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MAX LOEHR AT SEVENTY

MAX LOEHR retired from his chair at Harvard in June 1974. To those of us for whom the start of his teaching in the U. S. does not seem so long ago, and for whom he seems to have changed little in those two decades, the news comes very suddenly. It signals that we must begin to stop regarding him as a fixed institution, and take some time to consider this extraordinary man and his effect on Chinese art studies.

Max Loehr was born in Chemnitz, in Saxony, on December 4, 1903. His childhood and first five years of school were spent there. When he was about twelve his father’s textile store went bankrupt, and the family moved to Augsburg. After five years during which he attended middle school, another move was necessary, this time to Munich. The death of his father in 1920 forced Max to leave school and take a job in a bank of which his uncle was director. His interest, however, already lay in art rather than business—he wanted to become a painter, but to do so was economically impossible. He worked for seven years with the bank, and then for several years more with a company that sold woolen yarns. He never studied painting formally, but mastered it to a point where it could—judging from a few accomplished and beautiful landscape watercolors which he will still, when urged, show to guests—have led to a successful career as artist instead of art historian.

Since his schooling had been cut short, Max Loehr had to study on his own and complete the last three years of middle school by examination before he could enter the university. With this obstacle overcome, he was admitted to the University of Munich in 1931. The choice between law and the history of art was difficult—law seemed to offer more in material rewards—but his leaning was strongly in the other direction, and, happily for Chinese art studies and students, he made the right choice. (Whether unhappily for law is pure speculation, but one wonders: would not the mind that has worked to bring order to Chinese art studies have brought disorder to law, by insisting on the supremacy of human genius and creativity over all established conventions? Loehr quotes with evident approval this statement by Arnold Hauser: “Only where we get beyond the reign of law, and where chance or personal initiative, or, as philosophical idealists say, ‘freedom of the personality’ comes in, do we have to do with the experiencing and enduring of human existence.” [Loehr, “Fundamental Issues,” p. 186.])

During his five years at the University he studied Classical Archaeology, History of Art, and Sanscrit. He also began learning Chinese under Dr. Reismüller, the Director-General of the Bavarian State Library. Others of his professors included the chairman for the History of Art, Professor Pinder; Ernst Buschor, famous for his excavations at Samos, with whom Max studied Classical Archaeology; and, most import-

* Professor, History of Art, University of California, Berkeley.
antily, Ludwig Bachhofer, then Privat-
Dozent at the University of Munich. The
Winter term of 1934 he spent in Berlin,
working in Far Eastern art under Otto
Kümmel.

In the Spring of 1936 he was awarded
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, and
given a post as Assistant in charge of the
Asiatic collections at the Museum für Völ-
kerkunde in Munich. His doctoral thesis
was his study of the earliest styles in Chinese
bronzes, which grew out of a seminar taken
with Bachhofer, and which was published
in 1936, in condensed form, in Ostasiatische
Zeitschrift. In the years that followed, a
number of articles on Chinese bronzes ap-
peared in various journals, establishing him
immediately as one of the foremost authori-
ties on the subject, and an advocate and
exemplar of a stylistic approach at a time
when epigraphers, philologists, and ar-
chaeologists still dominated the field. His
early interest in Chinese painting was shown
in three articles: a brief piece on trees in
Chinese painting and another on the dated
works of Wang Meng, both of which ap-
peared in Sinica in 1939; and a third, on
Li T'ang's dated (1124) "Whispering Pines
in the Mountains," published in Burlington
Magazine in the same year. All of these,
written while Chinese art history was still
an area of contention between sinologues
and art historians, demonstrated Loehr's
resolution, and his ability, to combine and
reconcile these two approaches, an aim
from which he has never diverged.

In December of 1940 he was sent to Pe-
king, traveling by the Trans-Siberian Rail-
way, to study at the Sino-German Institute
there. This was intended to be a stay of two
or three years, but the outbreak of war
prolonged it, and he remained in Peking
until 1949. In 1941 he became Director of
the Institute, and held this post until 1945,
when the Institute was closed and its library
and other facilities absorbed into the Peking
National Library. At the end of the war he
was exempted from repatriating and taught
as Associate Professor at Tsinghua Univer-
sity in 1947–48. During most of this period
he was confined to Peking, but he took
advantage of a few opportunities to visit
Yün-kang, Dairen, and Mukden, as well as
Nanking and Shanghai to the south. While
in Peking he got to know such leading Chi-
inese scholars as the epigrapher Sun Hai-po,
Jung Keng, and Ch'en Meng-chia. His pub-
lications during this Peking period were
mostly on early Chinese art and archae-
ology; they include the two series of studies
of Chou dynasty bronze inscriptions (1944
and 1946), the first publication of the "Hui-
hsien" figurines (1946), and several studies
of early bronze weapons, which were to be
followed in 1956 by his major book on this
subject, the catalog of the Werner Jannings
collection, still in Peking.

In 1949 Max Loehr finally had to leave
China, first by a British boat to Hong Kong,
and thence by plane to Paris and train to
Munich, where he resumed his post, now as
Curator, at the Museum für Völkerkunde.
In 1951 he was offered, more or less simulta-
neously, the directorship of the Museum
and a professorship at the University of
Michigan. He chose the latter, and came to
Ann Arbor in October, 1951.

From that point, this account can take
on a more first-hand character (since the
present writer arrived there at the same
time to become his disciple) and can leave
behind the purely academic tone of the
curriculum vitae. Max Loehr came to the
United States with his family: his wife
Irmsgard, whom he had married in 1928, and their two sons, Klaus (born 1936) and Thomas (born 1939). Arriving in Ann Arbor, the Loehrs soon established themselves as luminaries in the local academic community, Irmsgard by her warmth and charm, and a motherly concern for students’ well-being—afternoons or evenings at the Loehrs’ were a delight for us—and Max by his erudition and old-world polish (Ann Arbor professors’ wives have never forgiven the person who traitorously informed him that kissing hands on meeting was not expected in American society). Max would perform occasionally on the classical guitar; the accepted theory was that he had taken up that instrument as the closest Occidental equivalent to the Chinese *chi’in*. His library, even though much of it had been left behind in Peking (including most of the books on Chinese painting) was still huge and enviable, containing many out-of-the-way items of which the University Library was innocent.

Even more impressive was Max Loehr in the classroom: the precision with which he inscribed Chinese characters on the blackboard—as one of his students puts it, it was like watching them being engraved in stone—and the similarly lapidary quality of his lecture notes, which could, one felt, have been published in facsimile as they stood. His writing of Chinese script may represent the first successful attempt in the history of calligraphy to execute a variant of the Slender Gold style of the Emperor Hui-tsong with a fountain pen.

Loehr’s lectures, besides being terrifyingly informative, were inspired always with a deep feeling for aesthetic qualities, and seemed at times sessions of pure enlightenment. Students were constantly encouraged by his willingness to consider gravely their most fatuous suggestions, somehow without relaxing, or failing to express gently, his critical judgements. His command of English, in spite of certain idiosyncratic word usages and turns of phrase (which his former students still find themselves imitating, consciously or otherwise), put all of us native speakers and writers to shame, possessing not only an exactitude beside which the clumsiness of our formulations was painfully apparent, but also a wittiness that was manifested, typically, in a playful parody of that same exactitude: the tubby figure of the Emperor T’ai-tsu of T’ang, making a show of playing football in an old painting, was pronounced to be “not outspokenly sporting.” Flashes of understanding came in deceptively simple phrases; of a very small, simple bronze plaque, representing a doe, mixed mistakenly in a plate with a group of Ordos bronzes: “This small, inoffensive specimen speaks, and says, ‘I am Chinese!’” In different ways we were constantly confronted with what are, for art historians, the Noble Truths: that style holds meaning, and its development a logic. At the initial meeting of Max’s first seminar in Chinese bronzes, the students were presented with a pile of mounted photographs of vessels ranging in date through the whole Shang-Chou period, and asked to arrange them in some order on the basis of style; all (excepting myself, who abstained) were newcomers to the subject, but the order arrived at after an hour of looking and shuffling was a fair approximation of the true development, and the point was made.

In the Fall of 1960, Loehr accepted the newly founded Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Chair in East Asian Art at Harvard University. There he has given guidance and
intellectual nurture to another generation of students, with courses and seminars on an extraordinary range of topics. His inaugural lecture, “Buddhist Thought and Imagery,” and subsequent seminars on both Esoteric Buddhist and Zen (including what he calls “Zennist”) art, carried into this new period a long-standing fascination with Buddhist art and iconography. Other seminars have been on Chinese archaeology and Chinese ceramics, as well as, of course, Chinese painting. He has also served as Curator of Oriental Art at the Fogg Art Museum, and Guest Director for two exhibitions at Asia House Gallery in New York, one of early Chinese art in the Paul Singer collection (1965) and the other of Chinese ritual bronze vessels (1968). A catalog of the early Chinese jades in the Winthrop Collection has appeared recently; a book on early Chinese landscape painting is impatiently awaited.

Especially important in recent years has been Loehr’s concern with art theory in China, the subject of seminars and several recent articles. He does not stop at ascertaining and analyzing the ideas of the Chinese, but tests them first against the works of art to which they were meant to apply—thus he avoids the all-too-common practice of dealing with art theory apart from art—and secondly against his own conceptual structure and system of beliefs. The question he tries to answer, that is, is not simply: What did the Chinese think on this matter? but also, Does what they thought make sense? Does the idea work?

Max Loehr’s contribution to Chinese art studies has been in two large areas and would be distorted if either were slighted. On the one hand, he has greatly increased our knowledge of the historical processes, “what happened in Chinese art,” and our understanding of the objects that are its substance. On the other, he has dealt more systematically and effectively than has anyone else with the theoretical and methodological problems that must, implicit or stated, underlie any responsible study. His achievements in the former area can scarcely be listed in a short space; they are well known to all serious students of the subject, who will be reminded of them in looking through the attached Bibliography. A single example may be mentioned: his brilliant tracing of the stylistic development of the bronze styles of the Anyang period through a series of clearly defined stages, a study based on stylistic analyses and still largely hypothetical when it was written, but later to be borne out by the excavation of earlier sites than were then known. This modestly brief piece, published in 1953, has been accorded several tributes in print by eminent colleagues, and many more in the adoption of its conclusions by others working in the field.

In the theoretical and methodological sphere, Loehr has formulated and stated large truths about Chinese art, such as (in “The Fate of the Ornament”) that its ornamental segment declines in quality and importance as its pictorial segment grows, or (in the Introduction to Ritual Vessels of Bronze Age China) that the motifs on Shang-Chou bronzes do not behave as though they had fixed symbolic meanings—truths that others had been too near-sighted or too timid to discern, but which, once stated, seem almost to have been always with us. Characteristically, Loehr sets these forth with an assurance and seeming ingenuousness approaching that of the little boy in Anderson’s story who pointed out that the
emperor was wearing no clothes, and with about the same effect in inducing consternation among some of the onlookers. He has grappled with the most basic and perplexing problems that Chinese art studies offer, such as (in “Some Fundamental Issues”) the problem of how to come to an understanding of the historical development of an art (Chinese painting) in which the safely datable monuments are so few, and so often peripheral, that one may seem to lack any firm basis for the historical understanding on which the dating of individual pieces must depend—and so on around the circle. He concludes that we must operate with the idea of continuity, even though this necessitates making judgements as to authenticity and importance, matters not open to objective verification; and that we must try to understand the style of an artist or an epoch even when the reliability of the works that represent it must remain in doubt. “A historian cannot rely on unverifiable attributions, but he can rely on the compatibility, consistency, and logicality of the stylistic properties of his material.”

The questions that concern Max Loehr become ever broader, ever simpler, and the answers proposed for them ever more profound. He has dealt with such matters as the nature of archaism or reference to the past in later Chinese painting, and the implications of that tradition having turned, after Sung, into what he terms (how familiar the phrase is to us who have based whole lectures on it!) “a humanistic discipline.” One of his recent pieces of writing (“Phases and Content in Chinese Painting”) begins with the announcement that it will deal “with questions of concern to the historian of Chinese painting. One is the question of whether we can discern a meaning in the history of painting at large; the other, closely related to the first, is that of a meaningful periodization.” Such meaning Loehr does indeed discern by ignoring, for the moment, all that is repetitive, derivative, historically inconsequential, and concentrating on those achievements that deflect the course of history. (“The historian is interested in the inception of styles, not their perpetuation.” [“Some Fundamental Issues,” p. 188.]) The formulations so arrived at may be momentarily distressing to those who are, by contrast, laboring to fill in all the spaces—how can one respond, for instance, to Loehr’s contention that Tung Ch’i-ch’ang is the only artist who matters in late Ming painting, when one is at that moment plotting an exhibition featuring some forty-five others? But, as Loehr has consistently maintained, we cannot advance effectively without such an underpinning. This is because the art historian who attempts to present a “clear and detailed picture” of the art of an age is in somewhat the same situation as the artist who sets out to create an ambitious, elaborate painting: however confident he may be of having his grand design complete in his mind, it is likely to come forth more or less crowded and ill-organized unless he has before him some preliminary sketch, indicating the large compositional components and movements, to guide him as he fills in the substance of his picture. Although he can of course alter its lines somewhat as he proceeds, the sketch serves to give clarity and logic to the whole. The analogy is of course imperfect: the artist can invent with a freedom that art historians, responsible ones at least, are denied. But it was common enough, on the other hand, for a Chinese painter to make use of
a design supplied by some illustrious master as the basis for his own work; and it is in a similar way that the grand designs in Chinese art perceived and laid out for us by Loehr, whether or not they are consciously used, will continue to underlie studies of the subject for generations to come.

We had best stop here, lest we give the impression that we are summing up a career. It is much too early for that. A Chinese art critic in 1340, or a Japanese one in 1910, might thus have attempted to sum up the careers of Huang Kung-wang or Tessai, unaware that the best was yet to come. With such examples in mind, we will make no such mistake, but will look forward confidently and eagerly to the surpassing works of Max Loehr’s octogenarian years.

ADDENDUM

At the retirement dinner given for Professor Loehr at the Fogg Museum on May 18, 1974, I read some excerpts from his letters, and several of those who were present suggested later that they should be printed. I append them here, with explanatory notes.

1. (Letter of September 14, 1953. I had left Ann Arbor for New York, had in a brief period met Kojiro Tomita, C. C. Wang, Alan Priest and others, and was disturbed to find how little agreement there was among these authorities on basic matters concerning Chinese painting.)

   “It is very good that you run into experiences such as those with Wang, Tomita, the Met; they throw everything open to an extent that you begin to feel the basic necessity of orientation; to realize that there is almost nothing you can take for granted and that ipso facto you are forced to rely on your own judgment and to the jiriki-dō.”

   (Responding to a quotation from Edward Schafer concerning independence in scholarship:)

   “Mr. Schafer’s words of wisdom amount to ‘jiriki’ thinking at the foundation level. In principle he is undoubtedly right, although I don’t believe it necessary to revolutionize; often you will find that you cannot improve on what was done before; but whenever by persistent thinking or a finer tuning you do experience some revelation you certainly should not suppress it but go ahead. This, however, is the eternal way of the scholar, and you are a scholar exactly to the extent you are independent in criticism and theorizing and revealing.”

2. (Letter of September 3, 1954.)

   “I did see Mr. Schafer’s article about how to translate. It was my impression that these matters cannot be solved by recipes of this sort. A translation has to be consistent and, as literature, acceptable, i.e. unified and in good taste. Even the most exact and accurate rendering of some specific Chinese term will have to be judged as to whether or not it is likely to be too cumbrous or jabberwocky in a given context. An interesting comment on the translator’s business is contained in the last volume of Artibus Asiae, in one or two reviews . . . by the master translator, Arthur Waley, who makes a point of the translator’s achievement depending as strongly on inspiration as does Beethoven when writing a sonata. Perhaps our colleagues who set forth rules and formulae for general application (which of course never work because nobody will
care) do not aspire high enough. I think, on the whole, that theorizing about how to translate is stale, academic, meaningless; it is a complete work of translation with its particular merits and style which can—by setting a standard—influence scholarly work at large."

3. (Letter of August 16, 1956; responding to something I must have written, but cannot imagine having written, about how scholars should stick to the facts and not speculate so much:)

"You take up a question of ideal or not so ideal method. Can you do without speculation? You can, surely, and that which results from it is a collection of data. These, in themselves, no matter how well ascertained and documented, are not much more than the raw material. In the humanistic studies, it is the meaning that counts. To arrive at the meanings, you must have an understanding of the facts. And acquiring understanding is more than a penetrating knowledge (—connoisseurship) of the material; it is given by, or rather arrived at through, a reasoned and logical theory which makes sense out of the facts by linking them in a coherent order. Depending on how well we observe, or look into, the known data, we may arrive at a theory with just a few facts, and afterward search intelligently, purposefully and systematically for further facts that fit into our theory. What you call speculation is probably the same as building up a theory without 'all the facts.' But, in the humanities, these are never fully assembled.

"In science it is very much the same thing. A phenomenon is observed but not understood at first. A theory is required to explain it. Without theory we are lost, and no phenomenon or fact falls into its place. Perhaps you may read Panofsky's brief essay on the question of method in his small book, Meaning in the Arts.

"Lack of speculation seems an unhealthy and cowardly trend which can be widely seen at present."

(At work on my doctoral dissertation, I had complained that my writing tended to be verbose and facile. Professor Lœhr did not entirely disagree, but added kindly: "Still it may be a better kind of ailment, if you have to be on your guard against too much, than if you had the impression that there was too slow a trickle of thought." He went on to express his views on prose style in a paragraph that can serve to illustrate its own argument:)

"The question of the literary style is a very vital and important one . . . To write 'natural' is probably the last achievement, but you must not expect that it comes any more easily than the 'natural' (t'ien-jan) spontaneous style of an artist. It must be conquered although it is one's own. The only indispensable qualities, in scholarly prose, are clarity and conciseness. As to the rest, you will have to follow the dictate of your feeling and taste. 'Where is your ultimate self to be found? It is always in the deepest enchantments you have suffered.' (Hofmannsthal). Stendhal had the ideal of writing in the terse and final style of the Code Napoleon. A fiction writer may decide one way or another. A chemist has little trouble. We in our sphere have the big task of having to describe and analyse, both of which are exceedingly difficult at times. All we can do is to try and remain lively and yet precise. Preciseness requires
much thinking. On the whole, I admire the short, trim, neat (and in as far elegant) presentation, with as much warmth, ease and grace as the subject matter and the writer's maturity will permit. Beethoven did not start with the Seventh either. Nor do I know of the painter who from the beginning was quite himself.”
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FORTHCOMING WORK
The Great Masters of Chinese Painting.
THE CONTEXT OF RAJPUT PAINTING

By MILO CLEVELAND BEACH*

Any attempt to characterize the Rajput paintings of Rajasthan must first take into account the particular context of the tradition within India. Rajput painting evolved contemporaneously with, and in the same geographic area as, the Mughal style; furthermore, Rajasthan had long been the home of a vital folk art. An investigation of the relationship between these three complexes—the Rajput, the Mughal and the village or folk—is essential to our comprehension of any one of them; and at the same time this will show that the three are by no means of equal art-historical interest. We will begin by discussing each of these stylistic units.

About Mughal painting we can be brief, for Mughal works are well-known as a type and have finally begun to be seriously studied. One specific trait should certainly be stressed: in the Mughal tradition consciousness of style was extreme and stylistic evolution intense and rapid. This is true already in what seems to be the earliest Mughal manuscript, the Cleveland Tūti-nāma.1 Imperial patrons were clearly concerned with the styles of individual painters in their employ. We recall the famous boast of the Emperor Jehangir: “If there be a picture containing many portraits, and each face be the work of a different master, I can discover which face is the work of each of them.”2 While this may seem an extravagant claim, it does not seem an extravagant concept—at least to the Western viewer. We shall see, however, that there is little precedent for such a boast in pre-Mughal artistic practice. In any case, the isolation of the styles of different painters is as meaningful and proper an activity for scholars of Mughal painting today as it once was for the patrons: and we see in the evolution of Báṣāwan or Miskîn, to name only the most familiar artists, the development and growth of personal interests and individual perceptions.

We can further note that the overall concerns of the Mughal style were determined solely by the Emperor or, occasionally, members of his family; indeed, painting outside of this circle is termed sub-imperial and, thereby, deemed provincial. It is the Emperors’ ateliers that define Mughal painting, and thus stylistic elements as well as comprehensibility did not necessarily extend beyond the bounds of imperial interests. Under Akbar, who was initially interested in literally everything, Mughal painting drew for some time even from Indian village traditions. However, later in his reign and under the rule of his successors, the interests of the two complexes became antithetical: the Mughal Emperors wished their artists to record and investigate the uniqueness of the natural world through studies of personalities, objects and actions—a concept at total variance with basic

---

* Associate Professor of Art, Williams College.


village beliefs and with pre-Mughal painting grew increasingly independent of indigenous Indian cultural attitudes, it became, in relation to these attitudes, both exotic and elitist; even more important, it became enormously isolated.

What are the distinctive visual traits of Mughal painting? The style undergoes such dynamic development that it is difficult to pinpoint typical characteristics, but we might at least discuss here a work that in many ways exemplifies the mature style. *Lovers on a Terrace* (fig. 1), datable to about 1645, is signed by Bālchand. The artist is interested in establishing an atmosphere, here a rather hazy and romantic one, and accomplishes this by the softness of his colors, the balance of the composition, the way in which the landscape background fades into the distance and other such details. He is also concerned with portraiture—the male figure convincingly depicts an actual person (Shāh Shuja, the second son of Shāh Jahān). Above all the painter is interested in minutiae: the pattern on the bolsters and pillows, the texture of the gold fabric, the way a translucent muslin affects the color of flesh or fabric beneath. Such details are presented with such refined craftsmanship that the painting has somewhat the character of a luxury object.

It might be worthwhile to compare *figure 1* to a Rajput work of a similar subject (fig. 2) more for the purpose of accentuating aspects of the Mughal painting than for a comparison of the Rajput and Mughal styles (in fact, the Rajput page shows considerable Mughal influence). This illustration to a religious text (the *Rāsamānjarī*), unlike the secular and commemorative Mughal illustration, shows a pair of lovers in a pavilion. Whereas in the Bālchand painting there is a comparatively easy naturalism and a sense, at least, of the actual scene, the Rajput work is built in blocks of color having an emotional rather than a visual reality. The figures, with rectangular heads and enormous eyes, are not portraits derived from observation but manipulations of pre-determined formulas. Both works stress mood, yet the moods are extraordinarily different. The Rajput painting is dynamic and impassioned; the Mughal work, by contrast, although elegant, is perhaps the least passionate love-scene imaginable. Its interest lies not in the vitality of its narrative but in stylistic and aesthetic refinements and the power of the artist’s observation and empathy with the figures portrayed.

If we place Mughal painting within a larger framework, we must remember that the Mughals were originally from eastern Iran and foreign to the territories of contemporary India, to which they came in the sixteenth century. In addition, they were Muslim and, by orthodox belief, militantly antagonistic to the Hinduism of the villages. While it is true that their art was profoundly affected by the Indian environment, both natural and man-made, mature Mughal art was nevertheless un-Indian, if by this we judge its links with, and sympathy for, the cultural traditions of the subcontinent. Imperial Mughal painting and civilization is of great interest because of this contrast with more historically deep-seated Hindu sensibilities. Although Mughal painting presents us with a perfectly valid set of responses to India, we must look elsewhere, and turn to village styles if we

---

wish to define more truly Indian painting, as opposed simply to painting in India. This is because the village cultures remained relatively free of Mughal and other imported influences.

_Figure 3_ illustrates the story of Dhola-Märu, a folk tale popular in Marwar, the region in northwest Rajasthan around present-day Jodhpur. It is a simple village painting meant to be sold in the bazaars and can be dated to about A.D. 1855 on the basis of an inscribed painting in an Indian private collection.4 _Figure 4_ is a scene from the great epic Mahābhārata. Six or seven distinct sets of this series are known, some on British water-marked paper of 1835 and 1887.5 Made for the use of village storytellers, pages would be held up to illustrate episodes as they were recited or dramatized. The work is not from Rajasthan but from the Deccan, to the south, although in style it is directly comparable to _figure 3_. The aim in both works is clarity of narration and vividness of immediate effect. Figures and objects are distinctly defined, and dramatic gestures emphasized. Outlines are heavy and of even thickness; color is simple and strong, evenly applied within the rigidly delineated boundaries, and the background (usually a single color plane) is often positive, as strong in pattern as the figures. Faces are drawn according to strict formulas (e.g. angular profile, large eyes), and there is little conscious artistic embellishment. Naturalism, personal individuality (in this case meaning portraiture) and formal refinements—so basic to Mughal paint-

4 An almost identical painting, from a _Ramayana_ set, is signed Nathu and dated A.D. 1855.

5 I am grateful to Jagdish Mittal for this information. The Deccani attribution is his, and the full argument will be published by him shortly.

ing but extraneous to a narrative and traditional subject matter meant for the easy comprehension of a villager—arc alien to this work. Furthermore, the subject matter here as in other village works is limited to religious and legendary texts, and the method to simple repetition of familiar and well-entrenched formulas. Altering illustrations to traditional texts was, in many cases, tantamount to altering the texts themselves.

The few examples scen here can serve, hopefully, both to typify folk traits and to indicate that such characteristics extend well beyond the boundaries of Rajasthan and are applicable over a large region of the country. Moreover, the same traits which we isolated to distinguish this outlook can be used to exemplify the most important remnants of non-Muslim, pre-Mughal painting in north India, such as the famous dispersed _Bhāgavata Purāṇa_ set, almost certainly from Rajasthan (although not necessarily Rajput) and datable to about A.D. 1540. _King Parikṣit and the Rśis_ (fig. 5) is from this set,6 and compositionally relates well to _figure 4_. While these two pages have distinct characteristics, little evolution in basic outlook or intent seems to have occurred over the course of more than three centuries which separates them. Both are severely limited in color; both arc composed in horizontal bands and compartments, with figures constructed from similar formulas and placed in profile and show other common features of the type mentioned earlier. By contrast, it is interesting to note that in the concurrent Mughal tradition, the evolution and distinctions of

6 The page has been published in color in Sherman E. Lee, _Rajput Painting_ (New York, 1960), fig. 3a.
style were so intense that paintings can often be dated to the approximate year of their execution by visual means alone. Considering the unity of aim of the folk style over both geographic and chronological distance, it seems clear that stylistic and formal concerns did not have the same value for the village painter as for his Mughal counterpart. Such variations in style as we do see in comparing, for example, the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (fig. 5) and the Mahābhārata (fig. 4) pages are more a reflection of variations on one way of perceiving than a mirror of change and growth of perception. This, of course, is an extreme contrast to the situation found in Mughal art.

The folk character of these village works does not imply—as it might in another culture—that the works are of peripheral interest. Villages, it need hardly be repeated, have always been central to Indian cultural definition, housing still more than eighty per-cent of the country’s population. Indeed, one can argue that the present great metropolitan complexes in India have evolved in response to foreign presence and requirements and remain inappropriate to Indian social and cultural needs.) It is this importance of village values to India, perhaps more than any uniqueness of these values—which are allied in many respects to folk and traditional cultures outside India—that determines their importance to the artistic life of the country. Village traditions resist change and the incorporation of elements that might disturb the status quo. This has already been implied by the seeming stagnation of the folk style of painting. In the cirea 1540 Bhāgavata Purāṇa and the Mahābhārata pages of the mid-nineteenth century, it is further evidenced by the fact that each set is on “foreign” paper: the Bhāgavata Purāṇa re-used paper from an earlier Islamic manuscript to support its illustrations,7 while, as we noted, the Mahābhārata is on British-made paper. Thus in each case, it seems that though contact with non-Hindu (non-village) ideas was available it was avoided, for there is no sign within the stylistic elements of the paintings of any such influence. And we know, of course, that orthodox Hindu social and religious structure strenuously forbids such intrusions. The allowance and recognition of the usefulness and inspiration of such contacts, in fact, is what differentiates the Rajput from village traditions in India.

While only very lightly sketched here, we hope some sense of the basic differences between Mughal and village interests in painting has emerged and that the complexes are seen to be visually distinct as well as different in intent and historic role. It should be understood that we have made these contrasts only in order to establish a framework for the study of Indian painting. For that reason they are presented with an absoluteness that tends to deny the richness and variety of the works themselves. The paintings cannot always be categorized as neatly as the argument implies.

Turning our attention now to Rajput painting, we should first define the social and political interactions of these three groups. The Mughals had conquered Rajasthan and thus had usurped the power of the Rajput rājās who had formerly ruled independently in many areas. The term “Rajput” refers to the rulers of Rajasthan—by definition a distinct class and of different caste from the villagers. These men

might control extensive kingdoms, such as Jaipur or Jodhpur. If they were minor members of Rajput families, their patrimony might have been reduced by time and lineage to a few acres and their titles to the equivalent, or less, of baron and earl. The most powerful Rajput chieftains often willingly served as generals in the Mughal armies and as governors of the Mughal provinces.

Like the villagers over whom they had originally ruled, the Rajputs were Hindus, reading the same texts and celebrating the same holidays as their subjects, sharing a common culture and even, on occasion, ritually reversing social roles. The Mughals kept apart from this; indeed, their refusal to sink roots into the indigenous cultures of their environment is an essential factor in the development—and especially the decline—of the imperial Mughal style of painting. Once the Empire was established and its power secure, the Mughal Emperors could afford to exist in isolation: they felt no need to reconcile that long-standing antipathy Muslims felt towards Hinduism and allowed into their circle only those Rajputs who adopted Mughal attitudes. Mughal criteria—in the arts as elsewhere—thus became a standard to which many Rajputs quite naturally aspired, for imperial favor was the chief means to wealth, prestige, and political power. Other Rajputs remained culturally allied to the world of the village and in some cases were so limited in their power and provincial in their territory that they were, in fact, mere villagers. Thus while Mughal India and village India were largely unaffected culturally by each other, the Rajputs provided a continuum linking the two extremes. And just as within the history of painting in India, Mughal painting is the polar opposite of village art, so—to a degree—we can say that the closer style approaches Mughal criteria of excellence, the less traditionally Indian it becomes. Perhaps we can go beyond this and say that conscious stylistic change seems to come about and perhaps is only possible in Indian painting when non-Hindu ideas dominate the indigenous and orthodox.

It might prove useful now to examine how the Rajput style works within the frame provided by Mughal and village art by establishing a sequence of paintings from one Rajput state, in this case Mewar, the capital of which was present-day Udaipur. Mālāśrī Rāgini (fig. 6), a page from the “Chawand” Ragamala dated 1605, has as its stylistic source the Bhāgavata Purāṇa of circa 1540 (fig. 5) and related sets, from which it derives its range of color, the compartmentalized compositions, and the figurative types. It is not the similarities that are important to us, however, but the differences: the inexplicable division between flat planes of color seen in the earlier works has been replaced in the 1605 illustration by areas more convincingly descriptive. The band of flat color behind the seated figures in figure 5 is found as well in figure 6, for example, but there it is explained to us as being a wall. In addition, the later figures show an easing of the stark, strong formulas used for the faces: the profiles are softer, the eyes less dominant. Still highly dependent on formulas, they are nonetheless comparatively more naturalistic. The same

8 Figure 6 could be even more advantageously compared to a scene of “Bhairavi Ragini” in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, contemporary to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa and reproduced in color in W. G. Archer, Central Indian Painting (London, 1958), pl. 3.
direction is followed in a further stage of the Mewar style, seen in a Rāgamālā page dated 1628 (fig. 7). Figures now are rendered in a scale more credible in terms of the architecture; the slight modelling of the faces further contrasts with the absolute flatness of the earliest phase of the style; and the band at the bottom is far more integral to the composition, no longer the seemingly decorative adjunct of figure 5 but connected to the major architectural pavilion by steps and the figure at the lower left.

One further comparison between two paintings both showing Krishna with goṇīs (milkmaid) (figs. 8 and 9), dated to about 1650 and 1680 respectively, extends these developments still further. The dominating flat surface of figure 8, accentuated by the strong, two-dimensional forms of the trees, is no longer present in figure 9 where the tree, for example, begins to have texture and weight. Of greater interest are the figural inter-relationships in each illustration. Both Krishna and the women in the later work are far more lively and show real interaction, in comparison to the rigid lineup of repeated figural formulas in figure 8.

The purpose of these comparisons has been to show the way in which the folk-based early Rajput style (represented by fig. 6) changed under Mughal influence: all the developments we have seen are adoptions of attitudes introduced into India by the Mughals and are not explicable except as a direct and continuing response at one court—albeit a very conservative one—to new standards of taste and new styles. The enormous stylistic range shown by the various Rajput schools (many of the Raj-put nobles supported local workshops of artists who directly reflected their patrons’ differing awareness of and taste for things Mughal) tells us how difficult it is to define a separate, visually identifiable, Rajput style. Rajput art reflects different responses to and balances within the tension established by Mughal and village ideals, and without this tension it could not exist. In fact, once the Mughals ended as effective cultural influences in India, the Rajput style either reverted to the folk outlook or came to be affected by British rather than Mughal influence. The Rajput style produced no lasting independent synthesis of Mughal and village art. The Rajput approaches to Mughal standards were forgotten as soon as such adaptations were no longer politically or culturally expedient. This reaffirms the fact that the grip traditional ideals held on the arts of Hindu India was intense, and emphasizes the dependent and therefore rather precarious nature of the Rajput style.

A further important distinction between Mughal and village traditions is pointed out in an examination of the origin of the Mughal style. This involved a forced reconciliation and synthesis of opposed artistic principles—mainly Persian, European, and, to a much lesser extent, Hindu—under the direction and at the personal demand of the Emperor Akbar, who thereby expressed interests antithetical to the Indian village sensibility, with its controlled avoidance of conflict and change. In addition, Akbar introduced subject matter which because of its secular nature was new to India: historical texts, for example, and portraiture. And as he was interested in studies of the physiognomy and character of particular members of his circle and

9 The illustration was sold at Sotheby’s on December 11, 1972, as Lot 86.
of people or things that had caught his interest, so too he demanded unique responses from his painters. The village tradition, like Hinduism itself, gave no such value to the role of the individual, and therefore the attitude of the Rajput artist towards individuality depended on the relation of the context in which he worked to the defining extremes of Mughal and village ideals.

This brings us to a final comment. It may be the attitudes towards the importance and value of individuality that explains best the differing approaches we have seen towards style, stylistic evolution, and the importance of individual artistic initiative and perception in the three general categories into which we have divided the Indian paintings we are discussing. If we believe, as we must, that stylistic change does not occur spontaneously or inevitably but expresses a progression of unique individual insights, then the recognition of the individuality of the artist is basic to stylistic evolution; and this is not contradicted by an examination of the dynamics of style in Mughal as distinct from village painting in India. Western art-historical method assumes the primacy of the recognition of the distinctions and historical sequences, of styles—in fact, it is meaningless without it. It is questionable, therefore, whether our own art-historical procedures are appropriate to the study of the art of traditional societies, such as village India, in which the individual is of little consequence and in which styles do not necessarily show meaningful sequential development. For Indian painting and we believe for other areas of Indian art as well this demands that we continually consider whether the ingrained techniques of art-history are adequate to provide us with the most significant possible information.
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Fig. 8.—Krishna with Gopis and a Young Prince. Mewar. Ca. 1650. American private collection.
Fig. 9.—Krishna with Gopis. Mewar. Ca. 1630. American private collection.
IN HIS ARTICLE, "SOUTH CHINESE INFLUENCE on the Buddhist Art of the Six Dynasties Period," Professor Alexander Soper explained the major shifts in style in sixth-century sculpture in the north in terms of successive waves of influence from the south. Southern influence is evident also in contemporary imagery of non-Buddhist origin such as the monsters, dragons, and phoenixes that served to decorate Han tombs. This type of ornament continued to appear in the late Six Dynasties period, when it was often set off by the floral scroll and palmette designs that embellished contemporary Buddhist art and replaced the Han cloud scroll as a decorative ground. And the floral forms, which began to proliferate in abundance in the course of the sixth century, would also seem to have been stimulated by southern taste.

The conjunction of these diverse types of ornamental motifs takes place on engraved stone tomb monuments and epitaph tablets, molded tomb bricks, and carved or painted ceilings of Buddhist caves done in the first half of the sixth century, toward the end of the political division between North and South China. Some of this material reflects
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3 Describing the transition from cloud to floral scroll ornament, Professor Max Loehr pointed out the Western influence evident in early floral motifs at the Yin-kang caves. See Max Loehr, "The Fate of the Ornament in Chinese Art," Archives of Asian Art, vol. 21 (1967-68), pp. 14-15. And inhabited vine scrolls, derived from Hellenistic prototypes, occur in painted lacquer and carved stone decoration from Su'-ma Chin-hung's tomb of 484 near Ta-t'ung, Shansi. See Wen-hua ta-ko-ming ch'i-chien ch'i-u wen-wu 文化大革命期间出土文物 (Peking: Wen-wu Ch'u-pan-shu, 1972), pls. 145, 146. There is, however, archeological evidence that rhythmically treated, sinicized floral ornament developed in the south before it appeared in northern art of the sixth century.
the decorative art of the southern court at Chien-k’ang, present-day Nanking, and some of that of the northern capital, Lo-yang. The funerary pieces can be dated fairly precisely by the death of the deceased whose tomb they ornament or by the inscribed date of burial. From this evidence it is possible to pinpoint links between southern and northern styles as well as to trace distinctive lines of development in separate areas, ranging across China from Nanking in the southeast to Tun-huang 敦煌 in the northwest corridor.

Outside Nanking are the tombs of the ruling families of the later Southern dynasties. The tomb approaches, or spirit ways, are lined with stone monuments that are known to us only from early photographs and hence are quite difficult to study in detail. Two works of the 520’s have interesting engraved decoration. One is the single remaining pillar of a pair at the tomb of Hsiao Ch’ing 蕭景, (fig. 1) who died in 529 and was a cousin of the famous Liang ruler, Wu-ti 梁武帝 (r. 502–549). Pairs of fluted stone columns marking the spirit way with inscriptions proclaiming the name of the deceased are known from Han times. But the seated lion that tops this pillar is visual evidence of the Liang court’s interest in Buddhism and its contacts, direct or indirect, with India. The inscription plackard is bordered by floral scrolls and supported by three grimacing, winged monsters, but the most important decoration is incised on one side. This interesting remnant of sixth-century southern figural art (figs. 2 and 2a), shows an attendant divinity with a floral offering in a vase, animated by an exaggerated stride. The figure is lightly clad by Chinese standards, and floral motifs in the background presumably depict the auspicious rain of flowers thrown in adoration by heavenly beings in Buddhist sūtras.


5 For Hsiao Ch’ing’s biography, see Liang shu 梁書 24 (Shanghai: K’ai-ming Shu-tien, 1935), pp. 1798D–1799A.

6 Reproduced in Itô Chûta, “[The Spirit Way of the Liang Courtier Hsiao],” Kokka, no. 217 (1908), p. 318; Chin Chi’, “[A Summary of the Repairs on Stone Sculpture at Six Dynasties Tombs near Nanking],” Wen-wu, no. 104 (1959:4), p. 31. If the placard is a replacement, this design may be a later copy unless some of the original stone remains.

7 See for example Alexander Soper, Literary Evidence for Early Buddhist Art in China (Ascona, 1959), p. 183.
More decorative material appears on the remaining upright stele in front of the tomb of Hsiao Hung 蕭宏 (fig. 3), who died in 526. Hsiao Hung was the younger brother of Wu-ti, the Liang Emperor who was equally noted for his devotion to Buddhism and his filial piety. Steles and stone animals were technically prohibited in an edict on tomb regulations of 507, but Wu-ti evidently made exceptions in the case of his father and brothers. Because of Hsiao Hung’s close relationship to the Emperor, the decoration must have been carefully supervised and undoubtedly reflected the current artistic taste of the Liang court. Rubblings of the low relief engravings on the side of this stele are quite well-known. In a series of eight square registers (fig. 4) winged monsters alternate with imaginary birds and animals. The birds are presumably feng-huang 鳳凰, the pair of so-called phoenixes, and the animal with antlers, a heavenly deer. One of the monsters is armed, and another holds over his head what may be a semicircle of linked drums, the attribute of a thunder god. Continuous floral scrolls bound each square, and swirls of floral ornament appear in the background.

Less well-known is a faint rubbing of the decoration carved at the top of the stele’s back (fig. 5). The stele still retains the traditional hole in its upper part, indicated in the rubbing by the blank circle of paper ringed with petals. Above it is a monster squatting on a lotus base and clad in breeches which hang low on his stomach ending in loose, petal-like folds about the kneecap. He pulls at a crossbow on top of his head with two miniscule arms in the usual pose of Ch’ih-yu 誠尤, the Han god of war who was accompanied into battle by spirits of wind, rain and thunder. A pair of dragons swoop down to either side below, with leafy branches in their mouths and a cushion of cloud puffs underneath them. At the bottom is a Buddhist motif, a pcarl and flaming jewels on a lotus-petal base flanked by elegant, twisting sprays of flowers. And to either side are attendant

10 For the biography of Hsiao Hung, see Liang shu 22, p. 1796B.
11 This edict, recorded in Sui shu 隋書 8, is translated in Soper, Textual Evidence, p. 23. Steles were usually set up within a few years after burial. For a description of elaborate Buddhist architectural projects dedicated to Wu-ti’s parents, see Soper, Literary Evidence, pp. 75–76.
13 For comments on these creatures, see Willets, Chinese Art, vol. 1, pp. 267, 277–282.
16 This type of elongated floral spray seems to be elaborated from the relatively naturalistic forms that serve as border decoration on some of the molded bricks from T’eng-hsien discussed below in the text. Its most significant appearance in Buddhist art is in the mandorla of a stone stele from Pu-t’o shan, Chekiang that has been thought to be a southern work. See Alexander Soper, “A Wei Style Bronze from Chekiang,” Artibus Asiae, vol. 23 (1960), p. 218. In the north cruder versions are carved in mandorlas of standing Buddhas in the central Pin-yang Cave at Lung-men, completed by 523 and presumably worked on in the second decade. See Terukazu Akiyama and Saburo Matsubara, Arts of China (II): Buddhist Cave Temples (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1969), p. 144, pl. 134; also see Nagahiro, Sekai bijutsu zenshū, vol. 14, pl. 52.
monsters, with wings and draperies tossing in an agitated fashion in the same wind that stirs the surrounding floral swirls.

Literary evidence would suggest that these monsters were members of a band of Thunders said to roam the skies of the southeast, armed with a mysterious thunder axe or wedge and associated with linked drums. They are described in T’ang texts as having pig-like faces and fleshy blue wings that differ from birds’ wings, and as wearing red knee-length breeches.\(^\text{17}\) As manifestations of demonic natural forces, monsters and dragons must have originally had an apotropaic function on Han tomb reliefs. Hence it seems incongruous here that they almost merge with sprigs of flowers and are treated with the same elegance as the sweeping floral tendrils. Elongated, twisting shapes give the design a dynamic character that is underlined by a balanced asymmetry in the positioning of forms.

A similar combination of mythical creatures and dynamic floral motifs appears in the ceiling of Cave 285 (P. 120N) at Tun-huang. Inscriptions dated 538 and 539 are found in what seems to be the latest part of the cave; hence the ceiling was presumably done somewhat earlier in the 530’s.\(^\text{18}\) In the northern quadrant (fig. 6), under a simulated canopy with pendant jades at each corner, a design of twisting lotus flowers and half-palmettes is placed slightly off-center. The attendant Buddhist divinities, apsaras with floating scarves, were not present on Hsiao Hung’s stele, but the monsters with fleshy wings and the crested birds with upswpt wings and plumed tails were. Here they chase each other across the sky surrounded by asymmetrical floral sprays and pinwheels and accompanied by other creatures found on Han reliefs, such as the nine-headed dragon and the heavenly deer with flaming shoulders, now minus antlers.

On the eastern side (fig. 7) the cast is enlarged by Fu-hsi 伏羲 and Nu-wa 女娲, the pair of mythical rulers, half-human, half-dragon in form, who are often associated with the sun and moon in this period,\(^\text{19}\) while below two attendant yakshas hold the floral support of an enthroned jewel, a symbol of the Buddhist faith. In the combination of Buddhist motifs with those of pre-Buddhist origin as well as in the types of creatures and flowers, this ceiling certainly seems close to Hsiao Hung’s stele, but the forms and compositions at Tun-huang lack the subtlety of the engraving. And the regional difference between the art of the southern capital and that of Tun-huang on the border of Central Asia can be illustrated by a comparison between the attendant with flowers on Hsiao Ching’s pillar and the yakshas of Cave 285. While the same stride galvanizes these figures, the Tun-huang yakshas are more Western in type with their brief loin cloths, encircling shawls, and halos.

However, for any perspective on Cave 285, one must look back to Cave 249 (P. 101) at Tun-huang, probably done about twenty years earlier, where similar mythical creatures cavort in the ceiling. On the eastern side (fig. 8), Central Asian types of


\(^{18}\) See Akiyama and Matsubara, Arts of China, vol. 2, pp. 208–211.

bird-winged, demon-faced *yakshas* with flaming hair support a jewel on a meager lotus base. Apart from a few schematic floral pinwheels, cloud puffs fill the background, and floral elements in the borders tend to be treated in a rather skimpy, linear fashion as in other caves of the very beginning of the sixth century. The birds have the lower tails of Han types, and a relatively crude early version of a horned, winged monster makes its first appearance. By comparison, the ceiling of Cave 285 has fewer Western aspects and seems far closer to the elegant Liang style, particularly in the dynamic, asymmetrical floral motifs.

It is possible that some contact with southern decorative art helped to inspire the new style of this ceiling, since works done prior to 530 in the north do not show a similar interest in floral forms. This conclusion can be drawn from a study of other early sixth-century material from the vicinity of Lo-yang in comparison with designs on molded bricks from a southern tomb at T'eng-hsien (Yüan) near Nan-yang (Nanyang) in Honan close to the northern border.

A *mélange* of Confucian, Taoist, and Buddhist motifs ornament the T'eng-hsien bricks, reflecting the hybrid beliefs of the period and hinting at the wide range of Six Dynasties decorative vocabulary. Comparable motifs were listed among the appropriate themes to be painted on the canopy of a Northern Wei chariot of state: "hills and woods, cloud emanations, Immortals, sages, worthy men, famous loyalists, paragons of filial piety, chaste ladies, roaming dragons, flying phoenixes, the Red Bird, the Sombre Warrior, the White Tiger, the Green Dragon, exotic birds and strange beasts." A large proportion of the decoration consists of fantastic creatures like those on the Tun-huang ceilings. On one brick (fig. 9), a robed spirit rider, presumably a Taoist Immortal, rides on what seems to be a winged tiger; on another (fig. 10)...

---


21 Compare the floral scrols in ceilings shown in Basil Gray and J. B. Vincent, *Buddhist Cave Paintings at Tun-huang* (Chicago, 1959), pls. 9 and 12.

22 Published in *T'eng-hsien ts'ai-se hua-hsiang-chuan mu* (Peking: Wen-wu Chüpan-shè, 1958). The southern character of this tomb, which is evident in the architecture and ornamental designs, is attested to by an inscription on a tomb brick indicating that the occupant had retainers from Wu-ch'un (Su-chou) in Kiangsu.


24 The White Tiger and other tiger-like beasts such as the *tsou-pii* (驅傩) were considered benevolent creatures in the fifth and sixth centuries. See Alexander Soper, "The 'Jen Shou' Mirrors," *Artibus Asiae*, vol. 29 (1967), pp. 62-63. The Han prototypes of such spirit riders were feathered Immortals on the orthodox Taoist mounts of heavenly deer or dragons. They seem to have been incorporated into Buddhist iconography in the south where Taoist concepts were easily assimilated. According to Nan shih 5, when the next-to-last ruler of Southern Ch'i rebuilt the palace after the fire of 501, "he stripped the ornamental ceilings from Buddhist temples, with their Immortals riding on beasts, in order to complete (the decorations)." Soper, *Textual Evidence*, p. 20. On the ceiling of Cave 28 at Yün-kang, probably finished in the first decade of the sixth century, riders on dragons are interwoven in the
there are two bird deities with the southern type of raised tail and bi-segmented wings emphasized by contrasting colors. In pre-Han and Han mythology, a human-headed bird was an auspicious spirit or a wind spirit, and a deer-headed bird, a wind god. The characters on this brick convey traditional wishes for longevity, which may in the context of the tomb express hopes for immortality. On both bricks the subjects are framed by and expand into a floral border, here derived from forms observed in nature. Flowers in the border and background still have a linear aspect, as do preliminary cloud puffs.

The Teng-hsien bricks are not datable by inscription and have been placed in both the fifth and sixth centuries. Comparable motifs on them are considerably earlier than those on Hsiao Hung's stele of about 526. At Teng-hsien the pair of descending dragons with floral offerings (fig. II) seem less elegant and lack the solidified cloud cushions. However, the half-palmette scroll occasionally used as a border may be more elongated than a similar scroll from a Ch'ang-sha 長沙 tomb dated 499. Whatever the date of the Teng-hsien style, it was current at the beginning of the sixth century since it entered North China in the

central lotus design. See Mizuno S. and Nagahiro T., Yün-kang, vol. 15 (Kyoto: Kyōto University, 1955), pl. 80. In the K'ü-yang Cave at Lung-men, on a niche archway in the second level to the right, seven riders on the traditional deer and dragons are encircled by cloud puffs and floral twists like the Teng-hsien figure, and probably date from the second decade. See Mizuno and Nagahiro, Lung-men, p. 103, fig. 102. Outriders on phoenixes and dragons escort the chariots of Hsi-wang-mu 西王母 and Tung-wang-kung 蘇王公 on the ceiling of the contemporary Cave 249 at Tun-huang. See Gray and Vincent, Buddhist Cave Paintings, pl. 11A; Akiyama and Matsubara, Arts of China, vol. 2, p. 45, pl. 18. On the sides of Erh-chu Hsi's epitaph tablet cover of 529 (see below in the text), robed spirit riders appear on each of the four directional animals conceivably because of a misunderstanding on the part of the Lo-yang designer since the directional animals are not ridden by figures on the Teng-hsien bricks or in the wall-paintings of Korean tombs. See Karlgen, “Legends and Cults,” pp. 244, 323–324; also see Marcel Granet, Dames et légendes de la Chine ancienne, 2nd ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1939), vol. 1, pp. 142, 257–258; vol. 2, p. 526. Two Shan-hai ching references link these “divine birds” or “dragon birds” with nature spirits that accompanied Huang-ti in his aerial journey described in Han Fei-tzu 韓非子 and served as outriders on spirit journeys in the Ch'ü ts' u. See Karlgen, “Legends and Cults,” pp. 280, 317–318.

However, certain identification is not possible since there were several different types of human-headed birds in Han art and literature and since commentators were unable to decide whether the Wind Earl was a deer-headed bird or a bird-headed deer-leopard. For a different opinion on the identity of the human-faced bird and the Wind Earl or Fei-lien 貔貅, see Sun Tso-yün, “The Identification of Some Fantastic Representations in the Murals of Tun-huang,” K'ao-kü, no. 48 (1963:6), pp. 27–30.


See Teng-hsien ts'ai-se huo-hsiang-chuaan mu, pp. 24, 26, 28; pls. 26, 30, 34; compare Wen-wu, no. 88 (1957:12), p. 43.
second decade. The Teng-hsien type of *apsaras* encircled by cloud and floral motifs (fig. 12) appear on niche arches in the Ku-yang 古陽 cave at Lung-men 龍門, wearing the upswept Chinese robes that were only briefly in fashion in the north.29

To turn to other comparative material, a series of stone tablets with engraved epitaphs from the graves of Northern Wei nobles near Lo-yang are also decorated with monsters, spirit riders, or the *su shen* 四神, the four directional animals of Han.30 The earliest, the tablet of Yüan Hui 元暐, who was buried in 520, has motifs that are closest to Teng-hsien imagery.31 On it the Green Dragon of the east (fig. 13) is elongated to fit into half of a side and surrounded by scudding clouds that seem believable elaborations of the forms on a comparable Teng-hsien brick (fig. 14).

Yüan Hui died in office in 519, and, according to an epitaph, his daughter Lady Yüan followed him three years later out of filial affection. Her tablet with its cover is in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, and the base is lined with deer-headed birds and fourteen cavorting monsters.32 They are the familiar bat-winged type with breeches, and the southern petal-like convention for the loose folds about the knee-cap is evident in the image of the stone-crunching monster (fig. 15). The stone, identified in the creature’s inscribed name, may conceivably be the mysterious thunder wedge mentioned in literature.33 In the style of Lady Yüan’s tablet, the first hint of a northern taste appears. These monsters are more heavily built than their southern cousins on Hsiao Hung’s stele, and cloud forms have solidified into punctuation marks in the background.

A similar style is found on the tablet of Yüan Mi 元暐 or Prince Chen-ching 貞景王 (fig. 16), which was done in 524 and is

29 See Mizuno and Nagahiro, *Lung-men*, p. 102, fig. 101; compare Nagahiro, Sekai bijutsu zenshū, vol. 14, color pl. 7. In early sixth-century ceilings of northern Buddhist caves, *apsaras* generally wear the Westernized costume of a long skirt and trailing scarves. Chinese robes may have continued to be fashionable in the south to judge from an *apsaras* on a Liang stele of 523 from Chi'êng-tu, and southern influence may account for the robes of some figures in the halo and mandorla of a Buddha from Cave 127 at Mai-chi-shan 釈頂山. See Akiyama and Matsubara, *Arts of China*, vol. 2, p. 111, pl. 89; p. 169, pl. 163.

30 One such tablet was recently found in an Eastern Wei grave of 538 near Chi-nan, see *Wen-wen*, no. 186 (1966:4), pp. 56–57.

31 Rubbings from this tablet are best reproduced in Nishikawa, *Seian hirin*, pls. 120–125; also see Chao Wan-li 趙萬里, Han Wei Nan-pei Ch'ao mu-chih chi-shih 漢魏南北朝墓誌集釋 (Peking: K'o-loi-hu Chi’u-pan-shu, 1956), 3.14b–15a; no. 55. For a comparison of drawings of the tortoise and snake and the *chi’shin* 鳳麟 on the tablet with motifs on the Teng-hsien bricks, see K’ao-ku, no. 35 (1959:5), p. 257, figs. 5, 6.

32 See Chao, Han Wei Nan-pei Ch’ao mu-chih chi-shih, no. 57. This tablet has been discussed at length in Okumura Ikurō 奥村伊九郎, “[The Engraved Images of the Epitaph of Lady Yüan, Wife of Feng Yung of the Wei],” *Urinsu 芸術*, vol. 1 (Kyoto, 1935), pp. 1–15; Nagahiro, *The Representational Art of the Six Dynasties Period*, pp. 118–123.

33 For the stones associated with thunder monsters, see the Appendix. The names engraved in the cartouches on base and top do not form a known series in literature, and only a few are recorded elsewhere: Ch’ang-she 長舌, “Long-tongue,” was the name of a hill inhabited by a monster in the *Shan-hai ching*; Wu-huo 烏藿, somewhat less appropriately, was a pre-Han strong man. Several of the names have a character in common or are very close in meaning, suggesting that they were not very significant in themselves and might in some cases have been invented to fill empty cartouches. See Chao, *Han Wei Nan-pei Ch’ao mu-chih chi-shih*, 3.15a. In the south, characters appear on tomb bricks from the fourth century (see K’ao-ku, no. 35 [1959:5]), p. 232, hence the inscribed cartouches may be another sign of southern influence.
in the Minneapolis Institute of Arts. A pair of confronting dragons deck the cover along with the auspicious bird deities of the Teng-hsien bricks (see fig. 10). The dragons, who hold no leaves in their mouths, are certainly heavier and more muscular than the pair on Hsiao Hung’s stele, and the surrounding cloud puffs are rather repetitive. Stimulating designs were conceived in the north, however, as on the tablet cover of Yuan Chao 元昭, (fig. 17) a cousin of Yuan Hui’s, also done in 524. Here, the dragons seem to erupt into swirling clouds, and their solid bodies lose all effect of heaviness. Such clouds may derive from the linear forms of the first tablet, that of Yuan Hui, but since they fill the ground they look forward to the latest development at the end of the 520’s that appears on Erh-chu Hsi’s 翳朱懿 tablet cover of 529.

On one side (fig. 18), an abstract cloud scroll based on Han decorative patterns dominates the design completely. A comparison of this spirit riding a tiger with its prototype on the Teng-hsien brick (fig. 9) can illustrate how far the northern designer had regressed. The northern spirit rider no longer grips the side of her mount with an emphasized knee, in fact she has lost the lower part of her body, and the tiger’s legs seem scarcely able to support him. The pervasive cloud scroll does indeed serve to camouflage a dissolution of bodily form.

On such memorial tablets floral ornament is either nonexistent or subordinate to decorative cloud forms. Other material shows that southern floral motifs did enter the north, in the early sixth century, but were generally treated in a stiff, patterned manner. Nowhere was there the free-floating luxuriance of flowers and foliage that appeared in the south. Similarities can be found between the floral ornament on Teng-hsien bricks (figs. 19 and 20) and the decorations on the imitations of coffered ceilings in the stone caves at Kung-hsien 嶽縣. But even in the most elaborate ceiling, that of Cave I (fig. 21) done in or just before 520, the Kung-hsien carvers tended to simplify and restrain the dynamism of the Teng-hsien style. And on the ceiling

---

35 See Chao, Han Wei Nan-pei Ch’ao mu-chih chi-shih, 3.11b–12a; no. 49.
36 See Nishikawa, Seian hirin, pls. 142–148. Professor Loehr reproduced the companion dragon rider from the opposite side of this tablet with its “historically noteworthy” combination of trailing floral forms and cloud filler in the ground. See Loehr, “The Fate of the Ornament,” p. 15, fig. 17.
37 Here history would support the theory that a tendency toward abstract decoration sets in when the times are chaotic. Erh-chu Hsi was a cousin of the rebel general Erh-chu Jung 翡朱榮, who massacred the Wei nobility in 528. At the age of seventeen, Hsi was killed in captivity on the same day as his brother Shao 賢, who was evidently minced to pieces on the orders of Yuan Hao 元 Hao, who retook Lo-yang from the Erh-chu clan in 529. See Chao, Han Wei Nan-pei Ch’ao mu-chih chi-shih, 6.57b–58a; nos. 273, 274; also see Soper, Literary Evidence, p. 105. Another example of this style appears on Kou Ching’s 悠景 epitaph cover of 529, where the tail feathers of human- and deer-headed birds are treated as cloud-scroll filler in the ground. See Nishikawa, Seian hirin, pls. 135–141; Chao, Han Wei Nan-pei Ch’ao mu-chih chi-shih, 6.57b, no. 271.
of Cave 428 at Tun-huang, where artists worked in the freer medium of painting and depicted flame-like floral motifs in abundance, the total effect is still schematic and repetitive.\(^{39}\)

Engravings on two free-standing northern Buddhist steles can give some perspective on the treatment of floral motifs in the background. On a stele base of 525 (fig. 22), a provincial work from Hopei in the University of Pennsylvania Museum,\(^{40}\) two lions that flank the earth spirit with incense burner are like a pair on a Teng-hsien brick, but the Buddhist rain of flowers and jewels is rendered only by an assortment of outsized, primitive forms. And the cluttered background of scenes carved on an Eastern Wei stele of 543 from Ho-nei-hsien in the Honan (fig. 23), still contains relatively stiff lotus forms and a schematicized pinwheel swirl.\(^{41}\)

To sum up, there is abundant evidence that elements of the Teng-hsien style entered North China at the beginning of the sixth century. But in the 520’s Northern Wei craftsmen simplified these motifs and modified them to suit northern taste. The style found on the ceiling of Cave 285 at Tun-huang, presumably done in the 530’s, does not appear to stem naturally from the art sponsored by the court at Lo-yang in the previous decade. Instead this style seems closer to decorations on Liang tomb monuments erected near the southern capital in the 520’s. Hence it is logical to surmise that some contact with southern decorative art inspired the ceiling of Cave 285. Elements of the Liang style could conceivably have entered the northwest by way of Szechwan 四川, but unfortunately no evidence substantiates this theory.\(^{42}\)

Professor Soper, who has investigated the history of the relations between the northern Wei court and the southern kingdoms, suggests that southern influence could not have entered the north after 507, and that only in 554 were direct contacts resumed between the south and the northwest. Thus he concludes that the most important Liang artist, Chang Seng-yu 張僧繇, who was active at Nanking from about 514–537, was unlikely to have affected northern art in the first half of the sixth century.\(^{43}\) However, it is possible to argue against this posi-

\(^{39}\) See Gray and Vincent, *Buddhist Cave Paintings*, pl. 14B. Gray would place Cave 428 in the 520’s, but it may be somewhat earlier; a rather stiff elaboration of this decoration appears in the ceiling of Cave 288, which was probably painted in the 540’s. See ibid., pl. 14A; Akiyama and Matsubara, *Arts of China*, vol. 2, pp. 11, 211.


\(^{41}\) This well-known stele back is discussed in Nagahiro, *The Representational Art of the Six Dynasties Period*, pp. 69–92.

\(^{42}\) Literary evidence for the transmission of styles by this route is lacking for the first half of the sixth century. See Diana Pyle Rowan, *“The Yakushi Image and Shaka Trinity of the Kondō, Höryüji: A Study of Drapery Problems,”* *Artibus Asiae*, vol. 31 (1969), p. 253. And visual evidence is scanty. A delicate floral scroll and swags and rosettes appear on the halo and mandorla of the stone seated Buddha of Cave 127 at Mai-chi-shan, which has been variously dated in the first half of the century. The rosettes scattered between *apsaras* are rather similar to lotus bosses close to *apsarases* on the edge of the stele of 523 from Ch’eng-tu. Compare Akiyama and Matsubara, *Arts of China*, vol. 2, pp. 111–112, pls. 89, 90 and p. 169, pl. 163.

\(^{43}\) See Soper, *“South Chinese Influence,”* pp. 84, 88–90.
tion on the basis of visual evidence. Chang Seng-yu, who had a post at court, was Liang Wu-ti’s favorite painter of Buddhist temple walls, and his style was followed by several artists of the period. It is not inconceivable that this style is reflected in the fashionable decorations on the stele of Wu-ti’s esteemed brother, Hsiao Hung 篙宏.44 And there would seem to be a definite link between these decorations (figs. 4 and 5) and the painted motifs on the ceiling of Cave 285 at Tun-huang (figs. 6 and 7). The similarity between these works not only ties together the art of the southeast coast and the northwest corridor but also indicates that such motifs transcended the limitations of ornaments as the subjects of contemporary painting.

Literary sources present a strangely contradictory image of Chang Seng-yu. On the one hand, he was a painter of realistic portraits and Buddhist images whose solid, full-fleshed forms influenced artists through the early T’ang period; on the other hand, he was known for his fantastic creatures and for dragons so full of life that they could leave the wall. While he used alternating bands of color to create three-dimensional flowers through abstract shading, he was famous also for a calligraphic definition of forms with interrupted strokes.45 The fleshy aspects of Chang’s art have been emphasized recently,46 but one should not forget that he was a noted painter of dragons that must have been of the slender Liang type.

Although the designs on Hsiao Hung’s stele are quite sophisticated, they obviously lack the supple, three-dimensional effects of painting. Hence it may be excusable to invoke Chang’s spirit in front of the dragon of the east painted on the wall of Tomb I at Jin-pa-ri 和坡里 near P’ongyang 平安 in North Korea (fig. 24), a work of the Koguryo Dynasty that is close to Chinese art of the late sixth century.47 Dynamic, 1, pp. 8, 240, 259. A contemporary technique of abstract shading done with different colors appears in the half-palmette leaves in the niche arches of the south wall in Cave 285 at Tun-huang. See Akiyama and Matsubara, Arts of China, vol. 2, p. 48, pl. 22. For an interesting analysis of Chang Seng-yu’s style, see K. Munakata, “The Rise of Ink-wash Landscape Painting in the T’ang Dynasty” (Ph. D. diss., Princeton University, 1965), pp. 57–66. 46 See for example James Cahill, Chinese Painting (Lausanne: Skira, 1960), pp. 15–16. A T’ang attribution is now thought more likely for the style of the “Five Planets and Twenty Eight Celestial Constellations,” formerly attributed to Chang Seng-yu. See Osaka Exchange Exhibition: Paintings from the Abe Collection and Other Masterpieces of Chinese Art (San Francisco Center of Asian Art and Culture, 1970), p. 16. 47 Illustrated in Umehara, Chōsen kobunaka sodan, vol. 4, pls. XXVI-XXXII; also see Sueji Umehara, “The Newly Discovered Tombs with Wall Paintings of the Kao-kou-li Dynasty,” Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America, vol. 6 (1952), pp. 8–10. It has been placed in the early seventh century in Kim Won-
swirling floral ornament of the Teng-hsien variety appears on the ceiling of this tomb. Furthermore, there seem to be definite reflections of the Liang style in the elegant, lean body of the dragon and in the relative importance of floral elements and their sensitive treatment. Surely it was a similar dragon, full of charging energy, that Chang Seng-yu left unfinished so that it would not fly away.

