Reception of Chinese bronze antiquities in early twentieth-century Japan

Ya-hwei Hsu

Abstract

With a focus on Chinese bronze antiquities, this study examines the relationship between collecting and studying in early twentieth-century Japan and investigates how ancient Chinese forms were appropriated for different purposes. Japanese reception of Chinese bronze antiquities can be summarized in three phases. Firstly, the 1903 exhibition organized by the Imperial Museum presented a mixture of the karamono *tradition of Japan and the* jinshixue *antiquarian knowledge of China. Secondly, in the 1910s, the Chinese antiquarian view became dominant as acclaimed Chinese collections were transported to Japan in large numbers. Finally, in the 1920s, the Chinese antiquarian view yielded to modern art historical and archaeological analysis when unearthed bronzes gained attention and the modern discipline of archaeology was introduced to Japan. Analysis of the bronze reproductions further sheds light on the triangulation of collecting, studying and appropriating in each phase.*

Published in *Journal of the History of Collections*

Published on February 14, 2017

DOI: 10.1093/jhc/fhx001

Link to the article: https://academic.oup.com/jhc/article/2991781/Reception

VISITORS to the National Palace Museum in Taipei are greeted by two archaic-looking gigantic bronze *ding* (cauldron) sculptures – one tripod and the other tetrapod – placed outside, in the museum complex. The tetrapod, sculpted in 1992, imitates a typical Western Zhou style bronze vessel, with bird designs and protruding bosses on the belly. The appearance of the tripod vessel is rather intriguing. Modelled after a common ancient *ding*

shape, it is decorated with an unusual cloud pattern, wave pattern, and plum flowers (Fig. 1), a fusion rarely observed in modern *ding* replicas.[1] Its inscriptions are equally fascinating: two bronze plates bear inscriptions associating it with Sun Yat-sen (1866–1925), one with Sun's calligraphy of a two-character motto, *bo'ai* (philanthropy), in high relief (Fig. 2) and the other with his final admonition (Fig. 3), namely, the lyrics of the national anthem of the Republic of China. The inscriptions suggest that the *ding* was made in memory of Sun Yat-sen, the founding father of Republican China. However, the two plates were added only when the relocated Palace Museum in Taipei was reopened to the public in 1965, on the occasion of Sun's 100th birthday.[2] Therefore, the association with Sun Yat-sen was a later development. According to the original Japanese inscriptions concealed underneath Sun's inscriptions, the *ding* was a war memorial, created by the Japanese army to celebrate the anniversary of conquering Nanjing in 1938 during the Sino-Japanese war.[3] Moreover, it was cast in the Nanjing Arsenal and then shipped to the Yasukuni Shrine, the national shrine in Tōkyō dedicated to the martyrs of the country, honouring the soldiers killed in the Nanjing battle.[4] After the war, the Nanjing *ding* was repatriated to the Nationalist government in Taiwan during 1950–1951.[5]

As a Japanese trophy, the Nanjing *ding* stirred ambivalent feelings in the Chinese. Suo Yu-Ming, a war survivor and keeper of the National Palace Museum who participated in relocating the 'national treasures' to Taipei, commented on the *ding*: '[The repatriation of this object] is made after the sacrifice of tens of millions of the Chinese people; therefore, the *ding* commemorates the 300,000 souls killed in the Nanjing battle.'[6] Once an offering to the dead soldiers in the Yasukuni Shrine, the Nanjing *ding* is now in memory of the Chinese people killed in the war; the object of commemoration is reversed. What underlies the nationalistic tone of Suo's comment are the extensive history of the *ding* icon and its symbolism in Chinese cultural tradition.

The *ding* is perhaps the most prominent and long-lasting political symbol in China. Since the myth of the Nine Tripod Cauldrons appeared in the Spring and Autumn period (475–221 BC), the *ding* has been viewed as a token of Heavenly mandate, and thus is often associated with political legitimacy.[7] The myth relates the creator of the Nine Tripod Cauldrons to the Great Yu of the first dynasty and narrates their loss after the First Emperor of the Qin dynasty (r. 221–210 BC) took the throne, implying his illegitimate rule. Nonetheless, many Chinese rulers throughout history have resorted to the myth by recreating the Nine Tripod Cauldrons in the face of ruling crises.[8] As a remnant of Imperial China, the *ding* symbolism did not end with the establishment of Republican China in 1911: in 1943 some officials prepared a newly cast set of Nine Tripod Cauldrons to present to Chiang Kai-shek (1887–1975), the leader of Republican China. The presentation, however, was cancelled at the last moment because of internal criticism.[9] Gu Jiegang (1893–1980), once a progressive scholar known for his critical attitude toward ancient Chinese myths, was involved in composing the inscriptions for the Nine Tripod Cauldrons.[10] This example vividly illustrates the endurance of the *ding* symbol in China. The *ding* continues to be appropriated for various purposes in modern China, from shaping collective memory to consolidating central control.[11]

The Nanjing *ding* is certainly vulnerable to criticism from any Chinese national who is familiar with the history of the *ding* symbol. However, what relevance does the Nanjing *ding* have for the Japanese? What does a *ding* or, more generally, an archaic Chinese bronze shape mean to them, given that the Japanese have, for centuries, imported Chinese artefacts, the *karamono*, for interior decoration, tea ceremonies, and Buddhist offerings? How did the traditional *karamono* knowledge contribute to shaping the Japanese reception of Chinese bronze antiquities during the Meiji (1868–1912), Taishō (1912–1926) and early Shōwa (1926–1989) periods, when Japan was transforming into a modern country? Taking the

Nanjing *ding* as a point of departure, this study investigates Japanese knowledge of ancient Chinese bronzes in the early twentieth century, examining its transformation and appropriation in the process of modernization.

<H1>Chinese bronze antiquities in the tradition of *karamono*

The term *karamono* refers to art and artefacts imported from China during the medieval and early modern periods. At least from the thirteenth century, the shoguns used these for interior decoration and Buddhist monks utilized them to hold religious offerings, as attested amongst excavated objects and as recorded in several temple inventories and illustrated accounts.[12] Corresponding with the development in China, the most popular types of *karamono* bronze objects were those that could be used as flower vases and incense burners. In Buddhist offerings, an incense burner, a flower vase, and a candleholder comprised an accessory set for the altar. In spite of often being referred to as archaic bronze, *kodō*,[13] most *karamono* bronze artefacts were created after the Song (960–1279) dynasty, which is much later than the creation of the models of the Shang (sixteenth–eleventh century BC) and Zhou (eleventh-century BC – 221 BC) dynasties that inspired the *karamono*; in other words, most of the *karamono* were archaistic rather than genuine ancient objects. Because the bronzes from China gained popularity, the Japanese began creating such close imitations that a sixteenth-century writer confessed his inability to distinguish between the Chinese original and the Japanese replica.[14]

The interest of the Japanese élite in Chinese antiquities was further developed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when some scholars embraced not only Confucian learning but also the lifestyle of the Chinese literati. Emulating the elegant gatherings of the Chinese literati, Japanese scholars composed poems, produced calligraphy, appraised artworks, and played music in the Chinese style. This new trend in Japan was accompanied

by a new way of preparing and drinking tea – the *sencha* – namely, steeping tealeaves in a teapot. Compared with the technique of whisking powdered tea in a bowl – the *chanoyu* – originating from China in the Heian period (794–1185),[15] the *sencha* was closely associated with the literati culture of Ming (1368-1644) and Qing (1644–1911) China.

