

UC Berkeley

Working Words: New Approaches to Japanese Studies

Title

洋画 / Yōga: The Western Painting, National Painting, and Global Painting of Japan

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3mn8m1bs>

Author

Winther-Tamaki, Bert

Publication Date

2012-04-20

洋画 / *Yōga*: The Western Painting, National Painting,
and Global Painting of Japan

Bert Winther-Tamaki

Today historians of modern Japanese art typically use the term *yōga*, literally “Western painting,” to refer to the modern Japanese practice of oil painting that was imported from Europe and to a great extent modeled on European precedents. But so ingrained is the European and American propensity to see Japanese culture through a lens of Asian otherness, that I have given whole lectures about the Westernness of Japanese *yōga* only to be dumbfounded by questions about how this type of painting related to the Asian discipline of training the consciousness for spiritual insight and tranquility. Let it be clear: there is no relationship other than one of homonyms between yoga meditation exercises and *yōga* painting. More importantly, the designation of a vast development of modern Japanese painting as “*yōga*” calls attention to its genealogical linkages to European canons, techniques, iconographies, and styles. Nevertheless, the desire to render *yōga* more conspicuously Japanese was felt even more keenly by its advocates and critics in Japan than by orientalizing viewers in Europe and North America. We may detect art historian Shimada Yasuhiro’s desire to nationalize *yōga* within his ostensibly objective characterization of its art historical development: “the Japanization of oil painting was the greatest task for oil painters in Japan from the very moment it was

imported from the West.”¹ This essay investigates a 1932 forum recording multiple authors’ views of “*yōga*” to demonstrate how the classificatory power of the word itself branded identities, art works, materials, and techniques with an alienating sense of Western otherness. Then I propose a re-deployment of the term to bring three global dimensions of Japanese Western painting into focus: the extension of *yōga* to other parts of Asia under the auspices of Japanese imperialism, the resonance between appropriations of European art by Japanese artists and similar initiatives by artists elsewhere in the world, and the application of globalization theory to reassess *yōga* as a medium of globalization.

First, however, I would like to briefly outline the career of the term *yōga*.² In the early Meiji Period, when the systematic acquisition of the techniques and practices of European painting first gained the imprimatur of official sponsorship in Japan, it was rarely called *yōga*. Much more common were terms that referenced not a cultural entity, i.e., “the West,” but rather the material, “oil painting” (*abura-e*). This initial emphasis on the material reflected the exalted status of oil-on-canvas in European academic practice, the contrast it posed to the water-soluble pigments of pre-Meiji Japanese painting, and the belief that oil painting was a superior technology for apprehending the visual world. However, by the 1880s, these considerations were overshadowed by a preoccupation with the Westernness of this type of painting and there was a shift from the term *abura-e* (oil painting) to *seiyōga* (Western painting). At this point, *seiyōga* was used interchangeably with *yōga*, its abbreviation. *Seiyōga* also functioned in opposition to *nihonga* (Japanese

¹ Shimada Yasuhiro, *Fuōbisumu to Nihon kindai yōga (Fauvism and Modern Japanese Painting)* (Kyoto National Museum of Modern Art, 1993): 305.

² See the account provided by Satō Dōshin, *‘Nihon bijutsu’ no tanjō; Kindai Nihon no ‘kotoba’ to senryaku*, Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1996, 76-103.

painting), which designated contemporary and pre-Meiji practices of purportedly indigenous Japanese painting. A sense of two competing schools of painting arose in the 1880s, leading a critic to ask: “Will a splendid and refined *nihonga* have sufficient worth in the future to attract supporters and compete with *seiyōga* or not?”³ These terms became institutionalized as names of the primary categories of contemporary Japanese painting practice, particularly by the establishment of *nihonga* and *seiyōga* submission categories in the government-sponsored salon in 1907. Over the next two decades, *yōga* designated what was arguably the largest and most innovative sector of Japanese painting practice.