Appendix: Iconography of the Sixth-century Thunder Monster

By T’ang times when the earliest records appear in the south, the thunder gods’ cult was well established in Nam-viet and centered on the Lei-chou peninsula fairly close to North Vietnam. There a thunder cart with linked drums was prepared for shrine festivals, and a band of Thunders was once seen in the skies loosing lightning bolts against a whale. Thunder-clap wedges or axes, the contemporary identifications of meteorites or neolithic weapons and tools, were thought to protect children against demons and induce childbirth. Despite some comic aspects, Thunder was considered an ancient deity. The character “Thunder” appears in the Yiian’s (1960), p. 37, 38, 40, 42; for the cloud scroll and floral motifs on the rather conservative molded bricks of a Ch’ien (?) imperial tomb, see Lo Tsung-ch’en, “Excavations of a Sui Dynasty Tomb at Yu Fang Ts’un Village, Hsi Shan Ch’ao, Nanking,” K’ao-k’ao, no. 82 (1963:6), p. 296, figs. 12, 14.

ders were generally described as horrific in form, as in two early ninth-century sightings from Kwangtung 廣東 and Kiangsu 江蘇 (near Nanking) translated by Edward Schafer:

“In appearance they are like bears or swine, with hairy horns and fleshy wings of a bluish color; . . . The body was more than two ten-feet long. It was black-colored and piglike, with five- or six-foot horns on its head, fleshy wings of more than a ten-foot, and a leopard’s tail. Moreover, it was half-clad in scarlet pantaloons, and its waist was bound with a leopard’s skin. Its hands and feet were double-taloned, all golden colored, and they clutched red snakes, which it trampled with its feet, with glaring eyes, as if intending to eat them.”

Early sixth-century monsters share some of these characteristics. They usually have a human torso topped by a stylized tiger, bear, pig, or bird mask, and possess animal claws and fleshy wings composed of separate segments rising vertically from the shoulders. Blue wings of this sort appear on the thunder monsters of Caves 249 and 285 at Tun-huang, and while those of Cave 249 have prominent horns, those of Cave 285 have double-taloned claws for hands and feet. Knee-length breeches are always worn, and ties like leopard tails float behind those on Lady Yüan’s monsters. These creatures

48 Edward Schafer, The Vermilion Bird (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967), p. 105. The texts quoted are given in T’ai-p’ing kwan-ch’i 太平御記, 393 and 394. These texts and others are placed by locality in Wolfram Eberhard, The Local Cultures of South and East China, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968), pp. 235–256. An early thunder monster seen in Shensi in Ch’in times, as recorded in Soù shen chi 报神記, was piglike with mirror eyes, red lips, and one soft horn; the still earlier “thunder spirit” of the Shan-hai ching was a human-headed dragon who lived in a swamp.
have three-taloned claws for hands, but their feet are two-taloned. Han images of Ch‘ih-yu occasionally grasp dragons or snakes.49

This monster type was already formulated in Han times when it could represent Ch‘ih-yu, who led the storm gods, but it was not exclusively identified as a sky deity. The fearsome, armed creatures that abound in the antechamber of the tomb at I-nan in Shantung (ca. A.D. 300) are not associated with implements of thunder and lightning and even lack fully developed wings.50 Similar monsters, preserved in post-Han decorative art,51 were probably reimported into the north since they do not appear in the early Northern Wei caves at Yün-kang and Lung-men. By the early sixth century, to judge from material at Tun-huang and Lo-yang, they were conceived of as the southern type of storm gods.

On Liang tomb pillars several monsters decorate a base or uphold placards,52 and on Hsiao Hung’s stele they are shown as a troupe with a few bearing arms and one bearing what may be a tiny set of linked drums. In the north, demons of thunder, wind, and lightning are specifically identified on the west side of the ceiling of Cave 249 at Tun-huang. In the later Cave 285, such monsters are treated as a generalized class, and hence two thunder gods circled with linked drums are shown together at the top of the west quadrant.53 The monsters on Lady Yüan’s tablet of 522 are not armed and have no linked drums, but their postures and the cloud puffs indicate that they are sky creatures, as do their names. The characters t’ien 天, “heaven,” and tien 石, “lightning,” both appear twice, and two monsters grasp and crunch on long, craggy rocks called shih 石, “stone,” in their descriptive names. Similar objects are gnawed on by two of the armed monster band depicted on the dadoes of Kung-hsien caves.54 The earliest representation of this “stone” is probably on a Han slab of A.D. 171, where a winged, leopard-tailed monster holds a tripartite form with pointed ends somewhat like a vajra, the Indian thunderbolt.55

51 Monsters decorated pottery well-head models and Yuēh ware vessels comparable to the examples illustrated in Mizuno, Sekai bijutsu zenshū, vol. 13, pl. 25, color pl. 6. They first appear on well-head models in early Western Han: see K‘ao-ku hsüeh-pao, no. 32 (1963), p. 17, pl. V.
52 See Chu Hsi-tsu et al., The Tombs of the Six Dynasties (Monumenta Sinica I) (Nanking: The National Commission for the Preservation of Antiques, 1935), pl. 26, no. 45b; pl. 33, no. 59; pl. 36, no. 65.
54 See Nagahiro, The Representational Art of the Six Dynasties Period, pl. 13; pp. 124–125, figs. 30–31; also see Kung-hsien shih-k‘u-ssu, pls. 71–79, 139–144, 220.
55 See Nagahiro, The Representational Art of the Six Dynasties Period, p. 114, fig. 25. As an object held by a single monster in a group, these “stones” should probably not be linked with the bars edged with cloud swirls grasped in the mouths of each of the dragon-like creatures on mirrors with “Deities and Animals.” See ibid., p. 115, fig. 26. Such barbiting creatures may simply derive from the trompe l’oeil transformations of the Han cloud scroll as on a Lo-lang lacquered box. See Mizuno, Sekai bijutsu zenshū, vol. 13, color pl. 21.
These mysterious objects may bring to mind the thunder gods’ stones, which were connected with lightning and claps of thunder or with the fall of meteorites. They were jet black rocks called “thunder lords’ ink” that glowed at night and clanged if struck, and “thunderclap wedges” or “thunder axes” that were defined as axe-like wedges found at the site of a thunderclap, a tangible sign of the punitive powers of these lords who controlled the lightning.\(^{56}\) A wedge-shaped form is held in one hand of a monster pursuing a man in the west quadrant of Cave 249 at Tun-huang, and a larger rectangular object with a pointed end is directed toward the earth by another monster on the north quadrant of Cave 285 (fig. 6).\(^{57}\) The latter is about the size of the “stones” on Lady Yüan’s tablet but lacks their craggy contours. The objects depicted at Tun-huang are evidently similar to the lightning “chisel” or spike which is pointed at the neck of a man by one of the storm spirits, armed with hammers and spikes, who serve as heavenly executioners on the Wu 武 family shrines of about A.D. 147.\(^{58}\)

On the Wu slab from Shantung, these beings are not monsters and a single thunder god rides in a chariot with two drums followed by a wind god blowing on bellows. While the belief in a single Thunder Lord was widespread in north and west China, multiple Thunders with linked drums were part of the local culture of the southeast.\(^{59}\) Hence the troupe of monsters on Lady Yüan’s tablet and on Cave 285’s ceiling point to a southern origin. A somewhat different iconography is presented on the ceiling of Cave 249, since individual thunder and wind gods are identified at one end. And to the sides monsters serve as outriders for deities drawn in dragon and phoenix chariots, thus fulfilling the function of Ch’ih-yu and the gods of wind, thunder, and rain who sweep the way on the spirit journeys described in poems of the Ch’u 舂州.

All these arguments have linked the winged monsters of the early sixth century with thunder demons. However, since many other strange creatures existed in contemporary beliefs, at least three other categories of demonic beings should be considered briefly: they are protective monsters, spirits of localities, and Buddhist demons.

In Chinese publications, Han and Six Dynasties monsters are sometimes identified as the fang-hsiang 方相, an exorcist mentioned in the Chou li 周禮 who drives away spirits of pestilence and the so-called fang-liang 方良, a nature demon. He is described as wearing a bear skin with four eyes of gold over black and red garments and carrying a spear and shield with four wild men as attendants.\(^{61}\) It seems questionable to use the term fang-hsiang to designate monsters as a category, since most repre-

---


\(^{57}\) See Gray and Vincent, Buddhist Cave Paintings, pl. 23; Akiyama and Matsuhara, Arts of China, vol. 2, p. 44, pl. 16.

\(^{58}\) See Chavannes, Mission archéologique, pl. LX-VIII, no. 132. For a contemporary description of a “Thunderer” by Wang Ch’ung 王充, see Alfred Forke, Lun-hang (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1907), vol. 1, pp. 292-293.


\(^{60}\) See the references in notes 24 and 25 above.

sentations appear to be of demons, not of exorcists impersonating them. For example, although at I-nan a masked figure hobbling with a staff is obviously an actor who provides comic relief, the monster mêlée on the north of the antechamber can only be an imaginary creation of the spirit world’s terrors. Of course the apotropaic aspect of monsters as tomb protectors was similar to the function of the exorcist, and the decorative creatures that prance in sixth-century tomb monuments are still presumably effective guardians through their spiritual powers. But the fang-hsiang designation can only apply to them at this general level and does not solve the problem of their specific iconography. Bands of demons protecting against sickness and death continue to appear in Six Dynasties literature, but they cannot be connected with existing monster images.

Another type of monster or demon was associated with a particular locality, often a hill or mountain. The locus classicus for these creatures is the Han text, Shan-hai ching 山海經, which frustrates the art historian by the innumerable kinds of monsters it lists. Toshio Nagahiro has made a study of the different types described and has found relatively few connections between them and the winged monsters of Lady Yüan’s tablet, all of which seem to be a single kind of sky creature. But there are other sorts of early sixth-century monsters that appear with leonine manes of hair in a landscape setting, sometimes crouching face-forward with trees and rocks on their backs. In such cases hill or earth spirits seem to be represented.

A third category to be considered is the Buddhist type of demon, such as Māra’s host or the yaksha class that gave rise to the Buddhist protectors like the lokapalas and vajrapāñas. Stories were current about demons subdued by the vajra-bearer and presumably allowed to share in vajrapāṇī’s task of defending Buddhist temples by striking down iconoclasts. Since visual evidence shows that nāgas tended to be equated with dragons and texts indicate that Confucian sages and Taoist saints were considered to be manifestations of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, it is conceivable that the thunder monster might have been identified with a guardian yaksha or thunderbolt-bearer. Strong arguments against this theory are that the Chinese monster type was most prevalent in the non-Buddhist context of funerary monuments, that at Tun-huang it

62 Compare Tseng, I-nan ku-hua-hsiang shih-nu fa-chüeh jiao-kao, pl. 29, fig. 8 and pl. 48, fig. 34. For a different opinion, see Cheng, “Ch’ih-yu,” p. 51.
63 Images of auspicious creatures were classed with living animals in Liang Wu-ti’s decree of 517, which testified to his devout Buddhism by forbidding the shedding of blood for medicinal or sacrificial purposes, and by prohibiting the cutting of the “Immortals, birds, and animals” in the tailoring of embroidered and figured silks used to make the garments of the nobility, since it would violate the principles of benevolence and mercy. See Nan-shih 6, p. 2564B.
65 See ibid., pp. 118–123.
was differentiated from the Western forms of *asura* and *yaksha* on the ceiling of Cave 249 and the dado of Cave 285, and that the *vajrapāñi* type of semi-clotted strong man had developed as the main guardian image by the 520’s. The only counter argument may be supplied by the provincial art of Kung-hsien, where the rather crudely executed monsters on the dados of a few caves might have been conceived of as Buddhist demons. These fierce creatures lack the distinguishing characterics of storm gods, and one particular image holds a schematized mountain range over its head in a pose reminiscent of Māra’s mountain-tossing demons.

After a review of other types of monsters, the majority of sixth-century monster images of the winged variety still seem to represent storm deities like the Han gods of thunder and wind who had fought in the company of Ch’ih-yu and escorted Huang-ti as outriders. These personifications of natural forces continued to be evoked in Six Dynasties poetry of the south, where the spirit journeys of the *Ch’u tz’u* were still remembered. Ultimately, the literary basis of such imagery must have determined its popularity in art. Furthermore, a southern belief in a band of Thunders might explain the multiplication of these creatures in the early sixth century. In copies of the Lo-shen scroll, which are attributed to Ku K’ai-chih (ca. 345-ca. 406) and reflect a late Six Dynasties style, a storm god is portrayed as a cloud-spitting monster with oversized ears in place of fleshy wings. Thunder gods, identified by circles of linked drums and occasional bat-wings, and wind gods with scarves or bags of wind continue to appear as minor figures in later Chinese and Japanese Buddhist scrolls, and are resurrected in a wingless state as major subjects by the great decorative screen painters of Japan. The Six Dynasties monster type was exported to Tibet and is often seen circling the sky in Lamaist *tanka*s. Equipped with spiky bird-wings, it became the Indian monster bird, *garuḍa*, and was still being painted up to recent times in the folk art of the demon-ridden Nashis of Yünnan.

69 See Gray and Vincent, *Buddhist Cave Paintings*, pls. 11B, 12, 24; Pelliot, *Les grottes de Touen-houang*, vol. 4, pl. CCLII; vol. 5, pl. CCLVIII; Sickman and Soper, *The Art and Architecture of China*, pl. 35B.


72 See Nagahiro, *The Representational Art of the Six Dynasties Period*, p. 90, fig. 18; also see Arthur Waley, *An Introduction to the Study of Chinese Painting* (London: Ernest Benn, 1923), p. 61. The large ears may be a copyist’s interpretation of fleshy wings.


Fig. 1.—Hsiao Ching’s pillar of ca. 523. Vicinity of Nanking.  
(After Tchang, *Tombeau des Liang*.)

Fig. 2.—Incised figure on side of Hsiao Ching’s pillar.  
(Photo, courtesy, Professor Richard C. Rudolph.)

Fig. 2a.—Rubbing on a side of Hsiao Ching’s placard.  
(After *Wen-wu*, no. 104 [1959:4].)
Fig. 3.—Hsiao Hung’s stele of ca. 526. Vicinity of Nanking.
(After Sekino, *Shina hiketsu keishiki no hensen*.)

Fig. 4.—Rubbing of a side of Hsiao Hung’s stele.
(After Nagahiro, *The Representational Art of the Six Dynasties Period*.)

Fig. 5.—Rubbing of the upper part of Hsiao Hung’s stele back.
(After Sekino, *Shina hiketsu keishiki no hensen*.)
Fig. 6.—Northern side of the ceiling of Cave 285 at Tun-huang, done before 538. Courtesy, James C. M. Lo.
Fig. 7—Eastern side of the ceiling of Cave 285 at Tun-huang. Courtesy, James C. M. Lo.
Fig. 8.—Eastern side of the ceiling of Cave 249 at Tun-huang of ca. 510. Courtesy, James C. M. Lo.
Fig. 9.—Immortal riding a tiger on a tomb brick from T’eng-hsien of ca. 500.
(After T’eng-hsien & ch’in-hua-shang-shih mu.)
Fig. 10.—Bird deities on a Teng-hsien brick. (After Teng-hsien ts'ai-se hua-hsiang-chuaan mu.)

Fig. 11.—Descending dragon pair on a Teng-hsien brick. (After Teng-hsien ts'ai-se hua-hsiang-chuaan mu.)

Fig. 12.—Apsaras on a Teng-hsien brick. (After Nagahiro, Sekai bijutsu zenshū, vol. 14.)
FIG. 13.—Rubbing from a side of Yuan Hui's epitaph tablet of 520. Hall of Inscriptions, Sian Museum. (After Nishikawa, Seian hirin.)

FIG. 14.—Green Dragon on a Teng-hsien brick. (After Teng-hsien ts'ai-se hua-hsiang-chuan mu.)

FIG. 15.—Rubbing of two monsters on the side of Lady Yüan's tablet of 522. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. (After Nagahiro, The Representational Art of the Six Dynasties Period.)
Fig. 16.—Rubbing of Prince Chen-ching’s tablet cover of 524. Courtesy, Minneapolis Institute of Arts.
Fig. 17.—Rubbing of Yuan Chao's tablet cover of 524. Location unknown.
(After Chao, Han Wei Nan-fei Ch'ao mu-chih chi-shih.)

Fig. 18.—Rubbing of a detail from Erh-chu Hsi's tablet cover of 529.
Hall of Inscriptions, Sian Museum. (After Wang, Chung-kuo ku-tai shih-k'o-huo hsian-chi.)
Fig. 19.—Floral swirls and a lotus-born soul on Teng-hsien bricks.  
(After Teng-hsien ts’ai-se hua-hsiang-chuan mu.)

Fig. 20.—Floral ornament on Teng-hsien bricks.  
(After Teng-hsien ts’ai-se hua-hsiang-chuan mu.)

Fig. 21.—Detail of the ceiling of Cave 1 at Kung-hsien from ca. 520.  
(After Kung-hsien shih-k’u-ssu.)
Fig. 22.—Rubbing of a side of a stele base from Hopei dated 525.
University of Pennsylvania Museum. (After Wang, Chung-kuo ku-tai shih-k'o-hua hsüan-chi.)

Fig. 23.—Rubbing of a detail of a stele back from Honan of 543.
(After Nagahiro, The Representational Art of the Six Dynasties Period.)

Fig. 24.—Green Dragon from Tomb No. 1 at Jin-pa-ri, near P'yöngyang, Korea. Koguryö Dynasty.
(After Umehara, Chosen kobunka sōkan, vol. 4.)
THE "THOUSAND-BUDDHA" PATTERN IN CAVES XIX AND XVI AT YÜN-KANG*

BY JAMES O. CASWELL**

A special category of seated Buddha images within the Northern Wei caves at Yün-kang 雲岡 is the frequently seen theme of the Thousand-Buddhas.¹ They may be divided into two essential types, one more ambitious than the other, which I shall call Type I and Type II. Both types are found within the early caves at Yün-kang, but it is acknowledged that only Type I was a part of the earliest periods of carving. Within Type I, however, I believe we may identify two stylistic aggregates—represented by the splendid display in Cave XIX versus that of Cave XVI—which were dependent respectively upon different precedents: an earlier one based upon a more iconically grand, seated Buddha image and involved within a more deliberately calculated program, and a later duplication of that earlier formula which demonstrates a mechanical competence more in line with the repetitious simplicity characteristic of the Type II Thousand-Buddha pattern.

Within the first five caves at Yün-kang—the Five Caves of T’an-yao 禪曜 numbered XVI through XX—it is my belief that only in the important case of XIX and, secondarily, in Cave XIX-A was the Thousand-Buddha pattern a part of the first period of carving. A Type I pattern also figures prominently in Cave XVII and, especially, in Cave XVI, but both are a perpetuation of the earlier experimental formulation. Indeed, it seems to me that,

* This article is based upon portions of my dissertation entitled “Cloud Hill and the Glory of the Law: A Study of the Five Caves of T’an-yao at Yün-kang” submitted to the University of Michigan (1970) in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. I should point out, however, that the material has been extensively reconsidered to the extent that conclusions have changed in at least some details. The completion of that dissertation represented a conclusion to my formal studies begun some years ago under Professor Max Loehr, and thus it is a pleasure to join here in honoring his thoughtful contributions in so many fields. I would also like to express again my appreciation to the members of my doctoral committee, chaired by Professor Richard Edwards, for their aid and encouragement. Neither this dissertation nor this article would have been possible without the monumental corpus of both scholarship and photographs published by Mizuno Seiichi 水野清一 and Nagaihiro Toshio 長尾利雄, Yün-kang (Yün-kang 云岡石窟). The Buddhist Cave-Temples of the Fifth Century A.D. in North China (Kyoto, 1952–1956), 16 numbered volumes of generally two parts each (Plates and text) with Supplement and Index. Those volumes shall be simply cited below as Yün-kang followed by a numeral to indicate the volume number and a notation of either “t.” or “pl.” to indicate the “text” or “plate” volume respectively.

** Assistant Professor of Far Eastern Art, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

¹ The only directed studies of this motif are, to my knowledge, those of Matsubara Saburō 松原三郎, “Senbutsu-zō 千佛像” (An Examination of the “Thousand Buddha’ Theme”), Bijutsushi 美術史, vol. 12, no. 4, 1963, pp. 118–123, and of Uehara Kazu 上原和 within his Tamanushi zushi no kenkyū 玉虫老子の研究, [A Study of the Tamanushi Shrine] (Tokyo, 1968), esp. pp. 278–304, 485–495 and figs. 1 (p. 7) and 39 (p. 272). The former concerns a mid-sixth century style which includes the Thousand-Buddha motif as an important theme and which the author would relate to the pattern found within the interior of the Asuka period Tamanushi Shrine; that shrine is then the subject of a many-faceted study by Uehara. Both authors’ interests are, however, of a manner of the theme generally other than that of my concern here (cf. note 53 below).
much like the Chinese painter, the Chinese sculptor was capable (within a brief time span) of imitation to a remarkable degree of outward exactitude and that cases of such are identifiable by a subtle loss of conviction or spirit in the later instances.

I would generally agree with the opinion of Mizuno Seiichi and Nagahiro Toshio that Cave XIX was perhaps first and that Cave XVI was last in the schedule of construction of the five caves and that the total endeavor spanned about fifteen years. But, contrary to their understanding of consistent and regular work at the site, it is my contention that the major excavations at Yün-kang occurred as a series of irregular pulses—with Caves XIX and XVI each being the product of a distinctly different and brief time. I shall emphasize here the index of the Thousand-Buddha pattern in each and not now attempt a more precise temporal assignment—though a dating of about A.D. 465 and A.D. 480 respectively would probably be suitable.

The representation of the Thousand-Buddhas is essentially an illustration of the idea found in the Lotus Sūtra whereby emanations of the Buddha appear in an infinity of Buddha worlds. In fulsome language that sūtra describes the magical appearance of a stūpa before a celestial assembly in which Prabhūtaratna, the primordial Buddha, was made manifest and heard the historical Buddha Śākyamuni expound the ultimate of the “Sūtra on the Lotus of the Wonderful Law” (Miao-fa lien-hua ching 莲華法蓮花). The Thousand-Buddha theme would allude to the numberless Buddhas arrayed about those two major discussants of the doctrine who rest at the core and propel the whole cosmic frame into being.

“... the Tathāgatas produced by the Lord Śākyamuni, who in the east were preaching the law to creatures in hundred thousands of myriads of kotis of Buddha-fields, similar to the sands of the river Ganges, all arrived from the ten points of space and sat down in the

2 For some of their comments, see Yün-kang 11t., pp. 104–107; Yün-kang 13–14t., pp. 121, 123 and 125, and Yün-kang 16 Suppl., p. 14.

3 It is not my intention here to positively state the textual referent of the iconography; rather I am interested in it only as subject matter—as were probably the sculptors who were likely less than perfectly schooled in precise sectarian and textual niceties. This is certainly true for the Yün-kang carvings; see Yün-kang 8–9t., Iconography of the Yün-kang Caves, pp. 73–79; Tsukamoto Zenryū 服本常隆, “Unkō sekutsu no bukkýō 岩洞方形の仏形 [Buddhism of the Yün-kang Cave Temples], Indogaku bukkýōgaku kenkyū 密教佛像学研究, vol. 2, no. 2, 1954, pp. 1–12, and cf. note 59 below. Alexander Soper has pointed out the earliest introduction of the Thousand-Buddha theme (which he calls, with greater precision than is commonly used, “Thousand Kalpa Buddhas”) to China in ca. A.D. 300 and its recurrence in various sūtras; Literary Evidence for Early Buddhist Art in China (Ascona, 1959), pp. 201–202. Neither the Lotus Sūtra nor any commentary upon it is among the texts associated with the translation activities of T’an-yao and his associates. (Two major studies of T’an-yao are those of Mizuno and Nagahiro in Yün-kang 13–14t., “T’an-yao and the Yün-kang Caves,” pp. 91–101, and Tsukamoto Zenryū, tr. by G. E. Sargent, “The Sramana Superintendent T’an-yao and his Time,” Monumenta Serica, vol. 16, no. 2, 1957, pp. 363–396. Mizuno and Nagahiro have pointed out that apparently the only instance within the five T’an-yao caves of an iconographic theme also being found in the texts associated with T’an-yao’s activity as a sponsor of translations is that of the “augmented seven” or the “Seven Buddhas of the Past” plus Maitreya; Yün-kang 8–9t., p. 73, note 2. That series is not, however, unique to a single text.) For various reasons one may assume that the North was indeed familiar with the Lotus Sūtra; see in general J. LeRoy Davidson, The Lotus Sūtra in Chinese Art (New Haven, 1954), and note 10 below.
eight quarters. Then, seated on their thrones, those Tathāgatas deputed their satellites into the presence of the Lord Śākyamuni...

In this sense the Thousand-Buddhas reconstruct a sort of endless stūpa of the cosmos, or a shell about the energizing core. Those Buddhas are seen as actively emerging from the noumenal into the phenomenal which allows, by contact and welcome, the ultimate penetration and comprehension that is the goal of the faith.

Instances of serial Buddhas in the Gandhāran region of northwest India are quite diverse, while those in China—limited only to the Thousand-Buddha pattern—are quite fixed. The determination of that pattern in China was an amalgam of both form and idea drawn from foreign sources in different ways—resulting in a new code of elements that had a different significance in their foreign homeland. The Chinese saw motifs as forms for the assignment of meaning rather than as only inherited physical and iconographically meaningless entities. But the one thing that characterizes both Chinese and foreign cases of serial Buddhas is the implication of movement—which we may imagine as religiously appropriate, such multiple Buddhas being the active emanations of the body of bliss, the bija or germ, within the stūpa itself. The remains of stūpas from the Gandhāran region would at least suggest a visual rendition of this idea. One example (fig. 1) consists of architectonic tiers over which are niches of two types: a compound pointed-arch enclosure—or a pointed-arch resting upon a split arch that opens upon the image, and a truncated pyramidal enclosure. The seated Buddhas within those alternating niche enclosures are throughout identical. Visual interest, even a sort of sequential movement, is engendered by the alternation of the surrounding architectural in the text illustrations of the Far East, are to be found in Gandhāra. See Y. Krishnan, “Was Gandhāra Art a Product of Mahāyāna Buddhism?” Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1964, 3–4, esp. p. 118. Rowland noted possible iconographical sources for the representation of serial Buddhas as, in addition to the “Great Miracle of Śrāvasti” and the Lotus Sūtra, “merely repeated effigies of Śākyamuni duplicated for the merit believed to accrue from the making of statues for the Great Teacher.” And he further states that “The multiple Buddha images could be interpreted as representing not many different Buddhas but one Buddha seen everywhere and simultaneously.” Rowland, “Gandhāra and Early Christian Art,” p. 46. Cf. my note 59 below.

tural framework. This, however, is not a firmly fixed standard within the Gandhāran tradition, and there are in fact other means—such as serial changes of pose—by which a pulse or current of movement may be seen within a contiguous series of images.

While single pairs of such contrasting arches are occasionally found in Gandhāran art, they apparently were not used with the same fixity of regulation as would pertain in Northern Wei China. In the latter instance the two arch enframements were locked into an iconographical association according to the images they contained: the “pointed-arch” with a seated Buddha or, most commonly, the paired Buddhas Śākyamuni and Prabhūtaratna (the one sure indication of the Lotus Sūtra), and the trapezoidal or “trabeated-arch” enframing a cross-legged Bodhisattva (presumably Maitreya). That regulation was matched by a developed grandeur of conception and, especially in the caves after the first five of T’an-yao, the static impact of the icon. Similarly, the enclosing structures lost much of their original architectonic character to become instead simply decorative enframements and, in line with this, embellishments were added—such as particularly the addorsed dragons that form the lower limit to the pointed-arch enclosure.

The implication of movement survived in China, however, within the Type I Thousand-Buddha pattern—obtained through alternating drapery articulations of the figures themselves even as the settings are otherwise the same. Representative of this type as generally found at Yün-kang is a portion of the upper storey of the west part of the south wall of the interior of Cave XVI (fig. 2). Within the series alternating figures are clothed in what A. B. Griswold has termed the “covering mode” of drapery. The other figures are clothed in a

8 See a fragment from what perhaps was originally a stūpa in Harald Ingholt, Gandhāran Art in Pakistan (New York, 1957), fig. 143 and cf. pp. 95–96. In a band along the top there are seated Buddha figures within a series of duplicated arches. On the face of it the rhythm established by the architectural enframements decorating the stūpa just discussed (fig. 1) seems lacking. Yet we should notice that a rhythm obtains within subtle changes given to the Buddha figures themselves. They are in groups of three, consisting respectively of a Buddha seen nodding slightly to his right followed by two bent slightly to their left. This is then repeated in what I would assume to have been a consistent way throughout the whole of the original panel.

9 For some examples, see Auboyer, Art of Afghanistan, pl. 47, and Ingholt, Gandhāran Art, fig. 468.

10 The two are commonly, but not always, placed one on top of the other. For example, the inscription upon the niche dated A.D. 439 on the east reveal of the window of Cave XVII (in my fig. 6) names those three figures and thus properly refers to the vertical composition of two niches. See Yün-kang 12 pl., pl. 21 and Yün-kang 12 t., p. 109, and cf. Soper, Literary Evidence, pp. 180–184.

11 That motif may have been of Chinese origin (cf. my note 29 below), or it may possibly have been drawn from another Indian area. The possibility of such addorsed dragons deriving from a mahākāra design found in the art of Amarāvati has been suggested by James H. Lindsay, “The Mahākāra in Early Chinese Buddhist Sculpture,” Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1951, pts. 3–4, pp. 134–148, esp. pp. 135–136. See also his “Indian Influences in Chinese Sculpture,” Indian Art and Letters, vol. 10, no. 2, 1936, pp. 125–133.

12 From Yün-kang 11 pl., p. 64; Yün-kang 11 t., p. 130.

13 A. B. Griswold, “Prolegomena to the Study of the Buddha’s Dress in Chinese Sculpture,” Arts bui Asiae, vol. 26, no. 2, 1963, pp. 89–90. The covering mode for Buddha figures within the Yün-kang caves is extremely rare—with the important exception of those figures clothed in the fundamentally different Chinese drapery fashion. Among figures of an “early style” in the covering mode there are a
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few minor figures in niches; see, for example, Niche 45 on the lower portion of the South wall of Cave XVI (Yün-kang 11 pl., pl. 105) and the stylistically similar Niche 50 dated 496 A.D. in Cave XI (Yün-kang 8 pl., pl. 52 and cf. pl. 66-D). These niches may in general be related to the visual effect of the Thousand-Buddha niches of Cave XVI; see fig. 2. The only major seated image of the five T‘an-yao caves to wear the covering mode of drapery is the colossal east attendant figure in Cave XVII (Yün-kang 12 pl., pl. 43). This is closely related, of course, to its standing mate on the west side of the same cave (Yün-kang 12 pl., pl. 56), to the two attendant figures of Cave XVIII (Yün-kang 12 pl., pls. 107 and 110), and to the surviving standing attendant figure of Cave XX (Yün-kang 14 pl., pl. 15)—all of which wear the covering mode but which are described with subtle expressive differences.

14 This particular mode has been qualified by Griswold as the "apostrophe inflection" of the covering mode; "Study of Buddha’s Dress", p. 110. Another term for this sort of drapery is the "himation pose" used by Ingholt, Gandhāran Art, p. 91 (fig. 133).

15 Thus it may be seen in a frieze of female figures identified as a portion of the presentation of his fiancée to Siddhārtha; see Madeleine Hallade, The Gandhāra Style and the Evolution of Buddhist Art (London, 1968), pl. 4 (p. 14). Or the Buddha himself may be seen wearing the same sort of drapery in cases where he is clearly involved in narrative contexts; see Sir John Marshall, The Buddhist Art of Gandhāra (Cambridge, 1960), pl. 47, fig. 71, and cf. pl. 93, fig. 129, which illustrates the Mahāparinibbāna. One further Gandhāran fragment consists, presently, of five standing Buddhas and a single standing Bodhisattva; see Fouqueres, L’Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra, vol. 1, fig. 134 (p. 257). (Rowland provided an example from Haḍḍa in Afghanistan which would be an even clearer example of this alternating system with, again, standing figures; Gandhāra and Early Christian Art, fig. 6.) Three of the five standing Buddhas have their arms in the sling and, but for the intervention of a pilaster and the Bodhisattva, they are regularly placed as alternates to Buddhas in the full covering mode. It is that sort of alternating pattern, which is not regularly found in the art of Gandhāra, that appears in the Type I Thousand-Buddha images at Yün-kang. The latter are, however, seated rather than standing, and they are enclosed in pointed-arch openings (which may be further embellished).

16 There is some evidence for the sling fashion in Central Asia. An octagonal "sūtra pillar" from Chotscho, probably to be dated to the mid-fifth century, seems decorated with images so clothed. See A. Soper, “Northern Liang and Northern Wei in Kansu,” Artibus Asiae, vol. 21, no. 2, 1958, p. 135, fig. 4, and A. von Le Coq, Chotscho (Berlin, 1913), pl. 60. Soper would see the mode of drapery as, somewhat erroneously it seems to me, a V-shape decolletage (p. 147). He also cites a case for Tun-huang (Cave 118; Tun-huang Institute No. 272) which he would date to ca. A.D. 420 (ibid., pp. 149–150).
thus satisfied their understandings of a basic religious propriety with their reordered representations.

Whether by the articulation of the setting or of the figures themselves there is the implication of a kind of sequential action—one thing leading, at least potentially, to another. Movement, as a sequence through time or as a development of attitude, was probably a necessary part of the religious basis of the art. One moves, physically and ritually, about the stūpa to overcome the surface and attain the core. One “reads” the narrative to understand it and then get beyond it and comprehend the teaching of the story, the real permanence beyond the beginning and end of the narrative. And finally one must not permanently linger over the attendant or helping figures but must move, ultimately, to some fixed and eternal center. In the same way, there is a movement back through the peripheral or attendant figures from the center, or there is an emanation of the auspicious force out from the core.

Movement was an important aspect of the philosophical bases of the earliest forms of Buddhism. In the early literature there are many metaphors, stories and such that describe the requisite movement towards nirvāṇa, or from bad to good. Indeed, an early statement of cause or the causal process as realized in the definition of dharma is potent with temporal suggestion: “If this is, that comes to be; from the arising of this, that arises; if this is not, that does not come to be; from the stopping of this, this is stopped.”  

Similarly, vital debate among contending schools of early Buddhism were phrased in time-based terminology, heavily laden with questions revolving around past, present and future existence of phenomena. The Chinese would have had great difficulty in fully comprehending those sorts of metaphysical machinations that did not, finally, at some point or another deal with the substantive—and controllable—phenomena. In fact, the Chinese language does not lend itself to precise concern with qualified, abstract tense that Sanskrit and related languages so richly permit. Yet the Chinese would have known of the effort, at least some of it, and have known that it was a necessary concern in the whole religious process of Buddhism. Alexander Soper has noted an interesting case of rather literal visualization which would lead to realization through a serial bringing to form of images until

“He who carries out this [process of] visualization will be absolved of the sins accumulated during sixty millions of kalpas of reincarnation. . . . In the time to come the acuteness of his mental powers will permit him to meet the Thousand World-honored Buddhas of this Bhadrankalpa, and They will be His teachers.”

We may then see a bow made to such a doctrine or process through the icono-


20 Soper, Literary Evidence, p. 190.
graphy of the Thousand-Buddha pattern.

That iconography was considerably inflated to appear as a Thousand-Buddha hall within the temple complex in much later times, and its function has been noted as follows:

"Such a hall is an attempt to express the truth that Buddhism embraces the whole universe. It also created a background for the lives of the monks which gives eternal meaning, cosmic width and spiritual bearing to their own religious calling which is, in accordance with the vows of the third part of their ordination, to become Bodhisattvas and as such to bring insight and health to mankind. To be surrounded by the representations of these myriads of Buddhas, perfected spirits which fill the universe, should remind the monks of this calling and make them look more steadfastly towards the goal which is set before them."  

The flow of the Thousand-Buddha program, was a part of the devotional process set by the stūpa; the Thousand-Buddha pattern was an easily sensed, minor "outside" image that commented upon the awesome force of the doctrine inside—diluting its impact even as it reinforced it.

The Type II Thousand-Buddha niche is commonly found on the lower areas of the interiors of the five caves of T'än-yao as well as on the reveals of the doors and windows and even on the exterior walls—virtually filling up any once blank area.

Both reveals of the window of Cave XIX are covered with a typical example (fig. 3). Each niche enclosure consists of a shallow opening over which is an arch in rather indifferently rounded relief. Between the niches is a flat band. The arch structure is not normally otherwise embellished, though occasionally a further incised line of detail on the arch front or the separating band is seen. The seated figures within are shallowly carved and are tightly contained within the niche space. They are generally of a vertical proportion, being approximately of a 2:3 ratio in width to height, which is characteristically complemented by softly tapering shoulders together with a rather bird-like chest and elongated head.

The figures are identically clothed and consequently lack that sort of alternating sequence of drapery design to be found in the Thousand-Buddha series of the Type I group. (That sort of alternation is only very rarely found in Thousand-Buddha niches of the Type II sort.) The hands of each figure are clasped at the lap, and the drapery falls equally over the wrists and arms to form visible "cuffs" and to cluster slightly between splayed knees. Throughout there is a scant and routine carving of shape and detail, and the whole construction is one of regular balance—each half of the figure being virtually a mirror image of the other. There can be no disagreement

---

22 From Tūn-kāng 13 pl., pl. 8, (and for the other reveal, that of the west, see pl. 9 plus a detail, pl. 10); Tūn-kāng 13–14 t., pp. 129–130.
23 For some rare examples, see a few figures on the lower left half of the front wall of the interior of Cave XIX-B in Tūn-kāng 13 pl., pl. 114 (and cf. pl. 109); a few figures below the middle zone niches (and just above Type I Thousand-Buddha niches) on the west reveal of the window of Cave XVI in Tūn-kāng 11 pl., pl. 55; or a few of the Thousand-Buddha niches to the right of the niche dated A.D. 489 on the east reveal of the window of Cave XVII in Tūn-kāng 12 pl., pl. 16 (which are seen in my fig. 6).
with Mizuno and Nagahiro’s early conclusion that the figures here labelled Type I are earlier than those called Type II. 24

One might well understand the later popularity of the Type II Thousand-Buddha series as the result of an inevitable tendency towards simplification due to the increased demand for image manufacture and, more importantly, a movement towards iconization—the fixing of the finite and graspable. That would be appropriate which may be seen in Chinese Buddhist art and the faith itself. 25 Thus the more unitary and meaningful scheme of the Type I program would finally fragment into simply the repetition of the rudimentary icon complete unto itself. Each instance of the Type II Thousand-Buddha figure is a unit suí generis, repeated to a similar standard of uniqueness and ubiquity by its neighbor. This static sort could then be plugged in at will into the empty space wherever it might be for it predicted nothing beyond itself nor need it be predicated upon anything before. 26 Or, as Max Loehr has so well stated:

"Instead of the quaint, nostalgic notion

24 As they have often stated; for example, see Tiün-kang 13–14 t., pp. 128 and 104 (relative to my fig. 3).
25 Sherman Lee has noted this in regard to a gilt bronze image from the Northern Wei of the “new born Buddha” which, though properly within a narrative context, is strongly iconic; “The Golden Image of the New-Born Buddha,” Artibus Asiae, vol. 18, nos. 3–4, 1955, p. 226, and cf. pp. 232–233 for the larger visual context of that figure.
26 This did not preclude the employment of the Type II pattern within a larger program. The most outstanding display of the Type II Thousand-Buddha niche pattern is that of Cave XV where it covers virtually all of the interior wall surfaces and co-exists with larger niches containing figures in the developed style of Chinese costume. See Tiün-kang 11 p., pls. 21–25, 31.

of an image as a unified whole we may place the notion of a natural complexity; the image and its religious meaning may be in harmony or they may not be. Sometimes, it seems to me, the two sides do not agree, or an image may actually express almost the contrary of its dogmatic content." 27

If one graphs the history of each type of Thousand-Buddha pattern the lifeliness of both types would overlap considerably at the middle even as Type I appears as an early innovation while Type II is only a codified perpetuation. And within Type I itself a similar situation is found—as especially represented by the contrast of the series in Caves XIX and XVI respectively.

The Type I Thousand-Buddha figures of Cave XVI (cf. fig. 2) are all of a significant sculptural bulk, seated firmly erect and are of a width to height ratio of approximately 3:4. Generally they all have an inflated, broad-shouldered dignity characteristic of the better carving of larger Buddha figures found at the site. The drapery is not modelled but rather is indicated by only shallowly incised lines. The drapery parts at the hands to quite consistently form subtle “cuffs” at the wrists and give focus to the gesture of meditation or dhhyänamudrā.

Each Buddha is rather tightly enclosed within the niche opening. The outer area is embellished with the following: a shallowly relieved pointed-arch front at the bottom of which is a raised moulding (though the arch front itself is otherwise undecorated); an incised line upon the flat strip separating the openings to define

two pilasters with a short, horizontal line at the top to indicate capitals; and a small, tear-shaped nodule or bud between the intersecting arch-front ends of adjoining arches. Such decoration does not detract from the Buddha figures but rather heightens their presence and significance.

Similar niches are found in the early caves at Yün-kang, usually in the upper areas of the interior spaces. Important examples are seen in Caves XIX-A (cf. figs. 9 and 11) and XVII (cf. fig. 12) together with the most comprehensive program in Cave XIX. Basically the same niche format, much the same alternating system of drapery, and figures conceived in a similarly grand way are seen in the Thousand-Buddha niches of Cave XIX (fig. 4). There is, however, a considerably wider variety within the Cave XIX pattern in contrast to that of Cave XVI.

Certain aesthetic distinctions may be made. Thus, to a small but possibly revealing degree the figures of Cave XIX are placed within niches of more liberal dimensions both relative to the available space for the figures and relative to their relationship to neighboring niches. While the complexity of the niche design in both cases is generally similar, there are some differences. The capitals at the top of the separating pilasters are often indicated by more than the single line which generally pertains in Cave XVI. Occasionally small figures appear at the outer slopes of the arch front of the niches in Cave XIX, bent over in adoration upon the main figure. These are not found in the pattern of Cave XVI, but interestingly, Cave XVI includes an embellishment not found in Cave XIX: the nodal bud between the intersecting arches is occasionally supported by the upturned ends of the arch front’s lower border—an abbreviated indication, I would imagine, of the addorsed dragon motif seen in larger niches.29

However similar the Buddha figures in the caves may be, there is some sense of a greater articulation of anatomical volumes in the case of those from Cave XIX. Those from Cave XVI often seem more consistently chunky and even bloated. The figures from Cave XIX were also carved with greater detail—seen in the pleating below the clasped hands and in the deeper incisions of the descriptive lines. A result of this, however, is that the rather emphatic detail of the “cuffs” over the wrists of the figures from Cave XVI does not so consistently appear in those of Cave XIX. One might imagine the consequent greater visual impact of the Cave XVI figures when seen from a distance in contrast to the greater descriptive clarity of the figures of Cave XIX when seen more closely—and vice versa.

The seated Buddha figures of the Cave XIX pattern are not so rigidly regulated in the rhythmic alternation of the two major

---

29 Even though this motif may be a foreign importation (cf. note 11 above), I believe it was based upon indigenous Chinese precedents—and that it is more common in later work at Yün-kang. Thus almost all niches of which it is a part are probably not to be counted among the first work at the site. The carvers, then, of Cave XIX would not have had that accessible precedent in nearby images but, if the conclusions of this article are correct, those of Cave XVI would have.
variants of the covering mode. Consistent with the vibrant enthusiasm which I would see within the expression of the figures themselves, either the right or the left arm may be covered in an almost capricious fashion—though there is some preference for covering the figures’ right shoulders. None of this denies the general flicker of movement through any variance within the series.

The most revealing detail within the Type I Thousand-Buddha figures of Cave XIX is the appearance of the zigzag or “sine-curve” design upon the drapery edge of some of the figures. This commonly—and properly—appears within the so-called “open mode” of drapery arrangement,30 but it may also be found as an element within the covering mode. Mizuno and Nagahiro have noted twelve different types of drapery arrangement upon Buddhas within this Thousand-Buddha pattern,31 but it seems more important to simply note the two variants of the covering mode together with the separate type of the open mode—with the often arbitrary appliqué of the sine-curve design upon either or both. The sine-curve element is not everywhere present in the series, but it is common enough to merit attention—particularly in that it nowhere appears in the matching case of Cave XVI. The brief and even hesitant indication of that pattern relates rather closely to a similar manner of design found on a few independent stone figures of the decade or so between the restoration of Buddhism following the persecution of T’ai-wu Ti 太武帝 during the years a.d. 446–452 and the start of the Yün-kang excavations in ca. a.d. 460. A comparison to a stone stele which bears a date equivalent to a.d. 455 (fig. 5)32 demonstrates that not only is that detail similar, but there is also something of the same ingenious directness in the expression of the figure.

One could be more convinced of the contemporaneity of the Thousand-Buddha niches of Cave XIX and the independent images of the 450’s in contrast to those more carefully calculated, perfected and simplified images of Cave XVI (cf. fig. 2). While the former would be less directly comparable, the general impact of patterned mechanization and even saccharine sweetness would relate them more closely to the most common style of Buddha figures seen in the Yün-kang caves as represented by the figures within a niche upon the east reveal of the window of Cave XVII which is dated a.d. 489 (fig. 6).33 Consequently I would submit that, however elaborate the Thousand-Buddha niches of Cave XVI, the repetitiveness of both pattern and style allies them conceptually rather closely to the principles of the Type II Thousand-Buddha pattern. In sum there is a spirit of

30 This is by far the most common fashion of drapery within the Buddhas found in all circumstances at Yün-kang—though figures so clothed are usually in abhayamudrā (cf. fig. 6) while here they are in the rarely found dhyānamudrā much like the Cave XX colossus, (see Yün-kang 14 pl., pls. 4–14). The term “open mode” is again Griswold’s, “Study of Buddha’s Dress,” p. 90.

31 In Yün-kang 13–14 t., pp. 121–122 and fig. 17 (p. 40).

32 From Sugimura Yūzō, Chinese Sculpture, Bronzes and Jades in Japanese Collections (Honolulu, 1966), pt. II, B & W pl. 2. Note too the three niche enclosed figures being in dhyānamudrā and the “attendants” at the top of the arch fronts—both of which being much like the Cave XIX Thousand-Buddha pattern (in fig. 4).

33 From Yün-kang 12 pl., pl. 12, and see also pls. 10, 13–21; Yün-kang 12 t., pp. 107–109.
experimentation within the Thousand-Buddha pattern of Cave XIX versus the impression of the copying of an established model within the outwardly similar pattern of Cave XVI. The Type I Thousand-Buddha pattern is commonly found in many later caves, and while there are important differences, by and large we may say that they seem more closely related to those found in Cave XVI than to those of Cave XIX.\(^{34}\)

Throughout the Cave XIX series the variations would indicate a sense of competition or just joyful play among the sculptors. Mizuno and Nagahiro have aptly noted the different hands which may be seen in that Thousand-Buddha niche pattern:

\(^{34}\) Some examples from other Yün-kang caves of the Thousand-Buddha pattern that should be grouped about this general type include: Cave VI, which includes a trabeated-arch niche (with a figure in Chinese dress) at the center much as that seen in Cave XVII (fig. 12), in Yün-kang 3 pl., pl. 54; Cave XI in Yün-kang 8 pl., pls. 25–29, and in various other cases of greater or lesser magnitude—to the extent that a Type I Thousand-Buddha niche is often a common adjunct to larger niche compositions. Among other sites the most interesting case is that found in the caves at Kung-hsien 龍門 which probably date from the second quarter of the sixth century. See Ch'en Ming-ta 陳明達, Kung-hsien shih-k' u 龍門石窟寺 [The Cave Temples at Kung-hsien] (Peking, 1963), esp. figs. 129, 33 and 47. While I would place the Thousand-Buddha patterns found there within the Type I classification, the sculptors apparently enjoyed more the broadly and richly conceived planes of drapery to the extent that linear description is frequently dispensed with. Once again—similar to the case of the pattern in Cave XVI at Yün-kang—a dramatic effect is achieved at some loss of detailed precision. What would seem to be a closely similar pattern (without, however, the alternating system) is also found in the Northern Wei caves at Lung-men 龍門, (though the published photographs at my disposal do not illustrate such well). See Chin Wei-no 金維諾, Lung-men shih-k' u 龍門石窟, [The Caves at Lung-men] (Peking, 1961), figs. 23, 36 and 43 (from the Ku-yang tung 古陽洞). "... a pair of niches were often executed by the same hand. The width of two niches corresponds to the space which would be occupied by a seated worker. It must surely have been a splendid sight to see the army of sculptors, each working on a pair of niches, and seated side by side in front of the walls of the caves."\(^{35}\)

But those authors have not commented upon the general truth that the higher the Buddha images are upon the walls of Cave XIX, the greater their formal variation. Thus those unframed figures at the top (fig. 8) include the distinctly unusual feature of the sine-curve design within the covering mode; those at the middle and upper registers (fig. 4) include figures in the two alternating variants of the covering mode together with those in the open mode with the sine-curve design, while those in the lowest reaches are generally the least various (fig. 7).\(^{36}\) It is as though the vitality had waned as the sculptors worked down the wall; or perhaps the beginning experiments in the upper reaches had been resolved into a codified system by the time the series was finished at the bottom. Yet that most regular series of the lower areas would have been literally the most easily seen as a precedent or model for the Cave XVI sculptors, and it is that series which is the most similar in both type and style to the Cave XVI series.

The essentially stylistic distinctions made above are admittedly subtle and would, by themselves, be unconvincing and insuf-
ficient proof of my hypothesis that the Thousand-Buddha patterns in Caves XVI and XIX are aesthetically and temporally different. If we now turn to the larger circumstances of the Type I pattern in the caves of our concern, however, we may note a particularly close stylistic congruence between the Buddhas of the patterns within Caves XIX and XIX-A and between those of Caves XVII and XVI. And we may, I believe, certainly ascribe such figures within Cave XVII to a later time which would strongly advocate a similar placement for those of Cave XVI.

The rows of Thousand-Buddha niches which cover the south (or front) and side walls of Cave XIX are very evenly spaced, and the niches are carefully designed throughout (figs. 14–16). The niches were carefully accommodated to the nimbus surrounding the great seated image of the cave, the standing Buddhas in the corners between the south wall and the side walls, and were piled up regularly to the ceiling. The niches were stacked vertically one on top of the other on the south wall and generally arranged like interlocking brick courses upon the east and west walls.

Just before meeting with the rounded ceiling the Thousand-Buddha niches pattern is replaced by a single row of seated Buddha figures (fig. 8). They are clothed in the alternating system of the covering mode with the anomalous sine-curve edge design applied, and they are unenclosed by niches. They are paced regularly upon a band which surrounds the cave’s side and front walls, and they are about twice the size of the niche-enclosed figures below. Each has a dual halo-mandorla pattern incised upon the backing stone, the one encircling the head and the other surrounding the whole image (much as the arch does the Thousand-Buddha niches below). Immediately above these figures are carved large loops of drapery, a triangular pattern of the canopy motif, and the ceiling itself. Thus a vital concept is defined within the cave: the central image together with the two Buddhas at the front corner in attendance (and lesser figures in turn in attendance upon them); multiple emanations of the prime seated figure in the Thousand-Buddha niches of the walls; serene, unenclosed figures at the top, with the whole great shrine being circumscribed and enclosed with the canopy design above. (There are some intrusions, especially and typically on the lower areas of the walls, which are not of concern here.)

37 Plans from Yiin-kang 13–14 t., figs. 4 (p. 16), 6 and 7 (pp. 18–19).
38 From Yiin-kang 13 pl., pl. 28; Yiin-kang 13–14 t., p. 134.
39 I must note, however, that neither the rhythmic alternation nor the sine-curve appliqué are necessarily temporally significant. The two variants of the covering mode also commonly occur within the “Seven Buddhas of the Past” upon the arch fronts of many niche compositions elsewhere, and the sine-curve design often survives within that series in later times. For example, see a demonstrably later case in Cave IX (Yiin-kang 6 pl., pl. 58–B), and a similar case from one of the great niche compositions of Cave XVI (Yiin-kang 11 pl., pls. 80 and 82). Both features were probably established as iconographically proper to that series, though it is likely that the larger system of rhythmic alternation of drapery articulation was the more durable (because of Gandharan precedents? Cf. note 15 above).
40 Such later work throughout the T’an-yao group is often of the latest phases of work at the whole site, going beyond even the termination of major work in A.D. 494 when the capital was moved south. But there are also cases where such intrusions in Cave XIX seem a part of the first carving, yet they may be generally understood as willful exercises of the same sort of license seen in the Thou-
Within Cave XIX-A we find small Buddhas unenclosed by niche structures through they are stylistically but a subtle variant of the Type I for the Thousand-Buddhas. On the upper portions of both the side and front walls rows of single, seated Buddhas are arranged in horizontal bands with no vertical separation (fig. 9). But where as those Buddhas at the sides are of an unique and upright power characteristic of the Type I found in Cave XIX, are provided with an ample spatial interval, and are seated upon slightly modelled separate lotus seats, those upon the front wall (fig. 10) are smaller in scale, more tightly shoulder to shoulder, and rest upon unmodulated ledges of stone (or a ground line that tapers away below to reveal the succeeding level of Buddha in relief). These ledges are not always aligned with the line of seats established on the side walls.

The drapery of the Buddhas in the tiers at the top of the side walls is of the undifferentiated covering mode with the Buddhas seated in dhyānamudrā. All of the Buddhas on the front wall are similarly presented.

sand-Buddha pattern. Examples of this include: a fairly elaborate niche composition to the lower left of the standing attendant Buddha at the meeting of the south and east walls, (Yün-kang 13 pl., pl. 16); a similar niche in approximately the same location on the opposite wall, (now almost completely destroyed, Yün-kang 13 pl., pl. 37); and two niches just to the left of the upper part of the door opening, and above a large niche below, (Yün-kang 13 pl., pls. 22–23).

But there are some Buddhas to the left of the shoulder of the large Bodhisattva of the left wall which just as consistently wear the open mode of drapery with the sine-curve edge (fig. 11). These latter figures are larger than those above them but are, however, also seated in dhyānamudrā. They are thus in both style and attitude much like those few figures within the Thousand-Buddha series of Cave XIX (cf. fig. 4). The figures from Cave XIX-A are presumably to be taken within the same pantheon as those above them and perhaps, due to the difference in drapery, to be read as engendering that sort of movement seen in those of Cave XIX. Yet the system (if any) is quite different than that of Cave XIX; and, in fact, the individual figures are closer in impact to those of the single row of Buddhas at the very top of the walls of Cave XIX (cf. fig. 8). It seems quite clear that these small figures from Cave XIX-A, as for those of Cave XIX—with their youthfully open faces, brief sine-curve design, and dhyānamudrā—are again very much like those stone images datable to the decade prior to

43 From Yün-kang 13 pl., pl. 98; Yün-kang 13–14 t., p. 148. There are also two Buddhas (flanked by small standing Bodhisattvas) within pointed-arch niches of a more elaborate sort high on the left wall, (numbered 33 and 34 on the plan in Yün-kang 13–14 t., fig. 10, p. 24). While they thus exist outside the scheme of the rows of Thousand-Buddhas to their right, they perhaps are contemporary with that latter series—being something of that same sort of capricious experiment seen in the more consistent pattern of Cave XIX. For a detail of the equivalent area from the opposite (right) wall, which is about the only area there now unmarred, see Yün-kang 13 pl., pl. 98 (and cf. pl. 97). Interestingly, a standing Buddha figure is there included among the rows of Thousand-Buddhas, being much like those which similarly appear in Cave XIX, (cf. Yün-kang 13 pl., pls. 14–15).

44 From Yün-kang 13 pl., pl. 83; Yün-kang 13–14 t., p. 147. For a view of the same area of the opposite or right wall (which is rather badly eroded), see Yün-kang 13 pl., pl. 92 and cf. Yün-kang 13–14 t., p. 149.
the start of work at Yün-kang (cf. fig. 5).  

While stylistically akin, the Buddhas of the front wall of Cave XIX-A are slightly more squat and softened when compared to those on the side walls (cf. fig. 10 vs. fig. 9). It would seem that we are here dealing with at least two different expressive variants and perhaps two different times as well. The carving of the large niches numbered 5 and 6 on the upper part of the right half of the front wall (cf. fig. 10) clearly did not disturb any seated Buddhas similar to the figures which presently exist to the right of (and above) those two niches. The plane of the rock face upon which they all exist is the same, and the right edges of the two large niches project above the relieved recess of the flanking Buddhas. One of those independent seated Buddhas rests upon the right upper border of Niche 12 on the front wall (in the lower center of fig. 10). It tilts slightly as that upper border tilts. It could have been there first and Niche 12 added later. Yet the contrary would seem to be true as an identical seated Buddha just to the right of that figure—surrounded by Type II Thousand-Buddha niches—is on a slightly lower line whereas in all other cases of such serial Buddhas they are carefully placed upon the same base line.  

We would thus be forced into viewing as contemporary Niches 5 and 6 and at least those unenclosed seated Buddhas to the right. And, while I will not give further evidence here, I am of the opinion that Niches 5 and 6 must have been done well after the first excavations of the caves, probably about A.D. 480. I would, however, hold judgment in reserve for the three rows of independent seated Buddhas at the top of the front wall. They may well have been the original continuation of the pattern at the sides; but, because the area was more cramped or because it simply was not visible and consequently not too important, they were not done with the same enthusiasm as those at the sides. Certainly the areas beneath those three rows were not originally carved, but at a later time there was some attempt to continue that pattern, briefly and even randomly. That effort, however, succumbed to the greater demand for the individually dedicated votive niche composition.

An analysis of the total structure of the cave reinforces this judgment. The cave was excavated according to no geometric or architectonic plan. Rather the interior

44 Apart from the probably different iconographic and/or representational function of the Cave XIX-A images (as I note below), it is tempting to think of these images, while closely related to those of Cave XIX, as somewhat later. This would be suggested by the greater emphasis upon the "cuffs" of the figures' drapery and, of course, by the fact that Cave XIX-A acts as an auxiliary wing to the larger Cave XIX. I would not, however, rigidly insist upon such quibbling and would instead emphasize the stylistic harmony—whatever the differences of compositional pattern and meaning—of the images from Caves XIX and XIX-A.

46 One further curious, but possibly enlightening, detail is a solitary seated Buddha, unenclosed by a niche and closely approached by Type II Thousand-Buddha niches well down the surface of the front wall. See Yün-kang 13 pl., pl. 78; this is labelled as image number 13 on the plan in Yün-kang 13-14 t., fig. 10 (p. 24). While that figure is unfortunately rather eroded, and while it is apparently in abhayamudrā unlike the dhyānamudrā which everywhere pertains in the Buddhas near the ceiling, it seems close in style to those in the upper portion.

46 For a helpful view upward to the ceiling, see Yün-kang 13 pl., pl. 103 and cf. Yün-kang 13-14 t., p. 151.
space was strongly conditioned by the expansive presence of the colossal cross-legged figure. The interior walls taper according to that conditioning factor towards an oval ceiling. That oval is cut by the line of the front wall along the chord of the arc of one side of that oval. The edge of the ceiling has triangular and half-circular whorl patterns to describe a canopy over the main images of the cave. This continues completely around the cut-oval shape of the ceiling, including the front wall. In the center of the canopy were celestials and musicians, though they are now largely eroded away. One may suppose that direct confrontation with the major image was the prime act of worship, followed by an awareness of the dimly lit attendant colossal Bodhisattvas on either side with, in turn, a further perception of the elaborate radiations of detail defined both by the myriad Buddhas emanating from the major figure and complemented by the panoply of paradisiacal detail in the flame nimbus about the main image, the canopy, the celestials and musicians, etc.—all richly painted.

The front wall was the least important, and in fact would have been simply difficult to see within the close confines of the cave. Indeed, the whole cave apparently acted as the shrine or altar for a structural temple before it,\(^47\) and any ritual penetration much beyond the door was not invited or even possible. The front wall thus was probably totally undecorated in the original scheme of this particular cave—with the possible exception of the aborted series of three rows of seated Buddhas at the very top. At some later time the wall was seen as a surface to be filled with individual donations which, while generally following the precedents of the previous scheme in plan and even in style (and so the further effort of independent seated Buddhas similar to those higher on the walls), all came to reflect the softened effect of that later period. In general, then, the original “Thousand-Buddhas” of Cave XIX-A extended from approximately the shoulder level of the attendant standing Bodhisattvas up to the ceiling on the side walls; the front wall was originally left almost completely blank but was later accepted as a surface for further dedications—and consequent inclusion within the larger paradise.

Based upon the overall design seen in Cave XIX coupled with the fact that the Thousand-Buddha niches at the top of the cast, south and west walls in Cave XVII are of that elaborate sort that I have labelled Type I,\(^48\) a natural conclusion would be that the Thousand-Buddha niches of Cave XVII were a part of the same original plan. Yet I must suggest otherwise.

Three essential points may be made. First, while the design of the Thousand-Buddha niches is much like that associated with my Type I, the carving tends to the routine and mechanical quality of Type II and lacks the vigor and stridency seen in Cave XIX. Second, there is no surrounding canopy pattern at the ceiling. If the cave was intended as a shrine like the others of the first series, then that canopy pattern almost certainly would have been com-

\(^{47}\) This would be indicated by the results of excavations which have found Northern Wei and later foundations in front of the caves. See Yün-kang 16 Suppl., pp. 185–188, and cf. A. Soper, The Evolution of Buddhist Architecture in Japan (Princeton, 1942), p. 82.

\(^{48}\) See plans in Yün-kang 12 t., figs 43, 44 and 45, (pp. 21–22).
pleted early in its excavation. The Thousand-Buddha niches, whether donated as a group or individually, would be properly expressive of religious devotion whereas no one would waste their resources in the donation of the religiously meaningless (in itself) canopy design.

But the third and most telling point is the fact that the Thousand-Buddha niches are adjusted to the larger niches compositions upon the wall and nowhere are either cut away by or intrude upon them. This is most clearly seen in the case of the upper portion of the east wall (fig. 12). The large Niche 60 (my numbering) in the lower center, which contains two seated Buddhas, is generally rectangular in format with the exception of the left side which is broken and confused by the presence of two niches, one of a trabeated-arch type (Niche 61) on top of one of a pointed-arch type (Niche 62). These latter two are clearly later in the general deflation and sweetening of the major figures and in the reduction of peripheral detail down to very shallow patterns. Most important is the addition of inventive detail such as the support of Bodhisattvas upon stemmed lotuses outside the opening of Niche 61 and the two flying celestials modelled almost fully in the round within the opening of Niche 62. These are characteristic of the undeniably later carving of the reveals of windows and doorways together with the lower portions of the interiors of the caves.

Niche 62 is carved below the surface of the wall established by Niche 60, and on the basis of that alone we could accept the confusion of the edge of Niche 60 as simply being due to the later addition of Niche 62. Yet Niche 61 above was clearly done at the same time, with the base line of the donors carefully placed along the upper border of Niche 62, and indeed it is likely that the two are to be considered as an iconographic pair. The combination of a trabeated-arch

49 While I know of no contemporary instance of a single Thousand-Buddha niche being demonstrably the product of an individual’s donation, I think it is necessary to recognize various levels of donations—dependent upon financial means, societal position, religious purpose, etc.—from whole caves to individual niches, of varying size and levels of accomplishment, to even a single Thousand-Buddha niche. (Certainly the wide range of gilt bronze shrines from the period provides a similar sort of commentary.) Soper has given textual evidence for the merit which accrues through the devotee’s act of making a representation of the Thousand-Buddhas; Literary Evidence, p. 202, and cf. pp. 62 and 78, where actual reports of such images having been made are provided. Injunctions to offer donations of diverse scope are found in many texts, such as particularly in portions of the Lotus Sutra. See Kern, Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka, pp. 50–51. The “Caves of the Thousand Buddhas” (Ch’ien-fo tung 千佛洞) at Tun-huang 敦煌 are so termed as they were supposedly the result of a vision of such by their founder in A.D. 366. See Soper, Literary Evidence, pp. 202 and 93.

50 From Tun-kang 12 pl., pl. 41; see also a detail in pl. 42 and cf. Tun-kang 12 t., pp. 114–115.

51 The stemmed lotus serving as a support for figures (within a niche composition enclosing two figures in Chinese costume) can be found upon the arch front of the upper large niche upon the west reveal of the window of Cave XVIII. A niche just below that includes two amply modelled celestials within the niche opening itself. See Tun-kang 12 pl., pls. 88–90; cf. Tun-kang 12 t., pp. 124–125. Mizuno and Nagahiro would see that area as being earlier, though presumably not by too much, than the niche dated A.D. 489 on the east reveal of the window of Cave XVII (in my fig. 6); Tun-kang 12 t., p. 114 (pl. 42). I doubt that such a distinction can be made. An interesting example of a possible development of the celestials within the arch opening into a completely Sinitified idea is provided by a stele from Mai-chi shan 麥積山. There the flying celestials have been replaced (in the sixth century) by purely Chinese phoenixes. See Cheng Chen-to 鄭振鐸, Mai-chi shan shih-k’u 麥積山石窟, [The Cave Temples at Mai-chi shan] (Peking, 1954), pls. 123 and 125.
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Plate 1

Fig. 1.—Gandhāra (Taxila). Stūpa of stucco. From Sir John Marshall, *Taxila*, III.