The calligrapher Ichikawa Beian (1779–1858) was a representative of this type of literati. Born into a renowned Confucian scholarly family, he learned Chinese classics and was particularly interested in writing and teaching calligraphy.[16] In addition, he assembled a large collection of Chinese works of art, including paintings, calligraphies, bronze antiquities, and stationery items for scholars' studios, and published them in a series of illustrated catalogues, *Shōsanrintō shoga bunbō zurok*u (Illustrated catalogue of the artworks collected in the Small Hall of Mountains and Woods, hereafter the *Shōsanrintō*), in 1848.[17] Ichikawa's ideal life is illustrated in the preface of the catalogues (Fig. 4). The inscription describes how the walls and desks of Ichikawa's small study were embellished with paintings and calligraphic works and stationery implements, respectively. The artefacts in his collection might be used for making tea and burning incense. In other words, Ichikawa's art collection served to recreate the lifestyle of the Chinese literati.

Ichikawa's catalogues clearly show that most Chinese bronze antiquities in his collection were made during the Ming and Qing dynasties.[18] Certain objects are labelled as belonging to the Han dynasty (206 BC – AD 220); the dating is, however, problematic from today's point of view. For instance, a Han cauldron is clearly a Ming or Qing replica on account of the horizontal soldering traces visible on the interior of the rim (Figs 5–6), which would never appear on a cast Shang or Zhou bronze vessel.[19] Ichikawa's error was not exceptional; his Chinese counterparts made similar mistakes.[20] The compilers of the collection catalogue of the Qianlong Emperor (r. 1736–1795), for example, labelled many Ming and early Qing replicas as Shang and Zhou objects.[21]

Ichikawa was familiar with current antiquarian knowledge in China. His catalogue adopted the format of Chinese antiquarian catalogues, with the object illustrated first followed by a short entry discussion, as represented in two imperial compilations, the *Xuanhe bogu tu* (Illustrated catalogue of antique treasures in the Xuanhe Hall) of the Song dynasty and the *Xiqing gujian* (Appreciating antiquities at the Tranquil West Studio, preface 1751) of the Qing dynasty; Ichikawa frequently cited these aforementioned works. To authenticate and to facilitate his reading of the bronze inscriptions, Ichikawa consulted the works of authoritative Chinese connoisseurs, such as Tu Long (1542–1605), Gao Lian (1573–1620), and Ruan Yuan (1764–1849).[22]

Although the Japanese élite were indebted to the developments in China, they evolved their own taste, as is evident in the Chinese bronze artefacts circulating in pre-modern Japan. The most admired *karamono* bronzes, all belonging to the category of the later bronzes from the Song to the Ming dynasties,[23] could be traced back to the shogun and daimyo collections in the sixteenth century. They often feature a distinct vessel shape and simple surface decoration.[24] For instance, one of the most admired *karamono* vases owned by Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1537–1598) and transferred to Tokugawa Ieyasu (1543–1616), the *kine no ore* (severed pestle) was so named on account of its shape: the long neck on a round body resembled a severed pestle (Fig. 7).[25] It has no decoration except for the lugs at either side of the neck; the surface, however, shines with a subtle hue of different gradations of brown, apparently having been carefully coloured and polished to produce that effect. The Japanese imitations exhibit a similar aesthetic. The flower vase that has the inscription *yonaga* (eternity) and belonged to the tea master Takeno Jōō (1502–1555), bears no obvious decorative pattern; on closer scrutiny, however, extremely fine lines are visible, running vertically from the top to the bottom (Fig. 8).[26] Left by a special type of tool, these vertical traces create a subtle visual effect that is distinctly Japanese. As many scholars have already

highlighted, the characteristics of these vases corroborate a sixteenth-century assessment that an undecorated archaic bronze object had higher value than a decorated one;[27] this preference for simplicity continued into the Edo period (1603–1868).[28]

In summary, archaic style Chinese bronzes were widely used in Japan at least from the thirteenth century. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, some members of the Japanese élite further emulated the lifestyle of the Chinese literati. The Japanese connoisseurs were familiar with Chinese antiquarian works and art treatises; however, they developed a distinct taste for the subtle surface treatment rather than the obvious decorative patterns commonly observed in archaic and archaistic Chinese bronzes. In a world where the majority of the so-called Chinese ancient bronzes were local reproductions or later replicas of the Song, Yuan (1271-1368), Ming, and Qing, the Japanese connoisseurs often could not distinguish among them,[29] but whether this was a concern to them remains unclear.

<H1>Collecting and studying ancient Chinese bronzes

Japanese society underwent a comprehensive transformation in the final quarter of the nineteenth century. The Meiji Restoration transformed Japan into not just a modern country, but the only imperialist power in Asia. The shogun and daimyo families declined and a new economic élite emerged along with the modern construction. Artworks and antiquities were transferred from the declining families to the emerging entrepreneurs, whose collections form the basis of many modern museums.[30]

The exhibition organized by the Imperial Museum in 1903 marked a new era in the reception of ancient Chinese bronzes.[31] A section was dedicated to ancient bronzes, both Chinese and Japanese, held in both imperial and private collections.[32] Although the exhibits were considered all to be ancient, they included later as well as early bronzes. Among them, thirty-six ancient objects from the collection of Sumitomo Tomoito (1865–1926) were

particularly eye-opening: a newspaper reported specially that Sumitomo had entered the field of Chinese bronze collection no more than a decade ago.[33] Sumitomo continued to collect high quality Chinese bronzes in the succeeding years.[34] He published his collection in a series of opulent catalogues, *Sen'oku seishō* (The collection of old bronzes of Baron Sumitomo) from 1911 to 1916, followed by an expanded edition in 1921. With the most advanced collotype printing of the images and professors from both Tōkyō and Kyōto Imperial University serving as editors, the expanded edition established new standards for art catalogues.

