

Introduction to Art Archive XXVIII:

# In the Shadows: The Obscure World of Hijikata Tatsumi's Choreography

Multilingual Version

2026. 1. 19 - 3.14

Keio University Art Center (1F Keio University Mita Campus South Annex)

アート・アーカイヴ資料展 XXVIII

幽暗 Shadow World —— 朦朧と立ち上がる土方巽の振付世界

多言語対応版

Fifty years ago, in 1976, butoh founder Hijikata Tatsumi created a series of performances at his studio, Asbestos-kan, which went alongside the creation of his choreographic language, “butoh-fu.” It was during this period that his disciples gradually began to establish their independence from Hijikata. This exhibition provides an overview of the trajectory of Hijikata’s creative activities from 1976 to 1978. Specifically, it focusses on three works: *Costume in Front* (1976), *Bitter Light* (1977) and *First Flower* (1978). These performances were choreographed using Hijikata’s unique, poetic, and imagistic notational language, or “butoh-fu.” Behind the movements visible on stage lie countless “invisible words” exchanged between Hijikata and his dancers.

This exhibition shines a light on specific movements associated with the image of “ghosts” (*yurei*) to illuminate Hijikata’s creative process. Figures of ghosts drifting between life and death—such as the “ghost ascending stairs,” the “ghost holding a child,” and the “ghost looking back”—frequently appear in Hijikata’s choreography, becoming existences that manifest and vanish on the stage.

The exhibition title, *Yuan* (Dim Darkness), is a term Hijikata himself used in his butoh-fu. We hope that by listening closely to Hijikata’s words—which exist vaguely yet surely within a dark and faint space—a conversation with the “ghosts” of Hijikata Tatsumi’s butoh can begin to take place.

The opportunity to present the precious butoh-fu notebooks on view in this exhibition was made possible through the cooperation of Kobayashi Saga, Yamamoto Moe, Seisaku, and the family of the late Waguri Yukio. We express our deepest gratitude to all of these individuals. We also sincerely thank everyone who provided advice and assistance. We hope this exhibition serves as a meaningful opportunity to encounter the archives that preserve the traces of Hijikata’s life and the materials within them.

Keio University Art Center

# Hijikata Tatsumi's Butoh-fu

## Coding of Designing without Thought

Takashi Morishita

It is only possible to discuss a small portion of Hijikata Tatsumi's "butoh-fu". Reading it, it can seem as though one is only skimming the surface of Hijikata's thoughts, inspirations, and creative practices. All the same, Hijikata Tatsumi Archive has consistently presented collected materials and research findings related to this butoh-fu. It has also had the pleasure of supporting researchers from Japan and abroad to publish the results of their archival research on this material. This essay offers some key information and provisional insights as a reference for the exhibition, while accepting that there are limitless further things to be said of Hijikata's butoh-fu.

### Before Butoh-fu

It is impossible to know exactly when Hijikata began conceiving of butoh-fu. In 1968, he performed his famous solo work, Hijikata Tatsumi and the Japanese: *Rebellion of the Body*. Throughout the 1960s leading up to this performance, Hijikata shared the stage with dancers like Ohno Kazuo, Ohno Yoshito, Kasai Akira, Ishii Mitsutaka, and Takai Tomiko. This period launched a movement that established butoh as a performance form.

Following *Rebellion of the Body*, these established dancers no longer participated in Hijikata's activities. It could be argued that he intentionally excluded those who helped found butoh in order to pursue a "new Butoh". He carried forward only Tamano Koichi and Ashikawa Yoko, who had been living at Asbestos-kan prior to 1968.

In August 1968, just before his seminal work *Rebellion of the Body*, Hijikata staged a solo performance for Ashikawa Yoko. Her debut solo recital entitled *The First Recital by Ashikawa Yoko: Towards Violette Nozière, a Friend on Board the D53264, the Landscape Constantly Receding / Butoh Maiden Yoko on Board the PACIFIC 231* was a chaotic affair. It was unclear whether it even constituted 'dance,' and it is said that Hijikata himself joined her onstage amidst the confusion at one point.

It may be that this experience spurred the initial conception of butoh-fu as a method to choreograph dancers who lacked formal training.

### The Beginning of Butoh-fu

Following *Rebellion of the Body*, Hijikata became a media icon, appearing in films, the Osaka 'Expo, and mainstream magazines. While he became a leader of the underground, young people began flocking to Asbestos-kan. Dancers who would later achieve global fame, such

as Murobushi Ko and Yamada Bishop, first arrived at his studio during this period. Hijikata produced small performances at the Shinjuku venue “Art Village,” which gave these dancers experience.

Whatever his strategy may have been, it is clear that Hijikata was determinedly pursuing the creation of a new form of butoh. The foundation for this was butoh-fu. However, since no physical records of butoh-fu from this early period have been preserved as archival material, we cannot introduce them in concrete detail. At the time, they likely existed only within Hijikata’s own mind and had not yet taken a definite physical form. Or perhaps the ‘movements’ themselves were still in a rudimentary and primitive stage.

As a relevant reference, I would like to point to Tsuji Nobuo’s “Lineage of Eccentricity <9> Jakuchu Ito: Avant-garde in Edo” (*Kiso no Keifu*), published in the October 1968 issue of *Bijutsu Techo*. This seminal essay sparked the subsequent Ito Jakuchu boom, and Hijikata followed the serialization closely. When one thinks of Jakuchu, one thinks of roosters and roosters are recurrent in Hijikata’s butoh. It is said that Jakuchu kept ‘dozens of chickens under his window’ to sketch them incessantly. Hijikata himself had also been in close contact with chickens since his childhood at his family home in Akita.

Hijikata Tatsumi studied Tsuji Nobuo’s *Lineage of Eccentricity* (*Kiso no Keifu*) in great depth. He underlined a passage that described ‘the repetition of forms in the [rooster’s] combs, reminiscent of red demon stars... deformed like the roosters drawn by Picasso,’ and added his own comment: ‘Necessary’.

Even if Jakuchu had abandoned strict realism, Hijikata did not merely trace external physical forms. When Tsuji characterized these as internal images evocative of surrealism, Hijikata a surrealist himself undoubtedly felt a profound connection. It is undeniable that Hijikata’s choreography for one particular work from this period, *Gibasa*, was directly inspired by Jakuchu’s art.

## New Dance, New Dancers

In the 1960s, Hijikata Tatsumi’s ‘Butoh’ might be thought of as an ‘anti-dance.’ While it could be described as employing methods akin to ‘happenings,’ he was ultimately pursuing butoh as a new form of dance precisely by refusing dance. This approach allowed for successful collaborations with avant-garde artists and musicians of the time.

Subsequently, Hijikata Tatsumi composed and directed works for Takai Tomiko and Ishii Mitsutaka, who were trained dancers. Through these collaborations, he began presenting his imaginary world in the form of a “narrative,” marking a significant transition from “anti-dance” to “dancing butoh.” These productions served as the prelude to his seminal work, *Rebellion of the Body*:

The shift toward “dancing butoh” provoked criticism from some, and a departure from his avant-garde musical collaborators. Hijikata moved forward from this point through separating from his former collaborators, including dancers, visual artists, and musicians.