Fig. 2.—Cave XVI. West part of the south wall. Middle portion. Thousand-Buddha niches.

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, all of the illustrations are of the Yün-kang caves and are taken from Mizuno Seichi and Nagahiro Toshio, *Yün-kang* (Kyoto, 1952–56).
Fig. 5.—Stone stele. Dated A.D. 433. Fujii Yurikaikan, Kyoto.
Fig. 6.—Carv. XVII. East reveal of the window. From niches behind, A.D. 489.
Fig. 7.—Cave XIX, West half of the south wall. Middle and lower storey: Thousand-Buddha niches.

Fig. 8.—Cave XIX, West half of the south wall. Top storey: Seated Buddhas.
Fig. 9—Cave XIX-A. Upper part of the left wall.
Seated Buddhas. Niches 33 and 34 at left.

Fig. 10—Cave XIX-A. Upper part of the right half of the front wall.
Niches 5 and 6 at left center.
Fig. 11.—Cave XIX-A. Middle part of the left wall. Seated Buddhas.

Fig. 12.—Cave XVII. Upper part of the east wall, Large niche 60 and niches 61–62 at lower left.
Fig. 13.—Cave XVI. Plan of interior walls.

Fig. 14.—Cave XIX. Plan of the south wall.
Fig. 15.—Cave XIX. Plan of the east wall.

Fig. 16.—Cave XIX. Plan of the west wall.
niche with one of a pointed-arch is commonly seen, and the only reason that they are not here of the same dimensions is that the carvers respected the existence of the nimbus of the main figure at the left. The right Bodhisattva borne up upon a stemmed lotus could not have been so ripely modelled if the edge of Niche 60 had been complete and established. Yet here it intrudes upon the space properly that of Niche 60 (determined especially by the drapery hanging above it). We are thus led to the belief that all three niches, for all of the expressive and iconographic differences, were done at much the same time.

I would thus conclude that this Thousand-Buddha pattern reflects the individual, later donation rather than the original imperial design. This is in spite of the still handsome overall scheme that pertains, a scheme that would probably more properly revolve around the centrally placed large niches on both the east and west walls than around the primary colossal image of the cave itself. What results on the upper portions of the east and west walls, then, is a mini-shrine, a two-dimensional duplicate of the larger idea of the early caves as especially represented by Cave XIX where the colossal, central figure propels a litany of Buddhas into form. At the center of the Thousand-Buddha pattern on the east wall of Cave XVII (cf. fig. 12) there remains a small panel for probably the donatory inscription. Thus originally Cave XVII was—much like the others—quite elementary in its original design and execution. The Thousand-Buddha patterns of the east and west walls (and the whole design of the south wall) were originally not present though, at a later time, the east and west walls were given a Thousand-Buddha pattern that coincides in the broadest

52 See note 10 above.

53 This would seem especially true in the case of the west wall of the cave; see Yün-kang 12 pl., pl. 55; cf. Yün-kang 12 t., p. 117. A very similar design, in both organization and expressive effect, may be found upon the lower portion of the west part of the south wall of Cave XVIII, (Niche 45). See the plan in Yün-kang 12 t., fig. 52 (p. 33) and the illustration in Yün-kang 12 pl., pl. 98. In this latter case there can be no question but that this is a close copy at a later date of an earlier formula. One other similar composition is to be found in the T'an-yao caves, that existing high up on the back or north wall over the east attendant Bodhisattva of Cave XVIII. See the plan in Yün-kang 12 t., fig. 53 (p. 35). While the published photographs are insufficently clear (see Yün-kang 12 t., pl. 116), and while one would automatically feel that it was a part of the larger program of that north wall, once again I strongly suspect that this too is later work, (though the Thousand-Buddha type niches near the ceiling and possibly some of the other work high upon the wall were likely products of the early period). See Mizuno and Nagahiro’s notes in Yün-kang 12 t., pp. 129–130 (pl. 107). A related scheme exists within the antechamber to the main shrine of the nearly contemporary Cave II at Ajantā, though it is presented in a vastly different way. See Heinrich Zimmer, The Art of Indian Asia (New York, 1960), vol. 2, pls. 156–157. The lack of niche enclosures in that painted representation may also be found in the rather special case of the two reveals of the window of Cave V at Yün-kang; see Yün-kang 2 pl., pls. 18–19. That manner of representing the Thousand-Buddha theme became more popular in the sixth century and later—as seen in the Tamamushi Shrine (cf. note 1 above).

54 The earliest dated inscription in the Yün-kang caves, that of A.D. 483 for a great composition of niches upon the east wall of Cave XI, functions similarly as it indicates a private donation of a commandingly large area. See Yün-kang 8 pl., pls. 29–31, and cf. Yün-kang 8–9 t., pp. 114–115. The inscription mentions that the donors were fifty-four “believers of the village.” The total niche composition includes five major niche and/or figural groups plus surrounding auxiliary detail—including, probably, a Thousand-Buddha pattern of my Type I classification which is stylistically close to that found in Caves XVI and XVII; (cf. note 34 above).
sense with my (early) Type I, but which, finally, is stylistically stilted.

We now return to the case of the Thousand-Buddhas upon the upper surfaces of the interior walls of Cave XVI. Due to a variety of careful adjustments and compromises there can be no question but that those niches were a part of the original plan that included, at least, the five major niche compositions so carefully placed upon the interior walls (fig. 13). The Thousand-Buddha niche pattern extends down from a canopy design which, though now badly eroded, originally circumscribed the circumference of the oval ceiling of the cave. Apparently that pattern terminated at approximately the ground line of the major figures and/or their thrones within the five major niches upon the interior walls. The great panoply of Thousand-Buddha niches are throughout vividly articulated and designed, and each Buddha within is possessed of the same ample breath as their larger counterparts housed within the five primary niches.

A factor of possible relevance between Caves XVI and XIX is the actual number of Type I Thousand-Buddha niches in each. A precise count is difficult as the illustrations are difficult to accurately and completely patch together, the published plans err here and there, and there are uncertainties as to what exactly should be properly counted within the scheme (such as those unframed seated Buddhas found at the very top of the wall of Cave XIX). Yet my count of the Thousand-Buddha representations within Cave XIX yields something over nine hundred while that for Cave XVI yields, at the most, about seven hundred (cf. figs. 13-16). (There are less than one hundred similar figures within Cave XIX-A and, given the facts that they also lack enclosing niche enframements and that the rhythmic system is different, there may be some question as to their proper inclusion within the iconographic scheme termed Thousand-Buddhas. They are, however, stylistically of the type and thus of interest and relevance here.) It is then tempting to think that the greater attention to iconographic and/or numerical precision would complement the greater intensity of purpose for the design of Cave XIX in some contrast to the indicative but imprecise—and individually offered?—pattern of Cave XVI.

If we now line up representative examples of the Type I Thousand-Buddha niche from the four caves of our concern here, we would note a close similarity in style and execution of those from Caves XVII and XVI (cf. figs. 2 and 12). Both share the same regularity of alternation in the drapery fashion of the Buddha figures, and both seem to be confident if somewhat mechanical repetitions of a basic formula. This is true only when placed in contrast to the other stylistic constellation seen in Caves XIX-A and XIX (cf. figs. 4, 7-9, and 11). There we have noticed a rather more vigorous if sometimes naive and “experimental” quality—particularly with the addition of sine-curve edge upon the drapery of some of the figures. I have also indicated that the Thousand-Buddha niches of the upper walls of Cave XVII are after the fact of the first plan and probably to be grouped with the carving of individually dedicated niches elsewhere. This must also be the case for those in Cave XVI.

Yet in Cave XVI they are more clearly

---

55 Plan from Tun-kang 11 t., fig. 43 (p. 37).
a part of a larger, overall plan—a plan incorporating the five major niches on the wall together with a canopy pattern at the very top of the walls. There would seemingly then be a dilemma of inconsistency in my analyses. The only solution would be that Cave XVI, among the five caves of T’an-yao, was not completed upon the first dedication of those caves. It may well have been rudimentarily excavated; but, for whatever reason, it was not then decorated. Yet, having been officially sponsored, it had to be completed in time. What apparently happened was that the rush of individual donors that would have followed the imperial dedication met the original walls of the unfinished Cave XVI and, while submitting their donations to an overall plan “on paper” so to speak, used that area first for the second period of carving. That was followed by, at almost the same moment, further carving of the front and side walls in the other caves (including the upper portions of the east and west walls of Cave XVII). But in those other caves where the larger plan was already complete as intended, the results of the second period of carving were more diffuse and uncontrolled by any rigid control, being pressed instead into the often awkward surviving surfaces.

The craftsmen and/or their descendants had, however, become completely skilled and adept at the production of codified images. Thus the images of the five major niches in Cave XVI appear confident for all of the fact of their “early style”—a kind of renascence of the earlier style which, however, lacked the rough conviction and emphatic and various carving of the earlier period. (At other points, such as the niches on the front wall of Cave XVIII, the work tended to the opposite extreme—a cursory sloppiness—that such later confidence also would breed.)

Among the five caves of T’an-yao there is an extraordinary consistency of style and harmony of moment in the carving of all the sculptural work only within Caves XVI and XIX (omitting, for now, consideration of the lowest portions of the walls and the reveals of windows and doorways). Both caves are, with only minor peripheral additions, complete as intended, but the intentions for each cave are characteristic of two fundamentally different attitudes and times. Essentially Cave XIX provides an imperial scheme, appropriate to the presumed original purpose, with the colossal Buddha being the impetus for the whole of a combination of opinions might be, I feel that the last word has not yet been provided on this problem.

The usual, and I think sufficient, explanation is that T’an-yao’s request to build the five caves was based upon the prior example of five colossal bronze figures erected in the capital in honor of the first five emperors of the Northern Wei. This is recorded in the Wei-shu 魏書; see the translation of Leon Hurvitz, (after the notes of Tsukamoto Zenryû), “Treatise of Buddhism and Taoism,” in Yun-kang 16 Suppl., [78] and [75], pp. 71–72. The historian’s summary report—to “open up five caves, and carve Buddhist images in [each of] them”—states, however accidentally and incidental to his brevity, the calculated
the rest of the cave—including, especially, the Thousand-Buddha pattern. Cave XVI in contrast was clearly and rationally designed to permit multiple levels of private or lay donations which resulted in a greater complexity of wall surface and a diffusion effect of confrontation with the essential colossi themselves. Soper has made a most ingenious effort to associate particular caves in the Yün-kang series with the Northern Wei emperors, (in his two articles cited in note 57 above).

Whether such directly derives from the Lotus Sūtra—or any text at all—is still open to question; (cf. notes 3 and 6 above). The Thousand-Buddhas of Cave XIX probably were most generally understood simply as emanations of the central figure, (in Cave XVIII; see Yün-kang 12 p.,pls. 113-123; Yün-kang 12 t., pp. 131-133). Thus I quite agree with the opinion that, at least for the first period of carving, there was “no systematized iconography in the proper sense of the term.” (Yün-kang 8-9 t., p. 73.) With succeeding periods of carving and with, especially, the virtual ubiquity of niches containing the twin Buddhas Sākyamuni and Prabhūtaratna (with Maitreya) reference to the Lotus Sūtra seems proper—at least in the general sense, and in the sense that the sūtra itself so instructs the believer (cf. note 49 above). While there may be nascent instances of that iconography (and possibly other iconographic precedents as well) in the first carving at the site, by and large such seems rare and possibly even nonexistent. Rather the imperial donors, with the confidence of rex non potest peccare, simply commissioned what they knew to be right while less peremptory donors found authoritative precedent within the rules of the sūtras.
JADE DEMONIC IMAGES FROM EARLY CHINA

By DORIS J. DOHRENWEND

The human image is relatively rare in pre-Buddhist China and often tells little when it does occur out of pictorial or other context. Animal imagery, on the other hand, is incomparably rich and original. There are therianthropic images of bronze, jade and wood, however, of semi-human or demonic aspect. It is from these that the jades here were gathered.

More than one scholar has been drawn to these works. Carl Hentze included a number of them in his wide-ranging books, noting trans-Pacific affinities. Umehara Sueji 梅原末治 in Japan grouped some in 1955 and more in 1966. Na Chih-liang 那志良 illustrated the best known ones again in his valuable two-volume study of jades. Last but not least, Alfred Salmony published most of the jade demons and related material known to him and came closest to the dates suggested here in his first major work on archaic jades, but in his last book he was moving them backward in time toward the Shang style or period, which many reflect. Salmony's puzzlement and willingness to change his dates was fair enough, however. The jades are not easy to place.

Many have been fascinated by the demonic images of early China, witness Salmony's book on the lacquered wood "guardians" of the tombs of the Yangtze state of Ch'u. No one to date has noted the scope and import of this particular group of jades, not at all out of line with the mentality and even the type represented by the antlered and tongued apparitions of Ch'u. Thus we have lacked much of the primary or in-
ternal evidence for placement afforded by sheer numbers of examples.

Only two of the pieces gathered here were excavated under controlled conditions. With this scarcity of objective or archaeological evidence, the time-and-space conclusions drawn here are necessarily tentative. Yet the fullness and arrangement of material may bear witness as yet uncited, and the results of this essay, if not “true”, may at least come closer to the ancient and complex reality. In any case they suggest that this subject in the study of early Chinese jade is important (1) for isolating and understanding something of regional arts in pre-Buddhist China, (2) for studies in Pacific art, and (3) as a partial basis for reconstructing early Chinese religious beliefs and practises, notably the survival of early forms of shamanism in the South. Place and, above all, time of manufacture are the main concerns here, however. These are the prime factors of historical import stressed again and again by Professor Loehr. Unsue or unknown, meaning is only briefly touched upon.

The jade and stone primary material for study is shown in figures 1–40. Figures 41–76 illustrate designs for comparison in all media both inside and outside of China. The forty images from thirty-six jades fall into interlocking series beginning at Anyang 安陽 and probably still current when the Buddha was on the doorstep. They are grouped here according to their most striking attribute, the headdress. There is often some doubt even as to the exact description of this, but until clarified by further finds the following four groups may serve well enough as a framework: These are: (1) images with branching headdresses suggestive of ornate, usually rigid, horns or “rococo” antlers; (2) masks with plumed headdress; (3) horned and plumed demons; and (4) capped heads linked in one way or another with the foregoing.

The jades are “catalogued” under these four headings as to form and color, image type, size or maximum dimension and published photos, drawings and dates. (My best effort at dating follows the long dash at the end of each entry.) A brief discussion of my reasoning and conclusions comes at the end. Most of the images were worked in incised line, flat or low relief, some higher relief, and notably the so-called yang-wen 陽文 line associated first and foremost with the finest of the Late Shang jades. This yang-wen style, however, has variations of some significance for dating, although quality and workshop differences may also be allowed even for Shang times and certainly enter the picture later. Thus the yang-wen style might be characterized in three ways: (1) proto or pseudo yang-wen—double incised line; (2) semi yang-wen—semi-relief line or double incised line with the stone rubbed away to some extent to either side of the incised lines, but incompletely; and (3) true yang-wen—line isolated in clear relief against backround or surface almost fully abraded away.  

I. The “Horned Crown” Group (figs. 1–16)

1.—Plaque: Flat, thick plaque of medium green jade with cream and grey-brown shadows, white flecks


9 See also Doris Dohrenwend, Chinese Jades in the Royal Ontario Museum (Toronto, 1971), p. 36.
and amber vining. Sole surface detail, engraved broken lines about openwork on one face. Max.
width: 7 3/8 in. (18.3 cm.) Collection of Dr. Arthur
M. Sackler, New York.—Late Shang.

2.—PLAQUE: Flat, thick plaque of calcified light
green jade. Possibly incomplete, since engraved lines
include unbroken ones on "crown" not associated
with silhouette or openwork. Diagonal scar across
otherwise plain back. W. 4 1/16 in. (10.3 cm.).
Eugene Fuller Memorial Collection, Seattle Art
Museum. Museum’s date (following Salmony’s
verbal “Middle Chou”): “Ch’un Ch’iu.”—Possibly
Ch’un Ch’iu 春秋; not earlier than the ninth century
b.c.

3.—PLAQUE: Curved plaque, which stands alone, of
calciﬁed light green and buff jade. Back concave and
plain. Front shows early demonic image in semi-
yang-zen or low relief line with horn-like crown
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6.—**Fitting:** Curved appliqué of light green jade with faintest amber markings at neck and on back. Back concave and plain but for grooves, cavities, and six meeting pairs of perforations for attachment: two in sides of top; two above earspoles; and two in center of back meeting in central, vertical perforation. Drilling rather sharp-edged and regular. Front shows similar demon as nos. 3–5 but of more mechanical and contained feature and outline. No tusks, no ornately projecting horns. Earspoles not bored all the way through. Bow-tie-like spirals on neck band. H. 1 13/16 in. (4.6 cm.). Freer Gallery of Art. See Salmony, *Chinese Jade through Wei*, pl. 12: 6: “Early Western Chou;” Wills, *Jade of the East*, p. 59, pl. 36: “Chou.”—Late Eastern Chou to Han.

7.—**Scepter** (fig. 28 shows mask on reverse): Long trapezoidal form with rounded cutting edge and two perforations below main design and borders (upper one larger, conical and drilled from this side; lower one near butt and smaller). Calcified, grey-green stone, gold-tinged above, with dark area at butt end. Fig. 7 shows round-eyed, mouthless “demon” with peak-centered “horned crown” in true yang-wen and flat relief. Ch’ien-lung 乾隆 period inscription in opposing position to mask image. L. 9 11/16 in. (24.6 cm.) National Palace Museum, Taipei. See Umehara, *NPMQ*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1966), p. 14, fig. 2: 3; also Ku Kung Yu-ch'i, pl. 4: “Chou.”—Eastern Chou.


9.—**Scepter:** Near rectangular tablet bevelled on one side above and appearing truncated below (design right at butt edge, no perforation). Calcified dark green stone. Incised design on both faces. One side shows round-eyed bracket-mouthed, long-toothed mask with roccoco horn motif stiffly vertical (no tusks, earrings). Reverse shows frontal mask-like design of spiral-eyed, confronting “profiles,” noses united by three lines and heads by peaked crown above with more usual lateral horns. L. 7 1/16 in. (18 cm.). Discovered 1963 in village near Lungshan 龍山, site at Liang-cheng-chen 兩城鎮 Shantung, and now in the Shantung Provincial Museum. After Liu, *KK*, 1972/4, pp. 57–58: Lung shan.—Eastern Han.

10.—**Scepter:** Long tablet, near rectangular form of light green jade with brown markings. Identical design on both faces suggests “crowned” nose (cf. noses in figs. 13 and 24) incised in small panel flanked by vertical fluting. Above and below are incised triple guilloches, with additional incised border design over upper guilloche band. One large perforation between décor and butt edge. L. 13 7/16 in. (34.2 cm.). A. F. Pillsbury Collection, Minneapolis Institute of Arts. Salmony, *Carved Jade*, pl. 33: 2: “Eastern Early Chou.”—Eastern Han.

11.—**Knife End** (fig. 30 shows design on center of blade): Large, trapezoidal blade (broken at smaller end) with two unevenly conical perforations about 1 1/16 in. from spine and smaller conical hole at broken end for hafting or hanging. Finely bevelled,
slightly concave cutting edge. Notches on short side only partly related to design, which may be later than blade. Softly polished, grey-green jade with buff and white clouding and grey patches. Finely incised on both sides of end shown (faintest traces at opposite end of similar design) is ornate profile version of horned crown at finest with elaborate system of pendants. No dear human image. L. 19 in. (48.3 cm.). Collection of Dr. Arthur M. Sackler, New York.—Late Shang or Early Western Chou.

12.—FITTING: Flat plaque of light green jade with traces of calcification below carved in 

13.—FITTING: Flat, fine plaque of yellow-green jade with brown markings. Three holes in (straight) top edge of crown, three in base; side perforations joined by bores from back for attachment. One side only carved in true and exquisite yang-wen style. Horn-crowned, round-eye, ear-spoolely and bracket-mouthed or “sad” demon. One short row of long upper teeth only and perhaps a protruding tongue. W. 3 1/4 in. (9 cm.). Edward and Louise B. Sonnen schein Collection, Art Institute of Chicago. See Hentze, Sakralbronzen, pl. 79: 153: Shang or Early Western Chou; Salimony, Carved Jade, pl. 32: 1: “Early Eastern Chou”; and Sonnen schein Catalogue, pl. 36: 2: “Early Western Chou.”—Han; southern or southwestern.

14.—FITTING: Bar-shaped fitting of light green jade with white and gold clouding and faintest traces of calcification. Bifacial (“trag-i-comic”) mask theme above and two-sided small animal mask below. One conical bore in center of flat top edge of horned crown, another below (they do not meet). True yang-wen design. Tusked demon has “smiling” mouth with peak-centered upper lip (cf. fig. 28), two rows of teeth, and ear extensions or pendants below (biconically perforated) earspools. Round-eyed mask on reverse side has bracket mouth with long uppers but no clearly suggested tongue. L. 2 7/8 in. (7.4 cm.). From the John Gellatly Collection in the National Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution. See Salimony, Carved Jade, pl. 31: 4–5: “Early Eastern Chou”; Umehara, Shina Kogyoku, pl. 74: 1; and Na, Tü-ch’i, vol. 2, p. 297, pl. 19 ab.—Han.


II. The “Plumed” Group (figs. 17–30)

17.—SICKLE: Stone blade showing traces of painted design excavated 1930’s from Hsi-pei-kang 西北岡 Tomb 1001 of royal cemetery at Anyang. About midway down cutting edge from broken tip is human profile with rectangular eye, large and sideways-C-shaped ear and small mouth and chin. Above eye rises angularly curving plume (?) Type and position of image (if drawing and reading accurate) as that on Karasuk stele in fig. 64. Collection of the Academia Sinica, Taipei. After Liang and Kao, 1001, pl. 105: 2—Late Shang (Anyang).
18.—FITTING OR FINIAL: Partly calcified, light green jade not meant for appliqué since representation is two-sided. Under same bifurcated, four-plumed headdress with criss-cross forehead band (cf. figs. 31 and 62) is ram (?)-horned animal mask on one side and high-cared (no earspools or tusks) human mask on other. Conical perforation in tenon below chin/snot drilled from human side—as was similar, if more erratically placed, hole in mask’s left cheek. Yang-ween, incised and flat relief carving. H. about 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. (3.8 cm.). Collection of J. Eguchi 江口治郎, Osaka. See Umehara, Shina Kogyoku, pl. 73: 2.—Western Chou.

19.—PENDANT OR IMPLEMENT: Recarved for human profile from ring segment of calcified pale green jade. Two rough perforations above for stringing and fairly sharp, slanting edge below. Flat nose, grooved mouth, small chin and large round eyes. High plume or crest flanged front and top. Semi-yang-ween verticals on plume, continuing meaningless on neck, suggest design remained from grooved disk of type recovered recently in Western Chou bronze ye 銚 from Ning-hsiang Hsien 宁鄉縣, Ch'ang-sha 長沙, Hunan. L. 1 15/16 in. (5 cm.). Mr. and Mrs. W. L. McKim, Palm Beach. See Norton Gallery, Jades Exhibition Catalogue, p.l: 11: “Late Western Chou.”—Late Western Chou disk or ring; profile image Western Chou, ninth or eighth century B.C.


21.—FITTING: Trapezoidal plaque of mottled yellow and green jade, much calcified. Form and type similar to no. 20 but for greater flare above and more ornate flanges. Back plain. On front near-rectangular eyes and round nostrils of mask in lowest flat relief. All other detail in Late Shang or semi-yang-ween style. H-form mouth as in no. 20, with conical perforation below center. Large conical hole above mask’s right eye probably pre- or post-dates plumed demon image. H. 1 7/8 in. (4.8 cm.). Formerly Collection of A. W. Bahr, Weybridge; now Collection of Dr. Arthur M. Sackler, New York. See Salmony, Carved Jade, pl. 21: 8: “Early Western Chou.”—Western Chou.

22.—HANDLE? FITTING: Roughly rectangular fitting of pale green jade with lighter and darker markings. Back plain. Front shows contained rectangular mask with more or less deeply but singly and somewhat roughly incised features including tusk-derived, H-form mouth. Concave border above mask; indented “handle” end done as vertically fluted high plume. Tenon has broken conical bore in base for attachment. H. 3 7/16 in. (8.8 cm.). Formerly Heng Chai Collection; now Edward and Louise B. Sonnenschein Collection, Art Institute of Chicago. See Heng Chai Catalogue, vol. 1, 3b; Salmony, Carved Jade, pl. 32: 5: “Early Eastern Chou Handle” and Sonnenschein Catalogue, pl. 36: 4: “Early Western Chou Handle”; Hentze, Sakralbronzen, pl. 78: 151: Shang or Eastern Western Chou; and Na, Tü-ch’i, vol. 2, p. 119, fig. 21c.—Eastern Chou; provincial.

23.—PLAQUE: Flat, thick fitting of wholly calcified jade diagonally broken above and apparently smoothed in antiquity. Back smooth but plain. Front shows lower part of demonic mask recognizable by tusks (H-form but curvilinear as in no. 22 rather than rigid as in no. 20), earspools (conically bored from the front) and band-edged neck. One row of teeth only. Ears have pointed lobes (?) below open spoons. Headress lost; place in this group based wholly on mouth formation. Pseudo yang-ween or double incised line detail. W. 2 3/8 in. (6.1 cm.). Collection of Dr. Arthur M. Sackler, New York. See University Museum, Archaic Chinese Jades Catalogue, pl. 11, no. 207 and p. 44: Shang.—Eastern Chou.

24.—PLAQUE: Thin bordered plaque with incurring sides bevelled to fine edges. Light green jade (above) shading into amber with faint traces of calcification.
Smooth, slightly convex back plain but for small uneven projections pierced for attachment at corners. Front center decorated with almond-eyed, ear-spoolled head with plumed-band headdress and shoulder length hair. Above and below image are designs in opposing position about eye spirals. True yang-seen and flat relief carving. H. 2 13/16 in. (7.5 cm.). Formerly Collection of C. T. Loo, Paris; now Freer Gallery of Art. See Salmony, Carved Jade, pl. 32: 6: "Early Eastern Chou;" Hentze, Sakralbronzen, pl. 78: 152: Shang or Early Western Chou; and Na, T'ieh'i, vol. 2, p. 296, pl. 18d.—Han.

25.—Pendant or Implement: Arc form probably due to recarving from older disk or ring of light green jade with brown markings. Sharp, slanting nether edge; biconical perforation in crown for stringing. Detail partly rubbed away but human profile clear. Flat nose, long chin, incised eye and eyebrow. Long front of hair down back. Faintly grooved, flaring, cap-like "crown" probably represents short plumes (cf. figs. 24 and 67). L. 3 in. (7.7 cm.). Mr. and Mrs. W. L. McKim, Palm Beach. See Norton Gallery, 1950 West Palm Beach, Jades Exhibition Catalogue, pl. 22: 9: "Late Western Chou;" Na, T'ieh'i, vol. 2, p. 123, fig. 26b.—Late Eastern Chou to Han.

26.—Fitting: Mottled grey jade plaque with semi-circular outline above, straight edge below. Lowest relief carving on front of "spectacle-eyed," bar-mouthed geometric mask, above which is trapezoid amid radiating curving lines suggesting a richly plumed frontal mask. W. 3 1/4 in. (8.3 cm.). A. F. Pillsbury Collection, Minneapolis Institute of Arts. See Arden Gallery, 3000 Years, p. 73, no. 125 and p. 30: "Late Western Chou."—Han; southern.

27.—Fitting, possibly for scabbard: Calcified, smoke-toned stone resembling chalcedony. Back flat and polished but plain, except for four pierced, barrel-shaped projections for attachment. Front shows same wide-plumed trapezoid as preceding but with facial features and an ogee-arched outline above. Below is roughly incised version of same geometric mask as in no. 26, like the one above facing in opposite direction vis a vis plaque outline from analogues on Minneapolis piece. W. 2 7/16 in. (6.2 cm.). Formerly A. F. Pillsbury Collection; now Collection of Dr. Arthur M. Sackler, New York. See Salmony, Carved Jade, pl. 28: 4: "Late Western Chou.—Han; southern or Dongson connections.

28. Scepter (see also under no. 7): This side of National Palace Museum's calcified, grey-green kuei scepter shows almond-eyed, double-tusked and ear-spoolled demon (cf. Fogg plaque in fig. 3) while complementing round-eyed "horned" image in fig. 7 in bifacial scheme. Curving headdress taken as plumed here due to likeness to shaman's plumed headgear in fig. 60. Type falls between tusked demon image of Western Chou bronze horse coronet in fig. 43 and Hupei-discovered ko šen shaman in fig. 60, probably Warring States. Earpool pendants (?) of figs. 28 and 75 also important for Eastern Chou date.


30. Knife, Central Design (see no. 11): Detail of grey-green Sackler blade of fig. 11 showing mask-related (?) configuration of curving lines and angular bands roughly comparable with imagery in figs. 28 and 29 but rubbed nearly to obliteration on both faces.

III. The Horn-and-Plume-Crowned Group
(figs. 31–36)

31.—Profile Head, Finial(?): Double profile image (no perforations) of medium green jade with some calcification. "Shang eye," rolled-under nose, Ordos style mouth and high, bean-shaped ear; no tusks or earpools. Back-bending, flanged plume rises vertically from criss-cross-decorated headband (cf. figs. 18 and 62), while behind band and ear extends horn-like process, making this earliest instance of horned and plumed demon—without, as yet, the other two attributes of the type. Semi-T'ung-zen style. H. 3 3/8 in. (8.6 cm.). Excavated from Hsiao-t'un 小屯, Section C, Tomb 331. Collection of the
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Academia Sinica, Taipei. See Umehara, *T'ou Hsi,* pl. 152: 2, Na, *Ts'ieh-i,* vol. 1, p. 21, figs. 72, 73; Shih, *BHFP,* vol. 20 (1957), pl. 14: 2; and Hansford, *Chinese Carved Jades,* pl. 8d.—Late Shang period; Anyang.


34.—*Pendant:* Two-sided profile image of calcified light green jade. Incised back-scrolling plume above. Horn-like element at side. Up and down tusks. Single perforation in diagnostic earpool, below which is curl of hair (?) Like detail on both sides in incised line, semi *Yang-wen* and flat relief. L. 1 7/16 in. (3.6 cm.). Collection of Dr. Arthur M. Sackler, New York.—Late Western Chou.


IV. *Capped Images in Jade* (*figs. 37–40*)
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Szechwan.

38.—SCEPTER: Long trapezoid of reddish-brown jade, regular in form except for slant above toward slightly chipped edge. Two neat perforations: upper or smaller one in center of cap-like crown of geometric mask near butt end of tablet; larger biconical one below mask. Image worn by rubbing and retouched. Rounded, rectangular eyes in bordered flat relief have spectacle-like frames finely engraved with dense and semi-angular spirals or lei-ven. Nose is geometrically patterned, tower-like form over enameled bar-shaped mouth. Above mask, and with incised geometric pattern like the rest, is crowning “cap” motif with raised edges. Mask’s left eye, upper nose and mouth re-incised where pattern nearly gone. Back plain. L. 12 in. (30.5 cm.). Edward and Louise B. Sonnenschein Collection, Art Institute of Chicago. See Salmony, Carved Jade, pl. 27; 1: “Late Western Chou;” and Sonnenschein Catalogue, pl. 54: 2 and Frontispiece: Middle Chou.—Late Eastern Chou to Han.


40.—KNIFE (see no. 32): Simple, rough and somewhat peculiar engraved imagery on great Freer blade with fine end profile of fig. 32. Same figures repeated just under notching. Crouching rhinoceros (?) has angular “r”-shaped nose projection, and forward-curving ear and helpless-looking feet of an arc-form jade feline in Brundage Collection. Flanges on rhino spines roughly follow those below which they occur. Before snouts (of similar shape also to nose of jade feline) are disembodied and again awkward and rough human profiles with shoulder length hair and plain flaring caps. See Na, Tü-ch’i, vol. 2, p. 158, fig. 63; Salmony, Carved Jade, pls. 7–8: “Shang . . . . The engraving at the top and side of the knife must be considered as modern additions.”—Han; Szechwan or Yunnan.

Discussion

The jades of Group I showing the horned crown and related designs form the largest of the four groups. Some crowns are peaked or gable-centered, others flat-topped. There are forms with shorter or longer, more or less elaborate, up-turned or down-curving branches. At their most decorative, as in figures 11, 13 and 33, they bear some resemblance to the antlered crown of the fifth or fourth century B.C. felt sphinx from Pazyryk 5 in figure 56. One of the earliest flat-topped crown-like designs in Chinese art can be seen in the inlaid ghost of a wooden stand in Royal Tomb 1217 at Anyang (fig. 42). Like the stand, the relatively large Sackler plaque in figure 1 shows a crown only. There is as yet no human image. The plaque is dated late Shang not only on the basis of this stand but also through the likeness of its relatively simple and angular openwork to that of an exquisite early huang neckpiece discovered in situ in smaller Tomb 2099 at Hou-chia-chuang. The medium green color of the Sackler crown plaque is also not unknown from among Anyang-excavated jades; it is similar to that of the paired jade masks with “claw”-ended curved bar found near the horse’s nose bone in Hsiao-t’un C164. Thus it seems likely

11 See Umehara, Yin Hsu, pls. 13:1 (in situ) and 158:1.

12 Ibid., pl. 139 (upper right, mask only); and Shih, CK KKHP, vol. 2 (1947), p. 23, fig. 6 (diagram with masks and bar as found).
that this is the earliest jade in Group I.

The frontal and profile crown design in figures 2 and 11, still without clear human imagery, allow much less sureness of dating. The Seattle plaque in figure 2 is lighter green than the Sackler one, more curvilinear in outline and fuller in form; there is space for a mask although none is drawn in. One can only call it "Chou" for the time being. This may be true also of the splendid double-branched headdress with multiple pendants on the (strictly speaking) faceless profile of the grey-green Sackler knife in figures 11 and 30. (The profile or crown is at the larger, rather than smaller, end of the blade, but its top is bladeside as in the case of the Freer jade knife of figures 32 and 40, bottom spine inward.) Its abstract quality and refinement seem of the earlier rather than later kind and so suggest the late Shang or earlier Western Chou date. The resemblance of the more curvilinear frontal design on the blade center, however, to those in figures 28 and 29 could point to a later date.

Figures 3 to 6 form a clearer sequence and show a development of the crowned, tusked and earspooled jade demon image of early China which is the main theme of this paper. Variations noticeable in figures 5 and 6, both perforated at edges and back for attachment to unknown objects, may be due to time, place or simply to human idiosyncrasy. A general likeness is visible, however, and the trend is toward higher relief of feature, especially of the nose. All four pieces are plain and slightly concave at the back. The Freer demon in figure 6 lacks the branching lateral horns, the tusks, the complete perforation of the earspools, and he sports bow-tie-like spirals on his narrow neckband; he lacks something of the magical character of the others.

The finely engraved spiral-decorated crown center of the British Museum demon in figure 5 is echoed in a crown-like motif in the flange or collar of the Royal Ontario Museum jade in figure 47. Formerly thought either a bracelet or a cover this is identifiable as an earspool through the exact likeness of its form, with decorative flange, to that of a hammered and cut gold earspool, one of a pair, from Peru, perhaps roughly the same date. The engraved jade earspool design can in turn be compared with incised ornate bands on a semicircular brownish jade plaque in the Freer (fig. 46). This has a "spectacle-eyed" geometric mask over the incised band decoration which includes confronting and vestigial looking hands. These skimpy claws are of identical character and posture to those (also engraved) on a thin bronze Dongson ʻao-tʻieh mask appliqué. By this indirect route we arrive at a probable Han date for the British Museum demon (fig. 5), otherwise thought much earlier, and suggest a Dongson or deep southern connection. The Freer fitting of figure 6ab may not be earlier than Han—if, in fact, it is not archaic; for even in this context of eccentrics it is peculiar.

The Hardt plaque in figure 15, with rich-plumed, bird-demonic image, has a crown related to those of Group I, though simpler.


The image is so close in general character to the bird deity on a carved lacquer disk (pommel?) in the Fritz Low-Beer collection, on the one hand, and to the composite bird-beaked divinity of the Fogg gold belthook in figure 67, on the other, that despite its Li-yü style bands (revival or survival) it is almost surely of Han date. It may also be from the province of Szechwan, where horned headdresses of somewhat comparable character are known from an interesting but little noted group of horned and tongued pottery tomb guardian heads, relatives and descendants of the wood ones of the Ch'u Kingdom.

The Snerd-like profile and slipping crest or "crown" of the Sakker jade demon in figure 16 (dated Shang by William Trousdale in 1964 but of Middle Chou aspect) is so like those visible now in procession on bronze cowrie containers of the Tien 滷 Kingdom in Yunnan (cf. fig. 69A, lower row, fourth from the left) and also similar to the simpler, rubbed-looking stones from Shih-chai-shan 石寨山 tombs, that one is tempted to date it late, late Eastern Chou to Han and to place it with the Yunnanese products.

The earliest of the bifacial images of "tragic-comic" type are those decorating the National Palace Museum's calcified green jade scepter in figures 7 and 28. Figure 7 shows a round-eyed, mouthless creature under peak-centered "crown" with lateral extensions related indirectly to the horned demon crown in figure 13. This image is datable to Eastern Chou through the relation of its "alter ego" in figure 28 to a plume-crowned shaman decorating the Hupei-excavated bronze ko in figure 60, almost surely of Eastern Chou date. As in other cases it is in the "Shang revival" or yang-ven style of the Eastern Chou period, which allowed combination with flat bands or relief. This same combination of yang-ven and flat relief on the Gellatly jade in figure 12—the earliest of the three Gellatly pieces left to the National Collection of Fine Arts in Washington—suggests that it is also of Eastern Chou or Warring States date. The important ko shaman, possibly originally from Szechwan, has been dated from late Western Chou to Warring States. It is probably closer to the latter time, considering its comparability to the multitude of shamanistic figures on the pictorial bronze vessels of Charles Weber's Group VII, estimated sixth-fifth centuries B.C. by him in 1968 and of central origin.

Most beautiful in technique, proportion and detail of all the demonic images here is the round-eyed or "foreign" mask with drooping mouth from the Sonnenschein collection in the Art Institute of Chicago (fig. 13). This type of round-eyed mask is, in a sense, secondary to the more inde-
pendent almond-eyed and tusked type. The Sonnenschein plaque is plain in back. This piece implies the prior existence of complementary bifacial images like those of figures 7 and 28 and seems relatively late in the tradition. It may reflect the type seen in figure 7, although it is from a slightly different tradition. It is also fairly clearly related to those Eastern Chou antlered, long-tongued, round-eyed and long-toothed monsters of lacquered wood which guarded the Ch’u tombs at Chang-sha and especially the ones at Ch’ang-t’ai-kuan, Hsin-yang Hsien 信陽縣, southern Honan (see fig. 57). It might be compared with the (probably) Han tile mask from the collection of the late Oswald Siren (fig. 50), with its relief linework and bowed mouth, and also with the like-mouthed mask (with earspools?) on a tin plaque recovered from the Siamese Gulf site of Oc-ço (fig. 51), the once flourishing port of Funan in Dongson and Han times. Finally, it is not unlike the round-eyed, long-toothed, relief-line-defined mask in figure 52 from a Yunnan, Eastern Han money-tree—even though this last is the face of a dragon. All this suggests that the Sonnenschein demon be dated Han and without hesitation to the South of China, even though nothing precisely like it has been excavated there—or anywhere else in China. Its closest analogues, in fact, are such images as that in figure 70 of a Tlaloc rain god priest of considerably later date from pre-Columbian Mexico.

The kuei scepter with two horned masks in figure 9 from Shantung was unfortunately discovered in a house above ground, so that its provenance near a Lung-shan site in Shantung is meaningless in terms of date of make, although it may date from around the time of the I-nan 濟南 tomb and, like it, reflect South Chinese styles and types. With its incised décor it is among the latest of these still-just-recognizable demonic types and is almost surely not earlier than Eastern Han.

The Gellatly jade fitting in figure 14 with “tragico-comic” bifacial mask top cannot be far in time and perhaps in space from the Sonnenschein classic in figure 13, though the tongue suggestion in the latter is all but lost. Further, in the nose and other of its details there is some similarity to the lug masks in relief line on Eastern Han pottery kuan 瓶 jars from Li-chü 濟渚, Shao-hsing 紹興, Chekiang (cf. fig. 53). Some Yangtze industry of Han date is probably indicated in this fine piece also with the Han bear-related small animal masks at its nether end. It is not impossible that this bar-centered piece and the Gellatly finial in figure 36 somehow went together, but it is unlikely, as suggested by Salmony, that all three Gellatly demons—figures 12, 14 and 36—formed a set. Number 12 is earlier than 14 and 36 in technique and conception with its simple duplication of the same mask on the reverse.

20 Hsio-yen Shih in “I-nan and Related Tombs,” AA, vol. 22, no. 4 (1959) suggests A.D. 290–310 as the most likely date for I-nan (see pp. 310–11). Cf. Tseng Chao-yü 曾昭燏, Chiang Pao-keng 蔣寶庚 and Li Chung-i 李忠義, I-nan ku-hua-hsiang shih-mu fa-chüeh pao-kao 濟南古畫像石墓發掘報告 [Report on the Excavation of an Ancient Pictorial Stone Tomb at I-nan] (Shanghai, 1956), pl. 84 (rub of “topless” acrobat or entertainer) and “Yun-nan Chao-t’ung Kuei-chia-yüan-tzu Tung Han mu fa-chüeh” 雲南昭通佳家院子東漢墓發掘 [Report on an Eastern Han Tomb at Kuei-chia-yüan-tzu, Chao-t’ung, Yun-nan], KK (1962), no. 8, p. 398, fig. 6:6, etc.

21 See Salmony, Carved Jade, pl. 31: 2–7.
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Surely later than these fully detailed and tortuously carved demons in relief line are the incised line designs from the Shantung-discovered and the Pillsbury kuei scepters in figures 9 and 10. The pillsbury central design, which appears as a crowned, trilobed nose (like the noses in figs. 13 and 24), is flanked by flutings which relate it as well as to the fluted plume of the demon in figure 36. The white National Palace Museum scepter in figure 8 is either slightly earlier (Ch'in or Western Han?) or higher in quality than its incised fellows, which are probably not earlier, again, than Eastern Han.

In a sense, the most important and puzzling of all horned, tusked and carspooled demons is the earliest of the Chinese “gorgons,” or the stand-alone, single-faced, calcified plaque from the Winthrop Bequest to the Fogg (fig. 3). If the demon in China was dependent on Mediterranean prototypes (and the white stone “gorgon” from Ch’ang-sha in figure 45 is surely related to the Greek type in figure 44, directly or indirectly) then the Fogg jade plaque is unlikely to antedate the 6th century B.C., if it is that early. If, however, it is independent, or dependent (as may also be the Greek and Etruscan gorgons of the 6th–5th centuries B.C.) on some more antique creation of the Near East or of Central Asia, then it may well be as early as the Early Western Chou date assigned it by Salmony in 1963.22 The yang-wen style is assuredly Late Shang. A possible Western Chou prototype or relative (with, however, only down-pointing tusks and different, downward-curving horns) exists for the jade demon in the bronze horse coconet demons of Chang-chia-p’o 張家坡 type (cf. fig. 43). Given the developed crown and the upward inner and downward outer tusks, I have dated the Fogg piece to the sixth or fifth century B.C. and placed it at the immediate head of a Late Eastern Chou to Han line. It may well be earlier, however.

It might be noted here, before looking again at Group II, that since the jades in figures 12 and 13 have bores in their crown tops which do not go through and may not be for attachment, it is not impossible that these images were fitted with jade or even real plumage (cf. the plumes in the straight bar top of the Freer knife profile in fig. 32), and so belong to the composite Group III. Since this is conjecture, on the other hand, they can remain here for now.

Group II is inhabited by the plumed demons, some of them relatives of the horned. The trilobed nose design in figure 24, for example, links this plume-topped, almond-eyed, tuskless Freer plaque mask with the round-eyed and horn-crowned Sonnen- schein demon in figure 13. They are from one tradition and perhaps the same time and workshop. The almond-eyed, probably plumed and much-carringed head in figure 28 has a horned, round-eyed “alter ego” on the reverse of the National Palace Museum tablet.

If the drawing and my reading of it are correct and if no horn has been effaced over time, figure 17 gives us an Anyang ancestor for jade demons with high, back-curving plumage. These reached their apo- gee in such images as the Gellatly jade in

22 A tusked-mask-decorated bifrons cup from Sardis in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, estimated as c. 600 B.C. is as close to Chinese bifacial demons (related to the Fogg demon) as the Greek gorgon in figure 44 is to the Han stone mask from Ch’ang-sha. See Salmony, Chinese Jade through the Wei, p. 93.
Figure 36. The one in figure 17 is a blade deity from HPK Tomb 1001, painted on a stone sickle. In type and placement, if not in time, is is close to the human-magical profile on another sickle-shaped stone from the Minusinsk Basin in Siberia, the so-called “Karasuk” stelae in figure 64.23

Figure 18 illustrates an early bifacial jade. Both frontal masks, one human and one animal, have the same plumed headband. So similar is the plume design in essence to the upper part of the design or “mask” incised on the red pottery Neolithic cup in figure 58 from Hupei that the jade may have come from some early Ch’u center also in Hupei. Of interest, too, is a possible link between the cross-criss-decorated plumed band on the Eguchi fitting and the Pa clan sign in figure 62, however much later in Chou times such ciphers began to occur on bronzes excavated in Szechwan, particularly at Pao-lun-yüan 寶輪院 and Tung-sun-pa 冬笋壘.24 The Shang V style of the Berlin bronze ceremonial axehead in figure 59, also with a band of short plumes across its broadly frontal human face, makes an early Western Chou date likely for the Eguchi jade, probably slightly later than the related bronze design and considerably earlier than the Pa clan sign of the feathered crown.

The McKim jade profile in figure 19, with high flanged “crest” read as a plume here due to the Anyang evidence, would seem to have been recarved in an early Ch’u center in Hupei or Hunan from a ring-disk of Late Shang type decorated with concentric circles in semi-yang-vene line. Such disks have been found recently inside a “Shang” (Western Chou) jü bucket from Ning-hsiang near Ch’ang-sha in Hunan.25 Aside from the curvature of the piece, recarving in the ninth or eighth century B.C. is suggested by the otherwise meaningless continuity of the yang-vene verticals of the high plume on the neck of the creature. The rimmed round eye, echoed much later in the white stone “gorgon” of figure 45 from Ch’ang-sha, may be an early Ch’u eye. It has a Western Chou relative in a bronze poletop face in the British Museum.26

Figures 20 and 21 alone, aside from the Anyang profiles of figures 17 and 31, give the “norm” or the early central members of the jade demon family. It is striking to note how ex-centric these are for the type. The center of jade demon development, wherever and however it began, was clearly elsewhere than in Chang Kwang-chih’s 張光直 Nuclear Area, whence number 20 probably came.27

Some features of the stelae are comparable with Shang design, others with such late and playful Han representations as the “immortals” on an inlaid bronze ring disk in the Woods Bliss Coll., Washington, D.C. (see M. Rostovtzeff, Inlaid Bronzes of the Han Dynasty in the Collection of C. T. Lo [Paris and Brussels, 1927], pl. 1:2).


23 See Wen-hua Ta-ko-ming-ch’i-chien Ch’u-t’u wen wen 文化大革命期間出土文物 [Treasures excavated during the Great Cultural Revolution Period], (Peking, 1972), p. 31. The photo shows the bronze, but unfortunately not the jade design; a recent Chinese film including this new find did, however, show precisely similar rings with their semi-yang-vene patterning.

24 See Watson, Handbook, pl. 12.

25 See Chang’s development of this concept, extremely useful from Shang times onward, in his Archaology of Ancient China and other works. No provenance was reported for the Sonnenschein fitting; Centrality is suggested, however, by its stiffly frontal and conventional t’ao-t’ieh-like quality in relation to most of the other demons.
I have read the H-form mouths on the high-plumed frontal masks of the Sonnenschein and Sackler fittings in figures 20 and 21 as stylized versions of the up-and-down demon tusks. Both of these pieces, however, are likely to be of Western Chou date (although the Sackler jade in fig. 21 retains a more Shang style of carving). This points to the Early Western Chou date proposed by Salmony and others for such developed demons as the Winthrop-Fogg one in figure 3. Unless this form of mouth represents something else of early date, such as a bit design or the Chang-chia-p’o bronze demon mask tusks (see fig. 43), the possibility of an earlier date than Ch’un Ch’iu for the earliest developed jade demons from China remains open.

An H-form mouth of more curvilinear, less rigid character can be seen on the Sonnenschein high-plumed mask in figure 22 and on the Sackler (broken) frontal demon mask in figure 23. These are less of a problem. The mouths clearly show abbreviated renderings of the up-and-down demon tusks. The Sonnenschein “handle” face is provincial (very like a bronze mask-topped chariot ornament discovered recently in Kwangtung), and the Sackler mask is summarily carved throughout. Both figures 22 and 23 are likely to be Eastern Chou. The so-far prototypical Fogg demon plaque, however, may be Eastern Chou.

The frontal mask on the superb Freer plaque in figure 24 and the McKim profile of more three-dimensional character in figure 25 can be dated through the resemblance of their short-plumed, flaring headresses to that on the Fogg belthook creature in figure 67, on the one hand, and of the Cernuschi nude jade squatting in figure 72, on the other. The former is generally given to Western Han period, while the latter’s S-curved body would lead one to date it Late Eastern Chou. Figures 26 and 27 show a Dongson or southern type of geometric mask with plumage exploding now in “imperial frontal,” the spectacular profile versions of which can be seen on the bird creatures in procession or in boats on the large bronze kettle drums of the South (fig. 68). These semicircular jade fittings, perhaps for scabbards, are almost surely of Han or later date.

Puzzling but important among the various plumed jade masks are the designs in figures 28–30 with horizontal or down-curving plumes (?) rather than the shorter or longer but vertical feathers. As noted above, the almond-eyed mask in figure 28 is datable to the Eastern Chou period though its resemblance to the ko shaman in figure 60 from Hupei or Szechwan. Its earpool-pendants (cf. the fourth or third century B.C. ares attached to the famous Freer necklace said to be from Ch’in-ts’un) also point to a late Eastern Chou date. Its friendly mien and contained upper outline remind

28 See Mo Chih 莫熙, “Kuang-tung Ch’ing-yüan fa-hsien Chou-tai ch’ing-t’ung-ch’i,” 廣東清远发现周代青铜器 [Chou Bronzes discovered at Ching-yüan in Kwangtung], KK (1963), no. 2, pl. 2:1–2 and p. 60.


30 Compare their shape with that of the guard on a probably southern sword from the Hellström Collection now in the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm (see B. Karlgren, “Bronzes in the Hellström Collection,” BMFA, vol. 20 [1948], pl. 46). One such jade was excavated recently from a Han grave in Chekiang (see KK, [1957], no. 2, pl. 12:15).
one of the same characteristics of the bronze horse coronet demons from Western Chou, Shensi (see figure 43)—a design, however, with paired down-curving tusks at each corner of the mouth and down-curving horns above the brows instead of up-and-down tusks and antlers or plumes. All three of the jade designs in question may have followed such Western Chou images either in Shensi or perhaps in Hupei (compare the design in fig. 29 with that, again on the Hupei Neolithic bowl, in fig. 58), or even in Szechwan. The rococo antler-like plumes (?) in figure 29 are taken as plumes because of the relation to the designs in figures 28 and 60 and also because they bend instead of rigidly rising or branching. The ambiguity of these designs is part of their interest.

It is also possible that the high part of the profile demon’s crown in figure 31 is a horn or crest rather than a plume. It is taken as plume here because of its horned-crown-related processes at the sides and the criss-cross band of its center, a band which occurs in two other instances only, both involving plumes or feathers (cf. figs. 18 and 62). Compared with more angular and flat representations from Anyang, the jade final with profile human head from Hsiao-t‘un C 331 (a complex and “difficult” tomb in many respects, with its mixture of primitive and advanced bronzes, etc.) is unusual for Late Shang despite its yang-wen style. Its Anyang provenance and unusually rich crown make it the earliest member of “composite” Group III. The horn and plume (not always identifiable as such, or as an eye-feather of a peacock, to be specific) occur also on a carved bone from HPK Tomb 1001 (see fig. 41). Although bone rather than jade and occurring in a not easily recognizable form, with ram-like horn over a conventional t‘ao-t‘ieh rather than human image, this bone design may come to mind again shortly in relation to figure 33.

The Anyang jade is probably followed by the also fine, if stylistically different, Sackler profile pendant in figure 34. This has a more closed silhouette and more smoothly back-curling plume. Probably already in Western Chou, we now have the ear-spools and (stylized) tusks diagnostic for the mature demon image. The awkwardly conceived horned-and-plumed demon in figure 35 (now also in the Sackler Collection in New York) is Middle Chou in style, probably Ch‘u in origin. It is easy to see that however much finer the bifacial, high-plumed demon finial from the Gellatly Collection in the National Collection of Fine Arts, Washington, is, it is heir to the role and type of this Sackler jade. The Gellatly finial is climactic within Group III. It is from a different center, but is perhaps not far in time from the trapezoidal masks of figures 26 and 27 with their luxuriant plume and from the Dongson drum-spirits of figure 68.

Among the most interesting and telling of these images, perhaps from the relatively isolated western province of Szechwan, is the splendidly refined if still barbaric profile (not clearly tusked) at the short end of the large Freer blade in figures 32 and 40. Szechwan was a province which tended to retain the old or central and admit the new from several directions, always creating in

31 See Cheng Te-k‘un, Shang China (Toronto, 1960), pls. 16b, 20d, 21c, etc. for the more usual type of Late Shang human profile in jade; A. C. Soper in “Early, Middle and Late Shang: a Note,” AA, vol. 28 (1966), pp. 9–10 discusses the peculiar mix of primitive (heirloom?) and florescent (Shang V) bronzes in Hsiao-t‘un C331.
every subject and time a distinctive mixture or combination of styles. Though this image on the Freer blade might seem to be Shang (yang-wen style retained), and related also to the squatting demon on the bronze Freer tao 之旅 in figure 65 (traditionally dated earliest Western Chou but perhaps not earlier than the ninth century B.C.), it is also a clear cousin to the Warring States jade squatter in the Cernuschi in Paris (fig. 72) and so is probably not earlier than Ch’un Ch’iu in date.

The single-branched profile plumes rising from the straight top of the ornate antler projecting backward from the crown of this Freer jade knife demon will recall the Pa clan sign in figure 62 (late Eastern Chou to Han) and also a Szechwanese type of peacock feather (known in Han times) from the head of the phoenix from a pillar of Ch’en 馨 (fig. 63). The ornately and eccentrically notched chang 章 scepters from Szechwan (see fig. 54) may help to place this notched-blade deity (?) with its feathered horn crown (tentatively) in the province of Szechwan.

The important peacock feather, partly in question in the case of the Freer blade, is seen again later and more beautifully in its now organic or more “sympathetic” relation to a whole and graceful design on the amber National Palace Museum kuei in figure 33. If shown right side up from the design, if not inscriptive, point of view, this might also be considered as a horned-and-plumed image with traces only of round eyes, of headdress and earring arcs. It is on the exact borderline between representation and design. It is related, looking back in time, to the handle design of a bronze ladle in the Hakutsuru 白鶴 Museum in Kobe (fig. 73a) and to the tusked demon with carspool-attached arcs in figure 28. As design it preserves an early Chinese, as against the Indian, strain in such Southeast Asian patterns as the padma-mila reproduced in figure 73b.

The Freer jade knife shows one of the most important of the horned and plumed demons—clearly horned, clearly plumed, and perhaps not far in date from the Pazyryk sphinx in figure 56 with its antler and bird attributes. It links the Late Shang and the Karasuk (?) blade deities to the Southeast Asian serpentine blade or kris with its cut-out bladehead (see fig. 66). It is also one of the earliest of the five “capped” jade images known to date.

Incised by a different and less inspired hand (perhaps also in a different time or place or both) on the same great Freer blade illustrated in figure 32, is the capped-profile-and-crouching-animal combination visible in the rubbing in figure 40. There are two of these odd embellishments on each side of the blade—one under the notched part of the blade edge near the end profile, the other under the also notched opposite end of the blade. The notches may have inspired the spines or flanges on the animal backs, positioned just under them. With angular small “r”-shaped nose-projections, the beasts might possibly be rhinos; the species, however, is doubtful. The snout

32 Closest to the peculiar figure on the Freer blade is that on a bronze chariot fitting in the Pillsbury Collection (see Karlgren, A Catalogue of the Chinese Bronzes in the A.F. Pillsbury Collection [Minneapolis, 1952], no. 63) dated too early by Karlgren. A Middle Chou follower is the figural bronze poletop or handle squatting in Nils Palmgren, ed., Selected Chinese Antiquities from the Collection of Gustaf Adolf (Stockholm, 1948), pl. 13:5. There are others of this also eccentric group.

33 “[The] engraving at the top and side of the knife must be considered as a modern addition.”
and ear design, on the other hand, is very like that on a far finer beast, an odd jade feline plaque in the Brundage Collection, with yang wen detail in the style of some of the demons. The incised human profile heads follow—roughly, of course—the capped-and-crowned head of barbaric splendor on the small end of the Freer blade. They also partake, in a now muddled way, of the old Yin-Chou theme of the human-head-in-the-animal’s-jaws. The simple looking, long-chinned profiles, incised rather than carved, are again so essentially like profiles on Shih-chai-shan bronzes (cf. fig. 69b, below, second from left) that one is tempted to see them not as Salmony’s “modern additions” but as possible Tien additions to a Ch’u, or more probably Szechwansan, blade.

The cap-likeness of the plastic forehead shield of the mask in figure 37 is suggestive of early capped images perhaps lost. This haunting jade face—with earplugs, without tusks—dominates the front of the small brown Freer kuei. Except for its almond eyes, earspools, and the absence of ornate headgear, this mask is strikingly like that on the Sumitomo 住友 drum in figure 74. The lobed nose design suggests a place in time between the great (Shang style but Chou date) drum in Kyoto, perhaps of southern origin, and the Sonnenschein and Freer jade masks of figures 13 and 24, with their linear but similarly-shaped trilobed noses. Almost lost now, a heraldic eagle on the back of the tablet helps to date it in the Eastern Chou period and to place it in Hupei or Szechwan. The bird’s oddly bilobed body is echoed by the bi-lobed base of the bird protome on the tang of the shaman ko in figure 60, thought to have been made in Szechwan. A southwestern origin for the brown Freer kuei is further suggested by the likeness of its simple decorative bands to the same on the Szechwan-found ts’ung 見 in figure 55, dated simply “Chou.” The Southwestern provincial origin would not be out of line with the lingering Shang style, the yang-wen line and the general eccentricity of this quietly striking visage with bamboo-like “mouldings” below and great bird “alter ego” behind it.

The geometric and geometrically-patterned mask on the russet Sonnenschein kuei in figure 38 has a cap-like crown clearly distinct from the mask. Although again slightly different, this simple topping allows inclusion here. The “spectacle eye” seen in figures 26 and 27, of which these are a variant, may be a southern design based on the shape of a Han Szechwansan eyesocket. It may go back even to the eye-frame or outline on the Chang-chia-p’o coronet in figure 43. Here the nose architecture and finely incised patterning are of some help in placement, for they are quite similar to

34 See d’Argené, Chinese Jades, pl. 10 below.
35 See the Meyer kwang in The Freer Gallery of Art, vol. 1: China (Tokyo, n.d.), pl. 7; the Sumitomo yu in S. Mizuno 水野吉一, In Shū Seidōki to Gyoku 勝周青銅器と玉 (“Bronzes and Jades of Ancient China,”) (Tokyo, 1959), pl. 69; a tiger-head axlecap design from Tomb 1705 in Shang-t’s’un-lüng Kuo-kuo mu-ti 上村霧露國墓地 [The Cemetery of the State of Kuo at Shang T’s’un Ling], (Peking, 1959), pl. 47:1–3 and other instances.
37 Cf. pottery tomb guardian heads from Han Szechwan such as that in Hsin Ping 迅郫, Szu-ch’uan Han-tai tiao-su i-shu 四川漢代陶塑藝術 [Szechwansan Han Period Sculptural Arts] (Peking, 1959), pl. 41.
motifs and patterns on a recently illustrated bronze tsun 禄 vase, believed Eastern Chou, from Kwangsi. Since the designs on the jade are not identical, however, and since jade tends to follow bronze in renditions of like designs, a late Eastern Chou to Han date may not be too late for the kuei in Chicago.

The light-clouded, grey-green Menzies head-toggle in the Royal Ontario Museum is similar in type to the Freer mask fitting in figure 6. It is smaller in size, greyer-green, and both more austere and convincing in detail (including, unfortunately, the break in the forehead). Its band-like cap is clearly comparable, now, with caps on tomb figurine heads from Szechwan (see fig. 76). The lenticular mouth without sign of teeth, much less tusks, also suggests a Ch’ien-Han date. The relief line detail and the mouth form, as well as the type of cap, are all known from the western province in Han times, if not in this finest jade form. The piece is unlikely to be earlier than the Warring States period, despite its “Shang” style. Its simple cap and use as toggle or bead may well point to the later, or Han, date.

Conclusions

Of the jades studied above, the Sackler and Seattle crowns of figures 1 and 2 were to date, unpublished. The greenstone kuei scepter in figure 9, unfortunately not excavated, was a recent discovery only lately reported from China with drawings and rubbings and a Lung-shan date. The jades in figures 23, 27, 35, and perhaps others have changed hands since they were last published, and there has been a misunderstanding as to the whereabouts of the important demons in figures 12, 14 and 36, part of the John Gellatly Bequest in the (now) National Collections (not National Gallery) of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution. The fuller group, different arrangement and clearer look suggests the “righting” of the three kuei scepter designs in figures 7–28, 8 and 33, generally heretofore published upside down perhaps because their Ch’ien-lung period inscriptions were engraved that way. It also allows the identification of the Sackler bone-white plaque of figure 23 as the lower portion of a (broken) demon mask rather than the suggested “sarcophagus” and of figure 20 as a high-plumed, semi-human mask rather than a cicada. But large questions, such as the date of key pieces like the Fogg demon in figure 3 and the Sackler blade of figures 11 and 30, remain. The Western Chou period knew the humanized t’ao-t’ieh with paired, down-pointing tusks in bronze (see fig. 43). Were there Chinese jade images before Ch’un Ch’iu or the eighth century B.C. with the “up inner” and “down outer” tusks of the classical gorgons?

The chief attributes of the “Mature” jade demon image in China are (1) an ornate, or in some way distinctive, head-dress, (2) a tusked or semi-animal mouth and (3) earspools.

There are three main types of headdress:

38 "Kuang-hsi Kung-ch’eng Hsien ch’u-t’u-ti ch’ing t’ung-ch’i” 廣西恭城縣出土的青銅器 [Bronzes Excavated in Kung-ch’eng County, Kwangsi], KK (1973), no. 1, p. 32, fig. 5 top and p. 41.
39 See Cheng Te-k’un, Archaeological Studies, pl. iii:3 (ting leg, pottery, of Eastern Han design).
40 As in the University Museum Catalogue, Archaic Chinese Jades, p. 44.
41 Thus described by Hentze, Frühchinesische Bronzen, pl. 14a and p. 161.
the horncrowned, the plumed band and the "cap." The horncrowned-plumed composite headdress, first known from the Hsiao-tʼun jade profile in *figure 31*, is still striking in the Gellatly image of Han date from the South (*fig. 36*).

The "mature" image had inner tusks which pointed upward from below and outer ones which pointed downward from above, as was often the case with the Mediterranean (Etruscan and Greek) gorgons. This arrangement, which does not occur on Anyang and related images, was not earlier than the ninth century B.C. and may not have occurred until Chʼun Chʻiu. Earlier images tend to show all possible teeth or two rows; later ones, often one row or none. The long upper teeth under arched or bracket-form upper lip may be a Han phenomenon based on the Chʼu guardian type in *figure 57*; the form may also somehow have survived from such addorsed animal-profiles-derived *tʼao-tʻieh* masks as we see on the Yin-Chou bronze axe-head in the British Museum in *figure 49*. Whatever the origin, it is interesting that the form continues on Han and later bear-munching monsters, on the wild-eyed and technically primitive clay "exorcists" from Western Chin tombs, and on some early warrior figurines from the Wei Dynasty.

Most early earrings (ěrh ||) from China are like the slotted disks or rings so numerous at the Chʼun Chʻiu site of Shang-tsʻun-ling in Honan. The same type occurs in Chʼu and in Tien, however, in series graded for size. The jade demon earrings are different. The type can be identified from surviving jade examples such as the Royal Ontario Museum spool in *figure 47* and another in the Cernuschi in Paris, both in clear relation to the gold earspool in *figure 48* from Peru. Collared or plain rings or earspools were worn within, rather than attached to, the lobe. From all available evidence they were a southern, rather than a North Chinese, ornament. That some earspools before Han had additional ornaments attached is suggested by the arcs below and beside the ears of the demon in *figure 28*.