Sumitomo became one of the greatest collectors of ancient Chinese bronzes in the first two decades of the twentieth century, when China was experiencing both internal and external difficulties. Many great collectors were forced to disperse their collections.[35] The works concerned were, in general, much older and finer in quality than those previously available.[36] Sumitomo managed to procure objects originally owned by the renowned antiquarian scholars, such as Ruan Yuan,[37] Chen Jieqi (1813–1884),[38] and Duan Fang (1861–1911),[39] as well as the Qing imperial court;[40] he rarely obtained works from other Japanese collectors.[41]

As high-quality Shang and Zhou bronzes entered Japan at an increasing rate, the Japanese began to appreciate the decoration of solemn animal masks. Moreover, the traditional Chinese approach to bronze study, *jinshixue* (study of metal and stone), was revived by the modern scholars in the first two decades of the twentieth century.[42] During the 1903 exhibition organized by the Imperial Museum, Hamada Kōsaku (1881–1938), who pioneered the modern discipline of archaeology in Japan and later became the first professor of archaeology at Kyōto Imperial University,[43] published an article in the major art journal, *Kokka*, as an introduction to ancient Chinese bronzes.[44] The content of Hamada's article and that of other articles on similar topics published in *Kokka* during the 1900s and 1910s was

greatly inspired by *jinshixue* knowledge in antiquarian catalogues and connoisseurs' treatises.[45]

The dominance of heirloom works transmitted from renowned Chinese collections began to change in the 1920s. In 1916, Luo Zhenyu (1866–1940), a Chinese antiquarian scholar and a Qing loyalist who placed himself in voluntary exile in Kyōto from 1911 to 1919,[46] published *Yinxu guqiwu tulu* (Catalogue of antique objects from the ruins of Yin), devoted entirely to the excavated objects from Yinxu, the late Shang capital in modern Henan.[47] Until this time, only words inscribed on oracle bones and turtle shells had received systematic publication, so that Luo's work was the first of its type. Its clear images vividly conveyed the fine carvings and delicate inlay on fragments of bone, stone, and bronze. Inspired by the new materials from Yinxu, Hamada compared the decorative patterns on bronze ritual vessels, engraved bones, and white potteries to reach a conclusion, based exclusively on the excavated materials.[48] After studying archaeology in Europe from 1913 to 1916, Hamada was prepared to surpass the Chinese antiquarian tradition to explore the potential of the unearthed objects.[49] In 1926, he and other Japanese scholars founded *Tōa kōko gakkai* (Society of East Asian Archaeology), in the hope of conducting archeological work in Yinxu with Chinese scholars from Peiping University. Their plan, however, faced grave obstacles and failed to materialize.[50]

During the 1920s, large tombs of the Eastern Zhou period were plundered at Xinzheng and Jincun in Henan as well as Hunyuan in Shanxi, flooding the market with novel bronze and jade objects rarely seen before; many objects were simply unlike any other transmitted heirloom bronzes. The quantity and quality of these burial goods suggest that their original owners belonged to the highest nobility. The attraction of the unearthed bronzes changed not only collectors' taste but also scholars' methods of research; the two were intricately related. The collectors now preferred bronzes of the *shengkeng*, namely, the

unpolished, lightly cleaned excavated bronzes with natural dirt and patina, as opposed to that of the *shoukeng*, referring to the transmitted heirloom bronzes with these features thoroughly removed and polished with wax until they acquired a black or brown sheen.

In the study of ancient Chinese bronzes, with Hamada's pioneering work, art historical and archaeological approaches gradually took the lead over Chinese traditional antiquarianism. A comparison of two works in particular highlights the shift from the *shoukeng* to the *shengkeng* and the change from antiquarianism to archaeology: the expanded edition of *Sen'oku seishō* published in the early 1920s and *Hakutsuru kikkinshū* (Ancient bronzes in the Hakutsuru collection) in 1934. With professors from Tōkyō and Kyōto Imperial University serving as editors and writers, the two catalogues not only represented the largest collections of ancient Chinese bronzes in Japan but also epitomized the development of Japanese scholarship during the 1920s and 1930s.

The expanded edition of *Sen'oku seishō* was of enormous scale, comprising five volumes divided into two parts: 171 plates on bronze vessels and 100 plates on mirrors. Of these plates, thirty were coloured. With fine collotype images on opulent pages, the new edition was elaborately bound and encased. Sumitomo invited four scholars to participate: the chief editors were Taki Seiichi (1873–1945) from Tōkyō Imperial University and Naitō Konan (1866–1934) from Kyōto Imperial University; the entry contributors were Hamada from Kyōto Imperial University and Harada Yoshito (1885–1974) from Tōkyō Imperial University; both universities contributed equally. Because Hamada was responsible for the content relating to the bronze vessels, the following analysis focuses on his discussion.

Transmitted heirloom bronzes from acclaimed Chinese antiquarian collectors formed the core of Sumitomo's collection. Many objects were already published and discussed by their previous owners, whom Hamada had to consult. In addition, with regard to the bronze inscriptions, Hamada relied mainly on Ruan Yuan[51] and Liu Xinyuan (1848–1917).[52] For the

vessel shape, he frequently cited the Song works, *Kaogu tu* (Illustrated catalogue for the study of antiquities) and *Xuanhe bogu tu*, two of the oldest antiquarian catalogues in China.[53] Hamada's citations revealed that he had a good command of Chinese antiquarian knowledge.

Hamada was also the first to apply art historical and archaeological methods to the study of ancient Chinese bronzes – before his Chinese and European colleagues.[54] Although none of the bronzes in the catalogue is provided with a provenance, Hamada referred to the archaeological materials known to him when faced with the problem of dating or determining the function of an object. Because modern archaeology was only just burgeoning in China, comparable examples were few: Hamada mostly resorted to objects from Yinxu or potteries from the Han-dynasty tombs in southern Manchuria, where he had the opportunity personally to conduct excavations.[55] In other words, Hamada attempted to modernize the study of transmitted heirloom objects.

More specifically, Hamada paid great attention to archaeological context and applied that knowledge to the study of the transmitted objects. On reckoning the function of a *yan* (steamer), Hamada compared it with the Han pottery containers from southern Manchuria, which had an upper vessel placed on a stove when discovered, and concluded that they served the same function of steaming rice.[56] Furthermore, he applied the concept of period style in dating Sumitomo's bronzes. By comparing the *taotei* (animal mask) motif of a *zun* (wine vessel) with that of the excavated examples from Yinxu, he suggested that they were closely dated and related.[57] Hamada also noticed a cross-media influence, such as the bronze imitation of rope patterns on potteries.[58] The scientific aspects, from the excavation context to the close observation of the formal characteristics, contributed to Hamada's analysis.

The antiquarian and archaeological methods occasionally conflicted with each other, causing Hamada to struggle with this dilemma. For instance, he pointed out that a cauldron had a *taotei* decor similar to those unearthed in Yinxu, which would indicate a late-Shang

date; however, he dated it to the Zhou based on the antiquarian view of the inscription.[59] In the current view, this object is considered a typical Shang cauldron. Eventually, Hamada became increasingly self-aware in adopting the new approaches. In the 1930s, he criticized the lack of art historical and archeological study of ancient bronzes in Chinese traditional scholarship.[60]

The fame of the transmitted heirloom works in the Sumitomo collection made it an immediate star, meanwhile, giving it an obvious antiquarian underpinning. By comparison, the works in other peer collections, including Nezu Kaichirō (1860–1940), Kanō Jihei VII (1862–1951), and Fuji Zensuke (1873–1943), were mostly plundered during the 1920s and 1930s from the large tombs, such as Nezu's famous three gigantic *he* (wine vessel), originally buried in a Shang imperial mausoleum in Yinxu (Fig. 9). Among them, Kanō had the second largest collection of ancient Chinese bronzes in Japan and founded the Hakutsuru Fine Art Museum in 1931.[61] The museum was opened to the public in 1934, with an inaugural catalogue dedicated to ancient Chinese bronzes, *Hakutsuru kikkinshū*.[62] Before that, Kanō had published two luxurious catalogues for his collection of Japanese, Korean, and Chinese artworks in 1907 and 1930, respectively.[63] The contents of these catalogues demonstrate a rapid expansion of Kanō's ancient Chinese bronzes during the period from 1907 to 1930.

