

From the Aesthetics of Sencha to a Way of Life: A Study of *Sei* (清) and *Kyōtō* (狂蕩) in Ueda Akinari *

SHIMAMURA Yukitada

Osaka University of Economics, Osaka

Abstract: This article examines how, for Ueda Akinari (1734–1809), the aesthetics of sencha (煎茶) intertwined with his way of life, focusing on *sei* (清: purity / clarity) and *kyōtō* (狂蕩: deliberate unorthodoxy and profligacy). Based on *Seifūsagen* (清風瑣言), the study reveals that *sei* is a multifaceted concept that encompasses the nature of tea, water, utensils, procedures, and the purified mental state. Furthermore, *Chakasuigen* (茶癡醉言) argues that the contrast between *sai* (才: talent) and *chi* (智: calculating, strategic intelligence) leads Akinari to align *sai* with *hana* (花: flower), *sei*, and sencha, and oppose them to *chi*, associated with *mi* (美: fruit), *daku* (濁: turbidity), and powdered tea (*chanoyu*). Based on *Tandaishōshinroku* (膽大小心録), the “Autobiography,” and Akinari’s creative appropriation of the *Liezi* (列子), the study argues that *kyōtō* signifies a positively chosen way of life on the side of *sei*, which rejects *chi* and the pursuit of worldly success. Hence, the *sei* of sencha emerges as an aesthetic ideal and a principle that organizes practice and way of life in Akinari’s late thought.

Keywords: Ueda Akinari (上田秋成), Sencha (煎茶), *Sei* (清), *Kyōtō* (狂蕩), *Chakasuigen* (茶癡醉言)

Introduction

This article reconsiders *sei* (清: purity / clarity), the central aesthetic concept in the sencha (煎茶) thought of the late Edo literatus Ueda Akinari (上田秋成, 1734–1809), by focusing on the contrast between *sai* (才: talent) and *chi* (智: intellect, in the sense of calculating, strategic intelligence) articulated in his sencha treatise *Chakasuigen* (茶癡醉言, ca. 1807).¹ It argues that Akinari’s view of sencha was deeply connected to a way of life² that he characterized as *kyōtō* (狂蕩: deliberate unorthodoxy and profligacy).

From the early to the middle Edo period, a new method of tea drinking – sencha (煎茶:

* This article is a partially revised version of a paper entitled “The Aesthetics of Sencha in Ueda Akinari: Through a Reading of *Chakasuigen*,” originally presented at the 73rd Annual Conference of the Japanese Society for Aesthetics on October 15, 2022.

¹ Three textual witnesses of *Chakasuigen* are currently known: the autograph manuscript in the Tenri University Library, the Seisō Bunko manuscript in the same library (a copy, printed as a variant text in the *Ueda Akinari zenshū*), and the Kashiwabara manuscript (copy) in the Osaka Prefectural Nakanoshima Library. On the date of the autograph, see Washiyama Jushin. 1979. “‘*Chakasuigen*’ seiritsu nenji kō”(On the Date of the Formation of *Chakasuigen*) *Hanazono daigaku kokubungaku ronkyū*, vol. 7, 36–46. Takahashi Tadahiko. 2021. “Ueda Akinari ‘*Chakasuigen*’ no ‘jishi-hon’ to ‘Seisō Bunko-bon’ no zengo kankei ni tsuite” (On the Chronological Relationship Between the Autograph and the Seisō Bunko manuscript of Ueda Akinari’s *Chakasuigen*) *Cha no yu bunkagaku (The Journal of Chanoyu)*, vol. 36, 1–22. Takahashi points out that the variant (Seisō Bunko) is a revised version, refining the autograph.

² In this article, “a way of life” refers to a comprehensive mode of existence in which the philosophical ideals and aesthetic values of the literatus Akinari are manifested through his practical behavior.

steeped leaf tea, also known as *encha* 淹茶) – was introduced chiefly through Ōbaku-line Rinzaï monks and merchants from China. Through figures such as Kō Yūgai Baisaō (高遊外壳茶翁, 1675–1763) and Kimura Kenkadō (木村兼葭堂, 1736–1802), *sencha* was widely embraced by the Japanese literati. By the late Edo period, *sencha* had become an indispensable pastime among the literati and was frequently served at their gatherings.

Ueda Akinari is widely known as a *waka* poet, a scholar of Japanese literature, the author of the *Ugetsu monogatari* (雨月物語, 1776), and a *sencha* practitioner. He exerted considerable influence on later generations as a practitioner and a theorist of *sencha*. In 1794, based on Chinese tea manuals, he published *Seifūsagen* (清風瑣言), which explained the cultural history of tea, the procedures of *sencha*, and tea utensils. In his final years, he prepared *Chakasuigen*, where he gathered corrections of errors and omissions in *Seifūsagen*, along with anecdotes collected later. In addition to these works, Akinari left several *sencha*-related pieces, such as hanging scrolls and hand-molded teapots. Studies that address Akinari's view of *sencha* include Sakata Motoko (1963), Tsukuda Ikki (1999), and Liang Xuzhang (2021). They all identify *sei* (清) as the central concept in Akinari's aesthetics of *sencha*. The character appears in the title *Seifūsagen*, where Akinari uses *sei* to describe a wide range of objects, from the nature of *sencha* to the water used for it and the utensils employed.³

Sei is a term that describes both material qualities and expresses a spiritual or mental state. Discussing Akinari's *waka* on *sencha*, Sakata noted that “what Akinari sought in tea can be summed up in the single character *sei*. He did not particularly strive to escape this turbid world, but he did attempt, over a single infusion of tea, to clear his mind for a moment.”⁴ Similarly, Tsukuda argued that this spirituality permeated Akinari's way of life, stating that “‘*Sei*’ is not only a metaphysical matter but intersects with a concrete ethic of ‘poverty’ (貧) in everyday life. The expression, ‘as long as one is *sei*, one will naturally be poor,’ is to a large extent a positive articulation of his own condition, an aesthetic consciousness that unifies aesthetic orientation and lived reality.”⁵ Liang focused on Akinari's way of life, noting that “‘*sei*’ referred to one's inborn nature and true feelings,”⁶ and “Akinari's conception of *sencha* was formed by appropriating Chinese literati consciousness of *sei*. This consciousness of *sei* influenced not only his view of *sencha* but also his outlook on life.”⁷

Hence, previous scholarship has argued that *sei* stands at the center of Akinari's view of *sencha* and is connected to his way of life. This article adopts the same position. However, none of these studies has the nexus between *sei* and Akinari's way of life as its main theme, and thus they have not examined that relationship in depth. To reconsider this relationship is a task that cannot be overlooked if one is to clarify the significance of *sencha* for Akinari.

Accordingly, this article reconsiders Akinari's notion of *sei* in relation to *sencha*. It focuses on *Chakasuigen*, a work that has attracted relatively little attention. Written in an essayistic style, it arguably presents Akinari's view of *sencha* more clearly than *Seifūsagen*. At the end of

³ Tsukuda 1999, 303–4; Liang 2021, 19–20.