In many instances (see *figs. 3, 4, 23, 34*, etc.), the jade demon occurs on plaques or pendants as an independent image, fetish or icon. Others, like the British Museum and Freer masks in *figures 5, 6* and 24, are pierced for attachment to unknown objects; the semicircular plaques in *figures 26* and 7 may, for example, have been scabbard fittings, but this is only an educated guess. A significant number of the most beautiful or interesting designs occur singly, bifacially, or with heraldic bird associates on the ritual jade tablets of the *kuei* family. This fact, plus the long and widespread life of early images, the domain of ancient Yunnan, see *Yunnan, Shih-chai-shan* monograph, pl. 114.

---

42 See Chiang Jo-shih 蔣若是 and Kuo Wen-hsien 郭文軒, "Lo-yang Chin mu ti fa-chʻieh" 洛陽墓的發現 [Loyang Chin Tomb Excavations], *KK HP* (1937), no. 1, pl. 3:7, etc.


45 For ěrh of graduated size from the Tien Kingdom of ancient Yunnan, see *Yunnan, Shih-chai-shan* monograph, pl. 114.

46 See Wardwell, *Gold of Ancient America*, col. pl. opp. p. 15 and pp. 13 and 16. The earspools were found in Northern Peru and are believed late Chavin, or about 400-200 B.C.

47 See the semi-circular guard decorated with benign, humanized *tʼao-tʻieh* also with vestigial-looking claws or hands on the Hellström sword mentioned (BMFEA, vol. 20 [1948], pl. 46:1).
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Figs. 6a and b.—**Jade Fitting** (front and back). Freer Gallery of Art.
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Fig. 26.—Jade Fitting.
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Arthur M. Sackler Collection, New York.
Fig. 31.—Jade Profile Head, Finial. Academia Sinica, Taipei.
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Arthur M. Sackler Collection, New York.

Fig. 35.—Jade Fitting.
Arthur M. Sackler Collection, New York.
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Figs. 36b and c.—Back view and rubbing.
Fig. 37a.—JADE SCEPTER.
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Fig. 37b.—Drawing of reverse side.

Fig. 38.—JADE SCEPTER (detail). Edward and Louise B. Sonnenschein Collection, Art Institute of Chicago.

Fig. 39.—JADE BEAD OR TOGGLE.
Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.

Figs. 40a and b.—JADE KNIFE, INCISED IMAGE, AND RUBBING
(fig. 32 shows chief image). Freer Gallery of Art.
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Late Shang; Anyang.

Fig. 43.—Bronze Horse Coronet.
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Fig. 44.—Greek Gorgon on Mantle of Athena.
Detail from Amphora.
Andokides Painter. Later 6th century B.C.
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Fig. 46.—Brown Jade Plaque. Han; probably southern. Freer Gallery of Art.

Fig. 47a.—Green Jade Earspool. Han; southern. Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.

Fig. 47b.—Rubbing of “collar.”

Fig. 48.—Chavin Hammered and Cut Gold Earspool. Peru. Museum of American Indian, New York.
Fig. 49.—Bronze Ceremonial Axe. Shang V style, possibly early Chou. The British Museum.

Fig. 50.—Pottery Tile. Han.
Formerly O. Sirén Collection.

Fig. 51.—Tin Plaques or Pendants. Han(?).
Retrieved at Oc-ēo, Gulf of Siam.

Fig. 52.—Climbing Dragons. Drawing of detail from “money tree” fragment. Han; Shih-chai-shan, Yunnan.

Fig. 53.—Pottery Kuan Handle Designs. Rubbings from jars excavated (1955) at Li-chu, Shao-hsing, Chekiang.
Fig. 54.—Ritual Jades and Stones. Chengtu Plain. Chou.

Fig. 55.—Jade Ti'ung. Szechwan. Chou.

Fig. 56.—Composite Creature. Detail of felt hanging from Barrow 5, Pazyryk, Altai. Ca. 400 b.c.

Fig. 57.—Lacquered Wood Tomb Guardian. Excavated at Ch'ang-t'ai-kuan, Hsin-yang, Honan. Ca. 500 B.C.

Fig. 58.—Red Pottery Vessel. Excavated at Shih-chia-ho, T'ien-men Hsien, Hupei. Neolithic.
Fig. 59.—Ceremonial Axe. Shang V. Staatliche Museen, Ostasiatische Kunstabteilung, Berlin-Dahlem.

Fig. 60.—Bronze Ao. Rubbings. Excavated (1960) in Ch‘ing-men Hsien, Hupei. Eastern Chou.

Fig. 61.—Bronze Cap for Axe Shaft. Western Chou; ca. 9th c. B.C. Shensi(?). A. Schoenlicht Collection, The Hague.

Fig. 62.—Clan(?) Signs from Szechwan Bronzes. Drawings. Late Eastern Chou to Han.

Fig. 63.—Szechwan Phoenix Design. Hall.
Fig. 64.—Siberian Stele Design. "Karasuk."

Fig. 65.—Bronze Pole-blade. Reported to be from Chun Hsien, Honan. Western Chou; ca. 9th c. B.C. Freer Gallery of Art.

Fig. 66.—Southeast Asian Serpentine Blade or Kris. Probably from Borneo. Date unknown.

Fig. 67.—Glass-inlaid Gold Belthook. Western Han. Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Grenville L. Winthrop Bequest.
Fig. 68.—Bronze Drum-shaped “Cowrie Container” Top. Rubbing. Han; from Shih-chai-shan.

Figs. 69a and b.—Bronze Cowrie Container Designs. Han; Shih-chai-shan.

Fig. 70.—Toltec Clay Tlaloc Priest. Early Post-classic. National Museum of Anthropology, Mexico.

Fig. 71.—Mayan Personage. Late Classic Painted Vase. National Museum of Anthropology, Mexico.
Fig. 72.—Jade Figure Plaque. Warring States; provincial. Cernuschi Museum, Paris.

Fig. 73a.—Bronze Ladle. Late Shang. Hakutsuru Collection, Kobe.

Fig. 73b.—Southeast Asian Padmodāla (Lotus Root) Design.

Fig. 74.—Mask Detail from Bronze Barrel Drum. Shang IV-V style; Western Chou date. Provincial. Sumitomo Collection, Kyoto.

Fig. 75.—Jade "Necklace." Lower part. Reported to be from Chin-ts’un, Honan. 4th–3rd c. B.C. Freer Gallery of Art.

Fig. 76.—Pottery Head of Tomb Figurine. From Eastern Han cave tomb, Chengtu region, Szechwan.
conservativeness of types and styles (the continuing refinement, for example, of the laborious, originally Shang, yang-ween style), the often exquisite workmanship, the non-burial (after Shang), and above all the precious material, jade—all these considerations suggest strongly that although they may have begun as designs and ended as designs, in their flourishing period these jade masks represented deity.

The elaborate crown design, the peacock feather and horn combination, and a high-plumed human profile in jade are all known from Anyang, though whether the jade was made at Hsiao-t'ūn where it was buried is uncertain. None of the other specimens was excavated from either a western, northern or southern site. The Sonnenschein handle (?) demon in figure 20 seems of central manufacture. Most other examples here, however, probably belong to the Yangtze River system and points south, rather than to the Yellow River and points north. The suggested relation of such images as the round-eyed, horned Sonnenschein plaque in figure 13 to the bulb-eyed, long toothed, tusked and antlered creature from Hsin-yang in figure 57 suggests a more southern origin, as do all other comparisons discovered for this image. The earpool, as stated, is a striking and important southern element in these designs as may also be the highest and widest of the later plumed crowns. One of the most exquisite of the demon mask-derived patterns, that on the National Palace Museum's kuei in figure 53, is clearly well on the way toward the luxuriant or tropical splendor of such Southeast Asian motifs as the padmāśila in figure 79b. Believed Indian in inspiration, and no doubt so, the lotus root design, like the Kāla head of Cambodia and Indonesia, may well have a touch of South Chinese blood in it as well. Such elements and aspects of Chinese jade demonology suggest retention and adaptation of types as early as Anyang in South China and Vietnam into Han and probably even later times.

Together with what they may tell about jade working and divinity from the Shang through the Han, and from Szecwan and Hunan to Annam and the sea, the later dating of some of the demonics and the links with Southeast Asia bring the Chinese imagery so often compared with pre-Columbian closer to the latter in time and space, thus adding a few briquettes of fuel to the fires of controversy over questions of trans-Pacific contacts. (Compare, for example, Yunnanese and Mayan feathered beings holding feathered lances in figs 68 and 71.)

In terms of human interest, embryonic psychology and complementarity in Chinese religious art, perhaps the most significant of all the jade demon designs are the bifacial ones—not just man-animal or man-bird or man-mirrored types but also the "tragi-comics" of figures 7–28, 14, and 36 where there is a real distinction between almond and round eye, with up-turned tusked mouth and drooping maw, respectively.

Possibly there are we-they, even sun-rain connotations. One might see in these images also the dual aspect of some major divinity known to have had such connotations, such as the Han Hsi Wang Mu perhaps traceable to the Western-Eastern

49 The Mayan "Person of Importance" was probably painted on the vessel after A.D. 500 (see I. Bernal et al., The Mexican National Museum of Anthropology [London, 1968], chart on p. 19).
Mothers of the oracle bones, the jadedecorated goddess-howler of the Shan-hai-ching山海經 and ultimately Madame Tung Wang Fu 東王父 in Eastern Han.\(^{50}\) Jenyns and Watson tentatively identified the creature on the Fogg gold belt hook, with head and plume so like that of the Frer jade plaque mask in figure 24, as Hsi Wang Mu.\(^{51}\) But names are not the point here, only faces, only those splendid if still barbaric masks which met the Buddha.
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The Early Chinese Jade Demon Families and their Relations from Late Shang (or Anyang) (above) to Eastern Han or later (lowermost)
THE YEN FAMILY AND THE INFLUENCE OF LI T'ANG

By RICHARD EDWARDS*

A good deal has been written about the painting of Li T’ang 李唐, much of it beginning with the assurance, as Max Loehr was the first to point out to us,¹ that one of his scrolls exists with a dated inscription. It is also generally accepted that Li T’ang had important followers. But to my knowledge the exact style of those followers has never been carefully evaluated with the resulting understanding of its significance, both for our perception of Li T’ang and for the development of painting later in the twelfth century.

If this course is to be pursued, there is no better place to start than with the Yen 家 family from the northern province of Shansi 山西. Records clearly tell us of three painters, a father and two sons. There are also shadowy suggestions of a third son, but they are so vague as to leave strong doubt as to whether such a person did in fact exist.² One recorded and one existing seal carry the legend: Ho-tung Ten shih yin 河東闕氏印 “Seal of the Yen family from Ho-tung.”³ While authenticity cannot be completely affirmed, such a tradition is at least worth mentioning. It would locate the family origins in Ho-tung, “East of the River” which refers to that area in Shansi bordered on the west by the downward sweeping course of the Yellow River as it completes its great loop in north-central China. The father, Yen Chung 閻仲, served under Hui-tsong 徽宗 in his famous academy and later, as with so many artists, moved to the south where along with other refugees he was given an official position by Kao-tsung 高宗 being appointed Chi’eng-chi-hang 承直郎, a middle-rank civilian post. He worked in the painting academy and received the standard reward of the “golden belt,” chin-tai 金帶. As there are no known surviving works, we have no alternative but to accept the judgment of Hsia Wen-yen 夏文彦, that as an academician under Hui-tsong, he was skilled at figures, colored landscapes and especially oxen (buffalo?). Such brief recordings suggest the kind of exact figure-drawing associated with the academy: for example, Hui-tsong’s “Literary Gathering;” or colored landscapes like Wang Hsi-meng’s 王希孟 “A Thousand Li of Rivers and Mountains;” or Chao Po-chü’s 趙伯駒 “Rocky Mountains along a

* Professor of Chinese Art, Department of the History of Art, University of Michigan.


² He is mentioned as Yen T’u-an 閻次安. Hsia Wen-yen 夏文彦, T’u-hui Pao-chien 絹繪寶鑑 (1365), ch. 4/p. 85. (I have used the convenient Commercial Press edition in Kuo-hsiüeh chi-pen ts’ung-shu chien-pien 國學基本叢書簡編).

³ The seal on the existing painting is that on “Rowing Home over a Mirror Lake,” signed Yen Tz’u-yü, in the National Palace Museum, Taipei. It is discussed and illustrated below, fig. 9. For the recording see Li E 厲, Nan-Sung yün hua-lu 南宋院畫錄, ch. 4/p. 109. (I have used the Mei-shu ts’ung-shu edition 美術叢書 [1928], I-wen yin-shu kuan ts’ung-shu reprint 藝文印書館印行 where it is included in vol. 17.)
River in Autumn,\(^4\) which adds elements of expressive vigor.\(^4\) That he had, or at least developed, an expressive style is hinted by Hsia Wen-yen who, after recording his move to the south, comments that the force of his brush was "rather coarse and common".\(^5\) Such judgments must be seen in the light of imagined taste of the fourteenth-century critic. Some perspective as to meaning is to be gained from T'ang Hou who, writing only a little earlier than Hsia Wen-yen, ca. 1330, accused Mu Ch'i牧谿 of similar indelicacies in the painting of bamboo: "incomparably crude and distasteful".\(^5\) Yet standing in front of the great hanging scrolls in Kyoto's Daitokuji, it is somehow hard to agree.\(^5\)

Be that as it may, Yen Chung was clearly one of those transitional figures whose art, nurtured in the north, became part of expression in the early Southern Sung. In this environment, his "coarse and common" brush then seems to partake of the same necessity for virile expression, that we see in the forceful work of Li T'ang, who, in the course of his life, knew more than just academic niceties. In the ease of Li T'ang, the artist was both a wanderer in the wilderness and an unrecognized painter. Or to cite another non-academic experience, there is the legend-fact that created the story of Hsiao Chao 蕭照 as being a bandit until lured by the magnetism of Li T'ang to somehow become a great painter.\(^6\) Can we not speculate that Yen Chung, living through the same time of troubles, may have had similar experiences?

At any rate, Yen Chung's two sons, Yen Tz'u-p'ing 鍾平 and Yen Tz'u-yü 鍾御, can best be understood against this background, and the earliest available written statements about them point out dependence on Li T'ang. Following Hsia Wen-yen, they both learned directly from their father and, painting in the same categories—landscapes, human figures and buffaloes—surpassed him. Yen Tz'u-p'ing's style approximated Li T'ang, but "his (surviving) works fall short of (Li T'ang's) ideas and Tz'u-yü even moreso.\(^7\) Chuang Su's 蕭舜 Hua-chi pu-i 畫繼補遺 of 1298, which if uncorrected is clearly an earlier source and one from which Hsia Wen-yen seems to have drawn, affirms both the relation to Li T'ang and Yen Tz'u-yü's inferiority in comparison with his older brother. Incidentally, Chuang Su's view of the father is even less complimentary than Hsia Wen-yen. He claimed that, while he knew of him, his works had not survived, adding the wry comment that because of his "coarse and common" style they could hardly be considered worthy of preservation.\(^8\)


\(^6\) For recorded material about the Yen family, see Li E., Nan-Sung yün hua-lu, ch. 2/p. 67, ch. 4/pp. 105–109; Hsia Wen-yen, T'ou-hui Pao-chien, ch. 4, p. 77. Tang Hou's 湯垕 remark on Mu Ch'i is found in Hua-chien 畫鑑 (reprinted., Peking, 1959), p. 54. Mu Ch'i's painting is conveniently seen in Sirèn, Chinese Painting, pl. 336–339.

\(^7\) For recorded material about the Yen family, see Li E., Nan-Sung yün hua-lu, ch. 2/p. 67, ch. 4/pp. 105–109; Hsia Wen-yen, T'ou-hui Pao-chien, ch. 4, p. 77. Tang Hou's 湯垕 remark on Mu Ch'i is found in Hua-chien 畫鑑 (reprinted., Peking, 1959), p. 54. Mu Ch'i's painting is conveniently seen in Sirèn, Chinese Painting, pl. 336–339.


\(^9\) Hsia Wen-yen, T'ou-hui Pao-chien, (see note 5).

\(^8\) Chuang Su, Hua-chi pu-i (reprint ed., Peking, 1963), hsia T, p. 11.
The two sons, however, have in small part survived even to our own time. And whereas in quality one may be inferior to the other, in style both are related and the most important fact of these brief early notices places them clearly within the range—however below his excellence—of Li T'ang's innovative painting. We can best consider the two brothers together.

In time they clearly stand midway between the work of Li T'ang and the art of the great names of the late twelfth and early thirteenth century—Ma Yüan 馬遠, Hsia Kuei, 夏珪, and Liu Sung-nien 劉松年. Hsia Wen-yen is quite specific about when they came into prominence. It was around 1163 that they considered their art of sufficient quality to make an official presentation to the emperor who then was Hsiao-tsung 孝宗 (r. 1163–90). He in turn rewarded them with official positions, and like their father before them they were firm members of the academy, receiving the reward of the “golden belt.” Dates of birth and death we cannot know. However, the brothers, Yen Tz’u-p’ing and Yen Tz’u-yü, must be thought of as two painters who painted for and during the reign of Hsiao-tsung. Whatever surviving works can be associated with them are logically, then, of the third quarter of the twelfth century, probably extending into the eighties. In this connection dates of two paintings, apparently no longer extant, one corresponding to 1181 on a Yen Tz’u-p’ing snow landscape and another of 1187 on a small buffalo scroll, are believable if these paintings are considered as works close to the end of his life.\(^9\)

It is possible to see a landscape by Yen Tz’u-p’ing in one single existing circular fan painting, “Villa by the Pine Path” Sung-teng ching-lu 松磴精巖 (fig. 1).\(^10\) It is signed on a rock near the right edge. It portrays a country retreat or small villa in a setting of pine trees on a rocky water-bound promontory. All definition is backed—almost, one feels, with the power of a withdrawn clenched fist—into the lower right edge of the painting. Well over half, perhaps two-thirds, of the landscape is open space expanding outward toward the upper left. There is thus created a special kind of intensity. On the one hand is the exaggerated compactness of form; and on the other, its implied unrealized release in the emptiness around it.

Emptiness, however, is of that peculiar sort that always seems to surround forms in the finest painting of the Southern Sung. Ever so subtly the crisp sharp lines of river-grass lu 蒲 dance over the surfaces of the silk just off the end of the point and on some lightly-washed shoals in the middle distance—enough to let us know that the fullness of life grows out of the emptiness; that emptiness is not void.

However, most remarkable about the painting is the compactness of the defined

---

9 Hsü Pang-ta 徐邦達, Li-t'ai liu-chuan shu-hua tsop’iu pien niem-piao 歷代流傳書畫作品編年表 (Shanghai, 1964), p. 4. The 1181 scroll was recorded in the sixteenth century by Feng Pang 豐坊 (Tao-sheng 諧生). That of 1187 in the mid-nineteenth century (1843) by Pan Cheng-wei 蕭正緯.

10 From an album of ten leaves, 8 7/8 inches by 8 7/8 in., Ming-t'ai chi-chên 名繪集珍. The painting is in ink and light color on silk; Ku-Kung shu-hua lu 故宮書畫錄 (Taipei, 1965), ch. 6/p. 208. Erroneously it is listed as not signed. Palace Museum Photo Archives, no. VA14f. Reproduced in color in Masterpieces of Chinese Album Painting in the National Palace Museum (Taipei, 1971), no. 26. There is a copy in the Freer Gallery that is usually dated in the Ming dynasty. T'ang Yin's 唐寅 seal is on it, and it may be by him; see James Cahill, Chinese Album Leaves (Washington, 1961), pl. XXVII.
forms. Everything “fits”—boulders join to
greater rocks; bamboo-like undergrowth
tightly blankets the lower cliff-sides; the
villa with its stone-wall foundation is at
once raised on and set in the rock; one pine-
trunk (the foremost of the five on the right
edge) firmly penetrates into a rocky hollow
so that it seems to grow out of the very
heart of the earth. The painting is about a
firmly constructed nature; how forms in
that nature are inextricably linked; and
how architecture can become equally a
part of that same compact strength and
from such a foundation partake of an in-
finite extension into space. For those who
would see great architecture and nature as
one, this is an impeccably exact portrayal.

Nature is strong and benign. Architecture
is strong and humane. There are no
human figures, for architecture itself is the
expression of humanity. But there is the
invitation of two empty circular stools on
a fenced ledge in the middle right. Our
view, seated in conversation with ourselves,
would be both here and of things beyond.

Following the suggestion of recorded
tradition, stylistic affinities to Li T’ang are
clear. Taking as a standard the Li T’ang
painting of 1124, “Wind in the Pines of
10,000 Valleys” (fig. 2), one notes a similar
approach to the definition of the all-im-
portant elements of rocks and trees. Li
T’ang is more structurally stark. He makes
no use in this scroll of pepper dots on the
rocks or dancing touches of grass to lighten
the starkness of the water. However, rocks
are similar in both pictures. Although less
crisply stated—partly because of the mini-
ture size—Yen Tz’u p’ing’s rocks have the
reality of solid form that James Cahill has
already noted as an innovation of Li T’ang
—foreshortening at edges and the arranging

of light and dark to distinguish areas turned
toward a source of light from those retreat-
ing from it.⁴¹ They are given basic shape by
a thick strong outline and solid texture by
variants of the familiar axe-stroke conven-
tion. There is, however, no obvious stereo-
typing of forms. Rocks are neither round,
nor square, nor exactly angled but some-
how a combination of all of these. The cal-
ligraphy of outline is varied in direction, is
often broken. The axe-stroke convention
ranges from small touches to rather free
broad expression, with occasionally a rough
horizontal stroke—particularly on the flat
areas and as part of the definition of path-
ways—becoming a clear variant. Pines have
in both paintings their tightly packed in-
dividually defined needles, and the rather
thick strong lines that describe trunk,
branch and root show a varied broken
touch that creates a firm yet shifting vitality
in these important elements. The conven-
tion of angled root dancing over the sur-
face of the rocks occurs once in the fore-
ground of the Yen T’zu-p’ing painting and
is clearly related to the same motif in the
foreground of Li T’ang’s scroll.

That Li T’ang’s style was a well-estab-
lished one attracting skillful followers in
the twelfth century can be confirmed not
only by Yen Tz’u p’ing but by another con-
temporary from whom we likewise seem to
have one surely surviving landscape, name-
ly Chia Shih-ku 賢師古. Although he came
from Kaifeng, no claim is made for him as
an artist in the Northern Sung capital, and
so we seem justified in thinking of him as
a painter of importance only in Kao-tsung’s
academy from around 1130–60, possibly a

⁴¹ James Cahill, “Some Rocks in Early Chinese
Painting,” Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America,
vol. 16 (1962), p. 86.
slightly younger contemporary of Yen Tz'u-p'ing. The painting, a ten-inch square album leaf, "Temple by the Cliff-pass" Yen-kuan Ku-ssu 嵚關古寺 (fig. 3), from the National Palace Museum, Taipei, is well-known having been exhibited in this country in 1961–62. It is signed and is impeccably beautiful in execution. The signature itself follows a convention similar to that of Yen Tz'u-p'ing's with the rather bold large-scale brushing of the surname followed by an appreciable space and the two characters of the given name written smaller and very close together, almost, as it were, shaped as a single character. It is likewise placed not on a blank portion of the silk but at an edge—here the lower left-hand corner—a half-hidden, almost odd textural variant on the dark definition of the land.

While most certainly earlier in time, there is a great deal in Chia Shih-ku's painting that parallels Yen Tz'u-p'ing's "Villa." Form is packed into one corner leaving large areas of empty silk. With Chia Shih-ku it is even more concentrated—the areas of empty silk being especially appropriate to suggest a limitless sky, relieved only by the far wash peak beyond the pass-gate and the shadowy angle of slope behind the figures at the lower right. Clear space only intrudes upon the solid form once in a tiny dot of light below the arch of the pass-gate and again in the restrained encroachment of mist that melts the lower edge of both the distant slanting peak and the base of the cliff near lower right center.

As with the Yen Tz'u-p'ing, it is the compactness of the defined scene that most impresses us. In this painting nothing flies off. A few scattered dots of leaves, a swaying temple banner may hint at the movement of wind in the heights, and certainly the forms present a wonderfully varied silhouette; but that silhouette is really the crisp edge of tense and concrete form—thick pine clusters, matted grass, tight repeated interwoven layers of rock, horizontal plateau, a screen of what appears to be a grove of deciduous trees. No far peak rises above the dominance of foreground forms to dilute the significance of their prime—and primal—importance.

Human elements answer natural elements. Thus the shallow slope of the plateau circled by the fenced path is repeated by the low-lying roof-slope of the first temple buildings. The shape of the figures (with over-hanging sutra-packs?) is echoed in the shape of the over-hanging cliff they are approaching.

Looking back to Li T'ang, almost every important element can be associated with known aspects of the work of that earlier artist. Both the left-edge peak and the trees on it are a close variant of a similar wooded peak on the left edge of the 1124 painting (fig. 2). The silhouetting of pines in tightly cusped branch clusters again might be lifted from the earlier painting. Layers of

---

12 It is from the same album as the Yen Tzu-p'ing painting (see Ku-Kung shu-hua hsü); Treasures, no. 38, p. 94. The painting is in ink and color on silk, 10 3/4 in. by 10 1/4 in. Palace Museum Photographic Archives, no. VA 14b. For an early record of Chia Shih-ku, see Hsia Wen-yen, T'ou-hai Pao-chien, ch. 4/p. 78.

rocks with light areas adjacent to their dark, firm outlines show that this structure is similarly treated. The use of pepper-dots and the thick matting of grass are features found on the short landscape handscroll, “Small Scenes of River and Mountain” Chiang-shan hsiao-ching 江山小景 in the Palace Museum collection. Add as well the common motif of white pine-roots dancing out of the ground.

Rock textures, however, are recorded not so much with the broad sharply angled axe-stroke ts’uán 斧 so prominent on the main peaks of Li T’ang’s large hanging scroll as with short jabs of the brush often extending into sharp, separate, horizontal strokes that roughly parallel the main outlines of rock or cliff and lie like flat, dry sticks to edge-level pathway areas. Such strokes are found in Li T’ang’s 1124 landscape, not on the towering peaks but on the lower-lying foreground. They are a crisper, more definite version of texture-strokes with an older heritage: the elongated daubs or rain-drop strokes on the surfaces of Fan K’uan’s “Travelling among Streams and Mountains,” likewise from the Taipei Palace Museum. This serves only to help re-enforce the established traditions that lay behind these Southern Sung creations of strong rock forms.

The two album paintings—one by Yen Tz’u-p’ing and one by Chia Shih-ku—are also related to Li T’ang in their basic structure. It is such an approach to the painting of landscape that is outlined in brief, aphoristic terms by the shadowy critic, Li Ch’eng-sou 李澄叟 who possibly may have been writing as early as the Shao-hsing 稀興 period (1131–63). His praise was particularly for Li T’ang and his close pupil, Hsiao Chao:

Famous landscape-painters both past and present who attained their own unique level are certainly not few. For example, Kuan T’ung 閻同, Fan K’uan 范寬, Kuo Chung-shu 郭忠恕, Kuo Hsi 郭熙, Li Ch’eng 李成, Ho Chen 胡辰, Chang Chien 張院, Kao Hsün 高均 晏 and the like. Each mastered a single style (t’i 题). It may have been in emphasizing many views, or in precision of detail, or through a strong tight (brush), or possibly (stressing) lightness, or elegance. They perfected a strong-point and thus put their landscapes together. Many reached their goal. Only two, Li (T’ang) and Hsiao (Chao), transformed style (pien-t’i 變題) and emerged unique, abruptly surpassing all artists of past and present. From what is simple and restrained to a spontaneous expressiveness (chien-tan chi-su 章淡氣速 “simple, bland, hurried, quick”) they fit the divine class. When Mr. Li painted the ink fell rich and strong. He opened up spaces, was simple and direct, so that in substance (shih 實) there is emptiness (hsü 虛). Master Hsiao brought his paintings out of clouds and mists so that in emptiness there is substance. If only we could put the two styles together—turn them around, mix them up—truly that would be the very top of the divine class!16

14 Treasures, pl. 37; also in many of the other sources cited in note 13.

16 Li Ch’eng-sou, Hua shan-shai chi-hieh 蠟山水訣 [Secrets of Landscape Painting]; Yü Chienhua 羽劍華, Chung-kue hua-hua lü-tien 中國畫論類編 p. 622. See also the text in Wang-shih shu-shu yün 萬石書書引.
This passage has special validity when applied to the two paintings by Li T'ang followers we have just discussed. In both, the power of their expression is anchored in the tight knot of defined form—“substance”—that is compressed into less than half of the picture surface. At the same time there is clear space among the tightly fitted units of form. Yen Tz'u-p'ing's villa is firmly planted on its promontory. It closely encloses a large outcropping of rock. Yet out of that tight union of what nature has built and what man has built—cliff and architecture—extends a path to the fenced-ledge and above that more architecture: roofs of an outlying pavilion. This time it is nature—a grove of pines—that surrounds the architecture. There is a further path, tightly bordered by bamboo, that leads to the water's edge at the lower right.

If anything, formal elements are even more compact in Chia Shih-ku's painting. Both in time and in style we can think of him as being closer to Li T'ang. Accord-

ingly there is an even clearer notion of "emptiness" operating within the confines of "substance." There is an exact articulation which opens up the denseness of rich unkempt grass, rugged rocks and thick leaves and allows us to penetrate into its very heart. A dark half-hidden cave in the rocky center of the mountain promontory is a mysterious and compelling focus. The dim path angles beneath it, turning it into a kind of natural bridge. The path disappears but, we are sure, emerges in the light road beyond. It again penetrates into something—this time a far barrier gate and must finally, at least in the mind, take us to the far distant peak, framed cave-like by roof, cliff-side and tree.

Following Li Ch'eng-sou's commentary, the debt to Hsiao Chao is less sure (as we would expect of a Li T'ang style). Still for Yen Tz'u-p'ing, delicate dancing reeds and subtly placed horizontal washes suggest that substance is indeed emptiness; and the same could be said of the misty area in the lower right of Chia Shih-ku's painting where the substance of far mountain and nearer cliff-side grows from the void, another mysterious focus for this extraordinary mountainscape.

The notion of emptiness as revealing substance, whether coming from Hsiao Chao or not, was increasingly important for Southern Sung painters. From what we know of Yen Tz'-yü, his painting seems to move in that direction. Without rejecting "substance," as expressed above, his paintings are a little softer in the definition of their forms; his void less empty. Less forceful, this may account for his lower position as indicated by traditional criticism. He seems not, alas, to have completely realized the glories, predicted by Li Ch'eng-sou, for

王氏書畫苑 (reprint ed., Shanghai, 1922) pu-i section, ch. 2, pp. 31-56. The shadowy author may have been active as early as 1130 (Yü Chien-hua) or even as late as the Yüan period. For uncertainties about the text, see my Li Ti (Washington, 1967), p. 5, note 2. The text refers only to Li and Hsiao without identifying them further. However, it seems hardly possible that any one else is intended, this master-pupil pair being obvious. Since what we know about their art—particularly Li T'ang—fits the comment so well, it is perhaps a case where the visual material can be used to "prove" the written comment, rather than the other way around.

As for the other artists—the "single style" group—all except the last three are too well-known to comment. The final three are all of Hui-tsung's time, contemporaries of Li T'ang. Accounts of them can all be conveniently found under their names in T'ang Sung hua-chia jen-ming tz'u-tien 唐宋畫家人名錄 (Peking, 1958).
one who would combine the Li-Hsiao manners.

A small square of silk, “Hostelry in the Mountains,” Shan-ts’un Kuei-ch’i t’u 山村歸騎圖 from the Freer Gallery of Art (fig. 4) is Yen Tz’u-yü’s best known and surest authentic work. Less compact, the composition is, however, the mirror reverse of Chia Shih-ku’s “Temple by the Cliff-pass.” As with Chia’s scene, the fenced semicircular top of an over-hanging cliff, with sharp undercut facets, is a main central motif. For Yen, however, solid and void are more evenly fused. Form is softened, space more filled.

His style is actually closer to his older brother’s “Villa by the Pine Path.” It, too, is signed, obscurely, on a dark rock-side at the same right-hand section of the picture; yü 余 appears very much like ping 平, but is still clearly distinguishable. The composition is similar with most of the forms massed to the right. The view-point is alike. In both we look slightly down on the foreground and directly across to middle-distance heights. Land is built up in similar fashion. There are like boulders at the water’s edge showing thick black outlines and partly curved, partly angled silhouettes. They in turn serve as neat steps to a rocky promontory which continues the same shapes in larger forms, made rugged by shadowed hollows and light ridges. Ink-dots, or tien 筆, are sparingly used as a lively leit-motif. Long-trunked pines with tight needle-clusters are in both paintings. The fence-edged cliff is a common motif in both.

But Yen Tz’u-yü is not painting the same scene. His landscape is about mountains and heights rather than the portrait of a lake- or river-side villa. The sense of dwelling close to the clouds and the presence of towering peaks are important. The scene as a whole, exact as it may be, is however delicately softer and infinitely more remote. As already noted, form is more spacious; space is more filled with form. Yet this dilutes the conception, and when contrasted with Yen Tz’u-p’ing, the elder brother emerges as the stronger, more forceful artist.

Yen Tz’u-yü’s interest in gentle heights and far spaces continues in a rather damaged and darkened square of tightly woven silk in the Palace Museum. It has been given the title, “Mist in the Autumn Mountains” Ch’iu-shan yen-ai 秋山煙霧 (fig. 5). Apparently because of a misreading of the signature, which is, characteristically, on the cliff-side toward the lower right of the picture, the painting has been mis-attributed to Lien Fu 廉孚, the son of Lien Pu 廉布, an artist who like Yen Chung, served Kao-tsung. The time, thus, is approximately right, but there seems little doubt that the slightly damaged characters should read Yen Tz’u-yü. Further the style helps

For account of Lien Fu and his father Lien Pu, see T’ang Sung hua-chia jen-ming tz’u-lien, p. 290. Since they painted from the time of Kao-tsung, the period is, as noted, approximately right for the painting. The painting is listed under Lien Fu as being the eighth leaf in an album, Ch’i-ku ming-hui 集古名繪, Ku-Kung Ming-hua lu, ch. 6/p. 218, Palace Museum Photographic Archives VA19h. To my knowledge the signature was first re-interpreted when the painting was carefully examined in Taichung at the time of the photography for the Palace Museum Photographic Archives. Chuang Yen 嶺巓, later Deputy Director of the National Palace Museum, was responsible for this reinterpretation. The second character is in itself difficult.

17 Cahill, Chinese Album Leaves, pl. V; The Freer Gallery of Art (Washington and Tokyo, 1972), vol. 1, China, pl. 39. The painting is in ink and color on silk, measuring 10 in. by 10 3/16 in.
affirm the justness of this attribution.

Like “Hostelry in the Mountains,” “Mist in the Autumn Mountains” is square in shape and has the same general composition—low and horizontal at the left and then rising to a middle-distance promontory at the right with the falling off of detail in defining far heights and haze-shrouded distance beyond. Two tiny figures—only a few twigs high—are similarly placed. On the Palace Museum painting they are a rather damaged long-gowned scholar and his attendant. There are, as well, birds (possibly four) poised in flight off the trees and near the center of the picture.

In the definition of the land there are further similarities, particularly the way in which the hollow edge of a hillside meets the top of a plateau area so that there is a sharp juxtaposition of light and dark in a characteristic concave pattern. This may be seen at the lower center of the picture in Taipei and at the lower right of the Freer painting. The jagged undercut cliff is a key motif in both paintings. Simply it is tipped up to create the effect of a steep plateau in the autumn scene. One might mention, too, the occasional scattering of ink-dots, tien, near or along an edge of definition. In both the Freer and Taipei paintings there is a special device found in the mid-distant mountain areas. It involves the direct juxtaposition of a darker and lighter wash area giving the illusion of joining two smooth broad facets of rock. This is at the right of both paintings.

With trees one cannot draw exact parallels, since on “Mist in the Autumn Mountains,” there are no pines, and the painting’s deciduous trees, with no color, are the scattered, loose shapes of empty autumn growing on a high place. Exactly this kind of tree does not exist on other paintings so far examined. However, these trees clearly derive from another known Li T’ang source, namely the pair of Landscapes from the Koto-in (fig. 7), for the legitimacy of which Richard Barnhart has most recently argued so persuasively.\(^29\) It is worth noting Yen Tz’u-yü’s rather miniature definition of this Li T’ang type. Trunks are described by thick-line edges and interior wash; sometimes a root dances out of the ground; and one notes a particular mannerism whereby the silk is left light at the bottom of a tree-trunk leaving a white sear. Loose brittle twigs—and some swift ink-touches of leaves—fan out to create the upper parts.

The mention of another Li T’ang painting in connection with the Yen family style helps reaffirm the clarity of the stylistic circle which we are discussing. The influence of Li T’ang is both certain and persistent. Thus the mountain peaks in the Freer “Hostelry in the Mountains” can be seen as a softer, more exact rendering of what Li Ch’eng-sou called “the spontaneous expressiveness” of their originator if one compares them to the mountains in Li T’ang’s seasonal landscapes from the Koto-in. In the latter paintings as well, one notes the convention of dotting the cliff-face with clusters of leaves, denoting distant high-growing shrubs or trees. We have stressed above the significance of the motif of the overhanging faceted cliff in paintings both by Yen Tz’u-yü and Chia Shih-ku. It is in the shadow of just such a cliff, seated on a plateau whose sides may be similarly con-
structed that Po-i and Shu-ch'i carry on their lofty dust-free conversation in another famous Li T'ang scroll, "Po-i and Shu-ch'i"\(^{21}\) (fig. 8).

Thus the work of Li T'ang's followers helps to clarify the art of the master himself and affirms its unique significance as the twelfth century progresses. In the case of the Yen family, how far can we extend this to encompass some of the countless anonymous works of the Southern Sung with which any student of the period is always confronted? Initially one suggestion can be made. In my earlier article on Li T'ang, I indicated that a somewhat damaged fan-painting "Autumn: Sailboat on a Lake" (fig. 6), a scene of sparse wind-blown trees, sailboat and distant mountains, held "unmistakably the shadow of Li T'ang."\(^{22}\) Having examined the art of Yen Tz'u-yü, who did indeed shadow Li T'ang, it seems even more just to attribute the painting to that later, more gentle interpreter of the style. Shape, texture and treatment of foreground boulders may be compared to those in the Freer painting—also the notion of touches of line to convey the quality of the water. In the Boston painting, calm serenity of this element is replaced by dancing movement, waves whipped by the wind of an autumn scene. The trees are closely analogous to those in the Taipei painting—outline, interior wash, roots dancing out of the ground, the white-scarred trunks (particularly at their base), and trunks stretched out in long, brittle angled lines with patterns of sharp twigs and leaves. In the Boston painting, leaves are flying in the air, again consistent with the wind-blown scene. Finally the mountain just beyond is treated with the juxtaposition of light and dark wash, the facetted effect that is true of mountain form in a similar position on both the other two paintings. The same mountain adds free ink-dots of distant foliage. The wind-blown scene in the Boston painting is of another mood, but it is perhaps not unjust to add it to the repertory of Yen Tz'u-yü.

Another album leaf, this time signed, must also be considered under the name of Yen Tz'u-yü—"Rowing Home over a Mirror Lake" Ching-hu kuei-cho 鏡湖歸棹 (fig. 9) in the Taipei Palace Museum collection.\(^{23}\) It is a painting in ink on silk measuring 10 1/2 by 10 1/4 inches. Its format is thus extremely close both to Chia Shih-ku's "Temple by the Cliff-pass" and the Freer's "Hostelry in the Mountains." It is signed again in an "authentic" manner with the two characters of the given name written together and the entire signature blending closely with the texture strokes of the rock on the lower right on which it appears. The signature also adds the word, "brush" (pi 笔). Impressed over the writing is the somewhat unique feature of a seal—the seal already mentioned above: Ho-tung Yen shih yin, "Seal of the Yen family from Ho-tung."

The freshness of the whole painting and the rather loose and free expressiveness of the brush inevitably create doubts about

\(^{21}\) Ibid., p. 306.

\(^{22}\) Edwards, "Landscape Art of Li T'ang," p. 52 and fig. 13. See also Kojirō Tomita, Portfolio of Chinese Paintings in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (Han to Sung) (2nd revised ed., Cambridge, Mass., 1938), pl. 58; James Cahill, The Art of Southern Sung China (Tokyo, 1962), no. 15, and pp. 44 and 46, where the painting is given to an "anonymous follower of Li T'ang." It is in ink and light colors on silk, 9 1/2 in. by 10 3/8 in.

\(^{23}\) It comes from the album Sung-jen chü-hui 宋人集繪 Ku-kung shu-hua lu, ch. 6/p. 221. Palace Museum Photographic Archives VA21c.
its antiquity. Still it must be considered seriously within the circle we are defining, and the more one studies it the more one recognizes unmistakable features of the Chia-Yen style. Both the firm, varied “calligraphy” that outlines the rock forms and the sharp distinct jabs of texture-strokes are part of the structure of Chia Shih-ku’s painting. The definition of the path in the lower right by means of sharp horizontal strokes is a variant in “Mirror Lake” of a similar path on the right of Chia’s mountainscape. Jabs of ink, however, do not stand out so sharply on the latter since the whole land-mass is washed rather dark. A feature in “Mirror Lake” is the sharply repeated accent of the axe-stroke. This is clearly derived from Li T’ang (“Winds in the Pines” of 1124) but not found with the same persistence on any of the Chia-Yen paintings we have discussed.

In what is really the compressing into a corner of the Northern Sung fondness for towering peaks (a limited area of space represented by the waterfall and a broader spatial ambient, here made endless, to the left) one is impressed by the sureness with which the various contending elements of rock are structured—both in themselves and in relation to each other. They rise in clashing but ultimately harmonized shapes beneath the thin, solitary disc of an ambiguous hazed—over sun (or moon?). The method of cupping the topmost pinnacle in an enclosing hollow is analogous to the way in which the foremost pine in the mid-distance of Yen Tz’u-p’ing’s “Villa” grows: its roots hidden, straight out of a similar hollow. All through the painting it is clear that the artist was aware of the Yen style: touches of tree on the edge of a far peak, the overhanging cliff with fenced path on its top, thin and draw-out trees scarred white particularly at their roots, angled roots out of the ground, touches of dancing water-grass, waves, thin tiny figures (only a few twigs—or leaves—high). Certainly the notion of juxtaposing a tight gathering of form beside a broad stretch of space is basic to the scene. The feeling of openness throughout the mountain scenery is perhaps too apparent—an exaggeration of Li Ch’eng-sou’s idea of “emptiness.” But in this respect, it can be compared to the relation of light and dark, daubs of ink to untouched ground, that one may find in a similarly fresh Late Sung painting, “A Pure and Remote View of Streams and Mountains,” attributed with much confidence to Hsia Kuei (fig. 10). Is “Rowing Home over a Mirror Lake” a slightly later rendering—still within the Sung—by someone completely acquainted with the basis of the Yen style? If we are to place it as late as the Ming, another possibility, it must indeed be considered a very close copy. It would range itself with other known examples of this kind of artistry, specifically Wang Ku-hsiang’s 王系祥 direct imitation in 1541 of an album by Hsia Kuei’s son, Hsia Shen 夏霖 (fig. 11),24 or possibly also Ch’iu Ying’s 仇英 effort to rather exactly catch the style of Li T’ang on the Freer’s well-known handscroll, “Landscape in the Style of Li T’ang” (fig. 12).25 “Mirror Lake” appears to be more crisply authoritative—in a Sung sense—than either of those known Ming-Sung works.

Finally, no discussion of the Li T’ang-Yen style can be considered complete without

25 The Freer Gallery of Art, China, pl. 54, pp. 163, 165.
mention of the genre universally associated with its expression—the painting of oxen or buffalo, specifically the familiar water-buffalo of South China. Of this type there are two scrolls of high quality, both attributed to Yen Tz’u-p’ing. One is the hanging scroll, "Herding Buffalo in the Autumn Wilds" 〈Ch’iu-yeh mu-niu 秋野牧牛 (fig. 13), from the Sumitomo collection in Japan.26 The other is a handscroll, "Herding Buffalo" 〈Mu-niu l’u 牧牛圖 (fig. 14), in China, comprising four separate seasonal views.27 With both of these paintings we move out of the tight miniature album leaf. The Japanese painting is a little over three feet high. It is the same height (within 2 cm.) as Li Tang’s Kōtō-in Landscapes. The scroll in China, even though divided into four sections, is a handscroll over a foot high (35.5 cm.) and each scene is approximately three feet long (89 cm.). They are also close-up views with only slight intimations of distance—washes beneath trees in the handscroll and a touch of far-peak beside or through the trees in the hanging scroll. We have moved from the rocky miniature world so far discussed to the water-edged flat grazing lands suitable for the water-buffalo. Basic differences have to do with a subject and the fact that the subject is treated not as a distant view joining the physical facts of nature (and accordingly tiny man) to infinite stretches of space but as a close-up scene in which the main "actors" are buffalos, trees and herd-boys.

26 So-Gen no Kaiga 宋元の絵画 (Tokyo, 1963), pl. 111.
27 Hua-yüan to-ting 畫苑掇英 [Gems of Chinese Painting] (Shanghai, 1955), vol. 2, n. 3. The painting is also recorded in Pien Yung-yü 筆永譽 (1645-1712) Shih-Ku t’ang sha-hua hui-k’ao 式古堂畫會考. See Li E, Nan-Sung yüan hua-lu, ch. 4/pp. 105-106.

Japanese scholarship has associated the Sumitomo painting with the thirteenth century;28 and there is a clear over-certainty about line, brush-stroke and wash, exactly and precisely rendered, that would support this. The crackling definition of the two herd-boys recalls Ma Yüan or Liang K’ai. The enigma of one herd-boy apparently looking for lice in the full hair of the other while the untethered, unwatched animals wander or rest at will suggests ambiguities we usually associated with thirteenth-century ch’an 禪. The scroll in China, however imperfectly seen in reproduction, seems to affirm more exactly the validity of associating both subject and style with the Yen family; and it helps draw the Japanese scroll into the same broad circle.

Except for the trees there are only a few suggestions of stylistic analogies that can be drawn between landscapes and buffalo scenes—and almost all are connected with what survives of Yen T’zu-yü rather than Yen Tz’u-p’ing. At the lower left of the Sumitomo painting the sharp juxtaposition of a light and dark wash (a feature we have previously found on distant mountains) creates the beginning of a diagonal not unlike the diagonal sweep of plateau in Yen Tz’u-yü’s "Mist in the Autumn Mountains." In the buffalo picture the diagonal quickly melts into the flat grazing land, but it sets a direction (not unlike the landscape) toward the groove of trees and beyond them, in both pictures, back to the faint apparition of high-rising distant mountain. The crisp lines of grasses on the Sumitomo picture are analogous to the dancing touches of crisp lu 草 in Yen Tz’u-p’ing’s "Villa by the Pine Path." In the winter scene
Fig. 1.—Villa by the Pine Path. Yen Tz'u-p'ing.
National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 2.—Wind in the Pines of 10,000 Valleys. Li T’ang.
National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 3.—Temple by the Cliff-pass, Chia Shih-ku.
National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 4.—Hostelry in the Mountains. Yen Tz'u-yü.
Freer Gallery of Art.
Fig. 5.—Mist in the Autumn Mountains. Yen Tz'u-yü.
National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 6.—Autumn: Sailboat on a Lake. Attributed to Yen Tz'ü-yü. Courtesy, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Fig. 7.—Two Seasonal Landscapes. Li Tsung, Ko-shan, Daitoku-ji, Kyoto.
Fig. 8.—Po-i and Shu-chh (or Gathering Herbs). Li T’ang.
Palace Museum, Peking.
Fig. 9.—Rowing Home over a Mirror Lake. Signed Yen Tz’u-yu.
National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 10.—A Pure and Remote View of Streams and Mountains. Hsia Kuei. Handscroll detail. National Palace Museum, Taipeii.
Fig. 11.—Two Album Leaves from Paintings after Hsia Shen. Wang Ku-hsiang. Dated 1541. National Palace Museum, Taipei.

Fig. 12.—Landscape in the Style of Li T'ang. Chiu Ying. Freer Gallery of Art.
Fig. 13.—Herding Buffalo in the Autumn Wilds. Style of the Yen Family. Sumitomo Collection, Japan.
Fig. 14.—Herding Buffalo, the Four Seasons. Attributed to Yen Tz’u-p’ing. Nanking.
from the herding series in China the outline of the horizontal land areas with scattered sprinkling of t'ien along its edge is the way Yen Tz’u-yü defines similar horizontal passages of land in the Freer “Hostelry in the Mountains” and in the Palace Museum’s “Mist in the Autumn Mountains.” In the autumn herdboy scene from China, the landspit of the upper left is treated with the convention of a darkened wash at the edges and light wash toward the center. This same convention is found on the landspit in the foreground of the Boston “Autumn” fan. These hints may be slight, but when we turn to the trees in these buffalo paintings they clearly betray their heritage: dark outline, textured within, roots—often white-scarred—dancing out of the ground at crazy angles, the shapes of their hollows analogous to the shapes of boulders in landscape scenes. To their often lively branches is added the rich matting of appropriate leaves, or perhaps the sparkly touches of twigs. These motifs clearly derive from Li T’ang (the Kōtō-in landscapes and “Po-i and Shu-ch’i”) and can be seen in miniature on the landscapes we have discussed. It is not surprising to find them used in paintings attributed to Yen Tz’u-p’ing. Finally the definition of distance, beneath the trees at the left of the autumn buffalo scene, seems to be a just development from the free washes and empty silk that define a similar distance beneath the trees at the left of Li T’ang’s “Po-i and Shu-ch’i.”

Perhaps one cannot exactly prove the authenticity of the herd-boy pictures, although the seasonal paintings in China seem the most certain. But it is important to understand their implications in relation to the total meaning of the Li T’ang tradition. The “Yen Tz’u-p’ing” buffalo paintings show the same relation to the tighter landscape tradition as do Li T’ang’s seasonal landscapes to “Wind in the Pines” of 1124. Richard Barnhart’s important article on Li T’ang makes clear the notion that two styles are not only possible within his creativity but that they may be necessary in order to explain the nature of painting at this time in history. To this end Professor Barnhart quotes Han Cho (1120): “When one paints in the style of Li Ch’eng, it cannot be mixed with that of Fan K’uan…” indicating, by contrast to Li T’ang, the unitary nature of the styles of early Sung masters.29

At least that is how they were seen by a twelfth-century critic, and the same view seems to have been expressed even more completely by Li Ch’eng-sou, possibly writing only a decade or so later. If we return to the passage from Hua Shan-shui chüeh that we have already found so revealing, its importance becomes even more apparent. Here the assessment of old masters—and a few closely contemporary artists—as being trapped in a single style, i-t’i — would seem to exactly parallel Han Cho’s ideas about these giants of the past. Indeed it is not without interest that one of the closely contemporary artists cited by Li Ch’eng-sou, Kao Hsin, painted in the style of Kao K’o-ming but, in his later years because of this style’s popularity in Hui-t’sun’s academy, shifted, apparently to avoid its banality, to another of those “unitary” possibilities, namely the style of Fan K’uan.30 Li T’ang and Hsiao Chao, of course, changed all this with their trans-

30 Teng Ch’un, Hua-chi 畫記 (reprint ed., Peking, 1963), ch. 6, p. 82.
formed style, *pien-t‘i* 變體. However Li Ch‘eng-sou praised not only matters of substance, *shih* 實 and emptiness, *hsü* 虛, but also the range of this transformation “from what is simple and restrained to a spontaneous expressiveness.”

There are, thus, hints in texts, in tradition, and in a limited number of surviving works telling us that not only Li T‘ang but also his followers were part of a continuing flexible “transformation.” The idea, for example, that Yen Chung’s painting was “coarse and common” makes most sense if we think of his painting, in part, according to an expressive free style that to his critics just did not come off. (Later Mu Ch‘i, apparently for similar reasons, was branded with the same criticism.) That the followers of Li T‘ang echoed the innovations of the master not only solidifies our understanding of him but helps to clarify the nature of painting in the years after he was gone. Nor must it be forgotten that, however dependent were the followers upon the towering innovations of the master, they, too, helped change style. Substance and emptiness received more balanced attention. With Yen Tz‘u-p‘ing and Yen Tz‘u-yü the world became less austere, more gentle and more accessible.

31 While the notion of flexibility of range in Li T‘ang’s style does not mean that anything goes, it does give a theoretical base for the acceptance of the rather different landscape elements in the famous scroll of “Duke Wen of Chin Returning to Power” Ch‘in Wen-Kung fu-kuo t‘u 晉文公復國圖 recently acquired by the Metropolitan Museum in New York.

The over-hanging undercut block of cliff-side, the occasional use of the axe-stroke, rock-shapes that in outline are neither square nor round nor angled but a combination, and certainly the trees—such forms, fall within an understanding of Li T‘ang’s style. But there is clearly a marked “restrained” effect—rather in the direction of Kuo Hsi (a conscious archaism?)—that gives a distinctly different flavor. *T‘ang Wu-t’ai Sung Yüan Ming-t‘ai* 唐五代宋元名迹 (Shanghai, 1957), pls. 41–57. Wen Fong and Marilyn Fu, *Sung and Yuan Paintings* (New York, 1973), no. 2, pp. 29–36, 52–53.
A RE-EXAMINATION OF AN-YANG ARCHAEOLOGY

By VIRGINIA C. KANE*

It has now come to be almost universally acknowledged that the “Five Styles” marking the chronological development of An-yang 安陽 bronze decor recognized by Professor Max Loehr in 1953 constitute the foundation upon which all further advances in the study of Shang bronze art must be based.1 The validity of his five-stage stylistic sequence received dramatic confirmation only shortly thereafter when, in 1955, reports of the finds at the pre-An-yang capital at Cheng-chou 鄭州 in southern Honan 河南 were published,2 revealing bronze vessels conforming to his Styles I and II, thereby proving these to be the early and primitive forerunners of the mature An-yang styles and not, as had been previously supposed, their late, decadent, or provincial after-
Text Fig. 1.—The Hsiao-t'ün Foundations.
(Shih Chang-ju, Hsiao-t'ün, vol. I... Architectural Remains at Yin-hsiü, p. 21, fig. 4.)
Text Fig. 2.—The Ping-group Foundations at Hsiao-t'un, with Burials M331, M333 and M388. (Shih Chang-ju, Hsiao-t'un, vol. 1 . . . Architectural Remains at Yin-hü, p. 302, fig. 116).
VIRGINIA C. KANE

dence behind their dating of these burials within the larger context of the Academia Sinica chronology of the rammed-earth foundations at Hsiao-t’un.5

THE RELATIVE SEQUENCE OF THE HSIAO-T’UN FOUNDATIONS

The fifty-three rammed-earth foundations at Hsiao-t’un have been divided by the Academia Sinica excavators (headed by Shih Chang-ju 石璋如) into three geographical groups, designated conventionally from north to south as chia ü, i 乙, and ping 丙 and comprising respectively fifteen, twenty-one, and seventeen separate foundations (text fig. 1). On the basis of various

5 In fairness, it should be noted here that this does simplify Umehara’s argument somewhat, since he has also objected that some of the Cheng-chou style bronzes possess features, such as incongruously advanced capped posts, which presuppose an already mature bronze art of which the Cheng-chou vessels must represent the somewhat later and poorer imitations, perhaps intended for burial only (Umehara, “In Chüki to sarete iro Cheng-chou shitsudo kodoki no seishtsu” 楚軼中興とされている鄭州出土古銅器的性質 [The nature of the ancient bronzes excavated at Cheng-chou which are said to be Middle Yin], Shigakuko 史學 vol. 33, no. 2 (1961), pp. 123–146; Soper, “A Note,” p. 8). Soper’s rejoinder—to the effect that such individual features of a vessel-type need not have developed at a uniform pace, and that the posts and caps of the chia or chüeh may have experienced a more rapid stylistic development than the t’ao-i’ieh 獨習 mask in the neck frieze—presents what would seem to be at best a remote possibility. In actuality, the single vessel adduced by Umehara which does exhibit this phenomenon (the chia in his pl. 2: lower right) is certainly a spuriously fabricated pastiche of old and more recent parts, similar to or else the same as the chia illustrated in his Nihon shi‘cho Shina kodô seika 日本蒐錄支那古銅器選 [Selected relics of ancient Chinese bronzes from Japanese collections] (Osaka, 1959–64), vol. 3, pl. 245, in W. van Heusden, Ancient Chinese Bronzes of the Shang and Chou Dynasties (Tokyo, 1952), pls. 3–4 (here with an incongruously late handle as well), and now in the archaeological data to be outlined briefly below, the excavators have concluded that the chia, i, and ping groups constitute a chronological as well as a geographical sequence and, moreover, that the ping-group foundations belong to a period not only late in the Hsiao-t’un occupation but characterized also, in their opinion, by a technological decline. Located in the vicinity of the ping-group foundations and dated by the excavators to the same late, supposedly decadent period were the three relatively large burials, M331, M333, and M388 (text fig. 2), among whose contents were found bronze vessels corresponding to Lochr’s Styles I and II and to the similar vessels excavated from Cheng-chou (figs. 1, 2, and 3).6 In accord-


7 Although neither these nor the other Hsiao-t’un burials containing bronze vessels have as yet been completely published, the issue concerning the Cheng-chou style bronzes from the ping-group burials has centered around the primitive-looking ku vessels and the flat-bottomed chüeh vessels from these burials; and these have been well published in Li Chi’s two studies on the ku and chüeh vessel-types: Ku-ch’i’wu yen-chiu chuan-k’an, Ti-i pên: Yin-hsiü ch’u-t’u chi’ing-t’ung ku-hsing-ch’i chüeh yen-chiu 古器物研究專刊 第一本: 殷墟出土青銅鼎形器之研究 [Monograph studies on ancient vessels, vol. 1: Studies on the ku bronze vessels excavated from Yin-hsiü], (Nankang, 1964), pl. 8 (present fig. 1–M331), pl. 9 (M333), pl. 10 (M333), pl. 11 (present fig. 3–M388); and vol. 2 in the same Monograph series, Yin-hsiü ch’u-t’u chi’ing-t’ung ku-hsing-ch’i chüeh yen-chiu 殷墟出土青銅鼎形器之研究 [Studies on the chüeh bronze vessels ex-
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ance with the late date assigned to these burials and their contents, the excavators, together with Li Chi and Umehara, have chosen to view the "primitive" qualities in casting and decor characteristic of such bronzes as further demonstration of the same lateness and technological decline which they claim to have discerned in the construction of the related ping-group foundations. The issue here—between earliness and primitiveness on the one hand, and lateness and decline on the other—thus centers around the date and alleged decadence of the ping-group foundations and the three burials which have been associated with them.

Of the several criteria used by the excavators to establish the relative dates of the Hsiao-t'un foundations, the most important relies on the presence—under, within, beside, or above the various foundations—of inscribed oracle bones which can be attributed to the various king-reigns of the An-yang occupation in accordance with Tung Tso-pin's 睦作賓 system of oracle bone periodization. Exploiting this evidence, Shih Chang-ju has concluded that the chia-group foundations were for the most part constructed during Oracle Bone Period I and occupied into Oracle Bone Period V; that the i-group foundations appear to have been constructed in two different stages dating respectively from Periods I–II and Periods III–IV, with i-5, i-7, and the lower stratum of i-11 associated with the earlier, and i-8, the upper stratum of i-11, and i-13 associated with the later; and that the ping-group foundations as a whole cannot have antedated Period IV and were in all probability constructed during the early part of Period V, contemporaneous with or somewhat later than the latest foundations of the i-group.

Translating Tung Tso-pin's oracle bone periods into king-reigns (see Table 1), this means that the chia-group foundations are attributed to the reign of Wu Ting, the early phase of the i-group foundations to the reign of Tsu Chia, the later phase of the same group to the reigns of Lin Hsin, K'ang Ting, and Wu I, and the ping-group foundations to the reigns of Wen Ting, Ti I, and possibly Ti Hsin.

Against this method and its conclusions can perhaps be raised the objection that the oracle bones on which it relies are extremely small in number, comprising

cavated from Yin-hsü] (Nankang, 1966), pl. 17 (M331), pl. 20 (present fig. 2—M333), pl. 21 (M333), and pl. 23 (M388). See also in the same volume, pp. 65–66, 102–107, and English summary pp. 138–139 (on the lateness and decadence of the flat-bottomed chüeh from the ping-group burials) and pp. iii–iv (on the necessity of dating the Cheng-chou burials close in time to the Hsiao-t'un ping-group burials). In addition to these ka and chüeh, there are also from M331 a p’ou (Li Chi, The Beginnings of Chinese Civilization [Seattle, 1957], pl. 34) and, from M333, a ting (Umehara, Yin-hsü 殷墟 [Tokyo, 1961], pl. 73/1), which correspond typologically and stylistically to Loehr's Style II and to the vessels from Cheng-chou.

8 According to the information tabulated and interpreted by Shih Chang-ju (Hsiao-t'un, pp. 320–326), there were no underlying oracle bones in the chia-group; but in chia-13 there were intrusions of Period I oracle bones, while pits beside the chia-group foundations contained bones of Periods I through V, with Periods I and II predominating. As for the i-group, trenches associated with i-1, 2, and 4 contained mainly Period I bones, with Period I bones both underlying and intruding into i-5; Period IV bones were found to underlie i-1, 6, and 8, to underlie and intrude into the upper stratum of i-11, and to intrude into i-13; Period V bones were found in an upper stratum pit of i-7. Among the ping-group foundations, only underlying bones of Period IV date were found.
merely fragments of the utmost insignificance, with inscriptions of no more than a few characters, frequently illegible and meaningless, and datable actually only on the rather tenuous basis of their script-style. Nevertheless, it does seem provisionally acceptable to view the chia, i, and ping foundations as a chronological sequence, with the terminating ping-group associated with the reigns of the latest Anyang kings.

Beyond this, the excavators have sought to equate this chia—i—ping chronological sequence with a "beginning—florescence—decline" technological sequence derived primarily from their analysis and interpretation of the ten varieties of rammed-earth construction methods distinguished at the site. Thus, since the presumably rather sophisticated system of water ditches (levels? conduits?) was discovered to underlie only certain of the i-group foundations, these foundations were accordingly ascribed to an alleged period of "florescence," preceded in time by the chia-group foundations—displaying a simpler method of construction—and followed by the ping-group foundations, whose much smaller scale and divergent techniques signified to the excavators a period of technological decline at the end of the Anyang occupation—a decline connected causally, they implied, with the conditions which precipitated the Chou conquest.

Yet, it should be observed that, beyond the presence of the water ditches beneath the i-group foundations, the chia—i—ping distinctions in construction methods are perhaps not so clear-cut as their excavators' interpretation would seem to imply: a variety of different techniques is actually represented within each group of foundations. Of the type of construction involving a leveling of the surface prior to the erection of the foundation, the majority of examples were found among the ping-group (seven in the ping-group as opposed to two each in the chia and i groups); but, rather than the symptom of decline inferred by the excavators, this technique would seem more to manifest a certain technological advance and an increasing finesse on the part of the builders.

It has moreover been suggested by Shih Chang-ju himself that the differences observed among the chia, i, and ping groups may actually reflect the variant uses to which their buildings were put—with the chia-group reserved for palaces, the i-group for temples, and the ping-group for sacrifices and ritual. Tentative as such suggestions must remain, they do imply that the much smaller and more complex character of the ping-group foundations, together with their lack of water ditches, may well stem from some special functional requirement, rather than from any sort of alleged technological decline.

Additional support for the "beginning—florescence—decline" theory of Hsiao-t'un culture has been further sought by the excavators among the chance remains of the

9 Those bones which can be assigned to one of Tung Tso-pin's periods and which also were found either under or above a major foundation are surprisingly few. They can be found illustrated in Li Chi, ed., Hsiao-t'Un, Ti-ehh i-pin: Ti-hsi wen-tzu 小屯第二本院虚字文 (Hsiao-t'un, vol. 2: Inscriptions) (Taipei and Nankang, 1948–67), in the i-pien, part 1, vol. 1, pls. 25–26, part 3, vol. 4, pls. 1153, 1194–96, 1198, 1215–17.

10 Shih Chang-ju, Hsiao-t'un, pp. 326–329.

11 Ibid., pp. 327–328, Tables 129–130.

12 Ibid., p. 332.
bronze industry (fragments of bronze, ore, molds, etc.) discovered under, within, or around the various foundations: from the predominance of such evidence in the i-group and its scarcity in the ping-group, the excavators have concluded that the period of florescence in the bronze industry coincided with the period of the i-group foundations, and that the alleged decline in architecture at the end of the Anyang occupation was accompanied by a corresponding decline in the bronze industry. Against this, one can only protest that the appearance of bronze or ore fragments under or within the Hsiao-t'un foundations is unlikely to be any more than fortuitous, since the major foundries—the workshops which produced the masterpieces of Shang bronze art and by whose creativity the florescence or alleged decline of the bronze industry must be gauged—were surely not located within the confines of the royal or ceremonial precincts which the Hsiao-t'un foundations represent. The negative bronze evidence from among the ping-group foundations cannot reasonably be adduced to support the contention of a failing bronze art at the end of the An-yang period.