Hakutsuru kikkinshū comprised fifty objects, including vessels and mirrors. Umehara Sueji (1893–1983) was responsible for the content, Naitō supervised the project, and Chinese scholar Guo Moruo (1892–1978) helped with some inscriptions. Umehara had served as an assistant for Naitō and Hamada a few years ago when they had worked on the expanded edition of *Sen'oku seishō*. After Hamada died, he succeeded him as the professor of East Asian archaeology at Kyōto Imperial University in1939.

The catalogue featured newly unearthed bronzes, many with a provenance from Henan and Shaanxi provinces. They had a distinct appearance from the transmitted bronzes:

the rich coloration and texture of the surface patina were preserved to prove the authenticity of the object, as emphasized by Umehara.[64] Some terms were used by Umehara to describe the antique colours resulting from being long interred in the earth.[65] He also noticed organic substances on the surface, such as the remnant of a grass mat on a container from Jincun, Luoyang, betraying its buried context.[66] Because the patina and remains on the surface helped to determine the authenticity and occasionally reveal information on burial environments, collectors and scholars now preferred the unpolished *shengkeng* over the waxed *shoukeng* bronzes.

Umehara's focus on the objective, formal characteristics is evident in another catalogue of ancient Chinese bronzes in European and American collections published in 1933–5. He further emphasized the objectivity by including cross-section drawings for many objects (Fig. 10).[67] Such drawings, although frequently featured in archaeological works, were rarely seen in art catalogues.

In a manner similar to Hamada, Umehara experienced the transition from tradition to modernity. He recounted in 1933 that he entered the field with the study of *jinshixue* and transmitted bronzes; after three years abroad, visiting museums in Europe and America from 1926 to 1929, he changed his focus to unearthed objects.[68] Umehara's objective observation and recording were innovative, but his interest on the surface coloration could be viewed as stemming from traditional connoisseurship, whether in the Chinese antiquarian tradition or in Japanese *karamono* aesthetics.

The first three decades of the 1900s witnessed major changes in the reception of ancient Chinese bronzes in Japan. At the beginning of the century, the Japanese readily accepted both archaistic *karamono* bronzes, prevalent in Japan for generations, and genuine ancient bronze objects recently imported from China, as manifested in the 1903 exhibition organized by the Imperial Museum. In the 1910s, as acclaimed Chinese collections were

transported to Japan in large numbers, the Chinese antiquarian view became dominant. This trend changed in the 1920s when excavated bronzes gained attention and the modern discipline of archaeology was introduced. The traditional antiquarian view yielded to modern art historical and archaeological analysis.

<H1>Reproducing ancient Chinese bronzes

On the surface, modern Japanese collectors appeared to enter the field of Chinese art collection following the practice of their Western counterparts. The Japanese, however, had a long history of receiving Chinese artefacts, the *karamono* tradition, in which the Japanese not only collected Chinese works, but also used and reproduced them. The Japanese continued to create Chinese archaic style bronzes in the modern era; as Japanese knowledge of ancient Chinese bronzes evolved, the forms, functions, and cultural meanings of the reproduced bronzes changed accordingly.

Artefacts crafted for tea ceremonies continued in the *karamono* tradition as the *sencha* tea gatherings throve in the Meiji and Taishō periods, expanding into many sections at various venues, some specifically for art viewing. The utensils and works of art in each section were often listed in the proceedings and sometimes further published in illustrated catalogues after the event.[69] Antique dealers were active in hosting the gatherings[70] while the emerging economic élite, to which almost all major collectors of ancient Chinese bronzes belonged, seized these opportunities to network and purchase works being alienated by declining noble families.[71]

The vase created by the metalwork artist Hata Zōroku (1814–1892) in 1885 was an example of the bronze replica in the *karamono* tradition (Fig. 11).[72] It appeared in a tea gathering in 1891, as testified to in the catalogue published subsequently.[73] Decorated with animal motifs, the vase was modelled after a *zun* recorded in the *Xuanhe bogu tu*, according

to Hata Zōroku's inscription on the storage box. Hata Zōroku's son inherited his metalworking skills and developed such a close relationship with Sumitomo that he not only replaced a missing lid for one of Sumitomo's *he* (wine containers) in 1903[74] but also wrote the first edition of the *Sen'oku seichō* published in 1911–16.

In addition to utensils for tea ceremonies, works in the style of archaic Chinese bronzes continued to be used in Buddhist offerings. A newspaper reported a remarkable example in 1917: several Buddhist monks from Korea, then under Japanese occupation, presented a silver incense burner to the Prime Minister of Japan to express their gratitude for his support of Buddhism in Korea. The newspaper further remarked that this silver object was modelled after the '*ding* of King Wen'.[75] Illustrated in the *Xuanhe bogu tu* (Fig. 12), the '*ding* of King Wen' attracted scholarly attention in the Northern Song because, according to the inscription, it was an offering vessel made by the Duke of Zhou for his father King Wen, both renowned historical figures.[76] The *ding* remained popular among connoisseurs in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century China, reproductions appearing in various materials, such as bronze, cloisonné, ceramic, and jade.[77] The newspaper report shows that the popularity of this object spread to Korea and Japan at least in the 1910s.

Some modern users moved beyond the *karamono* tradition and appropriated the archaic form in a new way. Following the death of the art collector Baron Iwasaki Yanosuke (1851–1908), his friends dedicated a gigantic bronze tripod vessel to his tomb in 1910, with their names engraved inside the object.[78] The animal masks on the belly suggest that it was modelled after a Shang-dynasty *ding* (Fig. 13). A newspaper reported explicitly that it was crafted by the metalwork artist Okazaki Setsusei (1854-1921) after the 'Ju *ding* of the Zhou',[79] an object recorded in the *Xuanhe bogu tu* (Fig. 14). Placed in front of a tomb constructed in the Western style, this archaic style vessel served no practical function; it was a commemorative offering, probably in memory of Iwasaki's accomplishments in collecting

Chinese rare books and artworks.[80] His collection laid the foundation for the Seikadō Library and Art Museum, built adjacent to the tomb complex in 1924 and thereafter expanded repeatedly.

Similarly, the *jue* (cup) made by Sumitomo in 1911, after the Emperor granted him the official noble title of Baron, was also a commemorative object.[81] Ascribing the great honor to the ancestors' blessings, Sumitomo not only named the garden in his newly built mansion *keitaku* (grace and blessing) but also emulated the Shang and Zhou aristocracy by commissioning a *jue* vessel (Fig. 15) inscribed with the same two characters to express his gratitude to the Emperor and ancestors.[82] The *jue* was modelled after a Shang-dynasty bronze object in his personal collection and, according to the accompanying document he wrote in person (Fig. 15), cast with the metal from the copper mine that the Sumitomo family had operated for generations since 1691.[83] With the form, inscription, and material referring repeatedly to the ancestors, this *jue* fulfils its function as a commemorative offering.