During the Pacific War, in the early 1940s, *yōga* and *nihonga* became associated with alternative approaches to the affirmation and glorification of the nation’s military mission. *Yōga* was preferred for propagandistic scenes of heroic Japanese soldiers in battle, while *nihonga* tended toward dreamy evocations of Japanese nature, spirit, and history. It was not until after the war that the distinction between Euramerican and Japanese practices of “Western painting” was clearly established by separate terms; *seiyōga* was reserved for the former and *yōga* for the latter. Subsequently, the contemporary practice of painting started to shed the term *yōga* in favor of a return to *abura-e*. Designating a Japanese practice of painting as “Western painting” irritated nationalist sentiments, while *abura-e* gradually came to be so neutral a term that painting students today learn to paint in acrylics under the aegis of departments of oil painting (*abura-e gakka*). Finally, the emergence of a new category, “contemporary art” (*gendai bijutsu*), relieved the term *yōga* from the task of designating contemporary painting, except for amateur and academic salon practice where there is minimal impact of the ethos of originality and progress. Nevertheless, *yōga* enjoys continued favor as a

³ Ichijima Kinji, “*Nihonga no shōrai ikaga*” (1889) as quoted in Satō, ‘*Nihon bijutsu’ no tanjō*, 86.

historical term; recent scholars have found it indispensable in assessing the plight of the lineage of modern Japanese painters who were absorbed with European art.

The Imperative for “National Painting” in 1932

I turn now to the forum of opinions on the question of whether *yōga* or *nihonga* was better positioned to serve the Japanese nation as “national painting” (*kokuga*) that was published in September 1932 in *Bijutsu shinron* (New Views of Art), a major Japanese art journal at this time.⁴ The 1920s and 1930s mark a poignant phase in the seventy or eighty years during which the term *yōga* identified a major category of contemporary Japanese painting production. By this point, *yōga* was well established as an authoritative medium of Japanese fine art with a considerable history of attempts to neutralize the disturbing Westernness trumpeted by the term *yōga*.⁵ Nonetheless, the climate of increasing fascism, militarism, and nationalism anathematized the nominal Westernness of *yōga* painting and poured new urgency into the defense of *yōga* and the search for ways to instill it with a sense of Japanese nativity. These tensions encumbering the word *yōga* are vividly documented in the 1932 *Bijutsu shinron* forum. This text resulted from the solicitation and publication by the journal editors of written responses

⁴ “*Nihonga oyobi Yōga no kokugateki tachiba*” *Bijutsu shinron* 7:9 (September 1, 1932): 4-46. The respondents are, in my own categorization and order, as follows. *Yōga painters*: Arishima Ikuo, Ataka Yasugorō, Fujishima Takeji, Hashimoto Yaoji, Hazama Inosuke, Hotta Seiji, Ihara Usaburō, Itō Ren, Kimura Shōhachi, Masamune Tokusaburō, Miyasaka Masaru, Nabei Katsuyuki, Nakagawa Kigen, Nakamura Ken’ichi, Nakayama Takashi, Nakazawa Hiromitsu, Noguchi Kenzō, Okuse Eizō, Oota Saburō, Sakamoto Hanjirō, Umehara Ryūsaburō, Wada Sanzō; *Nihonga painters*: Hashimoto Kansetsu, Hirafuku Hyakusui, Kawabata Ryūshi, Matsubayashi Keigetsu, Tsuchida Bakusen, Yazawa Gengetsu; *Art historians and critics*: Araki Sueo, Haruyama Takematsu, Kanai Shiun, Kinbara Seigo, Kojima Kikuo, Sakai Saisui, Tazawa Ryōfu; *Other*: Hasegawa Eisaku (sculptor), Kōno Michisei (*nihonga* and *yōga* painter), Mizukoshi Shōnan (*nanga* painter), Tsuda Seifū (*nihonga* and *yōga* painter), Tsuda Shinobu (metal craft artist).

⁵ For studies of earlier re-negotiations of the Westernness of *yōga*, see Mikiko Hirayama, “Ishii Hakutei on the Future of Japanese Painting” *Art Journal* 55:3 (Fall 1996): 57-63; Alicia Volk, *In Pursuit of Universalism: Yorozu Tetsugorō and Japanese Modern Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010).

from forty artists and writers to the question of whether *nihonga* or *yōga* held greater promise as “national painting” (*kokuga*). As we shall see, despite considerable points of disagreement among the respondents, their exchange delineates a clear profile of the perceived risks and advantages of the term *yōga* and the type of painting it designated.

