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TS'AO HSÜN AND TWO SOUTHERN SUNG HISTORY SCROLLS

BY JULIA K. MURRAY

TS'AO HSÜN (1098–1174, CHIN-SHIH 1124) WAS A MILITARY OFFICIAL WHO SERVED BRIEFLY AS A CONNOISSEUR OF PAINTING AND CALLIGRAPHY AT THE SOUTHERN SUNG COURT. He composed two historical narrative cycles about events in the life of Kao-tsung (1107–87; r. 1127–62), the founder of the Southern Sung. Ts'ao Hsün's collected writings, Sung-yin wen-chi, and connoisseurs' catalogues of later periods indicate that both works were handscrolls containing calligraphic texts and painted illustrations. One of the compositions was Auspicious Omens for Dynastic Revival (Chung-hsing jui-ying t'u), which presented twelve portentous incidents from Kao-tsung's birth in 1107 to the eve of his enthronement in the fifth lunar month of 1127. The other narrative, Welcoming the Imperial Carriage (Ying-huan t'u), portrayed the return of Kao-tsung's mother after the negotiation of peace with the Chin in 1142.

Ts'ao Hsün composed and transcribed the texts for both scrolls and took credit for painting the illustration for Welcoming the Imperial Carriage. The paintings for Auspicious Omens, on the other hand, have usually been attributed to the court painter Hsiao Chao (twelfth century). Fragments of both cycles have survived but are not well studied at present. Here I wish to introduce the two works systematically and apply textual evidence to place them in their proper historical contexts.

Auspicious Omens for Dynastic Revival

Auspicious Omens deals with twelve supernaturally tinged incidents from the first twenty years of Kao-tsung's life, when he was called the Prince of K'ang (K'ang wangi). As the ninth son of Hui-tsung (1082–1135; r. 1100–25), he was not a likely candidate for the throne. However, early in 1127, most members of the Sung imperial clan were taken north as prisoners by the Chin invaders, including Kao-tsung's brother Ch'in-tsung (1101–61; r. 1126–27), the reigning emperor; and his father Hui-tsung, the retired emperor. This disastrous invasion almost destroyed the Sung dynasty, and the loss of the northern heartland cast grave doubt on the legitimacy of continued Sung rule. Kao-tsung, who escaped captivity, succeeded his brother as emperor in order to save the dynasty from extinction. This decision was shown to have Hui-tsung's blessing when Ts'ao Hsün arrived two months later, bearing a secret note from Hui-tsung written on the collar of an imperial robe, urging Kao-tsung to take the throne. Ts'ao had initially accompanied Hui-tsung into captivity but had escaped soon afterwards.

The twelve "auspicious omens" about which Ts'ao Hsün wrote were incidents which ostensibly foreshadowed Kao-tsung's rise to the throne. Most of the events contained a supernatural presence or occurrence, demonstrating that his unorthodox succession was part of a heavenly plan and that the Sung had not lost its mandate. An undeviating concern with proving the legitimacy of the Sung government in its southern exile clearly identifies the Auspicious Omens as a work of political propaganda. Reproductions of the illustrations for seven of the twelve omens have been published. Three sections are in the Tientsin Art Museum (figs. 6, 7, and 10–13), and the other four are of unknown whereabouts (figs. 1–5, 8, and 9). Each section contains a preface describing the auspicious incident, a rhymed eulogy (tsan) in eight lines of four characters each, and finally an illustration. A preface to the entire series, preserved in Ts'ao Hsün's collected writings, preceded the twelve sections. In the preface Ts'ao commends the superior wisdom and virtue of Kao-tsung in extremely flattering language, and he declares his intention to make known the miraculous signs that heralded Kao-tsung's imperial destiny.

THE TWELVE OMENS

The first of the twelve texts concerns the auspicious signs that appeared at Kao-tsung's birth. After being captured and taken north by the Chin, Hui-tsung asks Kao-tsung's mother, the Hsien-jen Empress (1080–1159), whether Kao-tsung's birth had been auspicious. She replies that when Kao-tsung was born, a golden light filled the room and four sages attended him. The extraordinary experience made her realize that he would one day ascend the throne. Although the illustration for this section seems not to have survived, its appearance can be reconstructed from the detailed descriptions published by Pien.
Yung-yü in 1682 and by Wu Sheng in 1712. The scene is set in a residential palace with many palace ladies and maids. One of them holds a baby near a tub. Outside are a lotus pond and a long bridge.

The second incident takes place when Kao-tsung is very young and still living with his mother. One day she dreams that a deity comes to her and admonishes her to stop feeding leftover food to her son. The next day she issues strict orders for him to be given only food that comes directly from the kitchen. In his description of the illustration, which seems not to have survived, Pien Yung-yü says that the empress is sleeping inside an open-air water-pavilion. In her dream she is conversing with two spirits. Two palace maids sit beside her bed and seven more stand on the other side of the curtains. Outside the pavilion, there are lotus flowers blooming in the pool and a bamboo grove stretching off to the right.

In the third section, for which the illustration is also lost, Kao-tsung’s impressive physical strength is described. When he has leisure from his studies, the prince enjoys riding and shooting and is able to carry two large sacks of rice for several hundred paces. His astonishing strength arouses awe and reaches even the ears of the Chin, making them afraid. According to Pien, the illustration shows the courtyard of a multistoried building, where Kao-tsung stands holding two heavy sacks of rice. He is attended by ten men holding bows and arrows and two men with halberds. Four other men stand watching, and in the distance four saddled horses are tethered beneath a tree.

The fourth episode (fig. 1) occurs in 1126, after the Chin cross the Yellow River and assault Pien-liang, the principal capital of the Northern Sung. Kao-tsung suggests that the best course of action would be to take more gifts and negotiate for better relations with the Chin. Ch’in-tsung accordingly sends him on a mission to Chin, with Chang Pang-ch’ang (1081–1127) acting as his deputy. The Chin prince Aguda is so impressed by Kao-tsung that he fears that Kao-tsung would rally the subjugated Sung people if he crossed the Yellow River. Accordingly, Aguda sends Kao-tsung back and the Prince of Su (Su-wang) goes on the mission instead. The illustration for this section survives, although its whereabouts are unknown, and the reproduction matches the description given by Pien Yung-yü. Kao-tsung is shown riding out of a city gate, accompanied by a large number of mounted attendants and four men on foot. The road is lined with onlookers, buildings, and trees.

In episode 5 (figs. 2 and 3), the Hsien-jen Empress, Kao-tsung’s mother, declares that some of the imperial princes selected as envoys have not yet accepted their orders. Kao-tsung magnanimously volunteers to go, and Ch’in-tsung is very pleased. On the day of Kao-tsung’s departure, his mother and his wife (the I-chieu Empress) accompany him to the reception hall. A small girl named Chao-erh suddenly points her finger and cries that she sees four large warriors behind Kao-tsung’s horse. Although these figures are invisible to everyone else, the Hsien-jen Empress declares that they are the four sages to whom she makes daily offerings. In the illustration, which exists in an unknown location, a large group of women in a palace at right watch Kao-tsung mount his horse. Behind him, near the steps of the building, stand four oversized figures clad in heavy armor and robes; a young girl points toward them. Numerous attendants wait in the courtyard and beyond the gate of the palace for the journey to begin, and two donkeys are also shown.

Section 6 (figs. 4 and 5), whose current location is also not known, treats an incident of high drama on Kao-tsung’s mission to the Chin. Accompanied by Wang Yün (d. 1126), he arrives in Ts’u-chou (Hopei), and local residents suddenly begin calling to him to visit the local temple. In the courtyard of the shrine the next morning, Kao-tsung encounters an old man wearing a dark turban, who angrily tells him not to be lured north by Wang Yün. The crowd then seizes Wang and kills him. Offered a red-lacquer sedan to ride in, Kao-tsung humbly refuses to accept the honor. The illustration shows Kao-tsung standing at left in the portico of a magnificent temple, surrounded by attendants. Two figures motion for him to accept the sedan-chair waiting in the courtyard beside an unsaddled horse. A bridge at right leads to the mob that has seized the hapless Wang Yün; beyond stands the gate of the temple. The setting is luxuriant with trees, and many extra figures fill the court and pathways.

Section 7 (figs. 6 and 7), which is in the Tientsin Art Museum, illustrates an episode that occurs shortly after the capture of Hui-tsung, Ch’in-tsung, and most of the imperial clan. Hearing that Kao-tsung might soon arrive with an army, the Chin guards keep their royal prisoners incommunicado to prevent them from learning the news. The Hsien-jen Empress writes Kao-tsung’s name on an ivory chess piece and burns incense. She prays
that when cast upon the chessboard, the chess piece signifying Kao-tsung may enter the ninth palace (chin-kung), indicating that Kao-tsung will ascend the throne, the ninth palace being, in Taoist lore, the residence of T'ai-i' (Grand Unity). When she casts all the chess pieces onto the board, only the one with Kao-tsung's name on it enters the ninth palace. The empress sends an urgent report to Hui-tsung, who is both astonished and pleased. In the painting, the empress is shown hovering over a chessboard while seven attendants look on. The elegant palace is surrounded by a tall bamboo palisade erected to confine the inhabitants.

In episode 8 (figs. 8 and 9), after the people of Tz'u-chou kill Wang Yün to prevent him from taking Kao-tsung north, Kao-tsung decides to stay in Tz'u-chou. When the Chin armies come there to search for him, they interrogate an old woman along the road. She misleads them by claiming that Kao-tsung has gone to Shantung, so they give up their pursuit. The illustration, which exists in an unknown location, shows the Chin army massed at left, mounted on armor-clad horses and arrayed with battle flags. At right, an old woman standing outside her humble cottage gestures in reply to the Chin soldier who questions her from horseback. At center, the horseman is shown galloping back toward the rest of the army.

Section 9, in the Tientsin Art Museum (figs. 10 and 11), describes an incident from Kao-tsung's stay in Yün-chou (Shantung). His lodging has a pavilion whose name is written in three characters on a placard: "Terrace of Flying Transcendents" (Fei-hsien T'ai). In order to make a secret divination of his future, Kao-tsung shoots three arrows at the placard and hits his mark each time, a result that pleases him. The illustration depicts a grand and ornate terrace surmounted by an elegant pavilion, with the placard near the top. Kao-tsung has just shot an arrow into one of the three characters and is lowering his bow. Several attendants stand behind him in the courtyard, one of them holding a richly caparisoned horse.

The illustrations for episodes 10 and 11 appear not to have survived, so once again the description comes from the documentary accounts. The text for section 10 describes an incident that occurs during Kao-tsung's stay in Tz'u-chou. One morning he rises early and rides to the outer environs of town, followed by his army. Suddenly a white rabbit leaps into their path; Kao-tsung kills it with a single arrow. His astonished followers take the event as a good omen, both because of Kao-tsung's accurate shot and because white is the color of metal (chin) and is thus associated with the invading Chin. The illustration is an autumnal scene on a plain that stretches away from a high city wall. Accompanied by a party of twenty men, Kao-tsung is poised to shoot an arrow from the back of a galloping horse.

In episode 11, Kao-tsung is described as returning from the North in the depth of winter. Upon reaching Li-ku-tu, he orders his entire retinue to precede him in riding across the frozen Yellow River. As soon as Kao-tsung steps safely ashore, the ice breaks with a great roar, submerging Kao Kung-hai, who is riding behind Kao-tsung despite his orders. When Kao-tsung looks back, Kao Kung-hai's horse has already disappeared from view and Kao is clinging to the halter, barely escaping drowning. The illustration depicts the horizontal expanse of the Yellow River, its surface covered with splitting ice. Kao-tsung is safe on shore and Kao Kung-hai's head is visible above the water. Twenty-one men and seventeen horses fill out the scene.

The last section, also preserved in the Tientsin Art Museum (figs. 12 and 13), represents the least ambiguous of the omens. Chin-tsung makes Kao-tsung commander in chief of the Sung forces. Kao-tsung then takes the field in an attempt to rescue the capital. One night Kao-tsung dreams that Chin-tsung takes off his imperial garment and gives it to him. Frightened, Kao-tsung tries to refuse the robe, then wakes up. The illustration shows an encampment in the wilderness. As Kao-tsung lies sleeping in a tent at left, his dream is enacted in a palace depicted in the upper center of the illustration. A sinuous cloud, indicating the dream, emanates from Kao-tsung's tent, billowing up and around the palace.

DATE AND AUTHORSHIP

Although no date is attached to the Auspicious Omens scroll and none is recorded in the text published in Ts'ao Hsūn's collected writings, we can deduce a date from evidence in the texts themselves. First of all, the use of certain honorific and official titles indicates that the texts were written in the third quarter of the twelfth century. Ts'ao Hsūn refers to Kao-tsung's mother by her posthumous title "Hsien-jen Empress," which was awarded after her death in 1159. The texts also use the name "Chin-tsung," which is the temple name given to that emperor when news of his death reached the South in
1161. Complementary evidence is provided by the appearance of the character ching in the eulogy for episode 5. Ching was a taboo character until 1162 because Ching was the personal name of I-tsu, the grandfather of the Sung founder T'ai-tsu (927–76, r. 960–76). In 1162 the Court of Imperial Sacrifices of the Ministry of Rites (Li-pu T'ai-ch'ang-ssu) ruled that ching would no longer be taboo, because Ch'in-tsung had taken I-tsu's place in the imperial ancestral temple.

We can narrow the range of possible dates of composition even further. The preface to Auspicious Omens refers to Kao-tsung as Kuang-yao shou-sheng hsien-t'ien t'i-tao t'ai-shang huang-ti, a title he acquired in the twelfth lunar month of 1170 (January 1171). Since Ts'a'o Hsün died in 1174, we may conclude that the text of Auspicious Omens was written in the period between 1171 and 1174.

According to his son, Ts'a'o Hsün was summoned to court in 1169 and enjoyed the favor of Kao-tsung, by then retired, and his successor, Hsiao-tsung (1127–94; r. 1162–89). In retirement Kao-tsung devoted his energies to artistic pursuits, especially calligraphy and painting, and sponsored various artistic projects in his retirement palace, including the illustration of the Mao Shih. If Ts'a'o Hsün composed the texts for Auspicious Omens between 1171 and 1174, they were undoubtedly written for Kao-tsung, perhaps at his command. With Ts'a'o's neatly crafted accounts and the accompanying illustrations, the Auspicious Omens made a convincing case for the sanctity of Kao-tsung's unorthodox assumption of power and the legitimacy of the Southern Sung regime. Kao-tsung's appreciation of Ts'a'o Hsün's patriotic efforts is evident from the emotional testimonial he sent to Ts'a'o's family within ten days of Ts'a'o's death in 1174. This document, written in Kao-tsung's own hand, praises Ts'a'o's lifelong service to the Sung dynasty and laments his passing.

The format of the Auspicious Omens scroll is one that was used at the early Southern Sung court to illustrate traditional narrative subjects and was the embodiment of conservative good taste. The texts are written in neat, regular script and are paired with illustrations painted in fine mineral pigments. The extant illustrations, attributed to Hsiao Chao, display the decorative realism associated with Li T'ang (1050s–after 1130). Hsiao Chao was recorded as a direct follower of Li T'ang and came south with him after the fall of the Northern Sung. Connoisseurs frequently remarked on the similarity between the styles of Li T'ang and Hsiao Chao. In the Auspicious Omens scenes, the elegant architectural settings, schematic landscapes, and dignified figures are consistent with the types seen in other narrative figure scrolls belonging to the Li T'ang tradition, such as Duke Wen of Chin Recovers His State (Chin Wen-kung fu-kuo t'u) and Eighteen Songs of a Nomad Flute (Hu-chia shih-p'a p'ai).

The conceptual strategies used to illustrate the twelve texts are of two or three types, all of them well established. None of the compositions takes an innovative approach, unlike some of the illustrations for the Mao Shih. Most of the scenes simply depict the auspicious event as it is happening. Appropriate settings are provided and auxiliary figures surround the main actors. Two sections (2 and 12) show a sleeping protagonist as well as the portent, which appears in his or her dream. At least one of these (12) sets off the dream sequence with a billow of cloud, a convention for indicating scenes that occur in the mind of someone depicted in a narrative illustration. The moment of the appearance of the omen is illustrated in another section (10); Kao-tsung has just shot a white rabbit from horseback. So far as we can tell from the verbal description and Ch'iu Ying's copy (1502–ca. 1551) copy (fig. 15), this illustration derives its dramatic impact from a long tradition of hunting scenes showing galloping hunters. In another scene (9), by contrast, the arrow is in a stationary target, a calligraphic placard. Those illustrations which do not directly portray the occurrence of omens depict elaborate settings in which the auspicious event might conceivably take place. Perhaps the least informative of the illustrations is the fourth, which merely shows Kao-tsung's retinue riding out the gate of a city. Most of the illustrations would be hard to interpret without reference to the texts, and some could easily be taken for nonspecific figure scenes.

TRANSMISSION

The ownership of Auspicious Omens is unrecorded until the middle Ming period. Ming documentary sources suggest the existence of at least two versions, one containing twelve sections and the other only six, although Ts'a'o Hsün's collected writings clearly show the original conception to have been twelve sections.
I. THE TWELVE-SECTION SCROLL

The first connoisseur to record a handsxroll with twelve sections was Wu K’uan\(^\text{34}\) (1435–1504), who wrote a colophon for the scroll when it was owned by Lu Wan\(^\text{34}\) (1458–1526, *chin-shih* 1487).\(^\text{34}\) Wu believed that the painting was done after Kao-tsung abdicated the throne in 1162; however, Wu was unable to identify either the painter or the author of the texts. Nonetheless, he judged the quality of the scroll favorably and was optimistic that a connoisseur of painting would be able to determine its creator.

Chang Ch’ou\(^\text{35}\) (1577–1643?) included a discussion of a twelve-section handsxroll in an entry primarily concerned with the six-section version.\(^\text{35}\) Referring to a published text of Wu K’uan’s colophon, Chang commented that Wu did not attribute the paintings to Hsiao Chao. As further evidence that the authorship was problematic, Chang mentioned Sun Feng’s\(^\text{36}\) record of a work containing texts by Ts’ao Hsün and paintings by Li Sung\(^\text{37}\) (twelfth century), another Southern Sung court painter.\(^\text{36}\)

The twelve-section scroll was next recorded in 1682 by Pien Yung-yü, whose useful first-hand descriptions have already been cited.\(^\text{37}\) In addition to transcribing all the texts and giving a detailed account of each illustration, Pien also published two colophons by Tung Ch’i-ch’ang\(^\text{38}\) (1555–1636), the second of which is dated 1629; and one colophon by Tsou Chih-lin\(^\text{39}\) (*chin-shih* 1610), dated 1634. Tung Ch’i-ch’ang’s undated colophon attributes the paintings to Hsiao Chao and discusses his stylistic affinity with Li T’ang. Tung goes on to identify Ts’ao Hsün as the calligrapher and notes the similarity between his small-regular script and Sung Kao-tsung’s copy of a writing by Yü Shih-nan\(^\text{40}\) (558–638).\(^\text{38}\) Tung’s dated colophon says that he saw the scroll at the T’ing-yao\(^\text{41}\) Pavilion of Ch’en Shao-ying,\(^\text{42}\) names other men present, and remarks that it had been nine years since his last visit to the West Lake.\(^\text{43}\) Tsou Chih-lin’s colophon laments the Sung’s complacent but shortsighted enjoyment of peace, perhaps alluding indirectly to the late Ming attitude toward the Manchu threat. Tsou concludes by praising the quality of the painting and endorsing Tung Ch’i-ch’ang’s connoisseurship.

Pien Yung-yü’s entry also records the seals of several collectors that appeared on the twelve-section scroll, including those of Tu Mu\(^\text{44}\) (1459–1525), Chang Feng-i\(^\text{45}\) (1527–1613), Ts’ai Shen\(^\text{46}\) (active in Cheng-te era, 1505–21), and Su-ma Yin\(^\text{47}\) (*chin-shih* 1472); and also the palace seal *Ch’ung-yü chi ping*, which is believed to have been used by the Chin emperor Chang-tsung’s\(^\text{48}\) (1168–1208; r. 1190–1208)

A summary description of the scroll written ten years later by Ku Fu\(^\text{49}\) concurs with Pien Yung-yü’s account but adds no new information.\(^\text{40}\) Wu Sheng’s firsthand account, published in 1712, described the illustrations in some detail and transcribed all the texts, including the same colophons by Tung Ch’i-ch’ang and Tsou Chih-lin.\(^\text{41}\) Wu Sheng also gave the dimensions of each section, as well as the overall length and height of the scroll, but did not note seals or current ownership. Two other early eighteenth century catalogues essentially repeat information from earlier sources. The *P'ei-wen-chai shu-hua pu*\(^\text{50}\) (1708) quotes selectively from the last few lines of Wu K’uan’s colophon.\(^\text{42}\) Li O’\(^\text{51}\) (1692–1752) cited Pien Yung-yü’s account in full in *Nan Sung yüan-hua lu*\(^\text{52}\) (1721), ending with his own poem and a note about the transmission of the scroll.\(^\text{43}\) He reaffirmed that Ch’en Shao-ying had owned it during the Ming period and said that it now belonged to a Mr. Wu of Kuang-ling\(^\text{53}\) (Kiangsu).

By 1785 the scroll had entered the Ch’ing imperial collection and appears in the 1793 supplement to the catalogue *Shih-ch’u pao-chi*.\(^\text{54}\) The changes undergone by the scroll, presumably since 1721, included the removal of Tsou Chih-lin’s faintly subversive colophon and the addition of colophons by the Ch’ien-lung Emperor (r. 1735–96) and three of his courtiers, the Manchu Ho-shen\(^\text{55}\) (1750–99), Liang Kuo-chih\(^\text{56}\) (1723–87, *chin-shih* 1741), and Tung Kao\(^\text{57}\) (1740–1818, *chin-shih* 1763).

The Ch’ien-lung Emperor wrote his remarks in 1785 on the mounting at the front of the scroll, opening with the standard biographical information about Ts’ao Hsün and Hsiao Chao. The body of his colophon is a denunciation of the Southern Sung; he criticizes Sung Kao-tsung for pursuing peace and enjoying the pleasures of Lin-an instead of fighting to recover North China from the invaders and remove the shame from the Sung royal house.\(^\text{45}\) He also castigates the Sung officials who wasted time reporting auspicious omens and painting pictures of them while ignoring the grave task of dynastic revival. He nonetheless praises the quality of the scroll and notes the similarity of its calligraphy to Sung Kao-tsung’s regular script.

The colophon continues with a critical discussion of previous recordings of the scroll. The
Ch‘ien-lung Emperor asserts that this scroll not only was the work known to Wu K’uan, it was also the one that Sun Feng attributed to Li Sung. He speculates that the confusion arose because early documentation was removed from the scroll by a mounter. The colophon ends with an endorsement of Tung Chi-ch‘ang’s attribution of the paintings to Hsiao Chao.

The compilers of the imperial catalogue appended a list of seals that appeared on the scroll, including those given by Pien Yung-yü in his 1682 catalogue, plus a set of eight Ch‘ing imperial seals. In addition, they listed seals of Ku Chao-hui and “Fei-jo” (unidentified). Juan Yuan (1764–1849, chin-shih 1789), one of the compilers of the imperial catalogue, published a separate account of the scroll in his Shih-ch‘u sui-pi (1842), but the entry contains no new information or opinions. The subsequent fate of the twelve-section handscroll is unknown; according to twentieth century records, however, a painting by Hsiao Chao of Auspicious Omens was removed from the palace in the eleventh month of 1925.

II. The Six-Section Scroll

In addition to the twelve-section handscroll, a six-section version also appears in documentary sources, variously attributed to Hsiao Chao alone or to the cooperative efforts of Hsiao Chao and Li Sung. The first to record the six-part version was Wen Chia (1501–83), who listed it in a catalogue of the collection confiscated from the prime minister Yen Sung (1480–1565, chin-shih 1505). It was probably the same six-section scroll that Chang Ch‘ou knew in the collection of the family of Hsiang Yuan-piên (1525–90), and that Sun Ch‘eng-tse (1592–1676) recorded in 1660. Chang also reported that Ch‘iu Ying had painted an outstanding copy that deserved fame in its own right.

A six-part version of Auspicious Omens illustrating the last six omens reappeared in late Ch‘ing catalogues. Fang Chun-i (1815–89) recorded a scroll in his own collection which is obviously different from the one described by Chang Ch‘ou, because the joint signatures of Li Sung and Hsiao Chao appeared on the last scene. The scroll bore colophons by Tung Chi-ch‘ang (dated 1631), the Cantonese collector P‘an Cheng-wei (1791–1850; dated 1849), and Fang Chun-i himself (dated 1871), all of which are transcribed in Fang’s catalogue. Tung’s colophon says that the Li Sung/Hsiao Chao scroll had been submitted to the emperor and was superior to two other versions by Hsiao Chao alone, which Tung had seen in the collection of the Feng family. P‘an Cheng-wei’s colophon, written while he owned the scroll, speculates that Hsiao Chao painted the landscapes and figures and Li Sung the buildings. Fang Chun-i’s own colophon adds no new information, discussing in turn the pacifism of the Southern Sung period, the artistry of Hsiao and Li, and the subjects of the six scenes in the scrolls.

Certain oddities occur in the number and sequence of the scenes in the scroll recorded by Fang Chun-i. Although P‘an Cheng-wei’s colophon appeared on what Fang clearly described as a work in six sections, P‘an’s entry for the scroll in his own catalogue mentions just four sections. Furthermore, both P‘an’s and Fang’s catalogues list the scenes in an order completely different from the correct one established by the text published in Ts‘ao Hsün’s collected writings. As given in P‘an’s catalogue, the illustrations were for sections 10, 8, 11, and 7. In Fang’s catalogue the order of scenes was 9, 12, 10, 8, 11, and 7. The mix-up in sequence suggests that later connoisseurs knew little about the Auspicious Omens subject. Even more confusion occurs in Shu-hua chien-ying (1871), where what clearly were four sections from an Eighteen Songs scroll are described under the heading Auspicious Omens.

It is obvious that the six-section scroll with the signatures of Li Sung and Hsiao Chao was not the work owned by Hsiang Yuan-pien because Hsiang’s scroll was unsigned and attributed to Hsiao Chao alone. Hsiang’s version dropped from sight after being recorded by Sun Ch‘eng-tse; however, in 1909 Li Pao-hsün (1858–1915) published a scroll which he believed was Hsiang’s version. The scroll was finely and elegantly painted, and the brushwork, according to Li’s appreciative poem, was just like that of Liu Sung-nien (twelfth century), another Southern Sung court painter. Li contrasted its superlative quality with the many vulgar “Soochow fakes” he had seen and expressed scorn for the would-be connoisseurs who paid high prices for them. Even though Li Pao-hsün did not name the six sections in the scroll, which he had once owned, his prose discussion distinctly alludes to the subjects of each of the last six episodes. We are able to deduce that Hsiang’s scroll also contained the last six episodes, because the four extant sections of Ch‘iu Ying’s copy (figs. 14–17) illustrate episodes 7, 10, 11, and 12. Li Pao-hsün’s belief that his scroll was the one once owned by Hsiang Yuan-pien is
plausible, then. Since Li did not document the seals and colophons on his scroll, however, the identity cannot be proven.

III. OTHER VERSIONS

Finally, in addition to the six- and twelve-section handscroll versions of *Auspicious Omens* attributed to Hsiao Chao or Li Sung, or both, a few other scrolls are mentioned in catalogue records. Because of insufficient information we do not know whether these versions were six- or twelve-section handscrolls. Huang Yü (1426–97) describes a version by Su Han-ch’én (twelfth century) that had been found inside a lacquer tube in a gate of the Nanking palace; it ended up in the hands of the eunuch Huang Tzu (fifteenth century).58 Wang K’o-yü (1587–1645) lists three *Auspicious Omens* scrolls in his 1643 catalogue.59 One is attributed to “Li Ching-yu” (probably an error for “Li Sung”) and was owned by palace eunuchs in the late fifteenth century. Two others belonged to Yen Sung in the sixteenth century. One of these is an anonymous Ming work; the other is attributed to Hsiao Chao and presumably is the same scroll recorded by Wen Chia. Sun Ch’eng-tse, who had seen three or four *Auspicious Omens* scrolls, claims that the scroll Wen Chia attributed to Hsiao Chao had previously been transmitted as the work of Liu Sung-nien.60

EXTANT VERSIONS

Given the recorded transmission of at least one twelve-section scroll and at least two six-section versions, we might wonder whether any of the works extant today can be identified with any of the recorded versions. The seven scenes that have been reproduced in Chinese publications evidently did not come from the scroll formerly in the Ch’ing palace because published photographs show no imperial seals. The scroll from the palace collection was given to the Manchu prince P’u-ch’ien in 1925 and may survive intact somewhere.61

Hsiao Yen-i has suggested that the three sections in the Tientsin Art Museum are from neither the palace scroll nor the version once owned by Hsiang Yüan-pien. Hsiao considers the Tientsin paintings too different from Ch’iu Ying’s copies to have served as their prototype.62 Ch’iu’s copies and the Tientsin fragments have identical compositions in the two sections that correspond (7 and 12); the differences observed by Hsiao must lie in technical qualities such as brushwork, ink, and color, not visible in published photographs.

An *Auspicious Omens* handscroll attributed to Li Sung is listed in the catalogue of the National Palace Museum, Taiwan, among the abbreviated entries for paintings of lesser quality.63 Since the scroll has never been reproduced and the entry does not describe it, we do not at present know how many sections it contains. In any case, any attempt to identify it with the Li Sung scroll recorded by Sun Feng would be hampered by the absence of identifying information in Sun’s entry.64

One other extant work relevant to our study is an unsigned handscroll containing the text and illustration of episode 7, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art.65 Appended to it are colophons by Wang Wen-chih (1730–1802), dated 1793, and Kuo Lin (1767–1831). The illustration is painted in chalky pigments on very darkened silk and shows the characteristics of a later copy. For example, the bamboo palisade beside the pavilion has been made into something resembling a grove of tree trunks.

The only acknowledged copy of the *Auspicious Omens* is Ch’iu Ying’s version in the Peking Palace Museum, an unrecorded painting briefly mentioned above. Of the six scenes originally included in Ch’iu’s scroll, only four survive today (episodes 10, 12, 11, and 7, in that order), and it is not known when the other two sections were lost (figs. 14–17). No texts accompany the paintings, a frequent occurrence when Ming and Ch’ing painters copied old narrative illustrations. Tung Ch’i-ch’ang wrote a title frontispiece in large running script for Ch’iu’s scroll, endorsing it as “Ch’iu Ying’s copy of Hsiao Chao’s *Auspicious Omens* scroll” (Ch’iu Ying lin Sung Hsiao Chao Jui-ying t’u), and appended his colophon to the work. There are five other seventeenth-century colophons, by Ch’in Sung-ling (1637–1714, chin-shih 1655), Yen Sheng-sun (seventeenth century),66 Hsu Chih-chien (chin-shih 1655), Huang Chia-shu (seventeenth century), and Wu Wei-ye-h (1609–72, chin-shih 1631). Although none of these colophons is reproduced or transcribed by Hsiao Yen-i, and he does not mention whether any is dated, four of these men (Ch’in, Yen, Hsu, and Huang) wrote colophons in 1666–67 for another handscroll.67 We are probably safe in assuming that their colophons on Ch’iu Ying’s *Auspicious Omens* belong to the same period.
Welcoming the Imperial Carriage

Ts’ao Hsün’s other narrative subject, Welcoming the Imperial Carriage (figs. 19–21), celebrates the favorable benefits that resulted from the 1142 peace agreement between the Southern Sung and Chin courts. The terms included the release of Kao-tsung’s mother, the Hsien-jen Empress, after fifteen years of captivity; and the return of the mortal remains of Hui-tsung, his empress Cheng,19 and Kao-tsung’s Empress Hsing.20 As the assistant to Ho Chu21 (1088–1152, chin-shih 1115), the chief envoy to the Chin court, Ts’ao Hsün had been instrumental in negotiating for these conditions in early 1142, although he returned to Sung territory before the Hsien-jen Empress and the coffins actually departed from Chin.

After their safe arrival, Ts’ao wrote a preface and seven fire (rhymed prose) about the mission.22 His preface indicates that the text was illustrated. The existence of a scroll containing both calligraphy and painting is attested by Lou Yüeh23 (1137–1213, chin-shih 1163), who wrote a colophon for it.24 That Lou Yüeh was a close friend of Ts’ao Hsün’s sons is indicated by the fact that they asked him to contribute a preface to their publication of Ts’ao Hsün’s writings in 1190, and is further documented in Ts’ao Ssu’s postface. In his colophon on Welcoming the Imperial Carriage, Lou expresses the opinion that the scroll is a historical document too important to remain in private hands. He comments also that in his childhood he had heard about the splendid ceremony held to welcome the return of the Hsien-jen Empress and laments not having seen it in person.

In a colophon written five centuries later, Chu I-tsun25 (1629–1709) notes that Ts’ao Hsün’s descendants had faithfully kept the scroll for five hundred years and only recently had sold it to Chu’s clansman Ma Ssu-tsan.26 Chu’s comments indicate that the scroll contained only the calligraphic texts, and it seems likely that the illustration was sold separately. The calligraphic portion is now preserved as a scroll in the Ogawa Collection in Kyoto (figs. 22–24).27 Its texts largely agree with the transcriptions published in Sung-yin wen-chi, although there are numerous variant characters.28 After the texts were removed, the identity of the illustration soon became obscure, and it was recorded under various titles with attributions to different artists. The calligraphy scroll was transmitted separately, and it was forgotten that this scroll had once been connected with an illustration.

The Illustration

Hsü Pang-ta29 recently identified a painting in the Shanghai Museum as an illustration of Welcoming the Imperial Carriage (figs. 18–21). He was led to this conclusion by reading Chu I-tsun’s colophon in the latter’s collected works.30 Since Hsü assumed that each fu once had a separate illustration, he believed this painting to be the sole survivor of a set of illustrations. However, Chu I-tsun’s comments for the calligraphy scroll suggest that the texts were written as a continuous document; thus, the fu texts may never have been separated by paintings. Instead, it seems more likely that a single generalized illustration followed the last fu. The dimensions of the Shanghai scroll support this hypothesis: at nearly five feet31 the painting is much longer than illustrations found in sets where texts are paired with paintings.

Painted in mineral pigments of high quality on fine silk, the Shanghai scroll depicts the meeting of two large, ceremonial parties on the banks of a broad river. The motionless officials at right flank their leader, a red-robed figure on horseback. Two canopies rise above his head and banners billow at his back. This group faces another party, which is approaching from the left end of the scroll. In the center of the arriving group is a large enclosed sedan-chair, which is borne aloft on sturdy poles shouldered by many stalwarts and protected by attendants holding up fans and a curtain. This elaborate conveyance is followed by two low carts with saddle-shaped roofs. The nearer of these carts is pulled by an ox. A mounted official rides at the head of the arriving party, accompanied by attendants on foot who hold furled banners. Between the two parties, in the central portion of the scroll, humble onlookers line both sides of the road to watch from a respectful distance. The river stretches into the background.

Identification of Subject

The painting is recorded in the official catalogue of the Ch’ing imperial collection under the name Li Mi Greeting the Prince of Ch’in (Li Mi ying Ch’in wang t’u)32 and is attributed to Li Kung-lin33 (1049–1106).34 The catalogue entry is largely devoted to a discussion of the subject of the illustration. The scroll had entered the collection labelled “Five Dynasties’ Copy of the Southern Ch’i Painter Hsieh Ho’s Picture of the Imperial Sedan” (Wu-t’ai-jen mo Nan Ch’i Hsieh Ho Pu-nien t’u).35 Since the court connoisseurs believed
the costumes and vehicles in the painting to be of T'ang style, they felt that the painting was unlikely to be a copy of a Southern Ch'i work. They also considered the sedan-chair insufficiently grand for an emperor; and the onlookers showed too little awe for an imperial presence. Having discarded that attribution, the connoisseurs suggested that the painting might illustrate the alternative subject of Li Mi. Li Mi was the envoy sent by the T'ang founding emperor, Kao-tsun, (r. 618–26), to welcome the Prince of Ch'in (Kao-tsun's son and successor, T'ai-tsun; r. 626–49) on his triumphant return to Pin-chou after pacifying Kansu. However, a few details did not fit this new identification very well and the court connoisseurs left it somewhat tentative. In conclusion, they made the following recommendations: remove the forged Chou Mi (1232–1308) and Yü Chi (1242–1348) colophons; discard the old label; and add an attribution to Li Kung-lin. Li Kung-lin was known to have copied old paintings using fine colors on silk; furthermore, the connoisseurs found an entry for a painting of *Li Mi Greeting the Prince of Ch'in* by Li Kung-lin in the Su-chou scholar Tu Mu's catalogue *Yü-i pien*, an entry which I have not discovered in extant editions.

Hsieh Chih-liu was the first to point out that the clothing and ceremonial regalia in the Shanghai painting were typical of the Sung rather than the T'ang period. For example, the painting shows Sung official caps, which had long, stiff “ears” that extended outward from the side of the head. Hsieh, who had seen the three sections of *Auspicious Omens* in the Tientsin Art Museum, went on to speculate that the Shanghai painting might also illustrate an omen.

Hsü Pang-ta then proposed that the subject of the illustration was *Welcoming the Imperial Carriage*. Hsü identified the leader of the arriving party at left as Ts'ao Hsün and the central figure of the group waiting at right as Wei Yüan, the younger brother of the Hsien-jen Empress. The grand sedan shielded by fans and banners was the vehicle in which the empress rode, and the coffins followed in the two ox-carts. Hsü matched the scene with *Hui-luan* (The Returning Carriage), the only fu that mentions the empress's actual journey. According to the published edition of Ts'ao's text that Hsü consulted, this fu is the fourth of seven. However, in the Ogawa scroll it is the last of seven; so the transition to the illustration now in Shanghai would have been smooth.

Hsieh Chih-liu subsequently challenged this identification on the grounds that early historical texts contained information in conflict with elements depicted in the painting. Hsieh's main objection was that the Hsien-jen Empress and the coffins could not have appeared in the same scene because they had been received separately. His other points of contention concerned the details of ritual paraphernalia and vehicles portrayed in the illustration. For instance, Hsieh believed that the coffins would not have been in ox-carts because the “precedent of An-ling,” an earlier imperial reburial, had been followed in receiving them. Hsieh also felt that the illustration did not depict the people who historical accounts said had been present on the occasion. Finally, Hsieh conjectured that the returning party had traveled by water all the way to Lin-p'ing, where Kao-tsun then received them in person.

Some of the objections raised by Hsieh Chih-liu are valid, even if we do not accept his conclusion that the painting is not an illustration of *Welcoming the Imperial Carriage*. A careful examination of the primary sources for the Southern Sung, both official and private histories, reveals that there were separate ceremonies for welcoming the Hsien-jen Empress and receiving the coffins. However, the fact that the living and the dead were treated separately once on Sung territory does not mean that they did not travel together beforehand. If the painting shows the first occasion on which the returning party was met by representatives from the Sung court, it would not be anomalous to depict the empress and the coffins traveling together. The illustration could represent an advance greeting by court envoys, an event separate from the lavish and well-attended ceremony by which Kao-tsun himself marked their arrival at Lin-p'ing. By the same reasoning, we could argue that the coffins might have traveled from Chin in ox-carts and later were transferred to grander carriages provided by the Sung court.

Hsieh is also right in arguing that the leader of the arriving party was not Ts'ao Hsün but rather Kao Chü-an, who was appointed by the Chin ruler to escort the Hsien-jen Empress on the journey. Ts'ao Hsün had returned to the south immediately after the negotiations in the second lunar month of 1142, and the empress did not set out until the fourth month. The mounted official waiting at right, moreover, might be Wang Tz'u-weng (1079–1149) rather than Wei Yüan. Wang was appointed in the fourth lunar month of 1142 as the official in charge of welcoming...
the Hsien-jen Empress, but historical sources do not entirely agree in their accounts of the initial greeting. Wang Ming-ch'ing (1127–after 1214) says that Wang Tz'u-weng and Wei Yuan were sent to receive the empress at the border;\(^2\) Li Hsin-ch'uan (1166–1243) states that Kao-tsung appointed Wang Tz'u-weng in the fourth month but sent Wei Yuan and two imperial princesses in the eighth month of 1142 to greet his mother.\(^3\) The illustration shows two umbrella-like canopies, one for the official on horseback and the other possibly for the bearded official adjacent to him, who is partially hidden by the fans surrounding the mounted official. Perhaps, then, the illustration actually portrays both Wang and Wei receiving the arriving party.

Hsieh Chih-liu's observation that the initial greeting should have taken place on the water in boats also seems correct, although historical sources again are somewhat vague. All texts agree that the party traveled by boat from Tung-p'ing (Shan-tung) to Ch'u-chou (modern Huai-an, Kiangsu), where it entered Sung territory. Kao-tsung did not greet the party until its arrival at Lin-p'ing, a short distance from Lin-an. Tung-p'ing, Ch'u-chou, and Lin-p'ing all lie along the route of the Grand Canal, so it is probable that the entire journey was made by boat, and the greeting on land represented in the Shanghai painting never actually occurred.

The most likely reason for the return to have been portrayed on land is that the illustration was not intended to have documentary realism. For the illustration of a woman's return from northern captivity there was a powerful pictorial precedent in the illustration of Eighteen Songs of a Nomad Flute.\(^4\) The climax of the latter cycle was the dramatic repatriation of the lady Ts'ai Wen-chi,\(^5\) who was captured by nomads in A.D. 195 and spent twelve years in the north. The emotions associated with Wen-chi's journey were evoked by the return of the Hsien-jen Empress in 1142; thus, the Eighteen Songs was symbolically the perfect model to follow, even if the Hsien-jen Empress actually traveled by water. As shown in a copy in New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 25), Ts'ai Wen-chi journeyed over land in a covered carriage, accompanied by Chinese envoys and nomad attendants carrying assorted banners and canopies. A comparison between the two illustrative cycles shows striking similarity in the conception of the types of figures and the configuration of the parties escorting the ladies south on their respective journeys. If the illustrator of Welcoming the Imperial Carriage did not deliberately imitate the Eighteen Songs scenario, he was at least subconsciously influenced by it.

### DATE AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE WORK

All of Hsieh Chih-liu's reasons for doubting the identity of the subject, then, can be explained away. If we can accept the painting as the illustration of Welcoming the Imperial Carriage, we may use evidence from the Ogawa calligraphy scroll and the Sung-yin wen-chi text to arrive at a date and construct a context for the work. The composition of the texts probably occurred between 1142 and 1159, because the terms used to refer to the Hsien-jen Empress suggest that she was still alive. She is called T'ai-mu (Grand Mother) and Tz'u-yen (Maternal Countenance), rather than Empress Dowager Hsien-jen, as in Auspicious Omens. However, it seems that the texts were not actually transcribed onto the scroll until 1162 or later, because Ts'ao Hsün signed his name using an official title he attained after Hsiatsung's accession.\(^6\)

Ts'ao's preface also says, "I made this picture and fit to hand down to my family" (tso tz'u t'u fit i chuan chia).\(^7\) This dedication of the work to his family is most significant, for we would otherwise assume that the scroll was another propaganda piece for Kao-tsung. Since Ts'ao clearly states that the work was intended for private purposes, we are left to wonder why he would want to compose texts and illustrate the return of the Hsien-jen Empress. One plausible motive is that Ts'ao wanted his descendants to honor him for his role in an important political event. This reasoning is supported by a closer examination of the preface, where Ts'ao recounts his participation in the mission in exquisite detail. He describes Kao-tsung's summons to him in the tenth lunar month of 1141; the emotional interview in which Kao-tsung gave him his orders; his memorial to Kao-tsung accepting the mission; his journey to Chin with Ho Chu; his own eloquence in pleading Kao-tsung's case with the Chin ruler when Ho Chu was too frightened to talk; the successful outcome of the mission; and his request for permission to retire to Mount T'ien-t'ai upon returning home. By contrast, he has nothing to say about the actual journey of the empress and the coffins. The subjects of the seven fit that follow the preface
also reflect Ts'ao's emphasis on events in which he played a part.

The illustration, on the other hand, symbolically depicts the empress's entry into Sung territory, an occasion on which Ts'ao may not even have been present. Why, then, would he want such a painting to accompany his self-aggrandizing textual account? The reason must be that the return of the empress was the crucial event that gave significance to Ts'ao's participation in the earlier events. Without her return, his mission would have been judged a failure.

The work may be further interpreted as a political statement of Ts'ao's sympathy with the advocates of peaceful coexistence with the Chin. Kao-tsung's decision to make peace with the Chin, rather than fighting to recover lost territory, was a bitterly divisive issue of the Southern Sung period. Peace was obtained on costly and humiliating terms: the Sung court had to acknowledge the Chin as superior and was obliged to pay large tributes at frequent intervals. The most visible and tangible benefits the Sung gained from the agreement were the release of Kao-tsung's mother and the repatriation of the ritually important remains of Hui-tsung and two empresses. By focusing on this favorable aspect of the peace treaty, Ts'ao Hsün clearly sided against the opponents of the settlement.

The implication that Ts'ao painted the illustration himself is probably not to be taken literally. Since there is no other evidence that he was a painter, it is more likely that he had someone paint it for him. The painting is not the work of an amateur; its highly accomplished technique and the complex arrangement of numerous figures and vehicles in a landscape setting suggest the hand of a professional.

**Conclusion**

In both *Auspicious Omens* and *Welcoming the Imperial Carriage* Ts'ao Hsün reveals his deep devotion to Kao-tsung's interests. Despite the difference between the stated aims of the two works, they actually express a consistent political outlook. The underlying theme of both works is the affirmation of Kao-tsung's course of action. The differences have mainly to do with the intended recipients of the works. Ts'ao bequeathed *Welcoming the Imperial Carriage* to his family so that future generations would recall him with pride. His success may be judged from the facts that his sons placed these texts first in the posthumous publication of Ts'ao's writings and the scroll stayed in the family for five hundred years. In tone, these texts are more straightforward than the almost obsequiously reverent *Auspicious Omens*, which was created for the retired Kao-tsung. The weighty pomp of the latter work must have stifled any lingering doubts Kao-tsung might have had that Heaven had blessed his succession.
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19. Pien Yung-yu calls them camels, but the illustration clearly shows donkeys.
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Glossary

| a. | 曹効 | i. | 微宗 |
| b. | 遼士 | j. | 欽宗 |
| c. | 高宗 | k. | 贊 |
| d. | 孫皓文集 | l. | 興仁 |
| e. | 中興瑞應圖 | m. | 朴永謙 |
| f. | 順昌圖 | n. | 吳升 |
| g. | 蕭照 | o. | 張邦昌 |
| h. | 康王 | p. | 阿骨打 |
| q. | 崔王 | az. | 崔深 |
| r. | 慈節 | ba. | 司馬遷 |
| s. | 招兒 | bb. | 權玉中秘 |
| t. | 王雲 | bc. | 章宗 |
| u. | 磐州 | bd. | 頭復 |
| v. | 九宮 | be. | 譚文齋書畫譜 |
| w. | 太一 | bf. | 唐鎮 |
| x. | 南州 | bg. | 南宋院畫錄 |
| y. | 飛仙臺 | bh. | 廣陵吳氏 |
| z. | 金 | bi. | 石渠賓笈 |
| aa. | 李因渾 | bj. | 王席 |
| ab. | 高公海 | bk. | 梁國治 |
| ac. | 敬 | bl. | 董誾 |
| ad. | 翼祖 | bm. | 顧朝回 |
| ae. | 太祖 | bn. | 飛若 |
| af. | 禮部太常寺 | bo. | 阮元 |
| ag. | 光燿壽聖寰天 | bp. | 石渠隨筆 |
| ah. | 孝宗 | bq. | 文嘉 |
| ai. | 毛詩 | bs. | 項元汴 |
| aj. | 李唐 | bt. | 孫承澤 |
| ak. | 晉文公復國圖 | bu. | 方聞顧 |
| al. | 胡笳十八拍 | bv. | 潘正煒 |
| am. | 仇英 | bw. | 馮 |
| an. | 吳寜 | bx. | 書畫鑑影 |
| ao. | 陸完 | by. | 李葆恂 |
| ap. | 張丑 | bz. | 劉松年 |
| aq. | 孫鳳 | ca. | 黃煒 |
| ar. | 李嵩 | cb. | 蘇漢臣 |
| as. | 董其昌 | cc. | 黃暦 |
| at. | 鄭之麟 | cd. | 汪珂玉 |
| au. | 威世南 | ce. | 李景 |
| av. | 聽寇 | cf. | 謝僑 |
| aw. | 陳延英 | cg. | 肖燕翼 |
| ax. | 鄧穆 | ch. | 王文治 |
| ay. | 張鳳翼 | ci. | 郭鄭 |
| cj. 仇英臨宋箋照 | dr. 太母 | fa. 陳階尺 |
| cj. 仇英臨宋箋照 瑞應圖 | ds. 慈顔 | fb. 龍蓮 |
| ck. 秦松鈞 | dt. 作此圖賦以賜家 | fc. 平生畫觀 |
| cl. 嚴纘孫 | du. 思陵書畫記 | fd. 靜永堂 |
| cm. 徐之澎 | dv. 嘉業堂 | fe. 王杰 |
| cn. 黃家紳 | dw. 洪益中 | ff. 石渠寶笈續編 |
| co. 吳偉業 | dx. 曹彬 | fg. 陳仁壽 |
| cp. 鄭 | dy. 劉承幹 | fh. 鈐山堂畫堂記 |
| eq. 莫 | dz. 續昀 | fi. 庚子校夏記 |
| cr. 何瀚 | ea. 聖瑞圖 | fj. 聽騏懷堂畫堂記 |
| cs. 警 | eb. 中興頓應圖 | fk. 瑞應圖 |
| ct. 樓鑾 | ec. 瑞應圖 | fl. 李佐賢 |
| cu. 朱緣尊 | ed. 北符見聞錄 | fm. 瑪瑚絹繡錄 |
| cv. 馬思賚 | ee. 徐夢宰 | fn. 吳緣孫 |
| cw. 徐邦達 | ef. 三朝北盟會編 | fo. 招吳緣孫 |
| cx. 李密通秦王圖 | eg. 聚 | fp. 李森 |
| cy. 李公麟 | eh. 大觀錄 | fq. 懷克 |
| cz. 五代人華南齋 | ei. 李祖年 | fr. 中興小記 |
| da. 高祖 | ej. 臨 | fs. 陳炎以來 |
| db. 太宗 | ek. 登 | 繹年要錄 |
| dc. 周密 | el. 統 | fl. 司馬集 |
| de. 虞集 | em. 穀節 | fu. 迎請太后 |
| df. 富貴圖 | en. 留正 | 回憶圖 |
| dg. 韋織 | eo. 皇宋中興 | fv. 嘉書亭集 |
| dh. 侯鑾 | ep. 挥塵後錄 | fw. 朱 |
| di. 安陵 | eq. 張海鵬 | fx. 行齋 |
| dj. 臨平 | er. 夏文彥 | fy. 受令 |
| dk. 高居安 | es. 圖繪寶鑑 | fz. 便令 |
| dl. 王次翁 | et. 駐翁家藏集 | ga. 許還 |
| dm. 王明清 | eu. 清河書畫舫 | gb. 回憶 |
| dn. 李心傳 | ev. 孫氏書畫記 | gc. 上接 |
| do. 東平 | ew. 孫繡修 | gd. 身退 |
| dp. 墨州 | ex. 余紹宋 | ge. 閤居 |
| dq. 蔡文姬 | ey. 真草千字文 | gf. 敏行 |
| ez. 生甫 | gg. 見接 |
Fig. 1. Inauspicious Omens for Dynastic Revival, episode 4. Attributed to Hsiao Chao. Hand scroll, ink and color on silk. Collection unknown. (After TWSCC.)
Fig. 2. Auspicious Omens, episode 5, right half. Collection unknown. (After T1953M1C)

Fig. 3. Auspicious Omens, episode 5, left half. Collection unknown. (After T1953M1C)
Fig. 5. Auspicious Omens, episode 6, left half. Collection unknown. (After T'HYSTM.)
Fig. 6. *Auspicious Omens*, episode 7, right half. Tientsin Museum. (After *T'ien-chin* catalogue.)

Fig. 7. *Auspicious Omens*, episode 7, left half. Tientsin Museum. (After *T'ien-chin* catalogue.)
Fig. 8. *Auspicious Omens*, episode 8, right half. Collection unknown. (After TWSYMC.)

Fig. 9. *Auspicious Omens*, episode 8, left half. Collection unknown. (After TWSYMC.)
Fig. 11. Auspicious Omens, episode 9, left half. Tientsin Museum. (After T'ien-ch'in catalogue.)
Fig. 12. Auspicious Omens, episode 12, right half. Tientsin Museum. (After T'ien-chin catalogue.)

Fig. 13. Auspicious Omens, episode 12, left half. Tientsin Museum. (After T'ien-chin catalogue.)
Fig. 14. Copy of Auspicious Omens for Dynastic Revival by Ch’iu Ying, detail of episode 7. Handscroll, ink and color on silk. Peking Palace Museum. (After Ku-kung po-wu-yüan yüan-k’an, no. 2 [1982], p. 46, fig. 1.)

Fig. 15. Copy of Auspicious Omens by Ch’iu Ying, detail of episode 10. Peking Palace Museum. (After Ku-kung po-wu-yüan yüan-k’an, no. 2 [1982], pl. 1.)
Fig. 16. Copy of *Auspicious Omens* by Ch’iu Ying, detail of episode 11. Peking Palace Museum. (After Ku-kung po-wu-yuàn yuan-kan, no. 2 [1982], pl. 3.)

Fig. 17. Copy of *Auspicious Omens* by Ch’iu Ying, detail of episode 12. Peking Palace Museum. (After Ku-kung po-wu-yuàn yuan-kan, no. 2 [1982], pl. 2.)
Fig. 18. Anonymous Southern Sung artist. *Welcoming the Imperial Carriage*, detail of right end. Handscroll, ink and color on silk. Shanghai Museum. (After Hsieh Chih-liu, *T'ang Sung Yuan Ming Ch'ing hua-hsuan*, cat. no. 12.)

Fig. 19. *Welcoming the Imperial Carriage*, detail of middle-right section.
Fig. 20. Welcoming the Imperial Carriage, detail of middle-left section.

Fig. 21. Welcoming the Imperial Carriage, detail of left end.
Fig. 22. Ts’ao Hsün. Text for Welcoming the Imperial Carriage, detail of preface. Handscroll, ink on silk. Ogawa Collection, Japan. (Photograph courtesy of the Osaka Municipal Art Museum.)

Fig. 23. Ts’ao Hsün, texts of fu 1–4.
Fig. 24. Ts'ao Hsun, texts of ju 5–7.

Fig. 25. Anonymous copy of a Southern Sung work, Eighteen Songs of a Nomad Flute, detail, section 16. Handscroll, ink and color on silk. Metropolitan Museum of Art (gift of Dillon Fund).
A portrait connotes a likeness. Likeness is a relative term, however, depending on one’s vision, and the ideals of Western portraiture seldom were those of Japan. Traditionally, the Western artist sought to capture in his portrait a verisimilitude that included both the details of an individual’s physiognomy and the nuances of spirit, intelligence, and uniqueness of character. The concept of illusion was central to a convincing rendering of a three-dimensional form on a two-dimensional plane, and to this end Western artists developed techniques of modeling through half-tones and chiaroscuro.

The Japanese portrait tradition was quite different. Instead of employing illusionistic techniques, it maintained the integrity of the two-dimensional plane almost solely by means of linear modulation. Scientific exactness was irrelevant to the expression of an inner spirit best described through idealization. While it is true that in certain Buddhist portraits of Zen priests (called chinzō) individual characteristics were stressed in order to emphasize the specific personality of the sitter, in the more traditional Japanese portrait method physical peculiarities that might identify the individual were suppressed in favor of generalized forms considered expressive of the person’s true virtues or social station. Portraiture was intended to express the sitter’s achievements rather than his inner spirit, and anyone worthy of having his or her portrait painted was worthy of being given perfected form and features.

From this established tradition a young painter by the name of Kawahara Keiga\(^1\) departed radically and introduced to the Japanese a remarkable new method of seeing. His vision was that of neither the East nor the West, but an interesting amalgamation of the two. He painted portraits both of his kinsmen and of Europeans residing in Japan. Paintings of his kinsmen (called ezo\(^\circ\)) and Japanese associates will be discussed elsewhere; here we shall restrict discussion to the foreign subjects.

Keiga’s portraits represent an especially remarkable achievement when considered in the context of the isolationist, xenophobic society in which he lived. From the time of the edict of the third Tokugawa shogun Iemitsu in 1639, the Policy of National Seclusion (sakoku seisaku)\(^1\) virtually sealed Japan off from the rest of the world. The seclusion laws forbade all Westerners, with the exception of the Dutch, to reside in Japan; and in 1641 even the Hollanders were obliged to restrict their activity to a single locale—a tiny fan-shaped, man-made island called Deshima that projected into Nagasaki Harbor. Foreign trade thenceforth was conducted exclusively with Dutch and Chinese merchants, and in addition to their control over what was imported, the Japanese exercised their own rigorous censorship in determining what foreign knowledge was acceptable. The town of Nagasaki grew from a provincial seaport to the center for all exotica, the only place in the nation where actual evidence of a world beyond Japan could be found.

Into this exclusive milieu Kawahara Keiga was born in 1786.\(^1\) His father seems to have been an artist by profession and was his son’s first teacher. Though nothing remains of the elder Kawahara’s work, he is given indirect distinction as an associate of Araki Gen’yu\(^\circ\) (1728–94), the official appraiser of foreign pictures (kara-e mekiki)\(^1\) in Nagasaki from 1766, when he inherited the position from his father, Araki Genkei\(^\circ\) (1698–1766). Gen’yu’s heir, Ishizaki Yushi\(^\circ\) (1768–1864), also held the government office of mekiki and chronicled the artifacts and activities of the Hollanders residing on Deshima until his retirement from the post in 1832. At an early age, probably twenty-four or thereabouts, Keiga became Yushi’s disciple, establishing what would be a lifelong relationship with his popular and prosperous mentor.

Yushi’s sponsorship permitted Keiga access to the Dutch compound on Deshima, a proximity to the Hollanders enjoyed by few Japanese. Such contact enabled him to observe the foreigners firsthand and to examine directly Western pictures, a rare opportunity he put to good advantage. By the age of thirty he had achieved a reputation as a portrait painter through his numerous renderings of foreigners.

The earliest extant portrait illustrating Keiga’s occupation as chronicler of Europeans in Japan is that of Hendrik Doeff, opperhoofd (chief executive officer) of the Dutch East India Trading Company on Deshima (fig. 1). An inscription written in Dutch on the elegantly inlaid picture frame

PORTRAITS OF FOREIGNERS BY KAWAHARA KEIGA

By MICHAEL L. BROWNE
informs the viewer: "Hendrik Doeff Junior, Oppehoofd from 1803 A.D. until the year . . . ," indicating that the work was completed between 1803 and 1817, the year Doeff left Japan. This small picture shows the best qualities of miniature portrait painting, including an exquisiteness of detail that is a delight to examine. A floral motif on the waistcoat, gold braid and buttons on the frock coat, feathers on the quill pen, the wood grain of the table, the gold decorated bindings of the books, and, most of all, the crisp delineation and controlled fine line of facial features all contribute to the delicate effect.

Although the subject is a Westerner, the technique is not exclusively Western-inspired; prototypes for both composition and technique can be found in Japanese portraiture. A figure placed amid accoutrements selected to suggest the scholarly personality of the sitter is a method of depiction seen as early as the ninth century in the priest portraits imported from China, wherein the figure is often shown seated on a dais with sutra scrolls, stand, brushes, and other writer's paraphernalia surrounding him. The manner of composition is typically Japanese in origin: detailed patterns are juxtaposed against broad, flat areas of solid color. Perspective is also handled in traditionally Japanese isometric, or "reverse," recession, evident in the drawing of the bookcase. Basically, then, the conception is consistent with canons of Japanese taste. What would have been considered exotic—in addition, of course, to the subject—is the introduction of shading: arcs of shadow extend outward from the eye area on both sides of the nose, and shading of the cleft chin and frenulum of the upper lip gives a distinct definition that is more than five o’clock shadow. The source of this shading technique need be sought no further than the Ōbaku Buddhist priest portraits (chinzo) or the Nagasaki ancestor portraits (ezo) that Keiga was painting at the time that he was executing portraits of Europeans. Certain innovative touches, however, such as the highlights in Doeff’s eyes created by flecks of white, are not found in chinzo. Some influence closer to the Western idiom would seem probable and can, in fact, be surmised, though not specifically proven.

In China access to Europeans and European art methods was less restricted than it was in Japan, and the postrevolutionary French portrait tradition was known indirectly to Japanese through the China trade in the first half of the nineteenth century. European styles, though frowned upon by "serious" Chinese artists, were adopted as novelties, especially in the port cities where foreigners traded. One of the earliest Chinese painters who adopted the European style of portrait painting was a figure known to history as Spoilum, about whom no biographical details have been uncovered beyond the fact that he was working in Canton between 1785 and 1810. The subjects of his numerous portraits were primarily Western and Chinese hong merchants of Canton. Spoilum’s works became popular, and examples were carried on merchant ships throughout the world—including, most likely, Nagasaki, where Keiga could easily have had opportunity to examine them.

The portrait by Spoilum of a member of the British East India Company is a typical example of his work (fig. 2). Conceived in an oval format like Keiga’s picture of Doeff, it is remarkable for the meticulous rendering of gold-braid design and buttons against the dark coat, the shading around the nose and eyes, similar to that used by Keiga, and the distinguishing highlights of white in the eye pupils that contribute to the extraordinarily mobile character of the face. Further, the light area of background setting off the face, which is drawn in three-quarter view, is another technique employed by Keiga in a number of his portraits of foreigners. It would seem likely that Keiga was familiar with Spoilum’s work, that he did indeed have foreign models for his art beyond the priestly portraits of the Ōbaku sect, and that, in his typically eclectic manner, he assimilated them into his style.

When Hendrik Doeff’s term as opperhoofd expired in 1817, he was replaced by Captain Jan Cock Blomhoff (1779–1853), who, disregarding Japanese law, dared to bring with him his wife Titia, his infant son Johannes, and the child’s nursemaid Petronella Munts. Within months of their arrival, Titia, Petronella, and baby Johannes were deported, sent back to Europe on the first ship available—the same vessel that carried Doeff to retirement—while Blomhoff was obliged to remain behind to serve out his term until 1823. Brief though it was, the visit of the Blomhoff family made a phenomenal impression on the Japanese, who had never before beheld a Western woman. For decades after their departure, the print shops of Nagasaki continued to crank out versions of the female foreigners.

Ishizaki Yushi and Keiga, two of the very few who enjoyed direct access to the Deshima inhabitants and who were, in addition, among the most accomplished artists of Nagasaki, understandably
produced the most sympathetic renditions of Western women. One of Yūshi’s versions, dated to 1817 and now owned by the Kobe City Museum of Nanban Art, is the more lively, its sketchy brushwork imparting an animation to the family group that is worthy of the Japanese narrative handscroll tradition. Keiga’s work is more formal in format and execution, painted on a free-standing screen (fig. 3). Taken individually, each figure reveals Keiga’s characteristically delicate line, minute detailing, and soft shading. Jan Cock Blomhoff sits rigidly at left, gripping the chair arm with his right hand while gesturing toward his son with his left, this faint attempt at communication being the only connecting link among any of the figures. The child’s nanny stands stolidly between husband and wife, while the family’s Indonesian servant Maraty squats catlike at lower right before the sofa. Details of costumes, textiles, and furniture are rendered with expert and astonishing dexterity of brush. The overall effect is not unlike that of the exquisite Doeff portrait.

An interesting copy of—or perhaps prototype for—this composition bears the signature of Ishizaki Yūshi. Yūshi’s portrait omits the seated opperhoofd but contains an identical grouping of Titia, Petronella, Maraty, and Johannes. The existence of this painting further supports the close relationship assumed to have existed between Yūshi and Keiga at the beginning of the latter’s career.

As a portrait composition in the Western idiom, however, Keiga’s work is stiff and disturbing. The five individuals are encapsulated in poses that are totally aloof, without group cohesiveness. Each stares blankly into space, acknowledging neither the viewer nor the others, the intense blue of the Westerners’ eyes augmenting the exotic, trancelike effect. This haunting isolation is probably no less a result of Keiga’s failure to penetrate the European psyche than it is the natural consequence of his employing the formula for the rendering of individual portraits to create a group; each figure, in effect, is a portrait by itself.