Iwasaki's *ding* and Sumitomo's *jue* not only signified the owners' distinct social status but also honoured the dead while begging good fortune for the living, evoking multiple meanings of the ancient prototypes. Their shape and decoration also followed closely that of the ancient bronzes: Iwasaki's *ding* was modelled after the *Xuanhe bogu tu* but was enormous in scale, whereas Sumitomo's *jue* was based on his own collection. To endow the replicas with commemorative qualities, inscriptions were carved and thereby the original social and ritual significances of the Shang and Zhou bronzes were invoked.

As a war memorial cast in 1938, the Nanjing *ding* marked a new turn in this line of development. Dedicated to the heroic souls in the Yasukuni Shrine, it was shaped as a traditional offering vessel, the *ding*; the decorative patterns, however, defied the conventions and aimed at a different association. Although the meaning of the stylized cloud and wave patterns is hard to determine, the cherry flower was a widely used emblem in the Yasukuni

Shrine at the time. For instance, the notices, tickets and badges issued for the special ceremony in October 1938 all had cherry blossom designs (Fig. 16).[84] Furthermore, in the 1920s and 1930s, when Japan was marching toward militarism, with government promulgations, the cherry blossom became a symbol for patriotic soldiers, who were ready to sacrifice their lives for the Emperor.[85] The association of the cherry blossom with soldiers made it the most appropriate decorative pattern for the Nanjing *ding*. In this light, the three decorative patterns might stand for the three wings of the armed forces: the cloud for the air force, the cherry flower for the army, and the wave for the navy.

The Nanjing *ding* referred to ancient Chinese prototypes rather selectively, only the general ritual function being suggested by the *ding* shape. The object functioned as a collective offering to the dead soldiers at the national level. Therefore, it belonged to the public, military domain, diverging from the aristocratic familial emblems of the Shang and Zhou. Its unusual decorative designs of military symbols manifested this modern turn. The ancient form was emancipated from tradition and endowed with new cultural significance.

In the first two decades of the twentieth century, the reproduced archaic style bronzes followed closely the ancient prototypes. Newspapers explicitly named the '*ding* of King Wen' and the 'Ju *ding* of the Zhou' as the models, testifying to the popularity and authority of the *Xuanhe bogu tu* at the time. This happened concomitantly with acclaimed Chinese collections entering Japan, thereby rejuvenating an interest in Chinese antiquarianism. In the 1930s, the modern disciplines of art and archaeology challenged the authority of the antiquarian tradition. Wartime propaganda further introduced new forms and meanings into the ancient shape, bringing forth a curious amalgamation of the traditional and the modern, as in the Nanjing *ding*.

<H1>Conclusion

When encountering the Nanjing *ding*, the modern audience would conjure up the traditional images of the *ding* in China, particularly the long-lasting symbolism of political legitimacy. As a trophy of the war, the Nanjing *ding* would appear at first glance to be an appropriation of such Chinese tradition. Further examination discloses that the Japanese had a history of reproducing bronze objects after the style of Chinese antiquities in the *karamono* tradition. It underwent a transformation in the early twentieth century as modern Japanese collectors and researchers brought in new materials and approaches to studying ancient Chinese antiquities, thereby stimulating a new era of appropriation and reproduction. Many collectors of bronzes, belonging to the newly emerged economic élite, elevated their social and cultural status through collecting antiquities endorsed by scholars. Some even emulated ancient Shang and Zhou nobility to commission bronze works for personal commemorative purposes. The three aspects – collecting, studying and reproducing – were closely intertwined. The Nanjing *ding* marked a new turn in this development. As a Sino-Japanese amalgam, it might have referred to the *ding* symbol in the Chinese tradition; it also had its origins in Japanese collection and appropriation of Chinese antiquities during the first decades of the twentieth century.

<H1>Address for correspondence

Ya-hwei Hsu, Department of History, National Taiwan University, No. 1, Sec. 4, Roosevelt Road, Taipei 10617, Taiwan.

yahweihsu@ntu.edu.tw

<H1>Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Hirokawa Mamoru of Sen-oku Hakukokan, Ichimoto Rui and Inokuma Kaneki of Tokyo National Museum, Tabayashi Kei and Umihara Yasuko of Hakutsuru Fine Art Museum for offering generous assistance at different stages of this research. I am also

indebted to Sonya Lee, Patricia J. Graham, and Tajima Natsuko for sharing with me their insights and suggestions about different artworks discussed here.

<H1>Notes and references

[1] For discussion of creating *ding* in the modern era, see L. L. Tseng, 'Monumentality and transnationality: the fascination with gigantic *ding* bronze vessels in modern China', in *Art History and Fetishism Abroad: Global Shiftings in Media and Methods*, ed. G. Genge and A. Stercken (Bielefeld, 2014), pp. 289-302.

[2] For association of the National Palace Museum with the memory of Sun Yat-sen, see Suo Yu-ming, 'Wenwu yu guoyun (Ancient relics and the fate of a nation)', *Gugong wenwu yuekan* 1 (1983), pp. 6-11.

[3] For the contents of the original inscriptions, see Suo Yu-ming, ''Nanjing dading' liulangji: Jinian kangzhan shengli wushi zhounian (The wandering of the Nanjing *ding*: the 50th anniversary of the second Sino-Japanese War)', in *Qiyuan waizhi* (Accounts of lacquered artefacts and others) (Taipei, 2000), vol. XIa, pp. 534-5.

[4] The Yasukuni Shrine is arguably an epitome of Japanese militarism and has been a source of continuous debate since World War II. For the history of the Yasukuni Shrine, see Murakami Shigeyoshi, *Yasukuni jinja: 1869-1945-1985* (History of Yasukuni Shrine: 1869-1945-1985) (Tōkyō, 1986); Yasukuni jinjia (ed.), *Yasukuni jinja yushukan* (Catalogue of the Museum of Yasukuni Shrine) (Tōkyō, 2003); for discussion of the ideology behind the worship of Yasukuni Shrine, see K. Tsuyoshi, Zōho *Yasukuni shikan: Nihon shisō o yominaosu* (The ideology of *yasukuni*: reading into Japanese thoughts) (Tōkyō, 2014), pp. 90-133.

[5] For the repatriation, see Hang Li-wu, *Zhonghua wenwu boqianji* (Record of transporting Chinese cultural relics) (Taipei, 1980), p. 71.

[6] Suo Yu-ming, op. cit. (note 3), p. 537.

[7] For discussion of various versions of the myth during the Warring States and Han periods, see H. Wu, *Monumentality in Early Chinese Art and Architecture* (Stanford, 1995), pp. 1-15.

[8] R. Fracasso, 'The Nine Tripods of Empress Wu', in *Tang China and Beyond*, ed. A. Forte (Kyoto, 1988), pp. 85-96.

[9] Deng Ye, 'Xiang Jiang Jieshi zhuxian jiuding de liuchan yu feiyi (The termination and dispute regarding the plan of casting a set of Nine Tripod Cauldrons to present to Chiang Kai-shek)', *Jindaishi yanjiu* 2 (2009), pp. 148-51.