In short, while the ch'iao-i—ping foundation groupings may well represent a general southward chronological development, the theory of “beginning—florescence—decline” which the excavators seek to impose on this sequence must be seen to rest on no evidence which cannot be given some other more reasonable or more convincing interpretation. A more objective appraisal of the ping-group foundations might well conclude that—while they do, in all probability, postdate most (though not necessarily all) of the i-group foundations—their smaller scale, more complex arrangement, and innovative construction techniques actually reflect only their relative lateness, sophistication, and possible specialized function, not—in any readily apparent fashion—their architectural or technological decline. Yet, one must recall, it is to the alleged technological decline represented by the ping-group foundations that Li Chi has pointed in his explanation of the “primitive” (i.e. decadent) qualities characteristic of the Style I and II bronzes recovered from the three ping-group burials. The dating of these three burials in relation to the ping-group foundations and to the other Hsiao-t’un burials containing bronze vessels must therefore be called into question.

THE HSIAO-T’UN BURIALS CONTAINING BRONZE VESSELS

Of the large numbers of graves discovered by the Academia Sinica excavators in the vicinity of the Hsiao-t’un foundations, only ten were found to contain bronze vessels (a total of seventy-six items). Table 2 presents a summary of the nature and locations of the seven richest and most important of these burials, together with an indication of the stylistic range of their attendant bronze vessels, assessed according to Lochr’s Five Styles. In the crucial matter of the

---

13 Ibid., pp. 329–332.
dating of these burials and their contents, the excavators have chosen to rely exclusively on the clues offered by their position in relation to the various foundations (dated, as suggested above, according to oracle bone evidence) and to disregard as too uncertain whatever stylistic evidence the vessels themselves might advance. Thus, M222, M188, M238 and M32—associated with the early stage of i-11 or with the sacrificial burials which supposedly accompanied the construction of i-7—have accordingly been dated (in that order) to the reign of Tsu Chia, while M331, M333 and M388—associated with the ping-group foundations—have been assigned to the end of the An-yang period.

The wisdom and validity of this method of dating these burials can be evaluated only through a careful, vessel-by-vessel examination of their contents in order to determine whether the stylistic evidence offered by the bronzes confirms or contradicts the excavators’ conclusions. Classified according to Loehr’s Five Styles, it becomes evident that all of the bronze vessels from the ping-group burials belong—with only one exception—to the Styles I, II, III, and IV: only the M331 fang-yu (fig. 4) with ram heads protruding from its four corners and three-dimensional masks attached to its shoulder qualifies as Style V—the An-yang relief style. Yet even this vessel is by no means an example of An-yang bronze art in its mature or late phase: its rather timid proportions and flimsy casting technique—as contrasted, for example, with the artistic perfection of the noble Middle An-yang fang-yu of essentially similar design in the Hakutsuru Museum (fig.

38, and 40–48; and his two monographs on the ku and chüeh (see above, note 7) as well as the third in the same series on the chia (Yin-hsi ch’u-t’u ch’ing-t’ung chia-hsing-ch’i chih yen-chiu 殷墟出土青銅單形器之研究 [Studies on the chia bronze vessels excavated from Yin-hsi]) (Nankang, 1968). Also important are: Shih Chang-ju, “Yin-hsi tsui-chih chih chung-yao fa-hsien; Fu: Lu Hsiao-t’un ti-ts’eng 殷墟出土之重要器古—附論小屯地層 [The most recent important discoveries at Yin-hsi; Appendix: The stratigraphy of Hsiao-t’un], KKHJP, vol. 2, 1947, pp. 1–81; an English version of this article by M. Loehr, “The Stratigraphy of Hsiao-t’un (An-yang) with a Chapter on Hsiao-t’un Foundation Burials and Yin Religious Customs,” Ars Orientalis, vol. 2 (1957), pp. 439–457; Shih Chang-ju, “Hsiao-t’un C-ch’iu-t’e mu-tsang ch’üan 小屯C區的墓葬群 [The group of burials from the C-sector at Hsiao-t’un], Chung-yang Yen-chia-yüan Li-shih Yü-yen Yen-chiu-so chi-k’ou 中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊 [Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica—hereafter BHIJP?], vol. 23, part 2 (1952), pp. 447–487; Umehara, Yin-hsi, pls. 64–66; and M. Loehr, ACAS, vol. 7, p. 50, Appendix 1, where various Hsiao-t’un vessels are designated according to his Styles I–IV.

15 Shih Chang-ju, Hsiao-t’un, p. 319.

16 Concerning a lei from M333 decorated with a large, awkwardly fashioned relief mask (Umehara, Yin-hsi, pl. 64/3) and a very similar vessel from M3, Pai-chia-chuang, Cheng-chou (Chang Chien-chung, “Cheng-chou-shih Pai-chia-chuang,” pl. 12), it should be observed that typologically both of these antedate the lei vessels of Style III, and that the subsidiary shoulder frieze on the M333 bronze is still of Style II. In these cases, the mere presence of relief decor is not sufficient to qualify the vessels as Style V, as Soper contended (“A Note,” p. 9), but should be seen rather as a rare type of experimental “proto-relief,” which precedes the true Style V and bears no relationship to it. The use of relief on a vessel is thus not in itself an automatic indication of Style V date: only that style of relief carries chronological significance which in design and motif bears a demonstrable evolutionary relationship to the preceding flush designs of Style IV and which occurs on vessel-types technically and typologically more mature than those of Style IV. The lei are therefore correctly attributed to Style II, pre-An-yang; and the source of their kind of relief, since it is not artistically evolved from preceding bronze designs, is to be sought in some other medium (here apparently clay-modeling).
The Hakutsuru fang-yu may have come from the same An-yang tomb as such splendid vessels as the large flanged piou, the stately trumpet-mouth tsun, and the magnificent tall chia, all in the Nezu collection (Umehara, Kukan An'yô shô 河南安阳遺寶 [Treasure from An-Yang] [Tokyo, 1949], pls. 39, 36, 48), as well as the fang-lei (ibid., pl. 41) then in the Yamana collection. The clan-sign which each of these vessels carries is found only on such Middle An-yang vessels as these; it does not appear accompanied by ancestor dedications, and its use in late An-yang is characterized by a change in form which may indicate a discontinuity in meaning.

The full argument behind this relatively early dating of the M331 and Hakutsuru fang-yu, together with the chronological distribution of Loehr’s Five Styles among the reigns of the An-yang kings, would carry the discussion far beyond the limits of the present article. Suffice it to say that research has justified the assignment of Styles I–IV to the pre-An-yang and early An-yang periods (i.e., to Cheng-chou, and to the reigns of the An-yang kings Pan Keng through Wu Ting), and the onset of Style V (marking the change to Middle An-yang) to the reign of Tsu Chia.

In other words, the fang-yu cannot be used to support a late An-yang terminal date for M331. This fact renders unnecessary Soper’s argument (“A Note,” p. 9) to the effect that the Cheng-chou style bronzes from M331 must be viewed as genuinely early objects kept as “family heirlooms” to be buried only centuries after they were made in graves belonging, as the excavators claim, to the end of the An-yang period. The other types of evidence mentioned by Soper as indications of the late date of M331 can be quickly dismissed: the twenty-three jade fish from M331 (Umehara, Yinhsî, pl. 157/4) are not essentially different from a jade fish found at Cheng-chou (Chao Ch’îan-ku et al., “Cheng-chou Shang-tai,” pl. 4); the accomplished jade in the form of a plumed human head (Umehara, Yinhsî, pl. 158/2) need not be considered incompatible with an early Tsu Chia date (given the present lack of an established chronology of Shang jades); and finally the “Period IV” oracle bone said to be from M331 (listed as 15. 2. 46 and illustrated in Yinhsî wen-tzu, i-pien, part 3, vol. 4, pl. 1218) turns out to be an insignificant and illegible fragment, worthless, it would seem, as a criterion for the dating of this burial.
resolve themselves into the following relative sequence: M333, M388, M232, M222, M188, M331 and M238, comprising in its entirety a time-span of no more than three generations—the first three generations of the An-yang occupation.

With the invalidation of the excavators’ theory concerning a period of decline at the end of the An-yang occupation, and with the dissociation of the dating of the so-called ping-group burials from that of the ping-group foundations (and the subsequent assignment to the first three generations of the An-yang period of all of the Hsiao-t’un burials containing bronze vessels), the archaeological basis for the objections raised by Li Chi and Umehara to the early dating of the Style I and II bronze vessels excavated from Hsiao-t’un and Cheng-chou would thus be removed; and the early date ascribed to these vessels by Professor Loehr on the basis of style, typology, and quality of casting would be supported, rather than contradicted, by the archaeological evidence.

HSIAO-T’UN CHRONOLOGY

Since in their discussions concerning the absolute chronology of the Hsiao-t’un foundations the excavators have chosen to assume—quite arbitrarily—that all of the Hsiao-t’un remains must postdate the P’an Keng “move,” and since numerous dwelling or refuse pits were found to underlie the chia-group foundations—the earliest rammed-earth constructions at Hsiao-t’un—they have been forced to postulate that between the P’an Keng move and the initiation of rammed-earth construction at An-yang there must have elapsed a period of as much as fifty years during which these pits were dug and occupied. The earliest foundations, i.e. the chia-group, are thus seen to date not from the generation of P’an Keng and his brothers but from the subsequent generation of Wu Ting. The earliest phase of the i-group, which is characterized not only by a great expansion in size and elaboration in technique but also by a change in the orientation of the buildings, is thus attributed to the reign of Tsu Chia and associated with that king’s innovations in matters of sacrifice and divination (Tung Tso-pin’s “Progressive School”). The later foundations of the i-group and those of the ping-group are dated by the excavators to the end of the An-yang period, as noted above.

In criticism of this chronology, one might point out in the first place that it seems unnecessary to assume that Hsiao-t’un was an uninhabited site prior to P’an Keng’s “move,” and that all of the Hsiao-t’un remains must therefore postdate that move. Were the pits underlying the chia-group foundations viewed as essentially “pre-P’an-Keng,” then the need for a lapse of about fifty years prior to the construction of the earliest foundations would be eliminated and many of the chia-group and some of the northernmost i-group foundations could be attributed to the first generation of kings ruling at An-yang—P’an Keng, Hsiao Hsin, and Hsiao I. Wu Ting as well as Tsu Chia could then be seen as responsible for the first conspicuously large i-group foundations, including i-7 and the early stratum of i-11. It does not, however, seem appropriate to date all of the sacrificial burials located to the south of i-7 as contemporary with that foundation or with each other:

20 Shih Chang-ju, Hsiao-t’un, pp. 319, 332.
the fittings associated with the chariot burials M20, M40, M45, M202 and M204 are considerably later in style than the bronze vessels from M188 and M238 (both of which the excavators have nevertheless included among the so-called i-7 or “northern section” burials), thus suggesting not only that these two burials are earlier in date but also that their presence in the vicinity of the later sacrificial interments must be viewed as essentially fortuitous. M232, M331, M333 and M368 should be seen as independent burials of the same general period as M188 and M238 but not associated with any near-by foundation. The later i-group foundations, such as i-8 and the upper stratum of i-11, as well as the entire ping-group, should be recognized as works of the reigns of Wen Ting, Ti I, and Ti Hsin—though not as indicative of any supposed “decline” at that time.

ADDENDUM:

THE CHRONOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HSIAO-T’UN AND HSI-PEI-KANG

The vexing problem of the relative sequence of the large tombs in the necropolis at Hsi-pei-kang 西北岡 (and their possible synchronization with the Hsiao-t’un foundations) may forever defy adequate solution despite what would appear to be its relative simplicity: eleven large tombs (including the discovery at Wu-kuan-ts’un but omitting the anomalous M1567 in Hsi-pei-kang West) to be matched with the eleven ruling An-yang kings (omitting the defeated Ti Hsin, for whom it is unlikely that a major burial was ever completed). After the initial efforts by Li Chi to establish both a sequence for the tombs and a synchronization with the Hsiao-t’un foundations using as evidence the large numbers of carved bone hairpins recovered from both sites, the Academia Sinica scholars have remained judiciously silent on the problem; and the publication of the large tombs now in progress will apparently not concern itself with speculations regarding their relative chronology or the possible identity of their occupants. The excavators have instead assumed the not unreasonable position that Hsi-pei-kang has not been excavated in its entirety and that the present number of large tombs may well be increased in the future (as it was in 1950 by the discovery at Wu-kuan ts’un), thereby making a certainty of what is already a distinct possibility—namely, that large tombs were constructed for queen-mothers as well as for kings, thus rendering impossible an exact equation between the excavated tombs and the sequence of male rulers. (If the three relatively large ramped tombs located at Hou-kang and excavated in 1933 and 1971 are also to be counted, then the total of known tombs even now exceeds the number of ruling kings.)


The unpromising material upon which Li Chi based his studies of the sequence of Hsi-pei-kang tombs—typologically arranged series of similarly designed bone hairpins—suffers from the same deficiencies characteristic of virtually all of the remains excavated from the Hsi-pei-kang tombs: the most important and stylistically telling objects of whatever kind had disappeared from the tombs prior to their excavation; and what was left is simply too poor, too meager, and too inconclusive to afford sufficient criteria for a sound chronological sequence. Li Chi’s sequence, based on the comparison of four-hundred and twenty hairpins, places at its beginning the tomb M1001, followed by M1550 and M1004 (in an undetermined order of priority) and then by M1002, M1003, M1500, M1217, M1174, concluding with M1443 and the Hsiao-t’un burial M331. The tombs are not assigned to the various ruling kings nor to the successive generations of the Anyang occupation. In the sequence, the order of M1001, M1550, M1004 and M1002 is stratigraphically determined by the fact that M1550 and M1004 both impinge on M1001, while M1002 impinges on M1004 (text fig. 3); but the remainder of the sequence was considered only tentative by Li Chi. He nevertheless found reason to associate M1003 closely with M1002 and to relate M1217, M1443, and Hsiao-t’un M331, citing Shih Chang-ju to the effect that M331 is to be dated in or after Oracle Bone Period IV because of its association with the ping-group foundations.

In another slightly earlier article, Li Chi examined the progressive five-stage dissolution of the design on a certain type of hairpin characterized by a bird representa-
tion and, by documenting its occurrence in various locations in Hsiao-t’un and Hsi-pei-kang, managed to establish a synchronization of Hsiao-t’un i-7 with Hsi-pei-kang M1001 (at the hairpin Stage 2) and (at hairpin Stage 3) of Hsiao-t’un jing-1 with Hsi-pei-kang M1002.\(^\text{25}\) Less plausibly, Li Chi also concluded that since his hairpin Stage 1 was found at Hsiao-t’un but not at Hsi-pei-kang, and since Stage 2 connects i-7 (a foundation which he dates to the middle—or Tsu Chi—a period of Hsiao-t’un construction, following Shih Chang-ju) with M1001 (which he considers to head the sequence of Hsi-pei-kang tombs), then the supposedly earliest Hsi-pei-kang tomb M1001 coincides not with the beginning but with the middle period of Hsiao-t’un.\(^\text{26}\)

It should be observed, however, that the absence from Hsi-pei-kang of Stage 1 hairpins cannot be considered to be more than fortuitous, and that the quite considerable disparity in form between the Stage 2 and Stage 3 hairpins must be understood to indicate the omission from the sequence of a certain number of unillustrated intermediate stages.\(^\text{27}\) This fact strongly suggests that while M1002 must be at least two generations later than M1001 (for stratigraphical reasons) it is unlikely to be merely two generations later.

As a possible alternative to Li Chi’s sequence of the Hsi-pei-kang tombs, Soper has suggested that M1129, M1443, and the 1933 Hou-kang burial be assigned to P’an Keng, Hsiao Hsin, and Hsiao I, and that the stratigraphically related tombs M1001, M1550, and M1002 be given to Wu Ting and his three sons (including the non-ruling prince Tsu Chi).\(^\text{28}\) He does not, however, assign the remaining tombs. While his attribution of the three smallest and most primitive-appearing tombs to the first generation An-yang kings may seem quite plausible, the dating of the two large M1004 fang-ting 方鼎 to the third generation ruling at An-yang cannot be reconciled with the history of the fang-ting as a vessel-


\(^{26}\) Ibid., pp. 815–816. Kwang-chih Chang, adopting and advancing Li Chi’s conclusions without hesitation, has gone so far as to attribute the supposedly earliest Hsi-pei-kang tomb, M1001, to P’an Keng, thereby equating the (assumed) 273 years of the An-yang occupation with a “Hsi-pei-kang Phase” comprising all of the large burials and equivalent to a “Hsiao-t’un II Phase.” The foundations and pits of “Hsiao-t’un I” (presumably all those prior to i-7) are therefore seen to be pre-P’an Keng (Chang, The Archaeology of Ancient China, rev. ed. [New Haven, 1968], pp. 222–225). It should, however, be noted that Chang’s attribution of M1001 to P’an Keng derives from his own quite unconvincing theory concerning the kinship system of the Shang ruling house (Chang, “Shang-wang miao-hao hsin-k’ao 商王廟號新考 [Posthumous names of the Shang kings and the Royal Genealogy of the Shang Dynasty: a Sociological Analysis], Chang-yang Ten-chiu-yiian Min-tsu-hsüeh Ten-chiu-so chi-k’an 中央研究院民族學研究所集刊 [Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica], vol. 15 (Spring, 1963), pp. 65–94) and its reflection in certain “dualistic” aspects of Shang culture, including the East-West division of the Hsi-pei-kang necropolis (Chang, “Some Dualistic Phenomena in Shang Society,” Journal of Asian Studies, vol. 24, no. 1 [November, 1964], pp. 45–61).

\(^{27}\) Li Chi, BIHP, vol. 29, part 2 (November, 1958), pls. 1–2; and AA, vol. 22, nos. 1–2 (1959), fig. 2.

\(^{28}\) Soper, “A Note,” pp. 26–27.
type nor with the chronological development of the relief style in Shang bronze decor: these vessels, and presumably the tomb in which they were found, belong instead to the fifth of the eight An-yang generations. Moreover, Soper’s attribution of M1002 to the generation of Tsu Chia does not take into account Li Chi’s synchronization of that tomb with the late Hsiao-t’un foundation ping-1.

Although, for reasons already mentioned, it seems unwise to attempt to assign the individual Hsi-pei-kang tombs to specific An-yang kings (or queens), nevertheless the recognition of a certain likely relative sequence among these tombs does serve to invest them with a greater historical—as opposed to merely archaeological—interest, and to correct the misinterpretations to which the relationship between Hsiao-t’un and Hsi-pei-kang has been subjected by Li Chi and Kwang-chih Chang. The sequence suggested in Table 3 must, of course, be regarded as hypothetical in part and tentative at least until all of the tombs have been published in their entirety.

Since, according to this sequence, M1001 is thus not likely to be the earliest tomb at Hsi-pei-kang, and since it is possible that such a tomb as M1443 represents the generation of P’an Keng, it is clear that both the earliest Hsiao-t’un foundations (the chia-group) and the earliest Hsi-pei-kang royal tombs can be viewed as essentially contemporary creations of the first generation ruling at An-yang; and that additions to both Hsiao-t’un and the Hsi-pei-kang necropolis were made continuously throughout the span of the An-yang occupation.
Fig. 1.—Bronze *Ku* from Hsiao-t’un M331. Courtesy, Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei.

Fig. 2.—Bronze *Chüeh* from Hsiao-t’un M333. Courtesy, Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei.

Fig. 3.—Bronze *Ku* from Hsiao-t’un M388. Courtesy, Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei.
Fig. 4.—Bronze Fang-yu from Hsiao-t’un M331. Courtesy, Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei.

Fig. 5.—Bronze Fang-yu from An-yang. Courtesy, Hakutsuru Museum, Kobe.
### Table 1
The An-yang Kings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.</th>
<th>P'an Keng—Hsiao Hsin—Hsiao I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>武丁乙</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| II. | Wu Ting                      |
|     | Oracle Bone Period I         |

| III. | Tsu Keng—Tsu Chia           |
|      | Oracle Bone Period II       |

| IV.  | Lin Hsin—K'ang Ting         |
|      | Oracle Bone Period III      |

| V.   | Wu I                        |
|      | Oracle Bone Period IV       |

| VI.  | Wen Ting                    |
|      | Oracle Bone Period V        |

| VII. | Ti I                        |
|      | Oracle Bone Period V        |

| VIII. | Ti Hsin                     |
|       | Oracle Bone Period V        |
Table 2
The Hsiao-tʻun Burials containing Bronze Vessels

M222 A sacrificial burial with three occupants and three bronze vessels (whose decor corresponds to Loehr’s Style III), underlying the early stratum of i-11 and regarded as a door-guardian burial associated with the construction of the i-11A foundation.a

M188 A sacrificial burial with two occupants and eight vessels (with decor corresponding to Loehr’s Style III), located in the open space between i-7 and i-11. It is regarded (probably erroneously) as one of the large number of sacrificial burials associated with the construction of i-7.b

M238 A sacrificial burial with five occupants and twelve vessels, with decor ranging from the Cheng-chou styles and Style III to Style IV and early Style V, with a predominance of Style IV. Though underlying the upper stratum of i-11 (i-11FN), it is grouped (again probably erroneously) with the sacrificial burials associated with i-7. In the stratigraphical sequence of the i-11 foundation, M222 lies in the sixth stratum from the lowest, with M238 in the eighth stratum, thus suggesting a slight chronological priority for M222.c

M232 A rather large burial with nine occupants and ten vessels (ranging from the Cheng-chou styles to Style III), located in the open space between i-13 and i-14. It has been regarded as the southernmost of the i-7 sacrificial burials, perhaps that of the commanding general of the phalanxes of soldiers interred in those graves.d There is, however, no compelling reason for this association with the i-7 sacrifices.

M331 A rather large burial located in the open space between ping-5 and ping-6, with seven occupants and nineteen vessels, among which the Cheng-chou styles, Style III, Style IV, and Style V are all represented.

M333 Another rather large, independent burial, located also in the open space between ping-5 and ping-6, slightly to the south of M331, with three occupants and ten vessels, all mainly in advanced Cheng-chou styles or transitional to Style III.

M388 The third rather large independent burial located in the open space between ping-5 and ping-6, slightly to the west of M331 and M333, with three occupants and ten vessels, all similar in stylistic range to those of M333.e

---

*a Shih Chang-ju, Hsiao-tʻun, Ti-i pên: I-chih-té fa-hsien yū fa-chüeh, i-pien: Yin-hsü chien-chu i-tsʻun, pp. 113–116, 286; the position of this burial, as well as of M188, M238, and M232, is shown on the map on p. 280, fig. 114.


*d Shih Chang-ju, Hsiao-tʻun, Ti-i pên . . . i-pien: Yin-hsü chien-chu i-tsʻun, pp. 299, 314.

*e The three ping-group burials are discussed by Shih Chang-ju, Ibid., pp. 304–305, 313–314, and associated chronologically with the ping-group foundations on pp. 314 and 316. Their locations are shown Ibid., fig. 116 (present text fig. 2).
### Table 3

**Sequence of Hsi-pei-kang Tombs**  
*(cf. text figs. 3 and 4)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M1443</th>
<th>Hsi-pei-kang East</th>
<th>An-yang first generation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Stratigraphically later than M1004 and associated by Li Chi’s hairpin Stage 3 with the late An-yang Hsiao-t’un foun-
tion ping-1.¹

An inscribed marble kuei fragment from this tomb names the
owner of the Hsiao-ch’en Ssu 小臣盡 fang-yu, a vessel datable by
the style of its inscription to the reign of Ti I. Some bronze ko
with slightly extended lu and bronze fittings decorated in
mature relief style also indicate that this is the latest Hsi-pei-
kang tomb.²

¹ Li Chi, “Chi-hsing pa-lei chi’i wen-shih chih yen-pien,” BIHP, vol. 30, part 1 (1959), pl. ix: no. 75, 77 (both M1443) and no. 68 (M331).

² The numerous small burials in Hsi-pei-kang East were divided by their excavator Liang Sau-yung 樂思永 into nine Groups, among which a certain chronological sequence was thought to exist. Although the evidence has not been published, (Umehara Yin-hsü, p. 23) has listed the sequence as [1]–2–4–3–5–7–M1443–6–M1400–9–M1129–8. However, beyond the chronological relationships which are obvious from the diagram of the site, it is doubtful that this sequence can withstand the test of critical examination: for example, the most advanced bronze vessels yet published from these small burials come from M2046, located in Group 4 which is, nevertheless, among the earliest in the sequence according to Umehara.

³ Kuo Ch’ü-hsün 高去尋, Hou-chia-chuang, Ti-liu pên: 1217-hao Ta-mu 侯家莊第六本 1217 號大墓 [Hou-chia-chuang, vol. VI: M1217] (Taipei, 1968), p. 4; Li Chi, Yin-hsü ch’u-t’u... ku-hsing-ch’i... , pl. 6; Li Chi, Yin-hsü ch’u-t’u... chia-hsing-ch’i... , pl. 17. A crushed and fragmented chih icket of considerably more advanced style originally published with an M1488 provenance (Li Chi, Yin-hsü ch’u-t’u... ch’üeh-hsing-ch’i... , p. 31) is, not mentioned by Kao Ch’ü-hsün in connection with that burial.


⁶ Li Chi, Yin-hsü ch’u-t’u... ku-hsing-ch’i... , pls. 15, 34.

⁷ Ibid., pls. 14, 25, 26, 37/2; Li Chi, Yin-hsü ch’u-t’u... chüeh-hsing-ch’i... , pls. 37–40; Ch’en Meng-chia 陳夢家, “Yin-tai t’ung-ch’i”殷代銅器 [Yin dynasty bronze vessels., KKKP], vol. 7 (1954), pls. 5, 6, 7, 15, 19 and 20.

⁸ Umehara, Yin-hsü, pl. 60 and 61.

⁹ Kao Ch’ü-hsün, Hou-chia-chuang, Ti-erh pen: 1001-hao Ta-mu 侯家莊第二本 1001 號大墓 [Hou-chia-chuang, vol. III: M1002] (Taipei, 1965). It should perhaps be noted here that the fragments of white pottery with crudely incised designs illustrated in pls. 77–80 are the same as those published by H. Brinker (“The Decor Styles of Shang White Pottery,” Archives of Asian Art, vol. 21 [1967–68], pp. 39–62, fig. 14), who, by stressing their superficial resemblance to some incised pottery from Erh-li-t’ou, three years sought to establish a pre-An-yang origin for white pottery. The fact that these fragments were excavated—not from Hsiao-t’un, as Brinker mistakenly supposed—but from a late An-yang royal tomb generally invalidates this hypothesis. Other fragments of the same type were found in M1217.

A GROUP OF EARLY WESTERN CHOU PERIOD BRONZE VESSELS*

By THOMAS LAWTON**

I

In 1968, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer presented a Chinese bronze kuei vessel to the Freer Gallery of Art (fig. 1). For approximately fifty years the kuei had been relatively inaccessible at Mrs. Meyer’s summer home in Mt. Kisco, New York. When the vessel was uncrated at the Freer Gallery, staff members were pleasantly surprised to find what had been described simply as a “Chou dynasty kuei” was none other than the T’ai-pao kuei 太保鼎, one of the most famous bronze ritual vessels assigned to the early Western Chou period.²

The T’ai-pao kuei is said to be one of seven bronze vessels unearthed sometime during the mid-nineteenth century at Liang-shan 梁山, in Shou-chang Hsien 塞張 縣, Shantung province. There is some question as to exactly when these vessels were unearthed and which ones were the original seven. The unexpected reappearance of the T’ai-pao kuei provides an appropriate opportunity for a reexamination of questions relating to the original discovery of the seven vessels, to their stylistic diversity, and to the significance of their inscriptions.

II

The earliest dated reference to these vessels occurs in Chi-chou chin-shih chih 淄州金石志 by Hsü Tsung-kan 徐方幹 (1796–


* I should like to acknowledge my gratitude to Professor Max Loehr of Harvard University and to Dr. Virginia C. Kane of the University of Michigan, who generously read the manuscript, offered a number of helpful suggestions, and corrected many of my errors. Hin-cheung Lovell and Joseph M. Upton, my colleagues at the Freer Gallery, have given me encouragement and helped with the revision of the text. All responsibility for error is, of course, my own.

** Assistant Director, Freer Gallery of Art.

1 Accession no. 68.29. Height, 23.5 cm. (9 1/4 in.); diameter, 37.5 cm. (14 3/4 in.).
1866). In his discussion of the individual bronzes, Hsü quotes the opinion of Yang To 楊鐸. These same opinions appear in Yang To's *Han-ch'ing-ko chin-shih chi* 漢銘卿金石記. Unfortunately, all editions of this last work available to me are undated.

Hsü Tsung-kan states that the seven vessels had been acquired "recently" by Chung Yang-t'ien 鍾養田 (Chung Yen-p'ei 鍾衍培) of Chi-ning 濟寧, Shantung, from the foot of Liang-shan in Shou-chang. He does not elaborate on the circumstances of the discovery nor does he state specifically that all seven bronzes came from the same burial site. The preface of *Chi-chou chin-shih chi* is dated in correspondence with September 24, 1843, and the work was published in the spring of 1845. Since Hsü Tsung-kan used the phrase "acquired recently," it would seem that the bronzes were unearthed no later than 1843.

Hsü enumerates the seven vessels as: three ts'ung 萬, one shou 罡, one hsien 禮, and one chin-shih 章. He adds the note that two of the bronze vessels, the *Lu-kung ting* 魯公鼎 and the *Hsi-tsun* 鄉尊, already had gone to the K'ung 孔 family in Chü-fu 曲阜, Shantung. Hsü then proceeds to discuss six of the seven vessels in some detail.

---

3 Tzu, Shu-jen 前人 and Po-chen 伯慎; kao, Ssu-wei-hsin-ch'ai chu-jen 溪未信齋主人.

4 Tzu, Shih-ch'ing - 石經 and Shih-tao-jen 石造人. A native of Shang-ch'eng 商城, Honan, Yang To was active during the T'ung-chih (A.D. 1862-74) and Kuang-hsi (A.D. 1875-1907) periods.

5 Ch'i-ju-liao-ch'ai ts'ung-shu 此卷書叢叢, 1:4b. Yang To listed five vessels in detail: *Shao-po ting*, *Shao-po ko*, *T'ai-pao ting*, *T'ai-pao i* and *Hsi-tsun*. The entry discussing the *Hsi-tsun* (1:8b-9a) is separated from the entries of the other four vessels, which may explain why it apparently was overlooked by Ch'en Meng-chia.

6 Yang To recorded that the *Hsi-tsun* and the *Lu-kung ting* had gone to the Confucian temple in Chü-fu rather than to the K'ung family.

He provides the inscriptions with possible interpretations, gives measurements, a description of the decoration and the owner of each vessel.

The first of the six vessels included in *Chi-chou chin-shih chi* is the *Shao-po ting* 召伯鼎, usually referred to as the *Hsien ting* 晉鼎 or the *Po-hsien ting* 伯禽鼎, in the Ch'ing-hua University Collection, Peking (fig. 3), in accordance with the generally accepted practice of designating a vessel by the name of the person who commissioned it rather than by the name of the person to whom it is dedicated. Hsü states that the vessel was already damaged at the time it was unearthed and during later repair some of the characters were covered with lacquer, making them difficult to decipher. Consequently, he was able to transcribe only twenty-four of the thirty-nine characters. The *ting* was then in the collection of Chung Yang-t'ien. Some variation is given to the overall shape of the *ting* by setting both handles upright on the projecting lip and by using a rather flat, low-slung body. The sole ornamentation on the outer surface of the *ting* is a single raised "bow-string" band just below the lip.

The *T'ai-pao fang-ting* 太保方鼎 from the Tientsin Museum (fig. 5) is the second

---

7 In his discussion of the *Hsien ting*, Ch'en Meng-chia, part 3, *KKHP*, vol. 11 no. 1 (1956), pp. 88-89, mentions that the inscription originally was so heavily encrusted that it could not be completely read. Later cleaning made it possible to obtain a clearer rubbing.

8 According to Ch'en Meng-chia, part 2, *KKHP*, p. 96, the *ting* was owned by Chung Yang-t'ien 鍾養田, Li Tsung-t'ai 李宗岱, and T'ao Tsu-kuang 陶祖光, before being acquired by Ch'ing-hua 清華 University in Peking in the winter of 1948.

9 The *T'ai-pao fang-ting* is poorly reproduced in * Wen-še*, 文物 vol. 111, no. 11, 1959, p. 59, where there is a discussion by Fan Ju-sen 樊汝森.
vessel recorded in *Chi-chou chin-shih chih*. Strong, hooked flanges accentuate the corners and centers of each of the four sides of the vessel, halving the *tao-t'ieh* masks in the narrow upper register. Similar hooked flanges divide the horned masks at the top of the four legs. Descending triangular motifs complete the ornamentation on each of the four sides of the body of the *ting*. An unusual feature of the *ting* are the small, horned monsters which surmount the two arched handles. Equally remarkable are the fluted discs affixed horizontally to the lower section of each leg. These features are foreign to the Shang bronze vocabulary but quite in keeping with the more capricious experiments made by artisans during the early Western Chou period. Hsiu correctly deciphered the three-character inscription as *T'ai-pao chu* 太保鼎, which can be rendered “cast by the *T'ai-pao*.” He identifies *T'ai-pao* as a title of Shih 周, Duke of Shao 召公, 11 and poses the question as to whether or not the *T'ai-pao fang-ting*, the *Shao-po ting*, the *hsien* and *ho*, all of which are said to have been unearthed at the same time, might not have been the vessels of the Duke of Shao. Again Hsiu does not elaborate as to why he enumerates only these four vessels of the seven as having

---

10 The close stylistic relationship between the handles of the *T'ai-pao fang-ting* and those on the well-known *Ch'eng Wang fang-ting* 成王方鼎 in the collection of the Nelson Gallery, Kansas City, is immediately apparent. In his discussion of the inscriptions on the four *Tso-ts'e Ta fang-ting* 乍鼎大方鼎, Ch'en Meng-chia, part 3, *KKHP*, pp. 85–86, raises the possibility that two of the problematical *i ting* 異鼎, said to have been made by Shao Kung 召公 for Wu Wang and Ch'eng Wang, might be the *T'ai-pao fang-ting* and the *Ch'eng Wang fang-ting*. The identification must remain an extremely tentative one, since in one case the person for whom the vessel was made is not mentioned in the inscription, and in the other, the name of the maker is omitted. In any case, the *T'ai-pao fang-ting* and the *Ch'eng Wang fang-ting* are not a pair, and Ch'en Meng-chia asserts there originally were two pairs of fang-ting. Nonetheless, the two fang-ting must have been made during a relatively short period of each other early in the reign of K'ang Wang.


11 The precise relationship between Shih and the Chou royal family remains somewhat uncertain. The *Shih-chi*, 34:1a, merely records that Shih's surname, Chi 姬, was the same as that of the royal family. Huang-fu Mi 黄甫MouseDown (A.D. 215–282), in his *Ti-wang shih-chi* 帝王世紀, states that Shih was a son of Wen 文王 but born of a concubine. Other sources suggest Shih belonged to a branch of the Chou royal family. Ch'en Meng-chia, part 2, *KKHP* p. 122, summarizes the scant bits of information regarding Shih's background. Dobson, *Archaic Chinese*, p. 125, suggests that Shih may have been a cousin of Wu Wang 武王. Herrlce G. Credel, in his *The Origins of Skatecraft in China* (Chicago, 1970), gives a well balanced account of the role of the Duke of Shao. In footnote 144, page 358, he neatly sums up the problem with his comment, “Considering his eminence, the ancestry of the Duke of Shao is remarkably difficult to determine.”

According to traditional literature, when Wu Wang defeated Chou 智, the last ruler of Shang, he enfeoffed Shih as Duke of Shao, investing him with the principality of Yen 燕. Thus Shih became one of the *San-kung* 三公, “three dukes,” the highest ranking office of the Chou dynasty beneath that of the King. In the *Sha-ching*, Shih is referred to as Chih Shih 吉奭 (J. Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, Hong Kong, 1970, vol. 3, The Shao King, V. xvi. 1); Pao Shih 保奭 (*ibid.*, V. xvi. 19); and *T'ai-pao Shih* 太保奭 (*ibid.*, V. xxii. 3). According to Ch'en Meng-chia, Shih also is identified in bronze inscriptions as *Sha-po* 召伯 (part 1, *KKHP* p. 141; part 2, p. 95, and part 3, pp. 89–90); *T'ai-pao* 大保 (part 2, p. 97); and as *Huang-tien-yin T'ai-pao* 皇天尹太保 (part 3, pp. 84–86). While records differ as to when Shih died, there seems general agreement that he lived a venerable age. Ch'en Meng-chia (part 2, p. 95) lists the references to Shih's age.
been unearthed together, or why he suggests that the Shao-po ting and the ho could have belonged to the Duke of Shao, since their inscriptions preclude such a relationship.

Hṣü next discusses the T’ai-pao i 太保彝, or T’ai-pao kuei (fig. 1). After offering a surprisingly accurate analysis of the difficult thirty-four character inscription, Hṣü notes that the vessel was in the collection of Chung Yang-t’ien. The T’ai-pao kuei, like the T’ai-pao fang-ting, displays striking innovations in its ornamentation. The four massive handles are surmounted by horned bovine heads above the wings, tails, and claws of headless birds. Similar handles occur on a number of early Western Chou kuei and are regarded by Ch’en Meng-chia as one of the characteristic features of bronzes made during that period. The main decoration on the vessel consists of two unusually large t’ao-t’ieh masks modelled in extraordinarily high relief; the eyebrows project over the large eyes in two separate planes. Four k’uei dragons in rounded relief ornament the register above the raised foot rim. The use of plain rounded relief is characteristic of early Western Chou bronze decor.

The fourth vessel included in Hṣü Tsung-kan’s work is the Shao-po ho 召伯盈, usually referred to as the Po-hsien ho 伯霖盈, whose present whereabouts is unknown (fig. 6). Pairs of raised “bowstring” bands on the neck and cover of the ho and a flattened buffalo head surmounting the curved handle are the only ornamentation on the vessel. Possibly the cover was at one time attached to the body of the ho by a linking member. Apparently the four-legged ho was a form developed during the late Shang and early Western Chou period. The ten-character inscription occurs inside both the cover and the body of the ho. Hṣü recorded the inscription correctly, with the single exception of the second character hsien 晑, which he misread as mao 篠. A comment by the Ch’ing dynasty scholar, Hṣü Han 許瀚, included in Hṣü Tsung-kan’s entry, points out that the Shao-po mentioned in the inscriptions would suggest that the vessels may have belonged to the family of the Duke of Shao. He notes further that the Duke was invested with the State of Yen 燕, while the vessels were found in

12 For references to further attempts to decipher the inscription, see footnote 1.
13 According to Ch’en Meng-chia, part 2, KKHP p. 96, after being excavated, the kuei was owned successively by Chung Yen-p’ei, Li Tsung-tai, and Pu-lun 潘倫 (a fifth generation descendant of the Ch’en-jung Emperor, and the first son of Ts’ai-chih 蔡治 [died 1880]). The kuei was then acquired by Huang Chün, who published it in his Tsin-kwè-chai so-chien chi-chin 田氏私人典籍 [sic: a Chinese character is missing]. Apparently subsequently sold it. Presumably, the kuei was then purchased by Mrs. Meyer, perhaps directly from Huang Chün. Later references to the kuei usually mention that its whereabouts is unknown.
15 Some characteristic examples are reproduced by Higuchi, “Sei-shū dōki no kenkyū,” pl. 3.1; and in K’ai-kung t’ung-ch’i t’u-lü 故宮銅器圖録 (Taipei, 1950) hšia, pp. 16, 17, 19.
16 Tzu, Yin-lin 印林. A native of Jib-chao 佶, Shantung province, Hṣü was a ch’i-jen 菱人 of 1835. He attained the position of District Director of Schools of I Hsien 一百, Shantung. A noted commentator on classical texts, he was sometimes referred to as the “first scholar of the north.”
17 The extent encompassed by the State of Yen during the early Western Chou period is uncertain. Ch’en Meng-chia attempts to trace the possible
Shou-chang, which is located in the area of the ancient State of Ch’i 齐. As a possible explanation of the unexpected provenance, Hsü Han then cites the discussion between Mencius and the King of Ch’i, wherein Mencius asks the King to cease removing the “important vessels” (chung-ch’i 重器) from the State of Yen, which he had recently captured.18 Following a long discussion on the origin of the term ho, Hsü Tsung-kan notes that the vessel was in the collection of Chung Yang-t’ien.19

The fifth, and certainly the most unusual of the vessels found at Liang-shan, is the Hsiao-ch’en Yü tsun 小臣艅鈞, now in the Avery Brundage Collection in San Francisco (fig. 8).20 Without doubt, one of the boundaries of the early Western Chou State by studying the limits of the State of Yen during the Warring States period. In part 2, p. 123 of his researches on Western Chou bronze vessels, Ch’en describes a southern wall dating from the Warring States Period and having a western extremity between southwestern Hsien 易縣 and An-hsin 安新 and its eastern extremity west of modern Yung-ch’ing 永清, Hopei. T’ung Kuei-ch’en 佟桂臣 has discussed this problem in his article entitled, “K’ao-kung-hsüeh shang han-t’ai chi han-t’ai i-ch’en ti tsung-p’ei ch’iang-yü 考古學上漢代及漢代以前的東北疆域[‘Archeological Study of Northeastern Frontiers during the Han and Pre-Han periods’], KKHP, vol. 11 (1956), pp. 29–42, in which he states that the northern boundary of the wall constructed by Yen to ward off invaders ran west from Wei-ch’ang 魏昌 in Hopei province, by way of Ch’i-feng 赤峰, Hsin-hui 新惠 and Sui-tung 隘東 to Liao-yuan 遼源.

18 See Legge, I, 11, xi, 4. Higuchi Takayasu, Sei-shi doki no kenkyū, p. 26, offers yet another suggestion: when Ch’eng Wang granted the land of Hsü 齐 (which Higuchi believes included the area of modern Liang-shan), the Duke of Shao gave it to his eldest younger brother, Chih 季, who was then the first Marquis of Yen, with his capital located at modern Ch’ü-fu. When the Duke of Chou enfeoffed his eldest son, Po-ch’iin 坡季, with the State of Lu 鲁, Chih graciously yielded his capital to Po-ch’iin and moved to I-chou 易州. Higuchi reasons that since the brother of the Duke of Shao at one time resided finest examples of ancient Chinese sculpture still extant, the rhinoceros displays an astonishing realism. Some parallels for realism of this type are found in such vessels as the delightful tapir tsun, formerly in the Oeder collection,21 the somewhat ungainly horse tsun excavated in Shensi province in 1956,22 or in subordinate details like the powerful rams’ heads capping the handles of some bronzes belonging to the Ch’en-ch’en ortex group.23 The excessively meticulous realism of the Western Han period rhinoceros, decorated with gold inlay patterns and excavated in Shensi province in 1963,24 provides a telling contrast with the simple monumentality of the Hsiao-ch’en Yü tsun. Hsü Tsung-kan was in the area it should not be considered strange that the bronzes with inscriptions relating to the Duke of Shao were discovered at Liang-shan.

19 According to Ch’en Meng-chia, part 2, KKHP p. 96 the ho was owned consecutively by Chung Yen-p’ei, Li Tsung-t’ai, Ch’ien Yu-shan 錢有山, P’u-lun, Tuan-fang 端方 and Jung Keng.

20 The vessel and its inscription have been discussed by A. G. Wenley in his article entitled, “A Hsi Tsun from the Avery Brundage Collection,” Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America, vol. 6 (1952), pp. 41–43.

21 Jung Keng, Shang Chou i-ch’i t’ung-k’ao, pl. 698.

22 Excavated at Li-t’ung 李村, Mêi Hsien 魁縣, Shensi province. The tsun is reproduced and discussed by Kuo Mo-jo 郭沫若, “Li-ch’i-ming k’ao-shih” 鼎器銘考釋 (“Inscriptions on the Li Vessels Examined’’), KKHP, vol. 16, no. 2 (1957), pl. I-1, pp. 6–7; and Li Ch’ang-ch’ing 李長慶 and T’ien Yeh 田野, “Tsu-kuo li-shih wen-wu ti yu i-t’u chung-yao fa-lüen” 蘇國歷史文物的又一重要發現 (“Another Important Discovery of Chinese Historical Cultural Relics”), Wen-wu ts’an-k’ao to tzu-lüo 文物參考資料, 1957, no. 4, p. 5.

23 Visible on the Hakutsuraru ya, published by Mizuno, In Shu seidoki to gyoku, pl. 103.

24 “Shan-hsi Hsing-p’ing Hsien ch’u-t’u ti ku-t’ai k’an-chin t’ung hsi-taun” 陝西興平縣出土的古代鍾金錘銘文 (“The Ancient Bronze Rhinoceros with Gold Inlay Excavated at Hsing-p’ing Hsien, Shensi”), Wen-wu, vol. 177, no. 7 (1965) pls. 1–2, pp. 12–16.
fully aware of the extraordinary aspects of the vessel, which he ascribed to the Chou dynasty, because it was said to have been found at Liang-shan together with the other bronzes bearing inscriptions which mention the T’ai-pao. Hsü ends his description of the Hsiao-ch’en Yü tsun by noting that it was in Jen-ch’eng 任城, Shangtung, before being acquired by the Yen-sheng kung 衍聖公 (“Most Holy Duke”), a title conferred upon the lineal descendants of Confucius by the Sung emperor Jen-tsung 仁宗 (r. A.D. 1023–63) in 1055.

Finally, Hsü describes another, a smaller T’ai-pao fang-ting,25 noting once again that it was among the seven vessels “newly” unearthed at Liang-shan. He provides no specific description of the ornamentation of the smaller fang-ting, but discusses the inscription (fig. 14), which he interprets as being the four characters T’ai-pao is’e i 太保冊彝. Like the Hsiao-ch’en Yü tsun just discussed, the smaller T’ai-pao fang-ting also was in Jen-ch’eng before being acquired by the lineal descendant of Confucius in Ch’u-tu. Apparently the second T’ai-pao fang-ting has never been reproduced; its whereabouts is unknown.

All indications are that the Hsiao-ch’en Yü tsun and the smaller T’ai-pao fang-ting are the same two vessels mentioned by Hsü as having been acquired by the K’ung family. In his first reference to the two bronzes, however, Hsü referred to the ting as the Lu-kung ting. Only three ting were found at Liang-shan: the Hsien ting and the two

T’ai-pao fang-ting. By discussing the smaller T’ai-pao fang-ting together with the Hsiao-ch’en Yü tsun, and clearly stating that both had been unearthed at Liang-shan and both were in the collection of the lineal descendant of Confucius, Hsü eliminates the possibility of an additional ting being involved. It may be that his use of the name Lu-kung ting was yet another polite reference to the fact that the smaller T’ai-pao fang-ting had been acquired by the lineal descendant of Confucius. In any case, this point has continued to cause some difficulty for later scholars.

A different date for the discovery of the bronzes is provided by Fang Chün-i 方濬益 in his Chui-i-chai i-ch’i k’ao-shih 經遠齋器考釋,26 where he records the three-character inscription on the larger T’ai-pao fang-ting (fig. 5), and states that the ting had been found at Shou-chang during the Hsien-feng period (1551–61).27 Fang lists only six vessels: three ting, one tui (the T’ai-pao kuei), one hsien, and one ho; he omits any reference to the tsun.

Writing in 1940, Jung Keng, in his Shang Chou i-ch’i t’ung-k’ao,28 records that six vessels were found at Shou-chang during the Tao-kuang period (1821–50). Jung Keng lists the six vessels as: the T’ai-pao kuei, the T’ai-shih Yü hsien 大史友彝 now in the Su-Ting-yüan 定遠, Anhui province. He served as District Magistrate of Chin-shan 金山, Kiangsu province. Chung-kuo jen-ming ta-tzu-tien 中國人名大辭典 65.2.

25 Fan Ju-ên (see footnote 9) gives the measurements of the larger T’ai-pao fang-ting as 50.7 cm. high and the perimeter of the square bowl as 23 by 36 cm. According to the measurements provided by Hsü Tsung-kan (Chi-chou chihih-chih, 11a-b), the smaller T’ai-pao fang-ting stood less than half as high.

26 Tsu, Tzu-t’ing 子鼇, Fang was a native of
mitomo Collection, Kyoto (fig. 10), two T'ai-pao ting, the Po-hsien ting, and the Po-hsien ho.\textsuperscript{30} Although Hsü Tsung-kan mentioned that a hsien was one of the seven vessels found at Liang-shan, it is the only vessel that he did not discuss in detail. Possibly the vessel already had been sold or in some way separated from the other six bronzes. According to Ch'en Meng-chia\textsuperscript{31} the hsien was in the collection of Chung Yen-p'ei and Li Tsung-tai before being acquired by Baron Sumitomo Kichi-Zaemon 住友吉左衛門 (1864–1926). As is typical in hsien dating from the early Western Chou period, the ornamentation of the T'ai-shih Yu hsien consists of a simple t'ao-t'ieh band below the lip of the upper section, while boldly modelled t'ao-t'ieh masks occur on the three bulging lobes of the lower section.

Ch'en Meng-chia includes detailed discussions of the T'ai-pao kuei, the larger T'ai-pao fang-ting, the Po-hsien ho, and the T'ai-shih Yu hsien in his study of Western Chou bronzes.\textsuperscript{32} He also presents a list of those seven vessels which he believes composed the original group.\textsuperscript{33} He曾经 lists the T'ai-pao fang-ting, the T'ai-shih Yu hsien, the Po-hsien ho, the Hsien ting, the T'ai-pao kuei, the T'ai-pao e-yu 太保鵲卣, now in the Hakutsuru Museum, Kobe (fig. 12), and the Lu-kung ting. Ch'en speculates that the inscription on the Lu-

\textsuperscript{30} Jung Keng does include the Hsiao-ch'en Yu tsun in the Shang Chou i-ch'i t'ung-k'ao but quite separate from the other vessels in the Liang-shan group. See his terse entry on p. 247, stating that the bronze was in the collection of the K'ung family in Ch'ü-fu.

\textsuperscript{31} Ch'en Meng-chia, part 2, KKHP, p. 96. The hsien is illustrated and discussed by Hamada Seiryō 濱田耕作 in Senoku seishō 泉屋造出 (Kyoto, 1934), pl. 11.

\textsuperscript{32} Ch'en Meng-chia, part 2, KKHP, pp. 95-99; part 3, pp. 86-87, pp. 88-89, p. 90.

\textsuperscript{33} Part 2, KKHP, p. 96.

kung ting might possibly have referred to Chou-kung 周公, since Ch'ing dynasty epigraphers sometimes misread the character chou as lu. To support his theory Ch'en provides references to a number of fang-ting reproduced in various catalogues. While the styles of these fang-ting vary, they all bear the inscription Lu-kung tso Wen-wang tsun-i 鲁公作文王尊彝 (King Wen’s sacrificial vessel made by the Duke of Lu). His comments make it clear that Ch'en had not seen the entry in Chi-chou chin-shih chih, which provides a drawing of the three-character inscription on the smaller T'ai-pao fang-ting (fig. 14).

Ch'en Meng-chia’s inclusion of the T'ai-pao e-yu in the Liang-shan group once again raises the question of the provenance of that unusual bronze. The yu was published originally by Umebara Sueji 梅原末治 in 1940 in Kanan anyō ihō 河南安陽遺寶.\textsuperscript{34} Mizuno Seiichi included the yu in his In Shū Seidōki to gyoku, published in 1959.\textsuperscript{35} He concludes his description of the bronze by noting that while An-yang and Shou-chang have been mentioned as the possible provenance, he believes the yu probably came from Hsūn Hsien 淮縣, in Honan province, an opinion that is supported by the catalogue of the Hakutsuru Museum.\textsuperscript{36}

Not being aware of the entry in Chi-chou chin-shih chih, Ch'en Meng-chia’s decision to include the T'ai-pao e-yu in his list understandably was prompted by the fact that a Hsi-tsun was recorded among the original group and by the similarity of the three-character inscription, T'ai-pao chu 太保鵲

\textsuperscript{34} Pl. 36, figs. 23, 24.

\textsuperscript{35} Pl. 102.

\textsuperscript{36} Page 48.

\textsuperscript{37} Hakutsuru yoshikin senshu 白鷺古皿撰集成 (Tokyo, 1951), pl. IV.
III

Six of the vessels are related by their inscriptions rather than by one distinctive style. With the exception of that on the Hsiao-chên Yü tsun (fig. 9), all of the inscriptions in some way or other refer to Shih, Duke of Shao. As already has been noted, the simplest inscription is that found on the T'ai-pao fang-ting (fig. 5). The ten-character inscription on the Po-hsien ho reads: Po-hsien tso Shao- | po Fu-hsin pao tsun | 伯禽作召 | 伯父辛尊彝, which can be translated, “Po-hsien made this precious sacral vessel for Shao-po Fu-hsin.”

The thirty-nine character inscription on the Hsien-ting (fig. 4) reads: Wei chiu-yüeh ch'i-sheng-pa [Hsien-] yu tsai Yen. How 

| Hsien pei chin. | Tang Hou hsiu yung-tso Shao- | po Fu-hsin pao tsun i. | Hsien wan nien tsu-izu sun-sun; pao kuang yung T'ai-pao 佳九月既生霸辛 | 西才侯侯易侯易貝金 | 揭侯侯用作召 | 伯父辛寶彝 | 保萬年子孫寶光用太保. which can be translated “In the ninth month, second quarter of the month, the hsien-yu day, [Hsien was] in Yen. The marquis gave Hsien cowries and metal. To make known the favor of the Marquis, [Hsien] used [the gifts] to make this precious sacral vessel for Shao-po Fu-hsin. [May] Hsien’s descendants for endless years treasure [the vessel]

to indicate the color white.

During the Chou dynasty the month was divided into four quarters, each approximately one week long. For a discussion of “month-quarters,” see Noel Barnard, “A Recently Excavated Inscribed Bronze of the Reign of King Mu of Chou,” Monumenta Serica, vol. 19 (1960), pp. 80–84, and Ch'en Meng-chia, part 2, KKKP, pp. 112–115.

Higuchi, “Sei-Shü dōki no kenkyū,” p. 26, identifies the Marquis as Chih 車, and believes him to be a younger brother of the Duke of Shao, while Ch'en Meng-chia, part 3, KKKP, p. 89, identifies Chih as the second son of the Duke of Shao and first Marquis of Yen. On the basis of Ch'en’s own remarks on enfeoffment in early Western Chou, in part 1, pp. 146 and part 2, pp. 94–95, it would seem that Chih should be the Duke’s first son.

The last four characters are similar to the last four characters of the Ling fang-i 今方彝 inscription: yung-kuang Fu-ting 用光父丁 (“... for the glory of Father Ting”); see John Alexander Pope, et al., The Freer Chinesse Bronzes, vol. 1 (Washington, 1967), p. 220.

A variant translation of the Hsien ting inscription is offered by Higuchi, “Newly Discovered Western Chou Bronzes”, p. 33. Higuchi also quotes Kaizuka Shigeki 賀孫茂 Kı to the effect that Shao-kung Shih 召公典, Yen-hou Chih 侯侯侯和 Po-hsien 伯禽 are the names of brothers whose father’s name was Hsin 叔.
for the glory of the T'ai-pao.”

The inscription on the T'ai-shih Yu hsien (fig. 11) reads: T'ai-shih Yu / tso Shao-kang / pao tsun i 大史友 / 作召公 / 資尊彝, which can be translated “The T'ai-shih, Yu, made this precious sacrificial vessel for the Duke of Shao.” Although a number of questions still remain regarding the interpretation of several characters in the inscription on the T'ai-pao kuei (fig. 2), the general meaning is clear. The inscription reads: Wang fa Lu-tzu, Sheng, 43 44 chüeh fan. Wang / chi-

43 彈 was first identified as the ancient form of the character 衛 by Kuo Mo-jo, in Liang Chou chin-wen tz'u-ta hsü k'ao-shih (周金文大系考釋) (Tokyo, 1935) 27a. Shirakawa Shizuka in Kinkunshū identifies Lu-tzu Sheng as Lu-fu 梁父, son of Chou, the last Shang ruler, whom Wu Wang made prince over part of the former Shang domain so that he might continue the ritual sacrifices. Hsien 廉, yet another brother who also was a vassal of the Marquis, resided in Liang-shan, hence the bronzes were excavated there. Ch’en Meng-ch’ia (part 2, KKHP, p. 98), on the other hand, suggests that Lu was located in the south, perhaps in the area of Ch’u 楚.

Noel Barnard (Monumenta Serica, vol. 22 [1963] pp. 223–224) has advanced a provocative new theory of the date of the final conquest of Shang as probably occurring early in Ch’eng Wang’s reign. According to Barnard, the number of Eastern punitive campaigns during the reign of Ch’eng Wang, as revealed in growing numbers of early Western Chou bronze inscriptions, may alter the traditional interpretation of the Chou conquest.

44 The reading of the sixth character remains uncertain, although the meaning of the sentence is clear. Some possible alternative readings for the character are given by Max Loehr, “Bronzentexte der Chouzeit,” p. 61.

45 Interpretation of the four characters, K’o ching wang-ch’ien 克敬亡遷, has presented problems to everyone who has studied the inscription. Kuo Mo-jo (Liang Chou p. 27a) believes the character Chen 椿 should be 廢, and there is general agreement with his reading. Max Loehr (“Bronzentexte der Chouzeit,” p. 59) renders the phrase, “Der Grossprotektor siegte; [des Besiegten] Ergebenheit [war fortan] untadelig.” The compound 克敬 does appear in the Shu-ching, Tso-fang 多方 31; Legge, Part V, Book XVIII, par. 31, p. 507: pu-k’o-ching yü ho, 不克敬于和 (“If you cannot reverently realize the harmony. . .”). Again, in Tso-shih 多士 24; Legge III, 462: erh k’o-ching 餘克敬 . . . Erh pu k’o-ching 弃不克敬 (“If you can reverently obey. . . cannot reverently obey”). In discussing the inscription on the T’ü kwei 通簋 in the collection of the National Palace Museum, Taiwan, Shirakawa Shizuka in Kinkunshū, vol. 2, p. 18, entry 256.257, renders the phrase T’ü yü wang-ch’ien 留御亡遷 as, “Yü attended [Mu Wang in the Sacrifice] without error.” Ch’en Meng-ch’ia, part 6, KKHP, p. 87, also offers this interpretation for the two characters.

46 Here again the reading of the character is uncertain. It was read as p’ai 贊 and rendered as “at the instigation” by Dobson, Archaic Chinese, p. 192. Loehr (“Bronzentexte der Chouzeit,” pp. 66–68) read the character as p’ai 贊, and rendered it as “compelling,” which seems more suitable. Shirakawa Shizuka in Kinkunshū, vol. 1, p. 18, interprets the sentence as meaning “the King went in person to reward the T’ai-pao.”
in order to record the [King’s] charge.”

IV

The Hsiao-ch'en T'ü tsun stands apart from the other vessels both in form and by the nature of its inscription. As A. G. Wenley pointed out in his study of the Hsiao-ch'en T'ü tsun, the language of the inscription is related to Shang rather than to Chou idiom, and a late Shang dynasty date for the vessel is acceptable. The styles of the remaining six bronzes of the Liang-shan group, as well as the information contained in their inscriptions, indicate that they were cast during the reigns of Ch'eng Wang (ca. 1024–1005 B.C.) and K'ang Wang (ca. 1004–967 B.C.), when Shang traditions still were exerting strong influence on the Chou bronze artisans.

Basing his chronology on the familial relationship between the Duke of Shao and his sons, Chih and Hsien, Ch'en Meng-chia proposed that the T'ai-pao fang-ling and the T'ai-pao kuei were ordered by the Duke himself and therefore would be earlier in date than the T'ai-shih T'u hsien, the Po-hsien ho and the Hsien ting, which he believes were made for the Duke by his sons after his death, and would therefore date sometime after the early years of K'ang Wang's reign. It is impossible to say with any degree of certainty whether or not Ch'en Meng-chia is correct in his analysis of the relationship among the Duke of Shao, Chih and Hsien, or whether the three men actually were brothers, as has been suggested by Japanese scholars. But it is significant that those vessels bearing inscriptions which suggest they were cast by the Duke himself still reflect something of the bristling majesty of late Shang traditions, while the remaining vessels, both in form and decoration, have an elegant severity that is indicative of developments to come during the reigns of Chao Wang (ca. 984–966 B.C.) and Mu Wang (ca. 965–928 B.C.).

A further refinement of the chronological sequence of these bronzes is provided by a comparison of the different styles of the script used in the individual inscriptions. Recently Dr. Virginia C. Kane of the University of Michigan has offered a rather convincing argument for the use of script styles as a contributing factor in determining the chronological sequence of that Ch'eng Wang went with two Dukes to the east, remained at the camp during the battle, and rewarded the Duke of Shao when he returned. Ōshima believes the Camp was located at Liang-shan. Higuchi Takayasu, in "Sei-Shū dōki no kenkyū," p. 26, follows the same interpretation but adds that Hsü was in the area of Liang-shan, an old Shang domain. He also believes that the T'ai-pao presented the land to Chih ( arising his eldest younger brother, who became Marquis of Yen.

48 According to traditional literature Wu Wang also assigned three of his brothers, Kuan-shu (Hsien 賢), Ts'ai-shu (Chu 处), and Ho-shu (Ch'u 處), to the states into which the Shang territory had been separated as a safeguard against rebellion. These three men were known as the San-chien ( 三監 “three inspectors.” Soon after the death of Wu Wang, they joined Lu-fu in a conspiracy to overthrow the new dynasty. In the conflict that followed, the Duke of Chou and the Duke of Shao crushed the insurrectionary movement. Both Lu-fu and Kuan-shu were executed. Shirakawa Shizuka in Kibunshū (p. 18) believes this to be the punitive expedition referred to in the inscription of the T'ai-pao kuei. In his discussion in Shodō zenshū, Ōshima Riichi agrees with that interpretation and suggests

49 See note 20.

50 Recognizing the many problems that relate to the chronology of ancient China, I have used the dates proposed by Ch’en Meng-chia, Hsi Chou nien-tai-k’ao 西周年代考, Chungking, 1945.
bronze vessels dating from the hitherto problematical late Shang and early Western Chou periods. In addition to studying the content of the inscriptions to establish guidelines for determining their relative dates, Dr. Kane has traced the stylistic evolution of such frequently used characters as 父 and 之.\(^{51}\)

The inscription of the T’ai-pao kuei (fig. 2) contains an extremely archaic form of the character 之, a pictograph depicting two hands supporting a bird. The character 之 is approximately twice as large as the other more uniformly sized characters in the inscription and decidedly more sinuous, clearly appearing as a lingering of Shang calligraphic traditions.

A somewhat later, less pictographic form of the character 之 occurs in the inscription on the Hsien-ting (fig. 4). In contrast to the relatively even width of strokes used throughout the inscription, the long descending stroke of the character 父 still retains the gently curving fullness found in Shang dynasty inscriptions. The characters are not yet aligned horizontally, nor are they of uniform size. Also of interest is the phrase tzu-tzu sun-sun, which apparently occurs first in bronze inscriptions during the reign of Ch’eng Wang.

Fig. 1.—T'ai-pao kuei. Freer Gallery of Art.

Fig. 2.—Rubbing of the T'ai-pao kuei inscription.
Fig. 3.—Hsien ting. Ching-hua University, Peking.

Fig. 4.—Rubbing of the Hsien ting inscription.
Fig. 5.—Rubbing of the larger T'ei-pao fang-ting and inscription. Tientsin Museum.

Fig. 6.—Po-hsien ho. Present whereabouts unknown.

Fig. 7.—Rubbing of the Po-hsien ho inscription.
Fig. 8.—Hsiao-ch’ en Yü tsun. Center of Asian Art and Culture, The Avery Brundage Collection, San Francisco.

Fig. 9.—Rubbing of the Hsiao-ch’ en Yü tsun inscription.
Fig. 10.—*T'ai-shih Yu hsien*,
Sumitomo Collection, Kyoto.

Fig. 11.—Rubbing of the
*T'ai-shih Yu hsien* inscription.
Fig. 12.—*T'ai-pao e yu*. Hakutsuru Museum, Kobe.

Fig. 13.—Rubbing of the *T'ai-pao e yu* inscription.
Fig. 14.—Drawing of smaller T'ai-pao fang-ting inscription. Reproduced from Chi-chou chin-shih chih, 1:15a.
CHIEH-HUA: RULED-LINE PAINTING IN CHINA**

By ROBERT J. MAEDA*

The category of chieh-hua 界畫 ("ruled-line painting") occupies a rather special position in the history of Chinese painting. It is the only painting category which involves the use of tools in addition to the brush in the depiction of a specific subject matter. The tools were the ruler, compass, and square; the subject matter was man-made constructions (mainly buildings, boats, and wheeled vehicles). Both subject matter and technique of chieh-hua were in use before historians recognized chieh-hua as a stylistic entity. This paper will be primarily concerned with the early development of chieh-hua as a recognized style and some of the major masters of this style.

The term chieh-hua first appears, as far as I have been able to determine, in Kuo Jo-hsiu’s 郭若虛 T’u-hua chien-wen-chih 圖畫見聞誌 (ca. 1080) in a discussion of architectural painting:

In painting constructions, calculations should be faultless, and brushstrokes of even strength should deeply penetrate space, receding in a hundred diagonal lines. This was true of the work of painters of the Sui, T’ang, and Five Dynasties down to Kuo Chung-shu and Wang Shih-yian at the beginning of this dynasty.