But while the Blomhoff figures fail to relate psychologically as members of a family, the effect of the painting is an interesting pattern of interrelated shapes. Keiga’s organization of the figures into bold, flat forms, each embellished with richly textured fabrics and contrasted against the stark gold ground, recalls a Japanese sense of pattern seen in such works as the Bugaku Dancers screen by the early seventeenth-century master Tawaraya Sotatsu. Keiga similarly uses brilliant colors whose repetition dazzles the eye and creates a pleasing cadence of movement across the flat, gold surface. If Keiga has lost introspective portraiture, he has instead created a work marvelously reflective of the Japanese aesthetic.

On the reverse side of this free-standing screen is Keiga’s famous depiction of Nagasaki Harbor. One signature sufficed for both pictures. On the lower right corner of the Blomhoff portrait are Keiga’s distinctive seal and signature: a top hat with the characters for “Keiga” interwoven into the design and, beneath the top hat in roman letters, the Slavic-looking name “M. E. R. Tojosky.” While the meaning of the initials remains enigmatic, “Tojosky” is the Dutch rendering of Keiga’s Japanese given name, Toyosuke.

That Keiga’s portrait of the Blomhoff family is indeed based on direct observation is evidenced by a second portrait of Titia and Maraty that bears Keiga’s two most commonly used seals, “Taguchi” and “Keiga,” and is currently housed in the Nagasaki Prefectural Museum (fig. 4). Titia’s dress has changed, but the style is the same, ruffles and lace modestly trimming the hem of her skirt, sleeves, and neckline, a single string of beads about her neck, rings in her pierced ears, and her upswept hair half covered by a lace mantilla. She is distinguished by her brilliant blue eyes, chalk-white skin, and long nose, but at the same time she is generalized, for the exaggeration of the nose, and of the eye and skin colors, forms a type of iconography employed by many Japanese artists when drawing foreign women. As one Nagasaki author wrote:

Western women have very long noses and white complexions. Though extremely beautiful, they neither talk nor smile. They move people by inner emotions, which they are careful never to reveal outwardly. For this reason, artists can draw only their countenances and are unable to reach their inner feelings.

Although there seems little doubt that the lady intended is Titia, Keiga in his rendering nevertheless has adhered as much to generalized beliefs as to observation. So, too, her companion Maraty, shorter in stature, with dark skin, flaring nostrils, and beautiful black eyes, forms a common motif accompanying depictions of the Europeans.

The Dutch woman and her servant provided a unique theme in Japan, and the arrangement of the composition was no doubt based on the more common sight of the Dutch official, usually a captain, and his servant. This genre was so familiar that it formed the single most popular
Westerners passionately interested in the customs as well as the flora and fauna of his host country. He was followed two years later by the European artist Carolus de Villeneuve, who was summoned to assist von Siebold in illustrating his botanical observations. Little is known of the details of de Villeneuve’s activities, but surely in the course of his work he met Keiga, and it is not unreasonable to assume that de Villeneuve, an illustrator, may have instructed the talented Keiga in some basic principles of European art. One piece of evidence suggesting such a relationship is Keiga’s portrait of von Siebold (fig. 6), which is based on a portrait by de Villeneuve (fig. 7). Keiga’s work, like that of de Villeneuve, reveals generalized modeling in light and shadow; features, however, are exaggerated, and a fine, sharp line delineates the contours of nose, eyes, lips, and ears. Such linear treatment serves to flatten the forms in a manner typical of the Japanese portrait style. Clothing, too, reflects a Japanese sensibility in the unmodeled shapes with their rich color harmonies: bright blue uniform with gold braid, epaulettes, and buttons; black collar and cape thrown over the left shoulder, the finely textured details handsomely contrasted with the broad areas of flat, opaque color. Perhaps invoking artistic license, Keiga gave von Siebold rich chestnut-brown hair instead of the wispy blond depicted by de Villeneuve; the darker color would certainly have been more agreeable to Japanese tastes. Less meticulously—and exquisitely—conceived than the porcelainlike features of Hendrik Doeff, the portrait suggests a kind of primitive intensity, particularly in the gazing eyes, that imparts a compelling sense of life to the image.

Looking beyond Keiga’s renditions of portraits to his European figure compositions, another source of Western inspiration can be determined concretely. At some point in the 1820s, a series of lithographs entitled Les grimaces was brought to Deshima, perhaps by de Villeneuve. Among them were some of the most extraordinary images executed by the French artist Leopold L. Boilly (1761–1845). Keiga studied these picture thoroughly, using them in various combinations: he practiced making close copies, selected individual faces for inclusion in his own compositions, and embellished and augmented the groupings to create his own statements. Les amateurs de tableaux, Boilly’s caustic cartoon of art critics, is perhaps the best example of a work that Keiga copied directly (fig. 8). Six faces form a diagonal from lower right to upper left,
all peering at a single work of art whose content is denied us, for only the back of the frame is presented to the spectator. We “read” the painting solely through the reactions of the six critics, which run a gamut from bemusement to repugnance, shock, scorn, and amusement; only the woman remains noncommittal. The psychological depth of Boilly’s work, highlighted so vividly through the use of chiaroscuro, is attempted in Keiga’s rendition through caricaturing the figures with a more linear method (fig. 9). Keiga employs poses identical to Boilly’s but brings his faces closer to the surface plane, enlarges them, eliminates much of the shadow, and defines features with an outline. The result, here as in all his re-creations from Western works, is a concentration on broader, flatter shapes and surface pattern. Faces are curiously akin to the treatment in traditional narrative handscrolls, and less reflective of the probing, psychologically insightful portrayals seen in Boilly’s original work. In imitation, perhaps, of the florid script giving the French title in Boilly’s work, Keiga sighed his painting in Dutch at the lower left: “Getekent Door Tojosky U Nanagasaky” (“painted by Tojosky of Nagasaki”).

Among Boilly’s most memorable lithographs are groupings of heads that individually suggest different emotions but are given cohesion by the haunting repulsiveness of the total image (fig. 10). Thus, anger, hatred, disgust, avarice, and idiocy form a companionable group in Les grimaces no. 2, from which Keiga borrowed faces separately to compose a number of works of his own design. The central face of Boilly’s work was used by Keiga in an entirely different context to express pain on the face of a luckless patient being treated by a medical doctor (fig. 11). The theme of a Dutch doctor probing with a knife the tourniqueted arm of his victim was derived from the numerous woodblock portrayals of Dutch medical practices that never ceased to astound, impress, and dismay the Japanese. A typical hand-colored woodblock print executed by an anonymous illustrator depicts a barbarian doctor methodically severing his patient’s arm with a hacksaw. Ishizaki Yushi sketched a similar scene that he himself may well have witnessed.11 In Yushi’s interpretation, a table is heaped with medical supplies—surgical instruments, bottles, and bandages—along with a gratuitous sprinkling of the objects that formed the iconography of Hollander’s: a stemware cup, long-stemmed pipe, and tall top hat. To the right of the table the doctor saws away at the arm of a patient who is pinioned in a chair by three assistants, while blood spurts into a pan placed on the floor beneath the victim’s wriggling toes. Around the five foreigners a group of seven Japanese stands gaping at the scene with undisguised fascination. From Yushi’s sketch Keiga seems to have borrowed simply the theme and general position of the main characters, omitting the grisly details. The physiognomy of the doctor resembles Keiga’s portrait of von Siebold sufficiently to surmise that he is the person intended. Unlike the patients in typical ukiyo-e popular prints, who register little emotion on their faces, Keiga’s patient grimaces in apparent torment, a remarkably novel adaptation surely never imagined by Boilly when he conceived his original grimace.

One of the more interesting lithographs by Boilly is a bust portrait of three figures: a woman in center stage, a man at left making ardent advances to her, and a female at right slyly and disapprovingly observing the action (fig. 12). It is titled Finissez donc (“Oh, stop it!”), a title that could be construed as uttered by either of the two ladies. The chief figure, in any case, is a wily coquette who repulses her paramour while leaning toward him voluptuously. The love duet is full of hands: she smother his face, he paws her arm and shoulder. Behind the pair, the barmaid-type wench, who resembles the man enough to be his sister, flashes at the lovers a look compounded of disgust and envy. The picture appealed to Keiga enough for him to use it as a central motif in a more complicated scheme executed on silk (fig. 13). He transformed the busts into full-length figures, discarded the barmaid, and added three males, creating an entirely new composition. Peering intently at the pair is the bug-eyed madam from Les grimaces no. 4 (fig. 14), changed only by the addition of a cap. The other two males are pastiches of Boilly characters: the hand of the finger-biting scholar type appears, for example, in both Les amateurs de tableaux and Les grimaces no. 4. From the waist down, the figures are Keiga’s own invention, and here the realistic style of the upper portion gives way to the generalized stroke-shadow technique that one finds in Obaku priest portraiture.

The success of the picture lies in Keiga’s improved technical achievement; one has only to compare the fresh, mobile faces created with delicate color, shading, and highlights with the earlier rendition of the patient grimacing under the doctor’s knife to see how Keiga has mastered the subtleties of facial expression. In this respect
his art appears not inferior to that of Boilly. Where Keiga proves less successful, here as earlier, is in rendering his characters' states of mind. It is easy enough to imagine a variety of emotional interactions unifying the Boilly group; in Keiga's work, all four men concentrate on the woman, but with such diverse expressions that their thoughts are rendered ambiguously. Although the men study the lady in the same manner as the art critics examining Les amateurs de tableaux, the tongue-in-check humor, shorn of psychological insight, becomes traditional Japanese caricature dressed in Western clothing.

Keiga appears to have exhausted the limits of his experiments with Boilly without ever having fully mastered the more subtle and exciting possibilities of European techniques applied to the rendering of human emotions in a purely Japanese context. As we have seen, the power of Boilly's lithographs lies in the psychological states of mind he was able to convey. His figures generally represent strong emotions—lust, greed, anger, hate—all negative aspects of personality. One can only wonder what went wrong behind Keiga's mind as he studied these pictures. In view of the attitudes toward Europeans held by most Japanese at that time, Keiga might even have misconstrued the pictures as realistic renderings of authentic Western emotional expressions, missing entirely the ironic fact that Boilly's Grinaces are considered to lie within the romantic tradition of early nineteenth-century Western caricature. If we assume that he understood the hyperbole intended, we then must ask why these characteristics were not emphasized in his own renditions. Why is the acerbic wit evident in the lampooning of Boilly's Les amateurs de tableaux so diluted in Keiga's copy? Why does the flirtatious wench of Finissez donc become in Keiga's hands merely a pretty girl? One can assume that he failed to grasp the full implications of bitterness behind the masks. Japanese caricature displays marvelous wit in lampooning human foibles, exotica, and weaknesses—the cuckold, the fop, the quack, the Chinese, the man suffering from loose teeth or diarrhea—but rarely is the sarcasm directed against states of mind.

We who view Boilly's drawings through Western eyes perceive affinities with the work of Dau-
mier or Goya in their bitterness of conception and social comment. We must bear in mind, however, that such conditioning was never a part of Japanese consciousness. There simply was nothing in the Japanese tradition that could have prepared Keiga for transposing emotions such as loathing, disgust, or fury into caricature. But despite his failure to probe deeply into the psyche, Keiga nevertheless must be accorded credit for conceiving what was at that time the nearly inconceivable, for attempting something new to Japanese portrait painting: illusionistic, three-dimensional verisimilitude tinged with psychological overtones, though far removed from the Western models he emulated.

The works discussed thus far have all been paintings, Keiga's primary medium of expression. In creating them he used a water-based paint in the traditional Japanese method, eschewing all experiments in the exotic medium of oil practiced by some of his contemporaries, such as Araki Jogen' (1773–1824). Occasionally, however, he ventured into another realm where Japanese artists excelled, fashioning ukiyo-e designs for woodblock prints. As a final example of his portraits of foreigners, we illustrate the seventh and last print of a series entitled Auspicious Ceremony of the Russian Mission, executed around 1853, when Keiga was sixty-seven (fig. 15). It is a portrait of the Russian admiral Euphimiut Putiatin, bearing in the lower right corner in roman script Keiga's "foreign" name, "Tojosky." 17

Admiral Putiatin arrived in Nagasaki in August 1853 with four warships. Unlike Perry, who a year earlier had steamed into what is now Tokyo Bay despite the Japanese law expressly forbidding foreign warships from entering any port except Nagasaki, Putiatin attempted to abide by the rules; he allowed the Japanese to inspect his ships and sent a letter to the shogun respectfully requesting trade relations. For his pains he was informed that he might try again five or six years hence, but that Nagasaki was the only port open to trade and only Dutch and Chinese would ever be permitted there. Six days after the rebuffed admiral departed for home, Commodore Perry entered Tokyo Bay for the second time, on this occasion with an impressive fleet of American warships that proved more persuasive than polite negotiations.

In Keiga's portrait, Putiatin is seen seated in a chair, flanked by his flag-bearer and an armed guard. It would seem most unlikely that the admiral sat for his portrait. If he had posed formally, it is likely that he would have chosen to be represented in a grouping that included his officers and advisors rather than a rifleman and flag-bearer. Probably the only opportunity Keiga had to observe him was during
the parade, at which time he presumably sketched the various groups that appear as four other prints from this series. The final "informal" portrait was most likely Keiga's own invention. Although it is probably imagined, it nevertheless is executed with the artist's habitual precision of line and specificity of detail based on observation of uniforms, flag, and individual physiognomies. The formality of the pose can readily be compared to the portrait of the Blomhoffs painted more than two decades earlier (fig. 3). Both illustrations share the same posed isolation of parts. No figure relates in any way to the others in the Putiatin trio. The attendants, however, at least manage to establish eye contact with the viewer. Two of the men are drawn in the traditional three-quarter view, while the flag-bearer appears en face, a rare position in Japanese figure portraits. The techniques of shading used to define facial features and garment folds are similar to those employed in The Seduction (fig. 13). Both use lines to demarcate folds of cloth and swatches of shading to indicate depth and provide a sense of volume. In The Seduction ink and color on silk produce a compatible degree of realism, the medium allowing for the effect of softness in the garments. In the printed format of the Putiatin composition swordlike forms inevitably appear flatter and lines more rigid, with folds of cloth, especially in the flag and trousers, perfunctorily drawn. The pants of the Russian uniforms were designed to be baggy in any case, though probably not quite as diaper-like as Keiga rendered them. While Keiga's shading technique suffers in transference to the print medium, the quality of printing is nevertheless good.13

Kawahara Keiga's position in the history of Japanese art is something of an anomaly. His understanding was that of a nineteenth-century Japanese artist trained in a long tradition of linear portrait style. To his native method he added foreign techniques of modeling and made an effort to master psychological expression. But although he embellished his art with foreign touches, they remained technical innovations, never becoming integral parts of the total artistic fabric. The full mastery of Western art techniques and their assimilation into Japanese consciousness was to begin less than a decade after his death when, in the Meiji period (1868–1912), artists were at last permitted to travel abroad to absorb foreign concepts firsthand, then return home to make them a part of their own styles. Had Keiga had the benefit of such experience, his paintings, too, would likely have been even more important landmarks in the development of the East/West manner. Speculation on what might have been, however, is otiose. At most, Keiga was a painter of marked talent who in his own time contributed significantly to a portrait tradition in transition.14
Notes

1. The year of Keiga’s birth has been calculated from a date equivalent to 1860 written by Nakajima Hirotari (1792-1864) on Keiga’s portrait of a woman named Nagashima Kikuko (1776-1862), and from Keiga’s own inscription on the same painting stating that he was then seventy-five years old. Taking into account the Japanese practice of counting a person one year old at birth, Keiga was thus born in 1786.

2. Obaku Zen portraits were first brought to Japan by Chinese priests fleeing political unrest and persecution during the seventeenth century. The manner of composition and iconography followed the earlier chinzo tradition that had been developing in Japan since the Kamakura period (1185–1333). Simply stated, the bodies of such figures are conceived as broadly defined, flat shapes, articulated with textile designs and given paraphernalia connoting office and rank. To the earlier style, however, Obaku chinzo added the use of wash in the facial area to create shadows and to impart a greater sense of three-dimensionality to the subject. This method of portraying individual features derived ultimately from the European influence on Chinese art.


5. A reproduction of Yushi’s painting can be seen in ibid., pl. 24, p. 74.

6. The painting is housed in the National Museum of Ethnology, Leiden, but because it is privately owned, the author was not permitted to photograph it; to my knowledge, it has not been reproduced anywhere.


9. There are many. The earliest extant woodblock depiction of a Hollander and his servant was issued by the Hariya publishing house around 1750 (reproduced in French, Through Closed Doors, pl. 7, p. 38).

10. Adaptations of caricatures in the Les grincecs series of 1823 were based on the principles of Charles le Brun (1619–90). Many of the emotions can be found in le Brun’s Traités des passions (Paris, 1698). Le Brun, a cofounder of the French Royal Academy, published in 1698 a treatise setting forth the principles of French caricature titled Méthode pour apprendre à dessiner les passions proposée dans une conférence sur l’expression générale et particulière.


12. Though it is of different size and vertical, rather than horizontal like the others, this print seems to be part of a set of seven, the others depicting, respectively, a parade of the admiral’s marching band, flag-bearers, armed guards, and soldiers bearing slippers and chairs, plus two more depicting the Russian ships in Naganaske Harbor. Five are reproduced in French, Through Closed Doors, pp. 54–57. All seven (Putilin’s portrait in color) are found in Kōbe Shiryō Tsūkan Bijutsukan zukan, vol. 3, pp. 35, 52.

13. The print was executed by Isuno Bunsai, master of the Yamatoya publishing firm, whose name appears in the seal in the lower right corner: “Bunsai Yamatoya.” Yamatoya was the most accomplished and successful of all the Naganaske printing firms, and Isuno Bunsai was the master artist as well as proprietor from the early 1840s until his death in 1857. He had received his training in Edo, and when he returned to Naganaske he brought back craftsmen to work for him, thus vastly raising the standards of Yamatoya and ultimately producing the finest woodblock prints in Naganaske.

14. The author wishes to express sincere thanks to Professor Mamoru Kaneshige for his invaluable research assistance in Japan and to Professor Calvin L. French and Dr. Gail C. Weigl for seeing him through so many phases of this essay.
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Fig. 2. Portrait of a member of the British East India Company. By Spoliulm. Ca. 1785-1810. Collection of Graham Hood.


Fig. 3. Portrait of Jan Cock Blomhoff and family. By Kawahara Keiga. 1818. Kobe City Museum of Nanban Art. Note the characters for "Keiga" (within the top hat) and the name "M. E. R. Tojosky" in roman letters.
Fig. 5. Portrait of a Hollander and Servant. By Kawahara Keiga. Ca. 1823. Nagasaki Prefectural Museum of Art.

Fig. 6. Portrait of Dr. Philipp Franz von Siebold. By Kawahara Keiga. Ca. 1824. Nagasaki Municipal Art Museum.

Fig. 7. Portrait of Dr. Philipp Franz von Siebold. By Carolus Hubert de Villeneuve. 1823. Nagasaki Prefectural Library.
Fig. 8. *Les amateurs de tableaux*. By Louis Leopold Boilly. 1823. The British Museum, London.

Fig. 9. *Art Critics*. By Kawahara Keiga. 1825. Signed "Getekent Door Tojosky U Nangasaky." Ushijima Collection, Nagasaki.
Fig. 10. *Les grimaces*, no. 2. By Louis Leopold Boilly. 1823. The British Museum, London.

Fig. 11. *Dutch Doctor*. By Kawahara Keiga. Ca. 1825. Nagasaki Prefectural Museum of Art. The seals are partially obliterated, but the top portion of the top hat with the characters for “Keiga” is visible.

Fig. 14. Les grimaces, no. 4. By Louis Leopold Boilly. 1823. The British Museum, London.

Fig. 15. Portrait of Admiral Putiatin, panel 7 in the series Auspicious Ceremony of the Russian Mission. By Kawahara Keiga. Published by Yamatoya (1853). Kobe City Museum of Nanban Art.
THE DURGA TEMPLE, AIHOLE, AND THE SAÑGAMEŚVARA TEMPLE, KÛḌAVELLI: A SCULPTURAL REVIEW

BY CAROL RADCLIFFE BOLON

In 1979 the Sañgameśvara temple at Kûḍavelli Saṅgam, at the confluence of the Krishna and Tungabhadra rivers in Andhra, was cleaned of centuries of coats of plaster in preparation for its relocation to Alampur, and dismantled. This cleaning revealed the temple’s abundant imagery (figs. 1 and 2). Although both temples were built during the reign of the Early Chalukyas (ca. A.D. 543–757), it is remarkable to find at this outpost sculpture closely resembling that seen on the sophisticated and famous Durga Temple at Aihole (fig. 3). The Kûḍavelli temple is here described as it existed in situ.

Also revealed during cleaning of the Kûḍavelli temple was an imposing wall surrounding the temple, of which only about one meter had previously been visible above the base of the temple. The entire wall is about five meters high and also bears sculpture (fig. 2). The wall extends about four meters below the base of the temple itself. Around the base of the temple, therefore, the top of the wall forms a one-meter high “railing.” It seems plausible that the Dravidian-style wall was added after the Nagara-style temple was completed, in order to protect it from the seasonal flooding of the rivers. Siting then seems to have buried the wall.

The possibility that the wall was added after the temple was built is supported by the figures of its base, or gala (figs. 4–6), which are carved in a different style and are less carefully executed than those found on the temple itself. The gala includes elephant busts (fig. 5) similar to those found on the Pattadakal, Pāpanātha, Virūpākṣa, and Mallikārjuna temples, but they are most like those above the pillars of the mandapa hall in the Alampur Viśva Brahmā Temple. The Viśva Brahmā Temple is about twelve miles from the Kûḍavelli temple and seems to have been the last temple built at Alampur, probably between 690 and 696.

The presence of an enclosing wall around a Chalukya temple is also known from the Pattadakal Virūpākṣa Temple (ca. 735). The simpler (mostly buried) enclosing walls of the Alampur Bala Brahmā Temple (ca. 660–90) and Mahānandīśvara Temple (ca. 660–70) may have been predecessors. The Durga Temple at Aihole may have had a wall too, now lost, with its surviving gate one of a symmetrical pair.

The Kûḍavelli wall’s tall base moldings (fig. 4) include these elements: an upāna, a high padmajagati, a multifaceted kumuda, a gala (or kanṭha) segmented by pilasters framing ganas (dwarfs), dancers, gods, mithunas (couples), and large elephant busts (fig. 5). The iconography of the Varāha carved on the gala is not that seen in the caves and early structural temples of the Chalukyas; it is found again only on the Alampur Viśva Brahmā Temple (ca. 690) and on the Aihole Huchchapayya Temple (ca. 720). Varāha is posed in each case as if in flight, ascending from the ocean floor with Bhudevi seated on his raised elbow (figs. 6 and 7). A comparison of such iconographic and sculptural details as these to the corresponding details of other temples allows us to assign the construction of the wall to the period between 690 and 720.

The gala is surmounted by a curved eave (kapota). Above this is a garland (vyālamālā) and a pilastered segment supporting the encircling miniature shrine series (kuta-sālā parivāralaya). The projections of the wall correspond to the locations of the decorative shrines above.

At the southeast corner of the wall a sālā element is expanded into a rectangular mātrkā shrine. Its entrance is on the north side. The corresponding northeastern shrines is lost.

The temple at Kûḍavelli Saṅgam is large (12 by 20 m.) and rectangular. Before it stands a small, four-pillared, open Nandi mandapa. Its Nandi, similar to the one in front of the Alampur Viśva Brahmā Temple, is of a distinct type, with its head tossed up. The temple’s sāndhāra plan includes a vestibule (antarāla) before the four-pillared sanctum, which holds a linga, and a large mandapa with four rows of pillars creating five aisles. The pillars of the mandapa are of two types: the outer pillars are of the square rucaka shape of standard Chalukya style, but the long vertical bands on the two inner rows of pillars are unique for this period. They are carved with foliage and the shaft cubes are carved with figures. The roof above the side aisles slopes in the typical Chalukya fashion.
These details of the wall and the temple's basic sandhara plan are the features the Kūḍavelli temple shares with the Alampur temples. Yet some architectural and sculptural features are peculiar to this temple, such as the many sculpture-bearing niches found inside and outside the sanctum. Other features of the large Kūḍavelli temple bypass Alampur and can be related directly to the temple art of the Chalukyas' western sites, especially to the Durga Temple at Aihole in Karnataka. Most striking is the similarity of niche images in the Saṅgāmeśvara and Durga Temples.

The exterior walls of the Kūḍavelli temple, like those of the Durga Temple, are generously endowed with sculpture in niches. The north and south sides of the Saṅgāmeśvara Temple have four windows alternating with five niches. The eastern niche on both sides is empty. Iconographically, the program of the temple is like that of no other Chalukya temple. Starting from the southeast niche and reading clockwise around the temple, one finds Yama on his buffalo; an anthropomorphic serpent king (nāgarāja); Andhakāsura; and a Siva or a guard with one hand on his hip—the other one is lost (fig. 8). On the west wall three male figures are depicted with one hand on the hip and the other holding a lotus. The north side has four figures: two more of these Padmapāṇi-like male figures, a Naṭarāja (fig. 18), and a standing two-armed Lakuliśa holding a rosary and a club (fig. 9). On the east wall wealth deities (midhis) in niches, carved with virtuoso foreshortening, flank the entrance (fig. 10). Yamunā (fig. 23) on her tortoise appears on the south side of the east wall. The goddess Gāṅgā may have appeared in the northeast niche, now empty; such a placement for river goddesses, in facade niches, is unique among Chalukya temples. Viṣṇu appears on the east side, south corner, standing; he holds a staff, rosary, and cakra, while the fourth hand rests on his hip.

The proportions of the Kūḍavelli temple figures are somewhat stunted from the waist down. All are inset, high-relief figures in red sandstone, about 117 cm. high by 61 cm. wide.

A seventh Padmapāṇi-like male figure is detached from its original location and was found loose within the temple (fig. 11). Two more figures of this type are kept in the Alampur Museum. They are carved in a distinctive broad-plane style. These are odd images for niches, especially in such quantity. Unidentifiable due to their lost attributes, they recall the placid and broadly carved door guardians (dvārapalas) of Bāḍami Cave Temple 2 (ca. 550) (fig. 12), although with a more extreme posture, and a more fully shaped chest. Also in the Alampur Museum is Andhakāsura-vadhā, which may be the original image from the temple since the one placed in the niche seems a later and poor rendition.7 The fourth Kūḍavelli temple figure now in the Alampur Museum may be a Lakuliśa carrying an axe in his left hand. His other hand is lost. He wears a tigerskin dhott (skirt). Each standing figure has a broad, round face, adopts the tribhanga pose, and has a clinging cloth covering the genitals, which are thereby subtly emphasized.8 These details and the modeling of the figures are similar to some figures of the Durga Temple at Aihole. For example, the Śūrya (with Chāyā) (fig. 13) from an eastern pillar is similarly stout and broad-chested, and the faces are similar in shape and expression. The handling of ornamentation is similar, too. Figures like the anonymous males of the Kūḍavelli temple are also seen in the interior porch pillar medallions in groups of mithunas (fig. 14) and in a large carved slab in the apse end of the cloister (fig. 15); the latter figure is too damaged to identify but can be described as a four-armed, standing male with two females and three ganas at his feet and a host of flying figures above.9 The Harīhara niche image of the Durga Temple also shares features of proportion and modeling with sculptures seen in the Kūḍavelli temple (fig. 16).

The Varāha image on the Durga Temple (fig. 17) is iconographically distinct from the one on the Kūḍavelli temple wall. However, if we compare the modeling of the Varāha to that of the Padmapāṇi-like Kūḍavelli temple figures, we find distinct similarities in the treatment of the broad chest, with its distinct muscular curvature in the pectoral area and the curved, ridged flesh-fold beneath the rib cage. The treatment of the armbands, the necklace, and the sweep of the Brahmasūtra thread across the chest is almost identical in both images. If we move from the Varāha to the Narasimha image (fig. 18) on the same temple, it is difficult to accept one scholar's opinion that the Varāha is original and the Narasimha a replacement.10 The proportions and details are the same: note especially the armbands, the fold of flesh under the rib cage, the manner of tying, draping, and pleating the sashes, and the manner of dividing the multiple arms. Although there are differences in the quality of carving and in matters of composition, the Durga Temple images seem to be close relatives of those on the Kūḍavelli temple.
Six images of deities are still in situ within the eleven niches of the Durga Temple. All are carved in high relief on inset slabs. Lippe's opinion is that the Narasimha is a replacement piece, a copy of the Bädami Cave Temple 3 Narasimha, which he believes to be a Pallava recutting dating to the period following the Pallava victory over the Chalukyas at Bädami in 642.\textsuperscript{11} He considers the others to be original but notes that the supposed substitute Narasimha was carved on a slab which was crudely fitted into the niche. Possibly this tailoring of the slab to the niche shape, which is also evident on the Kūḍavelli temple, is due to the working method of the sculptors, who may have begun work on a stone without being certain where it might be placed.\textsuperscript{12}

While there do seem to be divergent substyles in the images of the Durga Temple, this circumstance may be the result of their being the work of different sculptors; perhaps a single sculptor was responsible for the images of Narasimha, Vṛṣavāhana Śiva, Viṣṇugarudāsana, and Mahiṣāsuramardini, all of which show a mastery of line and volume.\textsuperscript{13} These particular images are somewhat similar to those on the Mahākūṭa Saṅgmeśvara Temple, which share the refinement of surface and the taut, supple outlines.\textsuperscript{14} Comparing the Mahākūṭa Saṅgmeśvara Temple's Ĉūrdvaliṅga Śiva image to the Durga Temple's Vṛṣavāhana, we find the proportions and body shapes similar and a subtlety of gesture and relaxed attitude in both. The images of Vṛṣavāhana and the others by this particular artist on the Durga Temple are unique within the context of Early Chalukya sculpture. These figures, buoyant with an energy generated by their lines, surpass earlier images such as the Lad Khan facade mithunas in their weight and earthiness, yet have none of the attenuation that sometimes characterizes the figures on the early eighth-century temples at Pattadakal.\textsuperscript{15} There is a freshness and vigor about these images that distinguishes them from most Chalukya sculpture.

The Varāha and Harihara images, by contrast, are by a more conservative or less masterful hand. They are stout and shortwaisted, and their modeling is not as appealing as that of the other figures.

The Kūḍavelli temple's Natarāja (fig. 19) is so like a Natarāja now in the Aihole Museum (fig. 20) in style and iconography that one is led to suppose either that one hand carved both or that the second is a copy.\textsuperscript{16} The Aihole Natarāja's original or intended location is unknown.\textsuperscript{17} The figure is most like those of the Durga Temple in style but too large to fit into one of its niches. The face is petite like that of Mahiṣāsuramardini or Vṛṣavāhana Śiva and it is slightly less open, broad, or moonlike than that of the Kūḍavelli temple image. The extreme bend (bhanga) of the tāṇḍava dance pose is duplicated, and each image had either fourteen or sixteen arms, the front left one thrown across the chest in the gaja hasta gesture. The accompanying figures are in slightly different locations on each Natarāja panel, and the Aihole Natarāja adds flying gandharvas to either side of his halo. The arms of the Natarāja images were carved partially free of the slab, as were the legs. These two dancing Śiva figures remind one of the lower relief image of Śiva on Bädami Cave Temple I (ca. 550), which has eighteen arms (fig. 21).\textsuperscript{18} All three figures radiate from a center point, and move in balance as they dance, like a pinwheel. The treatment of the genital area of the Aihole figure is similar to that of others found in the Kūḍavelli temple (fig. 11).

The sculpture of the Saṅgmeśvara and Durga temples is of fine quality, but that of the former has a slightly odd character. Soundara Rajan described the Kūḍavelli Saṅgmeśvara Temple as representing a “fringe style” of Chalukya art,\textsuperscript{19} but this seems to be true more of the architecture and decorative carving than of the niche images. The temple walls and niches are short, and the difficulty involved in shortening the figures to this height may have resulted in their being stunted somewhat from the waist down. The decoration atop niches and the gana garland crowning make the wall seem ponderous (fig. 24). The single upāna base molding of the temple also stunts the wall. On the other hand, the Durga Temple’s Harihara figure exhibits the same stunted proportions (fig. 16). The Kūḍavelli images, except for the Natarāja, have much in common with the work of the lesser master of the Durga Temple. The large number of two-armed male figures shown in a strongly bent (bhanga) pose on the Kūḍavelli temple is also unusual. In fact, the temple’s entire iconographical program is atypical.

Is it possible that the very productive Aihole workshop sent some pieces via the Malaprabha River to the Krishna, and thence down to Kūḍavelli? The Kūḍavelli panels, like the Durga Temple panels, are carved on slabs obviously adjusted to fit into the temple niches.

Other aspects of the Kūḍavelli temple may be related to the Durga Temple. Divakaran noticed
the similarity in the distribution of niches and windows on the two temples.20 Niches and windows alternate all around the Kūḍavelli temple. The pierced windows are unusually bold in design: wheels with fish spokes (fig. 22), diamonds, swastikas, or eight-pointed flowers in a circle. They are most like the boldly patterned windows of the Pattadakal Vijayesvara (Saṅgāmeśvara) Temple (dated 696–733/4) (fig. 23). The windows are framed, like the niches, with pilasters and a lintel of flamboyant convergent or divergent figures of sea monsters (makaras) (fig. 24), kinnaras (harpies) (fig. 25), geese (hāṅsa), or Gaja Lakṣmi. Over most of the niches, various shrine types of the southern order are displayed in miniature. None of the niches bears the crowning udgama net design typical of the Early Chalukya temples at nearby Álampur. A similar, though not as deeply carved, makara portal (torana) is found above a window of the Durga Temple (fig. 26). The treatment of these decorative elements of the niches and windows in the Kūḍavelli temple is bizarre. The provincial quality of these details suggests that whereas the main images were imported from Aihole, the decorative carving on the temple was done by local artists.21 Furthermore, these local artists were not those who had worked at Álampur. The Álampur workshop, it seems, was moved to Pattadakal before A.D. 700; there its artists worked on the Gaḷaganātha Temple, among others.22 By 700, work at Álampur was finished except for the wall enclosing the site, and the center of temple and temple patronage shifted back to the Chalukya homeland—Karnataka.23

The Durga Temple contains much sculpture aside from the six preserved niche figures. There are also figures (most of them damaged) on the shafts of the twelve eastern pillars of the outer row and four of the inner porch area. These pillars are also carved with medallions. On the temple’s inner and outer plinths are decorative carving and a Rāmâyana frieze. Above the beams of the inner porch are figures framed between miniature pilasters.

In addition, the inner porch ceiling of the Durga Temple also has panels of a nāgarāja (fig. 27) and a matsuycakra (fish-wheel), and there were originally four gandharva couples as ceiling panels above the eastern cloister aisle, to the north and south of the porch. Two damaged ones remain in place, while two others are preserved in the Delhi National Museum.24 The doorway of the mandapa is elaborately carved. The mandapa itself, with its eight pillars, has been restored. Where there are now incorrectly restored brackets, which resemble tusk, at either side of the entrance to the veranda, there may once have been single figures or mithunas, similar in type and analogous in location to those carved in Bādami Cave Temple 3.25

If we compare the Durga Temple’s nāgarāja ceiling panel, which is remarkable in many ways, to the ceiling panel of Tārakārī Subrahmanya of the nearby Huchchimalli Temple (fig. 28) we see, possibly, two works by one master sculptor. There is a sense of drama present in the poses of the nāgarāja and the Subrahmanya that is not found in other Chalukya ceiling panel figures. The human torso of the nāgarāja emerges from his scaly snake coils and turns to the right. This turn is a break from the symmetry of all other Chalukya nāgarāja ceiling panels, in which the figure is frontal and symmetrical. The figure bears in his right hand a garland for the enshrined sun god Áditya and in the other a bowl of offerings.26 The line of his arched, ridged brow is parallel with the line of the crown (makuta) resting on his forehead. This face is the same as is found on the other Durga Temple gandharva ceiling panels. It is also the same as that of the Huchchimali Temple’s boy Subrahmanya on his peacock trampling the demon. The Huchchimali Temple has an inscriptive terminus ante quem of A.D. 708.27

The only Chalukya precedent for the use of two porch ceiling panels rather than one is the Bādami Jambuliṅga Temple, dated 699.28 Furthermore, the two ceiling panels of the Durga Temple use some patterns that also appear in the Jambuliṅga Temple’s ceilings. The designs and figures in the panels of these two temples, the Jambuliṅga and the Durga, are carved at much larger scale than those in earlier temples.29

Although the Durga Temple’s abundance of carving marks it as the most elaborately adorned temple at Aihole, it is more modest in its program than are the early eighth-century Chalukya temples at Pattadakal.

The sculpture of the Durga Temple bears affinities to that found on the Kūḍavelli and Mahākūṭa Saṅgāmeśvara temples and the Huchchimali Temple at Aihole. The sculpture of the Kūḍavelli temple is related to that on the Durga Temple, the Pattadakal Saṅgāmeśvara Temple, and, iconographically, the Álampur Svarga Brahmā Temple. Rather than identify the two divergent image types on the Durga Temple as original and replacement
images (although there are certainly cases where images are replacements) I would suggest that in this instance they are all original and that the difference is explained by the fact that one of the artists excelled in his work. Basic features are shared by all of them, features which vary in subsequent imagery. By the late seventh century in the Aihole area, temple construction and adornment with carved images had become an established industry. The sculptors who contributed to the Durga Temple also were responsible for images on the Kudadelli Sanameśvara and Huchchimalli temples, which were carved within a short period of time.30

Regarding the date of the construction of the Kudadelli temple, the Tummeyanuru copper-plate inscription of Pulikesin II commemorates the grant of a village in the area of the Sanameśvara Temple.31 It mentions that the grant was made in the presence of the god Sanameśvara. Some scholars have taken this as evidence that the grant was made at the Kudadelli Sanameśvara Temple and therefore date the temple to Pulikesin’s reign (609–42).32 On stylistic grounds this early dating seems impossible. Perhaps another temple preceded this Chalukya one on this ideal temple location and was also dedicated to Sanameśvara, Śiva Lord of the Confluence.

Based on the similarities between the Durga and Kudadelli temples, in sculptural style and the way in which niche images are displayed, the creation of the latter may be placed in the late seventh century.33 Its wall may have been added ca. 700–20.

In terms of sculptural and architectural evidence, the Durga Temple seems to postdate the Aihole Lad Khan, Huchchimalli, and Konti southeastern temples and to be nearly contemporary with the Sulebhavi gatehouse (pratoli) and the Bādami Jambuliṅga Temple. It would thus precede the two large temples at Pattadakal—the Virūpākṣa and Mallikārjuna temples, which date to 733/4–744/5.34 We can plausibly assign its date of construction to ca. 700, which would make it contemporaneous with the Kudadelli Sanameśvara Temple.35
Notes


4. For example, the Chikkî Temple at Aihole; see Divakaran, *op. cit.*, fig. 5.

5. Divakaran suggests the possibility of Buddhist influence on the figures I refer to as "Padmapañj-like" (*ibid.*, p. 72).


7. Divakaran, *op. cit.*, fig. 57.

8. Abdul Waheed Khan, *Stone Sculptures*, fig. 21. There is no excess of figures dislodged for the number of vacant niches, but there are doubles of particular *mûrti*, including Andhakâsuravadha, Lakûlitûa, and the uttânapad goddess (figs. 52 and 53) which were removed from the Kûdvellî Saṅgameśvara Temple. I know of no records of original find-spots.

9. The badly damaged Durga Temple panel is of interest because its complex composition marks it as an environmentally set figure, similar in this regard to the Ambikâ now in the Aihole Museum, which not only is set in a diorama full of detail, but is modeled with exceptionally involved planes of depth when considered within the genre of Chalukya-period sculpture. See Radcliffe, "Early Chalukya Sculpture," fig. 220.


11. This victory is recorded on the face of a boulder at Bâdâmi (near the museum); see J. F. Fleet, "Sanskrit and Old Canarese Inscriptions," *Indian Antiquary* 9 (1880), pp. 99–100.

12. Although the names of some Chalukya guilds are recorded we know little about their working methods. It seems that there were two methods of carving images for placement on Chalukya temples. The Durga Temple's images were carved on separate stone slabs and set into the niches with a mortise and tenon joint at the bottom. On many other temples the images apparently were carved out of the temple's masonry blocks and were worked *in situ*, as on Pattadakal's Saṅgameśvara Temple. The Durga Temple may have been provided with eleven major niches, perhaps never filled. Individual patrons may have sponsored the carving and placement of images set in the niches. Such images may have been purchased from artists of the local workshop. Alternatively, all of them may have been filled, with five slabs now lost. On temples where the carving was done directly on the wall, the images are often unfinished, perhaps suggesting a waning interest on the part of patrons.


16. Divakaran, *op. cit.*, p. 72, notes that the modeling, pose, and ornaments of the Kûdvellî Nâtârajâ in particular prefigure the style of images on the Durga Temple.

17. The image was moved to the museum after being found loose inside the Huchchimallî Temple. There is no place within that temple in which it could have been installed.

18. The Nâtârajâ figures introduced into porticos of the Alampur temples, such as the Svarga Brahâm (Divakaran, *op. cit.*, fig. 22), have a similar abundance of arms but were carved differently, apparently with separate arms that are now lost, but also with less sensitive modeling. The chests are quite flat and less full of life, and the torsos are leaner.


21. The style and quality of decorative carving on the pillars in the *mandapa* suggest that this was also locally done.


23. My reasons for believing this to be true are based on the evidence of inscriptions and sculpture: see Radcliffe, "Early Chalukya Sculpture," pp. 26–28, 282–83.


30. The idiom within Chalukya-period sculpture changed rapidly. It is not unusual to find similar or identical images or details on figures in two or three different temples: for example, the utsñapad goddesses from the Mahakuṭa, Nāganath, and Bala Brahmā temples; or the identical but smaller Ardhanarīśvara found on the Mahakuṭa, Mallikarjuna, Mahakutėśvara, and Aihole Lad Khan temples. Such similarities allow us to group temples within relatively short periods.

31. The grant was dated with reference to an eclipse that could have occurred in 618, 619, 635, 636, or 637. N. Ramesan, Copper Plate Inscriptions in the Andhra Pradesh Government Museum (Hyderabad, 1962), pp. 40–45.

32. Ibid., p. 43.


Fig. 1. Sangamesvara Temple, Kudavelli, as it appeared in 1977, before clearing by the Archaeological Survey of India.

Fig. 2. Sangamesvara Temple, Kudavelli, as it appeared in 1978.

Fig. 3. Durga Temple, Aihole.
Fig. 4. Saṅgamaśvara Temple, Kuḍavelli; temple and enclosing wall.

Fig. 5. Saṅgamaśvara Temple, Kuḍavelli; enclosing wall, elephant.

Fig. 6. Saṅgamaśvara Temple, Kuḍavelli; enclosing wall, Varāha.
Fig. 7. Visva Brahmã Temple, Alampur; dentils beneath niche, Varãha.

Fig. 8. Saŋgãmesvara Temple, Koḍavelli; male figure.

Fig. 9. Saŋgãmesvara Temple, Koḍavelli; Lakulîsa (?).
Fig. 10. Saṅgameśvara Temple, Kūḍavelli; *nidhi*.

Fig. 11. Saṅgameśvara Temple, Kūḍavelli; male image, loose.
Fig. 12. Cave Temple 2, Badami: dharapala.

Fig. 13. Durga Temple, Aihole: Surya with Chayā.
Fig. 14. Durga Temple, Aihole; pillar medallion mitthuna.

Fig. 15. Durga Temple, Aihole; apse end male figure.
Fig. 16. Durga Temple, Aihole; Harihara.

Fig. 17. Durga Temple, Aihole; Varaha.
Fig. 18. Durga Temple, Aihole; Narasimha.

Fig. 19. Sangamesvara Temple, Kadavelli; Nataraja.
Fig. 20. Aihole, Museum, Naṭaraja.

Fig. 21. Cave Temple 1, Badāmi; Naṭaraja.
Fig. 22. Sāngameśvara Temple, Kuḍāvelli; pierced window.

Fig. 23. Vijayeśvara Temple, Pattadakal; pierced window.

Fig. 24. Sāngameśvara Temple, Kuḍāvelli; Yamuna.

Fig. 25. Sāngameśvara Temple, Kuḍāvelli; lintel kinnaras.
Fig. 26. Durga Temple, Aihole; *makara torana*.

Fig. 27. Durga Temple, Aihole; *nāgaraja* ceiling panel.

Fig. 28. Huchchimalli temple, Aihole; Tārakāri Subrahmanya ceiling panel.
ELLORA: THE “ARCHAEOLOGY” OF A MAṇḍALA

BY GERI HOCKFIELD MALANDRA

Ellora (Aurangabad District, Maharashtra) was the last of the great rock-cut Buddhist sites in the western Deccan. Excavated during the seventh and eighth centuries, when there was a surge of activity at Buddhist centers throughout India,1 Ellora’s twelve Buddhist caves are like a museum, a visual record of the development of Tantric Buddhist art, from the relatively simple form seen in Cave 6 (ca. A.D. 600) to the splendid and complex perfection of the latest, Cave 12 (ca. 710–30).2 The artists and monks who created Ellora’s caves worked within the centuries-old tradition of Buddhist rock-cut architecture,3 but at every stage new ideas—in particular, experiments in iconography—illustrate the creative integration of old and new.

Ellora’s importance rests in large measure on two related facts. First, its Buddhist sculpture includes many images new or unique in the seventh and early eighth centuries. Secondly, because Ellora is a rock-cut site, its images have been preserved in situ in their programmatic context. The iconography of the images is in some cases comparable to that of images found at contemporary sites in eastern and central India. However, the absence of systematic iconographic or stylistic relationships between Ellora and sites in the traditional centers of development of Indian Tantric Buddhism has deterred scholars from discussing Ellora in the broader context of Buddhist art in India. Even though details of its Buddhist iconography have been available since James Burgess’s work was published in the 1880s,4 Ellora has received concentrated attention only in a study by R. S. Gupte, which included occasional references to comparative material.5 Gupte’s work, intended to serve as a catalogue of images at Ellora, is comprehensive as a study neither of the organization of the site nor of its place in the broader scope of Indian Buddhist art. More recent studies of Indian Buddhist iconography include brief discussions of individual images at Ellora in comparison with sculpture from other sites,6 but nowhere has an attempt been made to evaluate Ellora’s Buddhist iconography from an integrated point of view.

The study of Ellora’s iconography is complicated by a common methodological problem: many of its images have no clear relationship to texts that might explain their meaning. While it may be assumed that no object can be made to speak as eloquently of itself as a dialogue between object and text can, it is also true that ideal pairings of object and text are seldom encountered in the history of Indian art.7 Despite the steadily increasing number of iconographic texts being discovered, edited, and published, there is so far no known text that conforms in more than miscellaneous details to the overall iconography of images in Ellora’s Buddhist caves.

A solution to this problem becomes possible once the text-based approach is set aside temporarily in favor of a search for an internal unifying principle at the site itself. At Ellora we are forced to consider the monuments as their own text. It is proposed that the maṇḍala was the integrating principle that provided a basis for the systematic development of Ellora’s Buddhist imagery, as well as the spatial arrangement of caves.

Examined from the point of view of system and structure, the iconography takes on an importance that depends on but also transcends the details of specific iconographic problems. Moreover, as such an approach reveals changes in meaning through a study of objects (inferred from changes in iconography), it may be considered a sort of “archaeology” of the integrating principle at Ellora—its maṇḍala.

Rock-cut maṇḍalas—geometric, schematic diagrams portraying multiple Buddhist deities—appear at Ellora both in the earliest Buddhist excavation, Cave 6 (fig. 1), and in the latest, Cave 12 (fig. 2). These rock-cut maṇḍalas are essentially two-dimensional, carved on walls in very shallow relief, and are in this respect similar to the more familiar painted maṇḍalas of later, Himalayan Buddhism.8 At Ellora, the maṇḍalas are also transformed into the three-dimensional programs of the cave shrines. In these shrines the sculptures are still carved in relief, but so deeply that they appear to be nearly free-standing. This three-dimensionality is enhanced by the physical arrangement of the sculptures, whose worshippers had to move through caves and shrine areas in order to view all images. Thus, instead of proceeding mentally through a two-dimensional maṇḍala the worshipper at Ellora could walk through a set
of three-dimensional **mandalas**, the caves themselves.

More than a century ago James Burgess acknowledged the similarity between Ellora's Cave 12 **mandalas** and groups of Bodhisattvas in its shrines, but he did not explore the comparison in any detail.\(^9\) Recently, John Huntington argued that Caves 6 and 7 at Aurangabad (near Ellora) most likely represent the application to the iconography of rock-cut caves of a pair of **mandalas** known in a more complex form in Japan.\(^9\) But at Ellora, for the first time, **mandalas** were carved on the walls of the caves, a permanent proof of the use of such diagrams that is only implied at sites such as Aurangabad. It is the relationship between **mandala** as diagram and as shrine program that provides the key to understanding iconographic and spatial aspects of the development of Ellora's century-long Buddhist phase.

**The Earliest Manḍalas: Cave 6**

Ellora's earliest **mandalas** are those carved in shallow relief on the left and right side walls of the shrine in Cave 6, dated to *ca.* 600 (see figs. 1 and 3). Here the **mandala** is a large, nine-part, square diagram. Each section holds a Buddha making the **dharma**-**ca**-**krama**-**mu**-drā gesture and seated in the **vajra**-paryanka**sana** pose. This gesture (**mu**-drā), repeated nine times in each **mandala**, corresponds to that of the central shrine image in Cave 6.\(^11\)

The Cave 6 **mandalas** may be interpreted in several ways. First, and most obvious, they provided multiple images for worship in the shrine. That is, they functioned as any carved or painted images would have done.

Next, the **mandalas** may be taken as representing an iconographic concept, expressed in an essentially two-dimensional form in Cave 6, but found elsewhere at Ellora in three-dimensional form. Thus in Cave 2, another early Buddhist excavation (*ca.* 620; see plan, fig. 4), ten nearly life-size Buddha images were carved in galleries, five on the right wall of the main hall and five on the left wall.\(^12\) All are seated in the **pralaṁ**-**bopāđāsana** pose with hands held in the **dharma**-**ca**-**krama**-**mu**-drā gesture, except the first figure on the left wall. What remains of that image’s hands indicates that they were most probably held in the **dhyāna**-mu-**drā** gesture.\(^13\) This group of ten Buddha images may well be connected to the nine-Buddha **mandala** with shrine image in Cave 6.

In a similar way the Cave 6 **mandalas** may also anticipate the program of the third floor of Cave 12 (hereafter cited as Cave 12.3; see plan, fig. 5) where nine Buddha images fill the side walls, four on the left and five on the right, as Buddha images filled the galleries of Cave 2.\(^14\) But in Cave 12, consistent with the general increase in elaboration of early eighth-century art, there is a greater variety of gestures in the group of Buddha images. The first image on the left holds its hands in the **dhyāna**-mu-**drā** gesture, as does the one in the equivalent position in Cave 2. The next six, in clockwise order, display the **dharma**-**ca**-**krama**-**mu**-drā gesture. The next to last, that is, the second from the front on the right side of the hall, holds its hands in the **dhyāna**-mu-**drā** gesture; and the last, the foremost figure on the right wall, is portrayed with hands held in the **bhūmi**-**sparśa**-mu-**drā** gesture. Viewed as a whole, the Cave 12.3 group has no parallel at other sites.\(^15\)

The **mandalas** of Cave 6 and the hall Buddha figures of Caves 2 and 12.3 illustrate a degree of consistency in Ellora’s iconography, even as their specific meaning remains unclear. Perhaps most significant is the early precedent, established in the early seventh century (in Caves 6 and 2), for the portrayal of such groups in both two-dimensional diagrams and in three-dimensional, life-size scale.

**The Later Manḍalas: Cave 12**

The **mandalas** in Cave 6 may be viewed in a second way, as precursors of the three **mandalas** carved in the front hall of the first floor of Cave 12 (Cave 12.1), a three-storied excavation (see fig. 5). As will be detailed here, the Cave 12.1 **mandalas** are themselves abbreviated versions of the **mandala** represented by the nearby three-dimensional shrine sculptures of Cave 11 (second floor only, Cave 11.2; see figs. 8 and 9) and the shrines of Cave 12.\(^16\)

To state the case more precisely, these **mandalas**, carved in shallow relief, represent only the center of a hypothetical, larger **mandala** that would encompass all carved images, not only in the shrine but throughout each cave. Even a cursory examination of textual descriptions of **mandalas** shows that they contain many more than the nine figures found in Ellora’s rock-cut diagrams.\(^17\) Since Ellora’s are repeated several times in this abbreviated version (three on the first floor of Cave 12, and two in the cell half a story up, described below), it can be inferred that the “short form” had particular significance there. The frequent appearance of the abbreviated **mandala**-diagrams has determined the focus of this article—the “core
mandala—even as the presence of ancillary members of the mandala are recognized.  

The transition from the mandalas of Cave 6 to those of Caves 11.2 and 12 is represented by the nine-part mandalas (fig. 7) that flank the central Buddha image in a cell cut halfway between the first and second floors of Cave 12 (this cell is labeled Cave 12.1-2 on the plan, fig. 5). These mandalas are, effectively, placed in the same position as those in Cave 6: that is, on either side of a central Buddha image. Their position suggests an attempt at a solution to a spatial problem in a place where, as with the small Cave 6 shrine, there was no room to carve more nearly three-dimensional groups. The mandalas would thus appear to reflect a stage at which the requirement for rock-cut images had outgrown its traditional spatial allotment. It was only in the latest of the Buddhist caves that this problem was finally resolved through the excavation of larger shrine areas.

Furthermore, the mandalas in Cave 12.1-2 are identical to the three carved on the first floor of that cave (see fig. 5). They all depict a central Buddha making the dhīyanāmudrā gesture, surrounded not by other Buddhas but by eight Bodhisattvas. It can thus be seen that the position of the mandalas in Cave 12.1-2 is the same as those of Cave 6, but that the content had changed from a diagram depicting identical Buddha images to one representing eight clearly differentiated Bodhisattvas. In other words, the presence of mandalas was constant, even though their nature changed.

**Mandala and Shrine**

It is the presence of the later mandalas that unifies the multi-Bodhisattva shrine programs of Ellora’s latest Buddhist caves, numbers 11 and 12. In these shrines, the central image, usually a Buddha displaying the bhūmisparśamudrā gesture, is attended by Avalokiteśvara to his right and Vajrapāni to his left, with three or four additional Bodhisattvas added on the left and right shrine walls (see figs. 8–16). Representations of similar groups have been found in northwest and eastern India, in Tibet, Central Asia, China, and Korea, and most commonly in Japan. Such groups are comparable to mandalas of six, eight, or sixteen Bodhisattvas described in a number of iconographic texts. However, as many have pointed out, there is seldom a precise correspondence between texts and images, especially early ones. This is certainly true of Ellora’s mandalas and Bodhisattva shrine groups. It is just this imprecise correspondence between text and image that generates the methodological problem being explored here.

At Ellora the problem has several aspects. First, as the illustrations show, the attributes of mandala and shrine images are not always well preserved or clear. Second, more than one Bodhisattva in textual descriptions may hold the same object. So, even an identifiable attribute can produce a misidentification. Third, and most important, even if all attributes were perfectly clear and all figures could be identified, it is not certain that the mandala represented would be equivalent to one recorded in a known text. That is to say, Ellora’s iconographic program could well be based on a text that has not been recovered. Thus, as M.-T. de Mallmann pointed out, such identifications are extremely difficult, especially at a site such as Ellora, where the Bodhisattva images in question have lost attributes and probably distinctive colors, and are portrayed in identical poses and styles of clothing.

For these reasons the identifications made by Gupte are limited by their strict adherence to known iconographic texts. Huntington has suggested that Ellora’s eight-Bodhisattva mandalas be compared with those depicted in the Japanese pattern book Shosonzuzō. But, as is so often the case, even with texts recorded in India, only a few images appear to have counterparts at Ellora. On the other hand, Phyllis Granoff concluded, after comparing Ellora’s mandalas with examples from Central Asia, that the individual identities of the Bodhisattvas (which vary from image to image) are less important than the fact that there are eight. This conclusion is too limited to be of much help. Moreover, Granoff’s focus on a comparison of mandalas avoided the point that they might be evaluated more productively in the context of the site as a whole, supplementing the more traditional examination of iconography alone.

Without new discoveries of texts or of better-preserved images there will be no final solution to the basic iconographic problems of identifying the mandalas worshipped at Ellora. However, it is still possible to demonstrate the fundamental unity of the mandalas and shrine programs in Ellora’s latest Buddhist caves, numbers 11 and 12. The relationships between the two- and three-dimensional configurations are best expressed in diagrams, in which each figure is represented by the attribute it holds (when it can be determined).
If a further identification of the image is secure, its name is included as well.

First, the mandalas in Cave 12 may be reduced to a diagram (fig. 16) in which each horizontal row corresponds to a wall inside a shrine. In this diagram, the program of the first shrine on the second floor of Cave 11 (Shrine 11.2.1) is compared with the mandala. The illustrated comparison shows that the rear wall of the shrine, with a central Buddha image flanked by Avalokiteśvara to its right and Vajrapāni to its left, corresponds to the central row of the mandala. The bottom row corresponds to the right wall of the shrine. There the foremost Bodhisattva holds a flag or banner, as does the figure in the bottom left square in the mandala: these images are likely representations of Sarvanivaranaśīvakṣambhīn. The central figure on the right shrine wall and in the bottom mandala row holds a bud-like object. The last image on the right shrine wall, in the bottom right mandala square, holds a book on a lotus, a clear indication that the image represents the Bodhisattva Manjuśrī. Since these two rows are so similar, it is reasonable to expect that the top row of the mandala would correspond to the left wall of the shrine. The central figure in each is a sword-bearing Bodhisattva. If the bouquet (most visible in fig. 7) of the figure in the top left square of the mandala is taken to represent a branch of the nāgakesara tree, then the image may be associated with the rearmost image on the left shrine wall, whose dishevelled hair (kālikutā) adorned with a stupa, identifies him as Maitreya, who is depicted elsewhere at Ellora and in later images holding a nāgakesara branch. The top right square and front left wall figures are not identifiable, and their attributes do not appear to match.

The important point here is that, despite inconsistencies and blanks in the iconography, the patterns of the mandala and shrine correspond in most respects. While the inconsistencies are troubling from the point of view of twentieth-century art history, they appear to be the rule, not the exception for their period, as Granoff has clearly demonstrated.

In the shrines of the second and third floors of Cave 12 the pattern is similar, but a fourth Bodhisattva was added to each side wall, and, again, the attributes are not clear in every case. As the diagram illustrates (fig. 17), the basic mandala seems to have been the same, the invariable elements being the entire rear wall (the center of the mandala), Manjuśrī and Sarvanivaranaśīvakṣambhīn on the right wall (bottom of the mandala), and Maitreya and a sword-bearing Bodhisattva on the left.

These consistencies, together with similarities among the central shrine images in Caves 11.2, 12.2 and 12.3 (see below), outweigh the differences and problems of identification that may reflect the fluidity of an iconography being produced in stone for the first time. Thus images of Avalokiteśvara and Vajrapāni attending the central Buddha image in the shrines of Cave 11.2 must be included in the group so as to bring the number of Bodhisattvas to eight. By contrast, in the shrines of Caves 12.2 and 12.3, to include these figures would bring the total to ten. However, in the mandalas small attendant figures to the central Buddha image were included in the center square. It may be inferred that in Caves 12.2 and 12.3 their positions were represented by the large-scale images of Avalokiteśvara and Vajrapāni. This shift was then accommodated by the addition of another Bodhisattva on each wall to maintain a total of eight. From this functional perspective, iconographic problems can be viewed at least in part as the result of a larger set of spatial and sculptural problems that confronted the creators of the images. There clearly was a pattern that was to be followed, yet when translated into stone the pattern was changed slightly each time it was reproduced.

Mandalas, Shrines, and Caves

In the shrine of the first floor of Cave 12 the program diverges in significant ways from the basic mandala pattern. As the diagram (fig. 17) illustrates, the numerous shifts in position of Bodhisattvas include those of Manjuśrī and Sarvanivaranaśīvakṣambhīn, and Avalokiteśvara and Vajrapāni are absent. Moreover, the central image is a Buddha with hands held in the dharmacakramudrā gesture, not the bhumisparsamudrā one as in most of Ellora’s latest Buddha images.

Such significant differences in the program of the Cave 12.1 shrine would appear to have been deliberately introduced, if only because they are more numerous than differences among other contemporary shrines. Moreover, if this greater degree of variation in placement of images was deliberate, then the obvious question is what this means with respect to the overall iconographic scheme of Cave 12. A related
question is how such a three-part group of related but different mandala-shrines connects to the site as a whole. Tentative answers to these questions can be discovered by examining the varying shrine programs in Cave 12 together with those of the earliest caves, a connection made above with regard to the Cave 6 mandala and the program of Cave 2.

It is significant in this context that in some ways the program of the Cave 12.1 shrine is more like that of Cave 4 (ca. 650) than that of other caves. For example, Cave 4 is the only other one in which the shrine Buddha is not attended by Avalokiteśvara and Vajrapāni. Instead, in both Cave 4 and Cave 12.1 large chowrie-bearers, or nagas, stand behind the throne. Furthermore, the Cave 4 shrine dvārapalas are not the common pair (again, usually Avalokiteśvara and Vajrapāni). In Cave 4 they appear to be nearly identical—although not identifiable—Bodhisattvas. In the shrine of Cave 12.1, the shrine dvārapalas (guardians) are Maitreya to the left, holding a branch of the nāgakesara tree, and to the right Mañjuśrī holding a book on a lotus (upāla) (figs. 18 and 19).

Such similarities suggest that Cave 4 may have prefigured the program of the first floor of Cave 12. This possibility is important because it suggests a more extensive relationship between earlier and later caves. Thus Caves 4, 3, and 2 may have been members of a three-part set, arranged horizontally, analogous to the three vertically aligned levels of Cave 12. The similarity in the arrangement of Buddha images along the side walls of Cave 2 and the third floor of Cave 12 can then be seen to be part of a more systematic relationship between the earlier and later caves. Even Cave 3 and the second floor of Cave 12 are linked loosely by the fact that the shrine program in Cave 3 is very similar to that of Cave 2, just as the program of the second-floor shrine in Cave 12 is nearly identical to that of the third-floor shrine. Thus, Cave 4 would be equivalent to the first floor of Cave 12, Cave 3 to the second floor, and Cave 2 to the top floor.

In other words, Ellora appears to provide an example unique to the Indian subcontinent of architectural attempts to transform a threeteried (and thus multidimensional) mandala into a structural form. As Paul Mus demonstrated in his study of Borobudur, a similar attempt was carried out in great detail at a somewhat later date in Java. At Ellora, by contrast, the logic behind the plan may be inferred, but there the rock-cut mandalas offer at best a limited text upon which to reconstruct the origin of its programmatic arrangements.

**The Buddha Image**

In the preceding discussion attention was focused on the arrangement of Bodhisattvas in the mandalas and shrines of Ellora's latest Buddhist caves. However, as noted, the central and thus ritually most important image in all cases is a Buddha, whose form varies as do those of the Bodhisattvas. Thus, to understand the nature of the mandala it is necessary to explore the nature of its central deity, to whose worship the mandala is ultimately dedicated.

Variations in the iconography of the Buddha images and the continued difficulties presented by the absence of an adequate textual background impede a precise identification of the mandala's central image. Yet, the identity of at least some of the central Buddha images can be determined. This identification in turn clarifies to some degree the problem of identifying the sort of mandala represented and worshipped at Ellora.

The focus of worship in nearly every shrine in the Buddhist cave sites of the western Decan is a Buddha image. Such images were commonly portrayed with hands held in the dharmacakramudrā gesture, from the late fifth-century caves at Ajanta to the sixth-century caves of Kanheri, Nasik, and Aurangabad to the seventh-century caves of Ellora, such as Caves 6 and 2 (fig. 20).