[10] Yu Ying-shih, *Weijin de caiqing: cong riji kan Gu Jiegang de neixin shijie* (Endless virtuosity: Gu Jiegang's inner world as looked through his diary) (Taipei, 2007), pp. 59-60.

[11] L. L. Tseng, 'Myth, history and memory: the modern cult of the Simuwu bronze vessel', in 1901-2000 *Zhonghua wenhua bainian* (Chinese culture centenary), ed. Huang Kuang-nan (Taipei, 1999), pp. 717-67; Tseng, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 289-302.

[12] H. Nishida, 'The collection and appreciation of Chinese art objects in 15th-16th century Japan, and their legacy', in *Collecting Chinese Art: Interpretation and Display*, ed. S. Pierson (London, 2000), pp. 9-17; T. Kubo, 'Chanoyu ni okeru karamono tōki (*Karamono* bronzes used in *chanoyu* tea ceremonies)', *Nomura bijutsukan kenkyū kiyō* 20 (2011), pp. 1-66.

[13] H. Nishida, 'Hanaike toshiteno kodō to seiji no utsuwa (Antique bronze and celadon flower vases)', in *Hanaike* (flower vases), ed. Tokugawa bijutsukan and Nezu bijutsukan (Tōkyō, 1982), p. 139.

[14] Ibid.

[15] P. J. Graham, *Tea of the Sages: The Art of Sencha* (Honolulu, 1998), pp. 66-135.

[16] For Ichikawa's life and calligraphy, see T. Horie, 'Shoka toshite no Beian (The calligrapher Ichikawa Beian)', *Museum* 94 (1959), pp. 10-13; H. Kakui, 'Ō Kenchū shofuku to Ichikawa Beian: kizōsha Kōjirō Abe shi ni yosu (O Kenchū's works of calligraphy and Ichikawa Beian: approaching the donor Kōjirō Abe)', *Museum* 334 (1979), pp. 17-25.

[17] B. Ichikawa, *Shōsanrintō shoga bunbō zuroku* (Illustrated catalogue of the artworks collected in the Small Hall of Mountains and Woods), 1849 edition, National Diet Library Digital Collection: http://dl.ndl.go.jp/, assessed 15 December 2014.

[18] Ibid., vol. *shin*, pp. 11, 15, 30.

[19] Ibid., vol. *shin*, p. 2. I would like to thank Ichimoto Rui and Inokuma Kaneki of Tokyo National Museum for arranging a special viewing of this vessel in the summer of 2016.

[20] Hsu Ya-hwei, 'Wanming de gutong zhishi yu fanggu tongqi (Knowledge of bronze antiquities and its relationship to the archaistic bronzes made in the late-Ming period)', in *Guse: shiliu zhi shiba shiji yishu de fanggufeng* (Through the prism of the past: antiquarian trends in Chinese art of the 16th to 18th century), ed. Li Yu-min (Taipei, 2003), pp. 264-75.

[21] Rong Geng (1894-1983) has examined the Qianlong Emperor's catalogues for ancient bronzes and appraised their authenticity. Liu Yu further compiled a comprehensive list of the Emperor's objects and remarked on their authenticity, see Liu Yu, *Qianlong sijian zongli biao* (Comprehensive sorted tables of bronze antiquities recorded in the Qianlong Emperor's four catalogues) (Beijing, 1989).

[22] Tu Long and Gao Lian's works were popular in the late Ming. For discussion of the connoisseurship works and treaties of the late Ming, see C. Clunas, *Superfluous Things: Material Culture and Social Status in Early Modern China* (Cambridge, 1991).

[23] R. Kerr, *Later Chinese Bronzes* (London, 1990); R. D. Mowry, *China's Renaissance in Bronze: The Robert H. Claque Collection of Later Chinese Bronzes 1100-1900* (Phoenix, AZ,

1993); P. K. Hu, *Later Chinese Bronzes: The Saint Louis Art Museum and Robert E. Kresko Collections* (Saint Louis, MO, 2008).

[24] See Kubo, op. cit. (note 12), pp. 1-66.

[25] See Tokugawa bijutsukan and Nezu bijutsukan, op. cit. (note 13), pl. 57.

[26] Ibid., pl. 71.

[27] The original text comes from the *Kundaikan sō chōki*. For discussion of the related paragraphs, see Nishida, op. cit. (note 13), p. 139.

[28] Izumishi kubosō kinen bijutsukan (ed.), *Hana no utsuwa* (Flower vases) (Izumishi, 1994), p. 44, fig. 76.

[29] Even today, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish, especially between the Chinese-made and Japanese products.

[30] H. Tanaka, *Bijutsuhin idōshi: Kindai Nihon no korekutātachi* (History of the movement of works of art: collectors in modern Japan) (Tōkyō, 1981); Y. Otabe, *Kahō no yukue: bijutsuhin ga kataru meika no Meiji, Taishō, Shōwa* (Whereabouts of family treasures: prestigious clans and their art collections during the Meiji, Taishō, and Shōwa periods) (Tōkyō, 2004).

[31] 'Hakubutsukan no tokubetsu tenrankai (kodōki no bu) (Special exhibition of the museum: section on ancient bronzes), *Asahi shinbun*, 18 April 1903, Tōkyō, morning edition, p. 3. Online database: Asahi Shimbunsha Kikuzo II Visual, accessed 21 October 2014.

[32] Tōkyō teishitsu hakubutsukan (ed.), *Teishitsu hakubutsukan kanshō roku: kodōki* (Art catalogue of the Imperial Museum: ancient bronzes) (Tōkyō, 1906).

[33] 'Hakubutsukan no tokubetsu tenrankai (kodōki no bu)', *Asahi shinbun*, 22 April 1903, Tōkyō, morning edition, p. 3. Online database: Asahi Shimbunsha Kikuzo II Visual, accessed 21 October 2014.

[34] For the history of Sumitomo's collection of ancient Chinese bronzes, see K. Toyama, 'Sen'oku hakukokan shozō kōgei sakuhin no shūshū jiki to sono tokushoku ni tsuite I: seidōki, kyōkan (The formation of the artefacts collection in the Sen'oku Hakukokan I: bronze objects and mirrors)', *Sen'oku hakukokan kiyō* 27 (2011), pp. 81-108.

[35] N. Tomita, *Ruten Shinchō hihō* (Transmission of treasures of the Qing) (Tōkyō, 2002), pp. 98-126.

[36] For Chinese paintings, see H. Kohara, 'Jin bashinian lai de Zhongguo huihuashi yanjiu de huigu (Review of the Chinese painting studies in recent eighty years)', in *Minguo yilai guoshi yanjiu de huigu yu zhanwan yantaohui lunwenji* (Proceedings of the conference on a review of studies on national history during the Republican period and the future prospect), ed. Guoli Taiwan daxue lishixuexi (Taipei, 1992), pp. 541-51; for ancient Chinese bronzes, see N. Tomida, *Jindai Riben de Zhongguo yishupin liuzhuan yu jianshang* (Transmission and appreciation of Chinese works of art in modern Japan), transl. Zhao Xiumin (Shanghai, 2005), pp. 272-312.