1 *Assistant Professor of Fine Arts, Brandeis University.

**This paper is dedicated to my teacher, Professor Max Loehr, who has taught me all I know about Chinese painting. In addition, the writer would like to thank Mr. Tung Wu, Fellow for Research in Chinese Art, Asiatic Art Department, Boston Museum of Fine Arts, for his kind advice and help in the preparation of this article.


5 It is possible that the tools which were used in ancient copying techniques were similar to those used in chieh-hua; see Tseng Yu-ho Ecke, “A Reconsideration of ‘Ch’uan-mo-i-hsieh’, the Sixth Principle of Hsieh Ho” (and appended discussion), *Proceedings of the International Symposium of Chinese Painting* (Taipei, 1972), pp. 313-350. I will attempt to show that the excessive use of tools in the execution of chieh-hua was considered a liability rather than an asset in its early history.

6 Pai-miao 白描 ("uncolored outline drawing") is a technique which is sometimes spoken of synonymously with chieh-hua but it is not quite the same thing. It encompasses a broader range of subject than chieh-hua but is more limited by its monochromatic character than chieh-hua, which does use color. And chieh-hua was largely identified with professional painters, despite the scholarly prestige initially given it by a painter like Kuo Chung-shu; pai-miao, on the other hand, was most popularly linked to the style of the scholar-painter Li Kung-lin 李公麟 (1049-1106) and his literati followers. Likewise, the so-called “blue and green” technique (ch’ing-lü-p'ai 青綠派) used by Chao Po-chih 趙伯諤 (ca. 1120-60) in his architectural landscapes is to be seen as one ingredient of a larger context of chieh-hua painting. Line, not color, was the hallmark of chieh-hua style. On the whole, chieh-hua was the stylistic province of court painters, and for that reason this paper is mainly concerned with them.

4 Kuo Jo-hsiu is speaking here of the long history of chieh-hua motifs (and presumably techniques); he, however, like most Chinese painting historians, traces its beginnings as a viable painting tradition to Kuo Chung-shu in the tenth century, the first great master and specialist in chieh-hua. See Trousdale,
and pavilions usually showed all four corners with their brackets arranged in order; they made clear distinctions between front and back without error in the marking lines. Painters nowadays mainly use the ruler to accomplish their ruled line paintings (ch'ieh-hua). In the differentiation of bracketing their brushwork is too intricate and confusing and lacks their predecessors’ grandeur and sense of naturalness. That Kuo Jo-hsü mentions ch'ieh-hua without emphasis suggests that the term, or at least the technical basis for such a term, may have come earlier. In the late T'ang painting history titled Li-tai ming-hua-ch'i 歷代名畫記 (847), the author, Chang Yen-yüan 張彦遠, wrote of Wu Tao-tzu 吳道子: 

... he bent his bows, brandished his swords, planted his pillars, and placed his beams without resorting to line-brush and ruler. 

In a later passage he wrote: 

Now if one makes use of line-brush and ruler, the result will be dead painting. 

Since Kuo Jo-hsü implies that dependence on the ruler leads to overly complex architectural paintings and Chang Yen-yüan earlier predicted that the mere use of a ruler will lead to “dead painting,” it seems likely that the original use of the term ch'ieh-hua was pejorative. The fact that Kuo Jo-hsü so closely linked the term with the use of the ruler lends support to the traditional interpretation of the term as an abbreviation of ch'ieh-ch'i hua 界尺畫 (“painting done with the ruler”). The frequent translation of ch'ieh-hua into English as “boundary painting” is misleading when seen in this light and should perhaps be discarded. 

The disdain which Chang Yen-yüan and Kuo Jo-hsü exhibited for the ch'ieh-hua technique may also have affected their opinion of those subjects in which the technique was used. If judged by the standard of Hsien Ho’s 謝赫 (late 5th c.) first painting law: ch'i-yün sheng-tung 氣韻生動, the subject matter which comprised ch'ieh-hua, was worth but slight effort and certainly no imagination on the part of the painters. Chang Yen-yüan wrote: 

With regard to terraces and pavilions, trees and rocks, carriages and palanquins, utensils and objects in general, they have no liveliness that can be imitated or ch'i-yün [“the breath of life and its reverberation,” that is, sense of life] that can be matched. They only require placing and alignment and that is all. As Ku K'ai-chih once said, “Man 

“Architectural Landscapes,” p. 287, for names of other architectural painters mentioned by Kuo Jo-hsü (note Trousdale’s “Chou Wen-chu” should read “Chu Ch'eng”). 


7 Ibid., pp. 182–183. 

8 Chieh 界 in its basic meaning is “boundary” or “limit” but can also mean “to rule a line.” Giles’s translation of the term as “pictures drawn in prescribed spaces, such as obtain in buildings” is incorrect. See Herbert A. Giles, An Introduction to the History of Chinese Pictorial Art, 2nd ed. (London, 1918). See also Arthur Waley, An Introduction to the Study of Chinese Painting (London, 1923), p. 185; Li Chih-ch’ao, “Chieh-hua,” p. 66.
is the most difficult subject to paint, then landscapes, and then dogs and horses. As for terraces and pavilions, they are nothing but fixed objects and are comparatively easy to do.*

If chieh-hua subjects and techniques elicited such negative comments from the critics it is no wonder that famous painters such as Wu Tao-tzu did not specialize in it. It was too redolent of artisans’ or professional painting, what with its use of tools borrowed from the carpenter’s trade. However maligned, the motifs themselves were of great antiquity in the history of Chinese pictorial art. Late Chou pictorial bronzes, Han dynasty stone reliefs, Buddhist and secular tomb painting of the Six Dynasties and T’ang periods,10 all show architectural and vehicular motifs. Literary sources tell us of magnificent Han palaces11 which were presumably the subjects of wall painting done perhaps with chieh-hua techniques. Certainly such literature provided the inspiration, if in name only, to painters in later periods when chieh-hua was regarded as a legitimate painting tradition. This tradition began with one individual, Kuo Chung-shu.

Kuo Chung-shu 郭忠恕, t. Shu-hsien 許先, was a native of Lo-yang.12 He was some-

* The following biographical information is culled mainly from Kuo Jo-hsiu (Soper, Experiences, pp. 44–45). Kuo was apparently using material from a eulogy on a Kuo Chung-shu painting written by Su Tung-p’o (1037–1101); see Tung-p’o chi, vol. 20. Other biographical material can be found in Li Chi, Hua p’ing (late 11th–early 12th century), transl. Alexander Soper, Journal of the Amer. Oriental Soc., 69, no. 1, 1949, pp. 24–25; Liu Tao-ch’un 劉道醇, Sheng ch’ao ming-hua p’ing (ca. 1050), (Wang-shih hua-yüan 王氏畫苑 ed., ch. 5) and Sung shih 宋史, 442, which provides Kuo Chung-shu’s date of death, 977.

12 In Liu Tao-ch’un, Sheng-ch’ao ming-hua p’ing, it is said that “he was good in seal and clerical script.” Kuo was supposed to have applied these angular calligraphic techniques to his architectural paintings.
and infinite patience. Yet Su Tung-p'o (1037–1101) who eulogized him said that “if he had a desire to paint then he would spontaneously do it.”

His personal qualities, allied with his literary background, served to separate him from other chieh-hua painters and at the same time to legitimize their style. Although Kuo Chung-shu was hailed as a master who had created “a style of his own” in architectural painting, Kuo Jo-hsiu also saw him as recipient of an ancient tradition which went back to Sui times. Liu Tao-ch'un said that “he was completely in harmony with T'ang style.” His originality, then, was enhanced rather than compromised by his antique flavor. But one must note that Kuo Jo-hsiu clearly distinguishes between Kuo Chung-shu and painters of his own day, of whom he disapproved, because they “mainly used the ruler.” This antipathy towards the ruler on

14 Su Tung-p'o, Tung-p'o ch'i. One doubts that this comment refers to Kuo Chung-shu's architectural painting style; it probably indicates his untrammelled spirit, i.e., painting only when his spirit moved him. Shimada contrasts chieh-hua technique with i-ko (spontaneous technique) by quoting Huang Hsü-fu's 黃休復 I-chou ming-hua li 釜州名畫録 (1004–08): “painting of the i-ko may be clumsy in the ruling off of right angles and arcs, it may despise the fine grinding of colours; but even though the brushwork be simple and abbreviated, the forms are complete, and things are painted with spontaneity...” Huang Hsü-fu exhibits a bias against chieh-hua technique which is altogether different from Chang Yen-yüan and Kuo Jo-hsiu. He is against line itself and “the accurate delineation of the appearances of things generally.” See Shūjirō Shimada, “Concerning the I-p' in Style of Painting, vol. 1,” transl. James Cahill, Oriental Art (Spring 1961), p. 73.

15 Authors who said this about Kuo Chung-shu; (a) Liu Tao-ch'un (b) Kuo Jo-hsiu (c) Li Ch'i-h. See note 11.

16 Liu Tao-ch'un, Sheng-ch'ao ming-hua p'ing.

his and Chang Yen-yüan's part, which I noted earlier, was probably due to the belief that an artist's dependence upon it (and other aids) made chieh-hua too facile and unnecessarily complex, both qualities antithetical to wen-jen ideals. However biased he may have been against some of his contemporaries who used the technique, Kuo Jo-hsiu, by newly recording the term chieh-hua and acknowledging Kuo Chung-shu as one of its first great exponents, gave it, for the first time, stylistic and historical identity.

Kuo Chung-shu's architectural painting style was characterized most succinctly by Li Ch'i-h. 李鶴 in the Hua p' in 畫品 (late eleventh, early twelfth century):

Roof beams, girders, pillars, and rafters are shown with open spaces between, through which one might move. Railings, lintels, windows and doorways look as if they could really be passed through, or opened and shut. He has used an infinitesimal to mark off a foot, a foot to mark off ten feet; increasing thus with every multiple, so that when he does a large building everything is to scale and there are no small discrepancies.

The prevailing tone in this passage is one of realism based on an architect's correct proportioning. Significantly, it was reported that some chieh-hua paintings were used as designs for the actual construction of buildings. Kuo Chung-shu himself was said to have "fully mastered the actual

17 Li Ch'i-h, Hua p' in, p. 24.

18 Liu Wen-t'ung 劉文通 and Lü Cho 吕鶴, two early Northern Sung court painters, are mentioned in both Sheng-ch'ao MHP and T'u-hua CWC as having provided designs which were used as models for architects. See Soper, Experiences, pp. 70–71, 186.
practices of masons and carpenters."

As for extant paintings by Kuo Chung-shu there remain only attributed works. And of these, only one can claim any credibility on stylistic grounds. The painting "Two Boats on a River after Snowfall" (fig. 1) in the Palace Museum in Taiwan, bears an inscription by Emperor Huitsung (1082–1135) who declared it a genuine work by Kuo. The picture shows two large, nearly identical river junk side by side with a smaller boat moored at the side of the foreground craft. The ships are more like house boats than common barges because of their large cabins decorated with finely carved fretwork, bamboo shaded windows and elegantly draped curtains at their veranda-like prows. The various articles packed aboard the decks and on the cabin roofs are covered by blankets of snow. Some of the crew members are hunched over, sleeves to their mouths, as if protecting themselves from the bitter cold. The painter must have known his subject intimately to have depicted it in such convincing, meticulous detail. The ships are placed in perspective; shading gives dimension and mass to the forms.

The painting was cut at one time and is now half its original handscroll size. In its present form it is mounted as a hanging scroll. Fortunately, a very close Southern Sung copy of the Palace Museum painting in its original form, including copies of a number of the original colophons, exists in the Nelson Gallery, Kansas City (figs. 2a and b). The first part of the Kansas

19 Liu Tao-ch'un, quoted in Soper, Experiences, p. 156.

20 Chinese name of this painting: Hsieh-ch'ai chiang-hsiung t'u 雪景行船圖, inscribed by Emp. Huitsung on an imperial seal reading yü-shu chih pao 御書之寶 ("treasure of imperial writing"). The painting measures H. 74.1 cm., W. 69.2 cm., and is in ink on silk. There is another inscription by the Ch'ien Lung emperor (reigned 1736–95). Recorded in Ku-kung shu-hua lu (K'KSHL) (Taiwan, 1965), vol. 5, pp. 31–32. Reproduced in Chinese Nat'l. Pal. Mus., Three Hundred Masterpieces of Chinese Painting in the Palace Museum (300), vol. 2 (Taichung, 1959), pl. 52; Ku-kung po-ch'iu-yüan so ts'ang Ch'ung-k'ao li-tai ming-hua chi 故宮博物院所藏陳奐麟大顯名畫錄 (CKTMHC) (Peking, 1964–65), 2nd ed., 5 vols., vol. 1, pl. 20; Li Chih-ch'ao, Chieh-hua.

21 Similar to the k'o-ch'uan 客船 described by Hsü Ching 徐敬 in Kao-li t'u ching 高麗圖經. See Whitfield, "Ch'ing-ming shang-ho t'u," pp. 126, 131. Also cf. Han Cho 韓拙, Shao-shui ch'un-ch'ien chi 山水純全集 (1121), transl. in Robert J. Maeda, Two Twentieth Century Texts on Chinese Painting (Ann Arbor, 1970), p. 90, where such boats are called yu-ch'uan 鹿船 ("excursion boats").

22 The anonymous label to the painting reads: "A Sung version after Kuo Chung-shu—10th century." Handscroll, ink on silk, H. 20 3/4 in. L. 56 1/4 in. The colophons are by Chao Meng-fu (1254–1322), dtd. 1298; Yü Ch'i 葉其 (1272–1348); Chou Mi (1232–90); T'ai Pu-hua 裴不華 (Beginning Chih-cheng era [1341] app'td. Shao-hsing 程興 Dist. ruler); Wu K'un 吳寬 (1435–1504) and Yang Hsün-ch'i 楊循吉 (1456–1544). These colophons were presumably copied from the originals and were recorded, along with later colophons (apparently now lost), in Hsi-ch'ing cha-chi 西清續記 (ca. 1815), by Hu Ching 胡敬, included in Hu-shih san-chung 胡氏三種, ch. 1. The Hsi-ch'ing entry matches the description and the colophons (with the exception of a few lacunae) of a handscroll by Kuo Chung-shu recorded in Shih-ch'ih po-ch'i san-pien 石渠寶笈三編 (Taipei, 1969, v. 1, pp. 481–82), strongly suggesting that both entries correspond to the same Nelson Gallery painting. In a recent article titled T'ai-yü Ch'ing-kuo hsieh-chäng hua-hu i chi-chang k'wo-ch'ao (對於中國雲景繪畫的幾種考察 ["A Study of Several Kinds of Chinese Snowscapes") compiled in Chung-k'uo hua-shih yen-chiu hsü-ci 中國畫史研究續集 ["A Continuation of the Study of Chinese Painting History"], "Taipei, 1972), Chuang Shen 莊申 discusses the Palace Museum original and the Nelson Gallery copy at some length, not as examples of chieh-hua technique, but as illustrations of the technique of representing snow, that is, the liu-pai 留白 method (pp. 66–69). I am indebted to Mr. Laurence Sickman, Director of the Nelson Gallery, Kansas City, for his kind permission in letting me publish this painting and for supplying me with such invaluable information regarding it.
City scroll is equivalent to the section missing from the Taiwan painting; it shows that the boats are being towed by six men on shore with ropes attached to the ships’ masts. In the far distance behind the trackers are hillocks separated by a meandering stream. Farther behind is a range of low-lying mountains. By examining the copy one can see how Kuo Chung-shu originally meant to contrast pictorial and brush effects. The scroll opens onto an expansive, spacious scene of sparse landscape elements loosely rendered. The viewer is then drawn into the handscroll by means of the slowly rising, slackened lines of the towing ropes. These lead to the tightly packed detail, executed in chieh-hua brush technique, of the boats, which form the major interest as well as the climax of the short, but effective, horizontal composition.

A comparison of the two paintings reveals how the copyist failed to achieve the same keen sense of verisimilitude found in the original. For example, the long bamboo poles lashed to the side of the boat in front are clearly and realistically represented in the Taiwan painting, but in the Kansas City version they are more ambiguous in appearance, suggesting instead the flatness of masonry. In smaller details throughout the painting the copyist was content to give the surface appearance but not the underlying structure of the forms. One particularly startling and revealing difference between the two paintings is the way water is represented. In the Palace Museum painting thin, loose lines unobtrusively portray the movement of slow-moving water. The copyist, however, changed the water tempo to fast-moving rapids which break in curling waves against the boats. This type of decorative wave patterning appears in the late Southern Sung period (thirteenth century) and gives the copy its actual date of execution.

The inscription by Emperor Hui-tsung in the upper left corner of the original work in the Palace Museum is completely compatible in style and temperament with examples of “slender gold” script generally conceded to be by the emperor. A question regarding the authenticity of the inscription arises from the fact that this painting is not recorded in the Hsüan-ho hua-p’u (宣和畫譜) (ca. 1120), the catalogue of Emperor Hui-tsung’s painting collection. This is somewhat surprising since there are thirty-four paintings by Kuo Chung-shu listed in the catalogue. In a colophon to the “Two Boats” painting dated 1678, Shen Ch’üan 沈荃 (1624–84) surmised that the painting may have been either too small (cut?) to have been entered in the Hsüan-

23 During Sung times river boats were often hauled by trackers who specialized in this task, treading tow-paths especially constructed for this purpose along major rivers. See Shiba Yoshinobu, Commerce and Society in Sung China, transl. Mark Elvin (Ann Arbor, 1970), p. 21.

24 Both the original and the copy, like so many of the paintings I will discuss, were accomplished without extensive use of the ruler; not until the late Southern Sung and Yuan periods did painters widely and obviously employ the straight-edge in their chieh-hua paintings.

25 These poles served as buffers when docking.


28 Hsüan-ho hua-p’u, ch. 8, Hua-shih ts’ung-shu ed., p. 84.
ho catalogue or that it had entered the collection too late to be recorded so that the painting was presented to an intimate courtier as a gift. The lack of an official notice, however, did not trouble Chao Meng-fu 趙孟頫 (1254–1322) who wrote in the year 1298 the first colophon to the painting. He praised the painting and declared Hui-tsung’s inscription to be genuine and “truly precious.”

The painting’s third colophon is by Chou Mi 周密 (1232–98) who wrote:

This picture is a traced copy taken from a composition by a T’ang artist. I have seen it [the original]. Shu-hsien (Kuo Chung-shu) copied the ancient work but obtained its essence. It can be said that he measured up to the original in the smallest detail. Its exuberant atmosphere is uniquely achieved.

The difficulty of interpreting Chou Mi’s remarks lies in his neglecting to tell us by whom or exactly when the T’ang prototype of the Kuo Chung-shu painting was made. There is also the question of how many authentic T’ang works could have existed during Chou Mi’s time. However tantalizing Chou Mi’s words are, only an examination of the painting itself, in an historical context, can serve to tell us the stylistic identity of the painting.

An anonymous handscroll called “Market Village by the River” in the Palace Museum in Taiwan (fig. 3) is a pertinent comparison to the Kuo Chung-shu painting. In style, the “Market Village” can be related to tenth-century developments. The following are examples of its tenth-century landscape motifs: the large bluff with shaded contours in the left of the painting, typical of the Fan K’uan 范寬 (act. ca. 990–1030) manner; finger-like shore projections and rolling hills, suggestive of the influence of Tung Yüan 藤源 (act. ca. 937–975); and the linear wave patterns similar to what Max Loehr has termed “diagonally receding crests of short waves,” a motif which “presupposes observation” and may be traced to the tenth century. The figures and simple huts portrayed in the genre scenes are close to the types found in “Travellers in the Mountains” attributed to Kuan T’ung 阮囝 (act. ca. 907–923) in the Palace Museum, Taiwan. The motifs which contrast best with the Kuo Chung-shu painting, however, are water and boats. Although the “Market Village” wave patterns suggest the effects of wind upon water their sheer repetition conveys less effectively the actual movement of water than the discrete, spontaneous, linear rhythms of the water of the Kuo Chung-shu painting in the Palace Museum. While the “Market Village” boats are neatly and accurately described, their size, so toy-like in comparison to their surroundings, make them seem less seaworthy than the ships in the Kuo Chung-shu painting.

Overall, the unrealistic scale used in the “Market Village” painting relates it to T’ang dynasty scale discrepancies of the type found in a wall painting in Cave

29 Hu Ching, Hsi-ch’ing chao-chi.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid. I would like to thank Mr. Tung Wu for his help in interpreting this colophon, particularly the last line.
34 Chinese Art Treasures, pl. 13.
45 (A.D. 713–762) at Tun-huang (fig. 4). To Chang Yen-yüan in the Li-tai ming-hua chi, illogical relationships in size was one of the most archaic (and perhaps amusing) things about ancient painting. The persistence of this feature in the “Market Village” painting is what separates it so fully from the Kuo Chung-shu work which, in contrast, evokes a new spirit of realism in its fastidiously correct proportions and scale relationships.

Because Kuo Chung-shu was known as a landscape painter in addition to his work in chieh-hua, the landscape of the Kuo Chung-shu copy in the Nelson Gallery is a valuable indication of what his style was like. A very close parallel to the landscape in the copy is provided in a painting generally acknowledged to be the work of a close follower of Li Ch’eng 李成 (died 967). It is a hanging scroll in the Taiwan Palace Museum depicting a wintry forest scene (fig. 5). Both paintings have the same type of landscape motifs seen in level distance, such as, rounded boulder forms used as foreground elements and “Y”-shaped wintry trees growing out of low-lying bluffs. A possible basis for these landscape similarities can be traced to a colophon to a Kuo Chung-shu landscape painting recorded in the Kuang-ch’uan hua-pa 廣川畫跋 (ca. 1119–26) which states that the painting was based on an original by Li Ch’eng.

In retrospect, the “Two Boats” painting, despite some of its problematical features, should be considered a convincing addition to our limited inventory of tenth-century paintings—Chou Mi’s remarks notwithstanding—and perhaps our only stylistic link to Kuo Chung-shu.

The court painter Yen Wen-kuei 燕文貴 (967–1044) was a younger contemporary of Kuo Chung-shu and was ranked shen-p’ing “divine grade”) in both landscape and chieh-hua subjects in the Sheng-ch’ao ming-hua p’ing 聖朝名畫評. The handscroll of “Temples on a Mountainside” in

---

37 Tung Ch’i-ch’ang 蒲谷昌 (1555–1636) in Hua yen speaks of acquiring a Kuo Chung-shu copy of the famous Wang Wei (701–761) hanging scroll “Wang-ch’uan Villa;” it was this copy which was purportedly the earliest copy made from the original. See Mi Fei 李密, Hua shih 畫史, Mei-shu ts’ung-shu 美術叢書 ed., vol. 2, no. 9; Tung Ch’i-ch’ang, Hua yen, MSTS ed., vol. 1, no. 3; Oswald Sirén, Chinese Painting, Leading Masters and Principles, 7 vols. (London and N.Y., 1956), vol. 1, p. 128; B. Lauer, “A Landscape of Wang Wei,” Ostasiatis. Zeitschrift, vol. 1, 1931. The connection between Kuo Chung-shu and Wang Wei is important and revealing, since both were renowned for instituting realistic styles, one in landscape and the other in architecture. Apparently, Kuo Chung-shu’s landscape style was much simpler than his chieh-hua style and, thus, may have resembled Wang Wei’s. Kuo Jo-hsu wrote that; “He

might paint nothing more than a far-away mountain range with several peaks, down in one corner [of the silk].” Soper comments that this design description resembles compositions of Southern Sung Academicians (Soper, Experiences, pp. 44, 156 [note 424]). Cahill points out in a note to his translation of Shimada’s “I-p’ing” article (“I-p’ing, II”, vol. 1, p. 19, note 2) that an 11th-century text Chü shih 正史 by Wang Te-ch’ên 王得臣 tells of Kuo Chung-shu painting a landscape in the “splashed ink” technique (See Chü-shih, ch. 2). Chang Ch’ou 張翥 (1577–1643) in Ch’ing-ho shu-hua jang 清河書畫舫, 6, (1616) speaks of a similar type landscape by Kuo.
39 Tung Yu 鄧宇, Kuang-ch’uan hua-pa 廣川畫跋 (ca. 1125), vol. 6, in Wang-shih hua-yüan, pu-i, ch. 3–4.
40 Liu Tao-ch’un, Sheng-ch’ao ming-hua p’ing.
the Abe Collection (figs. 6a and b)\textsuperscript{41} illustrates Yen’s abilities in placing chieh-hua motifs so unpretentiously within a landscape that their presence, at first glance, is hardly noticeable. Buildings and boats, clearly delineated and convincingly architectonic, are in correct proportion to their immediate natural surroundings and to the overall panoramic conception of mountains and river. Yen Wen-kuei is representative of other Northern Sung landscape painters who had to be as adept as he in both realistically portraying and integrating natural and man-made motifs.

Yet, no matter how proficient Northern Sung painters were at chieh-hua, their real fame often rested on their achievements in landscape (as in Yen Wen-kuei’s case). This may have been due to the fact that landscape was the ranking subject of the period; it may also have been that chieh-hua, still plagued with its technical identification, seldom attracted specialists of the caliber of Kuo Chung-shu. In this regard, it should be noted that the Hsüan-ho hua-p’u listed only four painters in its architectural category (Kuo Chung-shu is the only Sung painter listed!) as opposed to forty-one in landscape.\textsuperscript{42} But in an era when painters were involved in realistically representing the world, very few landscape artists could do without chieh-hua motifs in their paintings. The very fact that chieh-hua motifs were man-made constructions necessitated, in addition, the portrayal of some form of accompanying human activity. Thus, the rise of chieh-hua is closely linked to the early development of genre and realistic landscape painting.

The subject that was most closely identified with chieh-hua was architecture. From Han times, buildings had been used as pictorial devices to convey the illusion of depth. Their “hundred receding diagonals” helped to penetrate and shape space. But architecture was seldom used as the main subject of a painting for reasons suggested earlier. As long as buildings were treated as minor though essential accents in Northern Sung panoramic landscapes, their pictorial effect was limited. During the late eleventh century, there began a change in the treatment of space in landscape designs which showed a shift from far to near distance and high to low perspective. This change resulted in a corresponding enlargement of buildings in paintings. Simply by being larger, buildings made greater visual impact upon the viewer than previously and tended to draw his attention away from nature to focus upon the presence of man in nature.\textsuperscript{43}

One example of the new focus upon buildings in landscape can be found in the hanging scroll “Buddhist Temple in the Mountains” in the Nelson Gallery (figs. 7a, 7b). The artist’s use of the painting is to convey the method of architectural representation in such a way that the viewer can understand the spatial relationships and proportions of the buildings.

\textsuperscript{41} Handscroll, ink and light colors on silk, L. 5 ft. 3 3/16 in., H. 12 1/4 in. Reproduced in Sōrakan kinhō (Abe Collection, now in the Osaka Municipal Museum), 2 parts in 6 vols. (Osaka, 1930, 1939), vol. 1, pl. 10; Osaka Exchange Exhibition, Osaka-San Francisco, 1970, pl. 3.

\textsuperscript{42} Hsüan-ho hua-p’u, ch. 8.

\textsuperscript{43} While I attribute the increasing interest in architectural subjects of late Northern Sung painters to shifts in spatial depiction, this interest may have been stimulated as well by the publication of the Ying-tao fa-shih 營造法式 (“Method of Architecture”) in 1103 by the state architect, Li Chieh 李誥. Besides being an architectural encyclopedia the Ying-tao fa-shih was also a practical manual for architects with illustrations that could also have influenced the painters. See Laurence Sickman and Alexander Soper, The Art and Architecture of China (Baltimore, 1956), pp. 257–259; Trousdale, “Architectural Landscapes,” p. 293.
Although attributed to Li Ch'eng, the painting's spatial concept seems more plausible in a late eleventh-century context. This scroll and the Yen Wen-kuei landscape in the Abe Collection are cast in the same basic Li Ch'eng-Fan K'uan landscape tradition of mountains and cliffs arranged in varying planes of recession. There are more abrupt, less gradual transitions into depth in the vertically composed “Buddhist Temple” painting than in the smoother, horizontal flow seen in the hand-scroll. The cutting rhythms of the hanging scroll do not speak, however, for carliness or inexperience in representing depth but for the creation of spatial tensions and expressivity, qualities characteristic of the paintings of Kuo Hsi (act. ca. 1060–75).

The representation of buildings set among mountains in the Nelson Gallery painting can be compared to the same motif in Kuo Hsi's famous work in the Taiwan Palace Museum, “Early Spring,” dated 1072 (figs. 8a and b). The various towers and pavilions of the “Early Spring” painting are glimpsed only as rooftops and upper stories to the right side of the picture axis; in addition, they are extremely small in scale to the rest of the landscape. In contrast, the Buddhist structures in the Nelson Gallery painting are much larger in scale in relation to the surrounding landscape than the Kuo Hsi buildings and are placed in the very center of the composition. The hexagonal tower is crisply and cleanly drawn against the backdrop of the central massif. The other, flat-roofed temple buildings, though half-hidden behind pine trees, are close enough to the viewer and large enough in scale to be instantly recognizable. Their structural detail is sharply etched in chieh-hua manner. Below the temple are the thatched huts and pavilions of a roadside inn populated with figures whose activities are succintly described. The genre motifs of the “Buddhist Temple” painting are not casual additions to the landscape but are meant as vital pictorial elements to be savored by the viewer. The dramatic rise in importance of chieh-hua motifs and genre elements together was to produce a significant alteration in their future relationship with landscape.

The change was first to be seen in the emergence of a new type of genre theme: the urban portrait. By taking the pulsating life of the city as their subject, painters reduced landscape to a supporting role in these compositions. The most brilliant exposition of the urban portrait in all of Chinese painting was coincidentally the earliest: Chang Tse-tuan’s 張澤端 “Ch'ing-ming shang-ho t'u” 清明上河圖 (“Going up the River for the Spring Festival”), in the Peking Palace Museum (figs. 9a–9b).

44 Hanging scroll, ink and slight color on silk, 44 × 22 in. Reproduced in Sirén, vol. 3, pl. 131; Sickman and Soper, pl. 86; Cahill, Chinese Painting, p. 30 (detail only).
45 Ibid., p. 32.
46 Hanging scroll in ink and light colors on silk, 62 1/4 × 42 5/6 in. Reproduced in Sirén, vol. 5, pl. 175; Cahill, Chinese Painting, p. 36; Chinese Art Treasures, pl. 20; 300, vol. 2, pl. 76; CKLTMHIC, pl. 21.

49 Handscroll in ink and colors on silk, 525 cm. × 25.5 cm. Reproduced in entirety in Cheng Chen-to 鄭振鐸, “Ch'ing-ming shang-ho t'u ti yen-chiu” 清明上河圖的研究 (Peking, 1958); reprinted in Wenhua ching-hua, vol. 1 (Peking, 1959); transl. into Japanese and publ. with a note by Y. Yonezawa in Kokka, no. 809. For other reproductions and later versions of this scroll, see Whitfield Bibliography.
Chang’s handscroll was the subject of a study by Roderick Whitfield who lucidly and sensitively analyzed the scroll from every aspect and convincingly ascribed the painting’s style to the early twelfth century. Whereas Whitfield interpreted the scroll as “the last major example of a [narrative] form that had already yielded to landscape painting as the chief mode,”⁵⁰ I would prefer to see it as the first major instance of a new form of genre painting, one devoid of literary and religious content and focused solely upon urban daily life. The painting so vividly captures the life of early twelfth-century Pien-ching (modern K’ai-feng), it is understandable why it was copied so many times over. By the Ming and Ch’ing periods its title had become “almost a by-word for a composition showing scenes of city life.”⁵¹

Although the Chang Tse-tuan painting is neither signed nor dated, its attribution to Chang, a little known court painter of the late Northern, early Southern Sung period, has been generally accepted on the basis of the scroll’s first colophon, dated 1186, by Chang Chu of the Chin dynasty.⁵² Since Chang Tse-tuan’s name and his “Ch’ing-ming” work are not recorded in the Hsüan-ho hua-p’u, it is difficult to give the work any more precise dating than sometime during the Cheng-ho (1111–18) and Hsüan-ho (1119–26) periods.⁵³ However, the style of the painting is perfectly suited to the dominant Academic painting style during these reign periods of Emperor Hui-tsung.

Figures, landscape and constructions of the “Ch’ing-ming” scroll are all observed and depicted with an unerring eye for realistic detail. Objects and figures, viewed from above, exist comfortably in space; the overhead perspective permits the viewer to peer obliquely into dwellings and boats and thereby establish a sense of eavesdropping intimacy with the figures seen within. Likewise, the high vantage point allowed Chang Tse-tuan to occasionally portray figures whose torsos were partially concealed behind the repoussoir of roof or tree trunk (fig. 9a). Such daring, cut-off views of figures can be related to the kind of figure described by Teng Ch’un 鄧椿 in Hua-chi 畫記 (1167) when he discussed a “lovable and delightful” chieh-tso 翹作 (a variant of chieh-hua) painting from Emperor Hui-tsung’s Painting Academy:

**It was a painting of a hall corridor painted in dazzling gold-and-green technique, with a red gate half-open, exposing half of the figure of a palace lady behind the door. . . .**⁵⁴

Earlier, in the same passage, Teng Ch’un speaks of the “great skill” and “new ideas” of chieh-tso paintings. Between the time of Kuo Jo-hsü’s painting history, T’u-hua chien-wen-chih (ca. 1080), and its twelfth-century sequel, Hua-chi 畫記, there must have occurred a softening of attitude towards chieh-hua which is reflected in Teng Ch’un’s words.⁵⁵ It is possible that paintings such as Chang Tse-tuan’s “Ch’ing-ming” scroll, with its spatial innovations and unparalleled

---

⁵⁰ Whitfield, “Ch’ing-ming shang-ho t’u,” p. 22.
⁵¹ Ibid., p. 3.
⁵² Ibid., p. 53.
⁵³ Ibid., p. 58.
⁵⁴ Maeda, *Two Twelfth Century Texts*, p. 62. Cf. the remarkable trompe-l’oeil effects achieved at the Northern Sung tombs (one datable A.D. 1099) at Pai-sha, Honan, where painting and sculpture are combined to give the illusion of figures behind or inside partially opened doors. See Su Pai 宿白, *Pai-sha Sung-mu 白沙宋墓* (Peking, 1957), p. 23, fig. 38. ⁵⁵ Cf. the quotation from Kuo Jo-hsü noted in no. 5 above.
use of foreshortening, may have contributed to this change in attitude.

Although the “Ch’ing-ming” painting has many stylistic facets, it is mainly an example of chieh-hua. The various types of wooden constructions that are depicted in the scroll have been discussed by Whitfield and need not be repeated here. It is sufficient to say that the chieh-hua motifs all present a functional appearance—as if their author was well aware of their actual modes of construction. As for Chang Tse-tuan’s technique, Whitfield writes that the lines which depict constructions are “never ruled, never lacking in vitality.”56 One reason that Chang’s lines hardly ever appear uniformly straight and thus “unvital” is that they are descriptive of the texture as well as the silhouette of the represented objects. He varied the breadth, the weight and the tempo of the line to suit the textural appearance of tile, thatch and wood. His technique, then, is more painterly than it is linear. In comparison to the varied lineament of the “Ch’ing-ming” scroll, the spare and finely inked line used to describe the ships in the Kuo Chung-shu “Two Boats” painting is more typical of what Kuo Jo-hsü called “brush-strokes of even strength.”57 On the basis of visual and literary evidence, Kuo Chung-shu should be considered more a draftsman than a painter; therefore, Chang Tse-tuan’s “Ch’ing-ming” scroll may be interpreted as both a departure from Kuo Chung-shu’s technique and an enrichment of chieh-hua style.

The “slice-of-life” realism of the “Ch’ing-ming” scroll can also be found in an anonymous early twelfth-century painting in the Boston Museum, representing the return of Lady Wen-chi from Mongolia to China (fig. 10).58 Originally, the painting may have been part of a long handscroll illustrating the narrative poem titled Hu-chia shih-pa p’ai 胡笳十八拍 (“Eighteen Refrains to a Barbarian Flute”) traditionally attributed to Ts’ai Wen-chi 蔡文姬 (Lady Wen-chi) who lived about A.D. 133–192. In style, the Chang Tse-tuan work and the Boston painting are strikingly similar,59 both use overhead perspective and oblique views, equivalent types of tile-roofed domestic buildings, and similar clusters of figures. There is little question that the anonymous painter put the Han dynasty narrative in a twelfth-century setting. To recreate an authentic Han dynasty milieu at such a removed period as the late Northern Sung would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible, due to the scarcity of actual physical models.60 Therefore, the painter of the “Wen-chi” work, who was probably an Academician, modernized his theme to
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suit the realistic tastes of his audience. The one difference between the Boston and Peking paintings is in the greater emotional content of the Boston painting. The poignance of Lady Wen-chi’s homecoming from years of Mongolian captivity is tenderly conveyed as she stands with quiet dignity before a host of relatives overcome with feeling. In contrast to this scene which takes place in courtyard privacy, there is the scene outside which shows the public life of the city. The members of Lady Wen-chi’s retinue who are grouped on the street in front of the courtyard gate draw the curious stares of some passersby, while others go undistractedly about their tasks or conversations. Taken together, these two connected scenes convey, by means of an almost cinematic technique, a sense of personal drama contrasted with the mainstream of life.

The “Lady Wen-chi” scroll is primarily figurative in content, despite its heavy use of chieh-hua. But another kind of historical painting which began during the late T’ang was almost exclusively architectural in subject, judging from recorded titles and the fact that paintings of later periods bearing these titles were executed in pure chieh-hua style. Yin Chi-chao 尹繼昭, a late T’ang painter and the only architectural specialist of that period listed in the Hsüan-ho hua-p’u, was author of paintings called the “A-fang Palace,” and “Palaces of Wu,” according to Kuo Jo-hsü, who said these paintings were still in existence in his time. In fact, one of the four paintings listed under Yin Chi-chao’s name in the Hsüan-ho hua-p’u was titled the “A-fang Palace”; another was the “Han Palace.” The same catalogue lists the name of Wei Hsien 徐賢 as one of two Five Dynasties architectural specialists. Kuo Jo-hsü wrote that Wei Hsien “began by taking Yin Chi-chao as his master”; he also mentions some titles of paintings by Wei Hsien which suggest Yin Chi-chao’s influence: “Waiting-for-worthy-men Palace” and “Pavilion of the Prince of T’eng.” Without visual evidence for the architectural style of either of these painters it is hard to imagine what their accumulated effect could have been on painters of the Southern Sung period who also did historically oriented paintings whose subjects were large palatial complexes. It is my impression that these Southern Sung works should be interpreted less as survivals of past painting than as manifestations of a new architectural painting style.

61 The A-fang was the name of the great palace built for Ch’in Shih huang-ti (“The First Exalted Emperor of the Ch’in”); the Wu palaces may have referred to the palaces of the Han Dynasty city of Wu (third century a.d.). See Soper, Experiences, pp. 26, 137.
The new works exchanged overt narrative appeal for a self-conscious aestheticism which drew attention to their formal qualities and mood. In their lyrical mood, many of these paintings exuded a romantic, nostalgic image of the past; in that sense, their pseudo-historical nature was more obvious than that of the “Wen-chi” scroll. Since most of these works were commissioned by a court which had fled south from the onslaught of the Chin Tatars, their images of grandiose palace structures may have been intended to shore up sagging imperial confidence.

The hanging scroll called “Banquet by Lanternlight” in the Palace Museum in Taiwan (figs. 11a and b) is an excellent example of the new style of architectural painting. Features of this painting such as the one-corner composition, the mist-suffused landscape, the towering expressionistic pine tree and the angular outlines of distant mountains are most often mentioned as typical stylistic traits of Ma Yuan (馬遠, ca. 1190–1225), to whom this painting is attributed and by whom it was very likely executed. Commonly overlooked by critics in discussions of paintings of this type is the architectural subject matter, in this case the “Han Palace” which is mentioned in the poetical inscription composed by Emperor Ning-tsung (1195–1224) and written by Yang Mei-tzu (楊妹子, 1163–1233), at the top of the painting.

Academic landscape painters of the Southern Sung period, like Academicians in the Northern Sung, had to master the styles of representing architecture and other man-made constructions in order to include these subjects in their paintings. What distinguished their works from those of the earlier period was the placement and, therefore, the emphasis given to architecture in their compositions. In a comparison of the “Buddhist Temple” painting in the Nelson Gallery (figs. 7a–c) and the “Banquet by Lanternlight” scene, this difference becomes clear. The earlier work is essentially a landscape painting with the inclusion of architectural motifs; whereas the Ma Yuan scroll is an architectural subject set against the backdrop of landscape—in short, an architectural landscape. The enormous banquet hall in the Ma Yuan painting occupies the focal point of the composition; it is the raison d’être of the painting. Its horizontal mass and straight lines stabilize and contrast with the darting, diagonal rhythms of the prunus trees in the foreground and the lofty pine tree overhead. The miniscule figures, particularly the sixteen female dancers in the court yard, lend delicate grace notes to the painting’s fleeting, evanescent mood; unlike the figures in the “Ch’ing-ming” and “Lady Wen-chi” paintings, however, they are lacking realistic detail. Realistic detail was perhaps considered inappropriate for the courtly figures of the “Banquet” scene. Yet, the architecture of the Ma Yuan painting also lacks the powerful realism of the “Ch’ing-ming” structures. The overall feeling of weight and mass of the banquet hall is contradicted by its rather spindly construction: the supporting columns seem too tenu-
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66 Ibid., pt. 1, pp. 1–2. By identifying the writer of this inscription as the second consort of Emperor Ning-tsung, Empress Yang Mei-tzu, Chiang gives further credence to the painting’s attribution to Ma Yuan.
ous to adequately carry the weight of the roof; and the lattice screens, composed of a network of crisscrossing lines, seem too weightless to be real. Furthermore, Ma Yüan placed the banquet hall in p'ing-yüan 平遠 ("even distance"), thereby stressing its facade. Chang Tse-tuan, on the other hand, used overhead perspective and diagonal views, thus presenting his constructions in a way which would emphasize their massive, three-dimensional appearance.

There is another painting in the Palace Museum which is comparable to the Ma Yüan scroll. It is an anonymous album leaf, the subject of which was identified by Li Lin-ts’an and James Cahill as "Emperor Ming-huang and Yang Kuei-fei setting out on their journey to Shu" (fig. 12). In his discussion of this work Li wrote that "it appears to be an Academy work of the twelfth century," an opinion which I would further refine to a late twelfth-century period. The central structure in the album leaf is a large, two-storied palace in front of which are the tiny figures of the Emperor, his consort, and their retinue. The scale of figures to architecture is analogous to that of the Ma Yüan scroll. In addition to the main building there are subsidiary galleries and pavilions set among landscape in the foreground and background of the painting.

The effect of horizontality in the buildings of the album leaf is stronger than that stemming from the single building of the Ma Yüan hanging scroll, due to the broad, straight lines used to depict the ridges of roofs. The same type of lines can be found in the buildings in both the "Ch'ing-ming" and "Lady Wen-chi" paintings. But in both those works the strong linear accents were used descriptively and did not distract from the narratives; in the album leaf, on the other hand, such lines tend to produce a sense of overall pattern which offsets the illusionistic character of the painting. Another effect of these heavy, horizontal and diagonal lines is to seemingly enframe and enclose the core scene; the slanting, open-ended views of the urban portraits, in contrast, convey the notion that the scenes portrayed could continue beyond the borders of the paintings.

The incipient patternization and narrowing pictorial focus revealed in the "Ming-huang" album leaf are symptoms of stylistic changes which occurred in late twelfth-century architectural painting. A pair of signed album leaves by Li Sung 李嵩 (ca. 1190–1230) in the Palace Museum in Taiwan represent the outcome of these trends in the thirteenth century. These delightful works are portrayals of a dragon boat and
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68 Li Lin-ts’an, "A Study," p. 320.
a palace executed in crisp, clean lines and bright colors (figs. 13a and b). The draughtsmanlike precision and structural validity of these depictions are the results, perhaps, of Li Sung’s training as a carpenter before becoming a court painter. These works, more than any others we have considered thus far, are examples of what could be called pure chieh-hua technique: a multitude of straight (ruled?) lines skillfully interwoven with lines drawn in freehand.

The most novel aspect of Li Sung’s architectural paintings is their lack of a natural setting. By boldly eliminating any suggestion of spatial environment Li was able to bring his subjects close to the viewer, enlarging the scale to the point that the constructions almost fill the entire picture surface. Seen at such close range, the subjects of these small works invite perusal of their tiniest details, provoking the kind of viewer delight and involvement often produced by miniature paintings.

The Southern Sung Painting Academy was the perfect aesthetic climate for paintings such as Li Sung’s. The taste for large monumental landscapes of the sort favored in Northern Sung had run its course; in their place had come the fragmented views of nature painted by artists such as Ma Yüan and Hsia Kuei. The next step—that of eliminating landscape entirely or giving it only minimal significance in paintings—of Li O 廖飚 (1692–1752). See Hua-shih ts’ung-shu ed., ch. 5. On the basis of brushwork and signature style, Chiang includes these paintings in a group of five album leaves which he says are the work of Li Sung.

Li O wrote regarding these works: “[Li Sung] did not use a ruler (chieh-ch’ih 幹梅) but his plumb lines are all correct” (ibid.). Although the nervous, tensile quality of Li Sung’s lines belie the use of a ruler, it is still difficult to believe that the sheer length and straightness of some of his lines could have been done without the aid of a straight-edge. provided opportunities for artists such as Li Sung whose style depended on the display of technical virtuosity in the minute depiction of material objects. The emphasis on technical virtuosity in Southern Sung court painting had an effect apparently on the resurgence of chieh-hua, a painting style which, first and foremost, stressed technique. We have already observed that the Southern Sung critic-historian Teng Ch’ün 譚暾 regarded chieh-hua paintings in quite a different and more favorable light than his predecessor, Kuo Jo-hsü. Thus, the Li Sung album leaves in the Palace Museum, seen against the period’s stylistic and attitudinal changes, do not seem to be isolated phenomena at all but rather are reflections of larger tendencies in Southern Sung court painting.

The realism of Li Sung’s album leaves is of a different sort from that of late Northern Sung Academy paintings. In sheer accumulation of detail, the dragon boat and palace scenes are convincingly realistic in appearance. If, however, the representation of space is used as a criterion for measuring realism, then the Li Sung paintings cannot compare with the realism of Chang Ts’u-tuan’s “Ch’ing-ming” scroll. Merely by comparing Chang’s sharply foreshortened high-terraced city gate (fig. 9e) with Li Sung’s structures indicates the difference in each artist’s spatial concepts. Chang’s building was conceived as an integral part of a spatial continuum. Its great mass is integrated with the surrounding landscape and figures. One imagines the flow of space about these various elements. Li Sung’s constructions, on the other hand, exist in a spatial vacuum. Since Li Sung was essentially a draughtsman and miniaturist, space became a negative factor in his paintings.
Fig. 1.—Two Boats on a River after Snowfall. Kuo Chung-shu. National Palace Museum, Taiwan.
Fig. 2a.—Copy of Two Boats on a River after Snowfall. Nelson Gallery, Kansas City.

Fig. 2b.—Colophon.
Fig. 3.—Market Village by the River. Anonymous. National Palace Museum, Taiwan.

Fig. 4.—Tun-huang. Cave 45 (a.d. 713–762).
Fig. 5.—Wintry Scene. Anonymous. National Palace Museum, Taiwan.
Fig. 6a.—Temples on a Mountainside. Yen Wen-kuei. Abe Collection. Osaka Municipal Museum, Japan.

Fig. 6b.—Temples on a Mountainside. Detail.
Fig. 7a.—Buddhist Temple in the Mountains. Attributed to Li Ch'eng. Nelson Gallery, Kansas City.
Figs. 7b–c.—Buddhist Temple in the Mountains. Details.
Fig. 8a.—Early Spring. Kuo Hsi. Dated 1072. National Palace Museum, Taiwan.
Fig. 8b.—Early Spring, Detail.

Fig. 9a.—Going up the River for the Spring Festival.
Figs. 9b–c.—Going up the River for the Spring Festival. Details.
Figs. 9d-e.—Going up the River for the Spring Festival. Details.
Fig. 10.—Lady Wen-chi. Anonymous. Early 12th century. Courtesy, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Fig. 11a.—Banquet by Lanternlight. Attributed to Ma Yuan.
National Palace Museum, Taiwan.
Fig. 11b.—Banquet by Lanternlight. Detail.

Fig. 12.—Emperor Ming-huang and Yang Kuei-fei setting out on their Journey to Shu. Anonymous. 12th century. National Palace Museum, Taiwan.
Fig. 13a.—PALACE. Li Sung. National Palace Museum, Taiwan.

Fig. 13b.—DRAGON BOAT. Li Sung. National Palace Museum, Taiwan.
Fig. 14.—Dragon Boat Regatta. Wang Chen-p'eng. Dated 1310. National Palace Museum, Taiwan.

Fig. 15.—Dragon Boat Regatta. Wang Chen-p'eng. Dated 1323. National Palace Museum, Taiwan.
Plate 14:

Chinese boat races in Taiwan.}
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Wang Chen-p'eng.}

Plate 16:

National Palace Museum.
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National Palace Museum.
He was less concerned with the representation of forms as they exist in space than he was with the surface appearance of the forms themselves. Through his preoccupation with minute details he shows his minia-
turist tendencies. The album leaves, especially the dragon boat scene, exhibit the difficulties inherent in introducing myriad details within a narrow, confined space. One is reminded, when examining Li Sung’s dragon boat, of Kuo Jo-hsü’s charge that the brushwork of chieh-hua painters of his day was “too intricate and confusing.” Li Sung’s affection for detail and overall, bounding silhouettes and his general dis-regard for spatial subtleties may have led to the distortions in perspective which occur in the dragon boat painting. The palace-like superstructure of the boat is depicted in a conventionalized three-quarter view which does not harmonize spatially with the diagonal view of the vessel’s dragon hull. Yet, the distortions are compatible with the painter’s aims: to depict the surfaces of structures which would provide the greatest opportunity for lavish detail, even at the expense of proper perspective, and all within the confines of a pleasing silhouette. That the total effect of Li Sung’s album leaves is something less than the realism of late Northern Sung painters does not indicate a basic change in the descriptive aims of Southern Sung court painters. The illusion of reality is still preserved in Li Sung’s subjects despite his inclinations to design and pattern.

Since Li Sung’s stylistically cohesive album leaves are almost identical in size and are part of the same album, they were probably intended as a pair. Several things indicate this. For example, Li signed his name on both leaves. In the dragon boat scene he placed it to the right of the painting (an unusual place for a signature), and in the palace scene he placed his name to the left, thus balancing the two inscriptions and indicating that the dragon boat was the right hand side of the pair. In addition, he positioned five courtiers in the portico at the right side of the palace who indicate by their anticipatory gestures the imminent arrival of the dragon boat. It is my belief that this pair of paintings, or one very much like it, provided the inspiration for the court painter Wang Chen-p’eng 王振鶴 in the Yüan dynasty when he painted the theme of the “Dragon Boat Regatta in the Chin-ming Pond.”

There are at least six extant versions of a handscroll, attributed to Wang Chen-p’eng (act. early 14th century), depicting the dragon boat regatta which took place annually during the Ch’ung-ning period (1102–06) in the Northern Sung capital of Pien-ching 荊京. Of these, at least two have identical inscriptions and poems by
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71 Li O (ibid.) identified these figures as eunuchs awaiting the arrival of the emperor. Since there is no one identifiable as an emperor in the dragon boat, Li O does not make the direct link that I do between these two pictures.

72 Complete biographical and bibliographical information is provided on Wang Chen-p’eng 王振鶴 in T’ien Hsu-wei 前衛, h. Ku-yün-ch’u-shih 孤雲處士, and these various paintings in Sherman E. Lee and Wai-kam Ho, Chinese Art Under the Mongols: The Yüan Dynasty (1279–1368) (Cleveland, 1968), under the entry (no. 201) for the “Dragon Boat Regatta” scroll owned by the Metropolitan Mus. of Art, N.Y. Ho, idem., quotes from an epitaph of Wang Chen-p’eng’s father recorded in Yüan-wen-lei 元文類 by Su T’ien-chüeh 蘇天爵 (1294–1352): “He (Wang) was given an official position in the period of Yen-yu (1314–1320). He was shortly afterward transferred to the post of the Registrar of the Imperial Library where he was able to examine all the ancient paintings in its inventory. As a result, his knowledge in painting was greatly advanced.”
Wang Chen-p’eng that are dated 1323.\textsuperscript{73} In the inscription there is reference to an earlier version of the same subject painted by the artist in 1310; a version of this painting exists in the Palace Museum in Taiwan (fig. 14).\textsuperscript{74} The same museum possesses an example of the 1323 painting as well (fig. 15).\textsuperscript{75} These two paintings show minor variations in motifs and composition, but the most noticeable difference between them is in the scale of objects represented. Since the motifs of the earlier works are depicted in much smaller scale than in the later version, one wonders if Wang’s failing eyesight, mentioned in his inscription, could have been responsible for the escalation in size. Both scrolls are executed solely in ink in a linear technique of intaglio-like clarity and precision and with a strong use of light and shade, particularly evident in the velvety dark shading which is used in modeling the bases of boats and buildings.

Wang Chen-p’eng translated his narrative into a marvelous series of witty vignettes which convey the sense of a fantastic pageant. Since the festival inspiring these scrolls was a nautical one, boats of all types abound.\textsuperscript{76} There is, of course, a whole fleet of dragon boats manned by crews of competing oarsmen whose spirits are incited by “thundering applause and cacophony of drumbeats and music.” In addition, there are boats used for daredevil acrobatic displays and the symbolic release of caged birds. Most unusual are the slim wooden floats carved in the shape of fish which are precariously ridden by single upright figures: in the 1310 version, one of these is ridden by a group of three figures balancing one on top the other, with the middle figure carrying banners and the top figure incredibly supporting himself with one hand while balancing a wheel with his feet—all of this happening while the float glides through the water! A few lines of Wang Chen-p’eng’s poem captures the flavor of his scenes:

Although the prizes [of the competition] could not be worth much, the river-boys from the Wu District
Were heedless in the height of their ecstasy.\textsuperscript{77}

The two motifs which Wang Chen-p’eng borrowed from Li Sung’s album leaves occur in the first and last part of his handscroll. Since he adapted and embellished both motifs in similar fashion I have chosen to discuss only the design of his dragon boat to illustrate what changes he made from the originals. The giant dragon boat which Wang placed at the beginning of his scroll is clearly based on Li Sung’s design, but with some significant changes. The most obvious is the fact that he put Li Sung’s single image into a larger pictorial context, adding three smaller dragon boats in the background. He also slightly shifted the movement of the vessel, turning it so that

\textsuperscript{73} One of the two Palace Museum versions and the Metropolitan version.

\textsuperscript{74} Handscroll titled “Pao-chin ching-tu” 寶津競渡, ink on silk, 36.6 x 183.4 cm. KKSHL, vol. 4, p. 121. The date of this work (1310) precedes the period of his tenure as Registrar of the Imperial Library when he was exposed to ancient paintings. However, this does not preclude his seeing the Li Sung paintings or a facsimile of them in 1310.

\textsuperscript{75} Handscroll titled “Lung-ch’ih ching-tu” 龍池競渡, ink on silk, 12 x 96 in., KKSHL, vol. 4, pp. 121-123. Reproduced in 300, vol. 4, pl. 160; Chinese Art Treasures, pl. 73; CKLTMHC, vol. 3, 18.


\textsuperscript{77} Lee and Ho, Chinese Art under the Mongols, p. 201.
the dragon's head and tail are almost in the same plane. This adjustment in direction may have been made because Wang felt uncomfortable with the spatial distortions in Li Sung's original. Furthermore, Wang lightened and heightened the superstructure, making its roof rise above the head and tail of the dragon hull. He left large pockets of empty space about the upper stories of the structure, alleviating some of the claustrophobic effects of Li Sung's more compressed composition.

Thus, Wang Chen-p'eng articulated his forms more clearly than Li, but by so doing he stressed pattern far more than did his predecessor. One is much more conscious throughout his scroll of repeated patterns and accents (such as the leitmotif of black caps worn by all his figures) than in Li's paintings. There is a machine-like precision to his technique and an undisguised use of the ruler that is quite different from the lighter, more natural touch of Li Sung. Yet, it is Li Sung who is the more soberly realistic of the two; Wang Chen-p'eng re-

78 See Chang Ch'ou, Ch'ing-ho SHF, vol. 6, for assessment of Kuo and Wang. However, T'ang Hou's remarks regarding chieh-hua in his Hua-chien (1328) (modern ed. compiled by Ma Ts'ai, Peking, 1959, p. 75) must be mentioned: "Painting critics commonly say: 'Painting has thirteen classifications, of which landscape is the top and chieh-hua is at the bottom'; hence, chieh-hua is considered an easy thing to do." T'ang Hou then proceeds to enumerate the difficulties of representing the work of the carpenter and architect and the need for using the proper chieh-hua aids. He concludes by placed that sobriety with whimsy and an all-inclusive decorative design.

Wang Chen-p'eng's chieh-hua style is characteristic of the architectural painting of his age. In the eyes of critics, Wang was regarded as the next great master of chieh-hua after Kuo Chung-shu.78 This high regard may have been founded on several factors, not the least of which was Wang's exceptional abilities manifested in paintings such as the "Dragon Boat Regatta." He was also the acknowledged master of the other architectural specialists of the Yüan period such as Li Jung-chin 李容瑾 and Hsia Yung 夏永. But, implicit in the praise lavished on Wang was the recognition, perhaps, that he had radically changed the nature of chieh-hua from realism to frank decoration. If Li Sung spelled the end of the first great cycle of chieh-hua style which had begun with Kuo Chung-shu in the tenth century, Wang Chen-p'eng heralded the beginning of the final phase, when chieh-hua became a reflection of the world of fantasy, rather than fact.

quoting Chao Tzu-ang's 趙子昂 (Chao Meng-fu) advice to his son Yung (Chao Yung 趙雍): "All of painting is perhaps fabrication to deceive people; but with regard to chieh-hua, no painter could do this without using the technique in accordance with the laws." The remarks of T'ang Hou and Chao Meng-fu reflect the respectful but grudging admiration of Yüan literati painters and critics for chieh-hua. It was once again considered a skill, a necessary technique for painters (even literati painters) to study but not to specialize in.
AJANTĀ'S CHRONOLOGY: THE CRUCIAL CAVE

BY WALTER M. SPINK*

Cave 16 at Ajantā (fig. 1) is an excavation of great importance, for it alone allows us to establish the chronology of Ajantā's Mahāyāna phase within narrow limits. Furthermore, although it is not a particularly elaborate cave, it plays a crucial role in the development of style and iconography at the site. This is hardly surprising when we consider that it was the donation of the royal minister of the Vākāṭaka king, Harisheṇa. This official, Varāhadeva, clearly wielded great power in the empire, for he could claim, in his cave's dedicatory inscription, that:

Beloved by the king and the subjects, he, who was of staid and firm mind, endowed with the virtues of liberality, forgiveness and generosity, and intent on [the performance of] religious duty, governed the country righteously, [shining] brightly with the rays of his fame, religious merit and virtue [verse 20].

The Cave 16 inscription, incised on the left side-wall just outside the cave's porch (fig. 2), first reviews the genealogy of the Vākāṭaka monarchy and refers in laudatory terms to the donor's own father, Hāshibhoja, the minister of the previous king, Devasena. The inscription then refers to the accession and the conquests of King Harisheṇa and to the establishment of the minister himself, whose virtues it fulsomely extols. Finally it goes on to describe the cave in unusually complete detail. It speaks of the decorations of the interior, of the presence of the shrine chamber, and even mentions the Nāgarājā-shrine on the stairway outside as well as the adjacent cistern. There seems every reason to assume—as scholars invariably have—that the cave was essentially complete when Varāhadeva's donative record was written.

Cave 16, in the five distinct stages of its history, sums up the whole later (i.e. Mahāyāna) history of the site.

I. Cave 16 itself was started circa A.D. 464, the site having been begun a very few years earlier (circa A.D. 462) just shortly after King Harisheṇa came to power. The elements of the cave which belong to this inaugural phase are characteristically early in style, with something of that diffidence which is to be felt in all of the earliest Mahāyāna endeavors at the site.

II. Cave 16's patronage, along with that of many of the other early caves, suffered a hiatus in its development circa A.D. 470. Only Caves 17, 19 and 20, started in circa A.D. 466 and circa A.D. 468 and circa A.D. 469 respectively, continued to be worked on throughout the hiatus period; Caves 17 and 19, and possibly cave 20 too, were sponsored by a feudatory dynasty which may not have been seriously affected by the political and/or economic setbacks which must have caused the interruption of work on the monuments which Varāhadeva (and possibly other donors connected with the Vākāṭaka court) had sponsored.²

* Professor of Indian Art, Department of the History of Art, University of Michigan.

1 For the inscription see V. V. Mirashi, Inscrip-

2 No other records of Varāhadeva or persons

iations of the Vākāṭakas, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, (Ootacamund, 1963), vol. 5, pp. 103-111.
III. Cave 16’s excavation and decoration was continued by Varahadeva from circa A.D. 477 until circa A.D. 479, in a characteristically late style. A great new surge of patronage had begun at the site some five years earlier, but at that time it seems that Varahadeva’s attention had been centered upon his large vihāra at Ghaṭotkacha, some eleven miles away. A consistent program of excavation seems to have continued at both Ghaṭotkacha and on most of the Ajantā caves, as well as Aurangabad Caves 1 and 3, throughout the latter years of the reign of the great King Harisheṇa, whose death must have occurred about A.D. 481.

IV. A small amount of very late work involving the addition of a few painted Buddha images continued in Cave 16 during the period from circa A.D. 482 to circa A.D. 483. At that time, Harisheṇa’s weak successor was in power, but very much dominated by the pernicious influence of the seemingly friendly Asmākas. Similarly sporadic or intrusive

known to be members of the Vākātaka court are extant, but they may be missing because of breakage or loss of paint from the cave facades. For the feudatory’s Cave 17 inscription, which apparently also refers to the donation of the nearby Cave 19, see ibid., pp. 120–129. Cave 20, which lies nearby and shows many stylistic and iconographic connections with Caves 17 and 19, may also have been donated by a member of this feudatory court. An incised donative record on Cave 20’s left porch pilaster, although very damaged, appears to refer to this still somewhat unfinished cave as a dedication of a donor named Upendra . . . whose father, according to Burgess’s reading (J. Burgess, Report on the Buddhist Cave Temples, Archeological Survey of Western India, vol. 4 [London, 1883], p. 132), may have been named Kṛi (ṣiṇa) or Kṛi (ṣṭhādāsa), which is the name of the father of the donor of Cave 17. The Cave 17 donor’s name is lost, but it is just conceivable that it was Upendra, since this name appears early in the genealogy given in the Cave 17 inscription, and could well have been the name of a later prince as well. (Kācha, for instance, appears as the name of two princes in the list.)

The plastering of the residence cells was probably done just after Varahadeva turned the cave over to the monastic community in ca. A.D. 479. See p. 163.

For the Asmaka usurpation, see below pp. 165–166.

additions were made to many other caves as well, most of which had not been finally completed by this time. The haphazard organization and the almost exclusively iconic (as opposed to narrative or ornamental) nature of most of the sculptures and paintings done in this final phase hints at the troubles with which both the Vākātaka dynasty and the site must have now been beset.

V. With the overthrow of the Vākātaka power in about A.D. 483 and the usurpation of many of their former domains by the Asmākas, all thought of further work on Cave 16 must quickly have been given up; indeed the patronage of the whole site quite abruptly ended at this time, as a study of the style and iconography of the many incomplete caves proves. From this moment, or very shortly thereafter, as the lack of later inscriptions, later repairs, later motifs, and even later smoke deposits suggests, Ajantā was forever abandoned.

6 Most caves in western India which appear to have been in use for any length of time have thick smoke deposits in their interiors (e.g. Bāgh, most Ellora caves, and the earlier Mahāyāna caves at Ajantā; of the latter Cave Lower 6, the first completed, is particularly darkened). By contrast most of the mural surfaces in the latest caves at Ajantā are quite unsullied. We do know that some of the Ajantā caves (notably Cave 11, which has thick smoke deposits) were used later on by sādhus, etc., as painted Saivite emblems would suggest; but such use seems to have been quite limited. There are no Hindu sculptures or converted images at Ajantā; nor are there even Buddhist sculptures or paintings which can be assigned to the later period when Buddhism was flourishing at the nearby site of Ellora. One presumed Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscription appears at the juncture of Cave 26 and Cave 27, but it is not a donative record. Its presence certainly suggests that large numbers of people may have visited the site in later centuries—as they did on certain Hindu festival days until very recent times—but it hardly allows us to infer that the site was an active monastic establishment during the period of Rāṣṭrakūṭa rule. The Chinese pilgrim Hsuan Ts’ang, who travelled through this region in the early 7th century, mentions the site as a famous one, but the imprecise nature of his description suggests that he did not even visit it, which he certainly would have done if it were active.
Our present study will comprise an attempt to establish this chronology, using art-historical evidence in conjunction with epigraphic and other historical data. However, we should preface our discussion with a word of caution about our dating. Since there are no absolute dates in inscriptions at Ajantā, all the dates which we have assigned are necessarily approximations, even though we render them in quite specific terms. The reader must allow a two or three year margin of error. This, however, should not affect the overall sequence of dating which we propose.  