Although the appearance and dissemination of images displaying the dharmacakramudrā gesture has now been documented there is no consensus about the identity of images exhibiting it. The simplest interpretation, that it is a symbol of the first sermon, is not satisfactory when the gesture is repeated outside a context that includes depictions of other events in the life of the Buddha. On another level, a variant of the dharmacakramudrā gesture identifies images of Vairocana, one of the five Tathāgatas, who became prominent in Buddhist thought and iconography from the sixth or seventh century onward. This pañcatathāgata system was commonly portrayed at many sites in eastern India, but it was not represented at Ellora. However, it is still possible that the dharmacakramudrā Buddha images of Ellora were intended to represent Vairocana alone, not as part of the pañcatathāgata system.
As the eighth century began, when the latest Buddhist shrines at Ellora were being excavated, the focus of worship changed. The central Buddha images were no longer portrayed with hands held in the dharmacakra-mudrā gesture (with a few exceptions). 45 Instead they were carved with the right hand held in the bhūmisparśamudrā gesture. And just as the Buddha/Vairocana is identified by his dharmacakra-mudrā gesture, it is the Buddha/Akṣobhya who is identified by the bhūmisparśamudrā gesture. De Mallmann has pointed out that Akṣobhya with his hands held in this gesture specifically personifies Vajrāsana Buddha or Mārāvijaya Buddha. 46 According to the Sadhanamālā, the four Māras (who attempted to prevent the enlightenment of Śākyamuni) are shown supporting the throne of this Buddha (explicitly called Śākyamuni in one Sadhana), seated in the vajrāsana pose (vajraparyankāsana) with his right hand held in the bhūmisparśamudrā gesture. This gesture symbolizes the episode during his final meditation before enlightenment, when the Buddha-to-be touched the earth in testimony to his righteousness. This type of Vajrāsana Buddha, according to the text, corresponds to a miraculous statue at Bodhgaya that represented the Buddha at the moment of enlightenment. 47

The description of Vajrāsana Buddha from the Sadhanamālā is very close to the iconography of central shrine images in Ellora’s latest Buddhist caves as in shrines one and three of Cave 11.2 (fig. 21), Cave 12.2, and Cave 12.3 (fig. 22). As noted already, the Buddha image is portrayed with right hand held in the bhūmisparśamudrā gesture, legs crossed in the vajraparyankāsana pose; the image is seated on a throne supported not by the usual lions but by four-armed dwarfs (figs. 22–25). These figures represent the four Māras, as described in the text discussed by de Mallmann.

To make the iconography more explicit, images were added on the floor of the shrine, just in front of the throne. To the left is an image of a woman offering a bowl (fig. 23). The figure has been identified as the earth goddess of the enlightenment episode. 48 The bowl is not a feature of that story. However, in another collection of Sadhanas, the earth goddess is equated with Vasudhāra, shown holding a pot and standing as witness against Māra. 49

To the right of the throne base is an image of a woman astride the back of a prostrate figure (fig. 24), most likely representing Aparājīta’s conquest of Gaṇapati—not a narrative element in the enlightenment story, but instead a symbol of the essence of the story, the triumph of good over evil. 50

In the shrine of Cave 12.2 the female imagery of the Buddha image’s throne repeats the symbols already found in Cave 11.2 (figs. 25 and 26). Here the throne base was not completely carved: the stone is still rough and the dwarfs are missing. However, both the earth goddess and Aparājīta are present. Aparājīta’s stance, lunging with a sword in her upraised hand, is similar to the poses of later, eastern Indian images. 51

In Cave 12.3 (figs. 27 and 28), all of the elements—four-armed dwarfs, earth goddess, and Aparājīta—are present. Four-armed dwarfs as throne-bearers are otherwise absent in the western caves but are relatively common in eastern Indian Buddhist sculpture of the eighth century and later. 52 These figures are occasionally found in compositions that include a female figure offering food in a bowl, always associated with images of Buddha in the bhūmisparśamudrā pose. 53

Although the Ellora images are comparable in iconography to those from eastern India, the transformation of the sculpture into three dimensions, with the earth goddess and Aparājīta placed forward from the throne, is certainly an innovation unique in surviving monuments. It underscores the importance of the third dimension in the sculptural conception of work at Ellora.

In certain respects, the closest source of comparison for these Ellora images is a stele from Kurkihar (Gaya District, Bihar) (fig. 29), now in the Indian Museum, that depicts a Buddha in the bhūmisparśamudrā pose. 54 The image is attended by Maitreya, a stūpa in his hair and a branch of nāgakesara flowers in hand; and Avalokiteśvara, holding a lotus in his left hand and wearing a small image of Amitābha in his hair. The throne is supported by elephants at each front corner and by a front-facing lion in the center (see detail, fig. 30). Between the elephants and lion are images of the earth goddess offering a bowl to the Buddha, and Aparājīta astride a dwarfish elephant. This image is one of the very few that depict two female figures. 55 The parallel to Ellora’s latest Buddhist shrine images is all the more striking, given the relative rarity of iconographically “complete” versions of this icon.

In other respects, however, Ellora’s sculptures of the Buddha in the bhūmisparśamudrā pose correspond only partially to comparable images and texts. Thus, while the attending pair of Maitreya and Avalokiteśvara found in the Kurkihar stele corresponds to the textual description
of the Vajrásana Buddha, at Ellora the attendants are nearly always Avalokiteśvara and Vajrapāni. In fact it is only in Cave 5, one of Ellora’s earliest Buddhist excavations, that Maitreya and Avalokiteśvara are clearly paired, as dvārapālas, and there the shrine image is a Buddha in the dharmacakramudrā pose. Such discrepancies suggest that the iconography that developed at Ellora could not have followed texts exactly like those available today, or more importantly, like those that inspired Buddhist sculpture at a slightly later date in eastern India. At the same time, many elements present in later texts and images are present at Ellora, but in simpler forms, organized differently. Yet the remarkable similarity between throne-base figures in the Ellora and Kurkihar images, together with the correspondence between the latter and a text describing an image of Vajrásana Buddha/Aksobhya, suggests that this is the icon represented at Ellora in Shrines 11.2.1 and 11.2.3 and in Caves 12.2 and 12.3.

However, as suggested above, the equation is further complicated by the fact that other Buddha images in important positions in these caves do not display the bhūmisparsamudrā gesture. Thus the image of the central shrine in Cave 11.2 (Shrine 11.2.2) holds its hands in the dhyānamudrā gesture, the one most commonly associated with the Tathāgata Buddha, Amitābha, as do the central Buddha images in all Cave 12 mandalas. The central Buddha image in the shrine of Cave 12.1 holds its hands in the dharmacakramudrā gesture. As noted above, an image of Śākyasimha/Mahāvairocana in the dharmacakramudrā pose is the central image in the Durgatiparipūṣodhanamandala as described in the Nispannayogavārttika. This mandala includes a group of eight Bodhisattvas and, among many other figures, a group of twelve females that appears to have a counterpart on the third floor of Cave 12. In other words, the iconography of Buddha images in Caves 11 and 12 suggests that elements of worship of both Aksobhya and Vairocana were present in the mandala used at Ellora, but not in the order found in comparable images or texts.

Conclusion

This “archaeological” exercise has explored the central elements in the main worship areas in Ellora’s Buddhist caves. At an early stage, a mandala focused on Vairocana determined the iconography of Buddha images in the dharmacakramudrā pose in excavations such as Caves 6 and 2. The importance of the mandala itself, attested by its rock-cut forms, continued to a later stage, in which the focus of worship changed. In the later mandala, the āstābodhisattva group was prominent, as the large-scale Bodhisattva images in the Cave 11 and 12 shrines affirm. In addition, the central Buddha image was generally Māravijaya Buddha/Aksobhya, even though representations of other Tathāgatas continued to appear. It seems that the mandala in question may have been one similar to the Durgatiparipūṣodhanamandala, but with important elements found in textual descriptions of other icons.

More important, given the unsatisfactory results of a purely textual approach to the problem, are the results of an “archaeological” methodology, in which the site is viewed as its own text. This approach reveals that Ellora’s earliest Buddhist caves provided a precedent for the use not only of a mandala but of a three-tiered path of worship. In the early caves the path was horizontal, passing from Cave 4 to Cave 3 to Cave 2. In the latest excavation, Cave 12, a greater familiarity with the possibilities of multistory work was applied to the expression of an intricate symbolic system.

In the absence of more comparable written material Ellora must remain its own text, preserving a record of worship more complex than that found at contemporary sites, and one that anticipated developments that would be better documented and preserved at later Buddhist centers elsewhere in India and abroad.
Notes


2. For the historical background and relative chronology of the Buddhist caves at Ellora see G. H. Malandra, “The Buddhist Caves at Ellora” (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1983), chaps. 1–3.

3. Still the best description and history of this development is to be found in P. Brown, *Indian Architecture*, 3rd ed. (Bombay, 1956).


7. A. Foucher, in his *Étude sur l'iconographie bouddhique de l'Inde*, 3 vols., (Paris, 1900–1905), was among the first to demonstrate the usefulness of examining texts together with images to improve the understanding of both.

8. The best description of the use of mandalas in Buddhist meditation is found in G. Tucci, *The Theory and Practice of the mandala* (New York, 1970), although it does not refer specifically to mandalas such as those found at Ellora. At Ellora it is clear that iconographic details must have been painted as well as carved in the caves (see figs. 9 and 10, in which painted traces of attendant figures and garment details are discernible).

9. As the plan (fig. 5) of Cave 12 shows, the mandalas were carved on walls in the front section of the first floor and in the cell cut on the right (south) side of the excavation, halfway between the first and second floors. Burgess, *Report on the Ellora Cave Temples*, pp. 16–17, described the mandalas, speculatively assigning names to the figures in them: “Which of the Bodhisattvas each of these is we can hardly say, but the corner four may perhaps be Ratnapāṇi, Ghanṭapāṇi, Maitreya and Samantabhadra. . . . But whatever be their names, they correspond with the standing figures we meet with so frequently in the shrines at Ellūra, arranged side by side along either wall.”


11. See Malandra, “Caves,” pp. 142–52, for a detailed description of Cave 6. Given the lack of correspondence between the Cave 6 mandalas and the program in the cave itself, the mandala-shrine analogy cannot be drawn very far in this case. However, as the earliest Buddhist cave at Ellora, Cave 6 includes iconographic features other than the mandalas that correspond to features in other caves. Among these are images of Tārā and Mahāmāyā located at the ends of the shrine’s antechamber (ibid., figs. 38 and 39) and an image of Tārā carved on the left front shrine wall (ibid., fig. 414) that correspond to images in Caves 2 and 8. I believe Cave 6 is best viewed as a seminal excavation whose features anticipated elements of later caves, in which they were arranged differently as the iconography evolved during the seventh century. Walter Spink has pointed out to me the resemblance between these groups and painted groups of Buddhhas on the shrine walls of Cave 2 at Ajanta.

12. See *ibid.*, pp. 142–52, for a description of Cave 2.

13. *Ibid.*, fig. 415. The left hand clearly rests in his lap, with some stone connecting it to the right arm. The right arm, partially broken just above the wrist, appears to be too low to have been raised in the abhayamudrā gesture.

14. For a complete description and discussion of Cave 12, see *ibid.*, pp. 245–62, and for the third floor pp. 258–59 and figs. 370–78.

15. As described in *ibid.*, p. 257, in addition to these nine Buddha images, fourteen more are found in Cave 12.3, seven on the left and seven on the right rear wall of the hall. It is likely that as a group these images would fit into accessory rings of deities in a mandala, but to my knowledge, groups precisely like these are not described in extant texts. Moreover, the identification of the groups themselves remains unclear. See Burgess, *Report on the Ellora Cave Temples*, pp. 19–20, and Gupte, *Iconography*, p. 179, where the seven figures at left are identified as the six past Buddhas and the Buddha of this age (distinguished by trees growing above their heads); the seven figures on the right are identified as “Jina” Buddhas, but ordinarily there are only five or six, leaving the identification in doubt.

16. Cave 11 was excavated several years prior to Cave 12; Cave 11.2 was the last floor on which sculpture was carved. See Malandra, “Caves,” pp. 220–44.

18. See notes 11 and 15. For a detailed discussion of these aspects of Ellora's Buddhist iconography see Malandra, "Caves," chap. 4. Within the shrines themselves, images of Jambhala and Tārā were carved on the front wall (that is, the wall facing the Buddha image), on either side of the door. They are comparable in size to the Bodhisattva images. Their absence from the two-dimensional mandalas, however, suggests that they were not as important as the Bodhisattvas.

19. P. Granoff, "A Portable Shrine from Central Asia," Archives of Asian Art 23 (1968–69), pp. 80–95, discusses several Central and East Asian examples. In a short response Pratapaditya Pal noted several other examples of asṭākṣobhīṣataṁ maṇḍala images, including a sixth-century circular terracotta plaque from Uttar Pradesh and a ninth-century bronze stūpa from Kurukhār ("A Note on the maṇḍala of the Eight Bodhisattvas," Archives of Asian Art 26 [1972–73], pp. 71–73). These examples show that Ellora’s maṇḍalas are neither the earliest nor absolutely unique in the Indian context, yet the small number of others that can be cited underscores their relative rarity.

20. The Niṣpannaḥaggaṇḍālakāra describes many maṇḍalas, which are conveniently summarized in de Mallmann, Tantrisme, pp. 41–82. Other Sanskrit sources include the Kriyāṣaṅghraha and the Sādhanaṇamāla. An important source is the Aṣṭamaṇḍalakāraśī, translated into Chinese by Amoghavajra in the mid-eighth century (Granoff, "A Portable Buddhist Shrine," p. 88).

21. Loss of distinctive skin color removes a key element in the identification of Bodhisattvas. Some paint is preserved in the shrine areas of Cave 11.2 and Cave 12, but where the coating of dirt and soot does not obscure it, the only pigments still visible are green and dark red, found on all images whose paint has been preserved. In most cases the thick coat of plaster that was applied to the faces of images to fill out contours has disintegrated completely.

22. For example, certain forms of Samantabhadra, Mañjuśrī, and Sarvanivaranaśvākimādhukī may all hold a sword; see de Mallmann, Tantrisme, p. 15.

23. Ibid., p. 127.


26. Granoff, "A Portable Buddhist Shrine," pp. 92–93, suggests that "the power of the eight bodhisattvās lies not within their identity as one or another bodhisattva, but is more related to a general conception of the efficacy of a group of four or eight beings as protectors. The reason for their potency seems, moreover, to be connected with the directional or astronomical symbolism of quadruples."

27. The shrine program of the third shrine on this floor (11.2.3), not illustrated here, is the same except for an alternation of positions on its left wall: at top Maitreya (jatāmukūṭa/stūpa), then a flower, then a sword.

28. Gupte, Iconography, identifies this figure as Jñāna-ketu, the only Bodhisattva besides Dhvajāsena assigned a dhvaja (de Mallmann, Tantrisme, p. 157). However, if the object the image holds is identified as a pūtaka (banner), the figure may be taken to represent Sarvanivaranaśvākimādhukī, although his banner is ordinarily surmounted by a vīśvavajra, not evident in any of the relevant images at Ellora (ibid., p. 12). Granoff, "A Portable Buddhist Shrine," p. 88, identifies the Ellora image as Sarvanivaranaśvākimādhukī on the basis of descriptions in the Aṣṭamaṇḍalakāśī and the Taizōkai Jizōin. This identification has the further, if still inconclusive, advantage that the name appears in several lists of Bodhisattvas, whereas Jñānaketu’s does not.

29. The problems inherent in identifying individuals in these groups are well illustrated by this figure. Granoff calls it "Avalokiteśvara (Samantabhadrā)?" ("A Portable Buddhist Shrine," p. 88) but notes the "curious deviation" of two appearances of Avalokiteśvara in the maṇḍala (p. 90). Gupte also identified the image as Avalokiteśvara (Lokanātha) (Iconography pp. 49–52). In the nine-part maṇḍala this duplication is difficult to understand. However, in the shrines of Cave 12 there are four, not three Bodhisattvas on each wall. In this case, a form of Avalokiteśvara might be expected among the eight (pp. 10–11). Many other Bodhisattvas may hold a lotus (de Mallmann, Tantrisme, pp. 17–18). However, given the evidence at hand, an informed choice cannot be made in this case.

30. De Mallmann, Tantrisme, pp. 250–57. In her earlier monograph on Mañjuśrī, Étude iconographique sur Mañjuśrī (Paris, 1964), de Mallmann refused to consider the problem of the origin of Mañjuśrī’s iconography (pp. 18–19). She therefore ignored images clearly recognizable as Mañjuśrī in terms of her own iconographical standards found at Ellora in Caves 10, 11, and 12 (see Malandra, "Caves," pp. 324–32).

31. According to Granoff, "A Portable Buddhist Shrine," p. 88, this figure is Akāṣagarbha, assigned a flaming sword in the Mahakalārūḍhaśāristabodhisattva. However, Akāṣagarbha is portrayed elsewhere holding a cintāmaṇi (ibid., p. 91; Huntington, "Shosonzuzō," p. 302). And many other Bodhisattvas, including Samantabhadrā and Sarvanivaranaśvākimādhukī, also hold swords (see note 22). Gupte identifies the figure as Śhiracakra (Iconography, pp. 49–52); this figure does not appear in the common lists of multiple Bodhisattvas. Granoff identifies the sword-bearing Bodhisattvas in the Nelson Gallery maṇḍala as Samantabhadrā, where Akāṣagarbha is portrayed holding a cintāmaṇi (pp. 90–91).

32. G. Bhattacharya, "Stūpa as Maitreya’s Emblem," in The Stūpa, Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance, ed. A. L. Dallapiccola (Wiesbaden, 1980), pp. 100–101, points out that iconographic texts mention the nagakesara flower but not the caitu, although both are found on many mediaeval images of Maitreya. The nagakesara flower is best seen in Bhattacharya’s pl. 10, illustrating an eleventh-century Maitreya sculpture from Bihar. An image of Mañjuśrī holding a branch of the nagakesara flower appears on the left, as dvārapala to the shrine in Ellora’s Cave 12.1 (fig. 18). To my knowledge, the attribute at Ellora has not been discussed before. See Malandra, "Caves," pp. 301–3.
33. Gupte, *Iconography*, pp. 49–52, unaccountably identified the image in the *mandala* as Rakta-Lokesvara, which would add a third form of Avalokitesvara to the group. Gupte thought the comparable figure in the Cave 11.2.1 shrine was Samantabhadra (pp. 44–45). Granoff, “A Portable Buddhist Shrine,” p. 88, identified the *mandala* figure as Ksitigarbha, on the basis of the attribution to him of a lotus in the *Mahāvairocana-abhisambodhisastra* and in the *Amoghapāśa-sūtra*. However, neither in the *mandalas* nor in the shrine images at Ellora does the figure in this position hold a clearly depicted lotus.


35. See below for a discussion of the Buddha imagery associated with the *mandalas*.


37. A similar interpretation has been suggested to me by John Huntington (private correspondence, 14 October 1980).


42. Weiner, *op. cit.*, pp. 56–63, offers a discussion of this development in relation to the textual tradition.


44. This seems to be the position advanced by Huntington, “Cave Six at Aurangabad,” pp. 50 and 54, and in letter of 14 October 1980.

45. Most notably, the central Buddha image in the second (center) shrine of Cave 11.2 holds its hands in the *dhyanamudrā* gesture; the shrine image in Cave 12.1 holds its hands in the *dharmacakramudrā* gesture. Gupte, *Iconography*, pp. 59–68, may be consulted for a tabulation of gestures. See Malandra, “Caves,” for discussions of individual images.


48. Mitra, *Buddhist Monuments*, p. 186. Alternatively, the image might represent Sujātā, who offered food to the Buddha at another juncture in the enlightenment episode. This is the identification proposed by de Mallmann, “Les bronzes,” pp. 142–44, but without extensive documentation.


50. According to the Sadhanamala, Aparājītā is portrayed trampling on Gaṇapati; she is the destroyer of all wicked beings (de Mallmann, *Tantrisme*, p. 103). As B. Bhattacharyya, *The Indian Buddhist Iconography* (Calcutta, 1958), pp. 245–46 and figs. 189 and 190, points out, images from eastern India clearly show the figure trampling on Gaṇapati. Although the Ellora image does not portray Gaṇeṣa so clearly, other details confirm the identification of Aparājītā (see below).

51. *Ibid.*, fig. 189, provides a good example.

52. For example, a stele from Bihar, illustrated in R. D. Banerji, *Eastern Indian School of Mediaeval Sculpture. Archaeological Survey of India. Reports. New Imperial Series*, vol. 67 (Delhi, 1933), pl. 19b, where a single four-armed dwarf squats in the center beneath the lotus-shaped throne base; and a Buddha image from Ujani, illustrated in N. K. Bhattachasali, The *Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum* (Dacca, 1929), pp. 30–31 and pl. 8, where four small figures squat below the throne, two on either side of a *vajra*.

53. See Banerji, *op. cit.*, pl. 21b. More to the point is the discussion in de Mallmann, “Les bronzes,” pp. 142–44, where she writes that the dwarfs represent the four Mārās; the woman with the pot is Sūjātā, and all are added to the image to clarify the meaning of the image as a symbol of the *Māṇavijaya* and the *Mahabodhi*.

54. I am grateful to Janice Leoshko for directing my attention to this image and providing a photograph of it. The image was first discussed by A. C. Banerji, “A Buddha Image from Kurkihar,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. Letters* 3 (1937), pp. 53–54.


57. It is worth noting that Granoff, “A Portable Buddhist Shrine,” p. 90, believes the central figure in Ellora’s *mandalas* is Śākyamuni, despite the *dhyanamudrā* gesture, for three reasons. First, the historical Buddha is prominent in the cave sites; second, early Tibetan temples involve Śākyamuni surrounded by eight Bodhisattvas of the *Aṣṭamandala-kasīra*; third, Śākyamuni is the only Buddha mentioned in that text.
58. According to John Huntington (letter of 14 October 1980), Caves 11 and 12 were meditation halls for the worship of Vairocana, explainable by a text similar to the Sarvadurgatipariprathamanatantra. A mandala, perhaps related to this teaching, the Durgatipariprathamanatantra, is described in the Nispannayogavali, where the central deity is Sakyasimha/Mahavairocana with his hands held in the dharmacakramudrâ gesture (de Mallmann, Tantrisme, p. 62).

59. These figures, flanking the shrine entrance in Cave 12.3, have never been identified satisfactorily because their attributes are not completely preserved and because analogous groups have not been found at comparable sites. Since there are twelve figures, earlier attempts to account for them in relation to groups of female figures such as the five prajhâs of the Tathâgatas have been unconvincing (Burgess, Report on the Elura Cave Temples, p. 21; Gupte, Iconography, pp. 97-98). Instead, the figures may be explained more securely as Dhâranis, embodiments of magical formulae, who appear in groups of twelve both in the Durgatipariprathamanatantra and in a mandala for the worship of Dharmađhatu Vâgisvara (de Mallmann, Tantrisme, pp. 60, 79, and 150-51). For a more extensive discussion of this identification, see Malandra, “Caves,” pp. 369-72, where it is proposed in the broader context of female imagery at Ellora.
Fig. 1. Ellora, Cave 6 mandala.

Fig. 2. Ellora, Cave 12.1 mandala.
Fig. 3. Ellora, plan of Cave 6. (After Fergusson and Burgess.)
Fig. 4. Ellora, plan of Caves 2, 3, and 4. (After Fergusson and Burgess.)
Fig. 5. Ellora, plans of Cave 12. (After Fergusson and Burgess.)
Fig. 6. Ellora, plans of Cave 11. (After Fergusson and Burgess.)
Fig. 7. Ellora, Cave 12.1-2 mandalas, left (above) and right (below).
Fig. 8. Ellora, Cave 11, Shrine 11.2.1, Bodhisattvas on left wall.

Fig. 9. Ellora, Cave 11, Shrine 11.2.1, Bodhisattvas on right wall.
Fig. 10. Ellora, Cave 11, Shrine 11.2.1, Avalokiteśvara, left wall.

Fig. 11. Ellora, Cave 11, Shrine 11.2.1, Vajrapāṇi, right wall.
Fig. 12. Ellora, Cave 12.2 shrine, Bodhisattvas on left wall.

Fig. 13. Ellora, Cave 12.2 shrine, Bodhisattvas on the right wall.
Fig. 14. Ellora, Cave 12.3 shrine, Bodhisattvas on left wall.

Fig. 15. Ellora, Cave 12.3 shrine, Bodhisattvas on right wall.
If the *mandala* is divided into horizontal sections and the top and bottom sections are rotated ninety degrees, as shown below, each section then corresponds to a wall inside the later shrines:

**Center of *mandala***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVALOKITEŚVARA</th>
<th>BUDDHA</th>
<th>VAJRAPĀNI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Cave 11.2 Shrine**

- **Top of *mandala***
  - **Bouquet**
  - **Sword**
  - **Flame? Utpala?**

- **Bottom of *mandala***
  - **Manjūṣrī**
  - **Bud**
  - **Sarvanivarana-Viśkambhin**

![Diagram](image_url)

**Fig. 16.** Relationship between two- and three-dimensional *mandala* shrines at Ellora.
**CAVE 12.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVALOKITEŚVARA</th>
<th>BUDDHA</th>
<th>VAJRAPAŅI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAITREYA</td>
<td>MAṆJUŚRI</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWORD</td>
<td></td>
<td>SARVANIVARAṆAVIŚKAMBHIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEWEL?</td>
<td></td>
<td>OPEN LOTUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAVE 12.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVALOKITEŚVARA</th>
<th>BUDDHA</th>
<th>VAJRAPAŅI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAITREYA</td>
<td>MAṆJUŚRI</td>
<td>OPEN LOTUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>SARVANIVARAṆAVIŚKAMBHIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWORD</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAVE 12.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDDHA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPEN LOTUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAITREYA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARVANIVARAṆAVIŚKAMBHIN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOWER/BUNCH OF JEWELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAṆJUŚRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTUS BUD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 17. Ellora, Cave 12, Schematic view of shrine iconography.
Fig. 18. Ellora, Cave 12.1, shrine door, left dvârapala, Maitreya.

Fig. 19. Ellora, Cave 12.1, shrine door, right dvârapala, Manjuśrī.

Fig. 20. Ellora, Cave 2, shrine door and main Buddha image.

Fig. 21. Ellora, Cave 11, Shrine 11.2.3, Buddha image.
Fig. 22. Ellora, Cave 12.2, shrine. Buddha image.

Fig. 23. Ellora, Cave 11, Shrine 11.2.1, Earth goddess.

Fig. 24. Ellora, Cave 11, Shrine 11.2.1, Aparajita.
Fig. 25. Ellora, Cave 12.2, shrine, Earth goddess.

Fig. 26. Ellora, Cave 12.2, shrine, Aparâjita.
Fig. 27. Ellora, Cave 12.3, shrine, Earth goddess.

Fig. 28. Ellora, Cave 12.3, shrine, Aparajita.
Fig. 29. Buddha image from Kurkihar. Indian Museum.

Fig. 30. Buddha image from Kurkihar. Detail of Earth goddess and Aparajita.
AJANTA'S CHRONOLOGY: SOLSTITIAL EVIDENCE

BY WALTER M. SPINK

When visiting the Ajanta caves at the end of December several years ago I was struck by the fact that the rays of the morning sun fell almost directly upon the facade of Cave 19 (fig. 1), the beautiful caitya hall which lies close to the center of the site. Since the date of my visit was hardly more than a week from the winter solstice (22 December), it occurred to me that the cave may have been positioned intentionally so that the rising sun’s rays would be aligned with its axis at this significant moment in the year’s cycle. Certainly, of all the caves at the site, Cave 19 would be the prime candidate for such an orientation, since not only was it one of the few caitya halls (as opposed to vihāras) at the site, it was also the donation of the local king, Upendra-gupta of Rishika, whose enthusiastic piety was largely responsible for the renaissance of construction at the old site in the mid-fifth century after it had been dormant for several centuries. Furthermore, Cave 19 was one of the first excavations planned in this new Mahāyāna phase, and it would still have been possible to orient the cave in this special way, since most of the ravine’s arc was free of excavations at that time.

However, at the time I made these first observations, late in December, an imaginary line drawn from the just-risen sun through the center of Cave 19’s doorway, or the center of the caitya arch above, fell considerably to the left of the center of the tall stūpa within, and of the standing Buddha which fronts it. Although the displacement would have been slightly less on the day of the solstice, the sun would have still fallen more than a foot away from the center line of the image and stūpa. I was thus somewhat discouraged about the validity of my solstitial hypothesis. Nonetheless, when I was at Ajanta again the following winter (1983), I made it a point to be at Cave 19 at sunrise on the day of the winter solstice, so as to make a more precise determination of the sun’s position, and something very significant was revealed. The rays of the rising sun were indeed aligned—but only with the axis of the front portions of the cave. Adjusting for the slight difference (some 0.22 degrees) between the sun’s position now and its position when the cave was excavated in the 460s, it was right “on target.” In the fifth century the rays of the solstitial sun would have bisected precisely the two front pillars of the portico, the two sides of the cave’s doorway, and the two front pillars in the interior. As observed in 1983 the sun did not, however, strike the midpoint of the cave’s stūpa, as one would have expected. The stūpa in fact lies considerably to the right of the cave’s axis, which is established by the careful alignment of the portico, doorway, and front center pillars (figs. 3–5). This offset was clearly due to an error made in the initial stages of excavation, when the whole interior was skewed to the right. However, as shall be shown below, the error was eventually discovered and adjustments made to compensate for it at least partially.

It is equally clear that a similar error was made in laying out the cave’s facade, which was skewed to the left, in the opposite direction from the interior (see fig. 5). That the architects took particular pains to line up the portico in accordance with the solstitial sun’s position is clear from the portico’s rather drastically different alignment with the plane of the facade. At the same time, the inner plane of the facade wall was brought into alignment with the established orientation of other elements in the front of the cave.

We know that excavations such as Cave 19 were often roughed out before their various parts were defined precisely. The generous margins that were left as a matter of course when the cave was blocked out are certainly what made it possible to align the portico so exactly. A similarly precise alignment was not possible with the stūpa and its Buddha image, even though it seems evident that this was the desired result. The error that caused the misalignment of the stūpa is typical of the imprecision with which Cave 19, like all other relatively early Mahāyāna excavations at the site, was blocked out. Such errors become more comprehensible when we realize that the artisans who made these caves had absolutely no experience in excavation prior to their work at Ajanta, which, at the time Cave 19 was excavated, had barely begun. When we think of the problems that confronted these craftsmen when they faced the sharply vertical scarp for the first time, knowing that their efforts were to yield structures resembling “the palaces of the lord of
wonder,” we can only marvel at what was in fact achieved.

It is reasonable to assume that when Cave 19 was first begun, every attempt was made to orient it on exactly the right axis. Indeed, the fact that the whole cave was skewed a few degrees from the axis established by the surrounding cliff face seems to confirm our theory that the cave was solstitially oriented, since it is hard to think of any other reason for making such an unusual adjustment. But because of the excavators’ inexperience the facade soon got quite out of line, particularly as work progressed down to the lower levels. As we have noted, it flares out quite significantly on the left side, although it must be admitted that this is most evident in plan; when standing in front of the cave most people would never notice either this misalignment or that of the stūpa within—or, for that matter, the many such inaccuracies in this cave and elsewhere at the site. Since these various misalignments, which are particularly common in the earlier Mahāyāna caves at the site, in no way weakened the structure of the caves and were barely evident to the innocent eye, they were generally left as is. Only in instances where compelling reasons for correcting them existed were efforts made to do so.

The problem of aligning the stūpa properly turned out to be much greater than that of adjusting the orientation of the portico. It appears that when the vault of the interior was roughed out—the stone was removed through the large caitya window, and only at the upper level—the vault was angled a bit too far to the right. Because the cave is long in format, the very slight angling resulted in the block roughed out for the stūpa being placed off-center by a foot or more. This mistake in layout, like the corresponding angling-out of the cave’s facade, would hardly have been discernible to the naked eye when the excavation was at this stage. Indeed, even today it is very hard to see that the stūpa and its image are not properly aligned with the cave’s intended axis or that the parallel rows of pillars skew slightly to the right as they go back. It is only when we examine the alignment very carefully (as in fig. 3), or when we scrutinize Burgess’s plan (fig. 5), that it is evident.

We can assume that the misalignment was discovered when the time came for the stūpa to be defined in detail and supplied with its image. This would have been in about A.D. 469, a few years after the excavation had begun. Of course some adjustment was still possible, since the stūpa as well as the nearby apsidal pillars were still only blocked out. Thus it was possible to skew the stūpa slightly to the left by increasing its dimensions on that side and making it lopsided (see figs. 5 and 7). This in turn suggested a slight leftward shifting of the five apse pillars as well, possible because they, too, were still only roughed out and thus had extra margins on all sides. One can see that these five apse pillars, as a group, have been shifted very slightly (presumably, as much as was possible) to the left in response to the stūpa’s equally subtle reshaping. The desire to provide adequate spacing between the stūpa and the apsidal pillars may account for the slight reduction in the thickness of pillar L7 (fig. 8) and for the drawing-in of the stūpa’s right rear corner (fig. 7).

Possibly the very upper level of the triple-umbrellaed stūpa was moved slightly to the left along with the vault’s ridge-beam when these elements were detailed; this could not have been a very significant shift, however, or it would have resulted in an asymmetrical ribbed vault. Furthermore, there may not have been as much extra stone left here in the somewhat earlier, upper level of the excavation, as there was on the larger lower levels of the stūpa. In any case the lower levels of the stūpa are much more visibly adjusted. The dome, the drum, the garlanded harmika, and the angled base of the stūpa all are subtly asymmetrical, with more mass on the left than on the right, as can be seen if one bisects the stūpa with a line running from the very top through the midpoint of the relief with dancing dwarfs at its base (figs. 7 and 9). But even these leftward compensations were not sufficient to center the stūpa and its central Buddha image on the solstitial axis that determines the orientation of the front of the cave: the mistakes made in the blocking-out stage of the excavation were just too great. In excavations that were roughed out at a later date—in particular, those worked after the Hiatus that began in 472 as a result of problems besetting the Rishika king—planners were much more aware of such problems and had developed greater skill in laying out their interiors. Indeed, one can rather confidently distinguish between an early and a late excavation solely on the basis of the precision in measurement and execution revealed by their plans.

One further confirmation of the architect’s concern about the proper positioning of the image can be seen in the placement of the central standing Buddha image itself (figs. 7 and 9). It, too,
has been squeezed very subtly to the left, as if to eke out another couple of inches in the inter-
est of a better alignment. This very slight but nonetheless very significant adjustment leftward is revealed clearly when one compares the place-
ment of the Buddha’s feet to the positioning of the central scroll-panel that separates them from the dancing dwarfs beneath. By the same token, the small seated Buddha on the front of the *harmika* was also placed slightly to the left of a line that bisects the *stūpa’s chatras* and its base. Yet nei-
ther here nor in the preceding example is the dis-
placement to the left at all disturbing visually, nor is it even readily noticeable. That is, it appears that the architect who planned the cave had no wish to disturb the apparent symmetry that is so important to the cave’s inspired design, with its fine balance of decorative variety and formal or-
der. Instead, he effected a compromise between aesthetic considerations and the ritual desirability of a precise alignment for the *stūpa* and its image.

We can understand this architect’s predicament. After all, he had been specially chosen to work for the king, who took great pride in and lavished great expense upon his pious donations, as is attested by his inscription in the adjacent *vihāra*, Cave 17, where he speaks of his many costly benefactions.9

Given the absolute precision with which the portico, doorway, and the foremost interior pillars of Cave 19 are oriented to the position of the rising sun at the winter solstice, and considering that the adjustments in the disposition of the *stūpa* and the pillars in the cave’s rear can best (and, perhaps, only) be explained on the same grounds, one can hardly suppose that Cave 19’s “solstitial positioning” is merely coincidental, even though this conclusion introduces issues that have not before been considered with regard to this or any other cave site.10 But what must now remove any possible doubt that these issues are relevant is the fact that the other great new ceremonial center at the site—Cave 26—shows a related orientation, being positioned so that it is aligned with the rays of the rising sun at the summer solstice. On that day, the just-rising sun shines along the cave’s axis; its low morning rays, coming through the cave’s main doorway, fall directly upon the pedestal of the seated Buddha that fronts the *stūpa*.11

Scholars have generally assumed that Cave 26’s remote location, at the far western end of Ajanta’s dramatically curving ravine, was chosen because the cave was undertaken at a very late date, when there was no longer room for major excavations along the more central stretches of the scarp. The fact that the decoration of the cave is of a very developed type appeared to confirm the monument’s late date. Scholars further assumed that the monument had nothing to do with the Vākāṭakas, who are known from inscriptions to have been the overlords of this region when some of the more centrally located caves (*e.g.* 16, 17, 19) were created. Since Cave 26’s dedicatory inscription mentions only the Aşmaka the cave was thought to postdate the Vākāṭaka dominion over the site and to have no connection with that great house.12

As I have tried to show in a previous study, all of these assumptions are either completely incorrect or quite misleading. The evidence reveals that Cave 26 was actually one of the first Mahāyāna undertakings at the site, having been largely roughed out by 468 when its construction, like that of so many other caves there, was temporarily interrupted. The admittedly late character of the cave’s decoration is due to the fact that this splendid but superficial carving overlies a relatively early core and belongs to the post-Hiatus period, starting in 475, when the Aşmaka, having defeated the rival Rishika house, reestablished their control over the Ajanta region and took up work once again on their previously abandoned cave. The omission of any reference to the Vākāṭakas’ overlordship in Cave 26’s dedicatory inscription of A.D. 478 is understandable, since the Aşmaka minister to whom it refers was at that very moment fomenting a rebellion against the sovereign Vākāṭaka house, which was by then much weakened and had just come under the rule of Harisena’s inept successor.13

The most problematic aspect of the proposition that Cave 26, despite its late appearance, was actually one of the first of the Mahāyāna caves at the site is its remote location at the developing monastery’s western extremity (figs. 11 and 12). My explanation previously was that the donor (Buddhabhadra) may have wanted to develop the Cave 26 complex as the nucleus of a distinct, Aşmaka-connected enclave, quite separate from the rival enclave surrounding the other *caitya* hall, Cave 19, which was specifically connected with Rishika patronage. This was not an unreasonable hypothesis, but it was hardly supported by the sequence in which the large *viharas* near Cave 26 developed: the first of these (Cave 21) lies farthest away, while Caves 24 and 28, which lie closest to Cave 26, were the last to have been undertaken.
Thus, Cave 26 was not treated, at least at first, as "the devotional focus of a whole new series of caves (Caves 21–28) at the western extremity of the site," even though it might have acquired that function, had those caves ever been finished, because of its proximity to them.

The discovery of Cave 26's solstitial orientation provides a welcome answer to the question of why such an early excavation was placed at such a distant point along the scarp, when at the time it was begun there was still plenty of space available at the site's center. It is only at the site's western extremity that the sharp arc of the ravine face comes into the appropriate solstitial alignment, thus allowing an easy and straightforward placement of the caitya hall within it (fig. 11). Its location, like that of Cave 19, was expedient, requiring little adjustment to the plane of the cliff face, though a slight correction of axis was made to achieve the correct alignment.

Just as the insistent adjustments made in the course of the excavation of Cave 19 confirm the assumption that it was conscientiously aligned with the sun's position at the winter solstice, some quite major (and otherwise inexplicable) adjustments were made during the carving of the Cave 26 complex in order to properly align this other great caitya hall with the sun at the summer solstice. These adjustments involved the correction of the original orientation, established incorrectly when the upper wings of the complex (Caves 25 and 27) were excavated (fig. 13). As I have shown elsewhere, these upper wings were already well under way when the main cave's facade (which lies much further back) was finally cut.

It seems that when the complex was first begun, despite the intention to orient it precisely, it was not quite correctly surveyed; or if surveyed correctly, then excavated inaccurately, since the portions first cut are skewed somewhat to the right, as in the interior of Cave 19. Again, we can attribute this error to the extremely early date of these wings—it is quite possible that the preparatory cutting-back of the cliff face was begun during the very first year of Mahāyāna activity at the site, when the workers were still totally inexperienced. It is not the kind of error that was likely to occur a decade later, by which time spirit levels or similar devices must have been in use, to judge by the accuracy of alignment of this later work.

In Cave 26 the error in alignment was perpetuated when, as work on the cave complex continued downward in the normal fashion, the lower right wing (Cave 26RW) was begun (ca. A.D. 465). But it was corrected when the larger, later, and more important lower left wing (Cave 26LW) was begun about a year later. Apparently it had been discovered by this time that the orientation of the entire cave complex was a bit out of the proper solstitial alignment, and so the process of adjustment was begun. We can see that the rear walls of Caves 25 and 27 and all of the interior walls of Cave 26RW were aligned according to the new determination (fig. 13), which must have been calculated when the facade and interior of the central hall (Cave 26 proper) were begun, for work was going on simultaneously in all these areas. It is reasonable to assume that the original angling of the complex was discovered to be in error when the facade of the main hall was being roughed out in 465 or 466, three or four years after work at the site had begun. By then excavation technology had developed considerably and it was also much easier to make precise measurements and cuts, for the great mass of the cliff had been cut back. It must have been extremely difficult, by contrast, to define securely the first cuts on Caves 25 and 27, when the rock face was still in its natural state. This helps us to understand how the alignments of the first workers—who not only were completely new to this process but also had no precedents upon which to depend—may have gone awry. And we should also remember that, by and large, neither the original misalignment nor its subsequent correction is really noticeable (fig. 12); it is only where there are clear reference points, as at the intersection of the courtyard plinth of Cave 26 with that of Cave 26RW, that we realize how really drastic the misalignment was (fig. 16). Otherwise the discrepancies are far more obvious on plan than in the cave complex itself.

Probably because the excavators discovered the original misalignment and were careful to correct it before the roughing out of Cave 26's facade and interior space was very far under way, the solstitial orientation of the main hall's axis turned out to be very precise, quite in contrast to Cave 19's. Admittedly, the stūpa is positioned a few inches to the right of center (figs. 13 and 17), and it may be that only this amount of adjustment was required. This degree of shifting was possible, of course, because the stūpa in its roughed-out state would still have retained some extra stone to be cut away later. In fact the symmetry of the completed, highly ornate stūpa (fig. 18) is so precise that it is not likely that a shift of even
a few inches in its positioning would have been accidental. Of course, by the time this final work was undertaken in 477 or 478, such precision was no longer a problem; this was at the very end of the period of consistent activity at the site.18

Indeed, it is clear that the stūpa, although probably under excavation by the time the first phase of work on the cave broke off in 468, was not even fully roughed out until at least 475, the year in which work on the cave began again with the establishment of Aśmakas' dominance over the region. We can be quite sure of this because the three (now ruined) monolithic kneeling devotees seen at the front left of the stūpa base (figs. 19 and 20) are a characteristically late (i.e., 475 or after) feature.19 If the stūpa had been fully roughed out by 468, the stone from which these figures were later sculpted would have been cut away in the process of defining the floor level near the stūpa base. On the other hand, if my hypothesis is correct, such extra material apparently had been cut away on the right side of the stūpa, for there it was necessary to carve a group of the same sort of figures from a separate piece of stone and plug it into the floor (fig. 20). The presence of a socket in the floor, together with the fact that the lack of such a symmetrical arrangement at this point is unusual, makes it quite certain that such "loose" figures did once exist, even though they are now missing.

The question then arises why the socket for the "loose" group, presumably also comprising three kneeling devotees, is placed noticeably farther forward than the row of three monolithic figures (fig. 19). I would suggest that this is because the proposed new figures were in the "correct" (and typically post-475) position, somewhat in front of the image they are worshipping. On the other hand, the three monolithic figures at the left were cut, expeditiously, from the stone still remaining when excavation was interrupted in 468; and it is not surprising that this block of remaining material was roughly aligned with the front plane of the blocked-out stūpa, rather than extending very much forward from it.

On the basis of the above observations, we can tentatively reconstruct the stage at which Cave 26's excavation, at least in this area, was left when work ceased in 468. The stūpa must have been generally roughed out, but more had been done on the right side than on the left, where much of the stone near the floor level remained intact. Thus it is reasonable to assume that the main area of the cave, right down to the back of the hall (and behind the stūpa), had been blocked out at least. This being the case, the aisle walls and the pillars must have been largely blocked out as well, although they were still probably very rough; indeed, the typically late (post-475) projecting motifs on the pillars could not have been carved had the forms been too fully defined by 468 (fig. 17).

Cave 26's interior must have been penetrated by 464, if not earlier. We can be quite confident about this date, since cells—a relatively low-priority feature—were already being excavated in the cave's porch ends by 466. Moreover, the adjustments made to correct the improper angling established by the closely connected Caves 25, 27, and 26RW were almost certainly introduced by the planner when he was blocking out the facade of the main hall and starting to shape its vault. Thus it is reasonable to assume that the excavators had been at work on the interior of the main cave for some five years by the time that work was interrupted at the end of 468.

My contention that the basic layout of Cave 26 was formulated slightly earlier than that of Cave 19 of course runs totally counter to our first expectations, since, as I have noted, all of the decorative and iconographic forms on and in Cave 26 are post-475, while all such forms on and in Cave 19 (excepting the later intrusions) must have been finished by 472. Nonetheless, the hypothesis is supported by a number of compelling arguments.

Although it seems evident that the king of Rishika at a very early date had reserved the whole great arc of scarp (fig. 1) in which his four connected caves (Caves 17–20) lie, it seems clear that he gave highest priority to the excavation of the splendid vihāra. Cave 17. This may have been done in order to provide some housing for the monks at the site as quickly as possible, since during the first few years of activity at Ajanta not a single cave was completed.

It can be shown that Cave 17 must have been under way by 464 at the latest; indeed, Upendragupta's whole complex (Caves 17–20) must have been conceived, even if all of the four caves were not actually begun, at the same time that the other very early new (i.e., Mahāyāna) caves at the site were being developed. Certainly, it is hard to believe that Cave 26 would have been given such a remote location if Cave 19's site had not already been determined. Thus we can conclude that Cave 19 and Cave 26 were contemporary (and, solstitially speaking,
complementary) conceptions, even though the cutting of the Cave 26 complex (starting with the very early upper wings, Caves 25 and 27) was clearly undertaken first—perhaps as early as 462 and certainly by 463. Bureaucracy, as well as obviously detailed planning procedures, may have somewhat delayed the start of work on the Rishika king’s complex (Caves 17–20); or it may be that his many other pious commitments—indicated in his Cave 17 inscription—may have occupied his workers, his attention, and/or his funds elsewhere for a few years.

While Cave 17 was certainly under way by about 464, it is most unlikely that Cave 20 was started much before 466, judging from its plan and other features. Cave 19, in addition, shows no particularly early features; in fact, its court cells—admittedly among its latest elements—were not even started until about 470, as shown below. Although both its ritual importance and its positioning close to Cave 17 suggest that Cave 19 could hardly have been started later than Cave 20, excavation work on both of them may well have begun at the same time, as part of a new wave of enthusiasm on the part of Upendragupta. Of course a certain amount of planning (typically subject to change) must have been done on them both prior to the beginning of excavation, and in each case the scarp would have to have been cut back somewhat first; but assuming that these preliminaries were effected, work probably began on Cave 19 in 466. If its interior was penetrated at that time (the first work typically occurring at the upper level), with the rock being removed through the great arched window, then its excavation and decoration would have occupied some six years (from 466 through 471), a fairly lengthy period for such a small cave. We know that work did indeed continue until 471, because when the hard-pressed Rishika king had to abandon it at the end of that year portions of the courtyard and the court cell complexes were not quite completed, and a dedicatory inscription that was almost certainly intended for the recessed panel on the cave’s inner front wall was never engraved. Furthermore, there is no evidence whatsoever that the cave was ever used for worship; it shows not a trace of smoke deposits nor any breakage of plaster around its garland hooks and the like, a common phenomenon when caves were used for even a year or two. This is why Cave 19’s interior painting, which would by no means have taken more than a year or two to complete, was certainly not started before 470 and must have been largely accomplished in 471, a conclusion supported by a study of the painting (much of it by the same artists) in the same patron’s vihāras, Caves 17 and 20. By the same token, it is most reasonable to date the detailed decoration of the interior pillars and of the stūpa no earlier than 469, with much of the work carrying over into 470. The general shaping of the pillars—their blocking-out as square-based types—would therefore logically fall in or very close to 468.

By contrast, the two pillars (and two demipillars) of the portico (fig. 2), which would have been reached somewhat earlier in the course of excavation, have sixteen-sided bases, a mode that was sometimes chosen in or slightly before 467, when more elaborate alternatives to the “standard” early octagonal pillar were being sought. However, such sixteen-sided types apparently were never chosen for use in 468 or after, for by that time the relatively new square-based type had completely won the day for use in main porch and main interior colonnades.

These same considerations strongly suggest that at least some of the interior pillars of Cave 26 had been blocked out in the sixteen-sided mode by 467, thus establishing the design that would have been employed for the remaining pillars as well in order to maintain consistency, even though by 468 the “design of choice” would certainly have been the square-based variety. Such a reconstruction of developments seems reasonable, for if Cave 26’s interior was penetrated by 465 or 466 and the stūpa at its rear quite fully blocked out by 468, the pillars must have been at least roughly defined, too.

As for the four pillars of Cave 26’s porch, which have a square-based format, it may be that they were still quite undefined when work broke off in 468, and thus could be turned into au courant square-based types when work was resumed after 475. Even so, they are uncharacteristically small in size (fig. 15), suggesting that when they were first blocked out, about 465, the intention may have been to cut them down to either the slenderer sixteen-sided forms that were briefly popular at that time, just before the new square-based type came to be universally preferred, or to early eight-sided forms.

Thus, a good case can be made for the Cave 26 hall pillars having been blocked out in their “earlier” sixteen-sided format a year or so before the Cave 19 hall pillars, which conform to the square-based mode that became standard a bit later. If this is true, then we would
expect the focal stūpa in Cave 26 to have been blocked out slightly earlier as well; there does seem to be reason to think that this was the case, inasmuch as Cave 19’s stūpa has a much more elaborate—one could say more developed—monolithic superstructure than that of Cave 26. It appears that at the time the Cave 26 stūpa was roughly blocked out in 466 or 467, the idea of carving the complex series of three umbrellas out of the living rock had not yet occurred to the excavators; otherwise that procedure, used so effectively in Cave 19 in about 467–68, would have been followed.

We should also note that Cave 19’s stūpa was attended by two more or less life-size (but now nearly obliterated) guardians or devotees, which were carved from the projecting stone reserved on pillars L6 and R6 (fig. 8). These apparently once-impressive figures were obviously cousins of the almost free-standing figures, datable not earlier than 469–70, which attend the Buddha in this same patron’s Cave 17. The fact that such effective figures were not included in Cave 26 further indicates that its stūpa and nearby pillars were blocked out earlier than their counterparts in Cave 19.27

Similarly, one might well consider the projecting portico of Cave 19, which I have suggested was being roughed out in 467, to be a more complex and “developed” feature than the standard porch of Cave 26, which merely duplicates similar porches excavated in nearly all earlier viharas. Although the very early Cave 7 facade, with its doubled portico, proves that porticos were not a novel architectural development, the fact that the only other single portico at the site, that on Cave 1 (fig. 10), was certainly not begun prior to 467 supports the reasonableness of the view that Cave 19’s portico is probably a later conception than that of Cave 26. The distinct similarities between Cave 1’s paired porch pillars, which would not have been defined before 468 at the earliest, and the paired pillars of Cave 19’s interior also support a relatively late date for the latter.

A particularly significant factor in this connection is the relative thickness of the main front walls of the two caves (figs. 5 and 13). That of Cave 26 is remarkably thin given the size of the hall, and this is characteristic of the situation throughout the site up to about 466, by which time architects began to thicken supporting walls and pillars in general. In the Cave 26 complex this trend can already be seen at work in the treatment of the latest of the wings, 26LW, where all of the partition walls as well as the porch pillars are noticeably sturdier than their counterparts in the earlier right wing. Much evidence suggests that the left wing’s wall was not even reached until about 466, and it may have been left quite thick and untrimmed—often the case with front walls, which were usually low-priority features—until the final stages of this wing’s excavation, which occurred after the Hiatus, at a time when thick walls were standard.28

By contrast Cave 19’s front wall and interior pillars are remarkably thick relative to the size of the hall (fig. 5). This is very much in line with the trend that started about 466, although it may also reflect the architect’s dependence on the old Hinayâna Cave 9. The wall’s stability is further emphasized by its attached pilasters (also derived from Cave 9), clearly planned when the wall was roughed out in about 467 or, possibly, 466 (see fig. 2). Of course their decorative detailing would have been added a year or two later, when the carving of the whole facade was brought to completion, in a much earlier style than the facade of Cave 26. The latter did not receive any decorative detailing until at least 475, after the long gap in its donor’s patronage.

The assertion that Cave 26’s great hall was being blocked out somewhat in advance of Cave 19’s is supported by a study of their associated cells, since cells throughout the site have a very clear pattern of development, tellingly revealed in the changing character of their doorways and door fittings. Although the final smoothing and fitting-out of the many cells in the Cave 26 complex was done after the renewal of work in 475, all of these cells (except for the unfinished group to the left of Cave 25’s porch) had been shaped before the work was interrupted in 468. In fact, only two cells in the complex were cut out as late as 468: these are L1 and R1 in Cave 27RW. As the doorways of both these cells show (the evidence is particularly clear and complete in the well-preserved Cell L1) these cells incorporated the simple, monolithic, projecting (B-mode, as I have called them) fittings which came into use in that year. As we might expect, the cutting of the cells at the porch-ends of the main hall took precedence over the cutting of these cells in the wing and, as I have shown elsewhere, can be assigned to 466 and 467.29 Thus a date of 465–66 for the blocking out of the porch, the initial penetration of the interior at the lower level (through the main and aisle doorways), and the resulting roughing-out of the thin front wall would seem correct.
The correction of the angle of the main cave must have been effected at this same time, probably in (but not earlier than) 465. Of course the roughing out of the upper levels of the façade must have been under way by 463 and the initial rough penetration of the cave’s vault by 464, since the excavation of these areas must have occurred simultaneously with the opening up of Caves 25 and 27. However, the work that had been done on the main cave by 465, when the misalignment was discovered, would still have been in the blocking-out stage, thus allowing the necessary realignment to be accomplished quite simply, merely by cutting back the main façade plane more on the right than on the left.

Significantly, there is one area of the main cave that still appears to follow the older, inaccurate alignment. This is the upper façade return on the right, the original surface of which has been much cut away (in ca. 479) by the addition of a huge inscribed (and intrusive) standing Buddha image. (This figure is barely visible in fig. 12; it is opposite the similar figure seen in fig. 15.) It is evident that this surface was roughed out parallel to the similarly misaligned plane of the left wall of the adjacent Cave 25, and probably at the same time (ca. 463), during the early stage of working the main cave’s façade. But why was it left as it is, instead of being realigned in ca. 465 with the rest of the roughed-out façade? Actually, there may be a number of reasons: first, cutting it back would have reduced the width of the face of the façade frame, creating an imbalance in the symmetrical design of the cave front; second, the necessary cutting back toward the front would have weakened the already thin wall that separates Cave 26 and Cave 25 at this point; or third, one could easily get away with leaving it as it was, since the misalignment was neither readily noticeable nor (in this minor area) important.

By contrast, the left upper façade return (fig. 15), which one can assume was once cut roughly parallel to that on the right, has been realigned; but here the misalignment (involving an obtuse junction with the realigned main façade plane) would have been more obvious. Moreover, its recutting (as opposed to that of the right return) involved trimming the rock back toward the rear rather than having to reduce the façade frame. Finally, there was no difficulty with the intervening wall since there is a large amount of rock between the plane of the return and the adjacent Cave 27.

As we would expect, the great arch and the surrounding main façade plane are properly aligned now even though they would have been wrongly angled when first blocked out. It was obviously an easy matter to trim this area back as much as was needed because of its thickness. Of course, the decoration is all post-Hiatus in date; but we can be quite sure that the plane into which this decoration is cut was smoothed down some time between 465, when the misalignment of the cave was discovered, and 468, when work was interrupted by the Recession of that year. Had it not been fairly well smoothed and ready for sculptural decoration when work started up again in 475, it would have been carved to a more consistent level, without all the “wows” and “waves” of quality so characteristic of the first years of Mahāyāna activity at the site. In fact the unevenness, which the surfacing of later sculpture by no means obscures, would seem to suggest a dating of 466 for the smoothing of the façade rather than one of 468, although this cannot be conclusively shown. However, it is perfectly reasonable to think the façade was smoothed down at the same time that it was being realigned; and it is reasonable, too, to believe that the façade had received its final shaping by this date if we accept that the whole interior was already pretty well roughed out by the time work was interrupted in 468.

As for the lower extensions of these return walls, which coincide with the pillared ends of the porch cells, they were probably not even roughed out until the cave’s realignment had been effected, and so it is not surprising that they are carefully aligned, as is the porch’s main (rear) wall and its colonnade.

Whereas a study of Cave 26’s cells supports the relatively early dating of the roughing out of the hall, the evidence of Cave 19’s cells allows, even suggests, the conclusion that Cave 19’s roughing out lagged behind somewhat. These cells contain a significantly more developed form of door fitting—one having a monolithic projection for the pivot both above and below—than those we see in the Cave 26 complex; and these features (which I have categorized as C-mode fittings) were carved at the site only during 470 and 471. Furthermore, these cell complexes, like so much else in the courtyard, were never quite finished, work having been interrupted by the Hiatus.

Since the last stages of the carefully programmed work on Cave 19 (involving the carving of the court cell complexes and the trimming of some of the still unfinished areas of the courtyard floor and walls, as well as the final detailing and painting of the cave’s façade and interior) were under way
in 470–71, the suggestion that the major features of the interior (stuipa, pillars, vault, and so on) were more or less fully defined by 468–69 is eminently reasonable, as is the conclusion that first exposure of the facade (at its upper levels) and the penetration of the interior at the vault level was started in 466. Although it may have taken a year or so after work first began to cut back the massive scarp, and although, as I have suggested, plans for the cave may well have been laid as early as 462, when the site’s renaissance began, the actual creation of the hall can be dated with some confidence from 466 through the year 471.

From 472 on, Cave 19 lay unattended and unused. This may have been because the new Aśmaka rulers did not wish to associate themselves in any way with a monument of the very king who had apparently been their conqueror just a few years before. In fact, the Aśmakas, once they had solidified their victory (by 475), cut a path right through Cave 19’s courtyard, destroying two of the still unused court cells in the process (fig. 2), in order to provide easier access between the central area of the site and their great Cave 26 complex to the west, by this time under construction again. By 478, when all of the original program of patronage at the site ended, the monk Buddha-bhadra, Cave 26’s patron, who claimed close connections with the Aśmaka court, 31 had essentially finished decorating the main hall (Cave 26 proper) inside and out. He had also completed most of the newer and more up-to-date left wing (Cave 26LW), although only a small amount of additional work had been accomplished on the rather old-fashioned and still very rough other wings of the complex (Caves 25, 27, and 26RW).

The wealth of decorative detail and of Buddha imagery applied to the Cave 26 complex between 475 and 478, while it was still only roughed out, certainly justifies viewing this great monument as a very late one, considerably more developed ornamentally than Cave 19, which had been abandoned by 472. Yet, when we look more closely at the Cave 26 complex, it is evident that its basic shape and structure were almost totally defined earlier than this, probably by the time work was so dramatically interrupted at the end of 468. Needless to say, this sometimes caused problems for the artists responsible for Cave 26’s later decoration.

In this respect the example of Cave 26’s main image, which can be dated to 477–78, is a most striking one (fig. 17). This image, and the almost exactly contemporaneous one in the imperial minister’s Cave 16, are the very first sculptural examples of the pralambapadāsana Buddha type, a particularly authoritative conception that became the “type of choice” in Ajanta’s Period of Disruption (479–80), then in late fifth- and early sixth-century sites in the Konkan (notably, Kanheri), and subsequently in the last half of the sixth and early seventh centuries at Aurangabad and Ellora, respectively.

I have elsewhere shown how the pralambapadāsana image in Cave 16 was carved in an area never originally intended for it, making it necessary to adjust the composition considerably: for instance, by making the flanking Bodhisattvas both unprecedentedly small and locating them expeditiously. A very similar situation can be seen here, for the context of the Cave 26 image was established a full decade earlier, just before work broke off in 468. Thus, the central stuipa, in which this important new image came to reside, was probably intended, in 468, to hold either a standing image (like that in the nearby contemporary and very similar stuipa in Cave 19) or a seated Buddha without standing attendants. No image conceived and made in or before 468 at the site (i.e., those in Cave Lower 6, the first phase of Cave 7, Cave 11, and Cave 15) had flanking Bodhisattvas. Of course, the Cave 26 sculptor made what adjustments he could when, in 477–78, he added his imagery to the previously blocked-out stuipa, but there was no way at that point to avoid the cramped effect caused by his disposition of the new type of main image (fig. 17) or to avoid relegating the by now conventional attendant Bodhisattvas to a very expedient and rather tenuously connected position just beyond the main panel’s pilastered enframement (fig. 19). 32

By contrast the other empanelled images of this type, carved in this same cave along the aisle walls in 478, 479, and 480 in distinct emulation of this new Buddha type, are more comfortable and indeed more conventional, for they were conceived without such compositional constraints (fig. 20). The most impressive image of this type and of this time is found in Cave 3 at Aurangabad (fig. 21), where both the Buddha and the Bodhisattvas are grandly, even regally, conceived. It is instructive for the art historian, who is sometimes too absolute in perceptions of “style,” to consider that the strikingly different pralambapadāsana images in Aurangabad Cave 3, Ajanta Cave 16, and Ajanta Cave 26 were all made at precisely the same point in time (477–78).
and under the same patronage. (One could cite hundreds of other—often extremely different—Buddha images of both this and the padmasana type, all conceived and carved at Ajanta within the four-year period from 477 through 480 to further complicate such a study of “style.”)

Almost the only part of Cave 26 (the main cave) not fully finished (not just carved but also painted) by the end of 478 was the wall of the so-called ambulatory. And it seems poignantly appropriate that the great dying Buddha there, the single most impressive image at the site, was never completed, as if presaging the death of the unfinished site itself (fig. 22). Not only was work on this beautiful image summarily abandoned just as its painting was begun, all of the original programs of excavation and decoration throughout the site (as opposed to the brief spate of intrusions datable to 479 and 480) came to a sudden halt at this very same time. Since we can infer from other evidence at the site that the great emperor Harisena had died only the year before (i.e., in 477), and, from the eighth chapter of the Daśakumāracarita, that the Āsmakas were responsible for fomenting a disastrous insurrection against his weak son and successor, it seems evident that it was the Āsmakas’ decision to prepare for war at this moment of dynastic instability that so drastically dried up Ajanta’s sources of both financial and political support, thereby diverting attention from any thought of either its further growth or its needs.

Admittedly, work of a sort continued at Ajanta briefly before the site was forever abandoned—at least as far as any further excavation, decoration, or image-making was concerned. But this reprieve lasted only a couple of years, which I have dubbed the “Period of Disruption.” During these anxious final years, approximately 479 and 480, a host of new donors, by and large the monks still resident at the site, sponsored great numbers of intrusive votive images, which were carved and/or painted wherever space was available on or in the previously carefully programmed caves. It was during this Period of Disruption that all of the haphazardly organized images, large and small, were added to the facade frames and to the facade returns of both Caves 19 and 26, destroying the intentional and effective symmetry of design that the original planners in both cases had maintained. In both caves, too, these intrusive images were placed in other still available spots as well: on the base of some of the facade pilasters and in the court complexes of Cave 19 (fig. 2), and under the great arch (fig. 15) and in the ambulatory of Cave 26 (fig. 20). This was done with little or no concern for the original patrons’ previously well-laid—and now totally abandoned—plans. It is significant that the latest of these intrusions—those carved at the very end of this short Period of Disruption—are very often unfinished. Often small and hastily executed, they represent the dying site’s last weak and failing breaths. By this time, war must have been flaring throughout the once great empire, which was soon to expire. And the great site, which Harisena’s imperial power had made possible, was soon to hear, once again, nothing but the “chirping of the birds and the chattering of the monkeys” of which Buddhhabhadra, the donor of Cave 25, in his still hopeful inscription, speaks.
Notes


2. The position of the sun as it appeared on the horizon was used for these observations; as it rises, it moves gradually to the west. I am grateful to Professor Richard G. Teske of the Department of Astronomy, The University of Michigan, for his generous advice about necessary astronomical calculations.


4. On the excavators’ inexperience, see Spink, “Politics and Patronage,” pp. 111-12. As an example, the original ceiling of Cave 4’s interior, upon which work was interrupted in 468, was more than two feet higher at the back than at the front! But when a new and higher ceiling was cut to replace it, in 475-76, it was perfectly aligned.

5. For the Cave 16 inscription see V. V. Mirashi, Inscriptions of the Vakātakas (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum) (Ootacamund, 1963), vol. 5, pp. 103-11.

6. The Hinayāna Cave 10 is angled even more vis-à-vis the plane of the cliff face, but I have not been able to discover the reason for this. The angled position of the cliff face of the very unfinished Cave 29 would be understandable if this cave, like Cave 26, was oriented to the summer solstice, but I have not yet been able to verify this. Since the position of the sun at the moment of sunrise depends upon the height of the horizon at the particular point in question, one would not expect Cave 26 and Cave 29 to be oriented in precisely the same direction even if both are positioned in accordance with the summer solstice.

