors,” who had established themselves in the world of “arts.” TAKAMURA Kotaro’s polemics against them were typical. For example, Kotaro claimed that sculpture was born “of the image-creating instinct, which pursues the three-dimensional sense,” whereas dolls are born of “the imitative instinct, which pursues the true-to-life.” (Note 7) However, when you see works by original doll artists, it is plain that dolls cannot be produced without the “image-creating instinct.” Conversely, with regard to Kotaro’s “sculpture,” those famous carved works with bird and catfish motifs could not have been produced without the “imitative instinct.” In the first place, “sculpture” began in 1876, when Japanese artists started to learn Western techniques, along with the idea of “fabricating the shape of objects.” (Note 8) Later, OMURA Seigai’s definition in his *Chosoron* was “a common designation of image-creative art embodying realities.” (Note 9) It is difficult to find in it the distinction that Kotaro claimed.

In his criticism, TAKAMURA Kotaro specifically had life-sized dolls in mind. Concerning life-sized dolls, which were popular as exhibits from the end of the Edo Period to the Meiji Period, he wrote, “even though they are shaped like sculpture, in some cases, they are simply dolls without the substance of sculpture...Viewed from the point of view of physics, I admit that there is a three-dimensional quality to YASUMOTO Kamehachi’s life-sized dolls, but this quality is far from the three-dimensional component found in sculpture. The reason for the lack of a sculptural three-dimensional component in life-sized dolls is that the motive behind their production lies in an outward copying of living, moving people and their purpose is to reflect a quite superficial outward reality.” (Note 10) However, could this claim not be applied, as is, to the sculpture of the early Meiji Period, whose technique tended to be limited to copying the outer form?

Note 7 TAKAMURA Kotaro, *Choso Soron*, Takamura Kotaro Zenshu Vol.4, Chikumashobo, 1957, p.304. (Originally published as *Chokoku Soron*, ARS Bujutsu Daikozo, Vols.3 and 4, 1926.

Note 8 “The study of sculpture teaches techniques such as the fabrication of the shapes of various objects, using plaster.”

Kobusho (Ministry of Industry), Okurasho (Ministry of Finance) ed., *Kobusho Enkaku Hokoku*, 1888, p.796.

Note 9 OMURA Seigai, “Chosoron,” *Kyoto Bijutsukyokai Zasshi*, No. 29, Oct. 1894.

Note 10 TAKAMURA Kotaro, Takamura Kotaro Zenshu, Vol.4, Chikuma Shobo, 1957, pp. 302-303.

(4) Size and Surface Sculpture

Some scholars point to size as an important difference between dolls and sculpture. Things that are “relatively small” are dolls, while sculptures are relatively “large.” In this respect, both those who study sculpture and those who study dolls often seem to agree. YAMADA Tokubei, who was born into a family that dealt in dolls wholesale, defines a doll in his *Nihon Ningyoshi* as “something that resembles a human, is relatively small, and is mainly cherished by children and women.” (Note 11) Certainly, if we consider statistics having to do with size, dolls, on the average, are smaller. Ivory sculptures are frequently categorized as craft products, and this may have something to do with the size of *netsuke*, their predecessors. However, if size were to determine what is to be called sculpture, then we would have to conclude that important modern sculptors such as TAKAMURA Kotaro, and NAKAHARA Teijiro are not creating

sculptures. Just as craft products and sculpture cannot be differentiated by size, size is not essential for deciding what is a doll and what is a sculpture.

Rather, the saying found in an old commercial that “the face is the life of a doll” is closer to the truth. Facial expressions, dress, and even surface details are all very important. Whether touching up his work or adding something, the doll maker can never relax when doing “surface sculpture.” Dolls demand, not just a “rough outline” of their form, but “detailed attention” to their surfaces. The attitude that this requires of the doll maker is the antithesis of what is taught in Japan concerning sculpture (clay sculpture) at Japanese universities of fine arts, particularly since Rodinism, with the idea that artists should grasp the overall form of an object in order to express what is inside and its true nature, rather than let themselves be distracted by the fine details. This fits in with the conventions of classic Western sculpture, which held that one should avoid showing clothing and accessories that are unrelated to the depiction of the flesh of the human body itself, with the detailed unevenness and wrinkles of its surface. (Note 12) However, since the 1960s, sculptors and figure makers who are concerned with “craft” type or “doll” type surfaces, have been steadily increasing, especially those who were trained in Italy. NAKAMURA Yoshitaka and KITAGAWA Hiroto, who are taking part in this exhibition and are introduced in **2. Doll-like Personified Shapes Created by Modern Artists** are of this group.