We have arrived at our dates by selecting (with a necessary arbitrariness) what we consider as the likely extremes for the site’s activity—namely ca. 462 to ca. 483. We develop our overall sequence between these poles, which are themselves limited by the terminus post quem of A.D. 458 (when Devasena was reigning) and A.D. 486 (by which time the Vākāṭaka house had fallen). The development of the thousands of separate motifs at the site is so complex and the temporal relationships between caves and parts of caves so intricate that it seems to us less misleading to use “precise” dates than to “round off” the dates at five or ten year intervals. The latter technique is appropriate for sites with a very extensive development, but it is hardly valid for a site such as Ajantā, where such a vast amount of work was accomplished in a mere quarter century.  

1. Cave 16 could not have been undertaken before circa A.D. 464.  

We know that King Harishēṇa could not have come to power before A.D. 458 since his father, Devasena, was reigning at that time, as the recently discovered Hisse Borālā inscription proves.  

Reading the inscriptive evidence in Cave 16 literally, and I think fairly, the following events occurred after A.D. 458. Devasena died (or gave up the throne) and was succeeded by Harishēṇa; Harishēṇa (as the Cave 16 inscription implies) appointed Varāhadeva as his minister; and Varāhadeva (“after having acquired much religious merit”) inaugurated the cave. Putting these events in sequence, it is hard to think that the cave could have been begun before about A.D. 464—or at the very earliest, a few years before this time.  

2. Cave 16 could not have been completed and dedicated later than circa A.D. 479.  

We know from the Kanheri copper plate inscription, dated in accordance with A.D. 494 that the Traikūṭakas were in control of the Konkan and nearby areas at that time, while the Surat copper plates of the Traikūṭaka Vyāghrasena dated in accord-

6 For further discussion of our views on the chronology of the site, see in particular Ajantā to Ellora (Ann Arbor, 1967); “Ajantā and Ghaṭotkacha: A Preliminary Analysis,” Ars Orientalis, vol. 6 (1966), pp. 135–155; “Ajantā’s Chronology: The problem of Cave Eleven,” Ars Orientalis, vol. 7 (1968), pp. 155–168. The reader will note that the datings which we now propose are not exactly the same as those given in these previous studies; our opinion regarding the development of cave 16, in particular, has changed.  

7 In a study of technical procedures (still unpublished) we shall attempt to show that this “vast amount of work” could easily have been accomplished in about two decades.  

ance with the year A.D. 490 make it clear that that region had actually been under their control from at least as early as A.D. 490, while the recently discovered copper plates of the Traikūṭaka Madhyamasena dated in K. 256 (= A.D. 506) suggest that this control continued without interruption into the early sixth century.9 But, according to Varāhadeva’s Cave 16 inscription, Harishena controlled Trikūṭa and Lāṭa (i.e. this western region) as well as many other territories at the time of the cave’s dedication, which must therefore fall prior to A.D. 490. Harishena’s control of these regions to the west is equally confirmed by the evidence of the Daśakumāracharita, wherein the Konkan is listed as being incorporated into the far-flung kingdom of Harishena, at least during the latter years of his reign, just prior to the destruction of Vākāṭaka power by a coalition of feudatories.10 The Vākāṭakas, under Harishena’s inept son and successor, never recovered from this overthrow, the outcome of which brought the Āśmakas into ascendancy in the very heart of Harishena’s former domains. Inscriptional evidence in the later Ajantā caves confirms this growth of Āśmaka power in the Vākāṭaka domains, thus adding confirmation to the Daśakumāracharita account. The great chaitya hall Cave 26 was actually given “in honour of (the minister Bhavvirāja) who served the king of Āśmaka.”11 Considerations of style and iconography show that Cave 26 must have been underway at just about the time when Varāhadeva’s patronage of Cave 16 was ending. This supports our assumption that the Cave 16 record was completed very late in Harishena’s reign, as does a study of the development of the cave itself, which comprises both very early and very late elements and yet was all done during the tenure of Harishena’s minister.

The above arguments provide a terminus ante quem of A.D. 490 for the Vākāṭaka empire’s collapse, since the Daśakumāracharita (assuming with Mirashi that it provides a reliable reflex of the political situation during the final years of Vākāṭaka rule) makes it clear that the Konkan was in Vākāṭaka hands during at least the latter years of Harishena’s reign and continued to be held by his successor up until the time of the dynasty’s collapse. Therefore the rise of the Traikūṭakas in the Konkan must post-date this event. The Ajantā Cave 16 inscription, which also shows that Harishena was holding the Konkan at a late point in his reign, gives further credibility to this conclusion. The Daśakumāracharita further states that when the Vākāṭaka house fell, the Āśmakas (who had engineered the uprising) spread dissension among the other feudatory kings and ended up by taking over control of all the lands gained; this would of course have included the Konkan. Since the Traikūṭakas were ascendant in the Konkan by A.D. 490 it would follow that the Āśmakas must have ruled there just prior to that date, as the usurpers of the Vākāṭaka domains. Allowing


a few years for this Asmaka interregnum, which may well have been brief due to the unstable nature of the feudatories’ coalition, it seems reasonable to place the Vākāṭaka collapse closer to A.D. 485 than to A.D. 490.

Other considerations also suggest that the Vākāṭaka dynasty may have collapsed a few years before A.D. 490, particularly when we again place a degree of reliance upon the Daśakumāracharita account, which tallies remarkably with evidence from other sources when, according to this record, Harisheṇa’s former feudatories rose up and destroyed the Vākāṭaka empire shortly after his weak son had succeeded him, Harisheṇa’s grandson fled for refuge to the city of Māhishmati, where his father’s half-brother (a “second” son of Harisheṇa, by another wife) was continuing to reign; obviously this region and its viceroy had somehow survived the more general collapse of the Vākāṭaka house, which had been caused by a revolt of feudatory states to the west and south, rather than to the north.

This flight of Harisheṇa’s grandson to his uncle’s court, which coincides with (and was occasioned by) the collapse of the main Vākāṭaka power, must have occurred prior to A.D. 486. We can assume this to be the case because we know from the Barwāṇi plate of that date (Gupta era 167 = A.D. 486) that a Mahārāja Subandhu who claims no connection with the Vākāṭaka house (and indeed dated his records according to the Gupta era) was then ruling in Māhishmati, and probably continued to rule there until the early sixth century.12

The terminus ante quem of A.D. 486 for the collapse of the main Vākāṭaka empire seems reasonable not only in the light of what we know of Vakāṭaka history but also in light of what little we know about the political history of Avanti (Western Malwa), which included the cities of Mandasor and (as its ancient capital) Ujjain. Harisheṇa had apparently captured this region along with others during the heyday of his power, judging from the Ajantā Cave 16 inscription which mentions this among other territories which he dominated. A study of inscriptions from Mandasor suggests that this expansion of Vākāṭaka power occurred no earlier than A.D. 473–474, since at that time (and also in A.D. 467) records from the region mentioned the Guptas but not the Vākāṭakas; while it could have occurred no later than A.D. 491, for at that date a King

---

12 Buddha Prakash (Studies in Indian History and Civilization, [Agra, 1962], pp. 399–404) argues that Subandhu can be identified with a powerful ruler of that name mentioned in the Mṛchhakatika, and would therefore have been ruling at the very end of the fifth century. Mirashi has suggested that the Barwani plate would be dated in accordance with the Kalachuri era (thus, A.D. 417), but this conclusion conflicts with evidence provided by the Bagh Cave 2 plate of this same ruler. A study of the style and iconography of the Bagh caves shows that none of them can belong to the early fifth century A.D. because they are more developed than Caves 16 and 17 at Ajantā, both of which have donative inscriptions of Harisheṇa’s period. Thus Subandhu’s Barwāṇi plate of the year 167 must be referred to the Gupta era, instead of the Kalachuri-Chedi era, and dated to A.D. 486 rather than to A.D. 417, as Mirashi suggests. We can assume that Subandhu’s related (but undated) Bāgh plate also dates to the late fifth century (i.e. close to A.D. 486). But here again, since it speaks of “repairs” at Bāgh and since none of the Bāgh caves can antedate the inauguration of Ajantā Cave 16, this inauguration must certainly have been made well before the date A.D. 486 when we know that Subandhu was ruling, rather than after this date, as Mirashi suggests. For the Barwāṇi and Bāgh plates of Mahārāja Subandhu, see Mirashi, Inscriptions of the Kalachuri-Chedi Era, pp. 17–21.
Gauri (whose capital may have been Ujjain) equally omits any reference to the Vākāṭakas, who could not have then been holding the region in any case if Subandhu was currently ruling further to the south at Māḥishmati. Thus Harisheṇa’s control over Avanti can reasonably be placed sometime between the outer limits of a.d. 473–474 on the one hand and a.d. 491 (or more probably a.d. 486—the known date of Subandhu) on the other.13 This control may well have continued right up to the time of the Vākāṭaka collapse, for the ruler of Avanti (like the Vākāṭaka viceroy of Māḥishmati) is conspicuously absent from the list of feudatory kings who according to the Daśakumāracharita banded together and destroyed the power of the central house which Harisheṇa’s successor so ineffectually controlled.

The above considerations support the view that Harisheṇa’s expansion to the north into Avanti and to the west into the Konkan took place well before the end of the fifth century a.d. and allow our conclusion that the Vākāṭaka empire had indeed fallen before a.d. 486, when we know that Mahārāja Subandhu was ruling in Māḥishmati. This Subandhu may well be one and the same as the Daśakumāracharita’s “Prince Viśruta” who conspired to have the Māḥishmati ruler (Harisheṇa’s “second” son) murdered, and who then set himself up in power, legitimizing his usurpation of the throne by becoming the protector of Harisheṇa’s very young grandson and by marrying the boy’s older sister, who was herself only thirteen at the time of the flight to Māḥishmati. According to the Daśakumāracharita this Prince Viśruta came from Magadha, the Gupta homeland; his suggested identity with Subandhu might explain the fact that Subandhu’s inscriptions are dated in the Gupta era.

The shifts in power after Harisheṇa’s death probably took place very quickly indeed. The Daśakumāracharita implies that Harisheṇa’s successor, obviously unable to hold the great empire together, ruled only briefly before the dynasty collapsed; it may be equally significant that Ajantā went into a sudden decline after its great heyday during Harisheṇa’s reign, for this also suggests that the dynasty suddenly fell upon disastrous times.

Harisheṇa’s “second” son, who continued to rule in Māḥishmati even after the main house had collapsed, must have been in a most precarious position. We can assume that prior to this time he had been politically supported as a viceroy of the main house, with which his relationship must have been good, since Harisheṇa’s grandson fled there for safety. But now he was on his own, and we should not be surprised if his survival, in these traumatic times, was very brief.

The following reconstruction of events can be suggested:
Circa a.d. 481—Harisheṇa’s death. Son and successor inherits large empire. Vigorous patronage continues at Ajantā. “Second” son of Harisheṇa continues ruling at Māḥishmati as Vākāṭaka viceroy—or else came into control here through inheritance or a power struggle at the time of Harisheṇa’s death.

Circa a.d. 482—Harisheṇa’s successor

ruling unwisely. Asmakas have become a prime influence at the Vākāṭaka court, and are plotting insurrection. Due to political and economic disruption (described in Daśakumārcharita) Ajantā’s patronage drastically declines; only intrusive votive reliefs are now being donated.

Circa a.d. 483—Vākāṭaka dynasty overthrown and ruler is killed by coalition of feudatories under Asmakan leadership. Young crown prince (Harishena’s grand-son) flees with mother and sister to court of his uncle (Harishena’s “second” son) at Māhishmatī. All patronage at Ajantā abruptly ends.

Circa a.d. 484—Ruler of Māhishmatī (Harishena’s second son) in precarious situation due to collapse of main house and unsettled political situation.

Circa a.d. 485—Subandhu (possibly the Daśakumārcharita’s Prince Visruta from Magadha?) overthrows Harishena’s “second” son, and becomes ruler of Māhishmatī. Probably continues to rule until the early sixth century.

A.D. 486—Subandhu issues Barwānī plate, date in the year 186 of Gupta era= a.d. 486. The Bāgh plate, mentioning repairs to those caves, probably issued slightly later (dated portion is lost).

A.D. 490—Traikūṭakas now ascendant in the Konkan, which Asmakas apparently had taken over just after Vākāṭaka collapse.

A.D. 491—King Gauri now ruling over (all or part of) Avanti (Western Malwa) having come to power sometime after the Vākāṭaka collapse.

Actually, Varāhadeva’s patronage of Cave 16 undoubtedly ended a few years before the traumatic last years of the Vākāṭaka rule. It is clear from Varāhadeva’s inscription that Harisheṇa was still alive and ruling over his far-flung domains at the time of the cave’s dedication; yet if the empire had broken up by a.d. 486, as both the inscriptions of Subandhu and of the Traikūṭakas suggest, then Harisheṇa must have already been dead for a few years. Thus we arbitrarily assign a date of circa a.d. 481 for the demise of Harisheṇa. This would allow about two years for the reign of Harisheṇa’s son, which would conform with the Daśakumārcharita’s evidence, which makes it clear that this son did indeed rule for a brief, even if very troubled period. At the same time, it would not seem right to assume that Harisheṇa died before circa a.d. 482, since his reign, which could have started only after circa a.d. 458, was a glorious and presumably extensive one. Furthermore, the overall development of style and iconography which takes place within his regnal period (witnessed by Ajantā Caves 16, 17 and the Ghaṭotkacha vihāra) is so extensive that it must have taken a period of about twenty years to accomplish it. We will discuss this latter point below.

It would seem, from the manner in which the Cave 16 inscription reads, that Harisheṇa was still alive at the time of the cave’s dedication, and it would further seem that Varāhadeva had actually finished his cave sometime before the record was written since verse 30 of the inscription states that “having presented (the cave)” he “ruled righteously.” (See p. 163 below.) For either or both of these reasons we hypothesize that the work on the cave which Varāhadeva sponsored—which left it complete except for a few minor unpainted sections—ended a few years before circa a.d. 481. We assign a date of circa a.d. 479 to the end of his patronage. This seems reasonable, since it
allows at least a few years for the impact of his iconographic innovations to be reflected at the site.

3. Cave 16 could not have been undertaken after circa A.D. 464.

It is generally recognized that Cave 16, although not the very first Mahāyāna excavation begun at Ajantā, must have been begun during the very early years of this renewed activity at the site. The form of its pillars, cells, doorways, windows, and many of its characteristically early paintings establishes its connections with other very early caves. This had often been noticed and hardly needs discussion here. Equally, the simple and “formative” nature of its basic plan and its location near the original nucleus of the site—from which center the site gradually spread out as it developed—make it clear that it was started earlier than most other caves, including such major vihāras as 17, 1, 2, 21, 23, and 24 at Ajantā or the relatively developed vihāra at Ghaṭotkacha, all of which must be assigned to the period of Vākāṭaka rule, as we have pointed out elsewhere. Thus it would seem entirely reasonable to assign a date no later than circa A.D. 464 to the inauguration of Cave 16; the sheer quantity of work accomplished and the complexity of the developments which took place at the site must have occupied a time-span of at least twenty very active years—and nearly all of this took place after work on Cave 16 had started.

4. Cave 16 could not have been completed and dedicated earlier than circa A.D. 479.

This is equivalent to saying that Varāhadeva’s patronage of the cave, although started very early, did not end until a fairly late moment in the total development of the site. This point, insofar as I know, has never been made before, although it is of crucial importance in understanding Ajantā’s development as a whole and Cave 16’s in particular. Various scholars have recognized that the impressive paintings of attended Buddhas on the rear wall of the interior belong to a very late phase both stylistically and iconographically; but they have wrongly (in our opinion) assumed that these paintings were added long after Varāhadeva’s patronage had ended; thus they take the curious position that this major wall, which flanks the shrine and which in nearly all other caves is decorated with images of prime importance, was not even painted when Varāhadeva dedicated this cave with its “beautiful picture galleries... and a temple of the Buddha inside.”

Since all these paintings on the rear wall show consistently late stylistic and iconographic characteristics, it is hardly surprising to discover that the cave’s colossal carved Buddha—the largest at the site and thus a fitting symbol of Varāhadeva’s presort to be regarded as the Buddha in his absence.” In Monier-Williams, English-Sanskrit Dictionary (Delhi, new ed. 1970), p. 402, one of the definitions of chaitya is “a Jain or Buddhist image.” The Ajantā Cave 17 inscription (Mirashi, Inscriptions of the Vākāṭakas, p. 129), describes that hall as “containing within it a Chaitya of the king of ascetics (i.e., of the Buddha)... ” where the term chaitya also appears to refer to the image itself.

— Walter M. Spink

14 See especially Spink, “Ajantā and Ghaṭotkacha.”

15 “A temple of the Buddha inside” is a translation of the inscription’s caityamandiram (verse 24). A. K. Coomaraswamy “Nature of Buddhist Art,” in B. Rowland, The Wall-paintings of India, Central Asia and Ceylon (Boston, 1938), pp. 13–14, writes: “a chaitya is by no means necessarily a stupa, nor anything constructed, but a symbolic substitution of any...”
tige and piety—has equally late stylistic and iconographic features.\(^\text{16}\)

4a. *The late character of the Cave 16 Buddha image.*

The most striking evidence for the late date of the great image in Cave 16 is its pose (the *pralambapādāsana* or so-called European position) which, combined with the teaching gesture (*dharmacakra mudrā* was perhaps intended to communicate an increased directness and authority (fig. 11). The important point in terms of our present considerations is that such a pose (although found elsewhere earlier) is used at Ajantā only in very late shrines. It is the pose of the main images in Cave 22 and Cave 26 as well as in the contemporaneous Aurangabad 3; the pose is used also for many subsidiary or intrusive sculptured images in Caves 4, Upper 6, 11, 15, 19, 20, 21, 24, and in the small shrinelts crowded around Caves 9 and 10. A number of these caves were of course started very early (see Time Chart, text fig. 5); however, such *pralambapādāsana* images always show, either by their intrusive placement or by their association with other very late motifs, that they were not part of the original plan. In no case can they be dated prior to circa A. D. 477–479—that is, to the very same period when the Cave 16 image would have been executed.\(^\text{17}\)

Various other features of the Cave 16 image support its late dating. The two earliest shrine images to have been completed at Ajantā, those of Caves 11 (fig. 26) and Lower 6—with which the Cave 16 image has generally (but incorrectly) been thought to be roughly contemporaneous have no bodhisattvas attending the throne, no dwarfs emerging from the mouths of the *makaras* at the throne back and no dwarfs gamboling on or under the *vyālas* at the throne-sides. By contrast, Cave 16’s image has all of these features (fig. 12). The first two are found for the first time (about a. d. 472) on the image in the shrine of Cave 17 and are very common thereafter. Standing attendants, in particular, are almost invariably included in later shrine groups; this common usage is probably the reason that the Cave 16 sculptor took the trouble to include them also, even if it meant crowding them in behind the throne. As for the third feature—gamboling dwarfs—they commonly accompany the throne-side *vyālas* in the later caves, as soon as these zoomorphic forms (which are present in Caves 11 and Lower 6 but omitted later in Caves 17, 1, and 4) reappear shortly before A. D. 480 in the more spaciously composed im-

---

\(^{16}\) S. Weiner first called attention to the significance and relatively late date of images in the *pralambapādāsana* pose at Ajantā and to the likelihood that the Cave 16 inscription post-dates that of Cave 17. (S. Weiner, “Ajantā and Its Origins” [Ph. D. diss., Harvard University, 1970], p. 37 and passim.) However we disagree with her suggestion that the *whole* of Cave 16 is relatively late, since this would essentially reverse the course of the site’s development which we have proposed, as would the theories of K. V. Soundara Rajan (“Beginnings of the Temple Plan,” *Prince of Wales Museum Bulletin*, no. 6 [1957–59], pp. 74–81). Our views on the development of Cave 16 (revising our own previous theories) are included in “The Two Phases of Mahāyāna Patronage at Ajantā” (paper delivered at the meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, San Francisco, January, 1972 [summaries of papers forthcoming]).

\(^{17}\) The use of the *pralambapādāsana* pose appears somewhat earlier in paintings at the site (e.g. Cave 17 shrine antechamber, Cave 19 aisle walls, etc.); such representations would have provided precedents for the Cave 16 image.
ages of Caves 2, Upper 6, 7, 15 and Ghaṭotkacha.  

The manner in which strands of flowers (and/or jewels) hang down from the paws of the vyālas flanking the Cave 16 image would seem to be another hallmark of lateness. Similar strands hang from the mouths of the throne-back makaras of the earliest Ajantā images, but this new usage apparently represents a considerably later variant which did not appear much if at all prior to about A.D. 480. The new form can be seen in the shrine of the Buddha and in the shrine at the right end of the rear aisle in Cave Upper 6. It also appears among the late throne motifs which were added to the early image in Cave 7. Examples of vyālas with such festooned paws are more common in paintings, where perhaps the motif first made its appearance at the site. They, too, are all relatively late. The earliest examples, probably done just before A.D. 480, are the tiny vyālas in the bead-festooned crown of the so-called Vajrapāṇi on the rear wall of Cave 1; another example involves two painted representations of vyāla-brackets supporting the roof above the dancing girl near the center of the Mahājanaka Jākata in that same cave. Painted vyālas with such strands hanging from their paws are also found flanking a sculptured Buddha image in the right rear corner of the very late and unfinished Cave 22, while the strands are also to be seen on the unusually-placed vyālas emerging from the makara-mouths in the very developed and clearly intrusive image group to the left of the porch doorway of Cave 4.

The last features which we shall discuss as useful in establishing the late date of the Cave 16 image are the crouching lions which support the throne. The inclusion of such lions as throne-motifs is of course a time-honored convention in India; however its usage during the Mahāyāna phase at Ajantā develops in a significant and revealing way. The motif first appears at the site in connection with the earliest carved shrine images, but it then loses currency. It does not appear again—and then only in a significantly different form—until much later. For this reason it is very useful in helping to determine the date of various problematic icons, among them the great image in Cave 16.

Although one might differentiate between the earliest and the later lion-motifs on the basis of their pose, relationship to the throne-cloth, treatment of the curling tail, etc., the single most reliable differentiating criterion would seem to be their function or non-function as throne “supports.” In the early occurrences on shrine images, of which there are only three, the lions are merely placed against the throne base, which was apparently conceived as a

18 The Cave 20 image, closely related to but slightly later than that of Cave 17, is the first in which vyālas reappear, although still unaccompanied by gamboling dwarfs. It appears to date circa A.D. 474. The painted Buddhas on the walls of Cave 19, probably completed well before A.D. 477, have no dwarfs accompanying their vyālas. The Cave 16 image has gamboling dwarfs on the left side only. The Cave 21 image, dating relatively late, nonetheless has no throneback motifs, because it was never completed.

19 The complex development of Cave 7 and of its anomalous image requires a study in itself. The throne-back motifs (circa A.D. 480) were added more than a decade after the image and the throne-base were carved. A pradakśiṇapatha may have originally been intended, but the idea was abandoned when the image proper and the shrine chamber were summarily finished about A.D. 480.
solid platform. The relevant examples are the images of Cave 11 (fig. 26), of Cave Lower 6, and of the very anomalous Cave 7. Lion-motifs of this type, even in other contexts, are found only in a few other minor carved reliefs at the site. In all later instances they are replaced by lions which are treated in such a way that they appear to actually support the throne base. In some cases, all very late, the tops of the legs of the throne actually appear to rest upon their heads. More often, as in the Cave 16 shrine image, this supporting function is not actually shown but is implied by the placement of the lions’ heads directly beneath the nubs (used for the leg-attachments) which are revealed on the upper surface of the throne platform. The Cave 16 image’s lion-motifs may well be the first of this late “supporting” type, which thereafter becomes very popular, being found in shrine images of Caves Upper 6, 22, 26, 27 (only traces now left), 15 (where the image was executed at least a decade after the cave had been begun), Aurangabad 3 as well as in a number of very late subsidiary image groups.

Between the time when the first three shrine images (in Caves Lower 6, 11, and 7) were carved and the time when the image was carved in Cave 16, lion-motifs do not appear—the treatment of the throne bases being different. Interestingly enough, all of these shrine images which omit lions (those of Caves 17, 20, 1, 2, 4, and Ghaṭotkacha) can be dated earlier than that of Cave 16. This is but one more suggestion of the tremendous transforming impact which Varāhadeva’s great image appears to have had on subsequent developments.

4b. The late character of the Cave 16 shrine chamber.

The three earliest shrine images actually completed at Ajantā—those of Caves 6, 11 (fig. 26) and 17 (text fig. 2)—can all be circumambulated. Since one can also walk all the way around the Cave 16 image and since it is obvious that this cave has many early features, it has generally been assumed that this image belonged to that same early group also—an assumption which the somewhat anomalous character of the image made it difficult to question, for the image is not immediately comparable with any others at the site and does not fit into any self-evident sequence of clearly allied forms. But we have seen that, when it is analyzed closely, the image does indeed have stylistic and iconographic peculiarities which strongly argue for a late dating.

A close study of the shrine chamber (text fig. 4) leads one to this same conclusion. First of all, there is very good reason to doubt that a pradakṣhipaṭha—which would suggest an early dating—was ever used or intended. It is true that one can enter through the doorway just to the left of the shrine and leave through that at the right (fig. 16), but the course of such a circumam-

20 See intrusive image over left porch door of Cave 20 and two examples, also later additions, on either side of the main facade of Cave 19.
21 E.g. various examples in the subsidiary shrines of Cave Upper 6.
22 Citing examples only in caves which were inaugurated relatively early: Cave 4, intrusive image at left of porch door; Cave 17, left of court; Cave 19, shrines at either side of court; Cave 20, left rear wall; see also the late-phase paintings in Caves 11 and 16.
23 Also probably that of Cave 21, as far as can be judged from its unfinished condition. For the Cave 7 image see note 19 above.
bulation proves to be neither easy nor natural; one hardly cleaves to the image when moving through these “corridors.” Most important, the doorways (fig. 8) not only are quite narrow but have high thresholds (identical to those of the cave’s cells) while the quasi-structural risers on which the shrine pillars rest run right across to the back wall of the shrine (fig. 17). If a circumambulatory path had really been intended, it is unlikely that such “stumbling-blocks” would have been placed in the way of worshippers proceeding around the image. 24

What seems to have occurred is this: when this new and grandiose type of image was conceived, the architects decided to design a fitting architectural setting for it—a “pavilion” of a type no previous image had ever had. Therefore they created this special pilared chamber, in the center of which this new and compelling image sits with an almost regal grandeur. The fact that one could, if one wished, circumambulate the image, is merely the result of (and not the reason for) the particular architectural form used. Furthermore, the fact that the “stumbling-blocks” are not at all worn down would appear to prove that the ritual of pradakshīpa was no longer a customary one by the date when Cave 16 was finally put into use. 25

Finally, it is evident that this special architectural form has little in common with the simpler and much more standard arrangements seen in the shrines of Caves 11 (fig. 26), Lower 6 and 17 (text fig. 2)—those early shrines which incorporate a pradakshīnapatha, and which are so often (but incorrectly) dated to the same period of work as this shrine in Cave 16. We should also note the very developed form of the two pillars with diagonal flutings in Cave 16’s shrine (figs. 12 and 18). Such relatively complex forms do not appear in a single vihāra started prior to Cave 1, a cave which was not undertaken until circa A.D. 472. Subsequently, pillars with diagonal striations appear in Caves 2, 24 (now-lost pair of porch pillars), and in the contemporaneous Aurangabad 3—all relatively late excavations. 26

4c. The late character of the painted scenes on Cave 16’s rear wall.

The conclusion that Cave 16’s image

24 The square openings high in the cave’s rear wall, although often thought to have functioned as “windows” to illuminate the side-chambers of the shrine, perhaps were not intended for this purpose, being in too shadowed an area to allow much light in. It is possible that they were intended as vents which would aid in keeping the air in the shrine from becoming too smoky.

25 We can be sure that the cave was used at least a few years because of the wear marks on the floor caused by the opening of the swinging doors which were placed at the opening of the shrine (fig. 13). Additional evidence that the cave was actually used is to be seen in the metal hooks (some of which still remain) which were fixed at major points such as the centers of the painted ceiling medallions throughout the cave. Often the plaster and paint around them has fallen away, due to damage caused either when they were affixed or in the course of their usage.

26 The diagonally striated form appeared a few years earlier in Cave 19 which, being a chaitya hall, was treated with a special elaborateness. Two such pillars also appeared in the porch of the chaitya hall, Cave 26, as old photographs prove (see Burgess, Report on the Buddhist Cave Temples, facing p. 58). Old photographs of the facade of Cave 24, showing now-missing pillars, are in the files of the library of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
and shrine belong to a relatively late date helps to explain the similarly late character of the impressive painted Buddha groups on the rear wall of the cave (figs. 20 and 22), for in the normal course of work these groups would be done only after the excavation of the shrine had been completed in order to avoid damage to the painting when the rock in such a nearby area was being cut out.

The manner in which the two splendid elephant-processions which are located between the painted Buddha groups converge upon the shrine equally suggests that these paintings on the rear wall were planned together with, and as complements to, the great Buddha image toward which they move (see fig. 19; also fig. 12).

The style of the figures in these processional scenes and in the large adjacent Buddha compositions (fig. 21) is very different from that of the earlier paintings near the front of the cave (fig. 23). The colors are more varied and high-keyed, with considerable use of the once-sparingly rationed blue; the highlighting of the bodies tends to be exaggerated, and the poses and gestures are no longer restrained by the simple and almost severe contour lines which characterize the “typical” style of the earliest Mahāyāna paintings at the site. All in all, if we are to look for analogous paintings, we must seek in late contexts—for instance in Cave 2, where the representation of Indra and his companions at the right end of the rear wall of the porch or the paintings in the adjacent pillared cell have much of the same character as the Cave 16 rear wall paintings. Even details such as the use of blue shadowing on the upper eyelid, a stylistic motif rarely found at Ajantā and then only in late contexts, is seen both in these Cave 2 examples and in the Cave 16 procession scenes.

Iconographically, too, these scenes on the rear wall are characteristically late in type, as a study of the two Buddha groups reveals. The pose of the two central images is an immediate clue to this, for such hieratic representations of the Buddha in pratilambapādāsana were never painted prior to about a.d. 472, whereas they are very common later on. Another very similar pratilambapādāsana Buddha was painted above each of the paired elephant-procession scenes; these two images are in an extremely ruinous state now (fig. 8).

The presence of birds’ heads emerging from the makara mouths at the throne-backs of the Buddhas in the scenes on the back wall is another hallmark of late date (fig. 21). If we date them in accordance with comparable examples in Caves Upper 6, 22, and in other very late contexts, it is doubtful that they could have been done much before a.d. 477; this gives a further clue to the dating of the painting of this rear wall, for such bird’s heads never appear either in sculptures or paintings at the site prior to this period.27

Another particularly significant hallmark of very late date is the presence (in the scene at the left) of subsidiary Buddhas standing in attendance upon the central seated figure (fig. 20). In sculptured compositions, such groups involving a Buddha-flanked-by-Buddhas never appear prior to about a.d. 477; in painted compositions,

27 See also Spink, “Ajantā’s Chronology,” p. 164. The motif appears on two painted images in Bāgh 4, where they probably date to circa a.d. 475, also on one painted image at the rear of the Pītal-khāra chaitya hall, dating about a decade later; it is very common in the sixth century.
they may have appeared some five years earlier, but in a somewhat simpler form than here.  

Still another late feature, seen in the left group, is the form of the “supporting” lion-motif beneath the throne (figs. 20 and 21). We have discussed this above, in connection with the great shrine image.

5. The course of Varāhadeva’s patronage of Cave 16.

The considerations presented above (4, 4a, 4b and 4c) all support the assertion that various features at the rear of Cave 16 should be assigned a very late date and would fall very reasonably at circa A.D. 477-479, when, if our conclusions are correct, Varāhadeva’s patronage of the cave (which he had begun circa A.D. 464) was completed. But this leaves us with an important problem: if we take circa A.D. 464 and circa A.D. 479 as our outside limits for the excavation and the allied decoration of Cave 16, how do we explain such an extended period—about fifteen years—for its accomplishment?

Admittedly, fifteen years would seem to be an inordinately long amount of time to have been spent on the execution of Cave 16. The cave, although large (the interior hall measures approximately 65 ft. square) is devoid of much detailed carving and, all in all, is much simpler than caves such as 17, 1, and 2 or even caves such as Varāhadeva’s own dedication at Ghaṭotkacha, all of which appear to have been excavated in much less than a decade. Furthermore, as the donation of Harisheṇa’s minister—apparently his chief minister—one would expect that Cave 16 would have been given priority over other excavations and would therefore have been accomplished relatively quickly.

The explanation for the very long span of time which separates the beginning and the ending of Varāhadeva’s patronage is to be found in the fact that his patronage of the cave divides into two distinct phases. In the case of the paintings the break in style and iconography is very obvious, and has been often noted, although previous writers have not connected the later paintings with Varāhadeva’s patronage. In the case of the sculptural and architectural elements, all of which previous scholars have ascribed to Varāhadeva’s patronage, it is the dichotomy in style and iconography which has not been recognized.

A. The cave was begun according to a plan (text fig. 1) which, not surprisingly, stands typologically midway between that of the slightly earlier Cave Lower 6 and that of the slightly later Cave 17 (text fig. 2), as a comparison of interior pillars, porch doorways, ceiling designs, and cave height, shape, and location would show. For some time, probably for five or six years, work proceeded without a break. The porch was

28 See ruinous paintings at lower level in right aisle of Cave 19, probably dating shortly after circa A.D. 472; also, just slightly later, in Bāgh Cave 3 and on pillars in the Pitalkhora chaitya hall.

29 For the Ghaṭotkacha vihara, see below, p. 166. In Spink, “Ajantā and Ghaṭotkacha,” an earlier study we assigned a somewhat longer time-span to the cave.

fully excavated, plastered and painted.\textsuperscript{31} Meanwhile the excavation of the interior hall was already underway, this work proceeding gradually from the front to the back and from the ceiling area downward, as we would of course expect (text fig. 3).

As was usual at the site, the plastering and painting of the more forward portions of the interior was expeditiously—even impatiently—accomplished, as if the workmen responsible for this aspect of the cave’s decoration were literally following upon the heels of the excavators (text fig. 3). Thus, even while some of the lower portions of the rear aisle wall were still being cut, the plasterers completed their work on the rear aisle ceiling.\textsuperscript{32} Not surprisingly, by this time they had also finished plastering all of the ceilings of the central area and of the front and side aisles as well as the walls of the cave down as far as (and including) the rear pilasters. Meanwhile the painters were not far behind. By the time the rear aisle ceiling was being plastered, they had already painted the ceilings of the cave’s central area and of the front and right aisle as well as the lateral portions of the front wall and the whole right wall as far down as the fifth cell doorway on that side.\textsuperscript{33} The work proceeded a bit slower in the left aisle—the ceiling had not been done, and murals had been painted only as far as the fourth cell doorway. There was of course no painting at all in the still not quite excavated rear aisle, where only the ceiling had been plastered by this time. All of the painting in these areas is characteristically early in style. But at this point work abruptly stopped, even the final coloring of the paintings was not completed at some of the lower levels of the compositions.

B. When the excavation and decoration of the cave was taken up again nearly a decade later, ideas had changed considerably (text fig. 4). Thus the later artisans never troubled to complete a number of previously planned details. They did not even bother to remove the small intrusions of uncut rock near the floor level of the rear aisle, particularly in the left rear corner (figs. 8 and 10); this might surprise us were not many similar “oversights” to be found in other caves on which patronage was interrupted and then renewed.\textsuperscript{34} Nor did Varāhadeva, in this renewed phase of his patronage, require his workmen to complete the painting of the narrative cycles

\textsuperscript{31} It would appear that the porch had been fully plastered and that its ceilings, pillars, main doorway and adjacent portions of the rear wall had been painted in the first phase of work; but the remaining (already plastered) wall surfaces were probably not decorated until Varāhadeva’s patronage was renewed. This is suggested by both the style and iconography of the extant fragments, notably the area at the left of the rear wall, where one finds a Buddha seated in the praśambopādisana pose and related figures in a somewhat developed style.

\textsuperscript{32} Such work procedures were normal at the site. See Spink, “Ajantā’s Chronology,” pp. 161ff. for discussion.

\textsuperscript{33} Only the extreme ends of the front wall appear to have been both plastered and painted. This is not surprising, since this less-obvious wall was commonly treated as a low-priority area. In Cave 2 only the extreme ends were painted; in Cave 1 much of this wall is either unpainted or has paintings which were never finished; in Cave 11 and Cave 20 these walls, unlike the other walls, were also unpainted.

\textsuperscript{34} There are many examples. For instance, the Cave 11 image was repainted in the late phase, but no effort was made to complete the pradaksinapātha; Cave Upper 6’s excavation was left unfinished, and attention turned to the execution of intrusive images; Cave 7’s porch was still unfinished when it was later painted, as were portions of Cave 20.
on the side walls, or to paint the already plastered rear aisle ceiling, or to plaster and paint the end walls of the rear aisle or the unfinished parts of the front wall, even though such tasks would hardly have been very time-consuming. However, they did plaster the rear wall of the cave in this new phase of work in order to prepare the surface for the Buddha groups and procession scenes which they painted there (text fig. 4).

As this new and late phase of patronage continued, interest seems to have become almost entirely centered on carving out and decorating the Buddha image and the cave’s features which directly complement it. Thus only the newly carved image, a small patch of ceiling directly over it, the two pillars in front of it, and the cave’s rear wall were plastered and painted at this time. The fact that so many previously plastered areas which could have been decorated rather easily were left unadorned reveals a new and indeed compulsive sense of haste. By this point in time, possibly because of an unstable political and/or economic situation, the idea of decorating walls and ceilings in beautiful or appropriately “architectonic” ways was being given up. Tectonic” ways was being given up. This is true not only for Cave 16 but for nearly all other caves which were still underway at the very end of the site’s development. Over and over hastily completed iconic formulations, often intrusively placed (fig. 24) are painted or sculptured in areas which it is clear were originally intended for narrative or merely “ornamental” designs, while the total excavation programs, particularly as one approaches the moment of the dynasty’s disruption in circa A.D. 483, are often either shoddily completed or abruptly abandoned. It could be fairly said that no narrative murals were ever started—or even completed—in the last few years of activity at the site. Sometimes jātakas and the like which had been begun earlier were abandoned while in mid-course, as in Cave 1 (right wall) or in Cave 2 (left wall); at other times the remaining space (as in parts of Cave 2 or in various other caves where the narrative scenes had not even been started) was filled with the iconic scenes which had by now preempted everyone’s attention.

5a. Adjustments in the conception of Cave 16 when work was renewed in circa A.D. 477.

Let us now try to be more specific in describing just how much excavating work remained to be done when Varāhadeva’s patronage was renewed and what adjustments in conception were made at this time. The style and iconography of the colossal Buddha proves that it had not been either carved or indeed conceived of in this form in the first phase of work, as we have shown. However, the pillars at the opening of the shrine chamber undoubtedly had already been carved when work was interrupted (fig. 8; text fig. 3). They have no counterparts among pillars in such positions in any of the later caves but are almost identical in style to the pilasters on the early porch doorway (fig. 4) of Cave 16 itself. Further proof of their early date is the fact that the “beam” above them was plastered but (significantly) never painted (figs. 14 and 15). The large pralambapādāsana Buddha panel at the right of Cave 19’s court was probably one of the first images of the new type, which “copy” the Cave 16 image, while the adjacent court shrine, probably started at about this same time, is framed by pilasters which derive in style from the pillars at the entrance to Cave 16’s shrine.
15). This plastering must have been done in the early phase, along with that of the rear aisle ceiling—and like it was never painted—for such “needless” work held no interest for the cave’s patron in the later phase. But the plastering could not have been done unless at least the upper portions of the two pillars had already been finished. In fact, it is only logical to assume that these pillars had been entirely carved in the first phase of work, since the whole rear aisle upon which they face had been essentially excavated by this time, except for very minor details which were not even smoothed out when work was renewed.

Another clear indication that these pillars were carved in the first phase is to be seen in the fact that their carefully detailed shafts have been crudely cut back (obviously at some later date, since the original early design has been partly destroyed in the process) to allow for the attachment of a double swinging door (figs. 8 and 14). The sockets from which each half of this two-panelled door was hung appear in the “beam” above (fig. 15), while the worn arcs on the floor show how it opened (fig. 13). This cutting back of the pillars to allow for the wooden shrine-door’s fittings was obviously done at some later date, since the original shaft and capital designs were partly destroyed in the process, as was some of the early plaster around the added sockets in the beam above. These surprising adjustments, by virtue of which the pillars were in effect transformed into “doorjambs,” can only properly be understood when we recognize that the entire (and wholly anomalous) plan of the shrine chamber represents a drastic revision of the architect’s original conception. It seems likely that the original plan was to include—as in nearly all other caves at the site—an antechamber fronted by two pillars with an inner image chamber beyond (text fig. 1). (Swinging doors, used to close off the image, appear to have been common in caves of this period, but they were normally attached [as we would expect] to the shrine doorways, which were supplied with socket holes for this purpose.) One can also assume that the shrine and shrine antechamber, if they had been completed as originally conceived, would have been much narrower than the present chamber, and that four cells (instead of the present two) would have opened from the cave’s rear wall. This would have been much more in line with conventional modes of planning. It would also explain why, when we look at the cave plan, we now see such an unprecedentedly wide area of unexcavated wall space at either side of the present shrine chamber (text fig. 4).

36 The close proximity of this early plastering to the still incomplete shrine is perhaps surprising, but a number of similar examples can be found in caves where work was still consistently progressing; see for instance Cave 21, where the rear aisle ceiling was plastered and even painted, despite the fact that the adjacent shrine area was still very incomplete. The fact that Cave 16’s right aisle ceiling was fully painted (see text fig. 3) in the early phase supports the view that the rear aisle ceiling was itself plastered at this time.

37 We have mentioned the remaining portions of rock in the right rear corner. The lowest level of the wall and of the pillars fronting the shrine also remains quite rough.
If we assume that the Cave 16 shrine was indeed to have had an antechamber, it is obvious that the excavation of the first phase broke off before the cutting of the shrine area had progressed very far beyond the two front pillars; otherwise the monolithic Buddha could not have been placed where it is. Thus it would seem logical to conclude that the four cells originally planned for the rear wall would have been barely begun, since normally the cutting of such lesser cells does not take precedence over major elements such as the shrine, even though there is a tendency to work on all such units more or less simultaneously.  

The normal way of starting such a cell at Ajantā was for a single workman to make a single, straight channel (generally the width of the anticipated doorway) into the rock. (Examples can be found in Cave 4, Cave 24, Ghaṭotkacha vihara, etc.) Sometimes such channels were slightly expanded beyond the point where the door opened, which would explain the otherwise surprising lack of perpendicularity shown by the forward portions of the side-walls of the shrine corridors at their lower levels (fig. 16).

Thus it is likely that the cave looked like this when the first phase of work broke off (see text fig. 3). We can now see how the new plan for the shrine area, developed nearly a decade after the original work had been interrupted, was worked out on the basis of these beginnings (cf. text figs. 1, 3 and 4).

39 This is logical, since the various workmen needed to keep out of each other’s way; note the plans of the various incomplete caves such as Caves 24 and 4, etc., in the author’s “Ajantā and Ghaṭotkacha,” pl. 7.

40 See the plans of these caves in ibid., pls. 7 and 9. See also caption to text fig. 3 herein.

The fact that none of the doorways opening off the rear aisle (fig. 8) have recessed enframements—which are a feature of all late cell doorways at the site—would seem to be clear proof that they were carved out in the first phase. (It is a peculiarity of work procedures at the site that forms once completed were almost never revised or re-cut.) At the same time, the fact that the walls around them were not plastered during the first phase of work supports our view that the cells into which they open had (with the exception of the right end-wall) been no more than started at that time. Later on, during the renewal of Varāhadeva’s activity in circa A.D. 477–79, these cells were finally fully cut out but, like the other cells in the cave they probably remained unplastered at this time, due to the very hasty nature of the final phase of Varāhadeva’s patronage. This hastyess extends even to the treatment of the shrine where, as in a number of other very late examples at the site, the pillars, walls and ceiling (except for a small area just above the Buddha’s head) were left completely

41 In certain cases where cell doorways in late caves do not have recessed enframements, it will be seen that they are in still-incomplete contexts.

42 Begley’s suggestion (Begley, “Chronology,” p. 80) that certain late-type cells in caves which were started early “represent subsequent alterations” is misleading. In all such cases it was the developing plan, not previously completed features, which was changed. (This explains why the cell doorways in the earliest portions of Caves 4, Lower 6, 7, and 17 are simpler in form than the latest cell doorway in those caves.)

43 The cell in the right end wall of the rear aisle is the only one with a door fitting similar to those toward the front of the cave, and therefore may have been cut out in the first phase of patronage (see text fig. 3). The fact that work on this part of the cave had progressed faster than on the opposite side tends to support this hypothesis.
bare, the image alone being decorated. Also, except for the image, these elements were finished in a very rough fashion (figs. 16 and 17), in striking contrast to the parts of the cave done in the first phase of Varâhadeva's patronage.

It is likely that the now-ruinous cells at either side of Cave 16's court (figs. 1, 2, text fig. 4) were added during this second phase of Varâhadeva's patronage; at that time the site was still vigorously developing and it must have seemed reasonable to add such extra units if they were needed for residence or other purposes. A number of other caves, including such relatively early undertakings as Caves 2, 4, Upper 6, 7, and 19, also have such added court cells, which often reveal the fact that they are later additions by the design of their entrances, their somewhat "haphazard" placement, and (in a number of cases) their unfinished state. The fact that Cave 16's court cells have ceilings which are over a foot lower than those of other cells in the cave is also significant; as the site developed there was a marked trend toward lower ceilings as well as toward lower thresholds such as these now-broken cell doorways must have had in order to allow easy entrance to the chambers, which are only slightly more than about six feet high.

It appears that the left court cell bore some functional relationship to Cave 16's cistern, which lies further to the left. A narrow "tunnel" in its rear wall (now partly cemented in) led back into the cistern beyond. Presumably water could be drawn up via buckets through this passage. A heavy projecting block is still visible behind the now-broken doorway. It was probably once paired with another (now-missing) projection and leads one to suppose that a double swinging door was once hung here. A somewhat similar doorway arrangement can still be seen in the cistern chamber at the right of the court of Cave 4. It is characteristic that such projections did not actually contain the holes for the door pivots but merely served as a strengthening device; as such they are used, usually singly, in many residence cells between A.D. circa 475 and 480. Before that they do not appear, nor are they common in the very latest doorways.

The cell at the right of the court is similar in size, placement, and height. Its doorway has been completely broken away so that we do not know if it was of the single-panelled type used in residential cells or of the double-panelled type more common in other kinds of cells.

It seems likely that when Varâhadeva renewed his patronage of Cave 16 in circa A.D. 477 the last two cells opening into the left aisle still had not been quite fully excavated, and work was taken up again on them at that time, along with the more important tasks at the rear of the cave. The position of these cells supports this view, since the walls and ceiling in this area of the cave had still not been painted when the first phase of Varâhadeva's patronage ended. At the same time, the fact that the surrounding wall had already been plastered would suggest that the doorway openings

---

44 See images in main shrines of Caves 4 Upper 6, 20, 11, and Ghaṭotkacha vihara, which were also painted although adjacent elements were not.

45 The cells in the rear aisle, although completed late, have high ceilings because they were begun in the first phase, with typically early high narrow doorways. The doorways of the court cells are now completely broken away (figs. 2, 3), but it would probably be correct to assume that they had recessed enframements, like other similarly late doorways.
(and presumably much of the interiors) of these two cells had already been excavated; this is hardly surprising, since even the doorways in the rear aisle had been cut by this time.

This matter is of interest because the way in which the door fittings in these cells were conceived provides us with a clue to the sequence of developments in the cave as a whole. All of the cells which appear to have been completed in the first phase of Varāhadeva’s patronage show a consistent mode of door attachment which is characteristic for all cells completed just before the hiatus in work occurred at the site circa a.d. 470.46 This mode, which involved simply the drilling of simple socket-holes (one above and one below) in the recessed inner frame of the door-way, was also used in many rather late doorways; but for a few years after the hiatus (say from circa a.d. 473 to circa a.d. 480) an alternative mode came into vogue which involved the retention of a “strengthening” projection of rock at the top (and sometimes at the bottom) of the doorway. This alternative mode (which bears some connection with the way in which the doors were hung in the left court cell of this same cave) is very common in Caves 17, 1, and 19 as well as in a few doorways of related date in the very sporadically excavated Cave 4. It is interesting to note that such a projection appears in the third doorway opening into the left aisle, a fact which almost certainly shows its date to fall in this post-haitus period. We should note, however, that even though this cell was eventually plastered the door was never actually hung in it—at least no pivot holes were cut and in fact the doorway does not even have the expected recessed inner surround (see text fig. 4). The reason for this is not clear, but it could possibly be due to the pressure of other tasks during the late phase of Varāhadeva’s patronage—a pressure which was responsible for many last-moment details being left uncompleted throughout the cave, as we have seen. All of the other late doorways in the cave (those of the three other cells beyond this one in the cave’s left rear area and that of the cell at the right of the shrine) also clearly differ in type from the early-phase doorways, being all fitted in a seemingly clumsy way, without pivot holes. Here again it may be that they were not actually fitted with doors during the second stage of Varāhadeva’s patronage but were instead clumsily finished after the cells had been turned over to the monks for use at the time when Varāhadeva’s patronage was finally withdrawn in circa a.d. 479.

5b. The final stages of work on Cave 16 (circa a.d. 479 to circa a.d. 483).

It seems likely that none of the cells in the cave had been plastered at the time when Varāhadeva’s direct patronage of the cave ended. Such plastering was after all a rather low-priority matter, at least as compared to the completion of the main wall and ceiling surfaces—and, as we have noted, Varāhadeva did not even complete this more important type of work in which, as the cave’s donor, he would obviously have

46 A very “primitive” type of door attachment, in which no pivot holes appear at the top of the doorway, is found in all of the cells of Cave 11 (except for the probably later and asymmetrically-placed cell in the left rear corner) and in the first and third cells on the left side of Cave 15. It is quite possible that these were the first cells fitted with doors during the site’s Mahāyāna phase. This type does not appear in Cave 16.
taken a prime interest. Thus it seems likely that Varāhadeva left this responsibility to his donees, who (thinking of their own comfort) did at least see to its partial accomplishment—not after all a very demanding or expensive task since there was no attempt to paint the cell interiors after they were plastered. They did not, however, finish all of the plastering work on the cells; those at the ends of the rear aisle have none whatsoever, while the two cells in the rear wall and three other cells in the cave have only plastered walls, the ceilings remaining bare. Nor did they trouble to complete the still-unfinished doorways of the third cell in the left aisle or other such minor details as the small remaining portions of incompletely excavated wall in the rear aisle (fig. 10). Furthermore, they obviously were unconcerned about completing the painted decoration or any further wall-plastering of the cave.

Verse 30 of Varāhadeva’s inscription says that “having presented (the cave) with devotion to the Community of Monks, Varāhadeva... ruled righteously,” implying that he actually donated the cave somewhat prior to the time his dedicatory record was inscribed. Possibly the plastering of the cells was done sometime during this period—presumably a short one—when work at the site was still proceeding vigorously, as we know from studying the development of some of the late caves, particularly those at the western extremity of the site, as well as Aurangabad Caves 1 and 3 (see Time Chart, text fig. 5).

It seems fairly certain that Cave 16 was put into use as soon as its great Buddha image and the work relating to it had been finished. Not only would we expect this to be the case, but, as we have noted, there are clear wear-marks on the shrine floor where the door in front of the image was opened and closed; furthermore, the interior paintings appear to be covered with considerable deposits of soot, which would equally suggest that the cave was used for a few years.

However, a curious fact must be noted. None of the pivot holes in the cell doorways shows any signs of wear whatsoever, whereas in all other caves at the site (except those which are quite incomplete) the door-poles generally have ground away the pivot holes to a noticeable degree. It is of course possible that wooden fillers were put into the pivot-holes and that they kept the poles from rubbing directly against the stone itself; we know that such wooden fillers were indeed sometimes used, for wooden blocks with worn round holes in them still remain at the floor level in one cell in Cave 17, one cell in Cave Upper 6, and on one side of the shrine doorway of Cave 11. However, such wooden fillers, which would prevent excessive wobbling when for some reason the holes in the doorways were too large,

47 We can assume that no plastering of the cell interiors was done in the first phase of work, for the cave was far from being ready for use as a residence hall at that time. An analogous situation is found in Cave 21, where the painting of the main walls and ceilings of the interior was also undertaken while excavation-work was still underway. Evidence from other caves equally shows that the plastering of the cells was among the last things normally undertaken.

48 See text fig. 4. Despite that fact that a number of these cells were not fully plastered, the fact that they have sockets for door attachments strongly suggests that they did have doors hung in them. The doorway of the cell at the left end of the rear aisle even shows thick mud-plastering along one jamb; this was apparently applied to make the door close more evenly.

49 For reference see note 1 above.
appear to have been the exception rather than the rule and were perhaps used only at the floor level in any case. Another possible explanation for the lack of any signs of wear could be that the cells, although apparently all fitted with doors, were never actually used for residence purposes. This might have been the case if the cave, with its hugely impressive image and spacious shrine-chamber, was turned over for a completely ceremonial use at some point late in its history. Or perhaps the cells of the cave were finished so close to the time of the site’s decline that they were never put to their intended use (or were used extremely briefly) due to a drop in the numbers of monks who required accommodation. The likelihood that the cells were not completed until sometime after Varāhadeva’s patronage ended in circa A.D. 479—and that some were never fully plastered—would add to the reasonableness of such an hypothesis.

About A.D. 482 when the cave was no longer a direct concern of Varāhadeva—if indeed he was still the royal minister then—other devotees added a few clearly intrusive painted Buddha images to the already plastered left aisle wall. This situation has clear parallels in a great number of other caves as well during the site’s troubled final years, when previously well-laid plans tended to be summarily abandoned and donative efforts turned instead to the sponsorship of relatively unambitious carved and/or painted images scattered at random on still-available wall surfaces.

One of these very late intrusive images (fig. 25) represents a painted pralambapādāsana Buddha whose throne displays notably late features such as we have previously described in discussing the painted images on the cave’s rear wall; in addition it includes converging flying couples, in place of the converging single figures which are invariably used (whenever flying figures do appear) in association with any image done before about A.D. 479 at the site.

The other very late and intrusive composition involves a double row of very similar seated Buddha images (fig. 24). Although one would normally expect each row to have comprised at least seven or eight figures, work appears to have been summarily finished. There are only six images in the top row, all apparently the donation of a certain monk, Bāpuka, whose inscriptions appear on or under four of them. Bāpuka is not known from other donative records at the site. However, the four in the lower row have inscriptions stating that they were the gift of “the reverend Dharmadatta.” This must certainly be the same Dharmadatta who is referred to in the donative inscription of the very late Chaitya Cave 26 as having “... seen to the excavation and completion” of that cave. As the Cave 26 inscription with its obsequious reference to two Āśmaka ministers suggests, that great chaitya hall with which Dharmadatta was associated was dedicated when the Āśmakas were a dominant force in Vākāṭaka affairs. The Āśmakas probably had not as yet actually overthrown Hariśeṇa’s weak son and successor, as we know (from the evidence of the Daśakumāracharita) that they were soon to do, but their pernicious and disruptive influence may already have been responsible for a worsening economic situation in the em-

---

51 For the inscription see ibid., text vol. 4 (Oxford, 1955), pp. 116–118.
pire as well as for the sense of doom which seems to hang over the site in its final years. This could explain the rapid erosion and then the final breakdown of patronage which is so poignantly revealed in the final stages of work not only on Cave 16 but in all of the other Vākāṭaka caves at Ajantā, Ghaṭotkacha, and Aurangabad as well.

6. The conclusion that Varāhadeva’s patronage of Cave 16 divides into distinct phases is supported by an analysis of the development of other caves at the site.

An analysis of the style and iconography

It is our assumption that the Cave 26 inscription, despite its reference to the Aśaka king, his minister, and his minister’s son, was written while the Vākāṭakas were still in power, during the final troubled years of their reign. At this time the son of the minister of Aśaka was dispatched to the kingdom of Vīdarbha, which Mirashi has convincingly argued was then ruled by the last Vākāṭaka king (see reference note 10 above). This Aśakan “éménce grise” then succeeded in dominating the polities of the weak ruler of that nominally sovereign house. The reasonableness of our assumption that the Cave 26 inscription reflects this historical situation and was actually written while the Vākāṭakas were still in power is supported not only by the (admittedly arguable) evidence of the Daśakumāra-ṛita but also by the likelihood that Chaityā Cave 26 was planned and started along with (and as the devotional focus for) such caves as 21, 23, and 24, all of which appear to have been well underway during the period when the Vākāṭaka minister Varāhadeva was still patronizing Cave 16 and the Ghaṭotkacha vihāra. The original program for Cave 26’s decoration was never fully realized; it appears to have been interrupted at the same moment as work on the other caves at the site. The haphazardly arranged reliefs subsequently carved toward the rear of its ambulatory and on its facade respond are related in style and iconography as well as in terms of their inscriptions to similar late intrusions in other caves. All of this shows that Cave 26’s development was affected by the very same political and economic factors which were responsible for the disruption of work on the other caves at the site during the troubled reign of Harishena’s successor.

A third (even later) phase, when plans became disrupted, can be seen in most caves also. (See Time Chart, text fig. 5; the period involved extends from circa A.D. 462 to circa A.D. 483.)

Although detailed justification must be published elsewhere, for brief comments on Caves 2, 4, and Upper 6, see Spink, “Ajantā and Ghaṭotkacha”; for Cave 11, see Spink, “Ajantā’s Chronology.” The later phases of Caves 7 and 15 included (among other things) the addition of intrusive images to their early doorways; the lintel of the doorway of Cave 15 was probably considered to be still incomplete when work first broke off, accounting for the addition of a developed lintel in the later phase.

See note 2 above. Work on Cave 17, 19, and 20 was disrupted at a later date. Cave 17’s shrine walls and ceiling were never painted. A number of haphazardly placed intrusive panels were added to the court walls of Cave 19. Cave 20’s excavation came to an abrupt halt at some point prior to the time when its (never fully completed) painting was undertaken.
and 1 at Aurangabad) were also begun. Work then progressed throughout the site in varying degrees of intensity until about A.D. 482 by which time the signs of its final rapid decline had probably already started to appear (see Time Chart, text fig. 5).

When we are aware of how widespread the haitus was which affected patronage at the site, it adds further credibility to the assertion that Cave 16 was among the caves affected. Such a rift in patronage at a site which had been developing so vigorously stands as clear evidence of some kind of political or economic setback which must have been felt throughout the Vakštaka domains—a not particularly surprising circumstance when we consider the extent of Harishena’s political involvements. Whatever these problems were, they obviously either reduced the funds available to Varāhadeva, or distracted his attention and energies causing the work stoppage on Cave 16 as well as on his other great monument, the Ghaṭotkacha vihāra. Then, when times improved, he renewed his activity, first turning his attention to the Ghaṭotkacha vihāra and then finishing Cave 16 in an admittedly hasty but nonetheless revolutionary manner. Nothing like his great pralambapādāsana Buddha—colossal in scale and unprecedented in type—had even been seen before at the site; and its impact was immediate. By the time it was finished, it had started a dramatic transformation of concepts of imagery at the site. Its iconographic heritage is witnessed in a whole series of sculptured Buddhas seated in the “European pose,” all of which invariably belong to the latest years of the site’s activity; these set the standard for the main images in most of the sixth-century caves in western India as well. Furthermore, it established an interest in the creation of gigantic images. The most notable example is the very late Dying Buddha in Cave 26, which was conceived in almost exactly the same huge scale.

56 Without attempting to justify our conclusions here, we list these late caves in the approximate order of their inauguration: Cave 1, 21, 26 (with its wings, one being numbered 27), 23, Aurangabad 3, 24, Upper 27, Aurangabad 1, 28, 29, 22, 5, 14, 25 and 3.

57 For the Ghaṭotkacha inscription see Mirashi, Inscriptions of the Vakštakas, pp. 112–119.
Text Fig. 1.—Cave 16. Hypothetical Plan showing original conception (never completed). Note that cells at left and right of court are excluded. Cells adjacent to shrine antechamber are completed. Shrine and shrine antechamber are of same type as those of Cave 17. (Adapted from text figs. 4 and 2.)

Text Fig. 2.—Cave 17. Plan as completed. (Reproduced from J. Fergusson and J. Burgess, The Cave Temples of India [London, 1880], pl. XXIII, right.)
Text Fig. 3.—Cave 16. Hypothetical Plan showing appearance of cave when patronage was temporarily interrupted in circa A.D. 470. Excavators were following programs as seen in text figures 1 at this time. The hypothetical shapes, assigned to the unfinished cells A, B, C, D, E, F, can be compared to unfinished cells in Caves 4 (A), 24 (B), 4 (C), Ghatotkachā vihāra (D), 24 (E), 24 (F), respectively as drawn in *The Cave Temples of India*, pls. XLVI and LII, and Burgess, “Report on the Buddhist Cave Temples,” pl. XXXIV. Note the plastered and/or painted wall and/or ceiling areas. All porch and interior pillars (excepting the two shrine antechamber pillars) had also been painted by the time this initial phase of work was interrupted in circa A.D. 470.

Text Fig. 4.—Cave 16. Plan as finally completed in circa A.D. 479. (Basic Plan reproduced from *The Cave Temples of India*, pl. XXXIII, left, with minor corrections made for design of shrine entrance and for lateral walls of shrine.) The new areas excavated, plastered and/or painted in this final phase are shown. *Text fig. 4* combined with *text fig. 3* reveals the total area plastered and painted by the time work on the cave finally ended in circa A.D. 479. The forward parts of the lateral walls of the shrine are not precisely perpendicular, a fact which can be explained by the assumption that the excavators had originally intended that cells be placed at these points (cf. *text figs. 1 and 3*). The plastering and painting of the rear wall of the interior hall and of the Buddha image (including a small area on the ceiling over the head of the image) was probably begun circa A.D. 479. Shortly thereafter the majority of the residence cells were plastered and the two new court cells started. The intrusive paintings on the already plastered left side wall (see symbols ++++) were probably done a few years later, circa A.D. 482; by that time Varāhadeva’s involvement in the patronage of the cave appears to have ended.

Camera position angles on the plan show the location of a number of the illustrations.
Circa A.D. 462—Harishena already in power; Mahāyāna Phase at Ajantā begins.
Circa A.D. 464—Varāhadeva undertakes Cave 16.
Circa A.D. 470—Drastic temporary decline in patronage of site by Vakātakas.
Circa A.D. 477—Varāhadeva re-institutes patronage of Cave 16 and revises original conception of shrine.
Circa A.D. 479—Varāhadeva's patronage of Cave 16 ends; original program of decoration never finished, but later donors add intrusive images.
Circa A.D. 481—Death of Harishena and accession of son. Excavation programs continue.
Circa A.D. 482—Political situation unstable due to Asmaka influence. Patronage at Ajantā and Ghatotkacha now limited to donation of intrusive images.

Text Fig. 5.—Time Chart showing approximate dates of excavation of the Mahāyāna Caves of the Vākātaka period at Ajantā (Caves 1–8; 11; 14–29), Ghatotkacha, and Aurangabad (Caves 1 and 3). (This Time Chart is a revision of those published in previous articles.) The approximate date of the main image in each cave is denoted by an asterisk. In the case of Cave 7 the asterisk refers only to the image proper and to the throne base; the throne sides and surrounding figures were carved more than a decade later.
Fig. 1.—Ajantā Cave 16. General View of Exterior.
(Photo, Asian Art Archives, University of Michigan [cited hereafter as AAA], 79-72.)

Fig. 2.—Ajantā Cave 16. Pilaster at left of porch. Varāhadeva's inscription can be seen above the partially restored front wall of cell at left of court (AAA, 68-72).

Fig. 3.—Ajantā Cave 16. Unfinished door socket in ruined cell at left of court. Wall beneath is restored (see angle for original position of doorway) (AAA, 84-72).
Fig. 4.—Ajantā Cave 16. Main doorway of porch, showing traces of painted decoration of lintel and on ceiling above (AAA, 1185-66).
Fig. 5.—Ajantā Cave 16. Interior. View toward right rear corner (note traces of painting on ceiling) (AAA, 1072-66).

Fig. 6.—Ajantā Cave 16. Interior. View toward left rear corner. Locations of figs. 24, 25 and 20 can be seen, reading clockwise (AAA, 11,244).
Fig. 7.—Ajantā Cave 16. Interior. Right aisle looking toward rear aisle (note painted ceiling and painting [fig. 22] on rear aisle wall) (AAA, 11.245).
Fig. 8.—Ajantā Cave 16. Interior. Rear aisle, view toward the right. This ceiling was once fully plastered, only traces remain (AAA, 11,252).
Fig. 9.—Ajantā Cave 16. Interior. Pilaster near right rear. The wall was plastered only up to this point (AAA, 67-72).