[37] Ruan Yuan's collection includes pl. 43, 65, 56; for discussion of these objects, see S. Taki and K. Naitō (eds.), *Sen'oku seishō (zōteibon)* (The collection of old bronzes of Baron Sumitomo, expanded edition) (Tōkyō, 1921-1922), explanatory volume *iki* (ritual vessels), pp. 31-2, 42.

[38] Chen Jieqi's collection includes pl. 23, 86, 98, 105; for discussion of them, see ibid., explanatory volume *iki*, pp. 23, 52, 56, 59-60.

[39] Duan Fang's collection includes pl. 7, 50; for discussion of them, see ibid., explanatory volume *iki*, pp. 14, 35. For a list of when and where Sumitomo acquired his bronze artworks, see Toyama, op. cit. (note 34), pp. 81-108.

[40] This includes plates 26, 28 and 74. For discussion of these objects, see Taki and Naitō, op. cit. (note 37), explanatory volume *iki*, pp. 24, 26, 46.

[41] For examples, see ibid., pl. 42 and explanatory volume *iki*, p. 31; pl. 8 and explanatory volume *iki*, p. 16.

[42] See Tomida, op. cit. (note 36), pp. 272-312. For study of the antiquarian scholarship in the late Qing and its relationship to the political situations in China, see S. J. Brown, *Pastimes: From art and antiquarianism to modern Chinese historiography* (Honolulu, 2011).

[43] For Hamada's pioneering role in the field of archaeology in Japan, see T. Saitō, *Nihon kōkogakushi no tenkai* (Historiography of archaeology in Japan) (Tōkyō, 1990), pp. 278-87.

[44] K. Hamada, 'Shina no kodōki ni tsuite (On ancient Chinese bronzes)', *Kokka* 163 (1903), pp. 144-50.

[45] Hōshū, 'Shina no kodōki (Ancient Chinese bronzes)', *Kokka* 183 (1905), pp. 53-7. Another article published in 1918 focuses on the transmitted bronzes in the Sumitomo collection, see Kokkasha (ed.), *Kokka sakuin* (Index of *Kokka*) (Tōkyō, 1956), p. 367.

[46] For Luo Zhenyu's role as a middleman between Chinese and Japanese collectors, see Z. Hong, 'A newly made marketable 'leftover': Luo Zhenyu's scholarship and art business in Kyōto (1911-1919)', *Lost Generation: Luo Zhenyu, Qing Loyalists and the Formation of Modern Chinese Culture*, ed. C. Yang and R. Whitfield (London, 2012), pp. 142-71; C. Yang, 'Deciphering antiquity into modernity: the cultural identity of Luo Zhenyu and the Qing Loyalists in Manzhouguo', in Yang and Whitfield, op. cit. (note 46), pp. 189-90.

[47] Luo Zhenyu, *Yinxu guqiwu tulu* (Catalogue of antique objects from the ruins of Yin) (Kyōto, 1916).

[48] K. Hamada, 'Shina kōdōki kenkyū no shinshiryo (Inkyo hakken to tsutafuru zōge chōkoku to doki hahen) (New materials for studying ancient Chinese bronzes: ivory carvings and pottery shards discovered from the ruins of Yin)', *Kokka* 379 (1921), pp. 197-206.

[49] A. Hamada *et al.* (eds.), 'Hamada Kōsaku hakushi ryakunenpyō, shuyō chosaku mokuroku (Chronology and selected publications of Dr Hamada Kōsaku)', *Tōhōgaku* 67 (1984), pp. 42-9.

[50] M. Yoshikai, 'Jindai Riben xuezhe yu Yinxu kaogu (Modern Japanese scholars and Yinxu archaeology)', in *Jinian Yinxu fajue bashi zhounian xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* (Proceedings of the conference commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Anyang excavations), ed. Li Yung-ti (Taipei, 2015), pp. 25-50.

[51] Hamada cited Ruan Yuan's *Jiguzhai zhongding yiqi kuanshi* (Inscriptions of ancient bronze ritual objects collected in Jigu studio) several times. See Taki and Naitō, op. cit. (note 37), explanatory volume *iki*, pp. 16, 31-2, 42, 52.

[52] Hamada cited Liu Xinyuan's *Qigushi jijin wenshu* (Description of the bronze inscriptions in Qigu chamber) many times. See Taki and Naitō, op. cit. (note 37), explanatory volume *iki*, pp. 23, 25, 43, 52, 56, 59-60.

[53] Ibid., explanatory volume *iki*, pp. 13, 14, 28, 31-2, 34, 59.

[54] For a review of the Chinese and European scholarship in the early twentieth century, see Chen Fang-mei, 'Shang-Zhou qingtong rongqi yanjiu de keti yu fangfa (Methods and issues in the study of bronze vessels from the Shang and Zhou)', in Guoli Taiwan daxue lishixuexi, op. cit. (note 36), pp. 959-90.

[55] K. Hamada, 'Minamimanshū ni okeru kōkogaku teki kenkyū (Archaeological work in southern Manchuria),' *Tōyō gakuhō* 2 no. 3 (1912), pp. 340-57.

[56] Taki and Naitō, op. cit. (note 37), explanatory volume *iki*, p. 17.

[57] Ibid., explanatory volume *iki*, p. 23.

[58] Ibid., explanatory volume *iki*, p. 14.

[59] Ibid., explanatory volume *iki*, p. 10.

[60] K. Hamada and S. Umehara (eds), *Santei sen'oku seishō* (The collection of old bronzes of Baron Sumitomo, revised edition) (Kyōto, 1934), pp. 2-3.

[61] These collections were all transformed into museums open to the public: Fuji's Fuji Yūrinkan in 1926, Kanō's Hakutsuru Fine Art Museum in 1934, and Nezu's Nezu Institute of Fine Arts in 1941. Finally, the Sen'oku Hakukokan of Sumitomo collection was established in 1960.

[62] J. Kanō, *Hakutsuru kikkinshū* (Ancient bronzes in the Hakutsuru collection) (Kōbe, 1934).

[63] J. Kanō, *Hakutsuru jyō* (Selected works in the Hakutsuru collection) (Hyōgo, 1907); J. Kanō, *Hakutsuru jyō* (Selected works in the Hakutsuru collection) (Hyōgo, 1930-31).

[64] For discussion of the patina, see Kanō, op. cit. (note 62), pl. 14; for discussion of the coloration, see pl. 7, 8, 12, 17, 19, 22.

[65] Ibid., pl. 5, 6, 10.

[66] Ibid., pl. 23.

[67] S. Umehara, *Ō-Bei shūcho Shina kodō seika* (Selected relics of ancient Chinese bronzes from collections in Europe and America) (Ōsaka, 1933-5).

[68] Ibid., Umehara's preface.

[69] Many masters of the tea ceremonies published illustrated catalogues to give a visual account of the tea gathering, a practice most popular in the Meiji and Taishō periods. For study of illustrated catalogues of tea ceremonies, see S. Miyazaki, 'Meien zuroku no jidai (The era of illustrated catalogues of tea gatherings)', *Bungaku* 7 no. 3 (1996), pp. 33-45.