This forum was provoked by an attack on the *yōga* establishment by a leading *nihonga* painter who deployed nationalist rhetoric and an East/West, us/them binary to undermine the legitimacy of *yōga* as an authoritative medium of Japanese fine art.⁶ The odds in the *Bijutsu shinron* debate were stacked in favor of *yōga*; the respondents included twenty-two *yōga* painters and only six *nihonga* painters (the remaining respondents being other artists, art historians, and critics). To goad their interlocutors, the journal’s editors caricatured two views: “Some believe that Japanese painting is to be equated unequivocally with ‘*nihonga*’ and that ‘*yōga*’ is absolutely foreign, while others take the view that there are no national borders in painting and excellent works are the treasures of the nation regardless of their style.” In the written opinions published, the three triangulated terms—*nihonga* (Japanese painting), *yōga* (Western painting), *kokuga* (national painting)—are thrust and parried back and forth as pointers for ideological forces that drive the practice of painting into service for the nation. One function of the terms *yōga* and *nihonga* was the designation of art world factions and most of the interlocutors betray their affiliation and loyalty to one camp or the other.

The *Bijutsu shinron* respondents who favored *yōga* tended to defend it for its purportedly superior material, for oil pigments were seen as a more versatile and durable

⁶ The 1932 attack on *yōga* by the *nihonga* painter Yokoyama Taikan was provoked by the recent selection of a *yōga* painter, Wada Eisaku, as the director of the Tokyo Bijutsu Gakkō. See, Yokoyama Taikan, “Bijutsu kyōiku no konpon seishin” (July 1932) in Nagao Masanori, ed. *Taikan no garon*, Tokyo: H.5, 159-165.

medium, while its primary vulnerability was its imitation of the West. *Nihonga*, however, was defended as authentic native expression and criticized for its alleged anachronism, insularity, and inferior materials. This topography of weaknesses and strengths was encoded in the range of reference in the terms *yōga* and *nihonga*. The terms *yōga* and *seiyōga* were still used interchangeably here, referring to the Japanese practice of Western painting and/or contemporary and past painting in the West. Similarly, while *nihonga* denoted a contemporary community and group of styles of Japanese painting, it could also evoke the full sweep of everything encompassed by the English term, “Japanese painting.” This terminological ambiguity aggravated the tendency to deride Japanese *yōga* as slavishly imitative of European painting and to fault contemporary *nihonga* as the retardataire relic of pre-Meiji traditions of painting. This problem of language may explain why some respondents turned against the terms themselves: “From long ago. . . I advocated abolishing the terms ‘*yōga*’ and ‘*nihonga*’ . . . There should be no classification by terms” (Fujishima Takeji).

The distinction between *yōga* and *nihonga* was the focus of much attention and disagreement. Some reduced this distinction to a mere difference of materials: painters should be granted the freedom to select which ever medium was best for realizing their artistic aims -- whether oil pigments or water-base mineral pigments. But this same material difference was characterized by others as an instrumental superiority of oil paint over *nihonga* pigments: just as Japanese buildings should be replaced by Western construction to better resist earthquake destruction, so Japanese painters should avail themselves of the greater expressive and technical capacity of oil paint (Fujishima Takeji). Parallels to the *nihonga/yōga* binary were found not only in architecture, but also

sculpture, crafts, food, music, clothing, and literature. Such comparisons led some respondents to locate the distinction between *yōga* and *nihonga* in profound differences of culture, race, and identity. Painting was racialized through references to the body: since Japanese artists have “Japanese faces,” they should paint like Japanese people (Hashimoto Kansetsu).

Seikatsu (lifestyle) was one of the most frequently employed terms in efforts to mediate the *yōga* /*nihonga* distinction by the artists and writers canvassed in this 1932 survey. Most of them seemed to agree that national painting should embody a close relationship to the lifestyle of Japanese people, but they deduced contradictory conclusions from this principle. Since Japanese lifestyle was the “confluence of both Eastern and Western” modes, a critic supposed that both *nihonga* and *yōga* were necessary components of “national painting” (Kojima Kikuo). While conceding that Japanese lifestyle was much Westernized, however, a *nihonga* painter maintained that older Japanese people typically return to Japanese customs and concluded from this point that “we are able to look at *nihonga* paintings with a greater sense of ease” (Hashimoto Kansetsu). Closely related to the mandate that painting match the lifestyle of the people of the nation was the belief that it should evince a sense of contemporaneity. An attitude of national seclusion (*sakkoku*), a term associated with the Edo Period, was condemned as an obstacle to progress (Nakayama Takashi, Araki Sueo). Attempts to marginalize *yōga* as non-native culture were therefore criticized as “anachronistic [for] it is a fallacy to think that even now you have to wear samurai armor and helmet to be a Japanese person” (Umehara Ryūzaburō).