⁴ Sakata 1963, 70; translation by the author.

⁵ Tsukuda 1999, 301; translation by the author.

⁶ Liang 2021, 222; translation by the author.

⁷ Liang 2021, 225; translation by the author.

Chakasuigen, Akinari set sencha, aligned with *sei* and *sai*, against *daku* (濁: turbidity) and *chi*, which he associated with powdered tea, that is, *chanoyu* (茶の湯). The same contrast between *sai* and *chi* appears in other works, such as *Tandaishōshinroku* (膽大小心録, 1808), which, this study suggests, is connected with *kyōtō* as Akinari's way of life.

In fact, while the concept of *kyōtō* has been discussed within the field of research on Akinari's literature and thought, studies on sencha have not incorporated the results of those fields. Conversely, within the fields of literature and thought, research on the history of sencha is rarely referenced, and *Chakasuigen* has rarely been mentioned. In other words, it seems that studies on the history of sencha and those of literature and thought have hitherto developed in relative isolation. Therefore, this study also aims to bridge this disconnect between these fields by clarifying the interpretation of *Chakasuigen* through a reading informed by the achievements of literary and thought studies. This, in turn, should lead to a deeper insight into Akinari's thinking about sencha.

The article proceeds as follows. Section 1 reaffirms Akinari's conception of *sei* based on a reading of *Seifūsagen*. Section 2 examines *sei* in *Chakasuigen* and considers the passages in which *sai* and *chi* appear. Section 3, to further clarify *sei*, *sai*, and *chi*, discusses the relationship between Akinari's way of life and sencha, using *kyōtō* as an interpretive axis.

In this article, all citations from Akinari's works are taken from Nakamura Yukihiro et al. (Eds.), *Ueda Akinari zenshū* (上田秋成全集: The Complete Works of Ueda Akinari), Vol. 9 (1991) and Vol. 10 (1992), Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha. The tea treatises are found in Vol. 9: *Seifūsagen* (pp. 273–316), *Chakasuigen* (autograph manuscript; pp. 316–353), and *Chakasuigen* (variant text; pp. 354–382). Note that *furigana* and *okurigana* are omitted in citation. For *Seifūsagen*, *Chakasuigen* (autograph manuscript), and *Chakasuigen* (Kashiwabara version), the study also consulted Tanihata Akio & Takahashi Tadahiko (Eds.). 2023. *Chasho koten shūsei* (茶書古典集成: Classical Tea Texts), vol. 14: *Edo kōki no chasho to sencha no sho* (江戸後期の茶書と煎茶の書: Late Edo Tea Treatises and Writings on Sencha), Kyoto: Tankōsha.

1. *Sei* of Sencha

Since being explicitly associated with tea in the Tang dynasty, the term *sei* (清) has stood at the core of the aesthetic sensibility of those who enjoyed tea in its various forms. In the *Kōko* (攷古: On Ancient Precedents) section of the first volume of *Seifūsagen*, Akinari wrote:

唐の玄宗の天宝中茶仙陸羽字鴻衛一名疾字季疵号東岡世に出。肅宗代宗の間朝野に交りて。茶経三篇を著し。烹点の法則を立。器を製し。水味を論ぜしかば。天下の人茶飲の清雅を知り。あまねく玩ふ事と成ぬ。⁸

During the reign of Emperor Xuanzong of the Tang, that is, in the Tianbao era (742–756), the “Sage of Tea” Lu Yu (陸羽, 733–804) came to the forefront. In the subsequent reigns of Suzong and Daizong (756–779), he moved among people at court and in the capital, composed

⁸ *Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 281.

the three volumes of *Chajing* (茶經, c. 760), laid down methods for boiling and preparing tea, explained the proper utensils, and discussed the flavors of different waters. Hence, people throughout the empire came to recognize the pure and elegant pleasures of drinking tea, and tea became an object of widespread refined enjoyment.

In *Chajing*, the character *sei* does not, as far as the author could see, receive particular emphasis. However, it appears in contemporaneous poems. For example, one finds the line “再飲清我神” in Jiaoran’s (嵇皎然, 8th c.) “飲茶歌詣崔石使君.” In Lu Tong’s (盧仝, 790–835) well-known poem “走筆謝孟諫議寄新茶,” the line “唯覺兩腋習習清風生” became particularly famous. It is cited in *Seifūsagen* and influenced the title of the work, even though Akinari criticized Lu Tong’s excessive tea drinking in the same text.

For early modern Japanese literati, who eagerly read Chinese tea treatises and poetry on tea such as these, *sei* was a particularly important concept. However, compared to his contemporaries, Akinari seemingly placed an especially strong emphasis on it. For example, in the Hinsei (稟性: On Inborn Nature) section of the first volume of *Seifūsagen*, he wrote:

陳元輔の茶略に。茶之有性。猶人之有性。人性皆善。茶性皆清と云は。茶の清雅を貴む語にて。茶の性寔に清也。人性におきて善惡の説喋と止ず。言は忌むに過。好むに失つとこそ思ゆれ。⁹

Chen Yuanfu (陳元輔) was a Fujian figure active in the early Qing. “茶略” refers to his *Zhenshanlou chalu* (枕山樓茶略).¹⁰ The passage cited, “茶之有性。猶人之有性。人性皆善。茶性皆清,” which means that just as humans have an inborn nature, so does tea: human nature is entirely good, and tea’s nature is entirely *sei*. Considering this passage, Akinari commented that Chen’s words esteemed tea as something pure and elegant, and in line with those words, the nature of tea was indeed *sei*. However, regarding human nature, he noted that discussions of good and evil never ceased, and whether one spoke too little or too much, one was liable to fall into error.¹¹

Hence, evidently, relying on Chinese tea treatises, Akinari regarded *sei* as the nature of tea. However, this *sei*, as the nature of sencha, cannot be enjoyed unconditionally. This is because the water used to brew the tea must already be *sei*. At the beginning of the Tōkō (湯候: On the Boiling of Water) section of the first volume of *Seifūsagen*, Akinari wrote that hot water should be prepared by selecting delicious, clear running water and boiling it according to a proper method.¹² Similarly, in the Bensui (辨水: On Discriminating Waters) section of the second volume, he said

⁹ Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 282–83.

¹⁰ Printed in 1805, the work seems to have been widely read among Japanese literati. Akinari was involved in this publication, and a letter to Ōdate Takakado, the publisher of the work, titled “Owari no monjin Ōdate Takakado e kotau” (尾張門人大館高門へ答ふ: Reply to Ōdate Takakado, Disciple in Owari) is extant (*Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 386–90). On the Japanese reception of the work, see Liang 2021, chap. 8.