[70] Many *sencha* tea ceremonies were held by antique dealers, see Miyazaki, op. cit. (note 69), pp. 34-5; for the role of the art dealer in the *sencha* tea gathering, see Y. Lai, 'Tea and the art market in Sino-Japanese exchanges of the late nineteenth century: *Sencha* and the *Seiwan meien zushi*', in J. A. Fogel (ed.), *The Role of Japan in Modern Chinese Art* (Berkeley, 2012), pp. 42-68.

[71] See Tanaka, op. cit (note 30), pp. 19-70; S. Tamamushi, 'Min Shin bunbutsu shōgan no keifu to Seikadō korekushon (The Seikadō collection and the connoisseurship of Ming-Qing artefacts)', in *Seikadō zō senchagu meihinten* (Masterpieces of *sencha* tea utensils from the Seikadō collection), ed. Seikadō bunko bijutsukan (Tōkyō, 1998), pp. 2-7.

[72] Baron Iwasaki Yanosuke acquired this object later, so it entered the Seikadō collection. See Seikadō bunko bijutsukan, op. cit. (note 71), pp. 19, 91. For the biographies of Hata Zōroku and his son, see Y. Kuroda, *Meika rekihōroku* (Interview with famous artisans) (Kuroda Yuzuru, 1901), *chūhen*, pp. 48-58.

[73] Seikadō bunko bijutsukan, op. cit. (note 71), p. 18.

[74] Taki and Naitō, op. cit. (note 37), explanatory volume *iki*, p. 58; Toyama, op. cit. (note 34), p. 86.

[75] 'Bunō no tei o moseshi ginsei kōro (The silver incense burner modelled after the *ding* of King Wen)', *Yomiuri shinbun*, 5 September 1917, morning edition, p. 5. Online database: Yomiuri Shimbun yomidas rekishikan, accessed 21 October 2014.

[76] Wang Fu (ed.), *Zhida chongxiu Xuanhe bogutulu* (Illustrated catalogue of antique treasures in the Xuanhe Hall, revised in the Zhida [1308-1311] period), fourteenth-century edition, vol. II, p. 3. Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan.

[77] The connoisseurs admired the curvilinear flattened feet of it and called them 'flying dragons': see Gao Lian, *Yashangzhai zunsheng bajian* (Eight discourses on the art of living)

(Beijing, 1988), p. 400. For reproductions in different media, see Li Yu-min, op. cit. (note 20), pp. 176-9.

[78] 'Ko Iwasaki dan bozen no kyotei (The gigantic tripod vessel in front of the late Baron Iwasaki Yanosuke's grave)', *Asahi shinbun*, 1 April 1910, Tōkyō, morning edition, p. 5. Online database: Asahi Shimbunsha Kikuzo II Visual, accessed 21 October 2014.

[79] Wang Fu, op. cit. (note 76), vol. III, p. 7a.

[80] Iwasaki also contributed a vessel to the 1903 exhibition in the Imperial Museum, which won much praise from the newspaper. Tōkyō teishitsu hakubutsukan, op. cit. (note 32), fig. 15; 'Hakubutsukan no tokubetsu tenrankai (kodōki no bu)', op. cit. (note 31), p. 3.

[81] For a chronology of Sumitomo's life, see Sen'oku Hakukokan, *Sumitomo Shunsui: binoyume owaranai* (Baron Sumitomo Shunsui: the beautiful dream with no end) (Kyōto, 2016), pp. 24-32.

[82] This object appeared in the special exhibition on Sumitomo Shunsui at the Sen-oku Hakukokan in Tokyo held in the summer of 2016.

[83] N. Asao, and Sumitomo shiryōkan (eds), *Sumitomo no rekishi* (History of the Sumitomo family) (Kyōto, 2013-14), p. 30.

[84] Yasukuni jinjia, op. cit. (note 4), p. 53.

[85] E. Ohnuki-Tierney, *Kamikaze, Cherry Blossoms, and Nationalisms: The militarization of aesthetics in Japanese history* (Chicago, 2002), pp. 109-15.

Captions

Fig. 1. The Nanjing *ding* (tripod vessel). 1938. Bronze. National Palace Museum, Taipei. Photograph by the author.

Fig. 2. Sun Yat-sen's two-character motto on the Nanjing *ding*. Photograph by the author.

Fig. 3. Sun Yat-sen's final admonishment on the Nanjing *ding*. Photograph by the author.

Fig. 4. Illustration of the Shōsanrintō. 1849. Ichikawa Beian, *Shōsanrintō shoga bunbō zuroku*, preface. National Diet Library, Tōkyō.

Fig. 5. Archaistic bronze *ding* (cauldron) in Ichikawa Beian's collection. Chinese; 18th-19th century. H. 27 cm. Tokyo National Museum, Tōkyō. Photography by the author.

Fig. 6. Illustration of a 'Han-dynasty' *ding* (cauldron) in Ichikawa Beian's collection. 1849. *Shōsanrintō shoga bunbō zuroku*, vol. *shin*, p. 2. National Diet Library, Tōkyō.

Fig. 7. Bronze vase, with the inscription *kine no ore* (severed pestle). Chinese; 13th–14th century. H. 25.7 cm. Tokugawa Art Museum, Nagoya.

Fig. 8. Bronze vase, with the inscription *yonaga* (eternity). Japanese; 15th–16th century. H. 37.8 cm. Private collection.

Fig. 9. Bronze *he* (wine vessel) excavated from Anyang, Henan. 13th–12th century BC. H. 73 cm. Nezu Institute of Fine Arts, Tōkyō.

Fig. 10. Cross-section drawing of a *you* (wine vessel). 1933–1935. Umehara Sueji, *Ō-Bei shūcho Shina kodō seika*, pl. 3.

Fig. 11. Vase made by Hata Zōroku (1814–1892) after ancient Chinese bronze *zun* (wine vessel). 1885. H. 29.6 cm. Seikadō Art Museum, Tōkyō.

Fig. 12. Illustration of the *ding* of King Wen and its inscription. *Zhida chongxiu Xuanhe bogutulu*, vol. 2, p. 3. 1308–1311 edition. Academia Sinica, Taipei. Photograph courtesy of Academia Sinica.

Fig. 13. *Ding* (tripod vessel) offered to Baron Iwasaki Yanosuke's tomb in 1910, Tōkyō. Photograph by the author.

Fig. 14. Illustration of the Ju *ding* of the Zhou. *Zhida chongxiu Xuanhe bogutulu*, vol. 3, p. 7a. 1308–1311 edition. Academia Sinica, Taipei. Photograph courtesy of Academia Sinica.

Fig. 15. Sumitomo Tomoito's bronze *jue* (cup), accompanied by the document calligraphed by Sumitomo. 1911. Sen-oku Hakukokan, Kyōto and Tōkyō. Photograph courtesy of Sen-oku Hakuko kan, Sumitomo Collection.

Fig. 16. Metal badges made for the special ceremony in the Yasukuni Shrine in October, 1938. Yasukuni Shrine, Tōkyō.