

*Jūyō-tōken* at the 48th *jūyō shinsa* held on October 11, 2002

*tachi, mei*: Sukekane (助包)

## Measurements

*nagasa* 68.7 cm, *sori* 2.2 cm, *motohaba* 2.8 cm, *sakihaba* 1.9 cm, *kissaki-nagasa* 3.4 cm, *nakago-nagasa* 22.2 cm, *nakago-sori* 0.2 cm

## Description

*Keijō*: *shinogi-zukuri*, *iori-mune*, normal *mihaba* and *kasane*, despite the *suriage* a deep *koshizori*, *chū-kissaki*

*Kitae*: *itame* that is mixed with *mokume* and that features *ji-nie*, much *chikei*, and a *midare-utsuri*

*Hamon*: *ko-nie*-laden *ko-chōji* that is mixed with *ko-midare*, *ko-gunome*, *ko-notare*, *ko-ashi*, *yō*, some *hotsure*, *sunagashi*, *kinsuji*, and small *tobiyaki*, the *midare* elements of the *ha* are overall rather small dimensioned

*Bōshi*: smallish *midare-komi* with a *ko-maru-kaeri* and *hakikake*

*Nakago*: *suriage*, *kirijiri*, old *yasurime* indiscernible, new *yasurime* are *kiri*, three *mekugi-ana*, the *haki-omote* side bears on the lower half and running over the second *mekugi-ana* a largely chiseled *niji-mei*

## Explanation

The *meikan* list a Ko-Bizen and a Fukuoka-Ichimonji Sukekane and extant Sukekane signatures are either small or large dimensioned. The majority of these extant signatures are *niji-mei* but there are also some *naga-mei* known. The prevailing view is that the smaller signatures go back to the hand of Ko-Bizen Sukekane and the larger ones to (Fukuoka) Ichimonji Sukekane. However, there are Sukekane works signed with a smaller *mei* which attribute to the (Fukuoka) Ichimonji School, thus, a differentiation solely on the basis of the signature is difficult.

This *tachi* bears a largely chiseled *niji-mei* and shows a *kitae* in *itame* that features *ji-nie*, much *chikei*, and a *midare-utsuri*. The *hamon* is a *ko-nie*-laden *ko-chōji* that is mixed with *ko-gunome*, *ko-midare*, *ko-notare*, *ko-ashi*, *yō*, some *hotsure*, *sunagashi*, *kinsuji*, and small *tobiyaki* whereupon we do recognize a rather classical approach. However, the *ko-gunome* elements are partially relatively prominent and therefore we can attribute this blade to the Sukekane smith who was active in the early Kamakura period and not earlier.