¹¹ This view was shared by Murase Kōtei (村瀬栲亭, 1744–1819), the Kyoto Confucian scholar who wrote the preface to *Seifūsagen*. He wrote, “水之与茶相得、特以其清耳矣。市茶有真香、有純香、有浮香、有間香。水有甘者、有例者、有輕者、有重者。譬之猶人性之万不同。故人之好之、非其性至清、則不得会其真趣、而適之自然矣” (*Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 275).

¹² “湯は。甘泉清流を択び。法を以て煮るべし” (*Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 294).

that even if sweet springs, clear streams, and tea were all excellent and harmonized well, whether that excellence was brought to life or squandered depended entirely on the skill or clumsiness of the person who boiled the water, thus one should pay careful attention to the boiling.¹³ In that passage he used expressions such as *kessei* (潔清: pure and clean) for particularly good water, terms that point to *sei*.

Additionally, the utensils used must be *sei*. At the end of the Senki (選器: On Choosing Utensils) section of the second volume of *Seifūsagen*, he wrote:

総て器物は分限に応じ。有に任すべし。素富の家には、珍奇を搜索めて。奢靡の情を恣にす。山林の士は。新匳を嫌はず。効用清潔を専らと択ぶべし。¹⁴

All utensils for sencha should be possessed and used in accordance with one's station. A well-off household pursues rare and unusual items and indulges in its taste for luxury. In contrast, a recluse in the mountains and forests, in other words, a literatus, need not dislike things simply because they are new or coarse and should choose them for practical utility and cleanliness. Conversely, when these conditions are lacking, the *sei* of sencha is lost. Obviously, the water must not be turbid, and the utensils must not be dirty.

However, in the Senpō (煎法: Methods of Brewing) section of *Seifūsagen*, Akinari admonished that drinking too much tea damaged its pure and elegant nature and was to be avoided.¹⁵ Concerning tea-tasting contests (*tōcha* 鬪茶), he wrote that concern with victory and defeat inevitably drew out vulgar feelings, making such contests little more than a nominal pastime, far removed from *seiga* (清雅: purity and elegance).¹⁶ Concerning utensils as well, he criticized ostentation as contrary to *sei*.

In the short piece “Cha wa sen o tōtoshi to su” (茶は煎を貴とす: Tea is best when steeped) (ca. 1807), Akinari drew attention to the difference in attitudes toward utensils between sencha and *chanoyu* (茶の湯: the tea ceremony or the preparation of powdered tea (matcha 抹茶)). He wrote that sencha practitioners delighted in newly made utensils because they accorded with the *seiin* (清韻: pure resonance) of the tea deity. In contrast, *chanoyu* practitioners, who vaunt rare utensils as being worth vast sums and pride themselves on having acquired them, stood outside *sei*. In itself, a rare object held within the bounds of an appropriately high status was harmless; however, when commoners imitated this taste and forgot their limits, even if they were wealthy, they would lose their properties and homes, and tea would be considered to “ruin people.” Their contests over utensils were at the level of gambling; hence, since the tea deity was *sei*, its purity was quickly damaged once it came into contact with *daku* (濁: turbidity). Nonetheless, even *chanoyu* practitioners, if they grasped this point and handled utensils in such a spirit, could pursue

¹³ “甘泉清流茶の三絶に和するとも。是を死活ならしむるは。煮る人の巧拙に有。能と意を用ふべき者也” (*Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 298–99).

¹⁴ *Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 304.

¹⁵ “客主の清雅多飲にあらず” (*Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 292).

¹⁶ “勝敗の気。必俗情を惹べし [...] 清雅ならぬ名目なるにておもふべし” (*Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 294).

a practice that was *sei*.¹⁷ (As discussed later, notably, *daku* is introduced as the term opposed to *sei*.)

The *sei* of sencha matters because it purifies the heart of the drinker. Akinari used the term *sumu* (澄む: clarity), which was synonymous with *sei*, in the postface to *Seifūsagen*:

津の国の蘆の八重ふき、朝なさな、すゝたれまさる真柴の烟よ。老か寐まとひく
さなるものから、あかでのみ春の木の芽をつみて煮て、心は秋の水とこそ澄め、
すむはこれか酔こゝちそとは、むへもむかしの人のいへりける。¹⁸

The mention of “Tsu no Kuni” (津の国), that is, Settsu (摂津), at the beginning indicates that *Seifūsagen* was written while Akinari was living in Awajishō in Osaka (the work was published after he had moved to Kyoto). As Sakata suggested in “Ueda Akinari to senchadō,” *sumu* functioned in Akinari’s waka on sencha as a near-synonym of *sei*. This is evident in, for example, the poem titled “Tōba mata iu, kamei kajin ni nitari” (東坡又云、佳茗似佳人: Su Shi further said that fine tea is like a worthy person)¹⁹ in volume 2 of his collection of prose and verse *Tsuzurabumi* (藤篋冊子, 1806). He wrote that he had heard it said that to be *sumu* and *kiyoshi* (清し: pure) was the constant nature of a good person, and this was nothing other than sencha, his ever-inexhaustible friend.²⁰

The postface to *Seifūsagen* quoted above means approximately the following: in the province of Settsu, reeds grow in many layers, and each morning smoke rises from the miscellaneous firewood whose soot hangs down. In this setting, old age clings to my body and will not leave it; yet I never tire of plucking spring buds and boiling them, and my heart becomes as clear as autumn water. This clarified heart is the state of intoxication, and it is only natural that people of old should have said as much.

Hence, this section confirmed how *sei* operates in *Seifūsagen*. It is employed as a term that indicates the nature of tea and extends to every element involved in brewing sencha, such as water

¹⁷ The summarized passage reads: “煎家は茶具新調を喜ふ。是茶神の清韻に叶ふへし。点家は珍器に其価巨万に代へ、吾獲たりと誇るは清からず。本是玩器は高貴の分上に於て、損害有へからず、庶民徴ひて分度を忘る。豪富といへとも、終に財崩れ家を失ふ。人の茶を損害すと云は是也。其あらしひや、博奕の徒に等し。茶神清なり、故に、濁に触るれば損害速かなり。点家亦此意を得て玩へは清し。東坡又云、佳茗似佳人。この句を味はひて、煎点いつれに遊ふとも可也。慎ますは有へからず” (*Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 393–94). The line “東坡又云、佳茗似佳人” derives from Su Shi’s poem “次韻曹輔寄壑源試焙新芽” and appears in works such as *Xu Chajing* (続茶経, early Qing) by Lu Tingcan (陸廷燦). The contrast between sencha and powdered tea, and the criticism of *chanoyu*, are found in Akinari’s other works and in Murase Kotei’s preface to *Seifūsagen*. However, from the perspective of the period, such criticism was not unique. See Shimamura Yukitada, “Rai Sanyō ni okeru chanoyu to sencha (Chanoyu and Sencha in Rai Sanyō),” *Ningen-Kankyōgaku*, vol. 29, Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies, Kyoto University, 2020, 63–75.

¹⁸ *Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 315.