Not surprising in a debate about how to enhance the contribution of painting to the nation, political considerations were voiced frequently. This exchange took place in 1932 during military campaigns that brought all of Manchuria under Japanese control and military analogies were used to demonstrate the potential of *yōga* to advance the cause of the nation. “Just as the soldiers in Manchuria with Western-style clothes and weapons make war like splendid Japanese warriors, so Western-style painting makes splendid national painting” (Okuse Eizō). Military and artistic aims were directly linked: “Putting Japanese art on the world market depends on the political advance of Japan into the world. Supposing there is a World War II and Japan is victorious, given the existence of excellent *nihonga* painting . . . I believe that there would be a globalization of *nihonga*” (Kōno Michisei). This assertion of military success as the enabling condition of artistic success was exceptional, but many comments indicate acceptance of the principle that the nation’s art should be designed to compete in an international art world. Concern for Euramerican judgments of Japanese art were common. For example, *nihonga* was said to be doomed by its failure to appeal to Western viewers (Ihara Usaburō, Wada Sanzō). In perhaps the most ambitious if wistful expression of the political aims of national painting, one respondent declared, “The *Ecole de Paris* is currently the center of international painting, but we do not know how long that will last. Perhaps it is not just a dream to think that one day it will give way to the *Ecole de Japon*” (Haruyama Takematsu). Thus, painting was imagined as the medium of a culture war where Japanese *yōga* aspired to usurp the artistic preeminence of France.

Ironically, however, the approval of overseas critics was assumed by many of the *Bijutsu shinron* correspondents to be a necessary component of the success of national

painting and various strategies were prescribed for appealing to foreign viewers. For example, it was suggested that for Japanese oil paintings to succeed when exhibited in Paris, they must demonstrate technique that is the equal of French painting and express the personality of Japanese people, though this sense of national identity was simply defined as whatever was completely different from French and American people (Nabei Katsuyuki). The *Japonisme* of modern European art was well known and three respondents complicated the assumption that *nihonga* was the exclusive property of Japanese people by raising the possibility that even Western artists could conceivably paint *nihonga* paintings. Indeed, awareness of the globalization of art caused one of these three to predict, with a shudder, that in the future, “all the formal qualities, materials, traditions of the world will become unified... and come under the rule of sameness in the age of Esperanto in painting,” though he hastened to prescribe a greater measure of “national essence” (*kokusui*) for Japanese art in the near term (Kōno Michisei).

“China” (*Shina*) was another frequent term in respondents’ negotiations of the proper path to the desired future of Japanese painting. Several reasoned that past centuries of Japanese absorption and indigenization of various forms of Chinese culture (literati painting, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Chinese poetry) predicted a similar transformation of European painting in the future. Indeed, preoccupations with the futurity of *yōga* were a common focus of views about its merit as national painting. Critics should have patience, for just as it took Japanese Nanga artists 150 years to absorb Chinese ink painting, with time *yōga*’s current phase of Western imitation would surely be overcome and eventually there would be no need to refer to it as “Western painting” at

all. Thus, *yōga* was imagined as a transitory instrument justified by the ends it was expected to produce.

Indeed, the erasure of the Westernness of *yōga* was predicted and advocated by the *Bijutsu shinron* respondents. Once a sufficient degree of “Oriental spirit is breathed into” this foreign medium (Tsuda Shinobu), it will merit a more gratifying term such as “Japanese people’s oil painting” (Okuse Eizō). This re-negotiation of the otherness of *yōga* was also projected retroactively into history. Oil painting was not so alien to the history of Japanese painting after all, if one recognized that *mitsuda-e* (litharge painting), a painting method apparent in certain Japanese artifacts from the seventh through ninth centuries, stands in the “lineage of oil painting” (Kinbara Seigo). But this author also recommended that *yōga* painters study *nihonga* tradition as a recipe for rendering *yōga* into efficacious “national painting.” Thus, while opinions of the forty participants in this forum vary considerably, most agreed that the “yō-” of *yōga* should be modified or removed to permit this type of painting to better serve the nation.