Whether or not he was prepared for what followed, Hijikata certainly set out to pursue his next ‘new dance’. This new dance could be seen, depending on how you look at it, as a revival rather than an innovation.

By around 1970, there were only about ten dancers who could be called “Butoh

dancers (Butoh-ka)". Aspiring dancers had to choose between Hijikata's Asbestos-kan or Kasai Akira's Tenshikan. These two studios practiced completely different styles: Asbestos-kan bound dancers to Hijikata's choreography, which involved a relinquishment of their individual egos, while Tenshikan allowed for an improvisational expressivity that sought the unification of body and spirit. At that time, any idea of moving back and forth between the two studios – Asbestos-kan and Tenshikan – was strictly out of the question. It was an absolutely binary choice between the two.

Around this time, a steady stream of young people aspiring to become butoh dancers began knocking on the doors of Asbestos-kan. Almost none of them had any prior dance experience. Even the two who had joined the training early on but tragically died in an unexpected fire were students who had come to Tokyo from the provinces without any training in dancer. Yamada Bishop and Murobushi Ko, who showed up at the studio after witnessing *Rebellion of the Body*, were also entirely new to dance.

Kobayashi Saga, who arrived around the same period and immediately began communal living, had studied modern dance briefly in Nagoya, but she was still early on in her training. She had first visited Tenshikan, but after being encouraged by Kasai Akira to go to Asbestos-kan, she began her journey into butoh there instead.

Before actually experiencing butoh dance itself, these newcomers found themselves appearing in feature films alongside Hijikata or performing in show dances. In this way, they were gradually swept up into the vortex of the 'new butoh' that Hijikata was beginning to conceive, or rather, beginning to explore.

### The Practice of Butoh-fu

Hijikata began by having his dancers move into his rehearsal space, Asbestos-kan, where they lived a communal life to fully immerse themselves in dance. Alongside daily lessons, he produced regular performances at small venues and show clubs, which gave them experience of performing in front of an audience.

As Hijikata prepared for a major 1972 production, more dancers gathered and he began to work with butoh-fu. Following this, a theater was established within the studio itself, which housed the Hakutobo serial performances (*renzoku kôen*) from 1974 to 1976, during which time the volume of butoh-fu increased exponentially. Movements became more intricate and technical. At some point, Hijikata made the assertion: 'butoh is technique'. So it was that during this period, the 'butoh of butoh-fu' moved toward its definitive completion.

This butoh-fu is not like a musical score neatly codified by notes. Though termed both a 'notation' and a 'score,' it contains neither 'diagrams' to specify body movements nor 'staves' to mark the passage of time. Most of the materials we call butoh-fu consist of clippings of illustrations from art books or lists of poetic words.

When referring to 'butoh-fu', I am describing the following materials:

**Scrapbooks:** 16 extant volumes containing clippings of Western and Japanese paintings (e.g., Bacon Francis, Bellmer Hans, de Kooning Willem) categorized by themes like "Animals," "Flowers," or "Nerves". The scrapbook titled "Avalanche Candy" is the only one whose title matches an actual work by Hijikata.

**Script Sheets:** These consist mainly of B4-sized paper, with approximately thousands

sheets currently preserved. Many of these sheets record the names of ‘movements’ and are written as either memoranda or as structured scripts for specific productions. Some explicitly specify a particular work, while others appear to have been created for specific performers. Illustrations for movements and costumes are also included. While the majority were written by Hijikata Tatsumi himself, some portions were recorded by his disciples.

**Notebooks:** Notes kept by disciples during rehearsals, listing movement names and sketches of poses as instructed by Hijikata. Some were written during lessons, while others were organized and summarized afterward.

## The Creation of Movement and Establishment of the Method

For dancers with no prior experience, Hijikata began by teaching simple movements, such as those inspired by the movements of animals like cows or simple distorted facial expressions. This was a stage he described in terms of movements that were “stamp-like,” which did not yet require the use of *butoh-fu*.

Hijikata developed and gave form to specific movements in reference to paintings. Later, he also drew on poetry and haiku as sources for movements. When teaching these movements to his disciples, he would sometimes present them with printed reproductions of paintings.

Looking at the scrapbooks, one can see that figurative paintings depicting human bodies were initially used, specifically works by Abstract Expressionist and Surrealist artists. Artists such as Bellmer Hans, Bacon Francis, and de Kooning Willem were among Hijikata’s preferences during this period, as their works clearly captured the human body in its “transformation”.

Gradually, he began to make use of more landscapes and abstract paintings that did not feature human figures, such as works by Turner William and Michaux Henri. Hijikata’s specific perspective and intention in choosing these paintings for movement became less explicit, and the resulting dances began to appeal directly to the dancer’s nerves and sensations.

Turning to the script sheets, “movements” were codified using words. These codes were remarkably diverse, ranging from movements named after the painters themselves and direct descriptions of paintings, to those named through metaphor or metonymy.

From 1972 onwards, and especially between 1974 and 1976, Hijikata intensively created movements. Through his serial performances, which entailed the creation of multiple new works, numerous movements were born. While it is possible to definitively count over a thousand, it is easy to imagine that the total number well exceeds three thousand.

The following is an outline of the process from the creation of a “movement” to its eventual consolidation in language:

1. **Creation:** The development of a “movement” by Hijikata.
2. **Encoding:** Codification into language by Hijikata.
3. **Codebook:** The recording of Hijikata’s words by his disciples.
4. **Embodying:** The embodiment and transformation into “movement” by his disciples.
5. **Text:** The transcription of the embodied words by his disciples.

Hijikata created his *butoh* method through generating an immense number of such ‘movements’. The ‘movements’ which were held in dancers’ bodies by Hijikata were ‘bridged’

and then ‘chained’ to compose dance sequences and scenes. Although any one dance was created through combinations (sequences) of these codified ‘movements’ as minimal units, the possible combinations were virtually infinite given the sheer volume of movements themselves.

Ultimately, this process established the ‘butoh of butoh-fu’ methodology, producing a systematic framework for the creation of butoh. Hijikata’s butoh was produced through the integration of body, space, and time based on this method. Hijikata took command of every element, from lighting to stage design, to music and costumes. He did not compromise on any one of these aspects in establishing butoh as an exceptional performing art form.

### Analyzing the “Butoh of Butoh-fu”

Analyzing Hijikata’s method is made difficult by the fact that the archival materials often contain only fragmentary language. Hijikata sought to turn all phenomena of the universe into dance. Everything from humans as biological creatures to a diverse range of animals, plants, and man-made objects, as well as natural phenomena and even abstract representations became sources for ‘movements.’ As Hijikata once suggested, one must know all creation even for a single dance. Movements were not fixed but changed depending on the space or background of each dance. While ‘movements’ were codified, they were not fixed. When performed through the different conditions Hijikata provided – such as space, environment, and background – they manifested as a diverse array of movements, which might even be said to connect with the realm of the subconscious.

The relationship between Hijikata and his dancers is also elusive. It was literally that of master and disciple – essentially one in which the disciple accepted the master’s words without question or doubt.

Hijikata’s disciples had no choice but to discard their own creative desires and impulses – in order to follow Hijikata’s choreography and direction without compromise. It is unclear whether this left any room for improvisation, but either way butoh was never stable and fixed for Hijikata’s disciples.