¹⁹ “すむといひ清しと云もよき人の常とし聞けはあかぬ我友” (*Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 10, 114). For “東坡又云、佳茗似佳人,” see note 17.

²⁰ Another example is the waka titled “Cha o moteasobu hito ni shimesu” (茶を翫ふ人に示す: To Show to a Person Who Enjoys Tea) in which Akinari wrote: “酒に代て誰いにしへに遊びけんにごれる世にもすみてあらばや”, and in the colophon he added: “酒に酔へは濁りて泥の如し、茶に急へはすむ、仙に通すとや。さらば、清ます、にごらず、いつれにも酔はてあらまほし。我はすむと濁るのあひたに、とむかしもいひし人のありき” (*Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 294).

and utensils, and to the mental state of the drinker. The next section examines how this *sei*, thus understood, comes to be linked at the end of *Chakasuigen* with *sai* and *chi*.

2. *Sai* and *Chi*

The reasons for writing *Chakasuigen* are explained in section 1 of the variant version (the Seisō Bunko manuscript) as follows:

前の清風瑣言に云あやまち、且云漏し、又後来に見聞し話説を、此頃の朝茶の酔こゝちに云ん。煎、点共に、益有事は目をとゝめよ。無味の酔泣と思ふは、一煎の滓とゝもに棄去へし。²¹

Akinari wrote that *Seifūsagen* contained errors and omissions that he had later seen and heard in various stories and accounts. Hence, he decided to record them “in the intoxicated mood of my recent morning tea.” He added that, whether concerning sencha (sen 煎) or powdered tea (ten 点; i.e., *chanoyu*), if there was anything of benefit, the reader should take note; if one regarded the book as nothing but tasteless drunken rambling, then one might discard it with the dregs of a single infusion.

Chakasuigen points out several errors in *Seifūsagen*. This is because several sections of *Seifūsagen* were written with reference to Chinese tea treatises; therefore, some parts did not match Japanese realities.²² Moreover, the work introduced numerous anecdotes about tea, including *chanoyu* (tea prepared from powdered tea), and stories that seemed, at first glance, to have no direct relation to tea.

While correcting these factual errors, however, concerning *sei* (清) in *Chakasuigen*, Akinari followed the argument laid out in *Seifūsagen*. For example, with regard to the water used for tea, section 11 of the autograph manuscript stated that selecting the right water was crucial: even if one had good tea, if the water was not clear, it was as if there were no Bo Le (伯樂), the famed connoisseur of horses, to recognize a fine steed.²³ Regarding sencha utensils, section 17 noted that sencha practitioners routinely replaced their tea utensils because new utensils were appropriate for the clarity of the tea’s flavor and the clarity of the water.²⁴ The text included a

²¹ Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 354.

²² As this lies outside the scope of the present article, these sections have not been discussed in detail. For example, section 7 of the autograph reads: “前に清風瑣言と云書二編をあらはして論せしかと、其事皆西土の品種にて、こゝにあたらす。上品ありといへとも、たま／＼来たるは、名のみにて匱製也” (“Although I previously wrote and discussed tea in the two volumes of a book called *Seifūsagen*, the matters were all regarding varieties from the Western Land (China) and do not apply here (Japan). Even if high-quality tea exists there, what occasionally arrives here bears only the name and is coarsely produced.”) (Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 322). Section 10 of the variant reads: “清風瑣言に、雨も、秋雨、梅雨はよしと云しは、西土吳閩の地、美泉なき故に、雨水の甘重を喜ぶにつきて、筆あやまちし也” (“That I stated in *Seifūsagen* that regarding rain, autumn rain and the plum rains are good was a slip of the brush, written because in the regions of Wu and Min in the Western Land (China) there are no good springs, so they delight in the sweetness and heaviness of rainwater.”) (Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 361).

²³ “水のえらひ、大事也。茶ありとも水清からねは、伯樂なしのたくひ也” (Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 326).

²⁴ “煎茶家、茶具新調をもはらとす。茶味の清に宜しく、水の清に宜し” (Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 328).

waka that said that although one could escape the world's turbidity, by drinking sencha one could, for a moment, purify one's heart: “濁らしと世はのかれぬとすゝる茶にしはしは心すますはかりそ。”²⁵

Hence, *Chakasuigen* maintained the same stance on *sei* (and *sumu*) as *Seifūsagen*. However, it emphasized the connection between *sei* and *hin* (貧: poverty). For example, in section 14, drawing on *Genryū sawa* (源流茶話, early 18th c.) by Yabunouchi Chikushin (藪内竹心, 1678–1745), Akinari recounted an anecdote about careful attention to water shown by Tsuda Sōgyū (津田宗及, ?–1591). He mentioned:

煎、点ともに、水品をえらへとも、煎品はことに気を貴しとすれば、水よからねは品おとり、清韻消す。昔老かひとり言して云、真茶真水俱清味、貧必非清と自貧。清の字よし、とて一友かほめてくれし也。²⁶

Both sencha (sen 煎) and powdered tea (ten 点) require one to select the water quality. Sencha particularly values this, so if the water is not good, the quality of the tea declines and its pure resonance is lost. Once, in my old age, I muttered to myself: “True tea and true water both have a pure flavor. Poverty is not necessarily *sei*; but if one is *sei*, one will of itself be poor.” A certain friend praised this, saying that the character *sei* in the line was especially good.

In the variant text of *Chakasuigen*, the aforementioned one friend (*ichiyū* 一友) of this passage is rewritten as “a friend equally shabby and poor as myself.”²⁷ Therefore, one may consider the line “真茶真水俱清味、貧必非清と自貧” to reflect Akinari's circumstances as well. For example, above the poem-scroll *Shimoyuki no* (霜雪の, 1809),²⁸ one finds the line “冥福蔽天資 厄貧顕奇才。” According to Iikura Yōichi's *Ueda Akinari* (2012), this means that good fortune and wealth can conceal one's natural gifts, whereas misfortune and poverty can reveal *kisai* (奇才: extraordinary talent). He considered it “an expression by which Akinari looks back over his own life, one in which a strong sense of self-assertion can be felt.”²⁹

The contrast between sencha and powdered tea (*chanoyu*), observed in the preceding citation, is argued more explicitly toward the end of the autograph manuscript of *Chakasuigen*, beginning in section 59 and continuing through section 66, the final section, except section 64, which contrasts gold and coins. Of further interest to this study is that the *sai* (才) of the *kisai* is discussed there in sharp contrast to *chi* (智). The passage that takes sencha as its explicit topic appears in section 63:

²⁵ *Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 326.

²⁶ *Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 326.

²⁷ “同じ寒酸の友のよしと云し也” (*Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 363).

²⁸ On this poem-scroll, see Nippon Kinsei Bungakkai, ed., *Botsugo 100-nen kinen Ueda Akinari* (Ueda Akinari: Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of His Death), Nippon Kinsei Bungakkai, 2010, 67.