One of the most striking features of *yōga* ideology expressed in the *Bijutsu shinron* forum was a pattern of oscillation between interior and exterior perspectives of the nation. On the one hand, *yōga* was constituted by perspectives imagined to lie within the nation, as evident in strategies for diminishing the Westernness of *yōga*, focus on Japanese lifestyle, and the obsessive comparison of *yōga* to *nihonga*. On the other hand, the preoccupation with Euramerican judgment, the criticism of attitudes of national seclusion, the concern for international competition—all suggest that perspectives exterior to the nation were fundamental and that the erasure of the “yō-” of *yōga* remained an unrealized ideal in

1932. Studies of *yōga* have contended with the “interior” dimension of *yōga* primarily by analyzing the *nihonga/yōga* binary, for example, by terms such as “opposing mirrors,” “double-othering,” and “dynamic structure.”⁷ Meanwhile, the “exterior” dimension of *yōga* has typically been dealt with by focusing on tensions between the Paris-centered art world of the West and the peripheral position of the Tokyo art world.⁸ I am not in disagreement with these approaches, but I would like to propose an expansion of the parameters of what may be considered relevant to the understanding of *yōga*. In part, this is a move which returns the term *yōga* to that period of its usage when slippage and confusion between reference to Japanese Western painting and Western painting *en tout* was common. But rather than equate “the West” with art in Paris, a larger globally manifest “West” may be brought into focus as the purview of studies of *yōga*. In order to trace the global repercussions of the movements of *yōga*, I will conclude by recommending three dimensions for the expansion of future *yōga* studies.

First, it may be observed that the term “*yōga*” belies a significant Asian dimension to the development of this type of painting in Japan. Art historians have begun to appreciate the role that *yōga* played in imperial Japanese culture and the establishment of Japanese colonies in Asia expressed by terms such as the Great East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.⁹ The establishment by the Japanese colonial bureaucracy of French-

⁷ These three characterizations are by, respectively: Satō, ‘*Nihon bijutsu’ no tanjō*; John Clark, “*Yōga* in Japan: Model or Exception? Modernity in Japanese Art, 1850s-1940s: An International Comparison” *Art History* 18:2 (June 1995): 258-9; Amano Kazuo, “*Nihonga to Yōga*” in Kitazawa Noriaki et al. eds. *Bijutsu no yukue, bijutsu-shi no genzai*, Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1999, 92-107.

⁸ For example, see Norman Bryson, “Westernizing Bodies: Women, Art, and Power in Meiji *Yōga*,” in Joshua Mostow, et. al., eds. *Gender and Power in the Japanese Visual Field*, Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2003, 89-118; Shūji Takashina, et. al., *Paris in Japan: The Japanese Encounter with European Painting*, Tokyo: The Japan Foundation, St. Louis: Washington University, 1987; *Japan & Paris: Impressionism, Postimpressionism, and the Modern Era*, Honolulu Academy of Arts, 2004.

⁹ For example, see John Clark, *Modern Asian Art*, Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1998; Aida-Yuen Wong, “A New Life for Literati Painting in the Early Twentieth Century: Eastern Art and Modernity, A

style official salons in the colonies of Taiwan, Korea, and Manchuria substantiates the Frenchness inscribed in the term “*Ecole de Japon*” mentioned in the 1932 forum, but these colonial institutions also reveal the function of the Tokyo art world as a clearing house for the transfer of French and European art to non-European agency outside Japan. Japanese painters, including several participants in the forum, served as jurors in these colonial salons, arbitrating Asian efforts in artistic systems based on European paradigms of art. Meanwhile, Japanese *yōga* painters sought painting motifs and even styles and techniques in China or other parts of Asia as a counterweight to the tremendous Francophilism that was at the root of their practice of *yōga*. At the same time, the Tokyo art world emerged as a destination for painting students from other parts of Asia much as numerous Japanese students had sought mastery of their *métier* in the ateliers of Paris.

While the study of history mandates attention to the role *yōga* played as a medium of inter-Asian communication in the context of Japanese imperialism, my second recommendation for the expansion of *yōga* studies might seem counterintuitive, because the art communities in Mexico City, Calcutta, and Teheran simply did not register in the awareness of most *yōga* painters and advocates in Japan. Nevertheless, Japanese *yōga* students may have rubbed elbows with painting students from these parts of the world in Paris, where the term “*Ecole de Paris*” was used with intense resentment in the 1920s to label foreigners in contrast to French-born artists.¹⁰ Moreover, attention today to the

Transcultural Narrative?” *Artibus Asiae* LX:2 (2000): 297-326; *Ajia no kyubisumu – kyōkai naki taiwa*, Tokyo: National Museum of Modern Art, 2005); Kim Hyeshin, “Images of Women in National Art Exhibitions during the Korean Colonial Period” J. Mostow, N. Bryson, M. Graybill, eds. *Gender and Power in the Japanese Visual Field*, Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2003, 141-153; Ushiroshōji Masahiro, “Senji-shita no ryūgakusei; kindai Nihon to Tai no bijutsu kōryū” *Bijutsu fōramu* 21 9 (January 2004), 74-78; Park Mijeoung, “Shokuminchi Chōsen wa dono yō ni hyōshō sareta ka” *Bigaku* 54:1 (2003), 42-55.