In order to elucidate the ‘butoh of butoh-fu,’ one must begin to decode codified ‘movements’ in order to phenomenologically explore the meaning of Hijikata’s creative materials, his world view, the structure of his thoughts, and the grounds of his expressivity. To do so, it is necessary to conduct an investigation based on the ‘language’ corpus of Hijikata’s script sheets as ‘signifiers’ which correspond to a matrix of ‘movements’ or ‘signifieds’, that are mediated through the bodies and psychology of his butoh dancers.

In order to do so, Hijikata Tatsumi Archive executed a project called the ‘Movement Archive,’ where Butoh dancers who had received butoh-fu from Hijikata (Waguri Yukio and Yamamoto Moe) restored the ‘movements,’ which were then recorded on video.

### Bricolage, or the Performative Power of *Kotodama*

In creating dance based on butoh-fu, Hijikata moved away from ideology and the idea of an individual consciousness. He pursued the idea that ‘butoh is technique,’ which involved a commitment to ‘chance’ but not improvisation. He discarded ideology and instead adopted

a vast number of movement codes, seeking expression through a signifiatory system rather than through ideology. His extraordinary stage designs and costumes were also produced through an idea of ‘design’ without ideological baggage.

One way to view this, is that Hijikata’s butoh works were created based on a structure and method that aligned with structuralism – a movement which was becoming influential in Japan at the time. His expression is similar to the ‘bricolage’ approach influenced by structuralism, which uses signs rather than concepts as its material. ‘Bricolage’ proposes a kind of ‘magical’ method that might be useful for considering Hijikata’s butoh-fu: it can be seen as a collection of movements held together in a ‘bricolage’-like structure.

It is also worth noting that Hijikata once placed the characters for ‘Norinaga’ on Ohno Kazuo’s back and made him stand on stage during the 1965 production *Rose-Colored Dance*. The association with Motoori Norinaga, a ‘linguist,’ conjures a belief in the spirit of words (*kotodama*) passed down from ancient times. Norinaga’s investigation begins with the discovery of a coterminous relationship between ‘words’ and ‘things’. Looking at the triangular structure of *kotodama* consisting of ‘word,’ ‘thing,’ and ‘meaning,’ there is a correlation with the structure of butoh-fu. Add to this Hijikata’s live ‘voice’ during the teaching process, and one might detect a sense of hidden verbal magic which induces further ‘movements’.

Above all, Hijikata’s words for Butoh did not merely prompt ‘expression’ on stage; it is certain that they existed as a magical power that shook the very ‘existence’ of butoh dancers. In 1976, as the Hakutōbō performance series concluded, Hijikata Tatsumi appeared to have established a coherent method grounded in the accumulation of signs. Rather than ending his inquiry, he continued to test this method with different dancers and contexts.

This late phase of experimentation coincided with the serialization of ‘La Danseuse Malade’ (*Yameru Maihime*). Beginning with his 1972 performance based on Butoh-fu notation and culminating in the book *Yameru Maihime*’s completion, Hijikata articulated a new critical threshold of Butoh, ultimately withdrawing into the Asbestos-kan.

\*\*\*

Among the materials at Asbestos-kan is a copy of a book on Labanotation with the character “Tatsumi” written on the cover, suggesting it belonged to Hijikata. When did Hijikata look at this book on Labanotation? It seems likely to have been during his modern dance period.

While it would be fascinating to know how Hijikata viewed or evaluated Labanotation, no record of his words on the subject remain. For reference, however, it is worth noting why Laban created Labanotation in the first place:

‘Laban’s primary purpose in creating a notation system was political. In order to lift dancers from the lower strata of the arts, he believed that dance, like other arts, must possess its own written language. He believed that dance must have its own literature, inherit a legacy, and overcome its ephemeral nature’ (Valerie Preston-Dunlop, ‘Laban’s Theory,’ *Keio University Art Center Booklet 10: Capturing the Body – Genealogy of Expressionist Dance*, Keio University Art Center, March 2003).

Some suggest, however, that as soon as he published Labanotation in 1928 – having finally solved the problem of a universal notation for movement through great effort – Laban lost interest in it. This was because he had abandoned his own beliefs regarding the true

nature of dance for the sake of methodology.

The comparison with Laban has particular implications when considering the ‘butoh of butoh-fu,’ including when it comes to its practical application.



◀ Link to *1972 Bacon Teki*

# Traces of a Live Language

## 生きた言語の痕跡

ローザ・ヴァン・ヘンスパーゲン

### The “Phantasmagoric Body” of Butoh – 舞踏の「変幻自在な体」

1970年代初頭から、舞踏の創始者である土方巽は、自らの踊りを振り付けるための言語を開発し始めました。本展で焦点を当てる1976年から1978年の連続公演の時期にかけて、彼はすでにその言語を「舞踏譜」として洗練させています。そして、この時期の公演は、舞踏譜を用いて緻密に振り付けられています。しかし公演映像を見ても、動きはしばしば最小限で曖昧、動きとして判別できないほどであり、どのように振り付けられたかを想像するのは困難です。ましてや、それらが広範かつ詳細な記譜法を用いて振り付けられたとは、想像もつかないでしょう。

スクラップブックやスクリプトシートという形で土方アーカイヴに保存されている舞踏譜は、土方が1970年代に生み出した膨大な数の「動き」を示しています。これらの資料の多くは、イメージ豊かな言語の列と、それに対応するドローイングで埋め尽くされています。「幽霊」に関連する動きのように、何度もページに登場する振付がある一方で、一度しか現れない動きも数多く存在します。これは土方がそれぞれの弟子や作品のために、集中して新しい動きをどのように生成していたかを明示しています。他のダンス、またはある程度舞踏の訓練を受けたダンサーでも、舞踏譜資料を手にとって、ページに記された動きを踊ることはできません。記譜の量が圧倒的であるため、記憶の欠落と共に失われた動きも確かにあるでしょう。しかしそれ以上に、特定の弟子や作品のために新しい動きが絶えず創り出されていたため、ある弟子が別の弟子によって記録された振付を踊るのですら困難を極めるのです。

土方アーカイヴに所蔵されている舞踏譜は、ほんの一部に過ぎません。1970年代に土方とともに活動した舞踏家たちの多くも、独自の資料を保存し、生成し続けています。それらには、土方の元で活動している間に作成されたノート、稽古場を離れた直後に整理されたノート、そして弟子たちが学んだことを理解し直す中で、何年も後に再編・記述されたノートが含まれます。こうした作業として最も広範に公開された例は、特定のイメージ世界を形成し、自らの舞踏譜レパートリーを整理した和栗由紀夫によるものです<sup>1</sup>。この拡張された舞踏譜アーカイヴは、それを作成した舞踏家たちと共に、現在も成長し、変容し続けているとも言えます。