²⁹ Iikura 2012, 180. On the superiority of *hin* (poverty), see section 55 of the variant text of *Chakasuigen*: “義士烈女の世に名をのこせしを見れば、大かたは不幸の人となり。孝子は家に聞えて、富貴にあらはれず。噫、貧夫の富に勝ると云は、気介ある人の語なり” (“When we look at the righteous men and heroic women who have left their names to the world, we see that they were mostly unfortunate people. Filial children are known within their families, but do not appear among the wealthy and noble. Ah, the saying that a poor man surpasses the wealthy is truly the word of a person of spirit.”) (*Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 382).

煎品は才也。気花ありて、味薄し。点品は味こまやかにて、胸膈を塞ぎ、病をまうくる也。すゝめは病なし。とゝこほれは病む。才智兼備の人、いにしへより稀也。黄備公は才智兼備、菅公は才花としくおはせりき。³⁰

Sencha (senhin 煎品) is likened to *sai*. Its essence is flower-like of temperament, and its flavor is thin. In contrast, powdered tea (tenhin 点品) has a fine and dense flavor that clogs the chest and invites illness.³¹ When it is clear and flowing, there is no illness; when it stagnates, there is. People who combine *sai* and *chi* have been exceedingly rare since antiquity. Kibi no Makibi (吉備真備, 695–775; referred to as Kibi-kō 黄備公) was a man who possessed both *sai* and *chi*; Sugawara no Michizane (菅原道真, 845–903; referred to as Kan-kō 菅公) was richly endowed with *sai*.

In this passage, sencha and powdered tea, that is, *chanoyu*, are opposed. The former is associated with *sai* and described as *hana* (花: flower). No corresponding term is assigned to the latter. In the second half of the passage, the compound *saichi* (才智) refers to human capacities. The specific *sai* and *chi* possessed by the historical figures cited here are discussed in sections 59 through 61; therefore, this study briefly reviews those sections.

In sections 59 to 61, Akinari concretely contrasted *sai* and *chi* by referring to historical examples. Section 59 stated that “*sai* is *hana*, *chi* is *mi*” (才は花、智は実也: talent is a flower, strategic intellect is a fruit) and contrasted Prince Ōtomo (大友皇子, 648–72) with Emperor Tenmu (天武天皇, ?–686). Prince Ōtomo, regarded as an *eisai* (英才: outstanding talent), was said to have had his throne taken from him by Tenmu, the *chiraku no nushi* (智略の主: master of strategic intellect), who hid in Yoshino and waited for the right time to act. Section 60 noted that Prince Ōtsu (大津皇子, 663–86), who plotted rebellion under the instigation of the Silla monk Gyōshin (行心) in the Asuka period, was destroyed because he was biased toward *sai* and lacked *chi*. Section 61 similarly stated that the *sai* of Minamoto no Sanetomo (源実朝, 1192–1219) aroused the fear of Hōjō Yoshitoki (北条義時, 1163–1224) and led to his ruin. The contrasts between *sai* and *chi* are summarized in section 62:

才は花、智は実、むすひとゝめて、利益ある事まされり。才子はすゝみて陥し入らる。智者は静まりて、時を待て起る。故に、智者の才を兼たるも、智にこめられてあらはれぬるあり。³²

Sai is *hana* (花: flower), *chi* is *mi* (実: fruit). If the two are bound together, there is all the more benefit. People of *sai* are inclined to push forward; thus, they are easily ensnared. People of *chi* remain calm, wait for the opportune time, and then act. Accordingly, even when a person of *chi* possesses *sai*, it may remain hidden, contained within their *chi* and not visibly expressed.

³⁰ Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 328.

³¹ Section 38 of the autograph similarly stated: “点服胸膈を塞きて、弱壯には害あり。是気のみならず、味のこまかなるを服する故也” (“Drinking powdered tea clogs the chest and is harmful to the weak. This is not only due to its *qi*, but because one ingests its dense flavor.”) (Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 340).

³² Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 352.

Sections 65 and 66 read as follows:

才は強に似て弱、智は弱に似て強也。天稟なれば、各いかにせん。たゞ公朝をおそれて、才智の人と事をなせば、いたりては一般なるへし。³³

Sai appears strong but is in fact weak; *chi* appears weak but is in fact strong. As these are qualities bestowed by Heaven, there is nothing one can do about them. However, when people endowed with *sai* and *chi* act in fear of public authority, the result is something entirely ordinary.

才の清、智の濁、相叶はずして相交はる。是群に出し人となれば也。³⁴

The *sai* of a person is *sei* (清); the *chi* of a person is *daku* (濁). These two are originally qualities that do not harmonize, yet they mingle. Those who combine them are people who stand out from the crowd.

Summarizing Akinari's discussion of *sai* and *chi*, he conceives them as contrasting temperamental endowments with which people are born. On the one hand, *sai* is likened to *hana* – a flower that is charming but fragile, and, for that reason, easily destroyed. On the other hand, *chi* is likened to *mi* – a fruit that is interiorized, cautious, and inclined to bide its time. Those who possess both at once are rare (among the figures cited by Akinari, only Kibi no Makibi fits this description). Hence, up through section 65, the question of the superiority of *sai* or *chi* is left open.

However, in section 66, *sai* is explicitly identified with *sei* and *chi* with *daku*, and the center of value shifts toward *sai*. This is supported by section 54 of the variant version, which cites Prince Ōtomo, Prince Ōtsu, and Minamoto no Sanetomo as examples of people of *sai*, stating:

才の為に亡ふ人、和漢にあまた也。智者は時世をうかゞひて、容易に事をなさず。なせば成ると云は、思ひのふかきにつきて、世に媚、あしきにも交りて、己を立てる事をはかる。智者の恐しき事悪むへし。³⁵

Many people in Japan and China have perished because of their *sai*. A person of *chi* watches the times and does not undertake actions casually. When such a person acts and succeeds, it is because their calculations are deep; they flatter the world, associate with the wicked, and plot to establish themselves. One should indeed hate and fear such people of *chi*.

Here, while the fragility of *sai* as a quality that may destroy its possessor is acknowledged, *chi* is portrayed in a negative light as a calculating capacity that gauges the flow of time and, in the pursuit of success, curries favor and associates with bad people to secure self-advancement. This *chi*, skilled in profit and self-preservation, is regarded as a morally turbid quality, a valuation

³³ Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 353.

³⁴ Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 353.

³⁵ Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 382.

that resonates with the identification “*chi* = *daku*” in section 66. Hence, one may posit the following two opposed chains of equivalence:

sai (才) = *hana* (花) = *sei* (清) = *sencha* (煎茶)
chi (智) = *mi* (実) = *daku* (濁) = powdered tea (*matcha* 抹茶) / *chanoyu* (茶の湯)

On the side of *daku* (= powdered tea / *chanoyu*), one should recall the critique of ostentation in section 1 and the characterization in section 63 of powdered tea as a drink that prides itself on the subtlety and density of its flavor; however, it clogs the chest and becomes harmful when it stagnates.