¹⁰ Romy Golan, “The ‘Ecole Français’ vs. the ‘Ecole de Paris’” in Kenneth E. Silver and Romy Golan, *The Circle of Montparnasse, Jewish Artists in Paris, 1905-1945*, New York: The Jewish Museum, 1985, 81-87.

congruent positions of painters in Japan and elsewhere on the periphery of European painting opens up a view of the globality of the plight of the *yōga* painter. Consider, for instance, that the *Bijutsu shinron* respondents of 1932 were the contemporaries of the celebrated Mexican muralists. Both national painting communities dedicated themselves to re-orienting European painting to the task of visualizing non-European indigeneity.

Octavio Paz wrote:

Without the modern artists of the West who made the totality of non-Western styles and visions their own, the Mexican Muralists would not have been able to understand their indigenous Mexican tradition. Mexican artistic nationalism was a result of the cosmopolitanism of the twentieth century.¹¹

The same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of Japanese *yōga* painters, for whom, as we have seen, the notion of European painters producing Japanese paintings was a disturbing possibility. Indeed, the cosmopolitanism Paz invoked was articulated, albeit in a very different spirit, by the *Bijutsu shinron* respondent who advocated “national essence” in the face of encroaching “Esperanto in painting.”

This global-local consciousness recommends theories of globalization as a third direction for understanding the diffusion of European oil-painting. This diffusion triggered local cultural formations that depended on dialectical articulation to the global.¹² The global consciousness embedded in *yōga* and its counterparts in Mexico and elsewhere stimulated a romanticization of the “local” as difference to be preserved for its own sake. Such far-flung developments of European painting typically pivoted on interactive homogenizations and fragmentations of the sort that have been proposed as a

¹¹ Octavio Paz, *Essays on Mexican Art*, New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1987, 116.

¹² Kuan-Hsing Chen, “Not Yet the Post-Colonial Era: The (Super)Nation-State and Transnationalism and Cultural Studies” *Cultural Studies* 10:1 (January 1996): 55.

definitive dimension of globalism.¹³ The *convergence* of painting pedagogies, styles, and techniques around the world facilitated a *divergence* of painting iconographies, narratives, and motifs. In other words, formal homogeneity rendered local or native distinctions meaningful in a globally imagined world. This phenomenon is analogous to the aspect of the world system of nations that calls upon each nation to define itself “uniquely” through the shared infrastructures of, for example, flag, monument, national anthem, as well as national art academy. The appeal of the elevated decorum, ideal erotic bodies, and illusionistic capacity of oil-on-canvas ran over boundaries in a manner not unrelated to the spread of the English language. And while *yōga* was typically “high art” practiced for and often by elites, it had tremendous impact beyond the upper classes, whether in the form of the cheap popular prints through which oil-and-canvas images were disseminated to a larger viewership, or the enormously popular state-sponsored exhibition salons such as that established in Japan in 1907. Indeed, “global *yōga*” poses an early predictive and foundational model for patterns of globalization associated with cinema, television, and *anime*.¹⁴

Yōga has often been regarded as a matter of Japanese imitations and responses to Paris-centered European painting and the European power that fortified this art. These are valid topics of *yōga* study, but the views of one *Bijutsu shinron* respondent suggest an expansion of the field that the term *yōga* may legitimately call to the art historian’s attention: “our national painting is expressive of an Oriental and Japanese sensibility, [but] in view of the conspicuous tendency toward the gradual internationalization in new

¹³ For example, see Reingard Nethersole, “Models of Globalization” *PMLA* 116:3 (2001): 646.

¹⁴ See Wimal Dissanayake, “Japanese Cinema and the American Cultural Imaginary” in Kwon-Kan Tam, et. al., eds. *Sights of Contestation: Localism, Globalism and Cultural Production in Asia and the Pacific*, Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2002, 197-214.

cultures and the ever more universal social environment of art, the danger of strict adherence to a national view of painting is indifference to transitions and developments of society and history” (Araki Sueo). The “*yō-*” of *yōga* may be taken to signify the pattern of the embrace of a globalizing visual medium by Japanese artists and their counterparts throughout the world who were striving to articulate their own presence in a competitive international arena of art.