### Unfixing Butoh-fu – 舞踏譜を固定解除する

森下隆が記しているように<sup>2</sup>、舞踏譜とは、「記号化」でありながらも「固定化」されていないものでした。そして、土方が弟子それぞれのために新しい踊りを開発するにつれて、絶えず進化し変容していきました。「譜」は書き記したものを指しますが、舞踏譜の場合、それは実際に使用される「生きた」方法の中で理解される必要があります。舞踏譜が伝えるイメージと同程度に、抑揚、擬音、リズムといった音声的な要素を通じてダンサーの身体を導いていく言語です。これらは、稽古が行われるスタジオという空間と時間に根ざして生成されています。その場にいる弟子の数、弟子たちの身体、そしてその間を動く土方の身体、そしてある特定の日における「状態」など、こうした局所的な偶然性によって創られたのです。弟子たちは、いつ動きや振付を書き留める時間があったのか。彼らはすべてを書き留めることができたのか、それとも細部を見落としたのか。土方が演出する際に指示した注意や指示を書き残せたのか。土方がカットすると決めた動きを、忘れずに消すことができたのか。

舞踏譜とその制作条件との関係は、直感的に思えるかもしれませんが、確かに、いかなるダンスの記譜も振付家とダンサーの間で生み出されるものであり、ゆえに生身のダンス空間の偶然性に左右されるものではないでしょうか。振付家にとっては、記

譜言語が「生きた」ダンスを扱う、それ以外の方法で役立つことはないでしょう。しかし社交ダンスやバレエのような西洋の舞踊、その歴史において記譜法は、この点であまり機能しているとは言えないのです。フランソワ・ブイヨードが述べているように、「ダンスの記譜システムがダンスの実践と真に統合されたことは、歴史的な瞬間を見てもほとんどありませんでした。現在でも、ラバナーテーションやベネチッシュ式記譜法などのスコアを書くこと、あるいは読むことすら、習得したダンサーや振付家のごくわずかです<sup>3</sup>」。ブイヨードが普及している記譜法は、劇場で行われる西洋の舞踊において最も広く使われているシステムです<sup>4</sup>。これらはいずれも、「対面での伝達」を通じてすでに作成・伝達された振付を、緻密に記録するために使用される記述システムです<sup>5</sup>。舞踏譜とは異なり、それらは「対面での伝達」の痕跡というよりも、専門の「記譜家」が訓練され、彼らが存在し続ける限り解読可能である、つまり抽象化・体系化された言語を通じてダンスを歴史的に保存するための手段なのです。

舞踏譜は回顧的なものではなく、土方の舞踏の創造にとって不可欠なものでした。舞踏手は、舞踏譜を自らの身体と統合してゆくために、数ヶ月、数年かけて稽古を積み重ねます。稽古を経た舞踏家の絶えず変容し続ける身体なしには、舞踏譜は存在しません。舞踏家のSU-ENは、芦川羊子の元での長年の稽古を振り返り、次のように述べています。「舞踏における言葉は、身体から発するリアリティと踊ることへ向けた扇動から生まれます。(中略)規律を持った段階を経ることで、やっと新しい振付やその準備が整います。言葉と身体が融合して初めて、舞踏が存在するのです<sup>6</sup>」。SU-ENの言葉は、舞踏の創造に必要な「言葉と身体」の結びつきを思い出させてくれます。舞踏譜という書かれた言語には、最初に創り出された際の身体、すなわち土方と芦川の身体、そしてそれを具現化することで継承し続ける舞踏手たちの身体が宿っています。土方が亡くなった後も、彼の言語は生きている弟子たちの身体に宿り続けます。土方や芦川に学んだ正朔は、近著『舞踏馬鹿』の中で土方の舞踏譜を記録しています。その舞踏譜は、40年経った今も彼の身体の中に残り、彼が「舞踏体」と呼ぶものを生み出しています。正朔は次のように書いています<sup>7</sup>。

そんなことをしているうちに  
すではっきりした体の輪郭への意識など、消えてしまっています  
空間に滲み出た変幻自在な体  
それを舞踏体と呼びます

舞踏の「変幻自在な (phantasmagoric) 体は、舞踏譜という言語を通じてのみ現れます。本展は、その「変幻自在な体」を呼び起こそうとする試みなのです。

## Workshopping Butoh-fu—舞踏譜のワークショップ

2025年に「Butoh Scores Mexico」として開催されたワークショップにおいて、舞踏家の山本萌は、金沢舞踏館の白柳ケイとともに、1976年に遡る山本のノートを用いて指導を行いました<sup>8</sup>。このノートは、土方が中嶋夏のために振り付けた作品《アスベスト館 4月公演・嬋嬢大踏鑑》作品No.13〈それはこのような夜だった〉(1976年)の稽古中に作成されたもので、舞踏譜がいつか創られ、修正され、そして決定されていったか、そのプロセスを明らかにしました。

最初のページは、「ハクセイのクジャクと花の合体」というイメージから始まり、その後に関わり合いのイメージを決定しています<sup>9</sup>。これらはいずれも舞踏譜の語彙によく現れる動きですが、全ての舞踏手が同じように踊る安定した形態ではありません。「クジャク」は、わずかに踵を上げた立ち姿で、身体の後ろに伸びるクジャクの尾と、頭の上に立ち上がる冠羽を意識することを含みます。「花」は、花びらを手や腕を使って一枚ずつなぞったり、身体の内部でなぞったりします。しかし、いずれの場合も正確な形、例えば花びらが何枚あるかといった細部は弟子ごとに異なり、土方が振付ごとに、あるいは時間の経過と共に動きを修正・変容させていったこと、またそれぞれの弟子が動きを吸収し、「自分自身の」舞踏の形態として再現していった結果を反映しています。後のページと同様に、最初のページは消されたり修正されたりした舞踏譜を含んでおり(一部は後半で再度登場)、土方が振付を試行錯誤し、修正していった様子を再現しています。

2ページ目では、「クジャク」のイメージが「ハクセイのシギ3羽」へと変容、あるいは進化し、その後に関わり合いのイメージが「飛ぶ鳥」、さらに後には「金属の鳥」が続くことが明らかになります<sup>10</sup>。3羽のシギのイメージは、山本が土方の稽古場にいた時代に学んだもので、ワークショップでもしばしば教えているものです。近著『正面に衣裳をながめれば』の中で、山本は1970年代半ばに土方

の元で活動していた際、「3羽のシギ」のイメージの変容として「亡霊のシギ」が現れたことを記述しています。これら3つの形態は、もともと土方のスクラップブックの一冊にコラージュされたイメージから発展したものでした。山本が指摘する重要な点は、「剥製」の状態を思い出すことです。これらの鳥は撃たれ、吊るされています<sup>11</sup>。死んでおり、内臓を抜かれ、乾燥しています。それらは異なる時間、より遅い時間、あるいは時間が止まった世界に存在しています。「剥製」という状態から生じる、軽さが具現化されています。ゆっくりとして軽い世界です。これらの乾燥した鳥は自ら動き出すことはできず、形態の間を「変容」させられるのです<sup>12</sup>。山本は、1970年代後半に土方の舞踏譜において、空間への強調が高まるにつれて一般的になった「染み出し」や「ぼやけ」といったプロセスを通じて、これらの「3羽のシギ」がいかに「幽霊のシギ」になったかを記述しています<sup>13</sup>。