Thus, even from *Chakasuigen*, it is evident that *chi* is repeatedly depicted as worldly calculation and scheming, and is therefore associated with *daku*, while *sai*, though dangerous and fragile, is placed on the side of *sei* and *sencha*. Reflecting on the historical figures discussed earlier, this structure suggests that the opposition between *sai* and *chi* is not merely conceptual but concerns a problem regarding one’s way of life. Nonetheless, it is difficult to see, from *Chakasuigen* alone, the extent to which *sai* can be positively affirmed, and how far Akinari accepted this valuation as a problem of his life. Hence, the next section examines other works, especially *Tandaishōshinroku* and Akinari’s “Jiden” (自伝: Autobiography, ca. 1808), for a deeper understanding of *sai* and *chi*.

3. *Kyōtō* as a Way of Life

The contrast between *sai* (才) and *chi* (智) presented at the end of the autograph manuscript of *Chakasuigen* appears in Akinari’s other writings as well. For example, section 106 of *Tandaishōshinroku* contains the following passage:

仏印は東坡とうるはしき友也しとそ。印、俗たる時、宮中の仏場のさかんなるを
 みよとて、東坡ニはかられて、侍者とやつして入内せしニ、帝、異相なる哉、法
 師ニなれ、とて、勅令によりて剃髪せしとそ。仏印の才は東坡にこへたり。論談
 辯説、是も東坡が敗をとりしに、智に斗られて、思ひかけなく僧となりしを思へ
 ば、智といふは大かた悪才也。³⁶

Fo Yin (仏印, 1032–1098) is said to have been a close friend of Su Shi (蘇軾, 1037–1101; referred to as Tōba 東坡). When Fo Yin was still a layman, Su urged him to go and see how flourishing the Buddhist hall in the palace was and arranged for him to enter the palace disguised as an attendant. The emperor, seeing him, exclaimed, “What an extraordinary-looking man! Shave his head and make him a Buddhist monk,” and had his hair shaven by imperial command. Fo Yin’s *sai* exceeded that of Su Shi. In debate and argument, he could even defeat Su, and yet, thinking how he was outmatched by Su’s *chi* and unexpectedly became a monk, one sees that what is called *chi* is, by and large, *akusai* (悪才: evil talent).

³⁶ Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 192–93.

According to Tokuda Takeshi (2012), this anecdote is based on “仏印為僧” in volume 9 of the *Dongpo Chanxiji* (東坡禪喜集).³⁷ However, Akinari reads the story through the lens of his own understanding of *sai* and *chi*. In the original tale, *sai* and *chi* do not appear as terms. Akinari, in contrast, adds that Fo Yin surpassed Su Shi in *sai* and asserted that Fo Yin became a monk through Su’s *chi* (the original does not state that Su’s intention played any role in Fo Yin’s ordination). In other words, to articulate his theory of *sai* and *chi*, Akinari reinterpreted Su’s action, which in the original story was presented merely as the witty suggestion of a friend, as a concrete example of *chi* as *akusai*, diverting Fo Yin’s life course.

This line of thought is repeated in section 157 of *Tandaishōshinroku*. The content of sections 59 through 61 of the autograph *Chakasuigen* is summarized, and Prince Ōtomo, Prince Ōtsu, and Minamoto no Sanetomo (“the Right Minister of Kamakura”) are said to have possessed *sai*; however, lacking *chi*, thus to have “scattered like flowers.” Akinari wrote:

才は花なれはもろくちり、実は智にて利益あるから、人を損害するなり。西土にても智者と云は必悪臣なり。³⁸

Since *sai* is like *hana* (花: flower), it easily falls to pieces. The *mi* (実: fruit) is like *chi*, and since *chi* brings benefit, it harms people as well. In China, people of *chi* are invariably bad ministers.

Thus, for Akinari, *sai* was a fragile flower that easily manifested outwardly as beauty and was easily destroyed. However, in terms of character, it was treated as something fundamentally desirable. *Chi*, in contrast, can bring success; however, due to its utilitarian quality, it is viewed in a negative light, as a capacity that can damage human relationships and political order. This evaluation is grounded in Akinari’s judgments about historical figures and is directed at his way of life. It is in relation to that way of life that the negativity of *chi* is articulated. In other words, criticism of *chi* is linked to an effort to reevaluate his existence in a positive light. For example, in his “Jiden,” one reads:

故郷をさり、六親をはなれ、産業なきものは、狂蕩の子と云。智略にて家をおこすも道にあらずと、聖人はをしへたまへりきとそ。智略なき性に心いらんよりは、狂蕩と呼ばれておのかまゝならんとて、かくて老くうつるまてはありけり。いと長物かたりなから、ふと筆にいはせて、心ゆかするなりけり。³⁹

One who leaves his native place, is estranged from his relatives, and has no occupation is called in the world a *kyōtō no shi* (狂蕩の子: a profligate individual defiant of the proper way). The sages, it is said, taught that even restoring one’s family through strategic *chi* is not the proper Way. In accordance with that teaching, rather than tormenting my *chi*-less nature, I resolved to

³⁷ Tokuda 2012, 279–282. See also *Ishikawa Jun zenshū* (The Complete Works of Ishikawa Jun), vol. 9 (Chikuma Shobō, 1962), 496–97.

³⁸ *Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 231–32.

³⁹ *Ueda Akinari zenshū*, vol. 9, 270–71. Similar statements appear in the self-preface to *Torō sasshi*, in the preface “Yomotsu-bumi” (よもつ文) in volume 6 of the same work, and in *Fumihōgo* (文反故).

let myself be called *kyōtō* and live as I pleased, and in this way I have passed my days until old age. It may be a rather superfluous tale, but having let my brush write this on an impulse, I feel my heart somewhat relieved.

As has long been pointed out in preceding scholarship, beginning with Sakai Kōichi (1959), this “Autobiography” was Akinari’s retrospective account of his life, cast in the following passage from the Tenzui chapter of the *Liezi* (列子):

晏子曰、善哉、古之有死也。仁者息焉、不仁者伏焉。死也者、德之徼也。古者謂死人為一為婦人、夫言死人為歸人、則生人為行人矣。行而不知歸、失家者也。一人失家、一世非之。天下失家、莫知非焉。有人、去鄉土、離六親、廢家業、遊於四方市不歸者、何人哉。世必謂之為狂蕩之人矣。又有人、鍾賢世、矜巧能、脩名譽、診張於世而不知己者、亦何人哉。世必以為智謀之士。此二者、胥失者也。而世與一、不與一。唯聖人知所與、知所去。⁴⁰

According to Yan Ying (晏嬰), the famed chancellor of Qi in the Spring and Autumn period, for the people of antiquity, death meant “returning” and life meant “journeying.” Yet people often go out on a journey and lose sight of where they ought to return, becoming those who have lost their homes. Those who leave their hometown, abandon their relatives, forsake their family business, and wander through the markets of the four directions without returning are called “people of *kyōtō*” by the world. Conversely, those who proudly display their talent and skill, pursue reputation, and spread their name through society by unceasing calculation are praised as *chibō no shi* (智謀之士: men of strategic intelligence). Yet these two kinds of people are alike in that both have lost sight of the proper way of living. To praise one and disparage the other is a mistake; only the sage knows which to accept and which to reject.