7. For instance, the great central arch lies slightly to the right of the doorway beneath it—a misalignment that was perpetuated when the vault of the cave was excavated and the stūpa’s positioning established. A less significant but equally characteristic impression can be seen in the disposition of the small arches that embellish the roof motifs above the portico and the facade pilasters; by contrast, such minor motifs on the facade of Cave 26, decorated a decade later, are invariably better aligned.

8. Compare the plans of early excavations, such as Caves 16, 17, 11, and Lower 6, with late ones, such as Caves 21, 23, and 24. See also note 4. For a discussion of the abrupt abandonment of Cave 19 see W. Spink, “The Vakātaka’s Flowering and Fall,” in the proceedings of the “Age of the Vākājākas” seminar (Nagpur, 1984), forthcoming.

9. According to the Cave 17 inscription, “while the moon among princes, Harishenâ ... [was] protecting the earth. . . . [Upendragupta], who has a marvelous store of merit . . . adorned the earth with stūpas and vihāras.” See Mirashi, Inscriptions of the Vakātakas, vol. 5, p. 129.

10. It may be significant that concern about orientation remained very strong in the first half of the sixth century in the first great Hindu caves to have been excavated, namely, those at Jogeśhvara, Mandapeshwar, and Elephanta (both main and minor caves). All of these are carefully laid out facing east despite the considerable technical problems this must have created, particularly in the case of Elephanta Cave 1; see W. Spink, “The Great Cave at Elephanta: A Study of its Sources,” in Essays on Gupta Culture, ed. B. Smith (New Delhi, 1983), pp. 235-82. In later caves these concerns give way to expediency, the orientation generally depending on the position of the sparp.

11. My friend Mr. P. V. Sastrī, Custodian of the Ajanta Caves, made these observations for me.

12. It is for this reason that the Cave 26 dediatory inscription is not included in Mirashi’s Inscriptions of the Vakātakas, along with dozens of other inscriptions from the site.

13. A poignant hint of these new political realities is provided by the fact that the Vakataka minister, Varāhadeva, had to abandon his patronage of Cave 16 in this same year (478). A year or two later, the monk Dharmadatta, who had helped in the creation of the “Asmak“ Cave 26, was donating intrusive images in Cave 16, whose carefully developed decorative program was by then totally disrupted.


15. On orientation, see note 6. The spaciousness of this area, although not unique, must have been seen as a virtue of the location, too. Is it possible that this could have suggested something of the expansiveness of the project?

16. See Spink, “Politics and Patronage.” A detailed study of the early development of the Cave 26 complex has been included in a volume now ready for publication.

17. This can be checked at the summer solstice.

18. During 478, the year after Harisena’s death, the original program of work in Cave 26 developed consistently, probably because it was so closely associated with the regional rulers. In most other caves the patrons concentrated solely on finishing their shrine images at this time, a fact which surely reflected their concern about the political situation.

19. Cf. the projecting devotees in front of the main images in Ajanta Cave 1 (476), Cave 4 (477), in the Chatotakacha vihāra (477-78), and Aurangabad Cave 3 (477-78).

20. It appears that the unfinished Cave 29 was also undertaken in this early period, probably in 466, since its location between them best explains why Cave 21 (started 467/68) was placed so far from Cave 20. Work had been done only on Cave 29’s upper levels when it was abandoned, almost certainly due to the Recession of 468. Since the excavation of its vault abruptly ends just before the point where its stūpa would have been cut, it seems likely that this area was being reserved for a stūpa with an elevated series of monolithic umbrellas similar to Cave 19’s; this further supports the suggestion that both Cave 19 and Cave
29 were started well after Cave 26. The ribbing pattern in Cave 29's vault, already started when work was abandoned (i.e., in 468), also relates in both type and time to Cave 19's; Cave 26's pattern is rather different and, like all the rest of the detailing in that particular cave, must be dated after 475.

21. The doorway fittings, still not all in use by the time work broke off in 471, are of a type (C-mode) not even developed until 470.


23. For an analogous situation in Cave 1, see ibid., p. 121, and compare figs. 10 and 9 therein.

24. See Cave 20, Cave 2's porch, the porch of Upper Cave 6, and Cave 25.

25. Exceptions are found only in special areas, such as shrine antechambers; see Cave 23 for an example.

26. As is evident from Cave 19's ground plan (fig. 5), the inner surface of the cave's front wall—a low-priority area generally left quite thick and rough during the early stages of excavation—was not finished until after concern about the cave's orientation had manifested itself; this inner wall plane, as opposed to the outer one, is very evidently responsive to the new and proper alignment, which, as I have suggested earlier, may not have been effected until 469. This late date for its finishing may well explain why the wall is so surprisingly thick.

27. As has been pointed out above, the kneeling devotees are distinctly post-475 additions and are related to the groupings in Caves 1, 2, 4, the Chatotkacha vihara, and Auranagabad Cave 3.

28. The development of Cave 26 and its wings, both lower and upper, is discussed at length in a forthcoming study; brief reference to this issue is made in Spink, "Politics and Patronage," pp. 116–22.

29. Spink, loc. cit.


31. He claims to have been the close friend of the Asmaka minister not only in this life, but in many past ones. See the inscription of the monk Buddhadhara in Cave 26 in G. Yazdani, Ajanta, 4 vols. (London, 1955), vol. 4, pp. 114–18.

32. Large Bodhisattvas had flanked all shrine Buddhas carved since 468; here they had to be much reduced in size and placed at either side of the stupa's pilasters. A somewhat similar adjustment had to be made in the contemporary Cave 16 image, which was developed under somewhat similar restraints. See W. Spink, "Ajanta's Chronology: The Crucial Cave," Ars Orientalis 9 (1975), pp. 143–69.

33. The progress of work on Cave 26's ambulatory is discussed at length in a forthcoming study of Buddha images at the site. The fine "Temptation" panel, the series of seven Buddhas and Maitreyo on the right wall, and the best of the large Buddha panels (R2-4 and L8) can also be dated to 478; all other ambulatory panels are intrusive, dating from 479 and 480.


35. On the Period of Disruption, see Spink, "The Vâkâṭakas' Flowering and Fall."

Fig. 1. Cave 19 (Cave 18 at right; Cave 20 at left), Ajanta. Photo Asian Art Archives, The University of Michigan (AAAUM).

Fig. 2. Cave 19, Ajanta. Courtyard as seen from the passage to Cave 20 via broken cell L1 (AAAUM).
Fig. 3. Cave 19, Ajanta. View from court, down axis of portico, showing misaligned \textit{stupa} (AAAUM).

Fig. 4. Cave 19, Ajanta. View down axis of portico, showing misaligned \textit{stupa} (AAAUM).
Fig. 5. Cave 19, Ajanta. Ground plan. (After James Fergusson and James Burgess, *The Cave Temples of India*, London, 1880.)

Fig. 6. Cave 19, Ajanta. Longitudinal section. (After Fergusson and Burgess.)
Fig. 7. Cave 19, Ajanta. Transverse section, with side view and plan of stupa. (After James Burgess, Report on the Buddhist Cave Temples and their Inscriptions, Bombay, 1882.)

Fig. 8. Cave 19, Ajanta. Pillar L6 (with traces of standing attendant) L7, and L8 (AAAUM).
Fig. 9. Cave 19, Ajanta. Interior, view toward stupa (AAAUM).

Fig. 10. Cave 1, Ajanta, portico details now missing.
Fig. 11. General plan of the Ajanta caves. (After Burgess.)

Fig. 12. Cave 26 complex, Ajanta. Left and right wings (26LW and 26RW) flank main cave, with Cave 27 and Cave 25 above them. Cave 21 is at right, Cave 28 at extreme left (AAAUM).
Fig. 13. Plan of Cave 26 complex, Ajanta. (After G. Yazdani, *Ajanta*, vol. 4, and Burgess.)

Fig. 14. Cave 26, Ajanta. Longitudinal and transverse sections. (After Burgess.)
Fig. 15. Cave 26, Ajanta. View of main facade from court of Cave 25 (AAAUM).

Fig. 16. Cave 25, Ajanta. View showing junction with right end of porch of Cave 26 (AAAUM).
Fig. 17. Cave 26, Ajanta. Interior, view toward stupa (AAAUM).

Fig. 18. Cave 26, Ajanta. Three monolithic devotees at left of stupa (AAAUM).
Fig. 19. Cave 26, Ajanta. Interior. Stūpa front from right, showing devotees at left of stūpa and socket at front right. Note attendant Bodhisattva next to stūpa front's right pilaster (AAAUM).

Fig. 20. Cave 26, Ajanta. Interior. Right aisle, panels R1 (unfinished Buddha) and R2 (AAAUM).
Fig. 21. Cave 3, Aurangabad. Shrine. View to left rear, showing seated Buddha and attendant (Avalokiteśvara) at left (AAAUM).

Fig. 22. Cave 26, Ajanta. Interior. Lert aisle panel L1: the Parinirvāna (AAAUM).
BYZANTINE SOURCES FOR THE JAMI' AL-TAWARIKH OF RASHID AL-DIN

A new book presents its illustrators with the problem of assembling a suitable cycle of pictures. In the Jami' al-tawarikh, or Compendium of Histories, the artists of early fourteenth-century Iran found not only a new book, but a new sort of book, for the Jami' al-tawarikh includes the first true world history ever composed—the first to discuss all of the world known to its author, from China to Europe. This article deals with the iconography of the illustrations to a single section of that book, the part relating the stories of the Ancient Prophets (those who preceded Muhammad).

Rashid al-Din Faḍl Allāh Hamadānī, vazir to the Il-khānid rulers of Iran, Maḥmūd Ghāzān and Muḥammad Khūḍābāndah Uljaytū, completed the Jami' al-tawarikh sometime between 706 and 710 A.H. (A.D. 1306 and 1311). It consisted of four volumes, the first dealing with the history of the Mongols, the second with world history, the third (called the Shu'āb-i panjgānah in Persian) with the genealogies of the Arabs, Jews, Mongols, Franks, and Chinese, and the fourth (the Suwar al-aqāltm) with geography.1

The Jami' al-tawarikh was written originally in Persian and then translated into Arabic and Mongol.2 Many copies of the Arabic and Persian versions were produced and dispatched to the principal libraries of the Mongol empire. The production of these copies, like the composition of the text, took place in the Rub'ī Rashidi, a complex of religious and charitable institutions constructed outside of Tabriz by Rashīd al-Dīn himself.3 Rashid al-Din's execution in 718/1318-19 and the subsequent looting of theRub'ī Rashidi must have put an end to production of the Jami' al-tawarikh.

Rashid al-Din's sources included contemporary Mongol, Chinese, and Western books, along with scholars versed in the histories of the nations described. The earliest extant copies of the manuscript, produced under Rashid al-Din's supervision, introduce a radically new style into Persian painting, different from anything that had gone before.4 The "heavy linear drawing, vigorous rather than sensitive,"5 of the Jami' al-tawarikh gave way very quickly to much different styles that were the point of departure for later Persian painting. The artistic innovations of the early fourteenth century were recognized by later connoisseurs, one of whom wrote in 951/1544 that during the reign of Uljaytū's successor, Abū Sa'id Khūḍābāndah (r. 717-36/1317-35), "the master Ahmad Muršā, who was a pupil of his father, lifted the veil from the face of painting and invented the kind of painting that is current at the present time."6 The identification of Ahmad Muršā as a problem unto itself, and the style ascribed to him must have been one of those that superseded the style of the Jami' al-tawarikh. But the Jami' al-tawarikh is not irrelevant to later developments, since the visual sources used by the illustrators of Rashid al-Din's new book must have been available also to artists such as Ahmad Muršā. Its iconography provides clues to the identity and use of those sources.

The Ancient Prophets section of the Jami' al-tawarikh contains the illustrations for which it is easiest to find parallels in other manuscripts. The cycle depends heavily on Byzantine sources, some of which can be identified fairly accurately. A survey of the iconography of the miniatures in two early Jami' al-tawarikh manuscripts indicates what other sources Rashid al-Din's artists employed and how they employed them. The Ancient Prophets section has a mixture of sources unusual for the Jami' al-tawarikh, but the principles of the use of this mixture may well apply to the illustrations of other sections of the work also. Four fragmentary illustrated manuscripts dated to Rashid al-Din's lifetime exist of the second volume, which contains the Ancient Prophets section. They are—or were—in Edinburgh (University Library, Arabic no. 20), London (Royal Asiatic Society, formerly Morley no. 1, then Arabic no. 27, sold in 1980), and Istanbul (Topkapı Saray, Hazine nos. 1653 and 1654). The miniatures of only the first two manuscripts have been published comprehensively,7 but a good deal of information about the Hazine manuscripts has been published by S. G. Inal.8 The Istanbul manuscripts apparently contain no illustrations of the section in question that date from the early fourteenth century.9

The Edinburgh manuscript is written in Arabic on 150 folios measuring 32 by 42 cm. and is
fragmentary. According to D. T. Rice, who published the illustrations, its beginning and end are missing, along with fols. 70 through 107. 10 Inal notes that some of the pages are out of order. 11 On folio 105r is a note in Persian, reading: “This, the history of al-Tabari [sic], was completed in 703 [1303 A.D.], but the whole work, including supplements on special history, was finished three years later.” 12 The manuscript is therefore dated, but with a confusing misattribution, which may be significant. The Royal Asiatic Society manuscript, also in Arabic, written on 65 folios measuring 30.5 by 43.5 cm., is a fragment of a different copy of the Jami’ al-tawârîkh. It is dated 714/1314–15 on folio 41v. 13 Interestingly, at their only point of overlap, in the Jonah story (Ed. A. 20, fol. 23v, and R.A.S., fol. 59r), the two manuscripts contain differing texts (possibly the result of different translations from Persian, as Inal suggests) and different images. 14 One should not conclude, as Inal does, that the manuscripts were therefore “designed as originals and did not copy each other,” 15 since large numbers of illustrations in the more complete Hazine 1653 copy are repeated from either the London or Edinburgh manuscripts, implying a cycle of illustrations that, while it had its variants, was common to the Rub’i Rashidi workshop as a whole. 16

The iconographic sources of the two manuscripts must be distinguished from the sources of their style and principles of composition. Some of the illustrations in other sections of the Jami’ al-tawârîkh, such as Mahmod crossing the Ganges (Ed. A. 20, fol. 134v), undoubtedly have Far Eastern compositional sources. Inal has suggested that some of the compositions, especially the common bandlike scenes in which figures are lined up in rows, may be based on Yuan revivals of archaic Chinese handscrolls. 17 Gray has suggested a Mesopotamian origin for the arcades that are frequently used to divide horizontal compositions into segments. 18 It is frequently noted that the heavy ink outlining of the figures is dependent on Chinese painting, and Central Asian, Manichaean, and Eastern Nestorian influences have also been suggested. 19 But Far Eastern sources do not provide complete models for the iconography of any scene in the group under consideration, although some individual motifs probably have Far Eastern prototypes (see the discussion below of Ed. A. 20, fol. 13r). Furthermore, the typical horizontal lining up of figures is also common in such works as the Greek History of the Byzantine Emperors of Johannes Skylitzes (preserved in a thirteenth–fourteenth-century copy of a late eleventh- or early twelfth-century manuscript), which is just the sort of historical work that could have been accessible to Rashid al-Din, and presumably also to his artists. 20 The discovered fragments of eighth-century Central Asian painting, which include Manichaean and Nestorian works, bear no plausible resemblance to the Jami’ al-tawârîkh illustrations.

In writing the Ancient Prophets section, Rashid al-Din used not Islamic but Jewish sources, including the Torah and probably a good selection from the exegetical literature too, though the stories illustrated have not been treated to an analysis of their specific sources. 21 No illustrated Jewish manuscripts appear to exist that would fill the bill, so it is no surprise that Christian manuscripts offer the closest prototypes for the scenes illustrated in the Jami’ al-tawârîkh. Neither Western European nor Syriac manuscripts provide suitable models, but Byzantine prototypes lie close at hand. It is only natural that painters required to illustrate the lives of the Ancient Prophets should turn to manuscripts already adorned with the desired images, and Byzantine sources offer some very close parallels for these scenes.

The Octateuch would have been the most convenient Greek source, and six Constantinopolitan Octateuchs survive in one form or another. 22

2 (2) Vatican, Apostolic Library, gr. 747, eleventh century, unpublished; 24
3 (3) Vatican, Apostolic Library, gr. 746, twelfth century, unpublished; 25
4 (4) Istanbul, Topkapi Saray, cod. 8, twelfth century, published by T. Ouspensky, L’octateuque de la Bibliothèque de Sérial à Constantinople (Sofia, 1907);
5 Smyrna, Evangelical School, cod. A. I, twelfth century, now lost but published by D. C. Hesseling, Miniatures de l’octateuque grec de Smyrne (Leiden, 1909);
6 (6) Mount Athos, vatopedi Monastery, cod. 602, thirteenth century, fragmentary and unpublished. 26

Kurt Weitzmann has established a schema for understanding these Octateuchs in relation to each other and to the Joshua Roll in the Vatican (cod. Palat. gr. 431). 27 According to Weitzmann’s reconstruction the Istanbul, Smyrna, and Vat. gr. 746 manuscripts are very close, and all depend to
some degree on the Joshua Roll and the archetype of Vat. gr. 747. The Vatopedi codex shares these characteristics but is later and shows the direct influence of the Joshua Roll. Vat. gr. 747 apparently derived from the same original cycle but is an earlier product and shows no influence of the Joshua Roll; it seems to preserve more faithfully the archetype of all the Octateuchs.

The compositions of Octateuch illustrations were also employed for the same scenes in other religious manuscripts, including Psalters, which are therefore also relevant, since they display variant compositions possibly derived from lost Octateuchs or in circulation independently.

Finally, the Ancient Prophets section includes some illustrations whose iconography is derived from the New Testament and some work or works concerned with the lives of Christian saints.

The illustrations may be ordered separately by manuscript, and according to the probable sequence of the narrative, which entails putting the less useful R.A.S. manuscript first. (The illustration of the City of Iram on fol. 1r of the Edinburgh manuscript is omitted from consideration here.)

The Royal Asiatic Society Manuscript

(1) The Ark of Nūh [Noah], fol. 45r.

Nūh’s ark is represented as a ship with seven passengers, of whom only one may be female. No animals are shown, although fish disport in the sea. There is land in the background, because it is the embarkation of the ark that is described in the text surrounding the illustration: the page begins with Allah’s warning to Nūh that the flood is seven days away, and the illustration immediately follows the description of the onset of the flood. Immediately following the picture is an enumeration of the eight occupants of the ark: Nūh and his wife, their three sons, and their three wives.

The image is markedly at odds with the text’s inventory of the ark’s passengers and also dissimilar to Christian depictions of the ark with respect to the shape of the ship, the lack of animals, and the land in the background. It bears a generic resemblance to its counterpart in the Freer al-Tabari manuscript of ca. 1330 (acc. no. 57.16, fol. 107) but differs in many significant details.

(2) Yaʿqūb [Jacob] and his family, fol. 47v.

The text above and below this miniature gives the names of Yaʿqūb’s offspring, without mentioning Liyyah (Leah). Yaʿqūb, at the left, faces three of his sons. His tent separates this group from a woman gazing at her mirror (Rahil, or Rachel) and a female servant kneeling beside her, who may or may not be Liyyah. The left two-thirds of the miniature could have been constructed by conflating Octateuch illustrations of Abraham greeting the three (disguised) angels and serving them dinner, but in these miniatures Abraham kneels before the angels (e.g., Smyrna, fol. 30r, and Vat. gr. 747, fol. 39). I have found no similar Jacob illustrations in the Octateuchs or related manuscripts and no compositional source for the group on the right. Apparently, the scene illustrates the text merely as a family portrait.

(3) Yūṣuf [Joseph] before an unidentified enthroned man, fol. 48r.

This illustration divides the text amidst Yūṣuf’s dialogue with Zulaykhā, Futifar’s wife, and is therefore obviously misplaced. The enthroned man has been identified as Farʿūn (Pharaoh) or Futifar (Potiphar). Whoever he is, his throne occupies the right side of a double arcade, in a composition common in the manuscript. To the left are three men, the one closest to the throne identified as Yūṣuf in a later inscription above his head. The illustrations of Joseph before Pharaoh in the Octateuchs are entirely different from this image, except for Pharaoh’s hand gestures, which are not unusual. The composition is similar to the following one, Yūṣuf and his brothers, but the participants are differently dressed.

(4) Yūṣuf and his brothers, fol. 49r.

At left Yūṣuf greets two of his brothers under an arch. The center arch is draped, and to the right a differently dressed Yūṣuf sits enthroned, conversing with his brothers. Octateuch illustrations of this scene are similar, and the composition could easily have been pieced together from standard court scenes.

(5) Mūsā [Moses] and the apostate Isrāʾīlites, fol. 52r.

Two men, separated by a tree, gesture at each other in odd poses. They are surrounded by onlookers, including a group at left comprising two men holding another captive. The scene has been identified by G. Meredith-Owens:

The Israelites apostatized and Samiri persuaded them to cast their ornaments into a fire and make a golden calf which loured. When Mūsā (Moses) returned from Sinai, he destroyed the calf and burnt it, making apostates drink the powder mixed with water. He who was still a true believer would remain unharmed but an apostate would
be left with a spot of gold on his tongue. Then Musa ordered his kin, the Levites, to draw their swords and slay all those with gold spots on their tongues.\cite{Jahn}

The text is broken by the picture at the end of the sentence describing the test demanded by Musá (Jahn translation, p. 60, l. 6), although in the illustration the apostates obviously have already been separated from the believers.

This image seems to have been composed by juxtaposing separately constructed figures or small groups of figures, since they are spread out along a groundline and against a landscape backdrop without forming successful ensembles or being arranged in depth with respect to one another. There are no similar scenes in the Octateuchs, and only the two central figures are unusual enough to suggest that they may derive from a specific model, rather than being stock figures.

(6) \textit{Musa on his deathbed}, fol. 54v.

Since this illustration is placed about three lines before Musá actually dies, it is not really a “death of Musá.” It immediately follows the end of the text of the prophet’s farewell address (Jahn translation, p. 70, l. 3, end of speech), but he is not shown as speaking. He lies on a rocky platform in the right half of the painting; his body slants up from his feet, at left, to his head. At left five men talk among themselves. The composition is not inspired, but makes use of a pose commonly employed for deathbed scenes in Byzantine manuscript painting, substituting the rock ledge for a bed. I have found only two images with the expiring figures lying on bare ground: the \textit{Death of Moses} in Sta. Maria Maggiore, Rome (in which the earthen platform is parallel to the bottom of the picture), and an illustration in a fourteenth-century manuscript of the \textit{Romance of Alexander the Great} by Pseudo-Callisthenes in the Hellenic Institute in Venice (fol. 131r), in which Alexander sleeps on a pallet spread on the earth.\cite{Mermid-Owens}

(7) \textit{Suicide of Tālūt [Saul]}, fol. 56r.

An extra-Biblical story. Three men look on while Tālūt falls on his sword\cite{Meredith-Owens} (Meredith-Owens believes them to be his sons, which would suit the story).\cite{Ibn-al-Tabari} The only unusual part of this illustration is the figure of Tālūt, for which a prototype is still to be found.

(8) \textit{Yūnus [Jonah] swallowed by the fish}, fol. 59r.

A large fish is shown apparently ridding itself of the ingested prophet in the direction of dry land, but, as the illustration immediately follows the text’s description of the prophet’s being swallowed,\cite{Rücker} it must have been planned to show him eaten rather than expelled. The motif of Jonah in the fish’s mouth is taken from Byzantine illustrations (\textit{e.g.}, Vat. gr. 1927, fol. 278v), but the rest of the image owes nothing to its Byzantine source. The sea is reminiscent of water in certain pictures in the Diez albums (Berlin, Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Diez A, fol. 71, pp. 17, 36, and 39) that Ipsiroğlu believes to come from a sea voyage cycle.\cite{Ipsiroglu} The corresponding scene in the Freer al-Ṭabari manuscript (no. 57.16, fol. 107) is conflated with the \textit{Ark of Nāḥ} and shows the unfortunate prophet swallowed head-first instead of ejected feet-last.

\textbf{The Edinburgh Manuscript}\footnote{\textit{The Edinburgh Manuscript} is a reference to a specific manuscript.}

(1) \textit{The prophet Şāliḥ produces a camel from a rock}, fol. 1v.

Şāliḥ, an Arabian prophet mentioned in the Qur’an,\footnote{The Qur’an is the holy book of Islam.} stands at center and raises his hands, bringing forth a camel from the large rock formation at the left. In front of another rock formation on the right, the people of Thamūd (in northwestern Arabia) pause at their feast to watch this proof of Şāliḥ’s message (in the end they murdered him anyway). The illustration is an accurate depiction of the text, which expands on the Qur’an and is, of course, without Biblical precedent. The miracle is similar to that of Moses producing water from a rock, but the image is not derived from any such scene. The \textit{Jami’ al-tawarikh} illustration is composed very simply, by setting three figures or groups of figures—the camel, the prophet, and the picnickers—flat against a landscape, and may therefore have been composed from stock units. The figure of the prophet is not uncommon in Byzantine manuscripts; compare, for example, the \textit{St. John Chuzibita of Palestine} in the \textit{Menologion} of Basil II (Vat. gr. 1613, fol. 145), which is similar also in the landscape behind the central figure, which rises to peaks that frame him.

(2) \textit{Ibrāhīm [Abraham] thrown into the fire}, fol. 3r.

This is a non-Biblical persecution of Ibrāhīm, in which the essential point is that he was thrown into a fire so hot that his persecutors could not approach it (thus the cranelike apparatus shown center), but the fire, turning cool in the center, did not burn him.

The scene is clumsily patched together from, again, three components: Ibrāhīm sitting amidst the flames, on the left, incomprehensibly looking
away from the rest of the picture; the crane used to put him there, in the center; and the enthroned king with two attendants, on the right. There is hardly any background, and the units of composition are exceedingly awkwardly juxtaposed. This image was certainly made to order for the *Jami’ al-tawârîkh* from available parts, since the composition of those parts is so much better than that of the whole. A similar crane appears in the near-contemporary illustration (Berlin, Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Diez A, fol. 71, p. 4), and the court figures are standard for the period. The only contemporary illustration of Ibrahim in the fire, in the Freer al-Tabari (no. 57.16, fol. 25), is radically different. Ibrahim’s costume is standard; it appears in an *Annunciation* in the 1307 manuscript of the *Aṭhar al-bāqiyah* of ʿAbū Rayḥān Muhammad al-Bīrūnī (also in Edinburgh), as well as in Skylitzes’s *History of the Byzantine Emperors*. The illustration follows the end of the story.

(3) The finding of Mūsā, fol. 7r (fig. 1).

This is one of the finest illustrations in the entire cycle. A large stream representing the Nile flows from upper left to lower right, carrying in it an elongated, closed chest with a gabled lid. At the extreme right stands the wife of Fārūn (Pharaoh) with two servants, gesturing and looking toward the chest. Their attitudes lead the eye across the tumultuous expanse of water toward the chest, which will come within their reach in the next (imagined) instant.

The basic composition used here occurs in all the Octateuchs. But, surprisingly, the closest parallel is the same scene in the Menologion of Basil II (Vat. gr. 1613, p. 13; see fig. 2), which is combined with a scene of an angel with the body of Moses, on the right. Only in the Menologion does the white-capped woman play an active role (she appears as a servant in the Istanbul, Smyrna, and Vat. gr. 746 manuscripts and is here Fārūn’s wife) instead of merely gesturing, and only in the Menologion is the chest closed and peaked. These features are taken over directly in the *Jami’ al-tawârîkh* illustration, although they are changed around and two servants added. The picture appears about one line before the action shown is described.

(4) The crossing of the Red Sea, fol. 8v (fig. 3).

Mūṣā stands at left with a stick in his hand. He is accompanied by three men and two women, representing the Isra’ilites. To the right, taking up most of the composition, the Red Sea engulfs Fārūn’s men. Although the composition has been considerably altered, it derives from Byzantine versions of the same scene, which occur in a large number of manuscripts, including: Istanbul, Topkapı Saray, cod. 8 (fol. 187v); Smyrna (fol. 81v); Vatican, Reg. gr. 1 (fol. 46v); Mount Athos, Vatopedi 761 (fol. 206v); Vatican, gr. 747; Vatican, gr. 746 (fol. 192v); Mount Athos, Dionysiou 65 (fol. 202v); Berlin, Theological Seminary, no. 3807 (fol. 231v); and the Paris Psalter (Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 139, fol. 419v).

Of the later manuscripts, Vatican gr. 747 is the closest, since it alone places Moses nearest of the group to the sea, as here. But the later manuscripts omit many of the drowning figures included in such earlier versions as the Paris Psalter (fig. 4), where the composition has been bisected and layered together in a squarish format. These figures must have furnished the inspiration for some of the *Jami’ al-tawârîkh* figures: the pair of confronted men (lower left in the Paris Psalter) may explain the fighting pair in the *Jami’ al-tawârîkh* (upper right), and the man-and-horse combination in the Psalter (lower center) may have been preserved in the lower right corner of the *Jami’ al-tawârîkh* picture.

Most important, however, are the Psalter figures of Bythos and Pharaoh, since their Byzantine representations changed in the course of time, and they may indicate the place of the *Jami’ al-tawârîkh*’s prototype in the series of Byzantine manuscripts. In the Paris Psalter, Bythos, a large nude labeled with his name, holds Pharaoh by the hair, whereas the *Jami’ al-tawârîkh* illustration shows the equivalent figure holding its counterpart by the beard. Despite this difference, the Paris Psalter is the closest of all the preserved Byzantine representations of this scene to the *Jami’ al-tawârîkh* picture. The prototype of the *Jami’ al-tawârîkh* must therefore have been similar to but somewhat removed from the Paris Psalter, while retaining the original horizontal format; the prototype probably dates somewhat later than the addition of personifications to the Psaltericonography, to, say, the eleventh century.

The illustration follows the description of Fārūn’s drowning and thus illustrates the whole event, rather than a specific moment.

(5) Mūṣā praying after the death of the seventy notables on Mt. Sinâ [Sinai], fol. 8r.

Mūṣā is seated in the center against a hump of the mountain, with hands outstretched to a cloudy
sky. Below and around him is a mass of bodies, loosely sketched.

The illustration depicts a development in the commentaries of a Qur'anic passage to the effect that seventy notables of the Banu Isrā'il followed Mūsā up into the clouds on Mt. Sinā, where they were struck down by Allāh.54 The text preceding the illustration, which is placed at the bottom of the page, includes only Mūsā’s discovery of the seventy following him and their greeting to him.

There is, of course, no Christian equivalent of this story, and there does not seem to be any Western prototype for the scene as a whole, the standard figure of the seated prophet excepted (cf. Ibrāhīm thrown into the fire).

(6) Qārūn [Korah] swallowed by the earth, fol. 9r.

Mūsā stands at left with staff in hand, next to two men. The right two-thirds of the illustration is occupied by the disappearing heads, upper bodies, and possessions of Qārūn and his followers, who are sinking into cracks in the ground as punishment for defying the prophet. Like the Crossing of the Red Sea, this scene is common in Byzantine manuscripts. It occurs, in very similar forms, in Vat. gr. 746, Vat. gr. 747, Topkapi Saray cod. 8 (fol. 349v), Smyrna (fol. 163v), and Mount Athos, Vatopedi 602 (fol. 150r).

There is nothing to indicate which, if any, of these illustrations represents the particular source for the Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh illustration. Rashid al-Din’s artist spread out the overly compacted group of sinking people, camels, and objects in his prototype, omitted the camels carrying chests and large pots, and switched the left-hand group in the prototype around so that Mūsā stands next to Qārūn’s group, thus changing the composition as well as its details substantially. The illustration follows the end of the story.

(7) Mūsā and 'Uj [King Og], fol. 9v.55

This is certainly the most entertaining of the illustrations. A tiny Mūsā, equipped with his staff but lacking his hooded cloak, stands at right, while the rest of the nearly square picture is filled with the bent-over figure of the giant ‘Uj, who rests clumsily on his head and elbow, holding the ankle smitten by Mūsā. The two appear against a rocky background, and the sun peeks out from the upper left corner. The scene appears in Christian manuscripts only as a detail in massed battle pictures (e.g., Topkapi Saray, cod. 8, fol. 360v) with figures posed entirely differently. The same scene in the Freer al-Ṭabarî (no. 57.16, fol. 68), while featuring a gigantic ‘Uj, is not at all similar in other respects. I have found no prototype for the figure of ‘Uj. The illustration appears just after the end of the story.

(8) Yūsha’ [Joshua] before Mūsā, fol. 10v.56

Mūsā, white-bearded and seated on two large pillows in the center, receives Yūsha’, perhaps to name him as his successor. The text preceding the illustration recounts Yūsha’’s association with Mūsā and his accession to power upon the death of Mūsā but does not describe a scene such as this, which may have been included just to show the two patriarchs together.

Yūsha’, on the left, kisses Mūsā’s robe and is accompanied by two men, while three seated men on the right look on. The only indications of setting are the small table and stand in front of Mūsā and a knotted curtain at the upper edge of the picture. I have found no illustrations of Biblical subjects with similar compositions, but a picture in the thirteenth–fourteenth-century History of the Byzantine Emperors by Skylitzes (Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, Vitrine 26–2, fol. 113v) shows Greeks in Arab dress interrogating an Arab.57 The two primary figures at the left in the Madrid illustration could have been taken as models for the principal actors in the Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh scene, if, in fact, the Madrid manuscript does not reflect an Islamic source.

(9) Shamsun [sic for Samsün, or Samson] destroys the temple of the Ahl Filastin [Philistines], fol. 11r (fig. 5).

Samsun, near the right, is shown bringing down a sort of roofed pavilion by pushing on two columns supporting it. The roof already tilts downward, and cracked brick masonry below reveals the bodies of the dead Ahl Filastin. The miniature occurs just below the line in which this deed is recounted.

Of the Octateuchs, only Vat. gr. 746 and 747 contain illustrations of this scene. The Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh illustration is not similar at all to Vat. gr. 747 but follows the composition found in Vat. gr. 746, folio 495r (fig. 6), with some simplification of the jumble of pediments, cornices, and doorways in the Byzantine original, which the Tabrīz artist (or an intermediary copyist) has turned into irregular masses of brick. The roof in the Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh illustration is evidently in contemporary Persian, not Byzantine, style, and Samsun wears a turban, but otherwise essentials of the Vat. gr. 746 composition are preserved.
(10) The ass of Irmiyâ [Jeremiah] restored to life, fol. 13r.

The story illustrated here, directly following its text, is Qur'ânic, although the identification of the man, unnamed in the Qur'ân, is derived from commentaries. It concerns the revivification of Irmiyâ’s ass, which died and decayed during Irmiyâ’s hundred-year sleep or death.\(^5\) Inal has suggested a plausible Chinese source for the figure of Irmiyâ in a type that occurs in a painting by Liang K’ai (active ca. 1200), *The Buddha on the Way to the Bodhi Tree,*\(^6\) but there was clearly no source for the entire composition, which is jumbled together and cramped. The text on this page could be a much-reduced paraphrase of al-Ṭabarî.\(^7\)

(11) Dâ’ûd [David] called to govern the Isrâ’îl-îtes, fol. 17r.

This illustration, like so many in the manuscript, is divided into thirds. At the left, under an arch, Dâ’ûd sits, attired in the usual prophet’s robe. He is approached by two men, who stand in the center under another arch connected to the first. The right third of the picture is filled in with landscape. The illustration occurs after the first line of the section on Dâ’ûd, which states that the Banû Isrâ’il agreed to make Dâ’ûd king after Ṭalût. This event is not included in the Octateuch cycle, and I have found no manuscript parallel for what looks like a scene constructed by a standard method.

(12) Yûnus under the gourd, fol. 24v.

A close relative of the fish in the Royal Asiatic Society’s Yûnus scene cavorts at right, while at left the cast-up prophet is shown hiding his nakedness under and obtaining food from the gourd plant sent to help him. This all agrees with the Qur’ânic and traditional versions of the story, in which the Biblical return to Nineveh is left out, and the gourd that in the Bible merely shades Yûnus instead provides him with sustenance and concealment.\(^8\) But the text of the *Jâmi‘ al-tawârîkh* (Jahân translation, pp. 88–89) follows the Biblical text closely, except that the Old Testament “gourd” is a tree, and Yûnus does not eat the fruit or its juice. The only vaguely similar scene in Christian manuscripts is in the Menologion, but that illustration (p. 59) shows Jonah in a completely different pose, and clothed. This scene must derive from another, Islamic source that deals with Yûnus but was not employed in composing the text of the *Jâmi‘ al-tawârîkh*.

(13) The Annunciation, fol. 22r.

In a mountainous landscape divided in half by a spring set vertically, Jibrâ’il (Gabriel) accosts Maryam (Mary), who holds a pitcher in her hand. A close comparison to this composition was found more than fifty years ago by Thomas Arnold, in the north transept of San Marco in Venice. Arnold notes that “even the dress of the Virgin in the two instances corresponds, and the artist working for Rashid ad-Dîn apparently did not understand the exact arrangement of her robe and in his endeavor to copy it produce[d] a garment of a clumsy character, calculated to fall off as soon as the Virgin moved forward.”\(^9\)

A similar scene occurs also in the Kariye Camii in Istanbul, which is, of course, later than the manuscript in question, and in an illustration to the *Homilies* of Giacomo Monaco (Vat. gr. 1162, fol. 117v) from the first half of the twelfth century, which is closest to the *Jâmi‘ al-tawârîkh* “annunciation” in its landscape, but not in its figures.\(^10\) The same scene in the contemporary al-Birûnî manuscript is not at all similar.\(^11\) The illustration is correctly placed in the text.

(14) The Ashâb al-Kahf [Seven Sleepers of Ephesus], fol. 23r.\(^12\)

The cave in which the seven youths sleep is revealed by a cutaway view into a rock formation. The entrance to the cave is apparently to the side, where a servant emerges from a fold in the rock. Near his feet lies Qitmir, the dog who accompanied the sleepers. The king Diqyânûs (Decius)\(^13\) appears on horseback to the right, accompanied by two other attendants.

The moment illustrated is the return of the servant from the cave he has just investigated to report to Diqyânûs, who had pursued the sleepers to the cave. This part of the story immediately precedes the illustration, and the line just above it ends “... and this is a representation (sûrah) of the people of the cave in this state” (i.e., asleep).

The composition is clearly a pastiche of at least two distinct parts. The sleepers, the emerging servant, and the dog all go with the rock formation. But the mounted king and his two attendants appear against a blank area, which ought to be read as sky, since it is above what seems to be a horizon line formed by an extension of the rock. These floating figures must have been added to a previously existing composition and are entirely ordinary, except for the foreshortened horse. I have found no parallel for the combination of sleepers and servant in Byzantine manuscript illustration.
(the dog is an Islamic addition to the story), but the sleepers are shown by means of the same cut-away view in the Menologion (p. 133), although they are differently arranged. The motif of a figure in a rock fold also occurs in the Menologion, though the figure is disappearing into the rock, and the scene in which it occurs is unrelated (it involves St. Ariadne, p. 48). Thus it is possible that in some intermediary, if not in the Rashidi workshop itself, these two motifs were combined to represent a particular point in the story of the sleepers, instead of showing the sleepers just lying around asleep, as they appear in the Menologion.67

I have found no published Islamic account of the sleepers that exactly parallels the text of Rashid al-Din, though some are close,68 and it is impossible to single out a potential Islamic prototype. The account of the cave in al-Biruni69 describes it as having “perforated columns” and “separate compartments”—obviously not the source for the Jami’ al-tawârîkh illustration. In fact, Rashid al-Din’s text is probably drawn from several sources, since in his version a character essential in the other accounts, a shepherd who seeks refuge from a storm in the cave and who should find and wake the sleepers, is merely vestigial, since the sleepers awake on their own. This must indicate an inappropriate combination of sources.

(15) Jirjis [St. George] required to worship an idol, fol. 24r.

The illustration is divided in two by a central column. To the right the king, not named in the portion of the text published, stands at the foot of his throne, on which a golden image stands. At the extreme right are three courtiers. To the left of the pillar two pairs of three attendants frame Jirjis, half-naked and led by a chain around his neck by his jailer, who carries a mace. I have found no Byzantine prototype for this scene, and it appears to be a successful invention using the standard technique of juxtaposing the important figures—the king, Jirjis, and the jailer—with figures that merely fill out the scene. The image heads the page on which the conversation between the king and Jirjis is described.

Conclusion

It is apparent that the Jami’ al-tawârîkh illustrations have Byzantine sources that include an Octateuch or a manuscript illustrated with Octateuch-derived scenes, such as a Psalter, that contained certain Old Testament illustrations not in the Octateuch (such as those of the Jonah story). A New Testament—or at least some image of the Annunciation—and a book of saints, such as the Menologion of Basil II, must be included as well, in order to account for the Annunciation and the Ashab al-Kahf scenes.

By comparing the Crossing of the Red Sea in the Jami’ al-tawârîkh with the same illustration in Octateuchs and Psalters, the date of the Octateuch cycle that served as a model can be placed in the eleventh century. That the sources of the Jami’ al-tawârîkh are much earlier than the composition of its text is also indicated by its links with the Menologion, dated around 1000.70 Of course, the actual manuscripts used for the illustration of the Jami’ al-tawârîkh in Tabriz could have been later than these particular examples, while preserving their iconography.71

Almost all of the scenes borrowed from Byzantine prototypes have interesting or difficult compositions (such as the Finding of Musa, the Crossing of the Red Sea, or Quran swallowed by the earth), so that the sources must have been chosen on formal or technical grounds—on the basis of the pictorial appeal of a composition or its successful solution of a difficult problem. Except for parts of the Ashab al-Kahf and Yusha’ before Musa, the Byzantine compositions chosen as models for the Jami’ al-tawârîkh illustrate the same scene in the source and in the Jami’ al-tawârîkh. The correspondence of subject matter indicates that when the Tabriz artists were confronted with a difficult compositional problem they looked through their Octateuchs or books of saints for Byzantine illustrations of the same scene. Simple court scenes were part of the workshop’s repertoire and did not present problems that sent artists searching for prototypes.

But Rashid al-Din’s artists also employed useful figures or fragments of compositions from their Byzantine sources regardless of their subject matter. Yusha’ before Musa is a case in point. Here the shapes of the Byzantine figures have been borrowed, but their identity and style have been changed completely. There are, in fact, several degrees of borrowing from sources in the Jami’ al-tawârîkh.

Some compositions are taken over from Byzantine illustrations of the same scenes (Yinus swallowed by the fish; The Finding of Musa; The Crossing of the Red Sea; Quran swallowed by the earth; Samsûn; The Annunciation; and The Ashab al-Kahf). A few compositions are largely based on a Byzantine illustration of a different story (Yusha’ before Musa and part of The Ashab al-Kahf).
Some compositions employ individual figures from Byzantine sources (Ya’qub and his family, possibly, Yüsuf and his brothers, Mısâ on his deathbed, and the figure of Salih), or from Islamic and Far Eastern sources (The ark of Nuh, İbrâhîm thrown into the fire. The ass of İrmiyâ, and Yunus under the gourd, the last because of its Islamic iconography).

Finally, there exist apparent inventions of the Jami’ al-tawärîkh’s illustrators, which may be more or less successful. Some were composed by a standard method of juxtaposing groups of figures, which frequently have the look of stock compositional elements; in any event, they cannot be traced to particular prototypes (Yûnus before an unidentified enthroned man, Mısâ and the apostate Isrâ’ilîtes. The Suicide of Tâlût, Mısâ praying on Mt. Sinâ, Mısâ and ‘Uj, Da‘ûd called to govern, and Jirjîs)."While the Byzantine sources are the most pervasive compositional influence on the section of the Jami’ al-tawärîkh considered here, there must also have been non-Byzantine sources, including Far Eastern and earlier Islamic works, of considerably less importance than the Octateuch cycle in furnishing compositions and figure models. The lack of Far Eastern sources for the compositions in the Jami’ al-tawärîkh is not really unexpected, though Far Eastern influence may be greater in other sections of the work. But the fact that so few Islamic sources can be suggested for these manuscripts is surprising. After all, the Ancient Prophets section is the most traditional part of the most untraditional Jami’ al-tawärîkh. Not only does the text derive from scriptural sources and commentaries on them (even though Jewish commentaries seem to have been used); the history of the Jews, at least insofar as it concerns Islam, had already been treated by the great historians al-Ya’qubi, al-Tabari, and al-Mas‘udi. The lives of the prophets had generated a considerable literature. Any of these sources, had they been illustrated, would have provided a handy cycle for the Tabriz artists to copy. The misattribution of the Edinburgh manuscript in the note quoted above points to the existence of illustrated al-Tabari manuscripts. Indeed, two volumes of Bal’ami’s Persian translation of al-Tabari, illustrated in a different style, are preserved in the Freer Gallery of Art (nos. 30.21, 47.19, and 57.16), and are thought to date ca. 1330. But these manuscripts have illustrations that do not resemble those of the Jami’ al-tawärîkh, with the exception of the Ark scene, although they treat many of the same subjects. Thus, although illustrated Islamic prototypes apparently existed for the Ancient Prophets cycle, it seems that the artists of the Jami’ al-tawärîkh turned to a broader range of prototypes, including Byzantine Octateuchs for the most challenging compositions, and generally ignored the models available in Islamic manuscripts.

The Tabriz artists apparently found the illustrations in Islamic manuscripts unsatisfactory. They possessed an independent technique of constructing ordinary indoor scenes, and when confronted with compositional challenges they demonstrated a critical approach to their visual sources. Images such as the Finding of Mısâ or Qarån swallowed by the earth must be regarded as the achievements of master painters, and it is worth noting that no Byzantine composition was copied without substantial alteration, which usually produced a better result than the original. Alongside these recompositional achievements must be set both truly creative inventions (Mısâ and ‘Uj) and truly disappointing pastiches (İbrâhîm thrown into the fire). That these unsuccessful illustrations were included in the single product of Rashid al-Din’s workshop that was most important to him indicates that the search for new approaches to painting that is apparent in every pictorial product of early fourteenth-century Iran was just beginning, and that artists skilled in a newer, more complex variety of painting were in short supply—this in the capital of the Mongol empire in Persia at its height. The uneven quality of the Jami’ al-tawärîkh illustrations, and their direct dependence on non-Islamic sources, show that when “the veil was lifted from the face of painting” in the early fourteenth century a quite young visage was revealed.
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4. A point made by everyone who has written on these manuscripts.
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12. M. A. Hukk, H. Elhè, and E. Robertson, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian Manuscripts in Edinburgh University Library (Hertford, 1925), p. 15; cf. Rice, op. cit., p. 2, where it is clear that the note is a later addition, though possibly a partial transcription of a damaged colophon.
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16. Inal, “Artistic Relationship,” pp. 140–43, identifies scenes in the London, Edinburgh, and Hazine 1653 manuscripts; her collation indicates that although there is considerable variation in their cycles there is also considerable overlap.
17. Ibid., pp. 120ff.; Gray, op. cit., p. 19.
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31. Jahn, Geschicte, p. 31, beginning of line 17 (top of page) to line 21 (top of illustration).


33. Misidentified by Inal, "Artistic Relationship," p. 142, as Abraham and the three strangers; correctly identified by Meredith-Owens, loc. cit.; cf. Gray, op. cit., p. 36, who refers to the wrong section of Jahn's translation. The relevant section is Jahn, Geschicte, pp. 41–42, where Liyyah is eventually mentioned. The illustration interrupts the text at p. 41, line 25, after the translation's "elf."

34. Wilpert, op. cit., fig. 147.

35. As Far‘un by Jahn, Geschicte, caption to pl. 58, and Futifar by Inal, "Artistic Relationship," p. 142, and Gray, op. cit., p. 36. The illustration first divides a line of text in the translation, p. 44, line 13, just at the start of Yusuf's speech.

36. The illustration breaks the text at p. 48, line 7 of Jahn's translation, in the midst of Yusuf's conversations with his brothers, at a point where Yusuf leaves them for a while.

37. Meredith-Owens, op. cit., p. 199.

38. For this manuscript see André Xyngopoulos, Les miniatures du Roman d'Alexandre le Grand dans le codex de l'Institut Hellénique de Venise (Athens, 1966), and for the illustration see pl. IX.

39. The last full line before the illustration is p. 77, line 2 in Jahn's translation, ending at the end of the sentence describing Talût's suicide.

40. Meredith-Owens, op. cit., p. 199.

41. The illustration interrupts the text at p. 88, line 16 of the Jahn translation, after "drei Tage."

42. M. S. İpsiroğlu, Saray-Alben: Die'sche Klebebande aus den Berliner Sammlungen (Wiesbaden, 1964), pp. 54–55, pl. XV, XVI.

43. The illustrations of the Edinburgh manuscript are reproduced on paper and microfiche in Rice, op. cit.

44. See "Salih" in Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st ed.

45. İpsiroğlu, op. cit., pl. V.

46. The same scene in the 1307 al-Brûni manuscript (fol. k) is completely different.

47. Illustrated in Binyon, Wilkinson, and Gray, op. cit., pl. XV-A.

48. On the Skylitzes manuscript see A. Božkov, The Miniatures of the Madrid Manuscript of Johannes Skylitzes (Sofia, 1972); and André Grabar, "Les illustrations de la Chronique de Jean Skylitzes à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Madrid," Cahiers Archéologiques 21 (1971), pp. 189–211. The Madrid manuscript may have Islamic visual sources (see Grabar, pp. 208–11), so it may be circular reasoning to cite it in this context. The mutual relations of the Skylitzes History, the Pseudo-Callisthenes Romance of Alexander the Great, the various copies of the Jami' al-tawarikh, and the Demotte Shah nāmah deserve systematic analysis.

49. In the Qur'an it is Far‘un's wife who finds Mûsâ, not Pharaoh's daughter. This change may explain the use of the old-woman type for this figure.

50. Wilpert, op. cit., fig. 165.

51. It may be noted that the Jami' al-tawarikh illustration is arranged so that the action proceeds from right to left, while the Byzantine prototype's composition reads from left to right; the change may reflect the visual habits of an artist who was literate in the Arabic script.


54. See "Harun b. 'Imlîn," Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd ed.

55. 'Uj's full name is 'Uj b. 'Anaq or 'Anaq; see Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st ed., s.v. for the story.

56. Misidentified in Binyon et al., op. cit., as Joshua orders the destruction of the spoil of Jericho, an error followed by Rice, op. cit., p. 67.


60. Abu Ja'far Muhammad al-Tâbarî, Ta'rîkh, ed. M. J. de Goeje, 13 vols. in 3 series (Leiden, 1879–90), s. r., 1, p. 666; see also "Irmiyyâ" in Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st ed.

61. For these accounts see Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st ed.


63. For the Vat. gr. 1162 illustration see The Kariye Djami, ed. Paul Underwood, 4 vols. (Princeton, 1966–75), vol. 4, Studies in the Art of the Kariye Djami and its Intellectual Background, fig. 27 to article by Lafontaine-Desogne.

65. Illustrated by Binyon et al., op. cit., pl. XXI-A, where the king is misidentified as Alexander.

66. See "Ašhab al-Kahf" in Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd ed., for this point: in the Islamic tradition the seven fall asleep under Decius and awaken under Theodosius, but the text clearly states that it is Decius who has pursued them to the cave.

67. A similar moment was chosen by the ninth-century painter of a fresco of the sleepers in Sta. Maria in via Lata, Rome, which seems otherwise unrelated; see Carlo Bertelli, "The Seven Sleepers, a Medieval Utopia," Paragone 25 (May 1974), pp. 23-35 and pl. 20-21.


70. See comments above on the Finding of Misâ: the Skylitzes manuscript, which I have also cited as a possible source, is a thirteenth- to fourteenth-century copy of an eleventh- to twelfth-century work, but is illustrated in what is thought to be an anachronistic style (Grabar, op. cit., pp. 194-95).

71. It is quite unlikely that the manuscripts from which the Tabriz artists took their Byzantine compositions were not Byzantine. A Manichaean, Nestorian, or Jewish manuscript illustrated with images derived from Byzantine painting could have been a source for the Jami' al-tawârîkh, but no such manuscripts of the period with appropriate illustrations are extant. Syriac manuscripts seem to derive from Byzantine iconography, but none of the manuscripts reproduced in the "Index of Christian Art" or published offers iconographic parallels to the Jami' al-tawârîkh. Contemporary European manuscripts are also ruled out as sources on the same grounds. Since the Octateuch illustrations show the impact of Jewish traditions (Weitzmann, "The Question of the Influence of Jewish Pictorial Sources on Old Testament Illustration," in previously cited Studies, passim, but esp. pp. 82-83), as do the Jami' al-tawârîkh illustrations, it is theoretically possible that both share sources in Flavius Josephus's Antiquitates Judaeae, which Weitzmann believes may have been illustrated (although no copies of such a manuscript exist or are known to have existed, ibid., pp. 83-84). But Josephus's text does not account for the iconography of any of the Jami' al-tawârîkh scenes, and is at variance with some of them, so a hypothetical illustrated Josephus must be ruled out as a source.

72. These inventions do not result from problems in constructing the manuscripts. The illustrations generally follow the appropriate texts, but seldom depict precise moments in the stories they illustrate. At least in the section examined here, the placement of the illustrations in correct sequence in the text does not seem to have influenced their composition: when they occur at the very bottom of a page they are not crowded into the space provided. The strip format that many of these page-bottom illustrations use is freely chosen, as its use for the page-top Irjîs scene shows. No illustration appears to be misplaced because of layout complications, with the possible exception of Yusuf before an unidentified man, which I think is probably just a mistake, since a Yusuf and Zulaykha would fit perfectly here.

Nor does the style of the illustrations whose compositions are borrowed differ significantly from that of the invented compositions. While the Edinburgh manuscript is composed and executed by a more talented and expansive hand or hands than the R.A.S. copy, both manuscripts derive their formulae for depicting clothes and landscape, for example, from modified Far Eastern sources. Note the details of the sea and armor in the Crossing of the Red Sea, the orientalizing architectural details and non-Byzantine faces in Samsin, and the Sino-Byzantine landscape and water details in the Finding of Misâ. The artists of the Rub'i Rashidi used Byzantine manuscript sources for poses and compositions only; these sources do not account for the novel style adopted in Tabriz.

73. There are other sea pictures in early fourteenth-century Persian painting, for example in the Diez albums already mentioned (Ipsiroğlu, op. cit., p. 54), and it is possible, though impossible to establish, that illustrations such as the Ark of Nôh derive from some cycle of sea voyage pictures, especially since the numbers and gender of the figures do not correspond to the story. The Weitzmannian detail that Ibrahim looks away from his captors as he sits in his fire suggests that there was a prototype for this scene in which Ibrahim appeared on the right, not on the left; the prototype would have to have been Islamic.

Far Eastern sources account for one figure (other borrowings may of course exist), and possibly a few of the band-like figure arrangements, as Inal and Gray suggest, but this influence seems to me to extend at most to the method of composition, and not to the specific compositions themselves. Furthermore, the Skylitzes History is also composed with bandlike illustrations, usually with architectural backdrops, and there is no reason to believe that it was influenced by Chinese painting (though this argument must be used with care, cf. note 48). The Sino-Byzantine appearance of some of the illustrations in the Jami' al-tawârîkh should not be taken as an indication of Chinese compositional models, since the Chinese details may be applied over entirely Byzantine compositions (see previous note).

The contemporary illustrated al-Biruni manuscript includes some Biblical scenes, such as Adam and Eve, but its text is at variance with at least some of the Jami' al-tawârîkh iconography; and the illustrated manuscript preserved has no illustrations of subjects illustrated in the Jami' al-tawârîkh.

74. Jahn, Geschichte, pp. 9-16.

76. The so-called small *Shāh nāma*hs, of roughly the same date, exhibit a nearly complete independence from known sources and have no consistent program of illustration (Marianna Shreve Simpson, *The Illustration of an Epic: The Earliest Shahnama Manuscripts* [New York, 1979], esp. pp. 324ff.).
Fig. 1. The Finding of Māsā. Edinburgh, University Library, Arabic no. 20, fol. 7r.

Fig. 2. The Finding of Moses. Vat. gr. 1613 (Menologion of Basil II), p. 13.
Fig. 3. The Crossing of the Red Sea. Edinburgh, University Library, Arabic no. 20, fol. 8v.

Fig. 4. The Crossing of the Red Sea. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, gr. 139 (Paris Psalter), fol. 419v.
Fig. 5. Samsün destroys the temple of the Ahl Filastin. Edinburgh, University Library, Arabic no. 20, fol. 11r.

Fig. 6. Samson destroys the temple of the Philistines. Vat. gr. 746, fol. 495r.
BOOK REVIEWS


In this the third volume of James Cahill's ambitious and welcome series of books on later Chinese painting we are introduced to the turmoil and perhaps one should say confusions of the late Ming. The author moves easily, even buoyantly through the churning seas of past tradition and present experience, theory and practice, intellect and feeling. It is a somewhat awe-inspiring task tackled with characteristic enthusiasm and knowledge.

Overflowing with that knowledge, it is also a personal book sounding the drums of Western influence, the revolutionary nature of Tung Ch'i-ch'ang and the necessity to constantly be aware of "the whole dynamic pattern of interaction" of stylistic, social, intellectual, and political history. I am not using "personal" in a pejorative sense. In Leo Bronstein's telling phrases, "The past is what we are within it. The past is ours, not theirs." Writing with a clear point of view is good writing, necessary writing. More often than not, however, it leads to controversy. In the case of the unsettled late Ming it serves to stimulate the creation of alternatives, or at least modifications, and to reemphasize complexity. This, after all, admirably fits the material. As the author declares: "It was a period in which everything was in question" (p. 29).

All this is to deny but rather affirm the richness of content and the general order with which the argument unfolds. Consider the chapter outline: "Background and Issues" (especially praiseworthy in clearly outlining the theoretical situation ending in the contrast between Suchou and rising Sung-chiang) "The Late Ming Masters of Soochow" (the major ones being Li Shih-ta, Sheng Mao-yeh and Chang Hung) "The Sung-chiang Painters" (a complex definition: 1. painters from Sung-chiang—Sung Hsu. 2. artists active in Sung-chiang who formed the Yun-chien school—Chao Tso, Shen Shih-ch'ung. 3. Sung-chiang artists who formed the Hua-y'ing school—Ku Ch'eng-i, Mo Shih-jung, Tung Ch'i-ch'ang.

After an entire chapter devoted to Tung Ch'i-ch'ang it is:

"A Diversity of Currents: The Scholar Amateurs" (a complexity of figures which "resists neat classification") "A Diversity of Currents: Some Professional Masters" (especially Wu Pin and Lan Ying) "Figure Painting, Portraits, Birds and Flowers" (the great master being Ch'en Hung-shou; one of the most informative chapters in the book)

What is the result? It is in part a brilliant summation of where we stand today in our knowledge of the period. It is also an effort to take us further with new or relatively unknown material: paintings recently available in China; anonymous handscrolls, one of which, attributed to the obscure Chang Chi-su, perhaps deservedly but rather startlingly becomes a major masterpiece with color reproductions and a spread on the dust-jacket; and reproductions from "collection unknown." There are also memorable insights, some that pop out unforgettable: "The disparity in style between realistic face and conventional setting can have the slightly unsettling effect of making a real person seem to look out from a work of art" (p. 214).

Throughout there is an insistent ambition in the method:

In this book we have attempted, along with giving a historical account of late Ming painting, to reconstruct the system of meaning within which artists worked: the assumptions, issues, and arguments, the regional and social and intellectual affiliations attached to the styles and motifs of their paintings. Such a system of meaning extends far beyond symbolism in the narrow sense (pine trees standing for integrity, etc.) to the meanings associated with stylistic choices and varieties of use of the past. What these communicate can be attitudes and ideas pertaining to a place, a class, a philosophical school, as well as the thoughts and feelings of the individual artist. [p. 264]

Well, universal knowledge is a commendable goal. One wonders whether we are in fact, especially as art historians, quite ready for the "system." The danger is getting caught, denials to the contrary, in trying to explain matters other than the visual ideas for which painting is uniquely suited, or retreating from the painting unless external material is at hand. In his preface Professor Cahill admits that the writing "proved unexpectedly difficult." This reviewer can echo that same remark. It is a difficult period, but it is also a difficult book. Issues are raised, yet questions remain. There are important insights into individual paintings and painters but somehow we often reach uncertainties. The professional- amateur distinction ends up by being blurred. Schools fall apart ("Still, we must attempt some ordering of our material," p. 129). Geographical distinctions are in question (Fukienese paint like northernmen). Of many scholar-amateurs only Tung Ch'i-ch'ang is a great painter.

The author seems to take an almost obsessive delight in dwelling on complexities: "The preference of northern landscape artists . . . adds still another dimension to the multidimensional structure of issues, affiliations, stylistic referents and determinants within which we are attempting to understand late Ming painting" (p. 165). One wonders whether the task is not, indeed, more direct.

By definition, the artist has a special sensitivity toward his environment. Naturally we will understand him better if we understand the issues that swirl around him—especially in periods of change. But the artist, also by definition, clarifies experience. He not only experiences, he creates and in that creation gives meaning, a meaning which is denied to others. We need thus to cling persistently to the work of art, not because it somehow rises in a vacuum or because styles are purely and mysteriously self-engendered, but because the work of art, especially visual art, speaks to us directly in a way no amount of verbalism about other issues can explain. The well preserved painting negates the uncertainties of time. It is exactly and directly before us as if it had just left the artist's brush.

It must be admitted that the author is somewhat ambiguous on this issue. The chapter on Tung Ch'i-ch'ang, although overcommitted to matters of tension, is perhaps the most satisfying in the entire book, and it is so chiefly because, while starting out with a "career," it works toward an understanding of Tung Ch'i-ch'ang through "the internal evolution of his style" (p. 99). It is firm in the assertion that "relating his theoretical writings to late Ming intellectual history or the
circumstances of his life to developments in political and social history are interesting and worthwhile but subsidiary concerns" (p. 127).

On the other hand, an artist such as Li Shih-ta suffers, apparently because there is not enough subsidiary material to affirm "affiliations" that might aid us in our understanding. I suspect a great deal more can be gained from his paintings. The opinion that the great landscape of 1618 in the Seikado reviving some of the grandeur of the Sung is a "totally serious work" (p. 30), while his mannered work, especially figure painting, presents "a pleasing oddness" (p. 34) or is "primarily to entertain" (p. 35) is too limiting. Why are they not all of a piece, reaching seriously for new expression and insisting—perhaps over-insisting—that we see the foibles of man clinging to traditional ways as a complementary contrast—a bit like a Chinese Brueghel—to nature's enduring serenity?

Why is not Li Shih-ta just as serious in his parodies as Ch'en Hung-shou—admittedly the greatest artist—whom we discover to be loaded with psychological, historical, and literary complexities? Working mainly from paintings and in the interest of clarifying Suchou vision at this time, can we not suggest that the same Seikado landscape and its justly recognized "visual whole that is reported as if first hand from nature" (p. 36) is of a piece with, say Chang Hung's Hua-tzu hill (pl. 11), helping to show, along with some of Sheng Miao-yeh's landscapes, that a painterly interest in specific or imagined "views"—in matters beyond surface texture, as is later suggested—was not confined to Chang Hung?

The use of writing about painting, the verbal explanation, is important but needs always to recognize the more concrete "language" of the painting. Ch'en Hung-shou's The Mountain of Five Cataracts has an added colophon which affirms its specific association with the mountain complex of Wu Hsieh, often visited by Ch'en in his youth. Apparently with this in mind, the author relates the scroll to Hung-shou's master, Lan Ying—a direct experience of nature as seen in the latter's closely contemporary 1622 mountain view, Listening to a Waterfall. Yet on the one hand—Lan Ying—we are presented with a spacious landscape dominated by a tall mountain set deliberately back in space, on the other—Ch'en Hung-shou—by a complex interface of close-up form, a shallow screen owing an allegiance, as Dr. Cahill interestingly tells us, to Wen Cheng-ming. It is a painting which with only the briefest upper corner of sky cannot be considered a normal "view." It appears to owe little to the teacher and much to Ch'en's own idiosyncratic commitment to "style." Nor would it be out of place to view some of its formal precision as related to Liu Tu, whose "decorative" landscape is found in the opposite plate.