土方がこのような形態を固定し、また修正する能力、すなわちある鳥のイメージを別の鳥のイメージに変容させ、状態や質を変容させる能力は、膨大な数の舞踏譜を創り出すためにイメージを採集してきた、これまでの努力を反映しています。舞踏譜には「鳥」が数多く存在します。土方は、限られた時間の中でリハーサルを行う際でも素早い修正を可能にする素材を、すでに手元を持っていました。特に鳥の採集について、土方は詩人の白石かずこの対話の中で次のように述べています<sup>14</sup>。

鳥でもね、シャガールだけでなく何十羽も倒れているわけですよ。その鳥は画家が一人一人工夫した鳥なんです。それを自分の身体に置きかえますと、画家のイメージが、鳥までさかのぼった線とかが、ちゃんとたどれるんですね。

例えば鳥の首が何センチ斜めにのびていて、鼻の下でどのくらいの香水をかぐと、首をのぼすのでなくて、嗅ぐというのび方がそこに行けるかという……。そこで的確なメモができてくるんですよ。そして自分で色々組み合わせさせてみて一晩考えて一番模写のうまい子に教えやらせてみる。そして「どうしてあなた方はできないの」と質問する。たんに首をのぼせば優雅だろうと思ってる。それは全然まちがいじゃないか。「匂いを嗅ぐと首は自然にそれにそっていくものでしょう」ということになる。そこに優雅さのランクが一人一人違ってくるという実験をする。それをノートにとって復元するのです。そういう風にして膨大なノートが出てくるわけです。いい舞踏家はノートの字の横に画をかくてありますね。更に才能のある人はそれに着色してますね。ですから非常にメカニク的な稽古をしているんですよ。

土方が舞踏譜やノートの取り方について、これほど明示的に言及するのは珍しいため、全文を引用しました。土方アーカイヴには、鳥のコラージュ画像が収められたスクラップブックが一冊あります。そこに現れるイメージ一つ一つが、動きを生み出すために使われた可能性があります。スクラップブック以外にも、マルク・シャガールのような西洋の芸術家から、伊藤若冲のような日本の画家まで、様々な出典から取られた鳥の画像のコピーが多数存在します。土方がこれらのイメージを舞踏譜に変容させたのは、単に「優雅だろう」と感じさせる動きを作り出すためではありませんでした。形態がどのように見えるかではなく、外的な形態を生み出す内的な感性、すなわち「嗅ぐ」という行為ゆえに、匂いの方向に近づき、身体を内側から外側へと変容させることへとつながる、その行為の発生を彼は強調したのです。「的確なメモ」を取り、広範な稽古を通じて初めて、土方の舞踏譜は舞踏手の身体に吸収されることができました。「匂いを嗅ぐと首は自然にそれにそっていくものでしょう」。この言語は形態を固定するための手段ではなく、「そこに優雅さのランクが一人一人違ってくるという実験をする」となるのです。言い換えれば、それは弟子の間に現れる微妙な差異を実験する方法、すなわち異なる身体の間で動きを固定解除する方法となり、舞踏の「変幻自在な体」の間に完全な複製ではないもの、つまり幽霊のように曖昧な類似と関係を生み出すのです。

## Connecting Butoh-fu—舞踏譜を接続する

土方が白石とのインタビューで語っているように、舞踏譜は個別に理解することはできず、接続された動きのネットワークを構成するものとして理解されなければなりません。彼は次のように述べています<sup>15</sup>。

非常に無理やりのレッスンでもあるんですよ。覚えるだけでもやっとなの。だって押入れにビッシリ細い字で書いたノートがあるんですよ。柳から霧、霧から霧氷、霧氷から無、無から光へ……というふうだね。

さっき鳥の話がたけど、森羅万象にわたって全神経を集中していないとホントは鳥も踊れないですね。蝶をやるためには蜜、鳥をやるためには花、とそういう関連がもう当然の事で、感覚的に、それを自然科学の本などをよんで調べてゆくというのではなく、舞踏という全感触の中でそれを記号として登録してゆく作業なので、とても教えるなどという一方的

なことではできない。相互に交換するという場がないとね。でも僕は教えることはできる、あるところまではね。

舞踏譜は関係のネットワーク、すなわちジル・ドゥルーズとフェリックス・ガタリの言う「リゾーム」を生み出します<sup>16</sup>。関連する動きは、非線形の方法で混合され、再構成されます。動きは「関係」の一部として、互いに変容し、変容させ合います。

《小林嵯峨舞踏公演〈にかい光〉(1977年)における小林のノートでは、特に「空間」と「態」を通じて、舞踏譜の相互接続されたイメージを明らかにしています。これらはまた、土方の舞踏譜を振付の記録として機能させることがいかに困難であるかを証明しています。小林は〈にかい光〉の稽古ノートを2冊保存しています。1冊には舞踏譜とともに詳細な指示とドローイングが含まれており、小林が振付を学んでいたリハーサルプロセスの初期段階で作成されたことを示唆しています。もう1冊のノートの最後には一連の衣裳のドローイングがあり、それらは公演における5つの「Part」またはシーンに対応しています。衣裳の横には、各シーンで振付のどの部分が演じられたかを示す簡潔なメモがあり、これらは作品全体の構造を理解するための「鍵」のようなものを提供してくれます。ノートだけでは判別できない点は、振付のどれが最終的に踊られたかということです。山本の〈それはこのような夜だった〉のノートが示しているように、土方は稽古の間に振付を変容させ、消去し、編集する傾向があったからです。

2冊のノートに書かれた記述には、繰り返しと類似性があります。どちらも同様のフレーズで始まり、〈にかい光〉で踊らなければならない全体的な「態」を記述しています。

植物と人間の間

かげろう

衰微した植物にかろうじてフォルムが見える

日ざし

せみの声

砂ぼこり

始めることよりも、状態であること

全体的に頼りない、ただよっている状態そのもの

埋没してゆく光の速度の中にスポッと入ってしまう

もう、もどれないところへどんどん落ち込んでゆく速度

一光

静かな発狂

かげろうが自分か 自分がかげろうか?<sup>17</sup>

ノートの両方とも、冒頭部分に「植物と人間の間」または「植物と人物」、また「かげろう」になる「態」を記述しています。稽古の最終段階を記述していると予想されるノートでは、この記述の後に5つの「かげろう態」が続き、それぞれが一連の形態を集約しています。「かげろう態1」の下には、「①子供」「②ふりかえる人」「③幽霊」という3つの形態がリストされており、それぞれがさらなる舞踏譜を通じて記譜されています。例えば「子供」は、「ぼっとした状態から何かを注視する」、「うばわれた状態」、そして「足元にカミソリ」がある、といったイメージで修飾されています。「ふりかえる人」は、自分の足元に近づいてくる「変な動物」を見ていると記述されています。「幽霊」は、ウィリアム・ターナーの絵画における「闇」と接続されています。

2023年8月に1週間かけて、小林と共にこれらのノートを精査することで、それぞれのノートを接続させることが可能になりました。例えば、最初に作成されたと思われるノートには、「子供」と「ふりかえる人」に対応するドローイングがありました。他には「変な動物」が、実は「蛙」であることが指定されていました。小林との作業の後に土方アーカイヴに戻った際、小林のドローイングと一致する土方の浮世絵コピーを見つけ出すことができました。これら資料を接続させることで、小林が自らの身体にこの振付を再現させることを可能にさせました。