Originally, the expression of Japanese sculpture, whether Buddhist statues, shrine sculptures, or Noh masks, emphasized the careful and detailed carving of the surface. Considering that Japanese sculptural figure making centered around colored carvings, we can even say that figure-making before Japanese “sculpture” was originally doll-like. In the days when “*saiku*” meant “figure making,” all sorts of images—Buddhist statues, dolls, Noh masks, *netsuke*, and the like—were made in the artists’ workshops, which were called “*saikuba*” and “*koba*.” It is understandable that TAKAMURA Koun, unlike his son Kotaro, was not necessarily negative about dolls. (Note 13) Last year, MIYAGAWA Kozan’s decorative pottery, TAKAMURA Koun’s carved works, and SUZUKI Chokichi’s worked-gold art were all entered in the same exhibition. It would be quite valid to judge that all these works fall within the broad category of *saiku*-technique. (Note 14)

As stated above, Japanese figure makers as a whole have put emphasis on “surface sculpting” since the days before there was “sculpture,” exhibiting a spirit of

“craftsmanship.” The word “*saiku*” used in the past is the equivalent of the present-day “*zokei*.” It transcends the fashioning of the surface and means figure-forming that “extends to and includes the surface.” In other words, the artist of course feels responsible for the beauty of the form he creates, but he also feels a responsibility for everything, including its surface. This could be called a typically Japanese approach to various genres of figure-making, including not only dolls, but also dyeing, lacquer ware making, metal working, and pottery, which make full use of a variety of materials and techniques.

Note 11 YAMADA Tokubei, *Nihon Ninngyoshi*, Kodansha Gakujutsu Bunko, 1984, p.18. (Written based on the late YAMADA Tokubei’s *Shinpen Nihon Ningyoshi*, Kadokawa Shoten, 1961, as the standard text.)

Note 12 WINCKELMAN Johann Joachim, *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst*, 1775, trans. Daigoro Sawayanagi, Zayuhō Kankokai, 1976, pp. 25-35.

Note 13 TAKAMURA Koun, *Koun Kaikodan*, Banrikaku Shobo, 1929.

Note 14 *Modern Age in Japanese Sculpture*, Miyagi Museum of Art, et al., 2007.

(5) Where Do We Find the Spirit of Buddhist Statues and Dolls?

Most literature on the history of sculpture discusses Buddhist statues from the standpoint of history, as if it were self-evident that they belonged there. Further, when we study the history of Japanese art, we find that Buddhist statues are almost always taken up under the heading of “sculpture.” The tendency shown by many scholars toward dealing with Buddhist statues in the framework of the history of sculpture as a matter of course and excluding dolls (doll-like objects) from the mainstream of the history of art is derived, for one thing, from the fact that size does not constitute a valid basis of judgment. As explained above, KUNO treats *goshō-mimgyō* and *ishō-ningyō* of the Edo Period as “doll sculpture” in his *Nihon no Chokoku*. (Note 15) This suggests that “sculpture” is a concept superior to that of “dolls.”

The introduction of Buddhism was, of course, responsible for the appearance of Buddhist statues, but one of the reasons why they were categorized as “sculpture” was that many Buddhist statues that were brought to the Kanko Bijutsukai [Exhibition of old works of art] held in Ueno, Tokyo in 1880 were classified as “sculpture.” The fact that these Buddhist statues provided a motivating impetus for wood-carving artists and the fact that Buddhist statue artists such as TAKAMURA Koun were invited to

educational institutes like Tokyo School of Fine Arts and taught “sculpture” laid the groundwork for Buddhist statues to be regarded as sculpture.

Incidentally, some think that the spiritual nature of Buddhist statues, quite apart from the materials and techniques or methods used in making them, qualify them as sculpture. They claim that before the advent of “sculpture,” it was Buddhist statues that provided support for the human spirit, supplying human “spiritual needs.” (Note 16)

It is true that the modern concept of “sculpture” has been directed at its inner qualities, apart from the physical aspects of its creation, such as materials and techniques. “Sculptures” dating from the end of the Meiji Period into the Taisho Period, during which time humanism took hold, having been preceded by realism and imitation, and then portrait sculpture, put emphasis on inner qualities, the spiritual aspect. The statement by OGIWARA Morie that the main object of sculpture is the expression of “inner power” implies the importance of the spirituality of statues as opposed to “outward delineation.” (Note 17) Buddhist statues have characteristics similar to those of sculptures in that a spiritual exchange is expected to take place between the statues and those who observe them.

However, many Japanese have experienced such spiritual communion with dolls as well. Buddhist statues acquired special and superior status thanks to their connection with Buddhism (for example, the feeling of “worship”); nevertheless, the faith of the Japanese has not only been directed toward Buddhist statues with their Buddhist religious background, but also to a wider range of objects. For the Japanese, who believe in myriads of gods and approve of animism, dolls could have been the object of folk religion and a spiritual support for individuals. The works of YABUUCHI Satoshi that appear in this exhibition cover a broad base of objects, from Buddhism, folk religion, legends, traditional lore, and this fact seems to indicate the trend that we have just touched upon. We could go so far as to say that dolls are characters that can give us spiritual support, and Buddhist statues were also dignified popular “characters” so far as people were concerned.

Note 15 KUNO Takeshi, *Nihon no Chokoku*, Yoshikawa Koubunkan, 1959, p.79.

Note 16 NAKAHARA Yusuke, *Gendai Chokoku*, Bijutsu Shuppan-sha, 1987, p.25.

Note 17 OGIWARA Morie, “Yo ga Mitaru Tozai no Chokoku,” *Geijutsukai*, Aug. 1908.