However, an over-reading of a colophon can also be a pitfall. In Ku I-te's Laeeries of Springtime, Tung Chi-ch'ang's inscription closes with: "It does not lapse into Ch'iu [Ying's] 'carved painting' approach. One can speak of this [superior quality] as the 'gentleman's spirit' or as the 'untrammeled' mode of painting." Dr. Cahill's point is first that "a less 'untrammeled' work would be hard to find in the late Ming"; and accordingly he draws the conclusion that Tung, rather than giving just a evaluation of the painting, is simply trying to protect his young friend "from any suspicion" of connection with a despised style. However, in evaluating the painting, Dr. Cahill himself concludes that it "has striking affinities with some French cubist painting" (p. 13). Now in general terms there is no painting style further from Ch'iu Ying's even-handed pictorialism than cubism. So, then, why cannot we accept the "language" of the painting as a precise definition of what Tung Chi-ch'ang might mean when he used the word "untrammeled"—a word which in the Ming was associated with such established styles as those of Mi Fu and Ni Tsan—and see with him that indeed there is no real connection with late Wu decadence? The "art-historical issues swirling around" the painting perhaps offer calmer sailing than is implied.

This is not to suggest that the writer—who has travelled farther, devoted more time, examined more scrolls, collected more avidly, and done more to share his experience than any other contemporary scholar—is unaware of the significance of the work of art. We all must gain from what he has to say about the paintings he has selected, and the book is to be read with care.

Still, there is a certain restlessness, which appears to press the analysis too quickly to another painting or to re-remind us that it is after all the broader issues that motivate our understanding rather than more exactly puzzling out connections from art to art.

This may be reflected inadvertently in the selection of paintings themselves. While there is always excitement in new discoveries, the presence of paintings from "collection unknown" or from collections where it may be difficult to get an adequate reproduction—as in the Tung Chi-ch'ang landscape from Shanghai (pl. 50)—can only dilute our understanding. For example, we are asked to appreciate Ni Yuan-ju as we would "the best European drawings" (p. 163). Yet that cannot be, for all we have is a hazy reproduction (pl. 79) whose source is not given, of a painting whose collection is unknown.

Other issues will doubtless provoke continuing debate. How revolutionary was Tung Chi-ch'ang? Admittedly a giant in this period, his search for a new integrity in painting was itself part of a long tradition in Chinese history. The establishment of a lineage, the insistence on art history, condemnation of the superficiality of much contemporary painting, the necessity to return to basic forms—these are not quite when viewed in the longer range of Chinese painting history. The implications of a revolutionary cubism never took hold in the orthodoxy of his followers and apparently not even in Tung himself, as his calmer later works suggest (p. 116ff.).

The fascinating but will-o'-the-wisp matter of western influence continues so. Its advocacy, which is pressed with less insistence than in the author's The Compelling Image, is not helped by such observations as the claim of consistent lighting (from the right) in Chao Tso's Lofty Retirees (p. 79). It remains puzzling that whereas "late Ming artists and their contemporaries talked and wrote so much about painting" (p. 3), there is as yet no written statement that affirms the positive impact of western art. Artists are usually more generous than that, especially when poised to find fault with their own time.

We need, too, as a background a more sympathetic approach to late sixteenth century painting in Suchou, which is here rather too readily condemned to "forced and mannerist effects" or "debilitating poetic mildness" (p. 6). At least in Western art, mannerism has been shown to have its positive aspects. The judgment that all scholar-painters of the period, with the exception of Tung Chi-ch'ang, were "minor" seems a bit precipitous. It may be justified but needs the backing of more considered studies before complete acceptance.

In the nature of editorial suggestions it may be said that books of this kind are often read, or at least referred to, from reproduction to text as well as the other way around. Page numbers in plate captions indicating the principal pages of discussion would be helpful. Since footnotes are relegated to the back of the book and organized by chapter number, the
inclusion of that number at the top of both text and note pages would facilitate their discovery. The sources of reproductions of paintings from "collection unknown" have not been given. It is helpful, too, in writing about Chinese painting to remind readers in the text of the collection in which a painting is found. There are too many landscapes or albums with similar titles or of similar subjects not to give the reader this additional aid.

Finally, I trust I will not seem overly contentious in questioning the titles of this and other volumes in this admirable series. None is, alas, memorable for suggesting the period with which the book is concerned—or at least in my dullness I have not discovered the key—least of all The Distant Mountains. For a period claimed by the author as one "in which everything was in question" it can only suggest the contrary—the calm integrated serenity of the far view. Or perhaps it, too, is a question—a kind of kung-an—the enigmatic conveyor of true enlightenment. For if read and contemplated with care, this indeed can be an enlightening book.

Notes


RICHARD EDWARDS


Few fields of cultural research have been as exciting over the past few decades as Han studies. Many unprecedented archaeological finds have brought to view a wealth of tomb goods and tomb decoration. Scholars of early Chinese culture are testing and enriching our already substantial understanding of the Han dynasty (206 B.C.-A.D. 220), engaging the well known textual tradition with newly found material evidence.

Pirazzoli-t’Serstevens has written a work that might well be an exhibit catalogue, given its opulent illustrations, but is in fact a cultural history of Han China that provides the reader a full sampling of the new archaeological materials. The lengthy first four parts of her text provide a chronological history of the four centuries of the Han, from the conquest of the Qin to the demise at the hands of the Wei. A brief but valuable fifth part summarizes Han achievements in cosmology and thought, science, and art. Throughout, carefully selected quotations from key historical sources and Han poetry and prose provide the reader direct contact with Han culture.

The book is not an exhaustive history, something that would require many volumes at present. Rather, the text marks major periods of the Han by describing major historical events. Within these delimited periods, it provides carefully selected background materials, reviews significant events, and introduces and explains characteristic artifacts. Discussion of the objects is well integrated with the historical materials, and the analysis of the objects is generally focussed on their cultural context. But issues of design and connoisseurship are not ignored. The book includes photographs of objects that have been reported in journals but have not previously been so handily assembled and so elegantly reproduced. The author also reaches out periodically to cultures beyond the Han imperial core, discussing the special aesthetic proclivities of the southwestern peoples of Sichuan and introducing the bronze drums of Yunnan tribesmen. She shows her special expertise in the area of non-Han culture.

The book reflects a valiant and largely successful effort to keep up with the latest in the rapid flow of new materials from China. Journals are noted up to 1980, and the bibliography is adequate through that year. Illustrations are consistently and carefully documented, and there are very few problems in the reliability of the materials chosen.

An appendix includes reference maps, city maps, and a tomb layout. The notes are rather sparse, fewer than eighty-five for the entire volume. This is a regrettable weakness in a work of such scope. Another is the total lack of Chinese characters in the text and the lack of a glossary. This book has been produced with meticulous care, and its attractive design and layout make reading it a pleasure.

KENNETH J. DEWOSKIN


The Golden Age of Japan surely represents the most serious effort to date to offer a balanced account of the arts of the Heian period in a Western language. Following a sweeping historical survey of the area that emphasizes its beginnings in the continental-influenced institutions, rituals, and art forms of the Nara era, a systematic exposition of Heian culture begins. Chapter by chapter a logical, studied discussion unfolds of religion, sculpture, politics, architectural and city planning, Chinese and Japanese literature and calligraphy, and related topics. The book as a whole, the individual chapters, and indeed the subchapters present well considered, succinct patterns of organization. The reader is, therefore, seldom at a loss to recall just where he is, an obvious problem with several recent books or exhibition catalogues (especially in the field of Chinese painting) written by American specialists.

Indeed, a distinct pleasure of this volume lies in its literary and methodological unpretentiousness, and in its determined focus on providing a comprehensive outline of the many art forms of Heian Japan. This must be considered a major undertaking, and the author, a European, accomplishes it with a more balanced perspective of the era's varied artistic achievements than the majority of American students of Japanese art. Of course such a panoramic view necessarily poses any number of problems for the specialist, but on balance this effort justifies most of the criticisms that may be levelled against it.

The volume is not really meant for the layman but seems directed principally to the academic community, who could certainly use it effectively in course preparation. Without going into great detail it may be worth noting some of the book's weaknesses. The illustrations are of uneven quality, especially
those in color. Most of the information is reliable, but occasionally reveals a perplexing eclecticism and abridgement. When combined with awkward English phrasing and slack editing this inconsistency seriously detracts from the author's purpose.

Several of the book's contributions deserve brief mention. The book includes chapters dealing with the significant role of early Korean culture in Nara-Heian Japan and the influential position of Japanese women in defining new literary and calligraphic forms. The sections on architecture (Shinto, Buddhist, and secular), the writing of sutras, calligraphy, and the role of the decorative arts in Heian Japan are exemplary. Much of this material will provide specialists with an expanded vision of the art of the Heian period. (The treatment of Fujisawa sculpture, religious and secular painting, music, and dance probably will not.) Perhaps if the author's original text had been better edited and translated, the results might have been considerably improved. The notes reflect an intriguing reliance on somewhat dated European and Japanese sources (all worthy of inclusion), despite the presence of a comprehensive, up-to-date bibliography.

The Golden Age of Japan is a welcome addition to Western literature on the arts of the Heian period, such as John Rosenfield's 1967 Asia Society exhibition catalogue, Japanese Arts of the Heian Period. It is to be lamented that these two fine efforts—fifteen years apart—should constitute, essentially alone, not only the specialist's means of access to Heian culture, but also the nonspecialist's key to appreciating one of the most glorious eras in the world's cultural history.

MICHAEL R. CUNNINGHAM


In the Great Central Asian Treasure Hunt which began toward the end of the nineteenth century the French were latecomers. Yet they did not come away empty-handed. This was owing entirely to the genius and industry of the very young (twenty-seven years old) Sinologist Paul Pelliot, who possessed in generous measure what all his predecessors and competitors lacked: a truly phenomenal knowledge of Central and East Asian languages and cultures. He had as well a capacity for greatly irritating many of his less gifted colleagues and a restless, exploring mind that to the greater benefit of Sinology at large prevented him from devoting the rest of his life to the meticulous cataloguing of the objects collected by his mission to Chinese Turkistan. Those catalogues and comparative studies, based on the work conducted between 1906 and 1908, primarily near the northern oasis towns of Tumshuq and Kucha, and at Dunhuang in Gansu Province on the northwestern frontier of China, are now only being published in detail, and if the present rate of publication is maintained, the projected sixteen volumes will carry us well into the next century, a hundred years and more past the time of the discoveries.

Pelliot's mission was a small but highly competent one, consisting of Dr. Louis Vaillant, who served both as medical officer and very capable surveyor, and Charles Nouette who, if we may judge by the published results, took the finest photographs ever of Central Asian sites. The mission had not the means, as had the great German and Russian expeditions of transporting large paintings sawn off the walls of Buddhist cave temples, and Pelliot's skill as an archaeologist probably did not equal that of Sir Aurel Stein (though Stein inspected and praised his work); nonetheless he excavated and collected thousands of smaller objects, including painting fragments, and arranged for the careful transport of these fragile objects safely to Paris, where they were immediately and wrongly disparaged as insignificant, their acquisition a waste of public funds.

The plates to accompany the present text volume were published, under different auspices, in 1967, and to such a high standard that one is grateful the present volume has need of only a single photograph. Except for the meagre extracts from Pelliot's journal kept while digging at Douldur-aqur and Subashi from April to June 1907 (pp. 31-38), the studies in this volume understandably are devoid of the immediacy and fascination of Stein's compelling accounts of his own archaeological explorations in this same region.

This hefty volume is divided into three unequal parts. The first contains detailed descriptions of structures studied by Pelliot in each of the two localities, based on Pelliot's notes but greatly expanded on the basis of later relevant research. These descriptions are followed by several plates of maps and plans, both of Douldur-aqur and Subashi structures and of comparative structures from elsewhere in Central and South Asia, most with neither dimensions nor scale. The plans of Douldur-aqur and Subashi are given here as handy references only, since they were earlier published at a more serviceable scale in the volume of plates. Plate A on p. 61 includes as well Pelliot's own crude and highly abbreviated sketch plan of the monastic complex at Douldur-aqur alongside Dr. Vaillant's measured but unscaled plan.

The architectural study is followed by a description of the severely damaged and fragmentary wall paintings uncovered at Subashi and photographed by Nouette, but regrettably left in situ. Every detail of gesture and ornament visible in these paintings has been painstakingly compared to similar representations in paintings, sculptures, and metalwork from across Asia, from all the cultures participating from time to time in the transport of goods and artistic styles along the several branches of the Silk Route, from the Mediterranean to China. The author of this chapter, L. Courtois, has illustrated her comparisons with some four hundred cartoonlike sketches executed by herself, bringing to the varied source materials an appearance of homogeneity not in the originals. She has, however, provided full bibliographic references for the scholar unsatisfied by this approach to the materials.

The second part of the volume deals with the archaeological collections brought back to France and now housed in the Musée Guimet: painting fragments from Douldur-aqur; sculptures and architectonic fragments in wood, stucco, and mud; small objects of wood, metal, and glass; and ceramics. The same descriptive analysis is employed and comparisons to similar objects are again made by means of hundreds of sketches. Chemical analyses of the glass fragments are especially welcome, and comparison is made to glass found at other sites, particularly at Bagram in Afghanistan, and some consideration is given to localizing possible centers of glass manufacture. Pelliot was evidently less interested in ceramics, except where whole shapes could be reconstructed, or where sherds bore some molded or stamped design. Consequently no ceramic typology of the sites is attempted; perhaps these were not excavated in a way that made this possible. This is manifestly the weakest part of Pelliot's investigations, since
one can imagine that these valuable chronological touchstones were discarded by the thousand.

The final section of the volume is a catalogue listing every object from Duldur-agur and Subashi in the Musée Guimet collections. The objects are described in commendable detail and every one is illustrated, again with an abbreviated sketch. In some cases a photograph would have served better.

It is difficult to fault the meticulous scholarship of this fourth volume of the Mission Paul Pelliot. It is certainly no fun writing someone else's archaeological report nearly eighty years after the field work was completed, but the authors have realized the importance of making this material available to an audience wider than that able to study the objects firsthand in the storerooms of the Musée Guimet. This book, and its companions, do not constitute in the normal sense a final report of excavations conducted long ago in Chinese Central Asia. Very little in these volumes, apart from the site photographs and plans, is dependent solely upon field records that evidently were not kept in what we would regard today as an orderly fashion. Pelliot is credited with having had a photographic memory; our misfortune is that he did not in this case commit it to paper before he died.

WILLIAM TROUSDALE


Pratapaditya Pal has brought his prodigious energy and flair to the creation of a book which will be argued over and referred to for many years by scholars and collectors in the field of Tibetan painting. In the preface he announces his intention to give “a lucid and connected account of the history of thankas [than ka, ‘something rolled up’] from the eleventh through the nineteenth centuries,” the first such attack on the problems of dating and provenance since Giuseppe Tucci’s Tibetan Painted Scrolls, published in 1949.1 In the very next paragraph, Pal also acknowledges the problems that “few thankas are dated or easily datable” and that “the provenance of the thankas is often unknown.” To overcome these problems the reader will have to follow and believe the author’s stylistic arguments, hanging vast quantities of extant Tibetan paintings on the mostly fragile hooks of the few known dates, places, and artists.

Tucci’s Tibetan Painted Scrolls and his many other publications between 1932 and 1980, which scholars must search for the facts gleaned by this scholar’s several expeditions to Tibet and for his often brilliant insights into the objects, texts, and rituals observed or gathered on these expeditions, are still to be reckoned with. Indeed, Pal’s footnotes show that he is dependent for some of his theories upon Tucci’s material. Pal has made use, however, of some of the new evidence coming out of Tibet (and Nepal and India), of paintings in situ, and of recent scholarship connecting dated Chinese and Tibetan material. Like Tucci in 1949, Pal is attempting to deal with Tibetan painting stylistically and he has the benefit of the large number of thankas which have come onto the market and entered public and private collections since the Tibetan diaspora following 1959. Pal also has a clearer understanding of the Indian, Nepalese, and Chinese influences on Tibetan art than did Tucci writing in 1949.

The publication has been laid out sumptuously, with 115 full-page color reproductions organized into five groups that have chronological and in some cases regional coherence. Two additional introductory chapters give finely presented essays on early historical developments, techniques, artists, patrons, and the processes by which philosophical doctrines and mystical visions become translated into paint and cotton cloth. In Pal’s historical overview in chapter 1, this reviewer would take issue only with the discussion of the possible Central Asian connection with Tibetan art in the seventh to ninth centuries. While it is certainly true that Tibetan troops penetrated and even occupied much of Central Asia during this period, it is mere speculation that Tibetan artists were at work in any of the Buddhist institutions in Central Asia. Portraits of Tibetan kings, and Tibetan (and Chinese) inscriptions listing Tibetan monk patrons, have survived, for instance, on wall and scroll paintings from Dunhuang of the eighth to ninth centuries, but these paintings are completely in the Chinese Central Asian style. It is not clear, as the author asserts, that Tibetan artists were painting in Central Asia as early as the eighth century “from inscriptive evidence”; such inscriptions confirm Tibetan patronage and subject matter but not necessarily artistry. Further, while it is plausible that “generals who returned to Tibet from their Central Asian sojourn, whether in Khotan, or in Dunhuang, may have brought back some examples of paintings as pious souvenirs,” it is not at all clear for the period of the so-called first diffusion of Buddhism in Tibet in the seventh to ninth centuries how extensive the temple of monastic structures would have been in which these souvenirs were “to be deposited.” The upheavals following the assassination of the Tibetan king Langdharma in 842 and the century-long period of political and religious disruption which followed insured, in any event, that very little of such painting (or sculpture) could have survived. To this date, no paintings can be even tentatively dated prior to the tenth century in Tibet proper, although, as Pal writes, “the dark interiors of Tibetan monasteries will one day yield their ‘hidden treasures’ which will take us by surprise.” The author is on firm ground once he reaches the eleventh century and the second diffusion of Buddhism in western Tibet. His 1982 book on the elaborate wall painting schemes of Alchi in Ladakh as well as Tucci’s and Snellgrove and Skorupski’s extensive reports on other Ladakhi and western Tibetan monasteries have established a clear progression of styles in this region. These magnificent murals as well as some fine illustrated manuscripts in Pal’s home base, the Los Angeles County Museum, but alas no thankas, attest to a flourishing Kashmir-dependent school of painting.

In chapter 2, the author gives a vivid account of the ways in which the complex theology of Buddhism is transmitted from texts and visions to concrete form as sculpture and painting, and of the interrelations between yogi, monk, and artist in Tibet. It is particularly welcome to see the author’s use of some dated Tibetan and Nepalese sketchbooks which have come to light in recent years. These give much insight into the iconographic and decorative corpus available to artists of the fifteenth to twentieth centuries and make clear, as well, the complex interrelations of Nepalese and Chinese influences on Tibetan art. Although certainly the primary use of this art was for the private meditation and rituals of the initiated, it should be pointed out that religious art for public and lay consumption has always been important in Tibet. The monumental cult images, large painted murals, and appliquéd hangings in the larger temples and monastery image halls were intended for public worship and small personal icons were carried and worn by laymen or placed on home altars. Although those public and lay images are by definition
exoteric, they spring from the same creative sources as the esoteric Siddharta images Pal has in mind.

In chapter 3, “The Kadampa Style,” Pal has gathered together fourteen examples of paintings in manuscript, wall, and thanka formats which, he argues, are examples of a coherent stylistic group painted between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries primarily in association with monasteries of the Kadampa Order. This style is the Pala-dependent style first recognized by John Huntington, who corrected Tucci’s idea that it was Nepal-derived. Pal gives a well written discussion of the Pala culture in Bihar and Bengal and its probable means of transmission to Tibet through manuscripts, paintings, images, artists, pilgrims, and missionaries. The prime eastern Indian missionary to Tibet was the great monk Atisa, who travelled from the monastery of Vikramasila in Bihar to western Tibet and then to central Tibet where he died at Nethang, south of Lhasa, in 1054. Since it was Atisa’s disciples who founded the Kadampa sect, and since several Kadampa monasteries established in the eleventh and twelfth centuries in southern and central Tibet (the reader should note that this publication denotes both U, or central Tibet, and Tsang, or southern Tibet, as “Central Tibet” in the plate captions) contain wall paintings in this Pala-dependent style, Pal has sensible reasons for using “Kadampa” for what is undoubtedly the dominant form of Tibetan painting in the twelfth to thirteenth centuries. The problem with using this name is that it is too limiting. Nyingmapa, Sakya, and Kagyupa sects were also expanding at this time, establishing temples and monasteries and actively commissioning art of all kinds (a Pala-dependent style of metal sculpture can also be identified for this period). Pal suggests this sectarian diversity himself, in linking the spread of the style by the Kagyupas to Kharakhotso (under Xixia patronage) and by the Sakyapas to Dunhuang (under Mongol patronage), both in Central Asia, and in seeing the “Kadampa” style in early Sakya thankas. Whether scholars will ultimately come to call these paintings “Kadampa” or “Pala-dependent,” there seems no doubt that they will always henceforth be recognized as a coherent group. Pal gives a forceful discussion of the probable dating limits and salient features. A terminus a quo of the mid-eleventh century is set by the establishment of the Tibetan institutions that could have used the style and by the dates of the earliest surviving palm leaf manuscripts from Bihar and Bengal that could have served as models. Portable cloth paintings must also be assumed to have served as prototypes. Pal has published as an appendix an astounding painting in the Pala style that betrays its Tibetan origin only by the presence of two Tibetan monks (Atisha and Drongton) above the main deity. Pal is perfectly correct in setting the fourteenth century as the last possible date for this style. The source of the art in Bihar and Bengal had been wiped out by the Muslim invasions of 1193–1200, and the latest known datable Central Asian and Tibetan examples are of the thirteenth century: the Karakhotso paintings and woodblock prints must be prior to the destruction of Xixia in 1227, the Dunhuang murals are under early Mongol patronage ca. 1275, and two drawing in the style were found in a chorten dated by carbon-14 analysis to 1230.

The end of Buddhism in India, the rise of the artistic influence of Nepal, and the advent of political pressure from the Mongols and then the Chinese brought distinct changes in Tibetan painting in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, treated in chapter 4, “The Sakya Style.” The author justifies the use of this name for the next chronological group of thankas because of the special favors both in political power and economic support granted by the Mongol Khans to the leaders of the Sakya sect. The sect’s subsequent expansion in central and southern Tibet (and elsewhere, notably Derge in eastern Tibet) created patronage for vast architectural, sculptural, and painting projects. Nepalese artistic dominance, completely self-evident in the many thankas which can be attributed to Sakya patronage in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, is exemplified by the famous story of Aniko, a Nepalese artist at work for the Sakyas when he along with a retinue of twenty-four artists was summoned to Beijing in 1260 to work on Buddhist projects for the new Mongol rulers of China. The Chinese interest in bureaucratic and historical documentation has luckily left records of the intense activity of Mongol military leaders, Tibetan religious masters, and Nepalese artisans both in China proper and in Tibet. Equally useful are the records of the pious donations of Nepalese patrons so that a body of inscribed and dated paintings from the fourteenth century on is now known from the Kathmandu Valley proper and serves as a clear comparison to the paintings commissioned by Tibetan patrons. Of the thankas chosen by Pal to illustrate the “Sakya” style, those in pl. 23–27 and 29–34 are, as he notes, completely Nepalese; the inclusion of portraits of Tibetan monks, especially recognizable Sakya hierarchs, among the subsidiary figures is the only indication that these are paintings intended for Tibetan rather than Nepalese use. With the wonderful Mahakala thanka of pl. 24 Pal shows the transition from “Kadampa” to “Sakya” styles, for the entire Nepalese repertoire is derived from the same Indian sources as was the Pala-dependent painting of Tibet and Central Asia in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries. In another such transitional example, Pal makes a convincing case for a Tibetan commission for the well known Tara in the Cleveland Museum of ca. 1300 (pl. 18): the goddess, whose facial features are Pala in style, is enclosed in a Pala-derived shrine and her throne has Tibetan “Kadampa” style lion and elephant supports, but otherwise the work is completely Nepalese.

With the other illustrations for this chapter, however, Pal is on less secure ground for a strictly “Sakya” epithet. As with “Kadampa,” using the name of just one sect to describe a chronologically coherent group of paintings is just too limiting. Sakya power had declined by 1368 when the Mongol empire collapsed, and various other orders (the Kagyu sects of Karmapa and Drigungpa, and the incipient Gelugpas based in Lhasa) were receiving Mongol and then Ming Chinese support and establishing monasteries all over Tibet between the mid-fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. The great monument of Tibetan art for the fifteenth century is the Gyantse Kumbum. This multispired stupa, consecrated in 1427, and its adjacent Tsug Lakhang, whose painting program is ascribed to the mid-fifteenth century (details of their wall paintings are shown in pl. 20 and 21, respectively), and many other southern Tibet temples and monasteries of the fourteenth to fifteenth centuries (alluded to by Pal and fully discussed by Tucci) employ a style of painting (and sculpture) that makes much freer use of diverse Nepalese and Chinese elements than do the rather rigidly Nepalese dependent commissions of the Sakya thankas. Are we in fact seeing a “Pan-Tibetan” style here, a unique, and for the first time indigenous, blend in which Chinese open space, portraiture, and drapery conventions are mixed creatively with Nepalese scroll work, body adornment, and geometric compositions? The recorded use of both Nepalese and Chinese artists for the major Tibetan projects, the appearance of clearly Nepalese-Tibetan elements in dated Chinese prints, paintings, and
artistic contact between Tibet and Central Asia and China proper in the seventh to twelfth centuries and the more clearly understood contacts between these areas in the thirteenth to twentieth centuries are mentioned by the author as he asserts that landscapes and Arhat portraits were the primary contribution of Chinese painting to Tibet. A group of fine Arhat paintings in pronounced Chinese styles is shown in pl. 56–60, and the possible Chinese sources of these paintings, including “embroidered pictures,” an off-mentioned gift from the Chinese emperors to Tibetan lamas, are discussed. The travels of Sakyapa and other hierarchs from central and southern Tibet to Beijing, imperial gifts from Beijing to the heads of the major sects residing in diverse areas of Tibet, the existence of Chinese stylistic elements in monuments in southern, central, and western Tibet from the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries, and the author’s own comparison of the lovely Richmond landscape painting (pl. 55) to the fourteenth century murals at Narthang in southern Tibet are ignored, however, by Pal, who gives an eastern Tibetan provenance for most of the “Chinese style” thankas just because Kham and Amdo, the two eastern Tibetan provinces, happen to lie closest to the Chinese provinces of Yunnan, Sichuan, Tsedepaht, and Gungthun. Pal even claims that all cultural exchanges were operating at the highest levels, from the Chinese imperial court in Beijing to the main monasteries of Tibet, not by a process of osmosis across provincial borders.

The understanding of the “Chinese style” has been obscured by both Tibetan and Western scholars for some time. Tucci (also ignoring his own evidence of Chinese influence at Gyanse in southern Tibet and Tsaparang in western Tibet) simply called all Tibetan paintings in a Chinese style “K’ams” (eastern Tibet). Since he did not himself travel in eastern Tibet, Tucci had no firsthand knowledge of the artistic evidence that could have been gleaned from extant monuments there. Extensive damage was done to palaces, temples, and monasteries in Kham and Amdo in the several Sino-Tibetan wars of 1894–1899, and again during the “Cultural Revolution” of 1965–75; foreign travel to those areas remains restricted today. Thus we are on very shaky ground in determining an “Eastern Tibetan style,” but mere Chinese influence is not the criterion. Turning to the traditional Tibetan sources that discuss eastern Tibetan schools of painting, Pal admits that the lack of descriptions of the characteristics of these schools makes it difficult to relate them to extant paintings. Pal uses as his source for Tibetan painting styles A. W. Macdonald and Anne V. Stahl’s 1979 Newar Art, but these authors have relied on the more direct source of E. Gene Smith’s introduction to a translation of Kongtrul’s Encyclopaedia of Indo-Tibetan Culture.”
“transcended schools,” the Tenth Karmapa (1604–74). This famous incarnation followed the Mentri school but then developed a unique idiom under the influence of Kashmiri art later in life. The Tenth Karmapa spent 1625–35 in western Tibet near the Kashmiri border, and Kashmiri merchants were known to be in Shigatse and Gyantse in southern Tibet by the early seventeenth century. In his annotation, Smith mentions that Mughal influence on Tibetan art is “much more subtle and less obvious than the Chinese, [and that] this development deserves a careful investigation.”

In Pal’s illustrations we see Chinese clouds, foliage and rocks, brocaded drapes, and thrones, but these elements are used in a much freer way than if they had been slavishly copied from Chinese paintings. In the thanka shown in pl. 61 (with an added Chinese inscription using the name of the Wanli Emperor who reigned 1573–1612) as well as those of pl. 62–66, the landscape elements are broken up into small vignettes sprinkled about a main icon, and the mountains, trees, lakes, and especially architectural features are in a much more Tibetan than Chinese style (the golden “pogoda” roofs on the buildings reflect a purely Tibetan architectural feature seen as early as the earliest Tibetan Buddhist establishments. Same, built in the eighth century). Possibly under the influence of Mughal or Kashmiri painting, alluded to by Smith and Kongtrul as characteristic of the Tenth Karmapa’s “Karma Gadhri” painting, the series shown in pl. 67–68 have reached a complete transformation of landscape form. Now the central icon is gone and only the vignettes remain, arranged in a spacious and lyrical setting. Here the architecture and landscape elements are indigenous, as are the peculiar horse-drawn carts (a vehicle completely unfamiliar in Tibet), but the secular figures and overall palette show Mughal influence. The figures in their architectural settings, hills, clouds, and even odd horse carts are closely comparable to the vignettes in the “Wanli” thanka of pl. 61.

By the final chapter, “The Age of the Dalai Lamas, Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries,” the author has largely abandoned regional schools, and like every other art historian in this field, simply comments on the extraordinary diversity of the paintings. The vast majority of extant thankas are from this period, which really can be extended up until 1959 and beyond, for some thanka artists are still working faithfully in the tradition as refugees. As Pal indicates, the establishment of the Gelugpa sect, with its leader the Dalai Lama, as a unifying force over all of Tibet insured the “Pan-Tibetan” geographical spread of these paintings (as this reviewer would argue had happened by the fifteenth century), although different thankas provide clues in their subject matter to specific sects and personalites, or can be compared to woodblock print series commissioned at specific times and places (for example those in pl. 93–94). Tibet was “going it alone” now: Central Asia, Kashmir, eastern India, Nepal, and China proper had ceased to be areas of creative Buddhist development and so outside influences had largely ended. Although much of this later painting is banal and repetitious, the wonder is that so much is lively, inventive, and spiritually forceful. Earlier imported forms have now all become free elements in the Tibetan artist’s repertoire. Totally transformed into uniquely Tibetan forms are the self-possessed Mahasiddhas of pl. 71–72 and the sants of pl. 93–94. The demonic forms shown in pl. 105–115, as Pal eloquently points out, are some of the most innovative paintings to have been produced in Tibet. Gold and red linear depictions on black, blue-black, or red backgrounds, these Nag-thang or Tsal-thang thankas carry all the energy and wild force of the mystic vision for which Tibetan adepts and artists are justly famous. Generally attributed to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, these thankas are almost always beautifully painted, with a nervous line and sparse areas of luminous wash causing the deities and their attributes to shimmer over a dark abyss.

While doubting the suitability of some of his sectarian or regional attributions, this reviewer found Pal’s overall grouping of paintings entirely satisfactory in chronological terms. The blocks of color plates and the broad scope of the introductory essays for each group are informative and give the reader concise and vivid insight into the general progression of Tibetan painting from the eleventh to nineteenth centuries. The use of a basically uniform full-page format for each painting allows for easy stylistic comparisons between examples which in their original state may be quite dissimilar. This is put to especially brilliant use for the manuscript illustrations and wall paintings, which can be difficult to “read” in their original form but which provide convincing visual juxtapositions when brought to the same scale. It is unfortunate, however, that the financial constraints of the publication did not allow the luxury of showing in secondary black and white photographs the full manuscript folios and the positioning of wall paintings (and true borders of many thankas), as in Pal’s Los Angeles County Museum series and Alchi book.10 Because many of the paintings chosen for illustration, especially those in the private holdings of individual collectors and dealers, have never before been published, one wishes for such informational photographs or more descriptive captions. The general quality of the color reproduction is very high, so it is disturbing to see some of the thankas in private collections in blurred and badly trimmed plates (e.g. pl. 11, 16, 23, 25, 50, and 97). There are a few errors and omissions in the footnotes and bibliography. These minor defects aside, the book fulfills the promises made for it on the dust jacket: it is “an important contribution” and will become a necessary addition to the libraries of all scholars and collectors of Tibetan art.

Notes

The Pala dynasty ruled much of Bihar and Bengal, including the portion that is today Bangladesh, from the mid-eighth century through the mid-twelfth century. The Palas were succeeded by the Senas, who ruled a considerably smaller portion of the area until the opening decades of the thirteenth century. In the realms of these dynasties both metal sculptures and stone images carved from a characteristic grey or black stone were produced in unprecedented volume. These sculptures are among the most common works of Indian art in Western museums. They are thus familiar, yet Huntington’s book is the first study of these sculptures in more than fifty years, entirely replacing R. D. Banerji’s 1931 publication, Eastern Indian School of Mediæval Sculpture. Here is a thorough, meticulous work, one that will remain the source for Pala and Sena art for decades to come.

Notably, Huntington refers to schools of sculpture, while Banerji’s title recognized a single school, suggesting only the broad evolution of style, which he documented largely by palaeographic changes, that is, the distinction in form of certain letters on inscribed sculptures. Huntington’s approach is quite different and far closer to the mark in recognizing how Pala and Sena artists likely worked. True, there is an overall style that one can call Pala, with common features apparent in the sculpture of the entire region on one hand and distinguishable from sculpture in adjacent parts of the subcontinent on the other. However, it was not a single school that produced all the sculpture but rather a great many schools, which Huntington clusters by region, as the book’s divisions indicate. To determine the general evolution of Pala and Sena sculpture, she uses the style and motifs of images bearing dated or closely datable inscriptions. These dated sculptures are discussed at length in the book’s third chapter, following a general introduction to the subject and a chapter on sculpture in the region preceding the Pala period. They are further enumerated in an appendix detailing every dated Pala and Sena sculpture known to her, an enormously valuable reference; most of these are also illustrated among the 282 figures. Subsequent chapters, the main body of the book, cover “Stone Sculpture of Bihar,” “Metal Sculpture of Bihar,” “Stone Sculpture of Bengal,” and “Metal Sculpture of Bengal,” divisions of convenience, it seems, rather than an explicit indication of major stylistic distinctions between metal and stone imagery on one hand or, on the other, between the art of modern-day Bihar and that of Bengal. Her purpose, as she states (p. 33), is “to define the main trends and evolution of style characteristics.”

It is appropriate that “Pala-Sena” be placed in quotes, as in the title, for though we use dynastic terminology to describe the date or region of much Indian art, the role of the ruling house in the production of art was often marginal. That is the case with both the Pala dynasty and the Senas. Pala and Sena patronage is unknown for any of the surviving sculptures, as is evident from Huntington’s appendix, although epigraphic and other evidence indicates that they supported several monasteries. One thus must distinguish between court-sponsored schools, such as those of the Mughals, and work whose relationship to a ruling dynasty is more loosely described in applying a dynastic label to it.

The book begins with a review of literature on Pala and Sena art and then examines the ancestors of Pala art. Huntington assigns generally earlier dates to these pre-Pala sculptures than I do, but her arguments are in many cases persuasive, and I stand corrected on the date of several works, for example, the Viśṇu from Narhaṭha in Bogra District. She sees in the evolving schools a definite eastern and southern movement of artistic centers from Bihar into Bengal (p. 6), although I might note exceptions to that generalization, for example, the late Gupta sculptures of the Mainamati region in southeastern Bengal or those of Bhagalpur District in eastern Bihar. If remains known today accurately reflect production, Huntington’s observation is accurate that the preponderance of Bengali sculpture dates late in the period, essentially from the eleventh and twelfth centuries. But one must remember that little stone is found in Bengal, and so there may have been a substantial corpus of Bengali images created in more ephemeral material such as terracotta or even unfired clay, so widely used today for sculptures intended for a single holiday and then immersed in water.

As she treats the trends of specific sites or broader regions, Huntington raises a myriad of issues, many of which have implications considerably broader than the period and region of her study. A case in point is the distinction she draws between Buddhist and Brahmanic imagery, for example in northern Bengal (p. 181) or in Bihar, where she sees an early Pala Brahmanic style (p. 111). If the styles are distinct, one wonders about the explanation. Is that simply our perception based on the happenstance of finds, or did artists, in fact, specialize in either Buddhist or Hindu imagery? Alternatively, did the Buddhist monasteries provide continuous work for settled groups of artists and thus promote the development of a distinctive style? Elsewhere, Huntington raises the issue of a linear evolution of style in Bihar and Bengal. Although she notes distinct local and regional styles (p. 81), she generally believes that stylistic developments from the pre-Pala phase to the late Pala and Sena periods proceeded in a rather straight line (p. 80). In fact, at some periods the development proceeded with little regard to regional distinctions so that “the question of Bihar versus Bengal schools becomes academic” (p. 165). Since Bihar and Bengal represent relatively modern geographic, political, and even cultural entities, her point is well founded, and the question we so often ask about a Pala sculpture—did it come from Bihar or Bengal—is probably not proper. Clearly Huntington sees a flux of styles from one end of the Pala-Sena realm to the other rather than a juxtaposition of Bihar and Bengal styles. Further, she recognizes for the first time interfaces with Burma (p. 167) and Orissa (p. 178), as well as an impact of central Indian art on the sculpture of Bihar (pp. 22–26). For the periods during which she sees a notable unity of style across the realm, for example during the eleventh and twelfth centuries (p. 129), Huntington postulates the flux of artists from Bihar.
to Bengal as the explanation. She credits itinerant artists with the dissemination of specific stylistic and iconographic types in Bengal (p. 155), a notion I think correct; groups of Bengali artists, the painters of pañs, for example, remained itinerant until modern times. Important in this notion is that the movement of artists is the explanation for the transmission of style, and not simply the vague notion of influence, all too often invoked without adequate explanation of how that influence was transmitted.

Huntington is too modest when she states in conclusion that her book "has dealt with stylistic trends" and that "by studying style, it has been possible to demonstrate chronological developments, regional and local trends, as well as some sectarian preferences." A great many more provocative issues are raised, at least by allusion, and therein lies part of the book's considerable importance as well as the substance that distinguishes it from the thesis from which it grew.

FREDERICK M. ASHER


For those who could never hope to buy an actual Deccani painting, owning Mark Zebrowski's book, Deccani Painting, is a fine consolation. For those who collect, curate, teach, or simply enjoy the Islamic painting of India, Dr. Zebrowski's book represents the most thorough survey of Deccani painting available today. The splendid production of the book, with its many excellent color and black and white reproductions, high quality paper, and manageable dimensions, complements the clarity and order of Dr. Zebrowski's text.

While Zebrowski takes an essentially stylistic approach to his subject, he includes quite a bit of historical information about the states in which and patrons for whom the paintings were made. Each of the twelve chapters of the book focuses on works from one of the Deccani sultanates—Ahmadnagar, Bijäpur, Golkonda, and Bidar—and the individual patrons from these regions. Zebrowski not only outlines stylistic developments within the particular sultanate and period under discussion, but also isolates major masters and their oeuvres, a welcome advance in the study of Deccani painting.

Zebrowski's review of the literature on Deccani painting in the introduction reminded this reader of the frustrations of studying this school of painting, and, for that matter, much of Islamic painting. Either because broad surveys of Islamic art include few examples of Deccani painting or because authors have been limited by the format of their books and articles, only two or three scholars have previously attempted to make sense of the whole three-hundred-year sweep of Islamic painting in the Deccan. Stella Kramrisch's admirable Survey of Painting in the Deccan, published in 1937, is by now outdated. The 1973 catalogue of Mughal and Deccani Painting from the Collection of Edwin Binney 3rd contains much useful information and a remarkable range of paintings, but the reproductions are restricted to works in the Binney Collection. Scholars such as Hermann Goetz, Douglas Barret, Basil Gray, Robert Skelton, and Jagdish Mittal have greatly increased our knowledge of the field, but the scope of their efforts has been somewhat narrower than that of Dr. Zebrowski's.

In such a survey the author necessarily sacrifices depth at times in order to present as much material as possible. Nonetheless, Dr. Zebrowski has shied away neither from bold, new attributions of single pages or series of works nor from speculations on the impact of Shī'ism and various ethnic groups on the art of the Deccan. A typical chapter in Deccani Painting starts with a summary of historical events in the period under discussion and a description of the main patron, usually the sultan of one of the Deccani states. If the patron was especially brilliant, such as Ibrāhīm ʿAdil Shāh II of Bijäpur, Zebrowski cites contemporary sources that shed light on the character of the sultan. He then proceeds to the works themselves, discussing each one in terms of its style and its relation to other works of the same school and period. In so doing, the author builds up a corpus of works attributable to specific hands, for example "the Bodleian painter," and their followers. His stylistic arguments are aided immeasurably by the wealth of new material he introduces, consisting of scores of previously unpublished paintings and works in private collections and little-known Indian museums and libraries.

Since so much of the book concentrates on questions of style in Deccani painting, iconographic problems receive only passing attention. For the most part Zebrowski uses the literary and historical information available to him to identify the subjects of portraits and the circumstances in which paintings were executed. However, the odd distortions, juxtapositions, and details of many Deccani paintings remain a mystery. Perhaps too much of Deccani poetry and painting has been lost for us ever to understand fully the meaning of such works as the Yogiṇī (fig. 82, color pl. XII) or the Jain Nobleman Worshipping a Thirthankar (fig. 189). Yet, one suspects that a thorough review of Deccani literature would uncover important clues to the elusive symbolism found in so many works of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Moreover, in the discussion of the illustrated Kulliyāt of Muhammad Quli Qutb Shāh (figs. 121-33) the contents of the text are not mentioned, much less discussed in relation to the illustrations. Such an approach is not without precedent. Art historians from F. R. Martin onward have focussed single-mindedly on pictures and artists, with lesser regard for the narrative that the paintings illustrate. While their work and that of Dr. Zebrowski have contributed unquestionably to the understanding of stylistic matters, one is still pestered by questions of the artist's success in conveying the narrative, the extent to which details from the story are incorporated into the painting, and the degree to which the composition of a painting is influenced by the text. One hopes that in his continuing work on the art of the Deccan Dr. Zebrowski will tackle these questions.

Throughout his book Zebrowski explains and demonstrates the myriad "foreign" influences at work in Deccani painting. The interplay of Mughal and Deccani art is perhaps the most complex of these relationships because of Mughal military pressure and political sway in the Deccan, on the one hand, and the divergence of Mughal and Deccani world views, on the other. Dr. Zebrowski makes many stimulating points in this regard including the suggestion that the Mughal artist Mir Sayyid ʿAli (who had come to India from the court of Shah Tahmāsp the Safavid) might have worked at Ahmadnagar after he left the court of Akbar for Mecca. As one would expect, Dr. Zebrowski also takes up the question of the Mughal artist Farrukh Beg, who, according to Robert Skelton and others, traveled to the Deccan "and then returned to the Mughal atelier imbued with Deccani stylistic elements (p. 116, n. 59). Suggesting that Farrukh Beg came from the
Deccan originally and traveled from there to the Mughal court. Zebrowski disputes the textual reference in the Akbar nameh to Farrukh Beg’s migration in 1585 from Kabul to Akbar’s court. Zebrowski believes that Farrukh Beg could have gone from his birthplace in the Deccan to the court of Muhammad Hakim, Akbar’s half-brother, at Kabul and then to Akbar’s court. However, the Akbar nameh also mentions that Farrukh Beg was a Kalmuk, that is, a member of a tribe living in and around Bukhara. If Farrukh Beg himself came from Bukhara, he would have been exposed to the highly refined, brilliantly colored ornamental style of that city’s paintings in the mid-sixteenth century. Since Deccani elements appear to be the last pronounced in Farrukh Beg’s earliest works (i.e., in the Khusraw and Shirin manuscript in the Keir Collection), the artist most likely came into contact with Deccani painting slightly later in his career. Whether or not he traveled to the Deccan remains a question that further documentation might help to answer.

In discussing emirite Iranian artists, Zebrowski states (p. 68) that the poet “Zahari arrived in the Deccan from the court of Shah Abbas in 988 A.H./1580-81 A.D.” This would have been impossible since ‘Abbas did not become Shah until 1587. His father, Muhammad Khudabandah, was Shah, albeit an embattled one, in 988. The late seventeenth century Sleeping Girl (fig. 168) with her female attendant, cat, and refreshments recalls various Renaissance depictions of Venus, both sleeping and awake. One wonders if the painting of Venus, by Cornelius Heda, a Czech artist who worked at the court of Sultan Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II of Bijaipur (p. 95), was not copied or brought to Golkondâ in the seventeenth century and if it did not inspire the Sleeping Girl.

Throughout, Deccani Painting stimulates the reader to ask deeper questions about the works, the artists, and their patrons. After reading it one has a sense of how the great variety of Deccani painting fits into the history of the region. Thanks to Mark Zebrowski, we are freed from hunting in fifty different places for valid historical information and for examples of paintings from particular areas or periods. Deccani Painting is not only the best resource for this field; it also sets an example for scholars attempting to write similar regional surveys of Islamic painting.

**SHEILA CANBY**


**Islamic Metalwork from the Iranian World, 8th-18th Centuries (Victoria and Albert Museum Catalogue).** By Assadullah Souren Melikian-Chirvani. 445 pp., many illustrations in text, color frontispiece, appendix, bibliography, 2 annexes and 8 indices. London: H.M.S.O., 1982. £60.00.

Scholarship on Islamic metalwork has been slow to branch out from the iconographic-stylistic approach described by James Allan as “the basic sorting of objects; dating them by comparison with pieces whose origins are certain” (Nuhad Es-Said Collection, p. 11). Probably it is because Rice’s studies were so well conceived that his traditional method has been so much followed. But except for periods from which a good deal of material has survived this method leads rapidly to dead ends for lack of the confirming evidence it requires. We now have impressive examples of the results that different though not entirely new approaches can provide.

James Allan’s Nishapur reflects the technical study that went into his Persian Metal Technology, 700-1300 A.D. (London, 1979). Nishapur follows the format of Charles K. Wilkinson’s volume on the ceramics of the site, which was excavated a half-century ago (Nishapur: Pottery of the Early Islamic Period, New York, [1974]). The 209 silver, bronze, lead, and iron objects include many hard-to-identify items of the sort that appear only in archaeological reports. But it is precisely for these objects that Allan’s expertise is most useful, and its deployment makes interesting reading here. There is also valuable comparative material and historical background, not least for the “Nishapur sword.” Allan’s use of technical vocabulary is careful and he defines his terms clearly. In the context of this review it is noteworthy that not all the inscriptions have been read or transcribed (e.g. nos. 104, 165), but all else is in order. One identification is controversial: the inlaid bronze hand (no. 186, discussed p. 54) is surely a talisman, not part of a human figure.

Allan’s Nuhad Es-Said Collection is a much different undertaking. The auction house-sponsored catalogue of a relatively new collection formed at auction sales has become a fixture of publication in the art world. At times, as here, this expensive and somewhat dubious genre succeeds in presenting the objects better than any of our other genres. Every piece in this collection is illustrated in color, sometimes from several angles, in well printed plates. The lengthy historical introduction, which sets the collection in its several contexts, is well written and concentrates on the major technical and economic points. Allan adheres to the theory that there was a “silver famine” in the Islamic cast in the fifth/eighth century. While apparently supported by the evidence, this view still leaves some unsettling economic problems unresolved. Allan uses it to explain the rise of the inlaying of bronze vessels in the Islamic cast as a substitute for solid silver vessels, but concedes forthrightly that it cannot explain the spread of inlaid bronze or brass metalwork to the Islamic west. This knotty topic still needs some unravelling, but Allan has loosened many threads.

The twenty-seven objects are described at length in the catalogue, their inscriptions are read, and their aesthetic merits evaluated. Despite an obvious unevenness in quality, some of these objects are splendid—a twelfth century inkwell possibly from Herat, an east Persian ewer, a well preserved fourteenth century Syrian pen case, and, beyond compare, the incense burner made for the Mamluk Sultan Muhammad b. Qala’un (r. 1294–1340), which is the subject of a discerning iconographic study. Very little information on provenance is provided; the information on provenance in Melikian-Chirvani’s book is both interesting and useful, and it is missed here.

Eva Baer’s book is a compilation and filling-out of the body of information accumulated by the Ricean line of investigation. She concentrates her attention on sequences of shape, color, decoration and iconography, and on style. Only four full pages are devoted to materials and techniques; the content of inscriptions is treated in eleven pages. Methodologically there is no advance here, and much of the information seems quite
familiar. The handling of questions of connoisseurship and centers of production inspires no confidence (pp. 300–02 may be contrasted with Melikian-Chirvani’s detailed and nuanced efforts to establish the location of regional schools). The final “chapter” (of not quite two pages) on “The Excellence of Metalwork” is merely a collection of obvious observations.

But this volume is in some ways the most useful of the four reviewed here. The curator, teacher, or student seeking to identify a piece of metalwork will turn here first, in order to find a wider range of examples and a longer bibliography keyed to them than can be found conveniently elsewhere. It is a shame that a book likely to sit on many a desk is so poorly produced. The binding is frankly ugly, the paper is cheap and sprinkled with inkspots (at least in the review copy), the typography is amateurish and inconsistent, and the figures are muddy (some of them printed from photographs that should have been rejected by both author and publisher, as figs. 59, 214).

The heaviest book in this group, at five pounds, is Melikian-Chirvani’s Islamic Metalwork from the Iranian World, 8th-18th Centuries. The title is misleading: objects made of gold, silver, lead, iron, and steel are omitted, and, most importantly, there is little here that is not inscribed (cf. Allân’s Nishapur). Even within these bounds the book appears to be a selection; it would more properly be titled “Some Inscribed Bronzes and Brasses from the Persian-speaking World.” But that is just its point.

For a decade and a half Melikian-Chirvani has been publishing articles intended to show that Persian art, and especially metalwork, his specialty, is conditioned by Ṣūfī esoteric speculation. There are two significant parts to this claim: the more general one, tossed around in the “General Introduction,” is that Persian art cannot be understood (especially by non-Persian) without fully appreciating this aspect of it. It is therefore not surprising to read: “Such problems could hardly be touched upon in the course of this volume because they involve in fact a general exposition of Iranian aesthetics, as yet very little understood in the West.” At least, it is hoped that the importance of the texts engraved on objects as well as literary themes, unexpressed but visually referred to, will no longer be questioned” (p. 22).

The latter sentence brings us to the second part of the claim, that the poetic inscriptions he records are used for their Ṣūfī connotations, and that pseudoinscriptions are “almost certainly to be connected with esoteric speculations.” In this handsomely produced catalogue Melikian-Chirvani has provided us with a large and representative sample of inscriptions with which to test these views. The sample demonstrates conclusively that Melikian-Chirvani cannot be correct.

To take his theory of abbreviations first: Melikian-Chirvani claims that the many inscriptions in which parts of words appear are deliberate abbreviations (pp. 16-17 and passim), and further, that certain pseudoinscriptions, composed principally of lam-jins and alifī, the letters most characteristic of Arabic script to an unpracticed eye, “are probably to be related to esoteric speculations on the secret meanings of the letters lam-alif” developed within Ṣūfī and Ismā‘īlī [sic] writings from the 11th century on” (p. 197). He points out that these pseudoinscriptions are well executed: “Clearly they were not due to the imagination of some ‘illiterate’ craftsman, an epithet freely used by some Western scholars without further examination. Their definitive interpretation must await further study.” Why? one may ask—is there not enough evidence here to propose an interpretation?

For inscriptions that simply drop parts of words Melikian-Chirvani has an explanation that is largely sensible: these are abbreviations of parts of standard formuale (al-fād for al-dālālah), and therefore the contemporary reader would have been able to restore the abbreviated words appropriately. The existence and identity of these formuale are quite convincingly demonstrated, and the only question remaining is whether the inscriptions are truly abbreviated or only truncated. Several rather nice samples on p. 34 show a pattern that is confirmed by most of the examples in the catalogue: the “abbreviations” generally occur at the end of a line or section of a line, indicating that the formula taken as a model by the craftsman (here probably but not necessarily literate) has been truncated to fit the space available. It is tempting to see abbreviations here—why else would these inscriptions not have been arranged to fit completely within the spaces available? The answer, though, must lie in the way these formuale (“banal” is too strong, but certainly “very familiar” is appropriate) inscriptions were seen: merely as part of the objects, expected to be there, and thus not required to be entirely legible or perfect (if these abbreviations could be found similarly applied in other media it is possible that they could be considered differently). The careful execution of faulty designs can be paralleled in early Islamic architecture, where remarkable divergences from right angles in the plan are carried up in elevation. The parallel is not irrelevant: the imperfections in plan are not apparent to the observer, and the imperfections in the inscriptions would not have been apparent to the user, who expected a familiar inscription to be present and was satisfied by seeing most of it. Why the artisans found these imperfections tolerable is another matter, but the large number of wonky buildings surely shows that architects took no steps to correct the practices that led to inaccuracies in plan, and we need not conclude that the metalsmiths had anything but practical convenience in mind when they cut off the end of a phrase in a decorative inscription.

The problem of single letters or apparently meaningless letters is much clearer. Melikian-Chirvani would like them routinely to have esoteric meanings, which leads to such readings as:

| بَارِکَة / وَجَيْنِ / وَسَرُ / وَورُ / سَمَ | [p. 34] |
| "Divine grace, felicity, esoteric knowledge R / joy, felicity." |

The “R” indicates the letter rā’ (�藏), of which Melikian-Chirvani believes it was possible to have esoteric knowledge. Now R can be read as “gladness, joy,” as Melikian-Chirvani acknowledges. But this reading takes the mystical out of the inscription, and he is compelled to put it back in by double entendre:

The group سَرُورُ is written so as to read “esoteric knowledge, R,” سَرُورُ “joy” being the alternative reading, thus suggesting that esoteric understanding of the letter R leads to supreme joy.

Such an argument, though suspicious, is strictly speaking plausible. But later examples than this one, which is used for demonstration, can produce obviously absurd results:

| پَالِبَرِ / وَأَبِّرَ / رَكَّةً ِبَالِبَرِ / وَأَبِّرَ / وَأَبِّرَ | [p. 46, p. 81, inscription no. 3] |
| “With godliness and divine grace (ace) with / godliness with godliness and B/T/TH/N/Y-A! A!” |

*"With godliness and divine grace (ace) with / godliness with godliness and B/T/TH/N/Y-A! A!”*
Melikian-Chirvani may be able to fool himself with interpretations like this, since he believes that even peculiarities of orthography are "possibly connected with esoteric abbreviations" (p. 116), but the reader who thinks for himself is likely to see here the work of a craftsman (possibly illiterate) using the single word 4 al-barakah) or parts of it simply to fill up space. In his determination to leave no word unread Melikian-Chirvani has multiplied examples of this sort, casting grave textual suspicion on the overall accuracy of his readings, which his competence and familiarity with the material serve only to mitigate. That he has taken his interpretation to an extreme is not an argument against a more restricted version of it, but further examples (e.g., no. 26, pp. 79–80) show that even the finest metalwork can have bungled passages. Care of execution does not prove clarity of conception. (See also pp. 106, 117–18, 163–64, 187, 197, and 168, col. 1 and col. 2, where there may be an actual inscription, as on pp. 171, 360, 363, and 364.) It is quite clear from examples such as that on p. 112, col. 3, that the artisan simply took a stock phrase and engraved it as neatly as he had room for. What the craftsperson did indeed come from full ones (and the ones Melikian-Chirvani identifies) the individual letters are obviously just fillers. Even of an indisputable pseudoinscription,
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it is remarked: "It is obvious from the care with which the letters are incised, as well as the numbers involved, 12 and 14, both of which are key-numbers of Persian aesthetics, that the letters have not been engraved at random. It is too soon to venture into interpretations: more inscriptions must be published first" (p. 175). This can be described only as disingenuous nonsense. What can be expected from the publication of more "inscriptions" like this one? (Another example of such jaw-slackening logic can be found on p. 182, where Melikian-Chirvani resorts to citing the incidence of meaningless repetitions such as this on so many occasions for the sake of the esoteric meaning.)

The truly literary argument advanced by Melikian-Chirvani is that poetry on post-Mongol metalwork is used for its Sufi connotations. It is in reading and identifying the poetry on these pieces that Melikian-Chirvani makes his greatest contribution, and, let it be said, a contribution that can be made only by someone, whether "Eastern" or not, who is saturated with Persian poetry in the way the contemporaries of the objects were.

The poems generally refer to the function of the objects (p. 18), although it is not therefore legitimate to derive from such poetry the names that were commonly used for them, as is done in the "Short Glossary of Object Names," which is a valuable contribution nevertheless. The demands of meter and variety may have led poets to use rare terms, and some objects may have had several names. This is sometimes recognized in the glossary but implicitly ignored in the catalogue proper, where every object is assigned a single Persian term.

The poetry thus provides sentiments appropriate for contemplation while using the object, drawing attention to it and its workmanship, and borrowing the eloquence of one art form to enrich another (unlike earlier inscriptions, which seem related to the user, not the object). And those sentiments were often mystical. In such circumstances Melikian-Chirvani's "Sufi connotations" seem at first well founded: consider the poetry on the Safavid bucket (no. 135, p. 307):

Which is the secret that makes anyone who sets foot in the bathhouse
Throw open the doors of mirth to his sorrow-stricken heart
He answered: he is not burdened with the trappings of this world
But for a bowl and a towel—and even those are someone else's.

This quotation can certainly be seen as an "illustration of the pervading imprint left by mystical speculation on all metalwork in Safavid times . . . . Even in the bathhouse, the owner of the object is advised to give up the burden of worldly possessions to experience elevation through ascetic detachment." But may this not be reading-in? Surely at times this poetry's Sufi connotations were meant to be perceived. But Persian poetry, and often prose, is shot through with phrases that have Sufi meanings, used rhetorically and routinely, and not always with primary reference to those meanings. May not this use of verses on such an object as the bath bucket simply indicate a taste for poetry in general, resulting in the selection of passages primarily because they refer to the relevant objects? Here, if anywhere, Melikian-Chirvani's line of interpretation is warranted, but it requires more dispassionate examination.

Once Melikian-Chirvani leaves the interpretation of inscriptions he is on solid ground. Perhaps the most balanced discussion in the book is connected with geographical and chronological attributions and small concatenations of similar pieces. Here Melikian-Chirvani's considerable experience in the art market provides him with valuable comparative evidence and a firm foundation for his very considerable connoisseurship. While one may differ at times with his use of nishkhs (patronyms) and find-spots as evidence—is there really no west Persian metalwork before 1206?—on the whole his arguments are sensible and founded on explicit reasoning. So is his aesthetic appreciation: the interpretation (pp. 243-44) of Timurid arts as decaying rather than rising to ever greater heights is unconventional but perceptive.

Less satisfying is Melikian-Chirvani's reluctance to connect text and figural representation, or to elucidate the iconography carried by such representations, which is one of the strengths of traditional scholarship in this field (note p. 176, n. 2; no. 97, pp. 211–13; p. 223; and p. 228, n. 3). This is an important point, because it is only by using more than one kind of evidence that theories about intent and meaning (such as his claims for esoteric meanings in the inscriptions) can be confirmed. If the inscriptions have esoteric meanings, one should then be able to find similar allusions in the imagery of the same pieces, allusions only rarely cited here and never critically examined as a topic.

The physical description of the objects is weak, which is regrettable in a museum catalogue. There are errors in terminology: "chamfered" for "faceted" (passim), "knop" for "band" (p. 164), a "nozzle" on a candlestick (pp. 166, 174), "lambrequin" for nonarchitectonic borders resembling fringes (passim), "imbricated" for "juxtaposed" (passim). There are enigmatic terms: what does ""brass" on page 159 mean? What on earth is meant by "welded" (often used) or "bottom disc hammered on a stake and welded, now missing" (p. 41)? What are the "hammered iron bars" in a bronze key (p. 50)? Allan has set a high standard for terminology that deserves to be observed in a publication such as this.

Several notes on format are called for. One can only deplore the decision to use an overly complicated system of transcription of Arabic and Persian pronunciation rather than transliteration. Because it produces rampant inconsistency

1 I remember an ancient master saying in the bathhouse
One day, some young man asked an older man
it makes the volume extremely irritating to use. The specialist will be able to compensate, but the noninitiate will become confused quickly (e.g., the "General Index" has both Mohammeds and Muhammadhs, and one finds "Neshaburi" on p. 18 and "Naysaburi" on p. 72, among other variants). The map, while better than some, lacks all orography, without which the geography of west Asia is impossible to understand, and omits (modern) national boundaries when they coincide with rivers, producing some bizarre geopolitical situations. The rivers of eastern Afghanistan, important for the location of mineral deposits and therefore entirely relevant here, are missing altogether. Index IV ("Objects") would be much more useful if it included inventory or accession numbers as well as the numbers assigned here to the Victoria and Albert pieces. There are not a few typographical errors (in a very difficult text).

I cannot conclude without remarking on Melikian-Chirvani's wearying lack of civility in discussing his scholarly predecessors and colleagues, simply because they were not interested in the inscriptions that so fascinate him (p. 84, n. 81; p. 106, col. 1, where inscriptions were not mentioned but were plainly visible in illustration), because they have slighted him unintentionally (p. 156, n. 60, for a particularly unjustified attack), or because they are not sufficiently Persophile. This prejudice is perhaps most clearly seen on page 23, where all parts of the Sasanian Empire are submerged in "Imperial Iran," or page 20, where only "Eastern" scholars are called on to improve Melikian-Chirvani's readings, as though those readings were superior to anything that a "Western" student of Persian poetry could ever produce. Ironically, in his argument from Sufism Melikian-Chirvani is only perpetuating a Romantic view of the East propounded by a Frenchman, Henry Corbin, and Melikian-Chirvani's scholarship is entirely within the venerable Orientalist tradition of understanding the East through texts. The author's achievement, which is considerable, is no occasion for belittling others. Melikian-Chirvani is not without his blunders, too: Semirechye can hardly be described as "lying North of the Iranian domain in the Soviet Union" (p. 130) any more than Taxila can be regarded as an "Indian outpost of Eastern Iranian culture" (p. 25). Ghazni was never a "Khorasanian outpost" (p. 76, a view not at all supported by the text cited: For nos. 13-15, pp. 50ff., cf. Allan, Nishapur, pp. 37-38, and for no. 49, an "unidentified object" that seems to be a lid, see for example Géza Feversari and Yussuf Kiany, "Discovers from Robat-e Sharaf: the Metalwork," Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, n.f., v. 15, 1982, pp. 329-46). There are recurrent errors in the apparatus. And throughout the notes Melikian-Chirvani corrects errors in his earlier publications, generally blaming them on editors. There are so many such corrections that another index would seem to have been called for.

Technically this is a splendid book. Many of the photographs are testimony to Melikian-Chirvani's skill with a camera; those taken at the Victoria and Albert Museum are all one could ask. The production is handsome as well. A promised second volume on Arabian metalwork (with "full technical analysis" of both Arabian and Persian metalwork) will be worth looking forward to. The publication of many objects from Afghanistan here is especially welcome, and one may hope that the next volume will also contain such surprises. It will be obvious that there are faults to all these approaches to Islamic metalwork. Each author works independently with his own methodology. But in working out their approaches Allan and Melikian-Chirvani have expanded the horizons of the field greatly. The integration of these approaches with the tradition of scholarship in the field (represented here by Baer) and with studies on such things as the use of vessels as revealed in texts is the next order of business. Given the magnitude of the contributions reviewed here, that integration will not be achieved quickly. But it should achieve results much more interesting than the study of Islamic metalwork has produced in the past.

Notes


2. No proof is offered for the aesthetic significance of these numbers, though Melikian-Chirvani may have in mind the connections he derives from analyzing the dimensions of metalwork using a module of only a millimeter ("Les Bronzes du Khorassân—Vl. L'oeuvre de Hasan-Bâ Sahl: de l'emploi de l'unité modulaire et des nombres privilégiés dans l'art du bronze," Studia Iranica 8 (1979), pp. 7-32).

3. Note for example p. 393, where the citations will not support the use of the term mash'al, "torch stand."

4. A connected question is that of the significance of certain elements of titulature in Fârs (pp. 147ff.), in which Melikian-Chirvani takes as proven his assertions in an earlier article ("Le royaume de Salomon: les inscriptions persanes de sites achéménides," Le Monde Iranien et l'Islam I (1971), pp. 1-41). It would be out of place to discuss that article here, but I suggest that a comparison of Melikian-Chirvani's interpretation of the key piece of evidence with Vladimir Minorsky's reading ("A Civil and Military Review in Fârs in 881/1471," Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies 10 (1938), pp. 141-78) will show that Melikian-Chirvani takes out of context "Sufl" phrases that are used rhetorically in the fulsome introduction to what is a very precise and realistic eyewitness account. One must distinguish in the sources the use of these phrases as allusion and simply as bombast. Readers confused about the roles of Persepolis, Solomon, and Jamshid in Persian culture may wish to consult the very clear but unfortunately referenceless note by Priscilla Soucek, "The Influence of Persepolis on Islamic Art," Actes du XIXe Congrès International des Orientalistes, Études Arabes et Islamiques (Paris, 1975), pp. 195-200.
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The first of these works on the monuments of the Fertile Crescent is a somewhat unusual book: a reprinting of two important but usually ignored studies by the famous British explorer and archaeologist, accompanied by a large and useful set of notes, a "Catalogue of Sites and Monuments," and other apparatus, all assembled by Martha Mundell Mango. The line illustrations, including plans, are reproductions of the original ones. The plates are not originals, but a new selection of photographs taken by Gertrude Bell and held by the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, many of which have not been published previously.