2024年にイェール大学で、また2025年にメキシコで開催された「Butoh Scores」ワークショップにて小林は、ダンサーたちに部屋の遠くから対角線上に近づき、身体の中に入ってダンサー自身を「変な動物」へと変容させる「蛙」を見るように指示しました。身体が回る際の方向性や角度、部屋を走る「蛙」を追う視線を指導しました。そして、これらすべての動きが「か

げろう態」の中で行われなければならないと述べました。その結果、形が曖昧に、判別しづらく変化します。身体が現れては消え、陽炎へと変容するにつれて、形は絶えず現れては溶解していきます。「かげろう」から溶解し、また現れるという全体的な質感ゆえに、残された公演映像においても動きを特定し、識別することを困難にさせてもいます。

小林は50年にわたり、土方舞踏の「態」を重視して活動を続けてきました。著作や指導の中で、身体を変容させるこれらの「態」の重要性を強調しています。例えば「幽霊態」について、彼女は次のように書いています<sup>18</sup>。

「幽霊態」—幽霊って何だろう。夜中に、闇の中にじっと座っていると、ざわざわと風が起きてその場所に黒い影がやって来たような気がする。見る事は出来ない。触ることも出来ないけれど、確かにそこに在ることを感じることは出来る。人はみんな足が行ったつきりになってしまって戻ってこないからみんなユウレイだ。

小林の言葉は、土方から学んだことを思い出させます。彼の言葉は、今も小林の身体に宿り、踊りとして彼女の身体を通じて生きています。舞踏譜は、和栗、小林、山本、正朔といった舞踏手たちの身体を通過してのみ存在します。それは身体の「態」を変容させ続けますが、同時に絶えず変容し続ける身体を通じてのみ、ダンスへと作り上げられるのです。自らの痕跡を絶えず固定解除し続ける、それが舞踊言語の本質なのです<sup>19</sup>。舞踏の移り変わる世界と言葉の中で、「みんなユウレイ」なのです。

- 1 和栗由紀夫『舞踏花伝』ジャストシステム、1998–2004年、CD-ROMを参照。また、<https://butoh-kaden.com/en/appendix/waguri-butoh-fu/>も参照のこと。和栗による舞踏の体系化に関する以下拙稿を参照：Rosa van Hensbergen, "Waguri Yukio's Butoh Kaden: taking stock of Hijikata's butoh notation (和栗由紀夫の『舞踏花伝』：土方の舞踏譜を再考する)" in *The Routledge Companion to Butoh Performance*, ed. Bruce Baird and Rosemary Candelario (Routledge, 2018).
- 2 森下隆、本カタログ内論考 p10 を参照。
- 3 Frédéric Pouillaude, *Unworking Choreography: The Notion of the Work in Dance* (機能しない振付：ダンス作品における記譜), trans. Anna Pakes (Oxford University Press, 2017), xiv.
- 4 これらの記譜法についての概要は以下を参照。Anne Hutchinson Guest, *Choreo-Graphics: A Comparison of Dance Notation Systems from the Fifteenth Century to the Present* (コレオグラフィックス：15世紀から現在までのダンス記譜法の比較) (Gordon and Breach, 1989).
- 5 Pouillaude, 前掲書, xiv.
- 6 SU-EN, "Light as Dust, Hard as Steel, Fluid as Snake Saliva: The Butoh Body of Ashikawa Yoko (塵のように軽く、鋼のように硬く、蛇の唾液のように流動的な：芦川羊子の舞踏体)" in *The Routledge Companion to Butoh Performance*, ed. Bruce Baird and Rosemary Candelario (Routledge, 2018), 204.
- 7 正朔『舞踏馬鹿—土方異の言葉とともに』論創社、2022年、p.6.
- 8 2025年11月メキシコにて開催された「Butoh Scores」の一環として、ワークショップは実施された。
- 9 山本萌「それはこのような夜だった」ノート、1976年。
- 10 山本、前掲ノート。
- 11 山本萌翁『正面に衣裳を眺めれば』能登印刷出版部、2025年、p.182。
- 12 山本、前掲書、pp.182–183。
- 13 山本、前掲書、p.184。
- 14 土方異『土方異全集2』種村季弘、鶴岡善久、元藤燁子編、河出書房新社、1998年、pp. 84–85。
- 15 土方、前掲書、p.87。
- 16 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (千のプラトー 資本主義と分裂症) (University of Minnesota Press, 1987).
- 17 小林嵯峨「にがい光」ノート、1977年。
- 18 小林嵯峨『うめの砂草—舞踏の言葉』アトリエサード、2005年、p.42。
- 19 André Lepecki, "Choreography as Apparatus of Capture (捕獲装置としての振付)" *TDR: The Drama Review* 51, no. 2 (2007).

# Interview with Yamamoto Moe

## Hijikata Tatsumi and Asbestos-kan (1976–1978)

Date: 31st October, 2025 Online

Interview Conducted by van Hensbergen Rosa and Ishimoto Kae

*—Can you tell us about the period after 1976, when disciples began to leave Hijikata Tatsumi to become independent artists? Why did they depart from Asbestos-kan<sup>1</sup> during this time?*

**Yamamoto:** Toward the end of the serial performances (renzoku kōen) at Asbestos-kan, and having seen members of the group DAIRAKUDAKAN scatter to regional areas, I think Hijikata-sensei<sup>2</sup> imagined that if his dancers began to spread out and expand their individual activities, they could eventually gather again to create something even greater. After 1978, when I had the chance to visit Asbestos-kan, Ashikawa san<sup>3</sup> said to me, “Moe san, you must come to see Sensei from time to time and let him know what you are doing”. She was in other words suggesting that Sensei wanted to hear about how everyone was doing and what kind of work they were pursuing.

*—So, it wasn't that Hijikata was consciously letting go of his disciples, but rather, because he trusted them, he took the attitude of “I leave Matsushiro to you” or “I leave Kanazawa to you”?*

**Yamamoto:** I believe he expected us to become independent—whether as a group or as individuals—and to feedback to him what we learned, thought about, and discovered new inspiration from. Sensei himself was always seeking out new inspiration and information to use in his own dance. But he wanted to hear from those of us who were working hard independently in different regions of Japan, in case we had ideas different from those active in Tokyo. That is why even those dancers who had already become independent artists, like Amagatsu san<sup>4</sup>, Murobushi san<sup>5</sup>, and Osuka san<sup>6</sup>, would visit Asbestos-kan to talk with Hijikata about what they were doing.

*—Did Hijikata ever speak directly to you about “expecting something” or “wanting to hear your ideas”?*

**Yamamoto:** Sensei never said such things directly. I feel Ashikawa usually spoke on his behalf. I felt some sense of his “expectations” when he called me from Kanazawa to participate in performances like *One ton of Coiffure in Scenery*<sup>7</sup> with Omori san<sup>8</sup> in Tokyo. And also, in 1985, the year before he passed away, when he organized his “Butoh Pilgrimage” (Butoh Angya)<sup>9</sup>, he made an effort to include Kanazawa in the tour. Ashikawa told me it was a struggle to include it, but Sensei insisted. After his Kanazawa lecture, as he was leaving by car, he shook my hand and said, “Take care...”. Kei<sup>10</sup> also wanted to shake hands, but he only shook mine. Later, I

thought that handshake might have been his way of saying, “I’m counting on you”.