Fig. 10.—Ajantā Cave 16. Interior. Extreme right corner of rear aisle, showing unfinished excavated portion at the base (AAA, 44-72).
Fig. 11.—Ajantā Cave 16. Shrine. Main Buddha image (AAA, 17-72, 18-72 [composite photograph]).
Fig. 12.—Ajantā Cave 16. Shrine, seen from rear aisle. Traces of elephant-procession paintings visible at extreme left (see fig. 19) and right (AAA, 1100-66).
Fig. 13.—Ajantā Cave 16. Shrine. Base of main Buddha image, showing feet. Note wear-marks on floor made by swinging door (AAA, 34-72).

Fig. 14.—Ajantā Cave 16. Shrine. View of left pillar showing portion cut away to allow for attachment of swinging doors (AAA, 14-72).

Fig. 15.—Ajantā Cave 16. Shrine. Carved beam above entrance pillars showing socket holes for attachment of swinging doors (note plastering of beam and adjacent rear aisle ceiling; ceiling of shrine was not plastered (AAA, 25-72).
Fig. 16.—Ajantā Cave 16. Shrine. View looking toward front shrine chamber showing doorway and vent above (note lack of perpendicularity of lower part of shrine wall) (AAA, 29-72).

Fig. 17.—Ajantā Cave 16. Shrine. View from right along rear wall of shrine chamber behind the image (note carved riser joining shrine chamber pillars and pilasters at floor level; also visible in plan, text fig. 4) (AAA, 8-72).
Fig. 18.—Ajantā Cave 16. Shrine. View toward pillars on left side of the shrine chamber (AAA, 11,250).
Fig. 19.—Ajantā Cave 16. Interior. Elephant procession painted on rear wall at left of entrance to shrine (drawing from G. Yazdani, Ajantā, vol. 3, pl. LVII [b]).

Fig. 20.—Ajantā Cave 16. Interior. Buddha group painted on rear wall, left portion, adjacent to fig. 19 (drawing from Yazdani, Ajantā, vol. 3, pl. LVII [a]).
Fig. 21.—Ajantā Cave 16. Interior. Buddha group (for drawing of same figure see central portion of fig. 20).
(note bird’s head motif above proper left shoulder of image; note nāgas supporting lion throne) (AAA, 972-68).
Fig. 22.—Ajanta Cave 16. Interior. Buddha group painted on right portion of rear wall (for location see fig. 7). (Photo, courtesy of Department of Archaeology, Government of India.)

Fig. 23.—Ajanta Cave 16. Interior. Scene from Conversion of Nanda story; toward front of left aisle wall. (Photo, courtesy of Department of Archaeology, Government of India.)
Fig. 24.—Ajantā Cave 16. Interior. Scene from Conversion of Nanda story with adjacent Buddha groups; toward middle of left aisle wall. (Photo, courtesy of Department of Archaeology, Government of India.)

Fig. 25.—Ajantā Cave 16. Interior. Painted Buddha painted toward rear of left aisle wall. (Photo, courtesy of Department of Archaeology, Government of India.)
Fig. 26.—Ajantā Cave 11. Shrine, showing main Buddha image and unfinished passage for circumambulation (AAA, 412-69).
Why is the image as it is? This question, fundamental to the study of art, is one for which the viewer's background predisposes him to seek a particular kind of answer. On the one hand, the iconographer (and Indologist in the case of Indian art) may choose to respond by describing as closely as possible the textual sources which the artist used. On the other hand, the art historian may choose to answer by considering the stylistic pedigree of the work of art. It is therefore challenging to try to examine a group of narrative reliefs using both approaches.

Among the various schools of Buddhist sculpture which flourished in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., only Särnāth continued the earlier Indian tradition of representing scenes of the Buddha's life. This subject is almost absent in the Gupta works of Sāncī and Mathurā, where, paradoxically, narrative scenes had previously been common.¹ The Särnāth steles, however, differ from early Indian reliefs in that they seem to have been installed as major objects of worship against a flat wall.² These Gupta works fall into four distinct types according to their format.

A. Multiple scenes arranged in a horizontal and vertical sequence:
1. National Museum, New Delhi C (a)² (fig. 1)

![Diagram](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

- a. Māyā's Dream
- b. Birth of the Buddha
- c. Bathing of the Buddha
- d. Great Departure
- e. Cutting of the Buddha's Hair
- f. Exchange of Robes
- g. Fasting Buddha
- h. Sujātā's Gift of Milk
- i. Nāgarāja Kālika's Praise of the Buddha
- j. Māra's Assault
- k. First Sermon

¹ One Gupta example from Mathurā is a pair of bracket capitals, Mathurā Museum 44.3118–9, which include the Parinirvāna and Māra's Assault.

² None have been found in their original context, but all are smooth and unfinished on the back and are comparable in size to images which are objects of worship such as the major seated and standing Buddhas of Särnāth.

---

* This article is the result of two trips to India made possible by the American Institute of Indian Studies and the Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley.

** Associate Professor of Art, University of California, Berkeley.
2. Calcutta Museum S1\textsuperscript{4} (fig. 2)

- a. Māyā’s Dream
- b. Birth of the Buddha
- c. Bathing of the Buddha
- d. Great Departure
- e. Cutting of the Buddha’s Hair
- f. Sujātā’s Gift of Milk
- g. Nāgarāja Kālika’s Praise of the Buddha
- h. Māra’s Assault
- i. First Sermon
- j. Great Miracle
- k. Descent from Trayatriśata Heaven

3. Sārnāth Museum C (a) \textsuperscript{3} (fig. 3)

- a. Birth of the Buddha
- b. Bathing of the Buddha
- c. Māra’s Assault
- d. First Sermon
- e. Great Miracle
- f. Monkey’s Gift of Honey
- g. Descent from Trayatriśata Heaven
- h. Taming of Elephant Nālāgiri
- i. Parinirvāṇa


\textsuperscript{5} Sahni and Vogel, \textit{Catalogue}, pp. 187–90. 99 x 67\times9 cm.

\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 183–5. 136 x 36 x 8.5 cm.
B. Multiple scenes arranged in a single vertical row:
4. Sārnāth Museum C (a) 1 (fig. 4)

C. Great Miracle alone:
6. Sārnāth Museum C (a) 6 (fig. 6)
7. Allahabad Museum (fig. 7)
8. Calcutta Museum S5 (fig. 8)

D. Multiple scenes arranged in a vertical row with Great Miracle on either side:
9. Calcutta Museum S2 (fig. 9)

---

5. Calcutta Museum S3 (fig. 5)

---

6. Sārnāth Museum C (a) 6 (fig. 6)

---

7. Allahabad Museum (fig. 7)

---

8. Calcutta Museum S5 (fig. 8)

---

9. Calcutta Museum S2 (fig. 9)

---

a. Birth of the Buddha
b. Bathing of the Buddha
c. Great Departure
d. Cutting of the Buddha’s Hair
e. Māra’s Assault
f. First Sermon
g. Parinirvāna

---

a. Birth of the Buddha
b. Bathing of the Buddha
c. Māra’s Assault
d. First Sermon
e. Parinirvāna

---

8 Sahni and Vogel, Catalogue, pp. 191–2. 99 × 49 × 8.5 cm. One might include with this group single large figures representing other scenes in the Buddha’s life such as the Assault of Māra, B(b) 175, or the First Sermon, B(b) 181 etc.

9 Pramod Chandra, Stone Sculpture in the Allahabad Museum (Bombay, 1971), p. 95, pl. LXXVI. 80 × 47 × 5 cm.

10 Anderson, Catalogue, p. 7. 94 × 50 × 9 cm.

11 Ibid., pp. 6–7. 105 × 58 × 15 cm.
c. Māra’s Assault
d. First Sermon
e. Great Miracle
f. Parinirvāṇa

10. Calcutta Museum S412 (fig. 10)

![Diagram of lintel]

A final piece which is comparable in scale and subject is the long frieze, probably a lintel (Sarnāth Museum D [d] 1), which represents the Kṣāntivādin Jātaka13 (fig. 11). While not a story drawn from the life of the historical Buddha, this jātaka raises similar questions about textual and stylistic sources. It is again a subject unique to the Sarnāth school in Gupta sculpture. This piece is also of particular interest in relating Buddhist to Hindu reliefs.

12 Ibid., pp. 7. 76 × 35 × 9 cm.

13 Sahni and Vogel, Catalogue, pp. 233–4. 56 × 492 × 40 cm.

Kṣāntivādin Jātaka

In order to consider the texts and the styles upon which the Sarnāth sculptor based his work, it is necessary to examine each scene from the Buddha’s life and its treatment in the various examples. First, the Kṣāntivādin Jātaka concerns a patient ascetic, dismembered without protest by a king whose harem he had attracted. This story occurs in a Pāli Jātaka, in the Mahāvastu, in the Jātakamālā of Aryasūra and in Kṣemendra’s Avadāna-Kalpalatā.14 The events represented in figure 11 begin with the two central scenes of the king’s wives disporting themselves, as mentioned in all accounts. At the left follows the king’s attack upon the ascetic, who is protected by the court ladies. This scene does not follow the Jātakamālā, in which all the harem had left at this juncture; nor does this correspond to the Pāli Jātaka, in which a second executioner does the dismembering. The fourth scene at the far right shows Kṣāntivādin restored, crowned, in meditation, surrounded by male worshippers.15 This follows most closely the Avadāna-Kalpalatā version, in which alone are limbs explicitly restored, wounds healed, and the Bodhisat-
tva-aspects of the sage underscored. Thus Kṣemendra's textual tradition comes closest to explaining the Sārnāth lintel.

Earlier artistic versions of this subject are lacking, for this jātaka is illustrated only at Kucā and at Ajantā (no longer preserved).16

Māyā's Dream

The conception of the Buddha or his mother Māyā's dream in which a white elephant entered her body occurs in the two earliest and most ample Sārnāth reliefs (figs. 1 and 2). This event is described in the Pāli Niḍānakathā and in various Sanskrit lives of the Buddha—the Mahāvastu, the Buddhacarita, and the Lalitavistara.17 The Niḍānakathā and Lalitavistara refer to the elephant's entrance specifically into the right side of Māyā, which is not the case in either relief. Before inferring that the Sārnāth sculptors followed the Mahāvastu or Buddhacarita, however, one should remember that if the Indian artist gave any consideration to this matter, he would certainly choose the right as the auspicious side. Moreover, both conception scenes conflict with the subsequent birth scenes on the same steles, in which the Buddha emerges from his mother's right. Thus the artists seem to have been guided by the requirements of composition; it is difficult to imagine an arrangement of the reclining mother with her head pointed toward her subsequent standing form which would not overburden the right side of the panel.18 In this case, therefore, there is little to choose among the possible textual sources.

This subject raises questions about the relationship of Gupta reliefs to earlier Indian narrative carvings. The Dream of Māyā is significantly lacking in Mathurā Kushan-period carvings of major events in the Buddha's life.19 In both Gandhāran and Amarāvati reliefs, the subject occurs with frequency but with certain differences from the Sārnāth pattern.20 In Gandhāra, Āndhra, as well as at Bharhut, Māyā with almost complete consistency presents her right side to the elephant. In Gandhāra the elephant is always nimbate, and an architectural setting is prominent. In Āndhra the sculptors often followed the Lalitavistara with exactitude and presented the elephant in a palanquin born by hosts of divinities, although this scene could also be reconciled with the later appearance of an elephant alone to Māyā.21 With allowance for condensation by the Gupta artist and reversal of Māyā's pose, it seems

18 The question of the order in which scenes are arranged is taken up below. In fig. 2, I infer from the direction of the elephant as well as traces of the pillow that Māyā reclines with her head to the left.
rahātī (Paris, 1961), pls. XVIIIa, XIX (the sole example of Māyā lying on her right), LIXa.
21 Stern and Bénisti, Évolution, pl. LIXa.
possible although not necessary that some Āndhra sculpture of the elephant with Māyā alone was known at Sārnāth.

Birth of the Buddha

The birth of the Buddha understandably occurs in all the texts cited above as well as in the Divyāvadāna.22 These vary in the length of description but agree on the major details of the event: Māyā stands grasping the branch of a tree and the Buddha emerges from her right side. The Nīdāna-kathā specifies that the baby was received first by the four great Brahmas (gods) on a golden net and then by the four great Kings on a roll of fine cloth. The Buddhacarita and the Lalitavistara, however, describe only Indra (and Brahma in the case of the Lalitavistara) as holding the baby. In this matter all the Sārnāth examples concur (figs. 1–5 and 9). Āndhra reliefs, which are similar in most details, here follow the Theravāda version of four divinities receiving the baby.23 Gandhāran and Mathurā Kushan examples show the Buddha caught by Indra alone.24 At the same time, most birth scenes of the two Kushan schools show the female attendant (presumably Mahāprajāpati) embracing Māyā, which never occurs at Sārnāth.25 A frieze from Mathurā, third century to judge from the figure style, illustrates clearly the extent to which this school prefigures the Sārnāth iconography (fig. 13a).26

Bathing of the Buddha

In the case of the Buddha’s first bath, which is represented after his birth in figures 1–5 and 9, the textual source can be specified. The Buddhacarita and Mahāvastu describe the apparition of miraculous streams of water. Only the Lalitavistara attributes these streams to two Nāgas, Nanda and Upananda; in the text the Nāgas perform the bath alone, while in the gatha they follow Indra and Brahma’s bathing of the baby.27 The Sārnāth steles represent two Nāgas pouring water on the child, and thus the Lalitavistara or a related text appears to be their source.

As for earlier sculptural models, this event is apparently lacking in the reliefs of Āndhra.28 In a sole Gandhāran example, the variant provided by the Lalitavistara gatha is followed, for Indra and Brahma administer the bath.29 The only possible prototype for the Gupta treatment is Mathurā Kushan sculpture, where the format of paired Nāgas on either side of

23 Stern and Béniṣti, Evolution, pls. XVIIa, LIXb. The Buddha is of course not represented in human form.
25 Foucher, l’Art gréco-bouddhique, fig. 152, presents one Gandhāran exception.
26 Lucknow Museum 46.13; findspot Ramnagar. The Buddha figures here still show the early Kushan wavy hair, yet the general figure type is more agile and the poses more varied than in other Kushan reliefs, pointing towards the Gupta.
27 Buddhacarita, pp. 5, 7; Mahāvastu, vol. 2, pp. v, 23. The bath is lacking in the Nīdānakathā and the Divyāvadāna; Lalitavistara, pp. 78, 85.
28 The only possible reference is a Nāgārjuna-kōṣḍa relief of the Birth including a jar with an elephant-head (Nāga?) spout. P. R. Ramachandra Rao, The Art of Nāgārjunakōṣḍa (Madras, 1956), pl. XXV.
the baby occurs at least twice.\textsuperscript{30}

**Great Departure**

A comparatively long period from the Buddha’s birth through his marriage, the subject of many Gandhāran reliefs, is passed over. Three Sārnāth reliefs resume with the Buddha’s departure from Kapilavastu on the back of his horse Kaṇṭhaka (figs. 1, 2 and 5). The event occurs in all the legendary cycles so far mentioned. In the *Nīdatākāthā*, the *Mahāvastu*, and the *Buddhacarita*, deities are said to hold up the feet of Kaṇṭhaka.\textsuperscript{31} The *Lalitavistara* and the *Divyāvadāna*, however, lack this detail.\textsuperscript{32} In the latter text, this might be the result of simple condensation, but in the *Lalitavistara’s* ample account, it is clear that the deities have induced so deep a sleep in all the inhabitants of Kapilavastu that such a precaution is not necessary. Thus music sounds and the earth reverberates (as in the *Mahāvastu* also), emphasizing the spectacle rather than the realistic mechanism of the miracle. The Sārnāth reliefs would seem to be closer to this second textual tradition, for the horse stands solidly on the ground with, at most, a small figure kneeling between its feet. In the representations of the Great Departure in both Andhara and Gandhāra, small figures consistently support the horse’s hooves; it would be hard to explain the omission of this detail by the Sārnāth artist if either earlier composition were his model.\textsuperscript{33} The only tradition showing Kaṇṭhaka unsupported is the Kushan sculpture of Mathurā.\textsuperscript{34}

**Cutting of the Buddha’s Hair, Exchange of Robes**

The Buddha’s tonsure in order to become an ascetic is described in all accounts except the *Divyāvadāna*, and this cutting with a sword is represented clearly in three Sārnāth examples (figs. 1, 2 and 5).\textsuperscript{35} A greater problem arises in identifying the pair of figures represented just below this event in figure 1. One stands with a piece of cloth in his hands, which are extended towards a smaller seated figure with a bowl. In all the textual sources cited, the Buddha’s exchange of his princely clothing for more humble garb takes place after his tonsure. Thus although the seated figure appears to be receiving something from the second who resembles the Buddha on his horse, this standing figure with uncut hair must represent rather a recipient of the robes. In the *Buddhacarita*, the *Mahāvastu*, the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Lalitavistara*, the clothes are given to a hunter, and in the *Nīdatākāthā* it is the Brahmat (god)

\textsuperscript{30} Vogel, *La Sculpture*, pl. L1a; Agrawala, *Catalogue*, p. 120 (H2).
\textsuperscript{31} *Nīdāna-Kāthā*, pp. 173–7 (devas hold feet); *Mahāvastu*, vol. 2, pp. xvi–ii, 160–2 (four great kings hold feet); *Buddhacarita*, pp. 59–61 (yaksas hold feet).
\textsuperscript{32} *Lalitavistara* 185–96; *Divyāvadāna* 391.
\textsuperscript{34} Agrawala, *Catalogue*, p. 121. H4 is the only example well enough preserved to indicate that the Mathurā tradition lacked deities below the horse.
\textsuperscript{35} *Nīdāna-Kāthā*, p. 177; *Buddhacarita*, p. 68; *Mahāvastu*, vol. 2, pp. xvii, 166; *Lalitavistara*, p. 197.
Ghaṭikāra who gives monk’s robes and a bowl to the Buddha. Since neither hunter nor god (such as Indra in the Birth) is indicated, the sculptor seems to have followed a version differing from all these texts. The seated figure is perhaps the groom Chandaka receiving the ornaments (as in the Lalitavistara and Divyavādāna), although these are by no means clear.

These anomalies are not found in other early schools of Indian sculpture. The cutting of the locks is not represented, although the worship of the turban does occur in both Gandhāra and Andhra. The exchange of clothing with a hunter occurs in Gandhāran reliefs (where the curled formula for the Buddha’s hair later in life had not become standard). But the difference between these scenes of a bare-torsoed hunter and the Sārnāth version in figure 1 is so great that it would be hard to see any direct visual connection. Thus the Guptan carving appears to be an independent creation.

Six Years’ Fast, Sujātā’s Gift of Milk
In figure 1 alone, a problematic scene occurs in which the Buddha sits padmāsana, hands in dhyāna mudrā, an umbrella above his effaced head, attended by a slightly corpulent figure who holds what may be a purse. I propose to identify the subject as the Buddha’s six-year trial of self-mortification. The order of this panel would in this case duplicate that of the lower panel on the same stele, following a boustrophedon course from left to right and then back across the top. This is the only event in this portion of the Buddha’s life in which he might be expected in dhyāna mudrā.

And the scene leads naturally into the next event in this panel, the gift of a bowl of milk by the girl Sujātā to the Buddha after he abandons his fast (occurring also in fig. 2).

The Fast occurs in all versions of the Buddha’s life so far cited, with no difference to indicate which was known to the Sārnāth sculptor. The subject is completely absent in the reliefs of Mathurā during the Kushan period. Sujātā’s gift at the end is occasionally shown at Nāgārjunakoṭa.

The well-known Gandhāran images of the fasting Buddha may inspire some disbelief that the subject could be represented in so much less graphic a manner at Sārnāth.

Other distant possibilities are the Monkey’s Gift as in fig. 3f (why no monkey or bowl?) or Indra’s visit (out of sequence, why no cave?).

Nidāna-kathā, pp. 178; Buddhacarita, p. 68; Mahāvastu, vol. 2, pp. xix, 195; Lalitavistara, p. 197; Divyavādāna, p. 391; Sahni identifies the standing figure as the groom Chan daka receiving the royal robes and ornaments (Sahni and Vogel, Catalogue, pp. 186–7). I know of no textual source in which robes as well as ornaments are given to the groom. The Lalitavistara, which Sahni in general regards as the source (p. 183, n. 4) mentioned only ornaments and later describes the exchange of clothes with a hunter (197). In Gandhāran reliefs of the farewell with Chandaka, the Buddha hands his servant objects clearly more elaborate than cloths (Ingholt, Gandhāran Art, pl. 49).

37  Foucher, l’Art gréco-bouddhique, fig. 187b; Ingholt, Gandhāran Art, pl. 46. The hunter is likewise clearly identified at Nāgārjunakoṭa. A. H. Longhurst, The Buddhist Antiquities of Nāgārjunakoṭa, Madras Presidency, Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, no. 54 (Delhi, 1938), pl. XXIb.

38 Other distant possibilities are the Monkey’s Gift as in fig. 3f (why no monkey or bowl?) or Indra’s visit (out of sequence, why no cave?).


41 Foucher, l’Art gréco-bouddhique, pp. 379–83; Ingholt, Gandhāran Art, pp. 62–3, pls. 52, 53, 55. The attendants in these scenes are not consistent, but none helps to clarify that in the Sārnāth version.
The difference, however, is only to be expected from the dissimilar attitudes of the Greco-Roman and Indian artist towards the human body. The Gandhāran sculptor welcomed a chance to display his skill in representing the underlying anatomy. The Gupta sculptor, on the other hand, could not conceive of the expansive form of the Mahāpuruṣa as seriously impaired. In the same way, Aśvaghoṣa describes the event: “Though diminished, he still shone with undiminished grandeur like the ocean.” Again in the case of Sujātā, there seems to be no visual connection between Gandhāra and Sārnāth. This prosperous and generous girl appears in Gandhāran reliefs only as one of the emaciated Buddha’s attendants, while the Sārnāth steles (figs. 1 and 2) show her presenting a bowl to the standing Buddha.

Nāgarāja Kālika’s Praise of the Buddha

The subsequent scene in figure 1, which is combined with Sujātā’s gift in figure 2, shows a Nāga worshipping the standing Buddha. This must refer to the serpent king Kālika, whose praise of the Buddha figures with certain variations in all accounts of the Buddha’s life between the Six-Year Fast and the Enlightenment. In the Nidānakathā, Kālika (or Kāla) is aroused when the Buddha throws the golden bowl Sujātā has given him into the Nairanjana River as an augury of his attaining enlightenment the same day. In the Lalitavistara, the same incident occurs with a serpent named Sāgara, and Kālika appears only later at the throne of enlightenment, together with his wife, worshipping the Buddha just before he takes his seat. In the Buddhacarita, Kāla praises the Buddha after he is seated under the Bodhi tree, which is not the case in the Sārnāth carvings. In the Mahāvastu and Divyāvadāna, the incident of the Nāgarāja is divorced from that of Sujātā, although his praise occurs while the Buddha is on his way to the Bodhi tree. If my interpretation of the Sārnāth reliefs is correct and if the sculptor followed any text with fidelity, the source would seem to combine elements found in several versions, for Sujātā is part of the same event in figure 2, while the serpent confronts a standing Buddha rather than voicing his praise alone in the river’s depths.

When this subject appears in earlier Indian sculpture, the Nāgarāja’s wife consistently accompanies him, which would suggest a textual basis closer to the Lalitavistara. In Gandhāran reliefs, where the scene is most frequent, the Nāga couple moreover appear as torsos emerging from a railed enclosure. The resemblance between the northern school and the Gupta version is thus at best distant.

Māra’s Assault

The attack of the anti-Buddha, Māra, first with his demonic warrior sons and then with his daughters who attempt to distract the Buddha before his enlightenment, is represented on seven of the Sārnāth steles (figs. 1–5, 9 and 10). In all of these, the Buddha is seated in bhūmiśparsa mudrā,

42 Buddhacarita, p. 133.
43 Nidāna-Kathā, p. 188.
surrounded by demonic hosts, with one or two of Māra’s daughters on his (proper) left. To the Buddha’s right in all except figure 3 stands a male figure with a bow, presumably Māra. In the second and fourth examples, Māra is accompanied by the bearer of a makara-topped standard. To the Buddha’s lower right sits a smaller male figure with one knee raised (in figs. 2, 4, 5, 9 and 10). The Bodhimanda or seat is thrice indicated as natural rock (figs. 5, 9 and 10). In all except the third and ninth figures, a separate scene is placed below, usually including several women, one of whom holds a vase, while a second runs with arms outstretched, and others kneel in worship.

The Assault of Māra is included in all accounts of the Buddha’s life, and any might serve as a basis for the representation of the demonic hosts. Māra’s weapon is identified as a discus in the Nidānakathā, which precludes considering that text as a source at Sārnāth. In most of the other texts, his weapon is not specifically named. In the Buddhacarita, however, he is compared to Kāma, the god of love, with his flower bow. The presence of the makaradveja in figures 2 and 4, the perquisite of Kāma (first noticed by Vogel), would suggest either that the Buddhacarita was influential at Sārnāth (which, however, is not borne out in general) or that the Gupta sculptors shared some of Asvaghosa’s literary conceits.

The figures beneath the Buddha are best explained in terms of the Lalitavistara by virtue of its lengthy descriptions, although it is not impossible that the more condensed account in the Mahāvastu or even the Divyāvadāna was related to the version known by the Sārnāth sculptors. The female figure with a vase, usually seen from the waist up directly beneath the Buddha’s downstretched hand, clearly corresponds to the earth goddess, who shows half her body and testifies to the Buddha’s right to take his seat with a voice “like a metal vessel from Magadha struck with a stick” (hence her vase?). The seated figure in the lower left is probably the disconsolate Māra after his defeat. The striding female figure which usually appears to the right may represent a member of Māra’s host mentioned by Asvaghosa:

A woman named Meghakāli, bearing a skull in her hand, in order to infatuate the mind of the sage, flitted about unsettled and stayed not in one spot, like the mind of the fickle student over the sacred texts. (Buddhacarita XIII, 49.)

In short, the Sārnāth scenes of the defeat of Māra do not follow any one text exclusively.

49 V. Fauböll, The Jātaka Together with its Commentary (London, 1877), pp. 1, 74 (cakkāvudham or cakkayudham).
50 Buddhacarita, pp. 137, 147.
51 Lalitavistara, p. 272.
53 Buddhacarita, p. 49. In figs 1, 2, 4 and 10 the figure holds something, perhaps a kapāla, in her extended hand. Another version of the same subject is the Sārnāth Buddha in bhūmisparsa mudrā B(b) 175 (Salm and Vogel, Catalogue, pl. 9). R. D. Banerji identifies this figure in Pāla sculpture as the Earth Goddess running to the scene (Eastern Indian School of Medieval Sculpture, Archaeological Survey of India, New Imperial Series XLVII [Delhi, 1933], pp. 59–60). I find it improbable in figs. 1 and 5 that the earth, shown half emerging from the ground, should also run forward.
although the *Buddhacarita* is more useful here than for the other life scenes.

This subject is amply represented in earlier Buddhist sculpture. At Amarāvatī and Nāgārnākṣṭhā, the most typical version is quite different from the Sārnāth form, although equally traceable to the *Lalitavistara*: the demonic hosts, riding animals, dominate the scene while Māra appears in a chariot and lacks a bow, and his daughters are absent. One aberrant relief from Ghanṭasāla comes closer in most of these matters to Sārnāth and includes Māra seated in defeat, unarmored in the lower left. A stray Āndhra composition like this might have been known and simplified by the Sārnāth sculptor. The Kushan Mathurā version, however, comes equally close in the essentials, generally including Māra’s bow. The late Kushan (possibly early Gupta) version in figure 13 even illustrates the *makara-dvaja* of Māra, suggesting that the comparison of Māra with Kāma was by now not limited to the *Buddhacarita*. If the Mathurā reliefs indicate a visual source for this scene, however, the Gupta Sārnāth carvers elaborated upon any one earlier example we can adduce.

In Gandhāra, likewise, separate details resemble the Sārnāth pattern or point to a common textual source for both (seated Māra, half earth goddess) but the preliminaries, assault, and temptation are broken into separate scenes, none of which strikingly resembles the Sārnāth composition. Similarly, the treatment of this subject in Ajantā Cave 26 bespeaks a source close to that of Sārnāth (hence Māra’s bow) but hardly any direct visual connection. Finally, it must be remembered that only the Sārnāth carvings show Meghakāli and represent the *Bodhitāṇḍā* as a natural rock rather than a constructed platform.

**First Sermon**

On all the steles with multiple scenes from the Buddha’s life, the event which took place at Sārnāth itself, his First Sermon, is naturally included (*figs. 1–5, 9 and 10*). All show the dharmacakra on the base, in two cases seen frontally (*figs. 1 and 3*). In all but figure 5, the setting of the Deer Park is identified by two deer flanking the wheel. In figure 1, characteristically, the event is dramatized by the inclusion of an audience next to the Buddha, focussing upon his sermon, while elsewhere this is relegated to the base of the scene. The kneeling worshippers below are generally six, although the stele in figure 10 includes five and that in figure 3 lacks any worshippers. The Buddha’s immediate attendants are Bodhisattvas and Vidyādharas except in the fourth ex-

---

54 Sivaramamurti, *Amaravati Sculptures*, pls. XLII, 1 and LVII, 1; Stern and Bénisti, *Évolution*, pl. XXIII left (?); Longhurst, *The Buddhist Antiquities*, no. 54, pl. XXIIIb.
55 A. Rea, *South Indian Buddhist Antiquities*, ASI, New Imperial Series XV, (Madras, 1894), pl. XX VIII. The piece is now in the Musée Guimet. Stern and Bénisti, *Évolution*, pl. XLIII, appears to be an iconic version of the same composition. One Nāgārnākṣṭhā example gives prominence to the Daughters and shows Māra with a bow (Longhurst, *The Buddhist Antiquities*, no. 54, pl. XXIXa).
58 V. Smith, *A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon* (Bombay, 3rd ed., n. d.), pl. 69b. The curious *vāraṇā mādrā* and the amount of space allotted Māra’s daughters are among the most obvious differences. To my knowledge, the only example of the figure I identify as Meghakāli outside Sārnāth and Pālā sculpture is a piece from Kauśāmibi, sixth or seventh century, which includes the Earth and a kneeling male figure (Archaeological Survey of India Photo Kauśāmibi A6).
ample, where two smaller Buddhas stand to the side on lotuses. This and the fifth example suggest some confusion with the next incident, the Great Miracle, for in figure 5 the Buddha, generally *padmâsana*, sits in the “European pose” (*bhadrâsana*) with his feet supported by a large lotus which replaces the *dharmacakra* and deer.⁵⁹ In both cases (figs. 4 and 5), I identify the scene as the First Sermon because several distinguishing marks of the Great Miracle are lacking, but there is some ambiguity.

The First Sermon is related in all versions of the Buddha’s life.⁶⁰ These, however, are concerned largely with the doctrine which was taught and include few physical details which would differentiate one from another as a source for the images. All, for example, describe the immediate audience of the sermon as the five ascetics who had abandoned the Buddha at the end of his six-year fast; from this, one might infer that the images in figure 10 and perhaps figure 1 are most faithful to the texts, although a preference for symmetry in the rest would explain the inclusion of six figures.⁶¹

Among earlier representations of the First Sermon it is generally the case that the *dharmacakra* plays a clear role either as a substitute for the Buddha or as a necessary prop, being turned by his hand. Sometimes when the Buddha does not actually turn the wheel, he holds his robe with his left hand while the right forms the *abhaya mudrâ*.⁶² The interesting late Kushan frieze from Mathurâ already referred to provides a version closer to Sârnâth, in that the wheel occurs only on the throne below and the hands appear to be in *dharmacakra mudrâ* (fig. 13c). Yet this must represent the Gandhâran *mudrâ*, one hand clasping the other, both turned inward, rather than the later gesture.⁶³ The arrangement of the audience around the Buddha resembles the composition in figure 1 and suggests the relevance of the Mathurâ model to the first Gupta Sârnâth carving.

**Great Miracle**

The Great Miracle which the Buddha performed at Srâvastî was the subject of a pioneering article by Alfred Foucher which has been amended in some of its identifications but which stands correct for the works from Sârnâth.⁶⁴ Figures 2, 3, and 6 to 10 re-

---

⁵⁹ For a general account of the origins of the *bhadrâsana*, cf. J. Rosenfeld, *The Dy- namic Arts of the Kushans* (Berkeley, 1967), pp. 186–8; pl. 167 illustrates another Gupta Sârnâth piece whose exact subject is not clear. The pose is sometimes used for the First Sermon in Pâla sculpture, e.g. Banerji, *Medieval Sculpture*, pl. XXIVd, e. For examples of a similar “contamination” of the Great Miracle with a Preaching Buddha (as in our figs. 4 and 5) cf. M. Bénisti, “À propos d’un relief inédit de Kârlâ,” *Arts Asiatiques*, vol. 8 (1961), pp. 263–70.


⁶¹ In the great Sârnâth version of the First Sermon, seven figures appear on the base, but only five are monks; the same differentiation may be intended on the steles.


⁶³ Among Gandhâran reliefs, the *dharmacakra mudrâ* is shown with right hand turned palm inward rather than towards the viewer as at Sârnâth. Foucher originally identified these as images of the Great Miracle (“The Great Miracle at Crâvastî,” *Beginnings of Buddhist Art* [Paris, 1917], pp. 147–84). Professor van Lohuizen convincingly queried this and moreover found Gupta influence upon Gandhâra here (*The “Scythian Period*” [Leiden, 1949], pp. 124–38).

present the essence of the second half of this miraculous multiplication of the Buddha’s body in various poses upon lotuses. The fat ascetic Purāṇa Kaśyapa, who was converted at the vision, is visible at the bottom of the scene in figures 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8. In figure 2 it is clear that he is balanced on the opposite side by King Prasenajit, also present at Śrāvasti and identified by his royal elephant. The two Nāgas, Nanda and Upānanda, which produced the Buddha’s lotus seat are included in this same example as well as in figures 6 and 7. In fact, the only question of identity arises with figures 9 and 10, in which Buddhas are represented without one point of origin on either side of other life scenes; for lack of a better explanation for their presence on lotuses, however, the traditional identification of these as the Great Miracle seems acceptable.

Among texts, only the Dīyāvadāna preserves all the details represented in figure 2. The Pāli versions of the Buddha’s life focus upon the first part of the “twin miracle”; these can therefore be excluded as sources. Other Sanskrit works may originally have included the event, now lost along with later parts of their texts.

The Great Miracle is not known in the reliefs of Andhra or of Mathurā. In Gandhāra, Foucher’s examples of the multiplication miracle are dubious. Again we are faced with a subject newly formulated in artistic terms in the fifth century.

The Monkey’s Gift of Honey

The story of a monkey who gave the Buddha a bowl of honey, died in delight at its acceptance, and was reborn as a god occurs only in figure 3. Since this stele, it will be argued, is clearly post-Gupta, this incident need be discussed only briefly. Moreover, it becomes progressively more difficult to consider textual sources for later scenes in the Buddha’s life in that the Sanskrit accounts which seem to be most relevant do not preserve their original conclusions. Thus the story of the Monkey’s Gift occurs only in the Pāli Dhammapadāthakathā, in the jātaka collection preserved in Tibetan as the Dzan Glin, and in Hsüan-tsang’s travel account. Among these, the last is closest to the Śrānāth relief, in which the monkey’s legs appear on the right as he falls into a hole rather than being impaled upon a stump as in the Pāli version. It is the Pāli which inspires a single example of the incident from Amarāvati. The sole Gandhāran version of the scene is closer to Śrānāth but cannot be considered a source in that the Buddha’s mudrā differs and the monkey’s death is not suggested.

The Mad Elephant

A second scene which is limited to figure 3 is the Buddha’s taming of the mad elephant Nālāgiri, loosed against him in the

---

65 Dīyāvadāna, pp. 161–2, 394.
67 Cf. n. 61 above.
nun who under the guise of a cakravartin first saw the Buddha at his descent. The stairs are represented in figure 2 as a single flight, in figure 10 in the triple form preserved at Sāṅkasya, while by the period of figure 3 they have been reduced to a slab. This subject may have been more popular at Sārnāth than the present small sample of carving indicates, for it is represented on at least seven more fragments, both Gupta and medieval.

Among the texts preserved in India, the Buddha’s descent is most amply described in the Dhammapādakathā; but from the brief references in the Divyāvadāna, it may be inferred that the event also figured originally in Sanskrit versions of the Buddha’s life. Both Fa-hsien and Hsian-tsang describe the site where the descent occurred at Sāṅkasya. Three ladders were preserved here, and Hsian-tsang noted a Sāṃmitīya community, which may explain the popularity of the subject at Sārnāth, also a Sāṃmitīya center.

This subject is lacking in the art of Āndra but occurs frequently in other schools. At Bharhut, Sāncī I, Mathurā, and (usually) in Gandhāra, a ladder or more commonly three ladders fill the composition, with the Buddha and his attendants superimposed on these if he is represented

72 Sivaramamurti, Amaravatī Sculptures, pl. XXV, 1; T. N. Ramachandran, “Buddhist Sculptures from a Stūpa near Goli Village, Guntur District,” Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum, n.s. vol. 1, no. 1 (1962), pp. III H. Both Āndra examples represent Nālagiri twice and are concerned with the dramatic contrast of the two moods represented. Foucher, L’Art gréco-bouddhique, pp. 522–4. In all three Gandhāran examples the elephant stands rather than kneels. Vogel, La Sculpture, pl. XXa; this Mathurā Kushan version is closest in the central panel, although far less symmetrical and iconic than the Sārnāth scene.
The Parinirvāṇa

The Parinirvāṇa is the final scene in figures 2, 5 and 9 and might well have crowned other steles now broken at the top. In all, the Buddha reclines on his right side with the grieving Mallas above and with seated disciples below; one, cross-legged and seen from behind, is traditionally identified as Subhadra, the Buddha’s last convert and the first to attain arhatship. In figures 5 and 9, a tripod is also visible below, and a figure, probably a tree spirit, leans from the śāla tree at the Buddha’s head.

The fullest description of the Parinirvāṇa is preserved in the Pāli Mahāparinibbana Sūtra, but again references occur in the Diivāvadāna. Fa-hsien and Hsüan-tsang describe the shrine at Kuśānagara. A single example of the subject from Amaravatī is too damaged for extended comparison, although it does include Subhadra, indicating the widespread tradition of showing that figure seated. In both Mathurā and Gandhāra during the Kushan period, Subhahra (occasionally seen from the front, fig. 13), the tripod, weeping Mallas, and the spirit of the śāla tree are present; thus either school is a possible source. For this event we possess also the statue which existed at Kuśānagara in the Gupta period, including Subhādra with tripod seen from the rear (fig. 12). This, if any immediate source, would seem to lie behind both the Sārnāth reliefs and the contemporary monumental version in Ajantā Cave 26.

Such a model, in conjunction with textual references:

81 Fa-hsien, A Record, pp. 70–1; Hsüan-tsang, Buddhist Records, pp. 202–5.
83 Vogel, La Sculpture, pls. LII, LIITa, c; Foucher, l’Art gréco-bouddhique, pp. 555–73; Ingholt, Gandhāran Art, pp. 93–4, pls. 136–41. Subhādra is shown facing forward in roughly half the Gandhāran examples, which is the case in one Sārnāth piece (Sahni and Vogel, Catalogue, p. 194, C(a) 14). Vajrapāṇi is included with almost complete consistency in Gandhāra but never at Sārnāth or Mathurā, arguing for the connection between the last two.
tradition, may explain details such as the seated Subhadra which are found in all versions of the subject.

*Text and Sect in Gupta Sārnāth*

Any discussion of literary sources for art in India is inevitably limited by several facts. In the first place, one must admit the possibility of missing or unrecognized texts. At the same time, in the case of Buddhist subjects, one faces a great panoply of literature preserved in non-Indian languages. I have consciously excluded the Chinese *Tripiṭaka*, not only because I do not read Chinese but also because it would raise complex problems in disentangling elements added in the process of translation. Perhaps one day a scholar with Sinological and Buddhist training as well as an interest in Indian sculpture can pursue this subject. Finally, one must recognize the likelihood that the Sārnāth sculptors did not read at all and were familiar with such literary sources in oral form which can never be precisely reconstructed. Thus the point of our textual comparisons is never to pinpoint the literary basis of a particular theme but rather to build up from a statistical vantage point an impression of general connections with various traditions of Buddhist literature. Lest one be overwhelmed by the the futility of even this endeavor, it is worth remembering that the probability of a folk version radically different from the written “big-tradition” texts is smaller for this kind of Buddhist subject than it would be in either esoteric Buddhism or in Hinduism.

The question of sectarian affiliations for Buddhist texts is equally knotty. Buddhologists are reluctant to classify the texts by school, for many must have been read and copied by Buddhists of a variety of persuasions. While some are preserved with sectarian labels, their content may reflect a differing affiliation. Moreover whole schools occupy a transitional position and reflect a range of opinion. Here again, we can build up an approximate picture from considering various kinds of texts in relationship to a number of subjects. Several versions of the Buddha’s life conclude in the form which is preserved with the First Sermon, although it is probable that they originally contained events through the *Parinirvāṇa*.86

We shall therefore focus on the early part of the Buddha’s life up to the First Sermon range of Miracle (whose order varies in the texts) in order to see the widest possible or Great comparisons.

Buddhist sources fall into two general linguistic categories: those in Pāli, representing the Theravāda school, and those in various kinds of Sanskrit, representing more evolved Hinayāna as well as Mahāyāna ideas. The *Jātaka* literature follows a broad range of doctrine. The Pāli *Jātakas* are clearly Theravāda, while the Sanskrit *Jātakamālā* of Āryaśūra is Mahāyāna. The Sanskrit *Avadāna-Kalpalatā* was written in the eleventh century by the Kashmiri Kṣemendra but preserves a Sarvāstivādin version of the tales.87 It is particularly significant that the latter is most relevant to the one Sārnāth Gupta illustration of a *Jātaka* considered here.

For the life of the Buddha, among the Pāli scriptures, I have cited primarily the

86 This is true of the *Nīdiṇakathā, Mahāvastu, Buddhacarita*, and *Lalitavistara*. Cf. M. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature* (Calcutta, 1933) vol. 2, p. 239 on the the abridgement of the *Buddhacarita*.

Nidānakathā, a work formulated perhaps as late as the fifth century A.D. but preserving on the whole an early phase in the development of the Buddha legend. The Dhammarāmapāda commentary and the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta have also been mentioned, although these as well as even earlier Pāli texts preserve only parts of the life story and are even less useful in connection with the sculptural cycles. Among the events found both in the Nidānakathā and in Sanskrit works, in no case is the Pāli version closest to the steles. Thus we can with certainty conclude that a Theravāda version of the Buddha's life was not influential for the Sārnāth Gupta sculptors.

Among versions of the Buddha's life in some form of Sanskrit (and here linguistic distinctions need not concern us), four have been widely considered in relation to the carvings. The Divyavādāna is largely a Sarvāstivādin work, illustrating the growing importance which this Hinayāna sect attributed to the Bodhisattva career. The Lalitavistara belongs to the Dharmaguptaka sect of the Sarvāstivādins, but initiates Mahāyāna ideas and hence was revered as a Mahāyāna text. The Buddhacarita of Āśvaghōsa (associated with Kaniṣka) purports to be Mahāyāna, but its lack of supernatural forms would suggest a strong Sarvāstivādin basis. And the Mahāvaastu belongs to the Lokottaravaadin sect of the Mahāsāṃghikas, anticipating Mahāyāna spiritual discipline as does this Hinayāna school in general.

Any one of these four texts might have served as a basis for the Dream of Māyā and the Birth of the Buddha in the form they are represented on the Sārnāth steles. The Lalitavistara and the Divyavādāna provide the accounts of the First Bath and Great Departure most relevant to the sculpture. The Divyavādāna alone describes most details of the Great Miracle as it is represented at Sārnāth, but this event may be lost from some of the other texts. For the Assault of Māra, the Buddhacarita and the Lalitavistara explain different elements. No text considered corresponds precisely to the version of the Hair Cutting or the Gift of Robes which was known to the sculptors. All (Pāli as well as Sanskrit) might have inspired the images of the Six-Year Fast, Śujātā's Gift, and the First Sermon. And finally, the Sarvāstivādin tradition as reflected later in Kṣemendra's Avadāna Kalpalatā, comes closest to explaining the Kṣāntivadin lintel.

---


89 In a late Gupta inscription, a statue of the Buddha assaulted by Māra is said to be the gift of a sthavira, apparently a Theravādin (Sahni and Vogel, Catalogue, pp. 67–8).


91 Winternitz, Indian Literature, pp. 248–56; Thomas, Buddhist Thought, p. 282; Lamotte, Bouddhisme indien, pp. 691, 723–4 (suggesting that this "incomplete life" belongs to the first century A.D. and precedes the more complete Buddhacarita and Divyavādāna); Murti, The Central Philosophy, p. 79 (stressing its influence upon the Mādhyamikas).

92 Winternitz, Indian Literature, pp. 236–62; Lamotte, Bouddhisme indien, p. 726; Murti, The Central Philosophy, p. 79.

93 Winternitz, Indian Literature, pp. 239–47; Thomas, Buddhist Thought, pp. 280–1; Lamotte, Bouddhisme indien, pp. 690–1, 724; Murti, The Central Philosophy, p. 79.
In short, no single text in the form preserved in Indian languages can be selected as the source of the Sārnāth Gupta sculptor. At the same time, it is clearly the Sanskrit versions of the Buddha’s life which are closest to the carvings. Moreover, among these the Mahāsāṃghika tradition is less helpful than texts with a Sarvāstivādin affiliation of some kind. Thus it would seem that some advanced Hinayāna work or body of legends, pointing towards the Mahāyāna but not necessarily Mahāyāna in the full sense of the doctrine, can be hypothesized as being current at Sārnāth in the fifth and sixth centuries.

It is interesting that this argument fits with our other evidence about the Buddhist sects in Gupta Sārnāth. Inscriptions suggest the predominance of the Sarvāstivādins from the second through the fourth centuries. But during the fourth century, a note was added to the Aśokan lion column (an important monument), reading “Homage to the masters of the Sammitiya sect of the Vatsiputra school.”

By the seventh century, when Hsüan-tsang visited Sārnāth he mentioned the Sāṃmitiyas alone as having a monastery at the site. Likewise, the manner in which the Buddha’s robe is supported without a waist-band in most Sārnāth images of the fifth and sixth centuries corresponds the manner of dress which It-sing ascribed to the Sāmittiya sect. Thus while the Sāmittiyas were probably not the only sect at Sārnāth, it would seem that they played an influential role there.

The Sāmittiyas (Sammiṭiya, Sāmmitiya) were a widespread advanced Hinayāna sect of whom no text is preserved in Indian languages and only one in Chinese. The Chinese pilgrims do indicate their strength throughout north India, with a particular concentration in the west. Their doctrine can be deduced from other sects’ criticisms and must have involved belief in the personal soul or pudgala, a subject of anathema to other Buddhists. It has been suggested that they may have developed ideas leading to Mādhyamika epistemology. They seem to play a transitory role between Hinayāna and Mahāyāna like the Sarvāstivādins, and one might expect their version of the Buddha’s life to

---

94 Archæological Survey of India, Annual Report 1904, p. 68; 1906, pp. 96–7; 1907, p. 73. These inscriptions, while hardly sufficient to suggest that the Sarvāstivādins were the only sect at the site, are on significant monuments (the railing of the original main shrine and the Jagat Singh Stūpa), as is the next.

95 Sahni and Vogel, Catalogue, pp. 30–1. After this, the only clearly sectarian inscriptions are those of “followers of the Mahāyāna,” on palaeographic grounds of the eleventh to twelfth century (ibid., pp. 123–4, 135–6).

96 Hsüan-tsang, Buddhist Records, p. 292.

97 A. B. Griswold, “Prolegomena to the Study of the Buddha’s Dress in Chinese Sculpture,” Artais Asiae, vol. 26 (1963), p. 113. Among the Sārnāth Buddhas, some which are also early Gupta in style also retain the Sarvāstivādin belt: J. Rosenfield, “On the Dated Carvings of Sārnāth,” Artais Asiae, vol. 26 (1963), fig. 9; S. Weiner, “From Gupta to Pāla Sculpture,” Artais Asiae, vol. 25 (1962), fig. 9. All the Buddha figures which appear on the steles are of the unbelted type. This might also correspond to the dress of the Āvīra-vasūnas (Theravādins), but since we have established that the Nidanākāthā is least relevant for these scenes, the Āvīras can be eliminated as a possible source.


resemble the Divyavadāna and the Lalitavistara.

Artistic Sources of the Sārnāth Reliefs

A second approach to sculpture in general is the purely artistic one, with the underlying assumption that visual rather than a literary tradition provides the best explanation for compositional formulae. One such visual tradition lies in earlier reliefs of similar subjects. Here, for example, Benjamin Rowland wrote, "A number of [Gupta] steles, with scenes from the life of Buddha very clearly show the perpetuation of the iconography for each episode as evolved in Gandhāra." 100

As an explanation of the compositions of the Sārnāth reliefs, this approach is not very satisfactory. At least eight events found in the Gupta steles cannot be said to follow the compositions or iconography of any earlier Indian school of sculpture (the Birth, Hair Cutting, Gift of Robes, Six Years Fast, Sujātā's Gift, Kālika's Praise, Great Miracle, and Descent). The only scenes sufficiently close to Gandhāran reliefs to suppose a direct connection are the Assault of Māra and the Parinirvāṇa. The latter, however, is equally close to Kushan Mathurā, while the treatment of the Assault bears an equal relationship to both Mathurā and Āndhra (and no school includes all the standard Sārnāth elements). Āndhra provides a possible prototype for the Sārnāth composition of Māyā's Dream. And Kushan Mathurā alone anticipates the Sārnāth composition of the Buddha's Bath, First Sermon, and Great Departure. Thus although the general traditions of Kushan Mathurā come as close as any to Sārnāth, the Gupta sculptor does not seem to have followed comprehensively the example of an earlier school in the composition of such narrative scenes.

A second kind of visual source lies in the sculptures which existed at the sites of the major events in the Buddha's life. Alfred Foucher suggested that such models may have been transmitted in the form of souvenirs taken away by pilgrims. 101 The colossal reclining Buddha at Kusanagara has already been mentioned as a prototype for the Parinirvāṇa images with their inclusion of the seated Subhadra on the base. Similarly at Sārnāth itself, Hsūan-tsang describes a life-size copper image of the Buddha turning the wheel of the law which, if it existed as early as the fifth century, would account for the standard format of that event in a large number of Gupta sculptures. 102 At Lumbini, a large, damaged relief, perhaps a late Kushan work from Mathurā, shows Māyā clinging to a tree with Indra and Brahmā holding the baby; this might have provided the basis for late Gandhāran as well as Gupta versions of the subject. 103 At Sānksaya, the Chinese pilgrims describe actual ladders, which may be reflected in the composition of the Buddha's descent from the Trayatrinśata Heaven in various schools, although not particularly at Sārnāth. At Bodh-Gāyā, the image described by Hsūan-tsang and reproduced in Pāla art seems to be later than the less abbreviated Gupta versions.


of the Assault of Māra and the Buddha’s Enlightenment. At Kapilavastu, Srāvasti, and minor sites, there is no evidence of any statue commemorating the events which took place there. Thus the Sārnāth Gupta iconography for the Great Miracle of Srāvasti appears to be basically an original local innovation. Here again, while the Gupta sculptor may have had some models in mind when he formulated his compositions, it is more striking that he worked inventively within general guidelines provided by the stories.

Development of the Sārnāth Reliefs

A final problem which this study of one type of carving poses is the variety within one genre. In part this must be ascribed to the individual talents of different sculptors or workshops. Only the examples in figures 6 and 7 resemble each other so precisely in composition that one might be considered a copy of the other, and unfortunately both are too damaged for their exact relationship to be defined.

Another reason for variety among the reliefs lies in their chronological sequence. The first three examples, all of the same general type, illustrate a clear evolution. The carving in figure 1 is the earliest of the three, that in figure 3 the latest. The latter includes new scenes (f and h) not found on any of the rest of the steles but common in Pāla sculpture. Subjects which are found on the other steles are simplified as well. The figure style points toward the exaggerated angularity and stiffness of medieval sculpture in general and of Pāla works in particular. For example, the déhanchement of Indra in the Descent is more emphatic than in the comparable scene in figure 2. Eyebrows are heavier and eyes less fully integrated into the shape of the head than in the previous two works. Details which can be considered specifically Gupta disappear, such as ebullient lotus foliage or varied hairstyles without crowns. In all these respects, the stele in figure 2 is closer to the first, but it does share with the third a certain regularity, the scenes being divided by borders. Those events which are spread over the two lower panels of the first stele are in the second reduced to a single vertical panel in the third to be further compressed into one small compartment. The two Nāgas bathing the infant Buddha are varied in their poses in the first relief, while in the second and all later examples they stand with rigid symmetry. Thus the work in figure 2 lies between the others, somewhat closer to the first on the basis of its figural style, which is not perceptibly “medieval.”

It appears to me that the remainder of the Sārnāth reliefs discussed here belong, with that in figure 2, to a middle or “High Gupta” group. Within this phase, it is tempting to make further distinctions. For instance, some progression from the work in figure 9 to that in figure 10 is apparent: 9 shows the human body in more varied and graceful positions; there are more distinctively Gupta details, such as the lotus foliage to the sides; and the oval heads and tapered limbs are closer to the Gupta canon. Similarly the Kṣāntivādin lintel seems relatively late in the stylization of some poses. Most striking is the exaggerated placement of the body’s weight on one foot with the rear leg bent parallel to the plane of the carving (the dancer in the second panel from the left and the female to
Fig. 1.—National Museum, New Delhi, C(a)2.
Fig. 2.—Calcutta Museum, S1.
Fig. 3.—Sārnāth Museum, C(a)3.
Fig. 4.—Sārnāth Museum, C(a)1.

Fig. 5.—Calcutta Museum, S3.
Fig. 6.—Sārnāth Museum, C(a)6.
Fig. 7.—Allahabad Museum.
Fig. 3.—Calcutta Museum, S5.
Fig. 9.—Calcutta Museum, S2.
Fig. 10.—Calcutta Museum, S4.
Fig. 11.—Sārnāth Museum, D(d)1, Kṣāntivādin Lintel. (Photo, ASIAR 1907, pl. XX.)

Fig. 12.—Kuṣanagara Parinirvāṇa image, detail of base, seated Subhadra.
Fig. 13(a)–(d).—Frieze of Buddha’s Life, Mathurā, 3d. c. A.D. (Ramnagar, Lucknow Museum 46.17.)
the side of Jambhala at the far right). This contrasts with the more relaxed angles of the bent leg for the Māyā figures in figures 5 and 9. At the same time, it is impossible to arrange all the members of this group in a neat chronological sequence.

The absolute date of the steles can be roughly indicated. The only clearly established dates for the Sārnāth Gupta school are those of three standing Buddhas inscribed with dates corresponding to A.D. 474 and 477. These have been discussed by John Rosenfield, who includes with the dated works the steles reproduced here in figure 8 and 9.\(^{106}\) The stele in figure 10 also bears an inscription which has been ascribed to the fifth century on the basis of palaeography.\(^{106}\) If our first example (fig. 1) precedes the middle group, it must belong to at least the third quarter of the fifth century if not earlier.

The absolute date of the transition to the latest stage is less clear, for the duration of the "High Gupta" style of the middle group remains to be fixed in terms of other kinds of sculpture. The Parinirvāna scene in figure 3 shows the same puffy outline of the thigh which is found in Nālandā bronzes usually assigned to the ninth century or later.\(^{107}\) The taming of Nālāgiri is close in iconography to an inscribed example of this subject done in the third year of Śūra-pāla (mid-ninth century).\(^{108}\) The Pāla characteristics of the style have been discussed above. Thus while this piece has always been considered "Gupta," and often fifth century, seventh to eighth century seems to me a cautious estimate of its date.

One aspect of the development of post-Gupta style which these reliefs illustrate clearly is the progressive simplification of narrative content. The group scenes of figure 1 are reduced in figure 3, and the dramatic interaction between the participants is minimized. The number of events sometimes increases in Pāla sculpture, and occasionally crowds of attendants remain.\(^{109}\) Yet these simply frame the isolated Buddha figure in the center. Thus the Gupta period appears as a transition from the dramatic concern of śārdudra and, to some extent, Kushan Mathurā art to the more exclusively iconic sculpture of medieval India. Moreover, the order of the reliefs becomes progressively formal. In the first stele (fig. 1), a plot winds back and forth across the two lower panels, loosely organized in sequence but with concern for the elegant formal balance of the asymmetrical parts of each composition. In the works within the middle group, this organization is on the whole simpler and episodic, with successive scenes read from left to right and from bottom to top. By the latest stele (fig. 3), the order is arbitrary and the relief has become a string of interchangeable beads on a rosary.

To return to the original choice between literary and visual sources, it should be obvious that each informs the image in a different way. In the earliest Gupta reliefs, literature seems to have played a greater role precisely because the Sārnāth sculptor

\(^{105}\) Rosenfield, “Dated Carvings,” p. 22.
\(^{106}\) Flect, Corpus Inscriptionum, p. 281.
\(^{107}\) Rowland, Art and Architecture, pl. 94b.
\(^{109}\) Banerji, Medieval Sculpture, pl. XXa particularly. Note also the enumerative treatment of pl. XIX b, c.
was not building upon visual models. But should a Sāṃmatiya text of the Buddha’s life be discovered tomorrow, this would hardly explain the successful and inventive composition of the first stele. With one of those insights which made his teaching so deeply instructive, Dr. Max Loehr used to characterize the relationship between an artist and his tradition which together comprise “style” as a continuing dialogue. In the fifth century, the artist himself had most to say, while by the time of the latest works, tradition had raised its voice.
RUTHERFORD JOHN GETTENS
(1900—1974)
IN MEMORIAM

RUTHERFORD JOHN GETTENS

Rutherford J. Gettens, Curator Emeritus and Research Consultant at the Smithsonian Institution’s Freer Gallery of Art, died suddenly on June 17, 1974 in Plattsburg, New York. He was stricken with a massive heart attack while doing historical research in the office of the County Recorder of Deeds. For forty years he had been one of the leaders in technical studies in the field of the fine arts, and his passing leaves a gap which cannot be filled.

He was born in Mooers, New York in January, 1900. He received the degree of Bachelor of Science from Middlebury College, Vermont in 1923, and taught in Colby College in Waterville, Maine, from 1923 until 1927, when he left to take a Master’s degree at Harvard University. In 1928 he was engaged by the Fogg Art Museum as Chemist, in what later became the Department of Conservation. He taught in summer sessions at Middlebury from 1927 to 1929, and in 1929 received the Master of Arts in Chemistry from Harvard. In 1930 he married Katharine Covelle; they had one daughter, Rebecca.

He continued as Chemist at the Fogg until 1951. He also served as Consultant to the Federal Art Project of the WPA, Boston, from 1937 to 1941, and during the war (1944–45) as staff member to U.S. Engineer’s Project Y, Manhattan District, in Los Alamos, New Mexico. In 1948 he assumed a lectureship in fine arts at Harvard and travelled to Brussels as a Special Fellow of the Belgian-American Educational Foundation. From 1949 to 1951 he was Chief of Museum Technical Research of the Fogg Art Museum.

In 1951, Mr. Gettens left the Fogg to found the Technical Laboratory at the Freer Gallery. He became Head Curator of the Laboratory in 1961, and retired in 1968 to become Research Consultant, a post he held until his death. In 1971 he travelled to Greece as Fulbright Lecturer to advise on the establishment of a National Conservation Laboratory for Art and Archaeology.

He belonged to the following professional societies: American Chemical Society; American Association of Museums; Archaeological Institute of America; Cosmos Club (Chairman of the Art Committee); International Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (Fellow, Council Member, Vice President, and President, 1968–71); IIC-American Group and AIC (First Honorary Fellow, 1974); The International Council of Museums (ICOM: Coordinator of the Working Group on “Reference Materials”; formerly Coordinator of the Working Group on “Preservation and Restoration of Out-door Metal Sculp-tures”); and the Washington Region Conservation Guild (Council Member). He also served on the Board of Consulting Fellows of the Conservation Center of the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, and the Science Advisory Committee of the H. F. DuPont Winterthur Museum. He edited Technical Studies in the Field of the Fine Arts
from 1935 until 1942; *IIC Abstracts* from 1958 until 1962; served as Section Editor of *Chemical Abstracts* (1962–68); and as Series Editor for the series “Identification of Painting Materials” in *Studies in Conservation* from 1967.

But these are only the bare facts of his life. The breadth of his interests shows more clearly in his bibliography. Subjects range from the frescoes of Bonampak through the *santos* of New Mexico, the gypsum quarries of Tuscany, the silver of Byzantium, to the bronzes of China and the paintings of Japan. This bibliography was, for the most part, compiled by John Gettens himself for use in his *curriculum vitae* and is printed here with a few additions made by Freer Gallery of Art staff members.

Rutherford J. Gettens, Curator Emeritus at the Freer Gallery of Art, was born in a small farmhouse at Mooers, New York on the 17th of January, 1900. At Mooers, near the border of Canada, on that day in January 1900, the planets may have imparted a keen yearning to discover the secrets of all things material.

“...who instructed him and taught him in the path of judgement, and taught him knowledge, and shewed to him the way of understanding?”

He must have pondered over the pebbles at the side of the road and asked what made them as they were, and the branches of trees, and the clouds in the sky, and the ripples in the Chazy River. He must have watched cattle in pastures, how they kept peace with each other, and horses in harness, how they pulled together. He must have learned from the farmer, the wheelwright, the blacksmith, and the cobbler, as well as from books and the teacher in his one-room school.

“For every one that asketh receiveth; he that seeketh findeth.”

Those of us who worked with him during the years when he began exploring in the arts remember that he was usually at a desk with a stage microscope. Occasionally he would look up and through the window at the trees of Cambridge; surely he was on an excursion, an unrelenting pursuit of the answer to a question. Many of the early questions were asked of him by Langdon Warner, Lecturer on the Art of Asia and Curator of the Fogg Museum’s collection of oriental art. What could be done to save paintings on the walls of the cave temples of China? Slabs of brown, sandy clay were carried into the work rooms. They were painted on one side—all together a huge picture in crumbling fragments, hacked from cavern walls. After many months a way was devised to separate paint from clay and fix the painting on a solid support. A bronze nail was brought to him from an excavation at Nuzi in Iraq. It wore a thick crust of corrosion. Out of his labor with that ancient nail came the explanation of the so-called “bronze disease”; from that, too, came his prolonged occupation with artifacts of bronze.

Each episode of study began like a journey: equipment and provisions brought to hand and made ready; the route decided; then the steady tread towards the answer.

“Let there be no strife... between me
and thee and between my herdmen
and thy herdmen; for we are brethe- ren.”

The journey moved along in moderate comfort. The climate of those work rooms was one of good humor and serenity. The works of art examined and treated often held high values to historians and to merchants. The rooms could have been charged with anxiety and with friction. But the place was calm. The air was mild. At moments you might have heard a heavy pun or a lame limerick.

Walking with him along a street in any city where his studies had brought him, I noticed how his inner realm of thought went with him always. People might crowd about him but he watched the stone of pavement or of walls; he looked at metal objects in shop windows or at trees if any grew there. Should some person accost him for a cause either worthy or contemptible, his customary response would be surprise, confusion about the cause of the interruption, query as to what was wanted, and a polite reply delivered with apparent respect for that other person.

“A man that hath friends must shew himself friendly; and there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother.”

Shortly after 1970, I visited the laboratory he had installed at the Freer Gallery, and was shown the work then in hand. I talked with his younger associates, and I recalled the laboratory where he had begun other investigations forty years earlier. Here, I tasted in the air that same tang of adventure as pursuit pulled close to the answer. Of what raw stuff was this wrought?

How did it reach this present state? I listened to the words heard a thousand times before: “We do not know . . .,” “We have reason to believe. . . .” I looked at the familiar order of the rooms—books, files, cases, flasks, bottles, jars, instruments and artifacts. One could not count the number of conservators whose luck had let them work with him in rooms like these that were permeated with calm and candor, void of panic and of fear, fraught with zeal for discovery. I went to his house and saw his collection of Indian baskets and scattered pieces, specimens, of rare stone. Going with him to the Cosmos Club, I watched him greeted with cheer, and surmised that he must live without an enemy.

“Wherefore I perceive that there is nothing better than that a man should rejoice in his own works, for that is his portion; for who shall bring him to see what shall be after him?”

Throughout those many years at the microscope, his eyes had caused trouble. Thick lenses were part of his features. By 1974 his eyes had worsened. Surgery was planned for the autumn to make them better. On the last days of May he and his wife attended the annual meeting of AIC in Cooperstown, New York. There he spoke in the program and was awarded the first honorary fellowship of the organization. They travelled on to Mooers, to his sister’s house.

He worked on his wood lot, bordered by his mile of abandoned railroad right-of-way, and viewed his one head of cattle (a white-faced heifer in a herd of Holsteins). During the evenings he wrote. He was stricken without warning, and in an hour
he was gone. He rests in a small cemetery on the banks of the Chazy River, not five miles from the small farmhouse where he was born.

This In Memoriam was written by the friends and colleagues of Rutherford J. Gettens.
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