Simply by reprinting these texts Mango has reminded us of the importance of Bell's work on the monuments of northern Iraq and southeastern Turkey, and of the importance of the monuments themselves. These churches are precious remnants in an area (still ill-surveyed) where most historical architecture has been destroyed and little has been excavated from the Late Antique and Islamic periods. These monuments, like Armenian church architecture, probably do not reflect directly the dominant metropolitan styles of their periods of construction: their architects probably were conservative in style. But if one adjusts for their idiosyncrasies the record of the monuments, combined with similar buildings in the general region, gives a picture of an architectural tradition very as strong as, and stylistically related to, the well-known pre-Islamic Christian buildings of northwestern Syria. This was the basis for the first Islamic architecture in northern Mesopotamia, and these buildings are probably representative of some of that Islamic architecture as well; furthermore they were the reservoirs of a Late Antique past that was revived in the eleventh-twelfth centuries, at just a time when the still obscure architecture of northern Mesopotamia was changing rapidly.

Mango's introduction sets Bell's studies in context and updates her discussion of many questions, with full reference to the more recent literature. The "Catalogue," also a concordance to the literature as a whole, is as valuable as Bell's original studies are. It makes the material available for study and organizes it in ways that give it greater value as evidence.

The selection of a new set of photographs is both a good idea and a bad one: while giving us many new and valuable views it deprives us of some old ones. Since the plates are not very well printed, the serious researcher will still want to use the older publications as well. The University of Newcastle upon Tyne may expect inquiries regarding other Bell photographs they may hold. The book is crisply printed and well bound; the first six pages of front matter are unnumbered.

Resafa I heralds the resumption of publication of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut's investigations at the antique pilgrimage city in the Syrian steppe, Resafa. The volume at hand deals with a heavily destroyed enclosure well outside the city, where an early Byzantine bath was excavated. It was probably used during the early sixth to mid-eighth centuries, although the later limits of occupation are inferred from only a few coins. The results of that excavation, handsomely presented here, are not very interesting visually, but they are worth noting because they extend the body of well described remains for a period of unusual architectural diversity in Syria. The bath is reconstructed carefully, its opus sectile floor is considered thoroughly, and the pottery and small finds are cataloged. Bones and plant remains are analyzed briefly.

What was this enclosure? Mackensen's carefully reasoned answer (pp. 25-26) is that it was a private villa, or suburban retreat—which makes it a forerunner of Ummayad rural complexes, though this angle is not developed by the author. One wonders whether the sites of the Rusafa area that have like surface finds (map, p. 26) are of them lying close to the same elevation for apparently hydraulic reasons, constitute a network of such villas.

This is a fine beginning for an important series of reports; the next volume, on the Basilica of the Holy Cross (Basilica A), promises to be similarly informative and well documented. Jean Sauvaget's Aleppo: essai sur le développement d'une grande ville syrienne, des origines au milieu du XIXe siècle (Paris, 1941) has long been cited as a model study of an Islamic city, and when it was written it was the best study yet. Aleppo is Syria's second city and the setting for a multitude of elegant stone monuments; it was and is a first-rate topic of investigation. Yet many of Sauvaget's conclusions are clearly untenable, and his documentation is at times slim. The latest volume in the Tübinger Atlas series addresses these issues squarely. The "wirtschaftlichen Dynamik" of the title is the key to the conceptual organization of this work: the extensive documentation of Aleppo's topography and functional differentiation is seen as the key to understanding its commercial importance in its region. Physically it is a very handy reference, well equipped with clear and handsome maps. The prose is vigorous and to the point. Economic geographers will see the obvious value of this book; what is its importance to historians of material culture?

From the discussion of textual sources in the early pages to the catalogue of historical monuments at the end, this Aleppo supplies the skeleton for architectural and urban studies on the city. Where else will one find a street map of fifteen century Aleppo with the streets named? There are some faults: there is no handlist to the catalogue, so the reader in search of the number of a catalogue entry must manipulate several parts of the book. And not all the literature relevant to each monument is cited in the short entries. But this is a solid structure to attach one's work to.

There is also plenty of material for further work. By collating biographical sources with the topographic data here a study of the residential patterns of the city's 'ita'ama could be undertaken, for example. The authors have not attempted an analysis of this nature, focusing instead on commercial relations. There are noncommercial insights, too: the vision of early Islamic Aleppo as a city built primarily of mud brick (p. 76); the conclusion that the visible pattern of the city can be projected backward into and perhaps beyond the seventh century with confidence (p. 106); and the discovery of a possible secondary grid in the southeast of the city (which needs to be accounted for more concretely). Speculation about the form of the city before the periods for which written sources exist is minimized; there is more to be said here, too.
A book such as this should encourage others to take up both the urban development and the individual monuments of its subject.

Notes

1. By a lamentable oversight the original locations of these selections have been omitted. Most are from Arnida, a collective work by Max van Berchem, Josef Strzygowski, and Gertrude Bell (Heidelberg, 1910); pp. 1–23 were originally pp. 224–62, with a few additional diacritical marks; Bell’s footnotes are now parenthetical inclusions in the text; pp. 23–24 (on Mar Cosmas) were originally pp. 167–69; pp. 24–26 were pp. 193–95. Pages 27–83 were published as Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Architektur, Beiheft 9, Churches and Monasteries of the Tür ‘Abdin and Neighbouring Districts (Heidelberg, 1913); Mango has added notes and headings, and Bell’s notes are again given between parentheses.
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As this series of studies begins to unfold, its rationale becomes clearer (cf. my review of vol. 1 in Ars Orientalis, vol. 14). The first volume established the concentration of certain building materials along the mihrab aisles of early Islamic mosques in the West. In one of those monuments, the Great Mosque of Cordoba, an obvious hierarchy governs the disposition around the mihrab of polylobed arches like those found at Tinmal, the subject of the second volume. With the concentration of all effects created by the simplification of ornament by the Almohads, other symmetries come to be developed.

The Great Mosque of Tinmal, now disused, stands above a small village some 100 km. south of Marrakesh in a rugged wadi well up into the Atlas Mountains. When it was built in the mid-twelfth century it was the principal religious structure of the city founded by Ibn Tûmart, the founder of the puritanical Almohad dynasty. Almohad architecture, particularly in its decoration, is drastically simplified from its models, but in no way simple. The author's careful survey and meticulous analysis—documented in exhaustive detail—show that the Tinmal mosque was laid out in plan, elevation, and decoration on a unified geometric scheme of considerable subtlety. The effect is indeed sublime, although the geometric correspondences are seen as harmonic rather than geometric effects by the viewer. The authors stay very close to their analysis, however, and the overall effects of the building are treated as briefly here as in the previous volume, despite an interesting numerical interpretation set at the very end of the text.

The metrological and geometric aspects of western Islamic architecture developed in this series are of great importance, and begin to justify the cost of these elegant volumes. But one wishes the authors would favor the reader with a more substantial integration of these aspects with other elements of the buildings studied.
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TÔHAKU’S BLACK AND GOLD

ROCKS AND WAVES, A STUNNING SEASCAPE IN BLACK and gold (Fig. 1) once formed the north and south walls of the Central Room of the Abbot’s Quarters at the Zenrin-ji, a Buddhist temple in Kyoto. An early seventeenth century visitor to the temple, sitting in quiet contemplation facing the Buddhist altar to the east of the room, would have been aware of a tumultuous gray sea thrashing against rugged black rocks on both sides, removed from the space of his mundane world by gold-leafed clouds. He would have marveled at the striking juxtaposition of monochrome ink tones and brilliant gold leaf.

The Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves is a major work from the studio of Hasegawa Tôhaku (1539–1610). It is a creative fusion of yamato-e and kanga, two painting traditions recognized as coexisting throughout the Muromachi period (1333–1573). Yamato-e (“Japanese painting”) refers to Japanese themes and styles that emerged during the classical age of the Heian court (794–1185), while kanga (“Chinese painting”) signifies paintings, from the fourteenth century onward, that were based on Chinese Song and Yuan (960–1368) styles. Yamato-e and kanga began to merge in the hands of innovative Japanese masters as early as the fifteenth century. The most remarkable fusions, however, appeared during the Momoyama period, the brief span of fortyodd years from 1573 to 1615 that witnessed enormous changes in the organizational structure of Japanese society, and in the art that gave expression to it.

Tôhaku’s mature activity fits securely within this period, and his paintings exhibit a strong sense of Japanese roots branching into a range of Chinese ink painting styles. The Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves is a fully developed manifestation of Tôhaku’s personal aesthetic, expressed with motifs and techniques taken from the Japanese development of the Chinese mode of Xia Gui (fl. ca. 1200–50), a Song artist whose landscapes were highly admired in Japan from the fifteenth century onward. The brilliant gold-leafed clouds, however, are not part of the monochromatic Xia Gui stylistic tradition. They eloquently speak the language of yamato-e.

Tôhaku used the black of kanga rocks and waves within a space defined by planes of the gold of yamato-e clouds and mists to shift the meaning of his painting from reality to metaphor: the Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves describes the probing quest of a contemplative mind seeking self-understanding. To explain this analogy is to analyze Tôhaku’s personal aesthetic, nurtured by his association with masters of chanoyû, the Japanese tea ceremony. It is to observe Tôhaku’s artistic development as he acquired the meditative aesthetic of Zen and translated it into painting. To understand the metaphorical message of Rocks and Waves is to understand how Tôhaku’s black and gold functioned in the intellectual climate of Kyoto in the last quarter of the sixteenth century.

Tôhaku: His Personal Aesthetic

The contemplative attitude of the tea ceremony underlies the masterworks of monochrome that Tôhaku created during the last two decades of his life, between 1590 and 1610. It is the foundation also for Tôhaku’s aesthetic attitudes as recorded about 1592 in a book known today as the Tôhaku gasetsu (Tôhaku’s Comments on Art). The supremely sophisticated paintings of Tôhaku’s maturity differ radically from the colorful Buddhist scrolls and careful portraits bearing the rectangular seal Hasegawa and the bag-shaped seal Shinshun, the name that Tôhaku had used as a young artist of Nanao in Noto Province (present-day Ishikawa Prefecture). The degree of aesthetic sensitivity that Tôhaku was to attain from twenty years of contact with cultivated warriors, merchants, and monks in the capital was scarcely predictable from his early works.

Hasegawa Shinshun probably had little contact with artistic developments in the capital until he arrived in Kyoto about 1572 at the age of thirty-three, shortly after both his father and mother died. During the next twenty years he effected one of the most remarkable transformations of style and aesthetic stance in the history of Japanese art. It was a transformation so astounding that scholars were incredulous in 1938 when Doi Tsugiyoshi first introduced his theory that Hasegawa Shinshun was not a separate Hasegawa-school artist, but was Hasegawa Tôhaku in his youth. Gradually, as stylistic evidence has accumulated so as to allow the manner of stylistic change to be followed
in the paintings, the circumstantial evidence that Doi found in painting inscriptions and Hasegawa-family documents has been accepted as fact.\(^3\)

A devotee of Nichiren's Buddhism and an artist of Buddhist icons, when Shinshun arrived in the capital, he immediately established contact with Honpō-ji,\(^4\) the Kyoto monastery with which his home temple in Nanao, the Hon'en-ji,\(^5\) was affiliated. Soon after his arrival, Shinshun painted the death portrait of Honpō-ji's eighth abbot, Nichigyō Šōnin\(^6\) (1543–72). His Nichiren beliefs also led Shinshun to develop a religious association and a deep personal friendship with the priest Nittsū Šōnin\(^7\) (1549–1608), who would become the tenth abbot of Honpō-ji in 1586. Since Nittsū was the son of a wealthy Sakai oil trader, he probably furnished the provincial painter with his first entree into the society of cultivated Sakai merchants who were the principal tea masters of chanoyu. Shinshun's close relationship with Nittsū was the first of a number of important friendships that the artist from Nanao cultivated during the next twenty years.\(^8\)

Also in the early 1570s, according to the theory of Doi Tsugiyo, Tōhaku began his association with Sen no Rikyū\(^9\) (1522–91). Rikyū was the Sakai tea master highly revered for perfecting chanoyu as an essentially Japanese artistic expression, suffused with the meditative spirit of Zen. As tea master first of Oda Nobunaga\(^10\) (1534–82) and then of Toyotomi Hideyoshi\(^11\) (1536–98), Rikyū had access to the most powerful men of his age.\(^12\) Doi speculates that it was Rikyū who introduced Tōhaku to supporters of Daitoku-ji,\(^13\) giving him avenues to treasured works of art in private collections as well as access to the many excellent Chinese paintings owned by this great Zen monastery.\(^14\) Several Edo-period artists' biographies comment on the friendship between Rikyū and Tōhaku, saying that Rikyū recommended the artist to influential patrons, most notably Hideyoshi.\(^15\)

In addition, Tōhaku quickly developed a close association with the 111th abbot of Daitoku-ji, Shun'oku Šōen\(^16\) (1529–1611). Shun'oku had many friends among the tea men of Sakai, including Rikyū, but he had especially close ties with the tea master Tsuda Šōkyū\(^17\) (d. 1591), who was Shun'oku's disciple in Zen. Šōkyū's son, Kōgetsu Šōkan\(^18\) (1574–1643), became the 157th abbot of Daitoku-ji in 1610.\(^19\)

While Doi considers Tōhaku's relationship with Sen no Rikyū to be the determining factor in the development of Tōhaku's personal aesthetic, Yamane Yuzō argues that his friendship with Shun'oku Šōen was the major influence forming Tōhaku's artistic taste. There is ample evidence of the artist's close connections with both Rikyū and Shun'oku. Tōhaku was a fine portrait painter and painted sensitive images of some of his closest friends, so it is fitting that there are portraits of both Shun'oku Šōen and Sen no Rikyū attributed to Tōhaku (see Appendix). It is a measure of the intimacy of chanoyu society that Shun'oku wrote inscriptions on both his own portrait and that of his friend Rikyū.

Yamane provides support for his view that Tōhaku's aesthetic was formed by his relationship with Daitoku-ji's abbot Shun'oku Šōen, rather than the great tea master Rikyū, by analyzing the artistic preferences expressed in the Tōhaku gaseitsu. He notes that Tōhaku favored the elegance of "Higashiyama meibutsu,"\(^20\) those "famous [Chinese] objects" once treasured by the master of the Higashiyama Villa, the eighth Ashikaga Shōgun Yoshimasa\(^21\) (1435–90). Yamane concludes that Tōhaku's preference reflects the high value given to elegant Song art objects by Tsuda Šōkyū and his circle, which included Daitoku-ji's abbot Shun'oku Šōen. Sen no Rikyū, on the other hand, had moved away from this aristocratic aesthetic toward a more rustic taste, a recognition of beauty in humble objects.\(^22\)

The large number of paintings by Tōhaku now in the collection of the Daitoku-ji, as well as the existing wall paintings in residential subtemples decorated by Tōhaku's studio and the documentation of others that have perished, testify that the priests and patrons of the temple appreciated the Hasegawa style they had nurtured. In these paintings, Tōhaku clearly followed the styles of Chinese Song dynasty artists. For Abbot Sun'oku's Sangen-in\(^23\) in 1589, for example, Tōhaku painted landscapes in the Xia Gui style and in the Yu-jian\(^24\) style, and for the Shinju-an\(^25\) in 1601, he painted Chinese figure subjects using the Liang Kai\(^26\) style.\(^27\)

Elsewhere, many of Tōhaku's most treasured paintings followed the quiet manner of Muqi\(^28\) (fl. 1249–69), whose paintings found an appreciative audience among connoisseurs of the tea ceremony. Atmospheric landscapes full of suggestion, simple fruits caught in a few brush strokes, supple animals with velvety fur, and birds with satiny feathers conveyed the very essence of existence to these connoisseurs of tranquility. Muqi paintings were inherently able to the simplicity of the Momoyama-era tea ceremony. Tōhaku
was especially drawn to the Crane and Gibbons flanking the White-Robed Kannon in the Mu-ch'i triptych that has been Daitoku-ji's most prized painting since the sixteenth century. Daitoku-ji's monks, its supporters, and its paintings had given the artist from Noto an excellent education in the spirit of the tea ceremony and the objects valued for it.

The Tōhaku gasetsu mirrors the artist's knowledge of paintings and their histories as well as his individual taste, testifying that he did, indeed, move freely among chanoyu aesthetes. In a sequence of ninety-seven remarks recorded by Nittsū, Tōhaku commented on twenty-two Chinese painters, their specific paintings, the owners of prized works, and the critical judgements he had heard from discriminating connoisseurs. He gave special praise to Yu-jian, Liang Kai, and most of all, Mu-qi. In addition, Tōhaku showed great interest and genuine respect for the achievements of twenty-one Japanese artists. Consistent with his veneration of Mu-qi, he spoke very highly of the Zen priest-painter Mokuan (fl. 1323, d. 1345), whose paintings approximated those of the Chinese monk.

Furthermore, although Xia Gui was scarcely mentioned in the Tōhaku gasetsu, Tōhaku spoke admiringly of Japanese artists inspired by the angular Xia Gui landscape style—namely Josetsu (fl. early fifteenth century) and Shūbun (fl. 1434–60)—whom he called the founders of kanga painting in Japan. Tōhaku was quite systematic in discussing his Japanese ancestors, for in the Tōhaku gasetsu, Tōhaku began to establish his own artistic lineage.

**Tōhaku: His Artistic Lineage**

When the thirty-three-year-old Hasegawa Shinshun entered the capital in 1572 he found himself in an art world dominated by innovative kanga artists of the well established Kano school. Prominent patrons were especially dazzled by the achievements of its star member, Kano Eitoku (1543–90), still in his twenties and four years Tōhaku's junior. A good six years before the provincial Shinshun came to the capital, Eitoku, at just twenty-three, had painted his commanding plum tree on the Jukō-in sliding-door panels. In the following year the courtier Yamashina Tokitsugu (1507–79) noted in his journal that Eitoku, with three assistants, was painting the residence of the Kanpakū, Konoe Sakihisa (1536–1612).

According to later artists' biographies written by Kano school chroniclers, Tōhaku entered the Kano studios for training, but later created his own style, left the Kano, and established a studio of his own. Whether or not Tōhaku actually entered a Kano workshop for formal training, the reality of survival as a painter in central art circles dictated that he learn the style and techniques so much in demand. Beyond that, however, he faced the fact that he either had to establish his own identity and compete with the Kano, or else simply submerge his individuality and become one of them.

He chose the former, and later Kano art historians recalled his competition. Kano Einō (1631–97) wrote in his Honchō gashi ("History of Japanese Painting," preface dated 1668) that Tōhaku was ensvious of his successful Kano contemporaries and joined with tea master Rikyū, who had never liked the Kano, to criticize the Kano artists. Furthermore, primary documentation attests that Tōhaku had established an independent studio in competition with the Kano by 1590. In that year he gained a commission from Maeda Gen'ō (1539–1602), Hideyoshi's construction supervisor, to decorate one of the buildings in the restoration project under way at the Imperial Palace. Kano Eitoku, who claimed that his studio had monopoly rights to the redecoration, petitioned the courtier Kanjuji Harutoyo to intercede on behalf of the Kano. As a result Tōhaku lost the job. The Hasegawa workshop was not able to get the large commissions from the most powerful patrons—especially from the military dictator Toyotomi Hideyoshi—until the Kano school, just a month after the conflict about the Imperial Palace decoration, unexpectedly lost its luminary: Eitoku died in the ninth month of 1590.

Clearly, after Hasegawa Shinshun came to the capital, assessed the Kano dominance, and began to develop aesthetic aims consistent with the atmosphere of chanoyu prevailing among his contacts in Sakai, Daitoku-ji, and Honpō-ji, he sought to define his own artistic personality. In the 1570s the young Shinshun was an artist in search of a lineage.
rock, hunched figures cross a simple bridge spanning a mountain stream, and filmy mountain silhouettes mark stages of recession in the distance. The vertical cliff wall that slightly overhangs the mountain village recalls the precipice that Sesshū rendered with such linear abstraction in the center of his Tokyo National Museum Winter Landscape, while the eye-level horizontality of the village houses are near quotes from Sesshū’s “Long Landscape Handscroll,” a painting that Kano Einō says Tōhaku owned.21

The artist from the provinces did not restrict his vision to the techniques and motifs of one artist, however. He muted the dynamic angularity of Sesshū by incorporating techniques learned from Kyoto artists of the Soga and Ami schools, particularly, from their paintings in Daitoku-ji subtemples. The humped central hill in Mountain Village, its gentle curve terminating in repeated squarish rock-cuts, recalls the Landscape of the Four Seasons that Soga school artists painted for the Shinju-an of Daitoku-ji in 1491. Less specific, but nonetheless pervasive, is the softer touch, the slightly scumbled texturing, the clusters of vegetation dots that Shinshun must have learned from the work of Sōami (d. 1525): he surely studied the Eight Views of Xiao and Xiang that Sōami had painted in the Daisen-in about 1513.22

Although the youthful Shinshun experimented with Soga and Ami painting techniques and evoked them at will as he developed his style, the mature Tōhaku proclaimed that his artistic ancestor was Sesshū. Sesshū was an artist great enough to bear comparison with the century-old Kano tradition, and he had created a school style that was sufficiently distinct to compete successfully with the undeniable genius of Eitoku. Furthermore, Tōshun (fl. 1492–1542), a direct disciple of Sesshū’s late years, had accompanied his master to Kaga and Noto Provinces, serving first the Togashi daimyo of Kaga, then the Hatakeyama of Noto.23 Thus Tōshun’s influence could be expected to have remained in Tōhaku’s home region at least during the lifetime of Tōhaku’s grandfather, if not that of his father.

On the lineage chart for Sesshū, as given in the Tōhaku gassetzu, Tōhaku claimed that both he and his father Shūsei (also called Dōjō)—and perhaps his grandfather Hōjun, too—were Tōshun’s disciples.24 Thus, Tōhaku claimed that he was “third generation from Sesshū.” Tōhaku was only four years old in 1542, the latest date of Tōshun’s activity (and the painting providing this date is not without questions), and Tōshun’s work for the Hatakeyama daimyo of Noto was done almost four decades earlier, about the time Tōhaku’s father was born.25 Maybe someone pointed out to Tōhaku that his claim was chronologically impossible, for when he dedicated his huge Nirvana to the Honpō-ji seven years later in 1599, Tōhaku had refined the lineage to show that he was fifth generation from Sesshū.

Although Tōhaku could not have had the advantage of direct training from Tōshun, Tōhaku’s painting shows that he learned a great deal about the Sesshū-school style through his own study. Kano Einō says in the Honcho gashi that Tōhaku owned two of Sesshū’s most prized landscape paintings in the style of Xia Gui, the “Long Landscape Scroll,” as already mentioned, and the “Short” Landscape Scroll as well.26 He probably owned paintings by Tōshun also.

Tōhaku was an artist committed to the study and practice of his art. To compete with the powerful Kano school he asserted his personality and developed a style that reflects a man both sensitive and strong-willed. Although Tōhaku did not have the backing of an established school, he had an extraordinary capacity for forming friendships in influential places, enabling him to establish himself at the pinnacle of the Kyoto art world during the final two decades of his life, from 1590 to 1610. It is through Tōhaku’s painting in the Xia Gui style as transmitted by Sesshū that the transition from Shinshun, the provincial Buddhist painter, to Tōhaku, the sophisticated artist of the Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves can be followed.

The Black: Tōhaku’s Xia Gui Style

The surviving left half of a pair of screens depicting Flowers and Birds of the Four Seasons, painted after Tōhaku had moved to Kyoto, indicates the direction the artist would take in his maturity (Fig. 3).27 In the lower left-hand corner are two seals. One is a rectangular relief seal similar to the Hasegawa seal used later by Tōhaku, but the other is unique among the seals stamped on his known works. Instead of the familiar bag-shaped Shinshun seal used earlier on works created in Noto Province (or the square Tōhaku seal used later), this Shinshun seal is in the cauldron shape that is the trademark of the Kano.28

It might be argued that certain conservative Kano features are present in the painting—the crisp clarity of forms, the distinct separation of motifs (although these features are also part of the
Sesshū flower-and-bird style)—so the artist might have been acknowledging a debt to training in a Kano studio. That seems unlikely, however, given Tōhaku’s strained relationship with the Kano painters. On the contrary, Tōhaku’s use of the Kano’s cauldron-shaped seal seems insolent, related to his competitive spirit rather than to his gratitude. The screen is a conservative work, probably painted in the late 1570s or early 1580s, as the artist was facing the challenge presented by the dominance of Kano Eitoku and intently absorbing new influences in Kyoto. Temple tradition at the Myōkaku-ji in Okayama Prefecture, owner of the screen, says it is a gift from the Gotō family of Kyoto sometime in the Meiji period (1868–1911).

Far more pervasive than the meager correspondences with earlier Kano work are features resulting from study of Sesshū-school paintings. The composition echoes the left-hand screen of a pair of Flowers and Birds of the Four Seasons associated with Sesshū in the Kosaka Collection that can be dated to 1483 (Fig. 4). The controlling concept of both the Shinshun and the Sesshū paintings is the simplification of subordinate scenic elements to focus on a magnified snowbound plum tree in an overall ink monochrome painting with accents of vivid local color. Shinshun clearly was emulating this or a similar Sesshū-school work.

A major difference can be noted, however, in the method of creating rock volumes. Tōhaku’s technique of using the brush to carve away the rock differs fundamentally from the Sesshū-school method of using the brush to build up the rock form. Tōhaku’s brush shaved away to the rock’s planes rather than modelling out to its bulges. Takeda Tsuneo, in pointing out this basic departure from the Sesshū-style model, notes that a similar method of texturing is used in some Ami-school works—especially those of Kenkō Shōkei (fl. 1478–ca. 1520). Takeda specifically relates the rock in the Shinshun screen to the rocky forms in Shōkei’s Sōsetsusa (Fig. 5), a winter landscape inscribed in Meiō 8 (1499) by the Kamakura priest Gyokzuin Eiyo (1432–1524). Here, as in other paintings from Tōhaku’s Shinshun period, including Mountain Village (Fig. 2), the dominant stylistic influence comes from the Sesshū tradition, with important modifications learned from works of the Ami school. The rugged contours of the strong forms learned from Sesshū and the subtractive method of sculpting their bodies learned from Shōkei find their sequel development in Hasegawa Tōhaku’s later Xia Gui-style kanga.

Other details of technique indicate that Tōhaku also studied the flower-and-bird paintings of the teacher he claimed: Sesshū’s follower Tōshun. The very small strokes used to fill out the texturing of the tree bark in the Myōkaku-ji screen are related to the way Tōshun handled the branch in his Dove (Fig. 6), one of twelve paintings following Chinese models that Tōshun had completed by 1512. Tōshun’s painting is based on the Dove on a Peach Branch by the Song Emperor Hui-zong (1082–1135), a prime Higashiyama meibutsu lauded by chanoyu aficionados, which is still in Japan (see Appendix).

The Myōkaku-ji screen marks the first stage of Tōhaku’s search for his identity through the art of Sesshū. There is little evidence to suggest that Tōhaku studied Chinese works attributed to Xia Gui directly, as he certainly studied Muqi’s Kannon, Crane, and Gibbons. Nor does he seem to have been very interested in the Xia Gui aura as part of his cultural grounding in Chinese aesthetics: he mentioned Xia Gui only once in passing in the Tōhaku gasetsu. Tōhaku absorbed his Xia Gui style through the intervening translations supplied by his Japanese predecessors—and he found many occasions to comment on them when conversing with his friend Priest Nittsu. Sesshū and Tōshun appear repeatedly in the Tōhaku gasetsu.

Tōhaku’s folding screens of the Eight Views of Xiao and Xiang, owned by the Bunkachō, suggest the next phase in the artist’s development of his Xia Gui style as he learned it through Muromachi-period mutations (Fig. 7). Although this painting is not dated, its style indicates that it is a work of Tōhaku’s early maturity, probably painted around 1590 when the artist was in his late forties or early fifties. Here, as in the earlier Flowers and Birds screen, Tōhaku’s brush chipped away at the rocks to create a multitude of facets. He was able to keep a potentially complicated landscape simple by massing units, rendering the whole with a consistently fine scale of repeated brushstrokes. The painting is essentially linear, however, with stringy strokes denying solidity to the massed forms.

On the outer panels of his composition Tōhaku emphasized two of the eight views that make up the theme. “Mountain Village in Clearing Mist” dominates the right half of the right screen, with its houses and people drawn close to the viewer. This scene is balanced by nearly equal emphasis
given to a quiet scene of “Evening Snow on the Hills” on the outer panels of the left screen. In a departure from fifteenth-century folding-screen versions of the theme, the other six scenes here are merely incidental motifs on the vast expanse of Lake Dong-ting, spreading across the middle six panels and into the distance. Deep space is marked by shadowy mountains.

The uncluttered watery expanse bounded by tight groupings of land masses on both sides conveys a sense of calm. It brings to mind an instance that Nittsū recorded in the Tōhaku gastosu, when Tōhaku spoke approvingly of a Sakai visitor’s observation that Liang Kai’s Bird in Willow was a quiet painting, and commented on that quality (shizukku in Japanese) as appropriate for a painting hung for the tea ceremony, in direct contrast to “busy,” or isogashii. This panoramic landscape composition creates a quiet hush, consistent with the aesthetic of chanoyu that Tōhaku evoked for many of his ink paintings during the last two decades of his life. The Eight Views of Hsiao and Hsiang represents Tōhaku’s Xia Gui style at its most elegantly conservative.

Like the Bunkachō Eight Views painting, the rock forms and swirling waters of the Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves are painted using Tōhaku’s Xia Gui brush conventions. But in contrast to the quiet panorama of a lake surrounded by mountains passing through the seasonal cycle, this is a dynamic tempest of whirling, swirling water crashing against outcroppings of sharply angled rocks. Nevertheless, Tōhaku’s Sakai friend would not have called it isogashii, or “busy”: the rocks are too formidable and, more importantly, the sheets of gold-leafed clouds are too riveting. The contrast between the Bunkachō Eight Views screens and the Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves sequence is not a contrast between “quiet” and “busy,” but rather a shift in orientation from past values to present concerns, from the Muromachi era to the Momoyama period, from a Mediaeval aesthetic toward Early Modern experiments.

Before examining the meaning of these motifs, the work must be located within Tōhaku’s stylistic development. The Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves bears many similarities to the Xia Gui style Landscape of the Four Seasons that Tōhaku painted when he was sixty years old in 1599 at the Rinkain, a subtemple of Myōshin-ji (Fig. 8). Twenty panels of a Xia Gui-style ink landscape completely surround the central room of the Abbot’s Quarters, passing through the four seasons in the process. The Zenrin-ji panels share with the Rinka-in landscape a similar treatment of the one motif the two works have in common: the rocks.

Although the handling of rock forms is generally the same, the Zenrin-ji rocks are more complicated, having more shifts of direction and more small facets than the more broadly conceived Rinka-in rocks. In both works planes are defined by both contour lines and “axe-cut” texture strokes. The contour line on the Zenrin-ji rocks is more dominant than it is on the Rinka-in painting, where Tōhaku simplified by frequently allowing the hard edge at the top of the axe-cut stroke to stand alone. Furthermore, the individual strokes of the Zenrin-ji internal texturing remain rather linear, while the individual strokes of the Rinka-in texturing tend to be broader, more like independent planes of sharp shadow marking the crystalline angles of the rock. Within the context of Tōhaku’s stylistic development, this places the Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves slightly earlier than the 1599 Rinka-in Landscape.

A probable date for Tōhaku to have painted the Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves is 1597. The Abbot’s Quarters itself, according to temple tradition confirmed by its physical characteristics, was built during the Eishō era (1504–21). A major restoration campaign for the entire temple complex was carried out from 1596 to 1607 by the thirty-seventh abbot of the temple, Kakū Shun’ichi (d. 1623). The record of his restoration is incomplete, but it is clear that Konoe Nobutada (1565–1614) inscribed the poetry on the Thirty-Six Poets plaques in the southeast Jōdan no ma in 1597, so it is likely that the entire Abbot’s Quarters was being decorated at that time. The Zenrin-ji is a temple of the Jōdo, or Pure Land sect, and is the only Jōdo temple featuring paintings from Tōhaku’s studio. The patron in this case was probably not Abbot Shun’ichi or another temple official, but Hideyoshi, for there are scattered records indicating that both he and his son Hideyori (1593–1615), after Hideyoshi’s death in 1598, supported Abbot Shun’ichi’s restoration project.

The date 1597 correlates comfortably with the stylistic development of Tōhaku’s Xia Gui-style rocks in the Zenrin-ji paintings. In relative terms, they follow logically after the many-faceted forms in the earlier Eight Views of the Xiao and Xiang (Fig. 7), and precede the structural simplifications in the rocks of the Four Sages of Mount Shang that Tōhaku painted in Daitoku-ji’s Shinju-an in 1601 (Fig. 9), and the further abstractions of the Zen figure subjects he created at Nanzen-ji during the Muromachi era. The Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves is very close in spirit to the paintings in the Abbot’s Quarters, and even if Tōhaku did not execute these early panels, he can be credited with the idea for an overall uncluttered landscape approach to the theme of “Rock and Branch” (kengi) as the basis for his second major rock painting work.
Tenju-an in 1602. The landscape setting for the Chinese figures in these early seventeenth-century paintings contains Xia Gui-style rocks with broader planes, simpler forms, and less interdependence of contour lines and internal texturing. Space is more abstract. The operative concept is simplification.

In general Tôhaku moved away from detailed description of form with strong contour lines and rather linear interior texturing, and toward an abstract separation of outer contours and broader inner textures. He moved away from description of form toward a summary indication of basic structure. In the process the balance of ink tonalities changed from the graduated harmonies of the earlier Eight Views to the simple contrasts of ink and white space seen in the later Shinju-an and Tenju-an paintings.

In both the Rinka-in Landscape and the Shinju-an Four Sages space is structured to concentrate on motifs in an avenue from foreground to middle-ground, but the background of the two works is handled differently. In the Rinka-in Landscape, distance usually is a mountain top that appears in the upper third of the picture surface with minimal description of intervening space (Fig. 8), showing a development away from the finer articulation of recession that Tôhaku provided in the screens of the Eight Views of Xiao and Xiang (Fig. 7). The background of the Shinju-an figure paintings is remarkably simpler, being largely white space (Fig. 9). Although this can be partially attributed to the focus on figure subjects rather than landscape, it is consistent with Tôhaku’s general tendency to shift from spatial definition in his earlier work to spatial abstraction later.

In the Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves, too, the concentration is on the foreground to middle-ground avenue of motifs. It is difficult to speak of background, however, for the horizontal currents of waves progress steadily to the top of pictorial space. This treatment neither articulates distance nor denies it. Rather, the simple repetition of the undulating movement seems to suggest the concept, rather than the description, of a vast sea. This indicates a difference in intention rather than a stage in a process of stylistic change. Like the paradoxical quiet of the seething ocean waves crashing against faceted rocks, the diminishing undulations of the stretching sea must be considered inseparable from the theme of the painting.

The motif of Rocks and Waves that is totally alien to both the Rinka-in Landscape and the Shinju-an Four Sages is the gold leaf, used both for billowing clouds and for sharp streaks of mist. The gold paint brushed over much of the surface of the Rinka-in Landscape (Fig. 8) resembles an atmospheric haze that blurs details in much the same way that the suggestion of faint ink mist in the Shinju-an pine trees (Fig. 9) envelops the unessential to allow the essential motifs to stand out sharply. The gold leaf arranged in precise shapes on the surface of the Rocks and Waves, however, is not part of the kanga mode of the Xia Gui landscape style; it comes from the separate tradition of Japanese yamato-e.

The Gold: Tôhaku’s Chishaku-in Paintings

Tôhaku viewed gold leaf as a Japanese element: in the Tôhaku gasetsu, he observed that the Chinese used gold paint, but they never used gold foil. Gold foil, said Tôhaku, began to be used in Japan in the time of Genshin, that is, in the tenth century. By the 1590s, however, gold foil was found in all the most lavish interior decorations, especially those painted by the Kano school. The mode of painting with liberal use of gold leaf paired with vivid color is called kinpeki-ga, and Kano Eitoku was famous for his brilliant compositions in this manner. Few kinpeki-ga came from Tôhaku’s studio, however, and perhaps none until after Eitoku died in 1590.

Tôhaku’s best known kinpeki-ga is the autumn Maple that is part of the cycle of paintings owned by the Chishaku-in in Kyoto (Fig. 10). These paintings were created for the Shoun-ji, a large mortuary temple that Hideyoshi built for his son Sutemaru, who died at the age of three in 1591. The composition of this Maple, as well as of the other paintings at the Chishaku-in, is exceptional within the context of Tôhaku’s work, for it is organized using the principles of large-scale wall painting created by Eitoku, represented by the large eightfold Cypress screen in the Tokyo National Museum (Fig. 11). Also originally part of a series of sliding-door panel paintings, the Cypress was painted for a commission the Kano studio was executing in 1590, the same year that Eitoku was successful in stopping the Hasegawa artists from taking part in the Imperial Palace restoration just a month before he died unexpectedly.
Comparison of Töhaku’s Maple with the Kano Cypress shows the similarity of concept: in both, the huge tree trunk, truncated at top and bottom, creates a strong diagonal across the middle of the composition, sending out bending branches to be silhouetted against sheets of gold leaf. The autumn colors of the Maple are brilliant, and originally the colors of the Kano painting were bright, too, with the ultramarine water still vivid and the high-toned malachite still adhering to the splayed cypress fronds. There are important differences in the treatment of these similar motifs, however.

First of all, Töhaku’s use of Sesshū-school techniques can be seen clearly in the texturing of the maple’s bark and the angles of its branches. But, in addition to small mannerisms of brush handling that had come to mark his personal style, Töhaku also made the tree’s spreading movement more lateral and used gold leaf more extensively as gold ground, making both form and space of the Chishaku-in painting more abstract. In contrast, the Kano Cypress is a muscular tree, with more organic movement and more volumetric rendering; the rocks nearby are rounder, lumpier, more three-dimensional. In addition, even though the subject of Töhaku’s painting, an autumn maple, is inherently more colorful than a cypress, Töhaku exploits a wider color range in the greens of the foliage and rocks as well as in the warm reds of the starlike scatter of maple leaves and the tactile coxcomb blossoms. The Kano artist restricted his palette to the rich chocolate brown of the cypress trunk against deeper, more somber blue-green rocks, in combination with the vivid ultramarine water and the gold leaf.

Differences in subject, motifs, and techniques thus render Töhaku’s stretching Maple less assertive, more lyrical, perhaps even more Japanese. The paintings now at the Chishaku-in represent Töhaku’s approach to a brilliant aesthetic that Eitoku had developed: in the Shōun-ji paintings Töhaku reproduced an idea that Eitoku had originated five years earlier for a mortuary temple he had decorated for Hideyoshi: the Tenzui-ji at Daitoku-ji. The Tenzui-ji was built in 1587 for Hideyoshi’s mother, Ōmandokoro. The paintings have been lost, but Daitoku-ji records tell of the remarkable innovation Eitoku effected in this project. Each of four rooms was painted with just one motif of the four seasons, magnified to fill the format of space-enclosing sliding-door panels: the cherry blossoms of spring, the bamboo of summer, the chrysanthemums of autumn, and the sturdy pine of winter. The paintings created quite a stir.

Less than a year after Eitoku died, Hideyoshi began the Shōun-ji project, and commissioned Töhaku to paint its interior. Only after Eitoku’s death did the independent artist Töhaku begin to receive the most lavish commissions from the most powerful leaders of Japan. The Maple shows Töhaku’s effort to create a project equalling the splendor of the one that won Eitoku so much praise five years before. Each of the rooms of the Shōun-ji was painted with the dominant tree of the appropriate season, and all have the larger-than-life boldness of composition that had been Eitoku’s creation. Yet if the comparison between the Chishaku-in Maple and the Tokyo National Museum Cypress has any validity, it would appear that Töhaku’s expression, even when he was emulating Eitoku’s pictorial concept, was somewhat gentler.

The composition of the Zenrin-ji Rocks and Waves contrasts with the Chishaku-in Maple and accords with Töhaku’s individual vision in avoiding radical truncations: major motifs are contained within the picture frame. Töhaku’s personal style was more confrontational than Eitoku’s, and was most characteristically expressed in ink painting. The combination of monochrome and gold in the Zenrin-ji works presents Töhaku’s own approach to meeting the desire of Momoyama patrons for paintings transposing the energies of nature into a conceptual vision that could control and interior environment. It is a more personal painting that expresses Töhaku’s aesthetic temperament.

**Rocks and Waves**

The subject of Rocks and Waves is extremely simple: waves breaking on a rocky coast. The theme of the painting, as already suggested, is more complex, enriched by associations with both the Chinese and Japanese artistic traditions. Its monochrome rocks and waves relate to Chinese paintings; its gold-leaved clouds suggest a Japanese context. The result is a creative merger of Chinese allusions and Japanese implications, of kanga and yamato-e.

On the most basic level, the restriction of motifs to waves pummeling a rocky coast recalls a pair of Chinese paintings highly valued among sixteenth-century connoisseurs of the tea ceremony and mentioned frequently in the Töhaku gazetsu: Yu-jian’s Waves and Shore. Commenting that Waves
showed the action of waves striking the shore and returning to sea, Tōhaku noted that the pair of horizontal hanging scrolls had been cut from one handscroll, and so would fit perfectly if placed side by side.\(^{39}\) Separated after reaching Japan, probably in the fifteenth century, *Waves* and *Shore* were listed under the heading “two hanging scrolls” (*ni-piku*) in the *Gyomotsu on'e mokuroku*,\(^{40}\) the catalogue of the Ashikaga shogunal collection, compiled during the time of the eighth shogun, Yoshimasa (1435–90).\(^{41}\)

As is the case for many of the treasured objects that were in Ashikaga Yoshimasa’s Higashiyama collection, the ownership and appreciation of Yu-jian’s *Waves* and *Shore* can be followed in the tea journals of sixteenth-century tea masters. The two scrolls travelled different paths. References in the journals note that the *Waves* was owned by Takeno Jōō\(^{42}\) (1502–55) in 1542, and that from 1556 until at least 1588 it was the prized possession of the influential Sakai tea master Imai Sōkyō\(^{43}\) (1520–93). The *Shore* also entered this circle of wealthy aesthetes of Sakai, as it belonged to Yūchō Sōen\(^{44}\) in 1559 and may have been owned by Dōki Sōtetsu,\(^{45}\) another Sakai tea man, in 1572.

It then entered Oda Nobunaga’s collection and suffered the misfortune of being among the tea furnishings destroyed with their master in the fires of treason that leveled Kyoto’s Honnō-ji,\(^{46}\) where Nobunaga had brought many of his treasures for a major tea ceremony, on the second day of the sixth month of 1582. Azuchi Castle, where Nobunaga had left the remainder of his large collection, was destroyed less than two weeks later.\(^{47}\)

Strangely, Tōhaku said nothing about the paintings’ existence or nonexistence in the *Tōhaku gasetsu*, although he usually demonstrated an insider’s knowledge of the ownership of tea scrolls. Furthermore, he always spoke of *Waves* and *Shore* as a pair, as when he observed that the two were cut from a handscroll, and so would fit perfectly if placed side by side. In another entry, Tōhaku specified the scrolls that should be shown as preparation for exhibiting the Yu-jian paintings in the *tokonoma*: for *Waves*, it was *Sparrow*, by Yue-shan\(^{48}\) (Ren Ren-fa,\(^{49}\) 1225–1328), and for *Shore* it was *Peaches*, by Mokuan.\(^{50}\) At another time, he named four paintings by Yu-jian which he called the masterpieces of painting in Japan: *Old Plum, Withered Willow, Waves*, and *Shore*.\(^{51}\)

The *Old Plum* as well as the *Shore* had been destroyed with Nobunaga ten years earlier.\(^{52}\)

Tōhaku’s comments are puzzling since he almost surely had seen the *Waves* in Imai Sōkyū’s collection: he described the painting early in the *Tōhaku gasetsu*. He supplied no such description of the *Shore*, and it is extremely unlikely that he had seen that painting before its destruction in 1582, for there is no indication that Tōhaku had any contact with Nobunaga or those around him. But Tōhaku must have known of the separate ownership of *Waves* and *Shore*, even if he did not learn of the destruction of the scroll he had not seen. Since he never spoke of the paintings except as a pair, it must have been the concept of the two, rather than their appearance, that attracted him.

Tōhaku may have seen copies, of course, for several are known to have been made. In the first month of 1553 Kano Motonobu\(^{53}\) (1476–1559) presented paintings to the Imperial Court that were identified as *Nami*\(^{54}\) *Kishi*\(^{55}\) *Kyakurai-ichimi*,\(^{56}\) referring to three famous Chinese paintings treasured by tea men of Tōhaku’s generation. *Nami* and *Kishi* are Yu-jian’s *Waves* and *Shore*, while *Kyakurai-ichimi* (literally, “Guest Comes One-Taste”) refers to a vegetable painting by Mu-qi, its title reflecting strong Zen allusions to transmission of the law from master to disciple.\(^{57}\) Motonobu’s paintings do not survive.

The horizontal hanging scrolls of *Waves* and *Shore* by Sesson\(^{58}\) (ca. 1504–1589 or later), do exist.\(^{59}\) These paintings have the strong flavor of Sesson’s own idiosyncratic style, however, and should not be considered faithful copies of the Yu-jian paintings. Sesson remained in eastern Japan throughout his life, and although several of his powerful patrons maintained contact with cultural affairs in the capital, it is difficult to imagine how he might have gotten access to the Yu-jian paintings—especially since they were in separate collections by 1542.

The most reliable image of the appearance of Yu-jian’s *Waves* is a copy dated 1674 by Kano Tsunenobu\(^{60}\) (1636–1713).\(^{61}\) There is quite a gap between the simplicity of the sweep of water Tsunenobu copied and the intricacy of the whirring eddies Tōhaku painted for Zenrin-ji.

Yu-jian’s *Waves* and *Shore*, then, did not provide a visual model for Tōhaku when he set out to design the twelve sliding-door panels for Zenrin-ji’s Abbot’s Quarters. The concept of Yu-jian’s paintings, however, must have been a very strong influence on this Momoyama painter’s way of thinking about the theme. The fact that Nittsū recorded Tōhaku’s comments about these paintings on five separate occasions, always with the quiet overtones of the tea ceremony, suggests that Tōhaku associated the image of waves rolling onto
a shore, recoiling, and returning to sea with the state of contemplative reflection.  

Yu-jian’s Waves and Shore were not the only paintings of the theme mentioned by Tōhaku in his discussions with Nittsu. Tōhaku also noted that a pair of paintings of Waves by the Tang dynasty poet-painter Wang Wei⁴⁶ (699–759) was used as the model for a pair of large-scale screen paintings by the Japanese artist Awano Sanshu⁴⁷ (Hosokawa Nariyuki,⁴⁷ 1435–1511). Nittsu added that Tōhaku owned these screens.⁴⁹ Tōhaku, therefore, had at least one visual image of waves by a Japanese artist who magnified small Chinese paintings onto large screens.

In addition, Tōhaku might have seen a nearly contemporary Chinese screen painting of Rocks and Waves. Water painting was an established theme in China, having a wide range of expressions. One current can be traced to Yu-jian’s older contemporary Ma Yuan⁴⁸ (fl. ca. 1190–1233), the Southern Song artist whose style often is blended with that of Xia Gui and the fusion cited as the “Ma-Xia” tradition. An album of Twelve Views of Water attributed to Ma Yuan in the Palace Museum of Beijing provides a set of water paintings ranging from shimmering ripples on a lake surface and slow eddies of a river flow to cresting waves of an open sea.⁵⁰ This Ma (or Ma-Xia) tradition seems to have been the reference point for large-scale paintings of waves by Chinese artists contemporary with Tōhaku.

A folding screen showing high-splashing waves is a prominent piece of garden furniture in an anonymous sixteenth-century Chinese painting in the Nelson Gallery (Fig. 12), and a close copy by Sakaki Hyakusen⁴⁹ (1697–1752) attests to the presence of this painting in Japan in the eighteenth century.⁵¹ The waves in the Chinese screen, however, rise and splash in the magisterial movement of waves at sea, and the moon at the horizon line indicates that this is the established theme of “Moon and Waves.”⁵² The pictorial concept, therefore, differs. Tōhaku’s waves lie low, changing size, direction, and curvature as they reel from one rock to the next: they swirl in the shallows of a rocky coastline, they do not rise grandly in the open sea.

There is, however, in the Tokyo National Museum, a large hanging scroll that shows a substantial reef being pounded by waves, and it is said to be a painting of the Yuan period (1280–1368).⁵³ Although it, too, differs from Tōhaku’s panels, the fact that it treats the same action of nature increases the probability that a Ming dynasty (1368–1644) painter might have rendered the subject in a more extensive format—perhaps on a large-scale screen—and that a scroll painting picturing such a screen might have entered Japan by the end of the sixteenth century. The influence of Ming painting on Japanese artists of the late Muromachi period can be seen in paintings of Sesshū, Motonobu, and Sesson, although their models remain elusive. In addition, Japanese paintings of Chinese figure themes proliferated in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, and many reflect Ming styles, indicating that Japanese painters had access to Chinese models otherwise unrecorded.

Even so, Tōhaku’s Zenrin-ji panels cannot be explained by his knowledge of Chinese paintings alone. Although Yu-jian’s Waves and Shore, as well as the enlarged Japanese vision of Wang Wei’s Waves, and maybe even a Ming painting of water beating rocky reefs, were part of Tōhaku’s inspiration for the Zenrin-ji panels, these Chinese paintings do not lead directly to Tōhaku’s Rocks and Waves. Other dynamics are at work here that have to do with the sheets of metallic gold, as well as with the horizontal repetitions of waves at sea.

The Zenrin-ji panels contain four motifs: water, rocks, clouds, and mists. Tōhaku’s calculated modulations of these elements create an emotion-charged panoramic vision of the movement of tides forward from the undulating currents of the sea to the craggy coast close by, where the waves form crests and strike against granite rocks, recoiling into capricious patterns of energy. Flat planes of gold-leafed cumulus clouds form spatial markers for the dramatic activity occurring on the rocky shore, while sharply pointed bands of mist separate conceptually the foreground tumult from the expanse of sea that is conceived to stretch in restless undulation beyond.

The clouds along the bottom edge of the wall and those intermittently appearing along the top edge define the front of the pictorial space and the dividing plane between the turbulent sea and the living space of the viewer who observes it. The larger cloud forms in the middle section of the picture surface define a plane that forms a backdrop to the foreground coastal area studded with rugged rocks. In the avenue of space thus created, rocks of dramatically angular form stand with geometric rigidity, playing the role of “immovable object” to the “irresistible force” of the pounding waves. The angular facets of the rocks are a foil for the moving swirls of the water.
Töhaku’s Zenrin-ji painting is a panoramic seascape, a complete vision of a subject which, of its very nature, has a limited number of simple elements. Despite the use of Xia Gui motifs and the allusion to Yu-jian’s *Waves and Shore*, Takeda Tsunoe has suggested that the key to understanding Töhaku’s *Rocks and Waves* lies not in these Chinese connections but in the world of Japanese painting. Takeda argues that the receding sea is a realistic feature intended to suggest the actuality of a real place.\(^{54}\)

The clue that stimulated Takeda’s suggestion is a notation in the nineteenth-century compendium of information about Japanese painting, the *Koga bikō*.\(^{55}\) The subjects of the paintings in each room of the Zenrin-ji (called by its popular name, the Eigan-dō)\(^{56}\) are named in this book, and the *Rocks and Waves* of the central room is identified as “Awaken.”\(^{57}\) namely, the narrow strait between Awa, the old name for Tokushima Prefecture at the northeasternmost point of the island of Shikoku\(^{60}\) and the island of Awaji\(^{62}\) in the Inland Sea. If the identification has any basis in fact or literature, then that puts this painting in the long tradition of *yamato-e meisho-e*, or “famous-place painting.” Attempts to link the Zenrin-ji panels with Awa Naruto have been inconclusive,\(^{63}\) but the *Koga bikō* compilers were not alone in associating Töhaku’s scene with a famous place in Japan. Ōoka Shunboku\(^{64}\) (1680–1763) presents as a famous place of Kashima\(^{65}\) in western Kyūshū\(^{66}\) an illustration of swirling waves beating against rocks that could well have been inspired by Töhaku’s painting.\(^{57}\)

Precedent for famous-place painting in monochrome exists in works by artists Töhaku held in great esteem. On a small scale, Sesshū painted *Ana no hashidate*\(^{68}\) in hanging-scroll format at the very end of his life in 1506. On a large scale, an early sixteenth century member of the Ami school painted the *Miho Pine Forest* on a sixfold screen, originally paired with a lost screen of Mt. Fuji.\(^{58}\) In the *Töhaku gasticsearch*, Töhaku’s praise for Sesshū and his deferential attitude when discussing Nōami\(^{69}\) and Sōami attest to his high regard for these Muromachi-period specialists in ink painting.

Töhaku’s own most lauded ink painting, his *Pine Grove* screens in the Tokyo National Museum (Fig. 13), has the warm intimacy of a Japanese place in quiet early-morning mists. Despite its painting technique, a merger of the evocative moisture of Mu-qi and the spontaneous “broken ink” (*haboku*) of Yu-jian, Takeda argues that it is a totally *yamato-e* painting most aptly classified as *meisho-e*, even though there is no allusion to a specific “famous place.”\(^{59}\) Like *Rocks and Waves*, these *Pine Grove* screens whisper the personal message of a sensitive Japanese artist. Inspired by the meditative aesthetic of Zen and the reflective tranquility of ch'anoyu, Töhaku interpreted the lyrical mood of his land in the sophisticated medium of Chinese-style ink painting.

The suggestion that the Zenrin-ji panel paintings might represent a famous place, the Straits of Awa, lead Takeda to compare it with the *yamato-e* tradition of *Pines on a Seashore* (*Hamamatsu*).\(^{60}\) Relevant points of correspondence go beyond the concept alone, and can be noted in a richly crafted fifteenth-century example, the earliest extant pair of screens illustrating the subject (Fig. 14).\(^{61}\)

Common to both *Pines on a Seashore* and *Rocks and Waves* is the feature of waves painted from the shore line all the way up to the top border of the painting, understood as a vast sea. In both, outcroppings of rocks appear near the coast, and the upper part of the painting is partly obscured by cumulus clouds and stratified by bands of mist. The *Pines on a Seashore* screen, by virtue of its theme, contains more elements: the pine trees and the fishermen in their boats.

It is interesting to note that even in the minimal motifs used by Töhaku there are technical similarities with *Pines*. The *yamato-e* artist of the *Pines* painted the waves with pale ink contours, shaded them in blue, and enriched their crests with a film of gold paint. Töhaku did the same for his Zenrin-ji waves, although the pale blue might at first be mistaken as the ink tonality alone. The gold paint is most abundant in the dips of the waves, taking on some of the character of the mists in ink paintings.

It is not necessary to equate the Zenrin-ji *Rocks and Waves* with the Straits of Awa to recognize its relationship with the *yamato-e* tradition of *Pines by a Seashore*. The suggestive possibilities of the *yamato-e* genre can be understood better by bringing into the comparison the right half of the pair of *Pine Islands* screens by Sōtatsu\(^{62}\) (fl. 1602–40) in the Freer Gallery (Fig. 15).\(^{61}\) Probably painted about 1630, a generation after Töhaku designed the Zenrin-ji sliding-door panels, the inspiration for Sōtatsu’s *Pine Islands* screens was the same body of *yamato-e* materials available to Töhaku.

Here in the full language of highly crafted ornamental *yamato-e* are the same elements central to Töhaku’s painting: coastal rocks being thrashed
by a turbulent sea, overhung with bands of mist. True, there are no cumulus clouds in Sōtatsu's right screen (there is one that doubles as a sand island [suhama] on the left screen), and pine trees grow on the rocks. Although there is little agreement on the specific subject or the specific literary reference of Sōtatsu's *Pine Islands* (it is variously identified as the “Pine Islands” [Matsushima] off the eastern coast of northern Honshu, the Sumiyoshi beach south of Osaka, and the beach between Ise and Owari provinces, all evoked in classical Japanese literature), there are few who would disagree with its classification as a *yamato-e* famous-place painting. Similarly, the Zenrin-ji *Rocks and Waves* need not be equated with a specific famous place (Awa Naruto or Kashima) to be experienced as a Japanese place with a Japanese mood.

On the other hand, while Tōhaku suggests a familiar natural world in the rhythmic movements of the tides, his Zenrin-ji panels are more personal, quieter, and more reflective than the explicit brilliance of Sōtatsu's depiction. Sōtatsu selected a minimum of vividly colored motifs distilled from centuries-old Japanese tradition. With these, he created a lyrical allusion to a beauty felt by all through a shared Japanese literature and its visual imagery. Tōhaku selected a minimum of monochrome motifs from the Japanese translation of the Chinese ink painting tradition. His elemental opposition of motion and rest invites each viewer to internalize shared experience in the quest of individual understanding.

**Tōhaku’s Black and Gold**

The Zenrin-ji *Rocks and Waves* should be seen within the context of Tōhaku’s mature aesthetic consciousness, cultivated by his association with tea aesthetes and influenced by the contemplative attitude of Zen. The metaphorical power of the theme, and Tōhaku’s probable expressive intent in the Zenrin-ji *Rocks and Waves*, become clearer when it is paralleled with the art of kare sansui, or “dry landscape” gardens.

Most suitable for comparison with the Zenrin-ji paintings is the famous dry landscape garden created about 1513 at the Daisen-in, a subtemple of Daitoku-ji (Figs. 16–18). One tradition says its design was part of the religious discipline of the founding abbot, Kogaku Sōkan (d. 1558); another says it was devised by Sōami (d. 1525), who painted the *Eight Views of Xiao and Xiang* in the Central Room about 1513, and who is known also for garden design. The attribution to Abbot Kogaku reflects the belief that such deeply religious symbolism could be managed coherently only by one who practiced severe Zen discipline, thereby understanding the perfect balance of cosmic forces that this garden encapsulates. The attribution to Sōami reflects the great respect given to this Muromachi-period artist, a respect Tōhaku shared.

The landscape symbolism of this garden focuses on two elements: earth and water. With minimal components it presents a microcosm of natural and cosmological forces. Rocks have been carefully chosen for their suggestive capacity, and placed on a ground of gravel that is raked to simulate the movement of flowing water. Showy flowers are omitted and shrubs are limited to the background. Only moss grows around the edges of the rocks. The arrangements are meant to stimulate the mind of the quiet viewer seated beside the garden. Like a small landscape painting hung for appreciation at the tea ceremony, this is an environment for contemplation, to be entered by the mind but not by the body.

In an abstract environment of rock and raked water, subtle details assume great importance and meanings reverberate as the mind focuses on the simplicity of concrete reality. The dry landscape garden is a microcosm of all nature, reflecting the Zen concept that any fragment of the universe contains all of the universe. Moved by the hushed elements of the garden, the mind of the meditative observer can be released to find its own reality. The dry landscape garden is the monochrome, the ink painting, the black—the Zen discipline for achieving Enlightenment through meditation.

The gold-leaf clouds and mists do not deny the meditative mood of Tōhaku’s painting; in fact they support it. Both documentary and physical evidence testifies that, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, gold-leaved folding screens depicting flowers and birds of the four seasons were highly valued for use when a quiet atmosphere of the sublime was desired, for they were associated with the Pure Land Paradise of Amida Buddha. Throughout the Muromachi period, beliefs of the Pure Land sect coexisted with the concepts of Zen. Amida’s golden Paradise was the Pure Land equivalent of Enlightenment, of transcending the sufferings of this world and passing into a state of eternal peace and contentment.

Abstract, inorganic, and brilliantly reflective, gold leaf cloud forms emphasize the separation of pictorial space from the living space of a room.
Used in planes in front of and behind the coastal rocks, the gold defines the intervening space where the forces of the tides meet the stability of the shore, just as the walls and background shrubs surrounding a dry-landscape garden separate the arrangement of rocks and raked gravel from the time and space of everyday life, marking it as a microcosm for personal reflection and meditation. Within these gold-leafed boundaries Tohaku has expressed the restless movement of a contemplative mind. He has merged the muted monochrome of kanga with the gold leaf of yamato-e, the reflective meditation of Zen with the reflective sheets of gold in the Paradise of the Pure Land. He has melded the black and gold of formerly distinct traditions into a unified personal aesthetic.
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49. Minamoto, _TG_, no. 63, p. 19 and commentary, p. 59. Awa no Sanshû, identified by Minamoto (p. 43) as Hosokawa Nariyuki (or Hisayuki, 1435–1511) appears several times in Tôkaku’s conversations with Nittsu. A member of a powerful warrior family, he devoted himself to the arts, becoming an accomplished painter, an expert on no drama, and a renga poet. He was also a patron of Toshun. For traditional biographical information on Nariyuki see the long section on Hosokawa Hisayuki in Asao Okasida (1800–56), (Tôtei) _Koga bikô_ revised and enlarged by Ota Kin, Tokyo, 1970, pp. 114–17. For discussion of Toshun’s relationship with Hosokawa Nariyuki see Tanaka, “Tôshun-ga setsu,” pp. 406–12 (see note 23).


51. Anonymous Ming artist (sixteenth century?), _Scholars in a Garden Studying the Classics_, a hanging scroll in the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art, Kansas City, and its copy by Sakai Hyakusen (1697–1752), _A Refined Gathering Beneath Ash Trees_, location unknown, are published by James Cahill, _Sakaki Hyakusen and Early Nanga Painting (Japan Research Monographs_, no. 3), Berkeley, 1983, pp. 1 and 2. I am grateful to Prof. Cahill for drawing these paintings to my attention. A similar composition including a large single screen of waves is the much later Japanese sequence of sliding-door panel paintings of _The Four Accomplishments at the Rinka-in of Myoshin-ji_, painted about 1825–30 by Kano Eigaku (1790–1867). Eigaku’s panel paintings seem to follow a later Chinese painting than the one in the Nelson Gallery, but its waves also rise freely in a boundless ocean. Published in _Myoshin-ji Rinka-in ten_, color plate 34, pp. 21–22.


56. The sole reference to Awa no Naruto I found in the index to the hundred volumes of _Nihon koten bungaku taisei_, Tokyo, 1961, occurs in the _Taiheiki_, v. 2, p. 258.
57. Ooka Shunboku (1680–1763), *Kashima meisho zue*, a woodblock-printed book published in Edo in Bunsei 6 (1823). A photograph of the illustration of *Rocks and Waves* taken from a copy of the *Kashima meisho zue* in the Musée des Arts Decoratifs, Paris, Bibliothèque Rés. A. 287, is published by Phylis Floyd, “Documentation Evidence for the Availability of Japanese Imagery in Europe in Nineteenth-Century Public Collections,” *Art Bulletin*, v. 68, p. 124, fig. 41. I am grateful to Christine Guth for bringing this illustration to my attention. I have been unsuccessful in finding a copy of the *Kashima meisho zue*, and my knowledge of it is limited to the bibliographic information given in the standard reference for premodern Japanese books, the *Kokussho bunken sōmokuroku*, and the figure just cited. The illustration shows three plover (chidori) flying above the rocks. The Chinese character for “big wave,” with its two phonetic readings (ōnami and tōdō), is printed on the right-hand page, and the character for “wave,” with its reading (nama)i), is on the left-hand page. In eighteenth-century hakatai plower and big waves are compound images of winter (Shogakukan’s *Nihon Kokugo daijiten* [Encyclopaedic Dictionary of the Japanese Language], entry for *ōnami*).

58. Sesshu, *Ama no Hashidate*, hanging scroll, ink on paper, 89.3 by 169.0 cm., Kyoto National Museum; and Ami School (attributed to Noami, 1397–1471). *Miho Pine Forest*, sixfold screen now remounted as six hanging scrolls, ink on paper, 155.3 by 347.0 cm. (total screen size), Egawa Art Museum, Hyogo Prefecture; both works are published in color in Tanaka Ichimatsu and Yonezawa Yoshiho, *Suibokuga* (Genshoku Nihon no bijutsu, no. 11), Tokyo, 1970, pl. 84, 85, 100–05.