—*So what about the period when you left Asbestos-kan in 1976 and returned to your hometown, Kanazawa?*

**Yamamoto:** I intended to eventually pursue my own work, but I didn’t think I could do it immediately. I returned to Kanazawa because the things I had learned in that short, intense period were far beyond what I could process. I needed time to organize my thoughts. But then as I began dancing alone in small venues, like coffee shops, I started to develop my own site-specific sensibilities, which began to create a slight difference from the performances of the Asbestos-kan era.

In the autumn of 1977, for the performance of *A Dusty Man Like a Firefly*<sup>11</sup>, Ashikawa and others from Asbestos-kan came to Kanazawa. First, Amamiya san<sup>12</sup> and the men from Asbestos-kan arrived about a week in advance to prepare the stage and conduct checks. Then, just three or four days before the show, Ashikawa and Nimura<sup>13</sup> arrived. Ashikawa brought the choreography for my role and taught it to me, saying, ‘This is what you need to do,’ and that is how I memorized it. Sensei arrived on the very day before the performance. He inspected the final result and gave further directions, like ‘Do this a bit more like that’ and what have you.

Having spent a year away, I had begun to wake up to my own way of doing things. When Ashikawa gave me the choreography, I realized it was exactly the same as when I had been at Asbestos-kan, and I felt a sudden sense of resistance, thinking, “I don’t want to do it this way anymore”. At one point, Sensei told me to do a movement called “Pomegranate Teeth” (Zakuro-ba)<sup>14</sup>, but I didn’t want to open my mouth properly. Seeing this, Sensei picked up a piece of silver grass (susuki) growing nearby and used it to force my mouth open, saying “Look, open your mouth”. While I had been a diligent and obedient dancer at Asbestos-kan, after just a year on my own, a spirit of resistance had taken root. That moment of Hijikata correcting my rebellion was actually caught on film<sup>15</sup>.

—*After becoming independent following the 1976 performance of *Costume in Front*<sup>16</sup>, you performed again in Hijikata’s works *First Flower*<sup>17</sup> and *Wings on the Pavilion*<sup>18</sup> in 1978. Did you feel any changes in his choreography or creative method?*

**Yamamoto:** When I returned for the performances of *First Flower* and *Wings on the Pavilion*, my own feeling was that, since I had danced duets with Nimura many times before, I simply wanted to go to Tokyo to be on stage and support her. That was the main reason I went. Even once I was living far away in Kanazawa, I remained curious about what Sensei was creating. After performing the duet with Nimura, I had expected to watch Waguri’s<sup>19</sup> piece as an audience member, especially given there were plenty of other butoh students available at Asbestos-kan. But then, right after *First Flower*, Sensei said to me, “Moe, get out there onstage,” as if it were a given that I should appear in *Wings on the Pavilion* as well. I was taken aback, thinking, “Wait, I’m performing in this too?” Because of that, my level of motivation was a little different, and in truth, I feel my sense of performance tension had tailed off a bit by then too.

In Nimura’s case—and this was a practice that had begun during the latter half of

the serial performances at Asbestos-kan Sensei would work directly with the lead dancer when choreographing. For *First Flower*, the choreography for Nimura was conducted one-on-one. Ashikawa was sometimes present, but there was also a period when she was away overseas<sup>30</sup>. The two of them also often worked on the choreography in locations other than Asbestos-kan, so I didn't actually see much of the process.

Of course, we practiced the duet sections together at Asbestos-kan, and I would listen to and follow Sensei's instructions like 'do this' or 'do that'. However, during the actual performance, I remained backstage (which served as the dressing area), watching Nimura frequently change her costumes and head back out onstage. Because I was performing with her, I was behind the scenes for everything from the rehearsals to the final dress rehearsal. As a result, I was focused on my own preparations, and mainly saw Nimura go out alone, return, fix her hair, change her clothes, and head back out again. My impression at the time was simply, 'She is changing costumes so many times; this looks exhausting'.

I was truly overjoyed that the footage of *First Flower* resurfaced<sup>31</sup>. In all honesty, I was astonished to see how much Nimura was actually dancing. She transforms continuously. I just thought 'Wow, it's incredible'. I found watching the recording of the work fascinating and really felt it could be appreciated again and again. I had the impression that she pushed herself to a limit at the very end in order to leave this trace behind through the video.

Regarding the change in Hijikata's choreography, I didn't feel there was a drastic shift, but rather a continued evolution. Toward the end of the serial performances, he was pursuing specific "spaces," such as the "Space of Mist" or "Space of Turner".

The work that left the deepest impression on me from that time was *Human Shape*<sup>32</sup>. At the end, Ashikawa performed an old woman who sits down and smokes a cigarette. She appears to be in a daze but somehow manages to manifest the entire world held within the old woman. I somehow felt that Sensei was constantly pursuing various 'spaces' to evoke such a state.

When it came to Waguri's *Wings on the Pavilion*, I felt the work was more concerned with space and background. Waguri himself was performing minute movements, but I personally felt that perhaps they weren't quite working yet. But the men surrounding him were creating an interesting field and world.

In Saga's<sup>33</sup> *Bitter Light*<sup>34</sup> a year earlier, Hijikata explored 'spaces of light' or 'spaces of the heat haze'. Personally, I felt the dancing itself was a little less strong, perhaps because Hijikata pushed a specific theme too aggressively. I thought to myself, 'Saga can do much more than that.' In contrast to that, Waguri stood out as a much more distinct presence.

Even so, as you asked me whether his style had 'changed', I believe he was actually pursuing the same trajectory all along. I get the feeling that Sensei was moving forward while constantly searching for a direction, thinking to himself, 'I have tried going quite far in this direction, but is this too weak?'

Nimura's *First Flower* was so incredibly packed with a variety of movements one after another that a part of me wondered whether it was too much. The performance duration was quite long, after all. There are clearly various movements that Ashikawa had performed (movements choreographed for Ashikawa) visible in the piece, combined with Nimura's own characteristic movements. I felt it was exceptionally dense as a work.

As Nimura diligently performed this mountain of movements, it was as if she were being

rejuvenated by them – becoming younger – during the performance. While I don't believe every single element was fully 'digested,' the dance evolved from an almost unskilled style towards a state where her very soul seemed to feed into the work. I am truly grateful that this archival footage preserving the entire process exists.

Even though works like *First Flower*, *Wings on the Pavilion*, and *Bitter Light* had many incredible moments, I don't think they stirred much of a response at the time. At least, that is how I remember it. I find that to be a bit of a shame.