Akinari directly incorporated phrases such as “去鄉土、離六親、廢家業” from the Tenzui chapter of the *Liezi* into his “Autobiography.” However, this is not merely borrowing at the level of words; it aptly describes the course of his life. Although adopted into a prosperous merchant household, he did not succeed in carrying on the family business. His shop was destroyed in a fire, and he abandoned his subsequent medical practice and left Osaka, later taking up residence in Kyoto. He was bereaved of his wife of 40 years, and for roughly the last decade of his life he lived in honorable poverty, devoting himself to writing and sociability centered on sencha. Iikura (2012) aptly characterized this life as “each time he lost (or cast away) something, he gained something in return.”⁴¹

Chibō no shi are those who, relying on their intelligence and talent, rebuild their houses and make a name for themselves; the world normally holds them in high esteem. However, Akinari repeatedly stated in *Tandaishōshinroku* and *Chakasuigen* that he regarded *chi* as an *akusai* (悪才: evil talent) that often bound and harmed people. Therefore, he did not lament his lack of *chi*

⁴⁰ *Shinshaku Kanbun taikai*, vol. 22, 42–43.

⁴¹ Iikura 2012, 180; translation by the author.

as a deficiency; instead, he resolved, in his own words, to “let myself be called *kyōtō* and live as I please,”⁴² actively choosing a way of life as *kyōtō*, that is, a life of playful poverty.

For Akinari, *kyōtō* was not simple dissoluteness or hedonism; instead, it was a way of life that refused to bind itself by strategic *chi*. Given that in *Chakasuigen sai* is linked with *sei* and *chi* with *daku*, one may position *kyōtō* as a way of life that belonged on the side of *sei*. The “Autobiography” can be read as a concise self-portrait of someone who, while successively relinquishing worldly foundations, such as family business and social ties, aligns himself with *sencha* = *sai* = *sei* (清), relativizes *chanoyu* = *chi* = *daku* (濁), and deliberately chooses a form of life that accepts being called *kyōtō*.

This relates to the question of technical aspects of tea preparation in *Chakasuigen* and offers a new way of reading that part of the text. Section 35 of the variant version states:

藝技法式なきにはあらず。李笠翁の画□□、有法の極無法にかへれ、と云しは聞つへし。法に入りて其局中に生涯つなかれたらんは拙なり。有法をのかれて無法に帰する人ならずは、自己の逸楽は有るへからず。然とも、才なき人は無法にかへりかたければ、其藝技の奴となりて、有法に終るをとかむへからず。稟得たる性に習ふ事の相当らぬをいかにせむ。⁴³

Akinari noted that the arts and techniques (*geigi* 藝技) are necessarily grounded in *hōshiki* (法式: specific forms and methods). However, he cited the line “有法之極、歸於無法” from the painting manual *Jieziyuan Huazhuan* (芥子園画伝, 1679) by the late Ming–early Qing playwright Li Yu (李漁, 1611–1680), explaining that while it was necessary to enter a certain *hō* (法: method), it was clumsy to spend one’s life bound within its confines. That is, unless one acquired *hō* and escaped it to return to *muhō* (無法: methodless), one could not arrive at one’s *itsuraku* (逸楽: genuine delight). However, for those without *sai*, returning to *muhō* was difficult; hence, they became slaves to their art or craft and ended up spending their lives within *hō*. If the nature one has received from Heaven and the disciplines one has acquired after birth are ill-matched, there is nothing one can do.

This passage corresponds to section 36 of the autograph:

芸技法あり。李笠翁か、有法の極無法にかへる、と云しは宜し。初めより法なくは、次序乱りて興なし。法に繋がれて活動なきは、死物の業也。法を脱して無法に帰する事、其時にみて機あるへし。点茶家は是をのかるゝ事えせず。是を茶奴と云へし。⁴⁴

Compared with the variant, the autograph text explicitly names *chanoyu* practitioners (*tenchaka* 点茶家) as the target of criticism. *Chanoyu* practitioners, he said, were so attached to

⁴² Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 271.

⁴³ Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 370. □□ indicates an unclear portion in the original text.

⁴⁴ Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 339.

prescribed forms that they lacked any opportunity to “cast off method and return to non-method”; hence, they should be called *chado* (茶奴: slaves of tea).

The line from *Jieziyuan Huazhuan* cited here was favored and often quoted by Akinari, as can be seen in works such as *Reigotsū* (霊語通). According to Iikura (1980), in this context, *hō* corresponds to *watakushi* / *shi* (私: the private), meaning humanly imposed norms, while *muhō* is linked to *shizen* (自然: the natural), the ground that negates *watakushi* / *shi*.⁴⁵ A similar view is seen in the phrase in section 48 of the autograph *Chakasuigen*: “式といふ物に泥みて、天地に私する、風流の拙也。”⁴⁶ To wallow in prescribed forms (*shiki* 式, *hō* 法) and force the natural order to conform to one’s private purposes is, from the perspective of *fūryū* (風流: cultivated elegance), clumsy; true *fūryū* lies in casting off such forms and returning to *muhō*.

Thus, in Akinari’s view of technique, the presence or absence of *sai* becomes crucial. Those who possess *sai* can, having once acquired *hō*, go beyond it and return to *muhō*, enjoying their proper *itsuraku*. However, those who lack *sai* can only remain bound to *hō*; as slaves to their art, they are reduced to performing what is essentially the act of a lifeless entity. In light of the judgment in section 36 of the autograph that *tenchaka* (*chanoyu* practitioners) cannot escape this and are to be called *chado* (slaves of tea), it is clear that the object of criticism is *chanoyu* (powdered tea) as a practice attached to form.⁴⁷ This structure may be seen as a concretization, on the level of technique, of the equivalences presented at the end of *Chakasuigen*: *sai* = *hana* = *sei* = *sencha* / *chi* = *mi* = *daku* = powdered tea (*chanoyu*). Hence, *sencha* as *sei* appears as a realm of delight that is not reducible to technique or profit.