64. For explication of these references see Bettina Klein, “Japanese Kinbyōbu, Part I: Iconographic Foundation,” *Artibus Asiae*, v. 44, 1984, pp. 5–33.

**Glossary**

<p>| a. 禅林寺 | ak. 山科言延 |
| b. 長谷川英伯 | al. 閔白 |
| c. 大和銘 | am. 近衛前久 |
| d. 漢画 | an. 狩野永納 |
| e. 夏珪 | ao. 本朝画史 |
| f. 茶湯 | ap. 前田玄以 |
| g. 禅 | aq. 齋修寺晴豊 |
| h. 等伯画説 | ar. 雪舟 |
| i. 信春 | as. 曾我 |
| j. 七尾 | at. 阿弥 |
| k. 能登 | au. 相阿弥 |
| l. 日蓮 | av. 大仙院 |
| m. 本法寺 | aw. 等春 |
| n. 本延寺 | ax. 加賀 |
| o. 日堂上人 | ay. 富館 |
| p. 日通上人 | az. 岳山 |
| q. 喜 | ba. 宗清 |
| r. 千利休 | bb. 追津 |
| s. 織田信長 | bc. 法淳 |
| t. 豊臣秀吉 | bd. 妙覚寺 |
| u. 大德寺 | be. 後藤 |
| v. 春屋宗國 | bf. 小坂 |
| w. 津田宗及 | bg. 賢江祥啓 |
| x. 江月宗玩 | bh. 枠雪齋 |
| y. 東山名物 | bi. 玉隠英琦 |
| z. 足利義政 | bj. 徵宗 |
| aa. 三玄院 | bk. 文化庁 |
| ab. 玉潤 | bl. 靜か |
| ac. 真珠庵 | bm. 忙しい |
| ad. 梨春 | bn. 雲華院 |
| ae. 牧草 | bo. 妙心寺 |
| af. 黒庵 | bp. 果空俊成 |
| ag. 如拙 | bq. 近衛信尹 |
| ah. 周文 | br. 上段の間 |
| ai. 狩野永徳 | bs. 淨土 |
| aj. 聚光院 | bt. 秀顕 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bu.</th>
<th>南禅寺</th>
<th>df.</th>
<th>鹿島</th>
<th>eq. 細川成之</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bv.</td>
<td>天授庵</td>
<td>dg.</td>
<td>九洲</td>
<td>er. 久之</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bw.</td>
<td>源信</td>
<td>dh.</td>
<td>天城立</td>
<td>es. 狩野永岳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bx.</td>
<td>金碧画</td>
<td>di.</td>
<td>能阿弥</td>
<td>et. 千鳥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by.</td>
<td>智積院</td>
<td>dj.</td>
<td>潟墨</td>
<td>eu. 潟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bz.</td>
<td>青雲寺</td>
<td>dk.</td>
<td>浜松</td>
<td>ev. 波</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.</td>
<td>秋丸</td>
<td>dl.</td>
<td>宗達</td>
<td>ew. 須川</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cb.</td>
<td>天瑞寺</td>
<td>dm.</td>
<td>湘浜</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc.</td>
<td>大政所</td>
<td>dn.</td>
<td>松島</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd.</td>
<td>御物御絵目録</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>住吉</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ce.</td>
<td>武野貂猖</td>
<td>dp.</td>
<td>伊勢</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>今井宗久</td>
<td>dq.</td>
<td>尾張</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cg.</td>
<td>桂長宗園</td>
<td>dr.</td>
<td>枯山水</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch.</td>
<td>道喜「道膳」宗哲</td>
<td>ds.</td>
<td>古岳宗亘</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ci.</td>
<td>本能寺</td>
<td>dt.</td>
<td>常刀</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cj.</td>
<td>安土</td>
<td>du.</td>
<td>本法寺過去帳</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ck.</td>
<td>床の間</td>
<td>dv.</td>
<td>教行院</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cl.</td>
<td>月山</td>
<td>dw.</td>
<td>猪野一溪</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cm.</td>
<td>任仁発</td>
<td>dx.</td>
<td>総見院</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cn.</td>
<td>猪野元信</td>
<td>dy.</td>
<td>聚楽第</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co.</td>
<td>波</td>
<td>dz.</td>
<td>龍泉庵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cp.</td>
<td>岸</td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>相国寺</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cq.</td>
<td>客來一味</td>
<td>eb.</td>
<td>金地院</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr.</td>
<td>雪村</td>
<td>ec.</td>
<td>入江</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs.</td>
<td>猪野常信</td>
<td>ed.</td>
<td>猪野宗栄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ct.</td>
<td>王維</td>
<td>ee.</td>
<td>三玄院</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cu.</td>
<td>可波讃洲</td>
<td>ef.</td>
<td>円徳院</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv.</td>
<td>細川成之</td>
<td>eg.</td>
<td>龍門寺</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cw.</td>
<td>馬遠</td>
<td>eh.</td>
<td>曾我慵溪</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cx.</td>
<td>彭城書川</td>
<td>ei.</td>
<td>春日</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cy.</td>
<td>古画備考</td>
<td>ej.</td>
<td>宮島新一</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cz.</td>
<td>永観堂</td>
<td>ek.</td>
<td>久藏</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da.</td>
<td>阿波鳴戸</td>
<td>el.</td>
<td>義教</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>db.</td>
<td>満国</td>
<td>em.</td>
<td>後花院</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dc.</td>
<td>淡路</td>
<td>en.</td>
<td>津田宗及</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dd.</td>
<td>名所絵</td>
<td>eo.</td>
<td>山上宗二</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de.</td>
<td>大岡春卜</td>
<td>ep.</td>
<td>武藤</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGY OF TÔHAKU’S PAINTINGS
MENTIONED IN THE TEXT AND NOTES

Daruma, ca. 1568–72

Hanging scroll, ink on paper, 71.0 by 56.7 cm., Ryumon-ji, Nanao. Bag-shaped seal: Shinshun. Published in Doi, HTK, color plate 9.

Cf. Soga Bokkei (fl. mid-fifteenth century), Daruma, hanging scroll, ink on paper, 111 by 58.5 cm. Published in Minamoto Toyomune, Soga Dazoku, (Nihon kaigashizenshū, v. 3), Tokyo, 1980, pl. 2.

Portrait of Nichigyo Shōnin, 1572

Hanging scroll, ink and colors on silk, 98.2 by 49.1 cm., Honpō-ji, Kyoto. Inscriptions: on lower left edge, the date Genki 3.5.12 (1572); on lower right edge, the prelate’s name and his age at death, thirty; and in the lower right-hand corner, the unusual signature, “[My] Father Dojo, aged sixty-five; Hasegawa Tatewaki Shinshun, aged thirty-four, painted this,” with bag-shaped seal: Shinshun. Published in Doi, HTK, color plate 22.

Mountain Village, ca. 1575–85

Hanging scroll, ink and light color on paper, 47.0 by 31.8 cm., University of Michigan Museum of Art. Bag-shaped seal: Shinshun. Published in Eighty Works in the Collection of the University of Michigan Museum of Art: A Handbook, Ann Arbor, 1979, no. 14, and in Kokka, no. 712, July 1951.


Cf. Sesshū, Landscape of the Four Seasons (“Long” Landscape Scroll), signed and dated 1486, ink and colors on paper, 39.8 by 1653 cm., Bofu Mori Foundation, Yamaguchi. Published in black-and-white (ibid., pl. 51), with color detail of riverside houses (ibid., pl. 10).

Cf. Soga School, Landscape of the Four Seasons, 1491, sliding-door panel paintings, ink on paper, each 178 by 141.5 cm., Shinju-an of Daitoku-ji, Kyoto. Published in Minamoto, Soga Dazoku, pl. 31.

Cf. Sōami, Eight Views of Xiao and Xiang, ca. 1513, sliding-door panel paintings, ink on paper, each 173 by 138.8 cm., Daisen-in of Daitoku-ji, Kyoto. Published in Eto Shun, Sōami, Shōkei (Nihon bijutsu kaiga zenshū, v. 6), Tokyo, 1979, pl. 9.

Flowers and Birds of the Four Seasons, ca. 1575–85

Surviving left-hand screen of a pair, ink and color on paper, 149 by 361 cm., Myokaku-ji, Okayama Prefecture. Bag-shaped seal: Shinshun. Published in Doi, HTK, color plate 30; and in Tsuji Nobuo, ed., Kachōgafukokuchō (Nihon byōbyu-e shusei, v. 6), Tokyo, 1978, pl. 62.

Cf. Sesshū, Flowers and Birds of the Four Seasons, dated Bunmei 15 (1483), pair of sixfold screens, ink and color on paper, 181.5 by 375 cm., Kosaka Zentarō Collection, Tokyo. Published in Tsuji, ed., op. cit., pl. 1–3.

Cf. Kenkō Shōkei, Sōsetsusai, inscription by Gyokuen Eiyo dated Meiō 8 (1499), hanging scroll, ink and slight color on paper, 100.6 by 27.1 cm., Seikado, Tokyo. Square intaglio seal: Shōkei. Published in Etō, Sōami, Shōkei, pl. 20.

Cf. Tōshun, Dove, from Flowers, Birds, and Figures, twelve paintings in ink and color on paper, 47 by 35 cm., bearing a square intaglio seal, Tōshun, and mounted on a pair of sixfold screens accompanied by inscriptions dated 1512 by the literary monk Keijo Shōrin (1440–1518), Yabumoto Sōgorō Collection, Amagasaki. Published in Tsuji, ed., op. cit., pl. 58. This painting is based on Song Hui-zong, Dove on a Peach Branch, hanging scroll, color on silk, Setsu Collection, Kanagawa Prefecture. Published in Yonezawa Yoshiho and Nakata Yūjirō, Shorai bijutsu (Genshoku Nihon no bijutsu, v. 29), Tokyo, 1971, pl. 25.

Landscapes, 1589

Thirty-two sliding-door panel paintings in ink on paper patterned with silver paulownia leaves, 177 cm high, painted for the Sangen-in of Daitoku-ji, now owned by the Entoku-in of Kōdai-ji, Kyoto, and by the Raku family. Partially published in Doi, HTK, color plates 43–45, monochrome pl. 125 and 126; all panels reproduced at small scale in Takeda, Tōhaku, Yashō, pp. 178–79.

Eight Views of Hsiao and Hsiang, ca. 1590

Pair of sixfold screens in ink and slight color on paper, each 162 by 356 cm., Bunkachō. Published in color in Doi, HTK, color plates 63–64.

Flowering Trees of the Four Seasons, 1593

Sliding-door panel paintings, color and gold on paper, painted for the Shoun-ji of Daitoku-ji, now owned by the Chishaku-in, Kyoto. See Tanaka Ichimatsu, Doi Tsugiyoshi, and Yamane Yūzō, Chishaku-in: Shökeiga zenshū, Tokyo, 1966.


Portrait of Enkan Kokushi (Shun’oku Sōen), 1594

Hanging scroll in color on silk, 110.5 by 50.7 cm., Sangen-in Daitoku-ji, Kyoto. Inscription by Shun’oku Sōen dated Bunroku 3 (1594). Published in Doi, HTK, color plate 24.

Pine Forest, ca. 1594

Pair of sixfold screens (originally sliding-door panels), ink on paper, each 157 by 355 cm., Tokyo National Museum. Rectangular relief seal on both screens: Tōhaku. Published in Doi, HTK, color plates 46–49.

Gibbons, ca. 1594–95

Two large hanging scrolls (originally the four right-hand panels of a pair of sixfold screens), ink on paper, each 154 by 114 cm., Ryou-sansan of Myōshin-ji, Kyoto. Square relief seal in lower right-hand corner of the right scroll: Tōhaku. Published in Doi, HTK, color plates 39 and 40.
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Cf. Mu-qi, White-Robed Kannon, Crane, Gibbons, triptych of hanging scrolls in ink and slight color on silk, center scroll 171.4 by 98.0 cm., each flanking scroll 174.2 by 100.0 cm., Daitoku-ji. Published in color in Toda Teisuke, Mokkei, Gyokukan, pl. 1–3.

Cranes in Bamboo Grove, ca. 1595

Pair of sixfold screens (originally sliding-door panels), ink on paper, each 157 by 350 cm., Irie Collection, Japan. Published in Doi, HTK, monochrome pl. 120–22.

Portrait of Sen no Rikyū, 1595

Hanging scroll in color on silk, 80.6 by 36.7 cm., Fushin-an, Kyoto (Omote Senke). Inscription by Shun’oku Sōen dated Bunroku 4 (1595). Published in Doi, HTK, color plate 23.

Gibbons in Pine and Bamboo Grove, ca. 1596–97

Pair of sixfold screens, ink on paper, each screen 154 by 345 cm., Shōkoku-ji, Kyoto. Square relief seal on each screen: Tōhaku. Published in Doi, HTK, color plates 41–42.

Rocks and Waves, ca. 1597

Twelve sliding-door panels now mounted as hanging scrolls, ink and slight color with gold leaf on paper, eight wide panels each 185 by 140 cm., four narrow panels each 185 by 83 cm., Zenrin-ji (popularly known as the Eigan-dō), Kyoto. Published in Doi, HTK, color plates 55–58, monochrome plates 134–38. First attributed to Hasegawa Tōhaku by Doi Tsugiyoshi, “Zenrin-ji no fusama-e to Hasegawa-ha” (The Zenrin-ji Sliding-door Panel Paintings and the Hasegawa School). Höiun, v. 17, November 1936; repr. in Doi, HTK, text v., pp. 92–97. Since the Zenrin-ji is a temple of the Jōdo sect, all buildings face Amida’s Pure Land in the West instead of facing south, the normal orientation for temples of other sects.

Cf. Pines on a Seashore, fifteenth century, pair of sixfold screens, in colors, mica, gold, and silver on paper, each 150.5 by 356 cm., Satomi Chūsaburō Collection, Kyoto. Published in color in Takeda Tsuneo, ed., Keibusha−Shiki keibutsu (Nihon byōbu-e shaien, v. 9), Tokyo, 1977, pl. 4–6.

Cf. Tawaraya Sōatsu, Pine Islands (Matsushima), pair of sixfold screens, color and gold on paper, 152 by 355.5 cm., Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. (acc. no. 06.231-1). Published in color, ibid., pl. 26 and 27.

Landscapes of the Four Seasons, 1599

Twenty sliding-door panels, ink and gold paint on paper, Rinka-in of Myoshin-ji, Kyoto. Published in Doi, HTK, color plates 52–54, monochrome pl. 132 and 133; all panels are published in Myōshin-ji Rinka-in ten, Tokyo, 1982, no. 30; and at small scale in Takeda, Tōhaku, Yashō, pp. 180–82.

Nirvāṇa, 1599

Hanging scroll, color on paper, 791 by 402 cm., inscription on lower left is dated Keicho 4.4.26 (1599) with the signature and monogram (kaō) of Abbot Nittsu, inscription on lower right, also written by Nittsu, reads “Fifth generation from Sesshū [ji Seicho goDar] Hasegawa Fujiwara Tōhaku, aged sixty-one,” with seal: Tōhaku. Published in Doi, HTK, color plates 15–17, monochrome pl. 102–04; for discussion of the extensive documentation on this painting see Carolyn Wheelwright, “Late-Medieval Japanese Nirvāṇa Painting,” Archives of Asian Art, v. 38, 1985, pp. 67–94, esp. pp. 84–88.

Gibbons and Old Pine, ca. 1600

Two sets of four and six sliding-door panel paintings, respectively, ink on paper, height 154 cm., Konchi-in Nanzen-ji, Kyoto. Published in Doi, HTK, monochrome pl. 128; small black-and-white reproductions of all panels in Takeda, op. cit., pp. 180–81.

Four Sages of Mt. Shang and Zen Eccentrics, 1601

Sliding-door paintings in the Kyakuden Shiju-an of Daitoku-ji, Kyoto; eight panels in the southeast room and four in the northeast room, respectively; ink on paper, ca. 170 cm. high. Partially published in Doi, HTK, monochrome plates 140–45; small reproductions of all panels published in Takeda, op. cit., pp. 178–79.

Zen Patriarchs and Four Sages of Mt. Shang, 1602

Sliding-door paintings in the Hōjō, Tenju-an, Nanzen-ji, Kyoto; sixteen panels in the central room and eight in the adjoining southwest room, respectively; ink on paper, 183 cm. high. Partially published in Doi, HTK, color plates 59–62, monochrome pl. 144; small reproductions of all panels published in Takeda, op. cit., pp. 181–82.
Fig. 1. Rocks and Waves. By Hasegawa Tōhaku, ca. 1597. Four of twelve sliding-door panels now mounted as hanging scrolls, ink and slight color with gold leaf on paper, each 185 by 140 cm. Zenrin-ji, Kyoto.
Fig. 2. *Mountain Village*. By Hasegawa Shinshun (Tohaku). Ca. 1570s. Hanging scroll, ink and slight color on paper, 47.0 by 31.8 cm. Bag-shaped seal: *Shinshun*. University of Michigan Museum of Art.
Fig. 3. Flowers and Birds of the Four Seasons. By Hasegawa Shinshun (Tôhaku). Ca. 1575–85. Surviving left-hand screen of a pair of sixfold screens, ink and color on paper, 149 by 361 cm. Rectangular relief seal: Hasegawa; cauldron-shaped relief seal: Shinshun. Myôkaku-ji, Okayama Prefecture.

Fig. 4. Flowers and Birds of the Four Seasons. Attributed to Sesshû Tôyô. 1483. Left-hand screen of a pair of sixfold screens, ink and color on paper, 181.5 by 375 cm. Kosaka Zentarô Collection, Tokyo.
Fig. 5. Sōsetsusai. By Kenkō Shōkei. Inscription by Gyokuin Eiyo dated Meiō 8 (1499). Hanging scroll, ink and slight color on paper, 100.6 by 27.1 cm. Detail. Seikadō, Tokyo.

Fig. 6. Dove, from Flowers, Birds, and Figures. By Tōshun. 1512. From twelve paintings in ink and color on paper, 47 by 35 cm., mounted on a pair of sixfold screens. Yabumoto Sōgorō Collection, Amagasaki.
Fig. 7. *Eight Views of Xiao and Xiang*. By Hasegawa Tohaku. Ca. 1590. Pair of sixfold screens, ink on paper, each 162 by 356 cm. Bunkachō (Agency for Cultural Affairs), Tokyo.

Fig. 10. *Maple*. By Hasegawa Tohaku. 1592. Four sliding-door panels, color and gold leaf on paper, 172.5 by 138.5 cm. each. Commissioned for the Shōun-ji of Daitoku-ji, now in the Chishaku-in, Kyoto.
Fig. 8. Landscape of the Four Seasons. By Hasegawa Tohaku. 1599. Three of twenty sliding-door panels, ink and gold paint on paper, 196.8 by 86.0 cm. each. Abbot's Quarters, Rinka-in, Myoshin-ji, Kyoto.

Fig. 9. Four Sages of Mt. Shang. By Hasegawa Tohaku. 1601. Two of eight sliding-door panels, ink on paper, 178 by 142 cm. each. Kyakuden, Shinju-an, Daitoku-ji.
Fig. 11. Cypress. Attributed to Kano Eitoku. 1590. Sliding-door panels now mounted as a single eightfold screen, colors and gold leaf on paper, 167.7 by 460.5 cm. Tokyo National Museum.

Fig. 12. Anonymous, Ming Dynasty. Scholars in a Garden Studying the Classics. Sixteenth century. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 204.5 by 109.2 cm. Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City.

Fig. 14. Anonymous. *Pines on a Seashore*. Fifteenth century. Left-hand screen from a pair of sixfold screens, colors, mica, gold, and silver on paper, 150.5 by 356 cm. Satomi Chûsaburô Collection.
Fig. 15. Pine Islands. By Tawaraya Sōtsu (fl. 1602-40). Right-hand screen from a pair of sixfold screens, color and gold leaf on paper, 152 by 355.5 cm. Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (no. 06.231-1).
Fig. 16. Dry Landscape (*kare sansui*) Garden. Abbot's Quarters, Daisen-in, Daitoku-ji, Kyoto.

Fig. 17. Dry Landscape Garden. Detail of Figure 16.
Fig. 18. Dry Landscape Garden. Detail of Figure 16.
LYNN WHITE, IN HIS MEDIEVAL TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIAL CHANGE, OFFERS THE INTERESTING HYPOTHESIS THAT THE FEUDAL CLASS OF THE EUROPEAN MIDDLE AGES DERIVED ULTIMATELY FROM THE STIRRUP. AFTER THE ARRIVAL OF THE STIRRUP IN EUROPE BY THE EIGHTH CENTURY, AND THE PRIMACY THIS GAVE THE HORSE AND ARMOR IN WARFARE, THE STATE MADE LAND GRANTS IN RETURN FOR THE PLEDGE TO PROVIDE ARMORED KNIGHTS ON HORSEBACK WHEN CALLED. THE FREEMAN WITH HIS BATTLE-AXE NO LONGER WAS THE MAINSTAY OF THE MILITARY MIGHT OF THE STATE, THOUGH HE WAS STILL SUBJECT TO GENERAL MUSTER. CHARLEMAGNE'S ATTEMPT TO RAISE HORSEMEN BY ORDERING THE LESS WEALTHY TO POOL THEIR RESOURCES WAS EVENTUALLY UNSUCCESSFUL BECAUSE OF THE DIFFICULTIES IN ADMINISTERING SUCH A PROGRAM. THE EVENTUAL RESULT WAS THE DISTRIBUTION OF LAND TO VASSALS ON CONDITION OF KNIGHT'S SERVICE; FROM THIS FOLLOWED THE CREATION OF A FIGHTING ELITE, WHICH WAS TO HAVE A PROFOUNGB EFFECT ON WESTERN SOCIETY AND HISTORY.1

IN EUROPE THE INTRODUCTION OF THE STIRRUP AND THE RESULTING TECHNOLOGY, THAT OF THE HORSE AND ARMOR, THUS MADE FIGHTING A MATTER OF CLASS. IN CHINA, THE APPEARANCE OF THE STIRRUP ALSO LED TO SIGNIFICANT CHANGES ESPECIALLY IN THE METHOD OF WARFARE AND IN MILITARY ORGANIZATION. THE INITIAL IMPACT MAY WELL HAVE BEEN TO PRODUCE A MILITARY ELITE, THAT OF THE TRIBESMEN, XIANBEI2 AND OTHERS, WHICH Ruled northern china from the fourth to the sixth centuries, but the effect on society was perhaps less pronounced because it was possible to administer effectively a program such as Charlemagne found impossible to implement. THE very success of the new military institution, however, led to the disappearance of the tribesmen as the military elite. Thus the invention of the stirrup and its ultimate effect on warfare and society in China is a topic well worth examining.

IT IS CURIOUS THAT SOMETHING AS USEFUL AS THE STIRRUP SHOULD HAVE APPEARED SO MANY CENTURIES AFTER MAN BEGAN RIDING THE HORSE. A. D. H. BIVAR, IN HIS ADMIRABLE ARTICLE ON THE STIRRUP, POINTS TO THE DANGER INVOLVED IN MOUNTING A HORSE WHILE CARRYING WEAPONS, CITING THE EXAMPLE OF CAMBYSES, KING OF PERSIA IN 522 B.C., WHO STABBED HIMSELF FATALLY WHILE LEAPING ONTO HIS HORSE.2 YET THE EARLIEST FORMS OF STIRRUP, FOUND IN THE SCULPTURES OF SANCHI AND ELSEWHERE IN INDIA, ARE ONLY OF THE LATE SECOND CENTURY B.C. THESE TOOK THE FORM OF A LOOSE SURCINGLE OR SADDLE-STRAP BESIDE WHICH THE RIDER'S FEET WERE TUCKED; LATER, ONE FINDS THE DEPICTION OF A TINY STIRRUP FOR THE BIG TOE.3 AS WHITE OBSERVES, SHOD RIDERS OF COLDER CLIMATES COULD USE A BIG-TOE STIRRUP ONLY WITH DIFFICULTY. HE ALSO cites A KUSHAN ENGRAVED GEM OF CA. A.D. 100 THAT APPEARS TO SHOW SOME SORT OF HOOK-STIRRUP, BUT THIS SEEMS TO BE AN ISOLATED EXAMPLE.4

IT IS NOT KNOWN WHETHER THE INDIAN EXPERIMENTS HAD ANY INFLUENCE ON CHINA. IT HAS BEEN CLAIMED THAT THE STIRRUP WAS IN USE IN THE HAN,5 BUT THE Earliest RELIABLE REPRESENTATION COMES FROM A JIN TOMB OF 302, NEAR CHANGSHA (FIG. 1).6 THIS WAS A MOUNTING STIRRUP, THAT IS, A STIRRUP PLACED ON ONE SIDE OF THE HORSE, TOO SHORT TO BE OF USE ONCE THE RIDER HAD MOUNTED. WHAT MAY BE THE EARLIEST REPRESENTATION OF A PROPER STIRRUP, OF FULL LENGTH AND ON BOTH SIDES OF THE HORSE (FIG. 2), COMES FROM A TOMB NEAR NANJIANG THAT HAS BEEN DATED TO 322 (THIS DATE IS NOT CERTAIN, BUT THE OTHER OBJECTS FOUND IN THE TOMB MAKE AN EARLY EASTERN JIN DATE PROBABLE).7 BOTH THE MOUNTING STIRRUP OF CHANGSHA AND THE FULL-SIZED PAIR DEPICTED ON THE NANJIANG HORSE ARE TRIANGULAR IN SHAPE, BUT THE MODELING IS TOO GENERALIZED TO PERMIT DETAILS OF CONSTRUCTION TO BE DISCERNIBLE. IT IS THEREFORE NECESSARY TO TURN TO EXAMPLES OF ACTUAL STIRRUPS FOR SUCH INFORMATION.

WHAT IS QUITE POSSIBLY A GROUP OF XIANBEI GRAVES DATING TO THE EARLY OR MID-FOURTH CENTURY WAS UNCOVERED IN 1974 AT XIAOMINTUN,6 NEAR ANYANG. IN ONE OF THESE (NO. 154) WAS FOUND A SET OF EQUIPAGE FOR A HORSE: THE SKULL OF THE DECEASED RESTED ON THE REMAINS OF A SADDLE, AND BELLS, BUCKLES, AND ORNAMENTS LAY ANTOPI HIS BODY. NEXT TO THE SADDLE WAS ONE Gilded BRONZE STIRRUP (FIG. 3). FEW DESCRIPTIVE DETAILS OTHER THAN DIMENSIONS HAVE BEEN PUBLISHED: OVERALL LENGTH, 27 CM.; THICKNESS, 0.4 CM. THE HANDLE IS 14.5 CM. LONG AND 3.1 CM. WIDE, WITH A HORIZONTAL SLOT AT THE UPPER END MEASURING 1.2 BY 1.5 CM.; THE RING HAS AN OUTSIDE DIAMETER OF 16.4 CM. AND THE BODY OF THE RING IS 1.8 CM. THICK. THE STIRRUP WAS APPARENTLY ATTACHED TO THE LEFT FRONT OF THE SADDLE.8 IF, IN FACT, THERE ORIGINALLY HAD BEEN BUT ONE STIRRUP, THEN IT MIGHT INDEED REPRESENT A TRANSITIONAL STAGE FROM THE MOUNTING STIRRUP TO THE FULL PAIRS WHICH FOLLOW, AS THE EXCAVATION
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report suggests. One might also conjecture that for purposes of pulling a strong bow while on horseback, it is precisely the left stirrup that facilitates the draw. However, a figureine of a horse with similar trappings was recovered from a Xianbei tomb of about the same period near Huhehot, and this figure, I am told on good authority, is depicted with a pair of stirrups. Thus it may be due to some oversight that the Xiaoamintun site yielded but one of the presumed pair.9 A pair of stirrups found recently in a tomb at Yuantai, c Chaoyang, d Liaoning, is believed to be contemporaneous with that of Xiaoamintun, but the construction is unlike any found elsewhere. A wooden core, perhaps of rattan, is bound with leather and then lacquered, with a painted cloud design in red. Again the handle is long, with a rounded end and a horizontal slot for attaching the stirrup to a leather strap. The bow is somewhat triangular, with a trapezoidal cross-section, broader on the inner rim than on the outer one. A triangular piece of wood was placed at the upper part of the bow, probably to help the bow keep its shape. The handle is 14 cm. long and 3.7 cm. wide, while the slot is 2.4 cm. by 1 cm.; the diameter of the bow is 15 cm. and it is 2.5 cm. thick.10

Another of the early examples of stirrups was found in the tomb of Feng Sufu e (d. 415), a member of the ruling family of Northern Yan, which adjoined the Koguryo f state. The construction of these stirrups is rather complex. A piece of mulberry wood with a triangular cross-section was bent to form the bow of the stirrup, with a ridge facing outward. The two ends meet to form the stirrup handle or “ear.” At the juncture a triangular chip of wood was inserted so that the shape would not be distorted under the weight of the foot. Gilded bronze plates were nailed to the surfaces, except for the inside edge of the bow, which was lined with thin iron plates and a layer of black lacquer. The original dimensions were 23 cm. high and 16.8 cm. wide (Fig. 4).11 It would seem that the Feng stirrups are the earliest of known date.12 Although the stirrups in Feng’s tomb are described as being triangular and derived from those of the Eastern Jin,13 it is more accurate to say that the bow is oval, and that this feature relates it to stirrups recovered from the nearby Koguryo sites in the area of Ji’an, in the Yalu River valley.

Stirrups found in Koguryo tombs may antedate the pair from the Feng tomb since these sites are usually ascribed to the fourth and fifth centuries, but there are no certain dates.14 The stirrups are generally oval in shape with a long, flat, rectangular handle at the top, to which a strap would be connected through a horizontal slot. Two pairs of such stirrups were found in Tomb 78 at Wanbaoting, g which is ascribed to the first half of the fourth century on the basis of its construction (Fig. 6).15 These stirrups are described as follows:

Four stirrups in two pairs. Wooden stirrups form the core and are covered with gilded bronze plate. The method of covering them is first for the inside and outside edges to be lined with narrow strips of gilded bronze and fixed with very slender bronze nails. The portion of the bow on which the foot rests has five gilded bronze rivets set into the inner edge. Finally, gilded bronze plates cover the two flat surfaces, with small bronze nails fastening them along the inner and outer edges. There is a bit of overlap, which is made to cover the strips along the inner and outer edges. The upper part has a horizontal slot by which to suspend it from a strap. The overall height is 24 cm., the width 18 cm.16

Other sites in this area where stirrups were found include tombs at Qixingshan, h Yushanxia, i and Maxian’gou, j

Tomb 96 at Qixingshan is dated to the early fifth century. The manner of construction of the pair of stirrups found here is not described in any detail, but again we are told the stirrups had a wooden core and were covered with gilded bronze plate fastened by nails. From the drawing available to us (Fig. 7), as well as the published photograph, it would appear that this pair resembled closely that of Tomb 78 at Wanbaoting.17

Examples of stirrups from a slightly later period are not as well preserved but display the same basic format. Tomb 41 at Yushanxia, dated to the mid-fifth century, yielded only one stirrup (Fig. 8). What is different here is that the metal covering is of iron.18 Yet gilded bronze continued to be used. As evidence of this, one can cite the fragment of a cover plate found in Tomb 1 at Maxian’gou, which was not originally identified but is now recognized as coming from a stirrup.19 Stirrups of this same shape, covered with gilded bronze or iron plate, or forged entirely in iron, turn up farther south in Korea, in tombs of the Old Silla period (fourth-seventh centuries). In a study by Akio Ito these stirrups, some seventy-six pairs in all, have been divided into five types, the first two of which resemble the kinds of stirrups just described, with wooden cores covered either with overlapping plates (Type 1, four pairs), or by plates attached with rivets (Type 2, sixteen pairs). The third type, represented by one example, is pear-shaped, and
the fourth and fifth types, of iron, have foot-rests that are broadened, sometimes split lengthwise, and often have slight protuberances for added traction. Types 4 and 5, probably to be dated toward the end of this period, differ from each other in the shape of the end of the handle. One pair, of Type 2, from the Gold Crown Tomb (no. 128), is exhibited in the museum in Kyöngju (Fig. 9). One may observe the same bands around the inside and outside edges, while the surface plates have incised decoration. The usual horizontal slot on the handle to hold a strap is obscured.

The stirrups depicted in various contemporary Korean ceramic figures and murals are consistent with the shape that emerges from the Koguryö and Silla tombs. The murals in the Dancing Figures Tomb are especially important in this regard. One of the two saddles depicted on the wall of the left wing seems to have stirrups of the oval shape. At the least, the painting indicates very clearly how the strap was attached to the saddle. In the hunting scenes in the main chamber, the oval stirrup is very clearly shown on the right wall (Fig. 10) and appears somewhat less clearly in the racing figure on the left wall. In these cases, however, it would seem that only the front portion of the foot entered the stirrup and it was the ball of the foot which rested on that support. This is also the case with the few examples known in Old Silla ceramic figures. The most famous, of course, is the mounted warrior from the Gold Bell Tomb of the fifth-sixth centuries (Fig. 11). The museum at Kyöngju has another mounted clay figure displaying stirrups, as well as some depicted on an unmounted horse, but the modeling is too vague to be useful.

Thus one finds from the fourth century onward, in North China, in northeast Asia, along the Yalu, farther south into Korea, and even into Japan, the appearance of a particular type of stirrup: oval, flat, and with a rather long handle, with either a wooden core covered by gilded bronze or iron plate or one forged entirely from iron. Unfortunately, the consideration of the early history of the stirrup does not bring us any closer to establishing where it was invented, since it seems to appear at the same time among the Chinese and their northern neighbors. As early as 1926 A. von Le Coq pointed out that, on the basis of conjecture, it is as reasonable to say that the stirrup was the invention either of a mounted people who sought with it to make riding less tiring, or of a people unused to riding who sought thereby to obtain quickly the skills necessary to meet the needs of cavalry warfare. White brands this remark by Le Coq as \textit{a priori} speculation, but his own conclusion that it was a Chinese invention rests on no more solid foundation than does the opinion of other scholars that it was the nomad's skill with the horse which led to the improvement of equestrian gear, including the stirrup. At this point, we are not much further along in the solution of the problem than was Le Coq in 1926.

In China the shape of the stirrup underwent some changes during the sixth century. A pair of iron stirrups from the Northern Wei tomb at Guyuan, Ningxia, appears to have an oval bow and a rather short handle, still with a slot at the upper end. The height of the entire stirrup is 18.7 cm., but no other details have been published and the printed photograph of the find is not clear. It was stirrups with the oval bow and short handle which were used in the Tang, it is the type which is encountered across Asia, and it may well have been the type brought to Europe in the eighth century. The form is seen depicted on the horses of Tang Taizong (Fig. 13) and stirrups of exactly the same form occur in Avar graves in Hungary, in both bronze and cast iron. Similar stirrups in the museums in Irkutsk and Frunze are dated sixth-eighth centuries and are identified as Turkish. There is no intent here to trace the history of the stirrup in any detail nor any farther in space and time—this history may be found in the writings of Bivar, Ambroz, and White already mentioned (see notes 1–4). For our purposes it can be demonstrated that the stirrup appears in China and the adjacent areas to the north by the fourth century and its use was well established shortly thereafter.

The earliest references to the stirrup in the literary record are not easily located. White's review of early mention of the stirrup in Western records falls back on such indirect evidence as the use of the verbs \textit{scandere} and \textit{descendere} among the Franks in the early eighth century to replace verbs denoting "leaping." In the same way, written sources in China are not particularly useful for the date or place of invention, not to speak of style or shape. The graph for stirrup, pronounced \textit{deng}, as it occurs in the \textit{Shuowen jiezi} of A.D. 100, represents a word meaning "lamp," and comes to be used for "stirrup" only later. This use of the graph must be independent of its earlier usage, since it is rather clear that in the latter case the noun is to be related to the verb \textit{deng}, "to mount, to rise." It would seem that the
word referred first to a mounting stirrup and that it use was then extended to the ordinary riding stirrup. The literary reference to the stirrup most often cited as the earliest occurs in reference to an event of 477 in which the dispatch of a stirrup was intended to signal an uprising. The recent reprinting of the collected works of P. A. Boodberg has made more generally known his citation of an even earlier reference, Wang Luan (fl. 380–400), a giant of a man, was said to be able to mount his horse while wearing armor, without need of grasping the saddle or using a stirrup! Boodberg also suggested an emendation of a text to read that a carnelian stirrup was pilfered from a tomb dating to A.D. 346.

If the stirrup were an item of the ordinary utilitarian sort, one would not be surprised at the paucity of the written material concerning it. But the stirrup has been claimed to be of enormous consequence in the history of warfare and, indeed, in social and institutional history. Lynn White, in his very provocative treatment of the stirrup, says its introduction marked the third significant phase in the use of the horse in battle, the first two phases being the chariot and the mounted rider. The stirrup was important because it provided the rider with a secure seat and enabled the horseman to become a better archer and swordsman; more importantly, it made possible the effective use of the lance in the charge. No longer was the rider in danger of being lifted from his horse on impact. The stirrup, therefore, "made possible mounted shock combat, a revolutionary way of doing battle."

The logic of White’s argument from physics seems irrefutable, and so it is with some surprise that one notes that the rise of “heavy” cavalry preceded rather than followed the appearance of the stirrup. Edward Luttwak, for example, in discussing the auxiliary cavalry of the Roman army in the late Republic and into the first century A.D., mentions that there are those who maintain that since the stirrup was not available these cavalry must have been “light,” that is, that they were armed with bow or javelin and might harass the enemy at closer quarters with spear or sword but could not be “heavy” cavalry, those warriors who were armed with the long lance and could charge the enemy with shock tactics. On the contrary, he goes on to say, cavalry charges even without the stirrup were useful in breaking up formations of light cavalry and in attacking unmassed or undisciplined foot soldiers. At Carrhae, Luttwak points out, it was the combined use by the Parthians of heavy and light cavalry that annihilated the seven legions under Crassus in 53 B.C. The light cavalry sent a heavy volume of arrows onto the massed Romans while the threat of a charge by the heavy cavalry prevented the Romans from opening ranks. One may see depictions of Parthian armored cavalry of this period in the friezes from Khalchayan (Fig. 14). Bivar, in his article “Cavalry Equipment and Tactics on the Euphrates Frontier,” estimates on the basis of Plutarch’s account that the ratio of horse-archers to lancers at Carrhae was about ten to one, and that in the following centuries the numbers of the heavy cavalry may well have increased while the role of the horse-archer seems to have declined. The main thrust of the Sasanian armies, which overwhelmed the Parthians in the third century A.D., was the cavalry charge by heavily armored knights who were relatively immune to long-range archery. One sees the evidence of this “superiority of armor over missile” in the friezes of Firuzabad, which depict the heavily armored Sassanians unseating their Parthian foes. The culmination of this development in Iran can be seen in the relief of Khusrau II (A.D. 591–628) at Tāq-i Bustan (Fig. 15), in which one finds a fully armored knight, very close in appearance to the mediaeval knights of Europe, and yet still without the stirrup.

The evidence in Iran seems to contradict White’s assertion that the stirrup was an essential precursor of the heavily armored knight, even though in Europe it appears that White’s observation holds true. It was only after the introduction of the stirrup into Europe in the eighth century that the armored knight began to replace the axe-wielding freeman as the mainstay of the military. What then was the case in China?

The evidence we have indicates that cavalry in China was of the “light” variety until at least the fourth century A.D. The traditional date for the adoption of mounted archery in China is 307 B.C., but the first real evidence with respect to equipment and appearance is probably the extraordinary pottery figures from the mausoleum complex of Qin Shihuangdi. The second of the three pits thus far reported is estimated to contain 116 figures of cavalrymen and mounts. The armor worn by the mounted soldiers is shorter than that of the armored infantrymen and has no shoulder guards. The robes worn under the armor also differ from those of the foot soldiers in that the overlap is to the front, probably to facilitate riding. The cavalrymen wear small caps with
chin straps and are shod in boots rather than in sandals. They are believed to have been archers, since their left hands seem to have held bows, and quivers holding eighty to a hundred arrows each were found in their vicinity. The military array of the pottery figures calls to mind the description in the Zhan'guoce of the Qin army of one million warriors wearing armor, one thousand chariots, and ten thousand cavalry. The ratio supports what the pits seem to indicate, that the cavalry at that time was a relatively minor part of the military force.

Cavalry apparently gained in importance during the Han, but the uses to which it was put perhaps did not change very much. In the army of figurines found in Yangjiawan⁶ the infantry still greatly outnumbers the cavalry—by approximately 2,000 to 600—but whether this ratio of three to one was typical of Han armies is not clear. Some of the cavalrymen are said to be depicted as wearing armor, but there is no information as to their numbers. Some of the cavalrymen carry quivers on their backs.

There are other indications, however, that the cavalry also carried spears and dagger-axes for close-range fighting. The remarkable procession of cavalrymen and chariots from Wuwei,⁷ Gansu, shows a troop with such weapons. How these might have been used is shown in the battle scene on the relief at Xiaotangshan,⁸ where one sees a man being pulled off his horse by a cavalryman wielding a dagger-axe while other horsemen gallop toward each other shooting arrows. The Chinese and their nomad opponents are distinguished only by their headgear (Fig. 16). This cavalry can still be classified as “light,” because we see no evidence of heavy armor for either rider or mount or any indication of the use of massed charges. The successful use of the dagger-axe depended more on the strength of the arms and the dexterity of its user than on the momentum of the attack. The increasing importance of cavalry as opposed to chariots and infantry came about in an attempt to deal with the Xiongnu horsemen, and in such battles heavy cavalry would not have been very useful.

In the lintel relief from the facade of the tomb at Yi'nan, possibly late Han or slightly later (Fig. 17), there seems to be very little change in the attack. Death is still indicated by the head being separated from the body. Foot and mounted archers move across the scene, but here we see two riders holding short swords and shields. Large side-boards, which become characteristic of the late Han and Jin, are in evidence, but there is still no stirrup. The Jiayuguan⁹ painted bricks of the Wei-Jin period are perhaps a better source, since the details are clearer, but here, unfortunately, we may observe only processions, not battles. The cavalrymen who form part of what seems to be an official entourage clearly wear armor, perhaps scale habergeon and casque helmets with plumes, carry spears, and nestle their legs in shaped side-boards for support (Fig. 18). There have been changes in the artistic style from the Han, but none in terms of equipment. In the next few decades, however, we may observe enormous differences from what went before.

One of the new developments of this time was the widespread use of horse armor, or bardings. There is a memorial written by Cao Zhi' (192–232), probably in 226, which is important for the study of the history of armor in China because it gives the names of a number of types of armor of his time. In one version of that memorial a set of horse armor (makai yiling⁴) is mentioned. A few years earlier Cao Cao⁷ (155–220), in speaking of the odds he had overcome, says he had twenty suits of armor against ten thousand for his opponent, and ten sets of horse armor against three hundred. It is not clear what sort of horse armor is meant here—it may simply be the sort of chest protector one finds depicted in the Changsha tomb of 302, where the mounting stirrup is also shown. A hundred years later the capture of five thousand and even ten thousand armored horses is recorded, and other terms such as “iron horse” (tiemay) and “iron cavalry” (tieji)⁷ have also become common. Iron plates that were probably used for horse armor were found in Feng Shifu's tomb of 415, where the earliest datable stirrups were found (see above). The conjunction of stirrups and bardings is probably not fortuitous, and it may well have been the increasing use of armored cavalry that provided the incentive and favorable environment for the development and widespread use of the stirrup.

One need only glance at the mural from the tomb of Tong Shou, dated 357, to see how different the appearance of the cavalry has become (Fig. 19). The body of the rider is almost completely covered by armor. He wears a plumed helmet that protects the sides and back of the head, a habergeon with high neck and shoulder guards, and chaps. The armor was made of lamellar plate, but one cannot say whether of iron or of lacquered leather. The bardings almost completely cover the horse and include
a chanfron of distinctive shape. One of these head protectors, of iron, was found in Japan.\textsuperscript{59} As with the stirrup, our best evidence of these developments is to be found in the murals of the Koguryô tombs of the fourth-fifth centuries. A variety of armor is depicted there, including a stirring scene of running combat (Fig. 20). The resemblance of these figures to the cataphracti in the famous graffito of Dura-Europos (Fig. 21), to be dated to the third century, perhaps gives evidence of widespread diffusion of this sort of armor, even if the stirrup was not yet available. The armor of the riders in China underwent a number of changes in the following centuries: “double-faced,” or liangdang,\textsuperscript{ab} and “cord-and-plaque” armor were developed, culminating in the marvelous cuirassiers of the Sui and early Tang.\textsuperscript{60}

As we have seen, heavy armor and horse bardings may develop without the stirrup, as they seem to have done in Southwest Asia and some parts of Central Asia. But in China the appearance of the two seem to coincide. It is just at the time that widespread use of horse bardings and heavy armor make their appearance, both in the archaeological record and in the literature, that we begin to find reference to the stirrup. The weight of armor must have made retention of one’s seat more difficult and recovery from a fall not easily accomplished. Strabo mentions that the fully armored Sarmatians were helpless when they fell from their horses.\textsuperscript{61} The Jin figures of horses with high, straight bows on the saddles and what may be molded side-boards into which the upper leg could fit may have been the response to this problem before the stirrup became available (Fig. 22).

The emergence of the armored cavalryman had an important impact on the nature of warfare in China. The first effect was to give the nomad horseman a new importance, and the nomad dominance of North China in these years is perhaps to be attributed to the nomad’s skill in using this new military weapon. The size of military forces during these years is infrequently mentioned, and when given the figures usually lump together infantry and cavalry, obscuring the ratio between these two branches of the armed forces. One may note, however, the association of cavalry with the nomads, especially those of the northeast. In 312, when Shi Le\textsuperscript{ac} managed to break a siege of his capital by the Xianbei, he reputedly captured five thousand kaima,\textsuperscript{ad} or barded horses.\textsuperscript{62} Four years later a Xianbei force joined the hard-pressed house of Jin, but fell into a trap prepared by the same Shi Le, and ten thousand kaima were captured.\textsuperscript{63} The Yuwen\textsuperscript{ae} people of Manchuria (whose rule of Northern Zhou was still two centuries away) gave Shi Hu,\textsuperscript{af} Shi Le’s successor, ten thousand horses in 342, while he managed to collect another fourteen thousand belonging to the commandery functionaries under his rule—the ease of the gift and the necessity of confiscation contrast sharply.\textsuperscript{64} In 352 the army of Yan was said to be all cavalry, while that of Ran Min,\textsuperscript{ag} successor to the Shi family, was said to be largely infantry.\textsuperscript{65} At the end of the century, when the Murong\textsuperscript{ah} were being pressed hard by the Tuoba,\textsuperscript{ai} it was argued in planning strategy that the Tuoba armies were mainly cavalry who carried but a week’s rations.\textsuperscript{66} These citations are not comprehensive, but perhaps give a sense of the kind of material one finds in the historical sources. As these nomads moved into China it became increasingly difficult to maintain their numbers of cavalry, yet it would seem that effective cavalry was the key to success in battle.

It is obvious that the cavalry was becoming more important in the wars of this period, but the ways in which the cavalry was employed are not clear, for there is unfortunately little information available to us. All too often the warrior is depicted as a lone champion. Chen An,\textsuperscript{60} who fell before Liu Yao’s\textsuperscript{ak} forces in 323 and became a local hero, is described as brandishing a seven-foot sword in his left hand and a long, snake-bladed lance in his right, but also as being able to fire off arrows at distant foes.\textsuperscript{67} Ran Min wielded a two-bladed lance to dispatch three thousand foes—obviously, a gross exaggeration or a synecdoche in which he is taken to represent his army.\textsuperscript{68} In another battle the Murong fastened together five thousand of their best mounted archers in a square formation by means of iron chains! In this case it is said that Ran Min led the attack with a double-bladed lance in his left hand and hooked halberd in his right, but despite his beheading three hundred of the enemy, their line held and Ran Min was captured.\textsuperscript{69} The utility of the iron chain for a force of archers is not clear, but it would seem that in this battle we have an example of cavalry being used both as chargers and as bowmen. The elegant cavalier of the southern courts depicted on a brick of the second half of the fifth century (Fig. 23) and cavalrymen in the battle scene from Cave 285 at Dunhuang (Fig. 24) carry bows or quivers or both. This may be only additional protection for
a cavalry whose primary purpose was the charge, as Bivar claims was true of the Sasanian warriors at Naqsh-i Rustam. In the Dunhuang mural we see an enemy force of infantry enduring a barrage of arrows from archers on one flank and on the other cavalry lancers picking off individual foe. Just such a scene is described in an incident included in the Zhou shu. Cai You, one of the foremost generals of the Western Wei, took part in a disastrous campaign in 538 against the Eastern Wei. As described in his biography, he distinguished himself in battle:

You then dismounted and fought on foot, and killed several men with his own hands. Those accompanying him urged him to remount to be prepared for the oncoming soldiers. You angrily replied, "The chancellor [Yuwen Tai] raised me like a son: how can I think of my own fate today?" He then led ten or so of his followers, all giving a great shout, and they killed and wounded a great many. As he had no rear guard, the enemy surrounded him ten or so deep and called to him, "You appear to be a brave knight, sir; if you would but put aside your armor and surrender, can you believe you would be without riches and honors?" You cursed them, saying, "Drop dead! I have today but to take [your] heads and I will be enfeoffed a duke; what have I to do with titles from you false bandits?" And so he stretched his bow to the full and stood them off on all four sides. The Eastern Wei men did not dare to press him but called up one with heavy armor and long sword to advance directly and seize him. When he was perhaps thirty paces from You, those about him urged him to shoot, but You replied, "Our life rides on one arrow—how can I shoot it in vain?" The enemy slowly advanced, and when he was ten paces away You finally shot him right in the face. He fell at the twang of the bow, and You then used a lance to pierce and kill him. They fought like this for several bouts, losing only one man. The enemy then withdrew a bit, and You slowly led a retreat.

Obviously, literary convention may have recast the conflict into terms of individual combat, for it would make no sense to send a single cavalryman on such a mission. The information on the movement of cavalry en masse, however, is sketchy. For example, we are told that at the battle of Shayuan in 537, to be discussed below, a cavalry charge cut through the enemy flank. One can only suppose some sort of massed charge, but no details are given.

At this point, let us broaden the focus from the cavalryman and his function on the battlefield to the military forces in general. As we do so, it will become apparent that during the post-Han period the cavalry had become a crucial factor in the military forces, and that at the same time large-scale mobilizations of the general population came to be less useful. In the following, we will go into some detail about two periods in particular because they provide comparable data on the use of the cavalry. The first period is that of the battles between the two states led by Shi Le and Liu Yao in North China in the early fourth century, and the second is that of the similar struggle between the states founded by Gao Huan and Yuwen Tai in the sixth century.

In the first case, North China was divided into an eastern state under Shi Le and a western one under Liu Yao, whose capital was Chang'an. Luoyang was seen as a key point in the defense of the northeast since it controlled passage into the Central Plains. At the same time any army wanting to move through the Tong Pass into Shaanxi needed first to control Luoyang. The battles between these two states in the 320s therefore revolved around control of this city. It was a battle at Luoyang that in fact led to the capture of Chang'an by Shi Hu, the successor of Shi Le, in 328, a significant event during this period and one which had important lessons to offer in later years. Liu Yao, the ruler of the western state, was a Xiongnu, and most of his troops seem to have been Di and Qiang tribesmen. Even when he marched at the head of an army said to number 280,000 men, in 323, it was remarked that he had few well trained troops (jing zu) and that the Di and Qiang scattered easily. An army of Liu's, consisting of eighty officers and several thousand Di and Qiang, was taken prisoner in 325 when Luoyang was taken by Shi Hu. In 328 Shi Hu made his next move by leading 40,000 men into the Tong Pass area. Liu Yao sent Di and Qiang soldiers to guard his rear while he led his best troops to counterattack. He was successful and pushed on to take Luoyang. There is a statement, no doubt only rhetoric, that he commanded 100,000 armored men (dai jia). Shi Le responded to this serious threat by leading an army of 60,000 foot and 27,000 horse to relieve Luoyang. Liu Yao made the mistake of remaining in Luoyang, where he was trapped and captured together with his army after a fierce battle at the gates of the city. The road to Shaanxi and Chang'an now lay open, and the armies under Shi Hu soon overthrew the Liu family and established control of that area as well.

It is clear that Liu Yao should not have allowed himself to be stranded at Luoyang, and certainly later tacticians took serious note of his blunder. One may see in later conflicts a general skittishness in this regard—it seems almost as
if every clash of arms is followed by one army or the other scurrying back to safety. Luoyang was a critical but also a dangerous vantage point. During this period there is mention of a number of organizational procedures that provide interesting parallels with later developments. Liu Yao had been aware of the vulnerability of his state well before his defeat and had taken steps to strengthen his defenses. In a move perhaps directly related to the threat from the east, a command structure was established to defend the capital. Liu Yao appointed his son Liu Yin to be Grand Constable (da sima) and Grand shanyue with his own headquarters; below him were the traditional Xiongnu posts, from xianwang on down, and the leaders of the various non-Chinese groups, such as Hu, Jie, Xianbei, Di, and Qiang, were appointed to fill these positions. Obviously Liu Yao looked to these various tribesmen for his support. What is to be noted here is that the form in which the organization of the defense took shape was the traditional tribal one. In many ways, the case of Liu Yao provides an illuminating parallel with the defense of the same area two hundred years later by the Xianbei under Yuwen Tai.

Turning to the sixth century, we find the situation in North China very similar to that of the early fourth century. Once more the north was divided into two contending states, again separated by that portion of the Yellow River which flows from north to south. The Tuoba state of Northern Wei had broken apart, and the intensity of the conflict may have been fueled by the fact that each side put forth its own Tuoba prince as the legitimate claimant of the Wei throne. Just as in the earlier struggle between Shi Le and Liu Yao, control of Luoyang was crucial, and the area along the Yellow River near that city became the scene of many important battles. A review of this struggle will provide the setting for our discussion of the restructuring of the military forces in the Western Wei state.

The Eastern Wei armies were the more aggressive at first, and the Western Wei seems to have been rather more on the defensive. In 537 a three-pronged attack was mounted on the Western Wei through the Tong Pass. Yuwen Tai crushed one of these armies and the others retreated. Yuwen Tai then followed the withdrawing forces as far as Hongnong, where he in turn had to fall back before the main Eastern Wei army, reputed to be two hundred thousand strong, and led by Gao Huan himself. The defeat of that large Eastern Wei army at Shayuan, just west of the Tong Pass and thus inside the threshold of the Western Wei stronghold, by a Western Wei force of a mere ten thousand men was a significant event in Western Wei history, and is mentioned frequently in the history of that state. The claim was that some six thousand of the enemy were killed and seventy thousand captured. Dugu Xin, a veteran Xianbei general under Yuwen Tai, was then ordered to take advantage of the victory by occupying Luoyang.

The triumph of the Western Wei was short-lived, however. Dugu Xin was besieged by the Eastern Wei at Luoyang, and Yuwen Tai led a force to relieve him. The besiegers withdrew, with Yuwen Tai leading his light cavalry in pursuit. The battle took place at Heqiao, and the Western Wei lost. The situation was a perilous one, since Hongnong, on the line of retreat, had gone over to the Eastern Wei, and, in addition, the many prisoners taken the year before were rebelling in Chang'an. Yuwen managed to overcome these difficulties and may have considered himself fortunate to have lost only the several tens of thousands that Eastern Wei claimed he had lost at Heqiao.

In 542 the Western Wei was successful in keeping possession of Yubi, a stronghold on the east side of the Yellow River, but in the next year there occurred another setback for that state. Yuwen Tai saw an opportunity to retake Luoyang when a defector from Eastern Wei offered him entry, but he was unsuccessful in preventing Gao Huan from leading his army across the Yellow River. At a battle in the Mang Mountains the Eastern Wei line held, and Yuwen Tai was forced to lead the remains of his army back through Tong Pass. The Eastern Wei claimed that he lost more than four hundred officers and sixty thousand soldiers. Whatever the actual count, it must have been a serious loss.

There was little action of this sort during the next decade, but starting in 553 there appears to have been an increase of military activity and of numbers of combatants on the part of Western Wei. In that year Yuwen Tai led thirty thousand cavalry against the Tuyuhun in the northwest. Having thus secured his rear, he dispatched fifty thousand foot soldiers and cavalry the next year to sweep over the defenses of the state of Liang to the south. There followed another decade-long pause in hostilities, until the northwestern state, now termed [Northern] Zhou, began joint operations with the Turks against their neighbor, the [Northern] Qi in 562–63. Two columns,
one of ten thousand cavalry from the north and the other of thirty thousand cavalry from the south, joined the Turks in an attack, but the action was ultimately unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{87} The next effort, in 564, was a general mobilization of the state. The description of this immense effort is as ponderous as the actual movement must have been. “Thereupon they summoned to the court the twenty-four armies, the unattached and the attached troops of the left and right apartments, the soldiers of Qin,\textsuperscript{bf} Long,\textsuperscript{bg} Ba,\textsuperscript{bh} and Shu,\textsuperscript{bi} and the hosts of the various border states, amounting to two hundred thousand men.”\textsuperscript{88} Unfortunately, there is no breakdown by type of the troops involved. This army returned after only one battle.\textsuperscript{89}

Another incident in 570–71 led to some minor activity, but in 575 a series of campaigns was mounted against Northern Qi that eventually led to the conquest of that state. The first attack was made in a number of columns (amounting to 170,000 men), but again the forward movement seems to have faltered.\textsuperscript{90} The actual conquest in 576–77 was accomplished by a force of 85,000 men, of whom 20,000 were said to be cavalry and the remaining 65,000 a mixed force of foot and cavalry.\textsuperscript{91}

In the foregoing account of the events during this struggle in the sixth century figures concerning the number of troops involved occur, but they are few, and any analysis based on such numbers must be tentative at best. Nevertheless, there are parallels that may be drawn between the conflicts of east and west in the fourth and in the sixth centuries. We have seen that the large-scale mobilization by Liu Yao in 323 was not considered a serious threat; similarly, the campaigns of 564 and 575 that involved large-scale mobilizations were not particularly successful. The same may be said of Shi Hu’s attack on Yan by five hundred thousand men in 342\textsuperscript{92} and the enormous concentration of manpower assembled by Fu Jian\textsuperscript{bj} in 383.\textsuperscript{93} In all of these cases the administrative techniques employed to mobilize such numbers far outstripped the capacity to use them effectively in the field: the significant victories were won by smaller numbers of more highly trained troops.\textsuperscript{94} The information we have suggests that the cavalry, both light and heavy, came to be an essential part of the armed forces, that greater reliance was placed on these mounted warriors and less on the poorly armed and inadequately trained infantry raised by large-scale levies for specific campaigns.

During the years of division, bearing arms in North China was mainly the responsibility of the non-Chinese invaders who ruled that area. It is said that Gao Huan told his soldiers in the Xianbei language, “The Chinese are your slaves, they farm for you, the women make your clothing, they bring you your supplies and clothing, enable you to be warm and well fed. Why do you want to oppress them?” To the Chinese he would say, “The Xianbei are your clients, you give them a measure of grain and a bolt of cloth, and they fight for you so that you may have peace and order. Why do you hate them?”\textsuperscript{95} Given such a division of functions, the position of the Xianbei as a ruling elite was stable. The Chinese could be mobilized as foot soldiers for local defense or for an occasional large-scale campaign without disturbing the arrangement. But armor for man and horse had become quite heavy after the appearance of the stirrup in the fourth century, and such equipment was also expensive. At the same time, the level of warfare had intensified among the rival states in the north, and between them and the southern Chinese states as well, while the reservoir of Xianbei tribesmen dropped. It thus became necessary to bring into the army well equipped and well trained Chinese. Only those of substance and strength were admitted in this recruitment since it was expected that they would contribute toward supplying their own equipment.\textsuperscript{96}

In 543, after the disastrous battle of the Mang Mountains in which the Western Wei forces sustained enormous losses, the statement was made: “Thereupon they recruited widely among the local magnates of Guan\textsuperscript{bk} and Long (i.e., the core area of Western Wei) in order to increase the military forces.”\textsuperscript{97} When we look to the sources to see whether there is actual evidence of this recruitment, it is most significant that we find five references to “local troops” being raised within the state and no mention of any other sort of recruitment. As an example, we have Guo Yan,\textsuperscript{bl} who in 546, “having been selected as being most eminent in his prefecture, controlled and led the local troops.”\textsuperscript{98} The other four cases are similar.\textsuperscript{99} One can find an echo of this system as late as 574, when it was announced that in certain areas rank as an officer was to be given to any who would recruit and lead a group of men to serve in the army.\textsuperscript{100} The units thus raised at the local level were fed into a centralized command structure that had the responsibility of fielding the main military force of the state. But as the Xianbei
rulers had begun to accept Chinese and other ethnic groups into their forces, it must soon have become apparent to them that they were in danger of being swamped by this new influx of recruits. At the same time, there may have been a need to introduce a more systematic organization into the army. We have noted that two centuries earlier Liu Yao made use of the traditional Xiongnu apparatus with a shanyu at its head. In this case the Xianbei revived a pattern of clan federation that frequently served as the organizing principle of nomad empires on the steppes.

A decree was issued in 554 that the thirty-six tribes and ninety-nine clans of the traditional Tuoba state were to be reinstated, that the officers of highest merit were to be appointed the heads of these tribes and clans, and that the soldiers they commanded were to adopt the surnames of their officers. This would have the effect of making the army into a tribal confederation, as the Tuoba state had been at its beginning. The bestowal of Xianbei surnames upon eminent Chinese, so common at this time, was intended to produce the same result, that of tribalization or “Xianbei-ization.” The effect of these policies was to make the enlistment of Chinese into the military forces acceptable to and controllable by the Xianbei rulers. The next step, taken in 574, no doubt in preparation for the conquest of Northern Qi, was active recruitment of Chinese; those who enlisted had their names removed from the district rolls so as to exempt them from taxes and corvée. Then, it is said, half the Chinese became soldiers, obviously an exaggeration but a significant statement nevertheless.

To return to the question posed at the start of this paper, why, if the stirrup brought feudalism to Europe, did the same thing not happen in China? Joseph Needham, in considering this problem, has recourse to the “astonishing stability” of Chinese civilization, which is “so deeply civilian in its ethics that the very conception of aristocratic chivalry was perhaps impossible.” The answer, rather, is to be found in the developments described above. In China the bureaucratic apparatus existed to administer the resources of the state down to a relatively low level. There was little need to “broker” central power on a regional basis in order to acquire the needed resources. “Local troops” were a kind of brokered product—rank was given in exchange for the service of these personal followers, but only at the local level. The recruitment of Chinese into the centralized army gave the Northern Zhou and its successors, the Sui and the Tang, the military advantage over their rivals. The advanced bureaucratic techniques of the Chinese state enabled this recruitment to remain under centralized control—there was no need for power to be brokered by middlemen as was the case in Europe. The problem for the Northern Zhou rulers, however, was that as they permitted the Chinese greater participation in the military, they were allowing their hold on the state to slip away. The pretense of Xianbei names could not conceal the fact that the Xianbei forces were becoming a less important factor in the power structure of the state. Just as the military participation ratio (to use Andreski’s term) of the Chinese increased, the Xianbei elite had to make way. Eventually rule slipped from Xianbei hands and after a transitional period of rule by men of half-Chinese, half-nomadic background, mirroring the army itself, China again came to have Chinese rulers—all this without undergoing a racial confrontation. The stirrup and the heavy armor that it made possible, therefore, seem to have had very different consequences from those which emerged in Europe.
Notes


4. White, op. cit., p. 15 and pl. 1. I. I. Kyzlasov, “O proiskhozhdenii stremyan,” *Sovetskaya Arkeologiya*, no. 3, 1973, pp. 24–36, traces the saddle with a solid frame (to be distinguished from one made of bags stuffed with soft materials) back to the fourth-third centuries B.C., and believes that stirrups of organic material were used as early as that period, although no trace of them survives. The earliest actual examples cited by him are the miniatures from the Tashlyk Culture in the Minusinsk area on the middle Yenisei River, a culture which dates from the third century A.D. (p. 29 and fig. 5). A. K. Ambroz, “Stremena i sedla rannego srednevekovya kak kihronologicheski pokazatel’ (4–8 vv.),” *Sovetskaya Arkeologiya*, no. 4, 1973, p. 87, remarks that the shape of the Minusinsk miniatures resembles stirrups of later periods, but he does not raise the possibility of their being intrusions. Ambroz goes into great detail on the stylistic development of the stirrups, and he traces their history across Asia into Europe. These two articles were kindly called to my attention by Dr. Emma Bunker.