*—From everything you have been describing, it seems Hijikata's creative activity far from ended with the 1976 serial performances<sup>25</sup> but rather continued with the same intensity through 1977 and 1978, even as he experimented with new ideas regarding "space." Thank you very much.*

- 1 Asbestos-kan Hijikata Tatsumi's studio and rehearsal hall. The term is used to refer to the physical location as well as the name of his creative collective.
- 2 Sensei Refers to Hijikata Tatsumi. Throughout the following texts, "Sensei" is used consistently to refer to him.
- 3 Ashikawa Yoko A central dancer in Hijikata's company, Hakutobo.
- 4 Amagatsu Ushio An early member of DAIRAKUDAKAN and the founder/director of Sankai Juku. Following the establishment of Hoppo Butoh-ha by Yamada Bishop, members of DAIRAKUDAKAN (formed in 1972) began expanding their activities both domestically and internationally.
- 5 Murobushi Ko An early member of DAIRAKUDAKAN. He founded and led groups such as Sebi and Compaigne Ariadone (Ariadone no Kai).
- 6 Osuka Isamu An early member of DAIRAKUDAKAN and the founder/director of Byakko-sha.
- 7 *Hook On 88: One ton of Coiffure in Scenery* (1983). A trilogy consisting of *Spanih Cherry*, *Temple Mimicry at plan-B (plan-B tera moshu)*, and *Extremely Rapid Inhalant Bromide (Hijo ni Kyusokuna Kyukisei Bromide)*, created, directed, and choreographed by Hijikata Tatsumi. Cast: Ashikawa Yoko, Iwana Masaki, Osugi Kuya, Omori Masahide, Kamiryo Kunishi, Goi Teru, Mori Shigeya, Yamamoto Moe, and Tanaka Min.
- 8 Omori Masahide Studied Butoh under Kasai Akira and founded / directed Tenro Seido after becoming independent.
- 9 "Tatsumi Hijikata Butoh Pilgrimage, Part 1" (Kyoto, Kobe, Osaka, Kanazawa, Nagoya), 1985. A program consisting of lectures and slide screenings.
- 10 Shirasaka Kei Joined Yamamoto Moe as his partner in Kanazawa Butoh Kan following Yamamoto's return to Kanazawa and the opening performance of the company. Since then, they have collaborated on the creation of multiple works.
- 11 Kanazawa Butoh Kan: Performance Celebrating the Opening of the House *A Dusty Man Like a Firefly* (1977).
- 12 Amamiya Koichi A veteran Butoh dancer who entered Asbestos-kan at the same time as Waguri Yukio and appeared in numerous performances thereafter.
- 13 Nimura Momoko A central dancer in Hakutobo who, along with Kobayashi Saga, was referred to as one of the 'Three Daughters' (San-nin Musume). She performed as principal in *First Flower* (1978).
- 14 Pomegranate Teeth (Zakuro-ba) A Butoh-fu movement describing a facial expression where the front teeth are exposed, resembling rows of pomegranate seeds.
- 15 A documentary-style film capturing the inauguration of Kanazawa Butoh Kan. Produced by Kaku-sen Kobo, directed by Aomi Yasuo; duration approximately 32 minutes.
- 16 Kanazawa Butoh Kan Opening Celebration by Yamamoto Moe Performance Series Celebrating the 20th Anniversary of Formation of School of Dance of Utter Darkness: Asbestos Hall Performance in June: Paragon of Sacrificing Great Dance No. 15 *Costume In Front: A Model of Darkness for Boys and Girls* (1976).
- 17 Butoh Performance by Nimura Momoko: Celebrating the Establishment of Asbestos Hall's Matsushiro Branch *First Flower* (1978).
- 18 Butoh Performance by Waguri Yukio: Recollection of the Kozensha *Wings on the Pavilion* (1978).
- 19 Waguri Yukio One of the senior male Butoh dancers in Hakutobo, following Tamano Koichi.
- 20 Ma Exhibition at the Festival d'Automne in Paris *12 Phases of a Dancing Girl of Darkness: Fortnight for the Louvre Palace* (1978). The first overseas performance at the Festival d'Automne à Paris (*MA: Space-Time in Japan exhibition*). Because Ashikawa Yoko (dancer) and Morishita Takashi traveled to Europe for this, there was a period when Ashikawa was absent.
- 21 The fact that *First Flower* is included in the Video Information Center (VIC) Collection at the Keio University Art Center (KUAC).
- 22 Performance 1, Performance Series Celebrating the 20th Anniversary of Formation of School of Dance of Utter Darkness: Asbestos Hall Performance in June: Paragon of Sacrificing Great Dance Work No. 14: *Human Shape (Hitogata)* (1976).
- 23 Kobayashi Saga Played a central role in Hakutobo activities alongside Ashikawa Yoko and Nimura Momoko during the early 1970s.
- 24 Butoh Performance by Kobayashi Saga: *Bitter Light* (1977). Cast: Kobayashi Saga, Waguri Yukio, etc.
- 25 Following Performance Series Celebrating the 20th Anniversary of Formation of School of Dance of Utter Darkness: Performance in December Commemorating the Sealing of Asbestos Hall: Paragon of Sacrificing Great Dance No. 16, *Lady on a Whale String* (1976), Asbestos-kan was closed, and the continuous performances by Hakutobo at the studio were discontinued. Located in a residential area, Asbestos-kan was not officially licensed as a theater; due to increasing complaints from neighbors and violations of Tokyo Metropolitan Ordinances and the Fire Services Act, it became difficult to continue its operation as a performance venue.

本事業の鑑賞サポートは、誰もが芸術文化に触れることができる社会の実現に向けて、「東京文化戦略2030」の取組「クリエイティブ・ウェルビーイング・トーキョー」の一環としてアーツカウンシル東京が助成しています。

本事業の2025年度化学研究費基盤研究(C)「『動きのアーカイヴ』における実証的研究——アーカイヴの創造的利用における国際連携」(25K03758)の助成を受けています。

The accessibility support for this project is subsidized by Arts Council Tokyo as part of Tokyo Cultural Strategy 2030's "Creative Well-being Tokyo" initiative.

Grant: FY2025 Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (c): *Movement Archive - International Cooperation of Creative Use of Archives*(25K03758)

Organized by | Keio University (Keio University Art Center-KUAC)

Supported by | The Kao Foundation for Arts and Sciences

Translation by | Rosa van Hensbergen, Kae Ishimoto

Designed by | Shinsuke Niikura

Published by | Keio University Art Center, 10th February 2026

2-5-45 Mita, Minato-ku, Tokyo, 108-8345, Japan

Tel. 03-5427-1621 Fax. 03-5427-1620

<http://www.art-c.keio.ac.jp> [ac-tenji@adst.keio.ac.jp](mailto:ac-tenji@adst.keio.ac.jp)

ISSN | 2433-4103 / KUAC-C59-ex

©Keio University Art Center

主催 | 学校法人慶應義塾 (慶應義塾大学アート・センター)

助成 | 公益財団法人 花王芸術・科学財団

翻訳 | ローザ・ヴァン・ヘンスヴァーゲン、石本華江

デザイン | 新倉慎右

発行 | 慶應義塾大学アート・センター 2026年2月10日

108-8345 東京都港区三田 2-15-45

Tel | 03-5427-1621 Fax | 03-5427-1620

<http://www.art-c.keio.ac.jp> [ac-tenji@adst.keio.ac.jp](mailto:ac-tenji@adst.keio.ac.jp)

ISSN | 2433-4103 / アート・センター叢書 59-ex

© 慶應義塾大学アート・センター