Conclusion

This article has reconsidered the central aesthetic concept of *sei* (清) in Akinari’s thought on *sencha* and, by reading *Chakasuigen*, a text that has received relatively little attention in previous scholarship, has sought to clarify the scope of that concept. Section 1 showed, through an examination of *Seifūsagen*, that *sei* is conceived as a multilayered notion that extends to the nature of tea, water, utensils, procedures, and the mental state of the drinker. Section 2 focused on the discussion at the end of *Chakasuigen* and confirmed that *sai* (才), likened to a flower and characterized as an outward-facing quality that is fragile even as it belongs to the side of *sei*, is contrasted with *chi* (智), which is linked to worldly calculation and the pursuit of status, thereby

⁴⁵ Iikura 1980, 49. Iikura explains Akinari’s notion of *watakushi* as follows: “The negative concept of *watakushi* that Akinari articulates can, for convenience, be divided into two types. The first is *watakushi* as a problem of political ethics; the second is *watakushi* as a problem of scholarship. As a problem of political ethics, *watakushi* [...] refers to the privatization of politics, where the corresponding *ōyake* / *kō* (公: the public realm) is *tenka* (天下: the world), conceived as an inviolable whole. As a problem of scholarship, *watakushi* denotes, simply put, arbitrary manipulation in textual interpretation” (Iikura 1980, 44; translation by the author).

⁴⁶ Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 344.

⁴⁷ Simultaneously, section 36 of the variant reads: “されは、人各性につきて好む所別なるは、己か志すかたにつきて、法局中を出て遊はん事、風流の拙をのかるゝ也。然共、才無くては、法に安居してあらん事、憎むべきにあらず” (Thus, since each person’s preferences differ according to their nature, following one’s own aspirations to venture *hōkyoku* (法局: outside the rules) and play freely is to escape the clumsiness of *fūryū* (風流). However, for those who lack *sai*, remaining content within the rules is not something to be hated.) (Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 371). Here, Akinari added the reservation that people were “not to be hated” when those who lacked *sai* simply remained content within the bounds of method.

positioned as an ethical *daku* (濁). In other words, the following approximate equations may be drawn: *sai* = *hana* = *sei* = *sencha* / *chi* = *mi* = *daku* = powdered tea (*chanoyu*). Section 3 turns to *Tandaishōshinroku*, the “Jiden,” and Akinari’s reception of the *Liezi* to show how this valuation of *sai* and *chi*, and *sei* and *daku*, is incorporated into an autobiographical narrative in which Akinari rejects the pursuit of name and profit through strategic *chi* and actively chooses a way of life labeled *kyōtō*. Simultaneously, drawing on the contrast between *sai*, as that which opens a path from *hō* (法) to *muhō* (無法), and the *chanoyu* practitioners, as *chado* (茶奴: slaves of tea) bound by prescribed forms, the study showed that the *sei* of *sencha* was conceived as a principle that encompassed both technique and life.

To bring this discussion to a close, let me turn to a well-known passage from section 69 of *Tandaishōshinroku*:

麦くたり、やき米の湯のんたりして、をしからぬ命は生た事しやか、書林かたのむ事をして、十両十五両の礼をとつて、十二三年は過したか、もう何もてきぬゆへに、煎茶のんて死をきわめている事しや。⁴⁸

Akinari sketches, with a mixture of cold laughter and resignation, an image of himself in old age: having sustained his life on barley gruel and hot water made from roasted rice, scraping by for a dozen years on the 10 or 15 ryō (両) he received in remuneration from bookshops, and no longer able to earn anything, simply drinking *sencha* as he approaches death. However, *sencha*, for Akinari, embodied *sei* and was tightly bound with the contrast between *sai* and *chi*, the choice of *kyōtō* (狂蕩) as a way of life, and his reflections on technique concerning *hō* and *muhō*. Hence, the phrase “drinking *sencha* and bringing death to its limit (煎茶のんて死をきわめている事しや)” is not a mere throwaway line of self-mockery. Rather, it should be read as another way of expressing his resolve to live his life within the *sei* of *sencha*, keeping his distance from worldly *chi* and interest. By making *sencha* his companion to the end of his life, Akinari sought to affirm his way of life, accepting the stigma of being called *kyōtō*. For those of us living today where rationality, which in some sense seems to lead to a way of life based on *chi*, is required, such a way of life held by Akinari and other early modern literati, which might be called an “aesthetics of existence,” may offer a reflection on our own existence.

References

- Iikura, Yōichi. 1980. “Akinari no ‘watakushi’ no setsu ni tsuite (On Akinari’s Theory of the ‘Private’),” in *Gobun Kenkyū* 50, 43–51.
- Iikura, Yōichi. 2005. *Akinari ko* (Studies on Akinari). Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō.
- Iikura, Yōichi. 2012. *Ueda Akinari: Kizuna to shite no bungei* (Ueda Akinari: Literature as Bond). Osaka: Osaka University Press.
- Ishikawa, Tadahisa. 2011. *Cha o utau shi: “Eichashiroku” shokai* (Poems Singing of Tea: A Detailed Commentary on “Eichashiroku”). Tokyo: Kenbun Shuppan.
- Kobayashi, Nobuaki, ed. 1967. *Shinshaku Kanbun taikai* (New Annotated Corpus of Classical

⁴⁸ Ueda Akinari *zenshū*, vol. 9, 173.

- Chinese Texts), vol. 22. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Liang, Xuzhang. 2021. *Nihon kinsei senchasho no kenkyū: Kanseki juyo to bunjin shumi no tenkai o chushin ni* (A Study of Early Modern Japanese Treatises on Sencha: The Reception of Chinese Texts and the Development of Literati Taste). Doctoral dissertation, Hitotsubashi University.
- Morita, Kirō. 1979. *Ueda Akinari no kenkyū* (Studies on Ueda Akinari). Tokyo: Kasama Shoin.
- Morita, Kirō. 2003. *Ueda Akinari bungei no kenkyū* (Studies in Ueda Akinari's Literary Art). Osaka: Izumi Shoin.
- Sakai, Kōichi. 1959. *Ueda Akinari*. Tokyo: San'ichi Shobō.
- Sakai, Kōichi. 1963. "Akinari no kyōto to *Ressi* to no kankei (Akinari's 'Kyoto' and Its Relation to the Liezi)," in *Ronkyū Nihon Bungaku*, vol. 21, 38–42.
- Sakata, Motoko. 1963. "Ueda Akinari to senchadō (Ueda Akinari and the Way of Sencha)," in *Joshi Dai Kokubun*, vol. 31, 62–76.
- Takada, Mamoru. 2012. *Teihon Ueda Akinari kenkyū josetsu* (A Definitive Introductory Study of Ueda Akinari). Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.
- Tokuda, Takeshi. 2012. *Akinari zengo no Chugoku hakwa shosetsu* (Chinese Vernacular Fiction before and after Akinari). Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan.
- Tsukuda, Ikki. 1999. "'Kyo-zoku' to 'sei': Ueda Akinari no sencha-bi ni tsuite ('Kyo-zoku' and 'Sei': On Ueda Akinari's Aesthetics of Sencha)." In Kumakura, Isao and Tanaka, Hidetaka, eds., *Chadō bunka-ron* (Essays on the Culture of the Way of Tea). Chadōgaku taikai, vol. 1, 289–312. Kyoto: Tankōsha.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows, Grant Number 23KJ2143.