Sōma Takashi, “Rintāo genryū kō,” in his *Ryōsakaisei kobunka ronko: Silk Road no Tōzai kōryū*, Tokyo, 1977, pp. 139–58, presents a curiously flawed survey of the earliest origins of the stirrup. He cites Harada Yoshito and Komai Kazuchika, *Shina koki zukō*, Tokyo, 1932, for evidence of the use of leather straps in the Warring States period. Those authors (pp. 59–62) claimed to see evidence for a round metal stirrup (*rintōshū*) in the depiction of the hunter on the inlaid mirror from Jincun, near Luoyang. They went on to say that the details of construction were not clear and that there was no literary evidence for its existence. On rather shaky ground, they surmise that the word *dōu*, defined in the *Shuowen jiezi* as a leather implement on the vehicle, was a kind of aid in mounting the vehicle, because of the graphic similarity of *dōu* to *deng*, defined in the same dictionary as “to mount a vehicle.” Harada and Komai then go on to say that there must have been some sort of strap of rope, vine, or leather to assist in the mounting of a horse, but they offer no evidence for this, nor do they carry further the discussion of the Jincun mirror. Sōma, in his article, takes up the graph *dōu* and creates a new graph, the “leather” radical adjoined to *deng*, using it to designate such a strap or mounting device. As evidence for the existence of such a strap he cites a Xiongnu plaque of the Han, found at Xiachagou, Liaoning (cf. Sun Shoudao, “Xiongnu Xichgou wenhua” guminqu de fuxian,” *Weiwu*, 1960, no. 8–9, p. 27 and p. 33, no. 2), which depicts two mounted riders and, at the left sides of the horses, two long oval objects, reaching almost to the ground, apparently free-swinging. Sōma calls attention to a similar object, this time on the right side of a tethered horse, depicted on a plaque found in the pre-Han grave of a northern nomad at Keshengzhuang, Xi’an. Other plaques are also added. In all these cases, Sōma states, what is being depicted is not some water bag or decorative element, but the leather strap which Harada and Komai had hypothesized. One may wonder how a loop reaching almost to the ground might have assisted in the mounting of a horse. This plaque is now on display in the History Museum, Beijing, and direct observation of the piece does not lend any confidence to Sōma’s interpretation.

For Scythian evidence, Sōma cites the strap hanging from the saddle of the horse on the Chertomlyk vase, on which E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, Cambridge, 1913, p. 75 (not p. 25, as indicated by Sōma), commented: “... as it seems no stirrups, though a thong hanging from the girth looks rather like a stirrup leather.” As Sōma says, evidence along the Black Sea is very rare (in fact, there is no other), but he refers again to Minns, p. 250, where a barrow on the Berel River, an affluent of the Irtysh, is said to have yielded an iron bit and two iron stirrups. These are dated as “Early Iron Age” and attributed to the people of Hunnic stock, but no dates are given. Since only one pair of stirrups was found in this group of graves one might surmise that it did not derive from the earliest period of this culture. On this point see the comments of Sun Ji in his thoughtful article “Tangdai de maju yu mashi,” *Wenwu*, 1981, no. 10, p. 96, n. 30.

Sōma then turns his attention to West Asia. He cites the hunting scene from House M7W at Dura-Europos and redraws the horseman so as to create a dangling strap in front of the hunter’s foot (p. 144, fig. 5). The photographs and drawings in M. Rostovtseff, *Dura-Europos and Its Art*, Oxford, 1938, pl. 17, and A. Perkins, *The Art of Dura-Europos*, Oxford, 1973, indicate that the loop in question is on the other side of the horse and parallel to the toe of the rider’s right foot, which is the side facing the viewer.

Rostovtzeff, in the original report, *The Excavation at Dura-Europos: Preliminary Report of the Sixth Season of Work, October 1932–March 1933*, New Haven, 1936, p. 152, said, “The boots project from beneath the horse and are painted in white with red outline. There are no stirrups.” See also the drawing, pl. 42. Thus what Sōma takes as a loop is rather the toe of the rider’s left foot.

Sōma assumes that the mounting of a horse by leaping required a facilitative device, and he traces the occurrences of *anapedao*, “to leap up,” through the writings of Xenophon and Herodotus, among others, as evidence of the existence of some sort of strap or loop. Yet the anecdotes concerning Cambyses, mentioned above, and Yao Yizhong, who vaulted onto his horse while wearing his armor to demonstrate his agility despite his advanced age (*Jin shu. juan* 116, 2961), would lose their point if a mounting device had been in use. Professor Michael Wigodsky, a professor of classics at Stanford whom I consulted on this point, is of the opinion that the use of *padó* or any of its compounds would be an odd choice to indicate a relatively effortless action.

5. Sharma, op. cit., p. 177, citing B. I. Marshak of the Hermitage Museum. Liu Han, “Beichao de kaima jiyong,” *Kaogu*, 1959, no. 2, p. 97, said there was no trace of the
stirrup in the Han. Wu Bolun, "Guanyu madeng wented ji Wuzwei Handai jiuzhang zhaoling mujuan," Kaogu, 1961, no. 3, p. 164, responded by saying that any discussion of the history of the stirrup needed to consider the representation of a stirrup scratched into the side of the reclining stone ox before the grave of Huo Qubing. Yang Hong, "Guanyu tiejia makai he madeng wented," Kaogu, 1961, no. 12, p. 694, suggested that the ox's stirrup had probably been done at a later date. White, op. cit., pp. 140–41, cites the like opinion of C. W. Bishop. J. Needham, Science and Civilisation in China, 6 v., Cambridge, 1954–83, v. 1, p. 167, reproduces a rubbing from the Wuliaci shrine of the Han, A.D. 147, as published in Feng Yunpeng, Jinsishuo, n.p., 1821, shi section, juan 3, no. 3, of a figure on a galloping horse, which very clearly indicates a stirrup (Fig. 24). The stirrup seems to have an arch through which the front part of the foot protrudes, while the sole rests on a platform which extends back from the arch. White was skeptical of the reliability of the rubbing (p. 141), but Needham, "Science and China's Influence on the World," The Legacy of China, ed. Raymond Dawson, London, 1964, p. 268, n. 1, does not accept his "cavalier" dismissal of the evidence. M. Loewe prudently asserts that there is not sufficient evidence to show that the stirrup was in general use in the reign of Wu-di (140–87 B.C.); see his "The Campaigns of Han Wu-ti," in Chinese Ways in Warfare, ed. F. A. Kierman, Jr., Cambridge, Mass., 1974, p. 100. It has been claimed that stirrups were painted on bronze horses from the late Eastern Han tomb at Leitai, Wuwei, Gansu, ("Wuwei Leitai Han mu," Kaogu xuebao, 1974, no. 2, p. 91), but this is denied by Sun Ji, "Tangdai de mai ju yu masi," p. 88, n. 5.

Another claim for a Han date for the stirrup is a report in "Qinghaisheng Huzhu Tuzu zixishxian Dong Han muzang chu ju wenwu," Wenwu, 1981, no. 2, p. 96, of a bronze plaque 7.3 cm. by 5 cm., depicting a horse semireclining, with a small horse on its back, and two square stirrups depicted between the larger horse's belly and the base line. This plaque was said to have come from a non-Chinese tomb in Huzhu Tu Peoples Autonomous Xian, and on the basis of a grey pottery jug (guan), it is believed to date from the Eastern Han. Another plaque like it had been found in Gonghe Xian, Hainan Tibetan Autonomous District. These plaques are said to derive from the Scythian-Xiongnu culture, and the contents of the tomb, that is, the plaque, grey pottery jug, and many belt buckles, represent the Xiongnu culture in Qinghai. The discussion of this same plaque in Feng Zhou, "Kaogu zaji," Kaogu yu Wenwu, 1983, no. 1, p. 104, underlines the significance of the plaque, stating that it is earlier by one or two hundred years than the earliest representation of the stirrup known heretofore, that of 302 from Changsha, and earlier still than the earliest representation of a pair of stirrups, that from Xiaoshan, Nanjing (for these see below). The author of the second report then concludes that it appears that the use of stirrups in China occurred as the result of influences received from the Scytho-Xiongnu culture. If indeed the plaque gives evidence of stirrups, they are of a shape and a date that are most unusual. One should therefore consider the possibility of other explanations. Yang Hong, "Zhongguo gudai mai de fazhan he duwai yingshang," Wenwu, 1984, no. 9, p. 47, observed that the horses had no saddles, and therefore could hardly have had stirrups. He concluded that what appeared to be stirrups were simply geometrical decorations. Another possibility that suggests itself, admittedly on the basis of a very poor photograph, is that the plaque represents, as they often do, an animal with legs depicted as bent and with the prominent hooves turned up. See, for example, K. Jettmar, Art of the Steppes, New York, 1967, p. 163, pl. 27. What appear then to be stirrup straps are simply the means employed by the craftsman to lend durability to the artifact. At any rate, the evidence that these are representations of stirrups is by no means certain.

6. "Changsha liang Jin Nanchao Sui mu fajue baogao," Kaogu xuebao, no. 3, 1959, p. 85 and pl. 11.1, 12.3, and 13.5. Only three of the twenty figures of horses in this group have the short stirrup. An undated example, said to be of the third-fifth centuries, is illustrated in Mario Prodan, The Art of the T'ang Potter, New York, 1960, pl. 12. This is a piece of yueyao ware, of much finer workmanship than the dated examples. C. P. Fitzgerald, China's Three Thousand Years, New York, 1974, p. 43, refers to a stele of 301 but provides no further information. This last reference was given to me by Prof. C. Goodrich.

7. "Nanjing Xiangshan 5 hao, 6 hao, 7 hao mu qingli jianbao," Wenwu, 1972, no. 11, pp. 30 and 34.


9. Guo Suxin, "Neimenggu Huhehote Bei Wei mu," Wenwu, 1977, no. 5, p. 39 and pl. 4, no. 4. The figure is reproduced in color in Wen Hao, et al., Chigoku Uchi Moko hoppo kita minzoku bumbutsuten, Tokyo, 1983, pl. 59, fig. 60. The left stirrup can barely be seen scratched into the saddle cover. The weblike criss-cross of belts, decorated with bells and ornaments over the rump and joined to the breech strap, is discussed by Yang Hong, "Zhongguo gudai mai," p. 46ff. A somewhat similar network of straps on the rump of the horse is seen on the figure of 322. The restoration of this saddle is described in great detail in Anyang Work Team, op. cit., pp. 554–59. Note also plate 8 in this issue of Kaogu (1983, no. 6), which pictures a quarter-size model of the final results. The assumption is that the saddle bows had been set on two boards, but whether the trestle type of saddle had already been achieved is not certain. On the development of the saddle from a strut to a trestle structure, see Ulla Johansen, "Der Reitsattel bei den altaischen Vélkern," Central Asiatic Journal, v. 10, 1965, pp. 269–85, esp. pp. 283–84. The drawing of the reconstructed Anyang saddle (Anyang Work Team, op. cit., p. 557, fig. 4) shows one stirrup, but since only the rims and cover plates of the saddle bows were preserved, there is no way to know whether or not there were the means of attaching a second stirrup on the opposite, or right, side. Likewise, a number of decorative pieces were reported missing from the remains, apparently lost before the burial (p. 588).

10. "Chaojyang Yuantaizi Dong Jin bihuamu," Wenwu, 1984, no. 6, pp. 37 and 44. The saddle bows are also said to have been made of leather wrapped about a wooden core.
11. Li Yaobo, “Liaoning Beipiaoxian Xiguanyingzi Bei Yan Feng Sufu mu,” Wenwu, 1973, no. 3, pp. 8–9, and for the date, p. 15. The tomb is located near Beipiaoxian by Liaoning. Another pair of early date is that found in the tomb of Sima Jinlong (474–84), but this pair has not been described in the reports; cf. “Datong Bei Wei Sima Jinlong mu,” Wenwu, 1972, no. 1, p. 83; and “Shanxi Datong Shijiazhai Bei Wei Sima Jinlong mu,” Wenwu, 1972, no. 3, pp. 20–33. Edmund Capon has informed me that the pair is made of iron and measures 17.5 cm in height and 13.7 cm in diameter.

12. An outdated claim for the earliest stirrup and credit for Korean invention was reported in a North Korean newspaper article, of which a translation was published in Kaogu tongxun, 1957, no. 1, pp. 60–61. Liu Han, op. cit., p. 98, fig. 1.12, publishes a drawing of the stirrup (reproduced in this article as Fig. 5). This stirrup, made of cast iron, is said to have been found in a Koguryo tomb of the sixth century; it resembles those of the same date found in China.

13. Li Yaobo, op. cit., p. 17.

14. The dating of Koguryo tombs, except that of Tong Shou (to be discussed below), which has an inscription dating it to 357, is still a matter of debate. Hiroshi Ikeuchi, T'ung-kou, 2 v., Tokyo, 1938–40, v. 2, p. 27, expressed the opinion that such tombs as the Dancing Figures Tomb and others near it dated from the period after 427, when the Koguryo capital was moved to Pyongyang. Later Yang Hong, on the basis of tomb design, concluded that it was built during the third-fourth centuries; see “Gaojuli bihua shimu,” Wenwu, 1958, no. 4, p. 15. Li Dianfu, “Ji'an Gaoguli mu yanju,” Kaogu xuebao, 1980, no. 2, p. 176, agreed with Yang.
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**Glossary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>鴻源</th>
<th>k.</th>
<th>固原</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>鐮</td>
<td>l.</td>
<td>鐮</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>恮恥</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>説文解字</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>俊</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>登</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>達</td>
<td>o.</td>
<td>王鶯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>高句麗</td>
<td>p.</td>
<td>陽家詩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>肃賓</td>
<td>q.</td>
<td>武威</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>七星山</td>
<td>r.</td>
<td>孝堂山</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>野山下</td>
<td>s.</td>
<td>匈奴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>麗績府</td>
<td>t.</td>
<td>津南</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>吳原</td>
<td>l.</td>
<td>鐮</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>説文解字</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>登</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>王鶯</td>
<td>p.</td>
<td>陽家詩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>武威</td>
<td>r.</td>
<td>孝堂山</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td>匈奴</td>
<td>t.</td>
<td>津南</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u.</td>
<td>嘉峪關</td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>曹植</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w.</td>
<td>馬鍾一領</td>
<td>x.</td>
<td>曹操</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y.</td>
<td>鐮馬</td>
<td>z.</td>
<td>鐮騎</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa.</td>
<td>冬roleId</td>
<td>ab.</td>
<td>獨錦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac.</td>
<td>石樂</td>
<td>ad.</td>
<td>獬馬</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ae.</td>
<td>宇文</td>
<td>af.</td>
<td>石虎</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag.</td>
<td>門閹</td>
<td>ah.</td>
<td>慕容</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai.</td>
<td>托跋</td>
<td>aj.</td>
<td>陳安</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ak.</td>
<td>劉曜</td>
<td>al.</td>
<td>蔡佑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am.</td>
<td>宇文泰</td>
<td>an.</td>
<td>沙苑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ao.</td>
<td>高歡</td>
<td>ap.</td>
<td>沛閹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aq.</td>
<td>氏</td>
<td>ar.</td>
<td>羅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as.</td>
<td>領卒</td>
<td>at.</td>
<td>帝甲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au.</td>
<td>劉胤</td>
<td>av.</td>
<td>大司馬</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aw.</td>
<td>單于</td>
<td>ax.</td>
<td>賢王</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ay.</td>
<td>胡</td>
<td>az.</td>
<td>胡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba.</td>
<td>弘農</td>
<td>bb.</td>
<td>獨孤信</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bc.</td>
<td>河橋</td>
<td>bd.</td>
<td>玉壁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be.</td>
<td>吐谷渾</td>
<td>bf.</td>
<td>秦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bg.</td>
<td>隴</td>
<td>bh.</td>
<td>巴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bi.</td>
<td>蜀</td>
<td>bj.</td>
<td>符堅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bk.</td>
<td>關</td>
<td>bl.</td>
<td>郭彥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bm.</td>
<td>輪轀</td>
<td>bn.</td>
<td>金村</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bo.</td>
<td>車</td>
<td>bp.</td>
<td>西岳塞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bq.</td>
<td>客省莊</td>
<td>br.</td>
<td>姚弋仲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bs.</td>
<td>霍去病</td>
<td>bt.</td>
<td>武梁祠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu.</td>
<td>越塞</td>
<td>bv.</td>
<td>北票縣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bw.</td>
<td>司馬金龍</td>
<td>bx.</td>
<td>頭輪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by.</td>
<td>壺</td>
<td>bz.</td>
<td>說文解字故林</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.</td>
<td>玉篇</td>
<td>cb.</td>
<td>廣韵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc.</td>
<td>寔字彙編</td>
<td>cd.</td>
<td>鍾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ce.</td>
<td>太平御覽</td>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>資治通鑑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cg.</td>
<td>玉海</td>
<td>ch.</td>
<td>文帝</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE STIRRUP AND CHINESE MILITARY HISTORY
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Fig. 1. Figurine with mounting stirrup, from a Jin tomb of 302. (After Kaogu xuebao, 1959, no. 3.)

Fig. 2. Horse figurine with stirrups. Ca. 322. Nanjing area. (After Wenwu, 1972, no. 11.)

Fig. 3. Stirrup from Tomb 154, Xiaomintun, Anyang. (After Anyang Work Team.)
Fig. 4. Stirrup from tomb of Feng Sufu. 415.
23 cm. high. (After Li Yaobo.)

Fig. 5. Stirrup found in Koguryo tomb. Sixth century. (After Liu Han.)

Fig. 6. Stirrup from Tomb 78, Wanhaoting.
Early fourth century. 24 cm. high.
(After Cultural Artifacts Work Team.)

Fig. 7. Stirrup from Tomb 96, Qixingshan. Mid-fourth century. 16 cm. high. (After Kaogu, 1979, no. 1.)
Fig. 8. Stirrup from Tomb 41, Yushanxia. Mid-fifth century. 27 cm. high. (After Cultural Artifacts Work Team.)

Fig. 9. Stirrup from Gold Crown Tomb. Silla. Fifth-sixth centuries. (After Kyöngju Museum.)

Fig. 10. Hunter from Dancing Figures Tomb. Koguryo period. (After Ikeuchi.)

Fig. 11. Figurine of mounted warrior from Gold Bell Tomb. Fifth-sixth centuries. (After McCune, The Arts of Korea.)
Fig. 12. Relief showing horse with stirrup. Chinese, A.D. 554. (After Chavannes.)

Fig. 13. Relief from six horses of Tang Taizong. (After Nishikawa.)

Fig. 14. Parthian mounted warriors, from Khalchayan. First century B.C. (After Colledge.)
Fig. 15. Armored warrior, from Taq-i Bustan.
Fifth-sixth centuries. (After Ghirshman, Persian Art.)

Fig. 16. Rubbing from relief of battle between Chinese and nomads, Xiaotangshan. Han period. (After Chavannes.)

Fig. 17. Rubbing of relief from Yinan. Second-third centuries. (After Nanjing Museum.)
Fig. 18. Mural of cavalry procession, Jiayuguan, Gansu. Wei-Jin period. (After Fontein and Wu, *Han and Tang Murals*.)

Fig. 19. Relief of a procession, from Tong Shou’s tomb. 357. (After Kaogu, 1959, no. 1.)

Fig. 20. Mural showing running battle, from Three-Chambered Tomb. Koguryo period. (After Wenwu, 1958, no. 4.)

Fig. 21. Graffito from Dura-Europos. Third century. (After Colledge.)
Fig. 22. Figurine of saddled horse, Nanjing area. Six Dynasties period. (After Akiyama, ed., *Arts of China*, v. 1.)

Fig. 23. Impressed-brick depiction of mounted warrior from the Southern Dynasties. Fifth century. (After *Kaogu xuebao*, 1976, no. 2.)

Fig. 24. Mural of battle scene, Dunhuang. Western Wei. (After *Kaogu xuebao*, 1976, no. 2.)

Fig. 25. Rubbing from relief of mounted rider with stirrup, from Wuliangci. Han period. (After Feng Yunpeng.)
CH'ING DYNASTY PICTORIAL JADES AND PAINTING

BY ELLEN JOHNSTON LAING

As the following review of the literature reveals, references to relationships between Ming and Ch'ing carved jades and painting appear sporadically throughout twentieth-century writings on later Chinese jades. The references are of varying value to our understanding of this relationship; some are quite casual, almost incidental, others are more explicit and substantial.

John Goette was perhaps the first to mention a relationship between painting and carved jade. Easily overlooked in his lengthy description, published around 1930, of the types of carved jade forms in the Imperial Palace (brush rests, screens, and the like) is this brief notice about a particular ornamental jade object: “Flat pieces, like partially unrolled scrolls, carry mountain scenes.”

A few years later, the Illustrated London News reproduced a green jade desk screen decorated with two quail done in gold-filled engraved line; the caption asserted that the screen was “a copy of an early Chinese painting” by Li An-chung or Hui-tsung, both twelfth-century artists. A diligent search of subsequent literature has failed to uncover another association between painting and jade carving for nearly fifteen years. Then, in 1951, William Watson declared, “Painting of the Sung and Ming dynasties provided models for the portrayal of the eighteen Lohan” in jade.

Shortly thereafter Cheng Te-k'un went so far as to write of a jade plaque with low relief of two immortals as “a painting,” noting, “the carving was fine and sensitive enough to express the rhythm of the calligraphy and the brush-strokes of the painting.”

Oddly, another fifteen years elapsed before painting was again mentioned in conjunction with jade carving. In 1966 René-Yvon d'Argencé commented on the Procession of Horsemen brush holder (Fig. 1) that the “environment has been inspired by contemporary landscape painting, but the proportions of various components have been readjusted to suit a scene in which the human element comes first.” Next, J. P. Palmer, in 1967, said of the landscape on the famous round screen in the Wolfson collection, “the technique used by the jade carver is here brought into line with the conventions used by Chinese painters for depicting different kinds of foliage, rocks, and clouds.”

In the 1972 catalogue of the Brundage jades, d'Argencé contributed additional observations on jade carving and painting, stating of the Pheasants on Blossoming Plum Tree round screen (Fig. 2), “the carver has succeeded in capturing the flowing, sensitive and incisive brush strokes of his painted model.” And he also pointed out correspondences between shapes of jade desk furnishings and painting formats, equating the round desk screen with the round album leaf and describing the scenes on the pi-t'ung brush holder as similar to “a short, circular ‘handscroll.’”

And, last, a lapis lazuli mountain (Fig. 3) provides, as d'Argencé and others have indicated, a specific link with painting, for the imperial inscription incised on one face of the mountain is titled “A Picture of an Immortal Gathering Fungus on the Mountains of the Immortals by Ch'iu Ying.”

The imperial inscription clearly implies that the carving—eighteenth century in date—was based on a painting by the sixteenth-century painter Ch'iu Ying.

Although the analogies between jade carving and painting quoted above appear justified and logical, no jade scholar has submitted this question to a sustained investigation, suggesting a certain reluctance to admit that painting had any profound effect on jade carving. There are, however, a number of other clues which substantiate close ties between painting and jade carving. The remainder of this essay will be devoted to elucidating some of these important clues, both visual and written.

Visual Clues: Inscriptions, Seals, and Themes

The first set of clues is visual and can be divided into two categories: the appearance of carved inscriptions and seals on pictorial jades, exactly paralleling their use in painting; and subjects and themes borrowed by jade carvers from the painters’s repertoire.

A pair of small, rectangular desk screens with birds and flowers on one side and an inscription and seals on the other (Fig. 4) can easily be likened to a painted album leaf with accompanying colophon and artist’s seals on a separate page. The greenish-white jade screen depicting the philosopher Lao-tzu (Lao-tzu at the Pass, Fig. 5) has incised on it an inscription and two seals; it
is the carved counterpart of a short handscroll or album leaf, with inscription and seals in the same position as they might appear in a painting (Fig. 6).11

The second visual clue deals with themes and subjects taken from painting. The Lao-tzu at the Pass can serve as an example, for we know that this subject was painted as early as the seventh century by Yen Li-pen12 (d. 693). The fact that several other pictorial jade carvings have prototypes in painting, however, has been largely unrecognized by Western jade experts. Among these painting-derived themes are: “The Lan-t’ing Orchid Pavilion Gathering,” “Agriculture and Sericulture,” “The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden,” and “The Peach Blossom Spring.” Each of these subjects, in painting, has a history long predating the Ch’ing period. Over the centuries, under the painter’s brush, there are shifts in visual emphasis in the pictorialization of three of these themes.

The “Orchid Pavilion Gathering,” as is well known, is the meeting in the year 353 at the Orchid Pavilion of forty-two poets who sat along the banks of a stream upon which floated cups of wine; the men wrote poems and tipped. Their verses were collected and Wang Hsi-chih13 composed a preface for them; this preface has become perhaps the most famous (and most controversial) piece of calligraphy in the history of Chinese art. Our concern here, however, is with the representations of the gathering. The “Orchid Pavilion Gathering” apparently was first depicted by the eleventh-century artist Li Kung-lin14 (1049–1106). His handscroll version, along with Wang’s Lan-t’ing Preface and other related writings, was engraved on stone at the instigation of an imperial prince in 1417. The stones were repaired in 1592, in 1617, and again in 1779, when the emperor Ch’ien-lung (r. 1736–95) ordered a court artist to make a painted copy of the engraving.15 Rubbings were made of these stone engravings and painted copies of the engraving or of the rubbing became popular. The early composition, of which two sections from a handscroll by the seventeenth-century artist Li Tsung-mo16 are illustrated in Figures 7 and 8, shows large figures set in scanty landscape surroundings, with the names of the poets and their poems inscribed next to each man. By the eighteenth century other painted versions of The Orchid Pavilion Gathering were current, ones in which there is a noticeable decrease in the size of the figures and a greater emphasis on the landscape, as in a folding fan (Fig. 9) by Li Tsung-wan,17 (1705–59). Some individuals are retained in all versions of The Orchid Pavilion Gathering as stock types, while other participants appear in slightly different poses or groupings. It is this latter approach—the one with expanded landscape and small figures—which is used as a model for the jade carving of The Orchid Pavilion Gathering in figure 10.

Another subject shared by painting, stone engraving, and jade carving, as well as appearing in woodblock prints, is “Agriculture and Sericulture.” The origin of the theme is lost in antiquity. However, by the twelfth century a set of twenty-one pictures illustrating rice cultivation and twenty-four showing silk production had been made. Early examples of these depictions, believed to reflect twelfth-century standards (Figs. 11 and 12), stress the activities of preparing the fields, planting, harvesting or tending silkworms, spinning, and weaving. Pictorial versions of these occupations were also made in stone engraving, especially under the Ch’ing rulers K’ang-hsi (r. 1662–1722) and Yung-cheng (r. 1723–35). These scenes were modernized at this time by the court artist Chiao Ping-chen18 (ca. 1680–1720), who combined elaborate backgrounds with Western techniques of perspective and shading. Chiao’s renditions, and variants thereof, were in turn converted into woodblock prints (Figs. 13 and 14). Today innumerable depictions of Agriculture and Sericulture are found in collections in China and in the West (Fig. 15).19 In these late versions the artists exercised considerable freedom in making minor permutations and modifications. When the jade carvers executed this subject, they imitated the painters by introducing small changes in secondary scenes or by lifting a lesser figure from one scene and placing it in another (Figs. 16 and 17).

The last two subjects, “The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden” and “The Peach Blossom Spring,” are both exceedingly common in the painting repertoire.

The subject carved on the brush pot illustrated in Figures 18 and 19 has eluded identification for decades. When Stanley Nott first published the piece in 1936 he labored valiantly to identify the theme, seeing it as representing several mythological events and portraying well-known figures, of which the following are easily recognizable: “TheClub of the Seven Worthies of the Bamboo Grove,”20 circa A.D. 275, . . . “The Six Poets of Noble Birth,” portraying the Female Court Figure, Three Nobles, and Two Priests; Hui Yuan6 on Mount Lu . . . where he is seen interviewing two Literati, Tao Yuan-ming and Liu Sui
Ching: The God Sun Teng is seen playing on a stringed instrument.15

This same brush pot was shown in the major exhibition of jade at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London in 1973. In the catalogue for the exhibition it was described in more general terms: “scene of numerous worthies engaged in a variety of cultivated pursuits in a rocky landscape with crags, pine, and pavilions.” A similarly decorated brush holder, published in 1971 (Fig. 20), was said to depict “eighteen lohan playing games, discoursing, playing musical instruments in a rocky landscape with pavilions and pine trees.”16 In reality, the figures on these two brush holders are not the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove, or the Six Poets, or Hui-yuan, or the Eighteen Lohan, nor are they simply numerous worthies. They are a specific group of named and known individuals who met together, according to tradition, in the eleventh century, in a meeting dubbed “The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden.” Tradition claims that sixteen men (including one monk), with two ladies in attendance, participated in the gathering.17

Tradition also has it that Li Kung-lin, one of the participants in the gathering, did a painting of the meeting, and that Mi Fu, another member of the gathering, wrote a description of the painting. According to Mi Fu’s record the figures in the painting were arranged in five groups: (1) four scholars assembled around a table under a pine tree, where a poet was writing; they were accompanied by two ladies and nearby was a low table holding art objects; (2) six gentlemen, also placed around a table, in a plantain grove, watching Li Kung-lin paint a picture; (3) a musician and a listener beneath a cypress tree; (4) Mi Fu inscribing a rock, observed by a colleague; this was followed by a landscape passage with a marble bridge; and (5) a Buddhist monk discoursing with a layman in a bamboo grove.

The earliest known versions of The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden show it to have been primarily a figure painting with minimal landscape; as time went by the painters, just as they did for The Orchid Pavilion Gathering and for Agriculture and Sericulture, shifted the emphasis to the setting and expanded it. In all painted renditions of The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden, however, the groupings and related trees noted above are observed; occasionally some liberties are taken by including more attendants, or by placing tables on different diagonals, as in a hanging scroll given to the Yuan dynasty artist Chao Meng-fu,” but undoubtedly of much later date (Fig. 21). In late sixteenth-century versions the Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden takes place in a neat courtyard, rather than the more wild garden environment. Probably around the same time (the late sixteenth century), as in The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden by Yu Ch’iu” (fl. ca. 1570–90), the pavilion was added as a scenic embellishment (Fig. 22).19

The mountain carving shown in Figure 23 is an illustration of the well known prose poem “The Peach Blossom Spring” by T’ao Ch’ien” (365–427). The poem tells of a fisherman who follows a stream lined with blossoming peach trees, sees a cave, goes through it, and discovers a utopian land, which he is unable to find once he leaves it. The miniature mountain shows thick clouds, the fisherman with an oar, his boat, and the grotto. In the history of painting illustrations of this poem go back to the ninth century at least.20 Later paintings of it may be episodic and narrative, as in a handscroll (Fig. 24) by Cha Shih-piao” (1615–98), or may consist solely of a few visual allusions, as in a fan painting (Fig. 25) identified by a damaged seal as having been executed by Ch’iu Ying (ca. 1494–1552): the fisherman with his oar, his boat, the flowering trees, and the cave. The abbreviated scheme is obviously the one used by the jade carver.

For all four themes—“The Orchid Pavilion Gathering,” “Agriculture and Sericulture,” “The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden,” and “The Peach Blossom Spring”—there is, then, a basic, set iconography. It should be noted that this iconography exists, changes, and develops in the sphere of painting long before it appears in jade carving, and that for the first three of the themes it is the later painted versions that are translated into jade carving.

Written Clues

Thus far only Western-language twentieth-century sources concerning pictorial jades have been cited; this is simply because no twentieth-century Chinese scholar has addressed the subject. It is, however, well known that the eighteenth-century Chinese emperor Ch’ien-lung composed many verse colophons on jade carvings. Several of these refer in one way or another to painting and have been published in Western literature on jade. For example, a Ch’ien-lung inscription dated 1781 on the huge jade Mountain of Longevity, now
in the Palace Museum in Peking, says, in part: “the stone is like a painting as it stands before the door as a screen... Its green and white colors resemble a painting.” This translation of the inscription was published around 1930.\(^1\) A second sample, published in 1960, is a Ch‘ien-lung inscription on a jade plaque in which the Emperor refers to a painting by the twelfth-century artist Liu Sung-nien.\(^2\) Again, such hints as to the nature of the relationship between painting and jade carving have been largely ignored.

In the second part of this paper I turn to the written clues found in Emperor Ch‘ien-lung’s collected literary works, and especially his poetic comments on jade carvings. Interestingly, these imperial poems provide direct confirmation of the close ties between painting and jade carving. To be precise: Ch‘ien-lung’s writings reveal that the practice of using painting as a basis for jade carving was widespread; he also tells us why this was so, and further suggests what procedure was used in making the transfer of imagery from one medium to the other.

Of Ch‘ien-lung’s dozens of poems about carved jades, many furnish us only with the titles of their subjects, which, although the Emperor does not so state, obviously come from the legacy of painting. Among the primarily figural works mentioned are: *Han-shan and Shih-te, The Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove, Bodhidharma Crossing the Yang-tze on a Reed, Wang Hsi-chih Writing on a Fan, The Three Laughters [of Tiger Stream] The Four Greybeards, and Mi Fu Worshipping a Rock.*\(^3\) There are also illustrations of literature, such as Su Shih’s (1036–1101) prose poem, *The Red Cliff* (a frequent subject in painting),\(^4\) as well as a large number of titles, all familiar from the context of painting: *Fishing by a Secluded Cliff, Lofty Scholar in the Shade of a Banyan Tree, Mountain Dwelling, Lofty Scholar near a Stream, Landscape, Watching Rapids and Brewing Tea, Mountain Pavilion and Pine-filled Valley, Autumn Mountains and Red Trees, and Waterfall on Mt. Lu.*\(^5\) While in these latter poems Ch‘ien-lung makes no direct reference to painting there are cases in which the Emperor does mention the names of artists, often simply saying that such-and-such an artist had painted a picture of the subject carved in jade.\(^6\) Here one must beware of pushing the interpretation too far; it may be that the Emperor was merely displaying his erudition, rather than asserting that the jade carving was based on the picture by the artist he names.

This ambiguity, fortunately, is offset by a number of other poems on jade carving in which the Emperor does make comments pertinent to painting, and it becomes evident that he looked upon some jade carvings as “paintings” in their own right, for he repeatedly used the character hua\(^7\) either as a noun to mean “painting” or as an adjective, “painted.” Given below are excerpts from five Ch‘ien-lung poems, all on carved jade and all using the character hua:

Take advantage of nature [i.e., the qualities in the stone itself] to produce a painted picture.\(^7\)

In judging the [raw] material, if too uneven in shape, it is not good for carving *ts‘an* and *fei*\(^8\) [vessels]. But inside is a painting, the picture is produced when the surface is opened.\(^9\)

... overworked and finicky carving does not please me. A carving which completes a painted scene, therefore, is worthy of praise.\(^9\)

On a carved mountain scene he wrote:

It is like looking at the Ling-yen Mountain face to face spread out.

Hoary pines, green cypresses, crowded peaks and cliffs,

Mountain tops and ranges, together complete a painting.\(^30\)

And last, a mild witticism, based on the meaning of the term yü-jen, “jade man,” which signifies a “perfect man,” and written about a carved jade depiction of *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering:*

This painting completely excels brush painting—

Everyone is a “jade man.”\(^31\)

So titles taken from painting and references to carved jade scenes as if they were paintings may be gleaned from Ch‘ien-lung’s poems on carved jades. His literary works also give us important information as to why this reliance on painting occurred. I have pieced together several scattered and brief notices by Ch‘ien-lung about what he terms a “new style” of jade carving. From these it emerges that, in Ch‘ien-lung’s opinion, there was a plot or conspiracy on the part of the jade carvers of the southern city of Su-chou to increase their profits. Here is Ch‘ien-lung’s view of what happened, from a note appended to his poem-colophon on a carving depicting *Spring Morning on the Cinnabar Terrace:*

The jade carvers, hoping to increase their profit, usually do not remove the blemishes and flaws in the stone, thereby keeping its weight heavy; the products are of a vulgar type. Recently, however, [the carvers] have
realized these are difficult to sell. Consequently, many have changed to making painted pictures like this one [in jade] and so, recently, the trend is to triple their profits.\(^{32}\)

Ch'ien-lung's note to his poem incised on a brush holder now in the National Palace Museum, Taipei (Fig. 26), sums up the situation:

for a long time the jade carvers of of Su-chou, when making objects, followed the shape of the jade-stone. In making new style [carvings] they hoped for increased profit; on the contrary, while boasting of their finicky skills, they did not know [their work] was vulgar beyond tolerance—I would set such aside and not look at them. In recent days the jade carvers have gradually realized their faults, and in making Duck and Fish hu,\(^{9}\) Chao-fu square t'\(\text{t}^{\text{n}}\)\(^{u}\),\(^{9}\) dragon-tail goblets, etc., all copy old works of the Three Dynasties [i.e., Hsia, Shang, and Chou]. Thus, [in such carvings as] the Yan-t'ai Spring Mists and the Hsi-hsia [Palace] Picture they copy drawings of landscape scenery, always taking antique models as a master, and so avoid vulgarity.\(^{33}\)

It should be indicated here that Ch'ien-lung's references to a "new style" of jade carving appear mostly in his later writings, sometime around or after 1780, implying that copying paintings into jade was a late eighteenth-century phenomenon.

The method used to convert painting into carving is also hinted at by the Emperor. In one of his poems on an untitled jade carving (the subject of which, judging from the content of the poem, was a landscape), he says, "The carving comes from the jade worker, but the design comes from a painter."\(^{34}\) Even more pertinent is a single statement by Ch'ien-lung wherein he asserts specifically that one of his court artists, Chin T'ing-piao\(^{7}\) (fl. ca. 1720–60), made the draft of a composition titled Travelling in the Mountain Pass, which was then carved into a nephrite boulder more than one foot in height. And subsequently, as if to substantiate the connection between painting and jade carving, Ch'ien-lung notes in his poem on this carving, "the painting has only one face [i.e., is two-dimensional], whereas this [carving] has eight sides [i.e., is in the round]."\(^{35}\)

What is of critical importance here is that these passages reveal that court painters under Ch'ien-lung were called upon to provide designs for the jade carvers. One must assume that sometimes these designs were based on older paintings; at other times they might be original creations. Although our information is incomplete, studies on Ch'ing court artists by Daphne Rosenzweig and others indicate that there were two broad categories of court artists. The first category is that of the elite artist-officials, men who were well educated, came from the gentry, had multiple talents, served in the court in varied capacities, and were often among the intimate friends of the emperor. They executed major painting commissions and their names are recorded in the annals of court artists. Chin T'ing-piao was such an artist. The second category is that of the strictly professional painters, hired solely on the basis of technical competence; they had no converse with the emperor, and their names are not recorded.\(^{36}\) It was those in this second group—the rank and file—who were, in all likelihood, assigned to the studios and workshops, and who were probably responsible for producing the thousands of small paintings used to decorate palace halls and the like. It was these unknowns, presumably, who were in general responsible for providing drafts of designs for lacquered objects and other types of decorative arts. Thus the fact that Ch'ien-lung mentions Chin T'ing-piao at all suggests that this was an unusual and exceptional instance of a major painter providing the draft for the jade carver to follow.

**Stylistic Relationships between Pictorial Jades and Painting**

Perhaps one reason there is so much reluctance to accept the influence of painting on jade carving lies in our inability to substantiate the claim for such connections by providing one-to-one parallels in painting and jade carving. But there was an intermediate step between painting and carving, that is, the draft, which presumably was discarded after having served its purpose. Once we recognize that many adjustments in composition and the like must have been made to accommodate the painting to the peculiarities of hard-stone carving, as well as to the very process involved in carving (grinding, as opposed to the use of flexible brush and ink), we realize the futility of seeking exact parallels between the painted picture and the carved one. This also perhaps explains why we (or at least I) keep seeing pictorial jades that are reminiscent of eighteenth-century paintings, and yet find that their prototypes in painted originals remain elusive.

Nevertheless it is possible to establish some of the general stylistic similarities that exist between painting and jade. The Pheasants on Blossoming Plum Tree screen (Fig. 2) could easily have been derived from a scroll by the eighteenth-century court artist Li Chih\(^{7}\) (Fig. 27). Many of the eighteenth-century pictorial jades have scalloped
rock formations placed on a diagonal, as in the brush pot in figure 28. These particular forms and arrangements compare well with the landscape shapes used by Chin T'ing-piao in his *Worshipping an Immortal* (Fig. 29). The multitude of tilted rocks and the pockets of space in which figures are placed in another brush holder (Fig. 26) is not unlike the turbulent scene by the Ch'ien-lung period artist Ch'ien Wei-ch'eng (Fig. 30). In the *Peach Blossom Spring* mountain (Fig. 23) the highly stylized, turgid clouds, as well as the mechanical, regularized repetition of rock shapes and the general congestion of motifs, suggest a model based on a blue-and-green landscape. Hunt scenes, such as that on the jade mountain (Fig. 31), are reminiscent of the paintings done by the Jesuit Giuseppe Castiglione (and other Western painters) who worked at Ch'ien-lung's court and who depicted the Emperor on his hunting excursions in Jehol. The two horses and riders, seen in foreshortening, have parallels in Castiglione's *Emperor Ch'ien-lung on a Rabbit Hunt* (Fig. 32), and the landscape on the brush holder illustrated in Figure 1 has a positive suggestion of broad plains receding into space, perhaps also reflecting Western painting techniques. The stormy sea raging beside towering mountains filled with pavilions, which ornaments two sides of a jade screen (Figs. 33 and 34), could have been taken from the painted *Isles of the Immortals* by Kao Ch'i-p'ei, one of the artist-officials associated with the imperial court (Fig. 35).

Finally, what about those carvings supposedly based on pre-Ch'ing paintings, such as the lapis lazuli mountain (Fig. 3), which we are to understand from its inscription was based on a sixteenth-century painting? Why does this carving not look "Ming" in style if it was derived from a Ming dynasty painting? The answer is found in my final example: the famous, gigantic nephrite carving *Yu Harnessing the Floods*. It bears a lengthy inscription by Ch'ien-lung dated 1788. The Emperor specifically says he ordered that a painting in the imperial collection (which he believed to be an anonymous T'ang dynasty scroll) be copied into this huge boulder. A comparison of the painting (Fig. 37) with a detail of the nephrite carving (Fig. 36) clearly shows the close relationship between the painted model and the stone carving (although some of the figures in the nephrite version have been rearranged, and the carver could not duplicate all the minute brush lines denoting creases and folds in the garments). Far more dramatic, when we compare the whole painting with the whole carving (Fig. 38), are the modifications in the setting: in the carving the landscape is completely transformed, having been recast into an eighteenth-century landscape idiom by the person who prepared the painted draft for the carvers to follow.
Notes

1. This study is restricted primarily to Ch’in dynasty (1644–1911) desk furnishings, such as brush holders, screens, and miniature mountains ornamented with relief landscapes and figures, and, occasionally, with birds and flowers. These will sometimes be referred to as “pictorial” jades. For the sake of simplicity, the term “jade” is used generically to include jadeite, nephrite, and other hard stones.

2. John Goette, Jade Lore, New York, n.d. (ca. 1930), p. 190. Two examples of such pieces have been reproduced recently. One with a landscape scene (brought to my attention by Daphne Rosenzweig) is in Rebecca Rice Jones, “Saleroom News: Chinese Works of Art in New York,” Arts of Asia, v. 11, 1984, p. 118; the second example, ornamented with the carved theme of One Hundred Children at Play (a theme, incidentally, common in painting since the twelfth century), is in Oriental Art, v. 22, 1976, p. 151.


9. Ibid., pp. 150 and 136.


11. It should be remarked that the one and only time this screen was published no mention was made of this important feature, which so securely connects the carving with practices followed by painters (Stanley Charles Nott, A Catalogue of Rare Chinese Jade Carvings, Palm Beach, 1940, no. 48).


18. Considering that the total number of figures is eighteen, and taking into account the difficulty in distinguishing male and female figures in the jade carving because of their diminutive scale, the confusion of this subject with that of the Eighteen Lohan is understandable.


23. Ch’ing Kao-tsung yu-chih shih-wen ch’u’an-chi, 1794, repr. Taipei, 1976, shih 3, ch’uan 36, p. 10b; ch’uan 66, p. 18a; ch’uan 75, p. 18a; ch’uan 89, p. 26b; shih 4, ch’uan 29, p. 23a; ch’uan 32, p. 33a; and ch’uan 34, p. 32a.

24. Ibid., shih 3, ch’uan 33, p. 21b.

25. Ibid., shih 3, ch’uan 30, p. 13b; ch’uan 35, p. 26b; ch’uan 36, p. 24b; ch’uan 40, p. 25a; ch’uan 59, p. 5b; ch’uan 61, p. 32b; ch’uan 69, p. 25a; shih 4, ch’uan 40, p. 11a; ch’uan 92, p. 22a.

26. For example, the Ming dynasty master Shen Chou (1427–1509) is mentioned in a poem in ibid., shih 4, ch’uan 39, p. 19b, and again along with T’ang Yin (1470–1523), in a poem on a jade carving of Watching the Waterfall (ibid., shih 3, ch’uan 43, p. 22b).

27. Ibid., shih 3, ch’uan 74, p. 16a.

28. Ibid., shih 4, ch’uan 51, p. 10b.

29. Ibid., shih 5, ch’uan 17, p. 37b.

30. Ibid., shih 4, ch’uan 42, p. 5a.

31. Ibid., shih 4, ch’uan 39, p. 20a.
32. *Ibid.*, *shih* 5, *chüan* 53, p. 3a. Other statements echoing these ideas, along with occasional laments about the venality of the *Su-chou* carvers, are found in *Ibid.*, *shih* 5, *chüan* 29, pp. 14b–15a; *chüan* 43, pp. 6a–b; *chüan* 51, pp. 11b–12a; and *chüan* 56, pp. 16a–b.


37. 1, and others, have searched in vain for a painting by or attributed to Ch’iu Ying that even remotely resembles this carving. There exists a written reference to a Ch’iu Ying album leaf in blue-and-green that depicted “a person leaning on a rock beneath a pine tree; near a stream, a youth gathering fungus at a cave mouth”; see An Ch’i, *Mo-yüan hui-kuan lu*, preface dated 1742, repr. Taipei, 1956, *chüan* 4, p. 222. The painting apparently is no longer extant.
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Fig. 3. Lapis lazuli mountain: *Immortal Gathering Fungus on the Mountains of the Immortals* by Ch’iu Ying. Eighteenth century. San Francisco, Asian Art Museum. Inscription by the Ch’ien-lung emperor.

Fig. 4. One of a pair of table screens: *Tree Peonies and Two Pheasants*, green jade. Tao-kuang period. Poem and artist’s name and seals on the reverse. (After *Oriental Art*, v. 20, 1974, p. 255.)
Fig. 5. Table screen: Lao-tzu at the Pass, celadon-toned white jade. Ch’ien-lung period. (After Nott, A Catalogue of Rare Chinese Jade Carving.)

Fig. 7. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, by Li Tsung-mo. Handscroll, section. National Palace Museum, Taipei.

Fig. 8. *The Orchid Pavilion Gathering*, by Li Tsung-mo. Handscroll, section. National Palace Museum, Taipei.

Fig. 11. *Rice Culture*, section 5, *Rolling*. Attributed to Ch'eng Ch'i. Handscroll. Thirteenth-fourteenth century. Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

Fig. 13. Agriculture: Plowing. Woodblock print after painting by Chiao Ping-chen. 1696. University of Oregon Museum of Art, Eugene.

Fig. 16. Screen: *Rice Culture*, light green jade. K'ang-hsi period. Seattle Art Museum.

Fig. 17. Screen: *Silk Culture*, light green jade. K'ang-hsi period. Seattle Art Museum.
Fig. 18. Brush pot: *The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden*, deep green mottled nephrite. Ch'ien-lung period. (After Nott, *Chinese Art Throughout the Ages*.)

Fig. 19. Another view of brush pot in Figure 18. (After Rawson and Ayers.)
Fig. 20. Brush holder: The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden, spinach-green jade. (After Oriental Art, v. 17, 1971.)

Fig. 21. The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden. Anonymous, once attributed to Chao Meng-fu but probably eighteenth century. Hanging scroll. (After Osvald Sirén, Gardens of China.)
Fig. 22. The Elegant Gathering in the Western Garden, by Yu Ch’iu. 1573. Hanging scroll. Tientsin Municipal Art Museum. (After T’ien-chihang-shih i-shu po-wu-kuan ts’ang-hua hsi-chu, Peking, 1963.)
Fig. 23. Nephrite mountain: *The Peach Blossom Spring*. Sage-green nephrite with brown striations. Ch’ien-lung period. (After Joan M. Hartman, *Three Dynasties of Jade*, Indianapolis, 1971.)


Fig. 25. *The Peach Blossom Spring*, by Ch’iu Ying. Fan. University of Michigan Museum of Art.
Fig. 27. *Flowering Plum*, by Li Chih. Eighteenth century. Hanging scroll. (After Li-tai ming-jen shu-hua, Peking, 1925.)
Fig. 28. Brush holder: *Figures in a Landscape*, spinach-green jade. Ch'ien-lung period. (After *Arts of Asia*, v. 6, no. 1, 1976, p. 68.)
Fig. 29. *Worshipping an Immortal*, by Chin Ting-piao.
Hanging scroll. (After Li-tai ming-jen shu-hua.)
Fig. 30. Colored Landscape after Wang Meng, by Ch'ien Wei-ch'eng (1720–72). Hanging scroll. (After Sōgen irai meiga shoshū, Tokyo, 1947.)

Fig. 32. *Emperor Ch'ien-lung on a Rabbit Hunt*, by Lang Shih-ning (Giuseppe Castiglione, 1688-1766). (After *Lang Shih-ning hua*, Peking, 1931-35.)
Fig. 34. Reverse of table screen in Figure 33, showing Stormy Seascape. (After Hansford.)
Fig. 35. *Isles of the Immortals*, by Kao Ch'i-p'ei (1672–1734), Hanging scroll. (After *Li-tai ming-jen shu-hua*)
Fig. 36. Detail of Figure 38. (After Selected Handicrafts in the Palace Museum, Peking, Peking, 1974.)
A NOTE ON DUNHUANG CAVE 17, “THE LIBRARY,” OR HONG BIAN’S RELIQUARY CHAMBER

By JOHN C. HUNTINGTON

Cave 17 at Dunhuang's Mogao Caves, the so-called "library," is justifiably famous as the source of the documents and paintings brought out on expeditions by Stein, Pelliot, Oldenburg and several others. Along with the material housed in the Capital Library in Beijing, the collections these men made from the "library" form one of the most important bodies of ephemera from the premodern world. The material affords detailed insights into the history of Buddhism in north China and the development of Buddhist art, as well as incidental insights into secular matters of the mid-Tang period through the Song. It has long been held that the documents and paintings found in the chamber were placed there as the result of fear of their imminent destruction by the Xixia's conquest of the region in 1035. Thus it has been thought that the closing must have taken place some time just before 1035, a date partially corroborated by the main bulk of the documents and the style of the majority of the paintings. However, there have been problems with this date from the start, mostly because some of the material is clearly later in date. But at first hearing it is a quite logical conclusion, and there have been attempts to rationalize away the problems. I will offer an explanation that suggests a different primary reason for the enclosure of the documents and a mechanism by which the problematic paintings and documents may have been added to the hoard. Both the enclosure of the documents and the addition of the problematic pieces fall within the patterns of common Buddhist practices that are very likely to have been known during the eleventh through thirteenth centuries and that were used in the region; walling up documents in the manner suggested by proponents of the 1035 date does not.

Terukazu Akiyama best sums up the current scholarly position regarding the date of the closing of Cave 17:

At the beginning of the eleventh [century], when Tun-huang was threatened by Il-i-hua [Xixia] invaders, it was made into a storeroom for sūtra scrolls, documents, paintings, etc. belonging to the local monasteries, after which the entrance was bricked up and its existence further concealed by wall paintings in the corridor outside. In 1900, these deposits were accidentally discovered by the Taoist priest who was in charge of the Tun-huang caves, Wang Yen-lu (Wang Yuanlu), and thereafter the wealth of their contents was revealed to the world of scholars.3

There is one problem with this idea that the chamber was closed in advance of the Xixia conquest which, to my way of thinking, cannot be resolved or rationalized away. If the chamber was used as a hiding place from the invading Xixia, how is it that the painting in the corridor outside the chamber is clearly of a relatively late Xixia date? Although I was not permitted to photograph it, and therefore cannot clearly publish it for the reader to see, I was able to examine the north wall of the entry to Cave 16 in considerable detail during a visit to the site in the summer of 1982.4 It bears what I identify as mid- to late Xixia painting and, as there is much damage around the entrance to the chamber, it is easily determined that there is no underpainting extant between the first plastering and the Xixia painting. This demonstrates that the Xixia painting was not simply painted over some earlier work on top of the layer of plaster that covered the opening. There is, however, painting on the wall under the plastering, as is to be expected.

Beyond this problem, the suggested date of the closing of the chamber generated considerable debate when it was first put forth, and up until fairly recently, as well. This controversy was based on the fact that some of the objects found inside the chamber are clearly later than the eleventh-century date indicated by the supposed pre-Xixia plastering-over of the opening.

An obvious example of a post-eleventh century work is the "Tibetan" style image of Tārā, now in the British Museum (Fig. 1). A very problematic painting chronologically, in poor condition and of a very common subject, it has not inspired much scholarly attention. It has been recently published by Roderick Whitfield, who observes:

This painting is one that seems completely at variance with the remainder of the material found in Cave 17 at Dunhuang, and yet it seems undoubtedly to have been part of the paintings found there by Stein. It has to be remembered that the paintings had already been disturbed by Wang Yuanlu before Stein came to Dunhuang, and the possibility exists of his having added to the store something he found elsewhere . . . but, since the style is entirely Tibetan or Nepalese, and in view of
the two lamas seen at the top of the painting, the date must be considerably later than the presumed date when Cave 17 was sealed (early in the eleventh century). It has been included here for the sake of completeness.\(^5\)

For the purpose of this paper, it is of interest to examine the problem of the painting in some detail. To the best of my knowledge, P. H. Pott is the only qualified Tibetologist to have examined the painting with the idea of dating it.\(^6\) He based his argument on the fact that the lineage teachers in the upper right- and left-hand corners wear yellow caps that he associated with the *dGa-* sect of Tibetan Buddhism and, by that association, he concluded that the painting was from the fifteenth century (the sect was founded) or later. What is in 1948, could not have known is that type is a characteristic of the Bengali nature that is represented in Eastern Asia in the tenth century and current systems as well as since the mid-try. Apparently the hat type came Atiṣa, who was active in Tibet in th other teachers from the Bihart remained current with the *bKa-* which had been founded on Atiṣa's 1d become part of the *dGe-lugs-pa* through Tsong-Kha-pa's early *bKa-gdams-pa.? Moreover, in a of the early Tibetan paintings, find *dBus-rnying-*bris (Ancient School) paintings of *bKa-gdams-* which the hat type is found. In type has a history in art works y Bengal through modern *dGe-Pott's main point is moot and for the dating of the painting, indeed problematic. It is but ngs in its style known to me\(^8\) han ten that show any evidence n of relatively pure Nepali and an apparently very early date. elements relate closely to the Blue-xinesse academic painting (*rGya-* fairly early in style, about century. The major Buddhist of the composition relate to the *gSpiritual* school in southern Tibet of about the fourteenth century. Analysis, one would simply elements and assume that they ximate date of the paintings. lem with this approach, how-*Bal-*bris conventions that were integrated with *rGya-nak-*bris landscape conventions are very poorly understood and, in fact, there are very few paintings that show any evidence of the early forms of the combination of the two streams of stylistic tradition. Because of the extremely conservative nature of the Buddhist figurative convention from eastern India and Nepal, and because much of post-eleventh century Bud-dhist painting in Nepal and by Nepali (Newari) artists (especially that done for Tibetan patrons) was an attempt to emulate the Bhart tradition as closely as possible, a definitive dating on the basis of the figurative elements alone is impossible. One has to be alert to the possibility that this painting, and potentially any of the few others that relate to it, may constitute the “formative stage” of *Bal-*bris/*rGya-nak-*bris combinations that are “missing” in the sequence. The *rGya-nak-*bris elements in landscape as seen in Tibetan paintings are known to evolve away from the treatment seen in the Dunhuang Tārā along rather specific lines down to a related convention that was current as late as the eighteenth century. Since these Chinese elements are part of a well known and clear sequence, it is possible that the less well understood *Bal-*bris elements are earlier than previously imagined. As for the actual date of the painting, since the *rGya-nak-*bris treatment of the landscape elements and the *Bal-*bris treatment of the Buddhist figures are relatively distinct and, by comparison to later examples, essentially a pure form of their respective heritages, it is my admittedly subjective opinion that the Dunhuang painting dates to the thirteenth century. It must have been painted either just before the Mongol period (beginning in 1227 in the Dunhuang region with the final defeat of the Xixia princes),\(^9\) when Nepali artists under Tibetan patronage were establishing themselves as the successors to the Pāla school, or even later, under Mongol patronage, when there was a known Nepali connection with the Mongol court. Thus, I would place the painting between ca. 1175 and ca. 1275, between 150 and 250 years after the presumed closing of the chamber.

If, as Stein reports, this painting was part of the hoard (and there is no reason whatever to doubt his reporting), the date of the closing could not have been prior to 1035. Even if the plastering and painting of the north wall of the entry to Cave 16 had taken place under the direction of Xixia-trained artists (and it is obvious from the paintings on the wall that it did), it is only barely possible that the painting was made, received considerable wear, and was placed in the chamber, and that
that the wall was plastered over and painted in the late Xixia style, all before 1227.

The way this “paradox” has been dealt with in the past, without any evidence whatever, has been to blame the “additions” to the hoard on Wang Yuanlu, as was done by Whitfield in the passage cited above. There are two problems with this approach. First, with Tibetans known to have been in the Dunhuang/Mogao area at the time of the 1900 discovery of the “library” and subsequently, why are there no other late, possibly very late, Tibetan-style paintings in the hoard?

As early as the eleventh century, it was, and to this day still is, a common practice for Tibetans to place damaged paintings and other religious artifacts either in a shrine (chos rten, Sk. stūpa) or in a small house (known as a tsā-tsā-khang) when they are no longer of use.10 Certainly the size and locally-known importance of the hoard would have attracted other works of more modern origin if additions had been made randomly. It must also be pointed out that Wang Yuanlu, although aware in a general way of the importance of what he had discovered, was totally naïve regarding the technical aspects of the material in a modern sense and could not have decided that any given painting was sufficiently old and historically important to be added to the hoard. Indeed, in traditional Buddhist practice, the age and art-historical significance of any given work are inconsequential. It is the efficacy of the work that matters. Accordingly, a painting of any date, including new works, could have been considered important enough to have been included in the hoard had modern additions been considered.

The second problem with presuming that Wang Yuanlu added this painting to the deposit in the chamber is that the painting’s age and style place it in a category of great rarity, and the statistical probability of his placing there such a rare painting, randomly acquired from western Gansu, or from any other Tibetan cultural region for that matter, is millions to one against. This last factor argues especially against the random addition of the painting by Wang Yuanlu.

Other evidence, such as might have been available if the chamber had been opened under scientific conditions, is simply lost. Indeed, the narrative of the opening of the chamber as related by Stein,11 tells us nothing worthwhile about the status of the contents at the time the cave was opened or even much about the nature of the crack that led to the discovery of the cave itself. Unfortunately, we shall never know the condition of the wall or the nature of the telltale crack. There are several possibilities. Among them is the possibility that the whole door was fully sealed off, with minor cracking revealing bricks or mud plaster. Another is that it was partially sealed off by Xixia or slightly later work, leaving a small opening through which objects could have been thrust up until then end of the thirteenth century, with this partial opening sealed off only at a later date. The only thing that seems evident is that the crack must have been large enough to attract the attention of Wang Yuanlu’s workers.

Given these arguments, it seems to me that some other answer regarding the closing of the chamber has to be found. It must be one that accounts for the continued addition of material to the hoard.

The chamber that constitutes Cave 17 is a modest affair by Dunhuang standards. Measuring 2.94 meters wide (from east to west), 2.91 meters deep, and 2.66 meters high,12 it is essentially a cubic volume carved out of the rock. Against the north wall is a low platform on which rested at one time, and on which again rests, a sculpture of the monk Hong Bian (restored to its original position in 1964).13 On the north wall, behind the figure, there is a painting of two attendants and two trees14 while the other three walls are devoid of painting. Originally there was a marble slab against the west wall, containing an inscription that Stein copied and Chavannes translated for inclusion in Stein’s Serindia.15 It recorded an imperial edict of 851 and provides a terminus a quo for the cave. If Hong Bian was alive and receiving imperial edicts in 851, the cave must have been excavated sometime after that date. It must be assumed that he was a senior prelate, since he appears to have been invested with considerable rank and power by the court. Further, it is reasonable to expect that he lived no more than about twenty-five years beyond the date of the edict. Accordingly, the date of the excavation of the chamber is very probably within the third quarter of the ninth century.

There are two possible functions for the chamber. One is that it served as the kind of “founder’s hall” where the founder of the sect or monastery is paid homage, usually annually. Because of the small size of the chamber, it is hard to conceive of its use by an assembly of any size, and since it is located off the entry, it is impossible that it could have been a shrine at the end of the assembly area. The second possibility is that it was a kind of reliquary of the great teacher. Sev-
eral factors point to this latter function. There are at least three stūpas with virtually identical chamber types at the Mogao site, standing free on the hill to the east of the caves proper (Figs. 2–4). The one that appears in Figure 4 has been broken into, and I was able to examine the interior without difficulty (Fig. 5). The overall appearance of the interior of the stūpa is virtually identical with that of Cave 17, each consisting of a small cubical chamber with a figure against the back wall (in the case of the stūpa, the east wall). Moreover, the placement of the stele inscribed with its imperial edict inside the chamber of Hong Bian parallels Tibetan custom regarding teachers’ statues and stūpas commemorating teachers. Objects associated with them during their lifetime and relating to their teachings are commonly placed inside the statue or stūpa for vivification of that object and, further, to complete the persona of the individual as manifested by the statue or stūpa.

If this is the case, and I submit it is a logical assumption, it is only one step beyond the known limits of the custom to expect the continued addition of material to the hoard in the chamber. The practice in Tibet of making tsa-tsa from mud and the ashes of the teacher and placing them in a reliquary structure (chos-rtens and tsa-tsa-khang) dates back at least to the ninth or tenth century. In Ladakh I have partially examined the contents of such tsa-tsa-khang that contained the remains of very early tsa-tsa, birch-bark manuscripts, and other ephemera, essentially the discards of the monastic and surrounding lay community, simply piled in with the remains of the teacher. If Hong Bian’s chamber had remained open, at least partially, it would have been possible for material to be added over a relatively long period of time. Placed in the chamber both as offerings and as discards, the objects would have survived undisturbed to the date at which they were enclosed, probably because the chamber was full rather than to protect it from invaders. This closing seems to have taken place in the very late Xixia or even in the early Mongol period. In this connection it must be noted that all of the stūpas in Figures 2–5 have separately sealed small entries of exactly the type to which I refer. Accordingly, I believe that it is most likely that an excavated chamber of a type intended to duplicate the stūpas in the matrix of the cliff face also had such an opening.

To conclude, I suggest that the following occurred: in 851 Hong Bian received the imperial edict that in effect turned the site over to him. Shortly after, by the usual preceptor-disciple relationships, Cave 16 became profoundly associated with him and his teachings by the monks and lay followers then active at the site. At his death or just shortly after, a reliquary chamber, Cave 17, was excavated to commemorate him. Among the objects placed inside were the marble stele inscribed with the imperial edict and also numbers of paintings, sūtras, and other documents that characterized both his life and teachings. The entrance to the chamber was left open, and it became a repository where other items of importance could also be discarded. The practice continued very actively through the tenth and eleventh centuries. At some point in the thirteenth century the repository chamber became full, and it was decided to seal the chamber forever. Whether this would have been done under the Xixia or the Mongols is an issue that will probably never be settled.

If the closing did take place in the early (pre-dynastic, 1227–1279/80) Mongol period, it is likely that it occurred before the rise of ‘Phyags-pa as the hierophant under Kublai Khan, because the paintings that covered the opening are definitely in the Xixia style. At the time of the conquest of the Dunhuang region the Mongols were still Shamanists with little or no documented interest in Buddhism. The first contact of Kublai, then prince Godan, with the Tibetan Buddhists took place in 1246 and it was not until 1251 that the young priest ‘Phyags-pa was given control of religious matters in the Mongol dominions. At that time the Tibetans under ‘Phyags-pa gained domination over all religious matters in the whole of China, Tibet, and Mongolia. However, although the Mongol conquest of the region was both complete and very abrupt, it came before the Mongol interest in Buddhism, and it is very likely that if any painters trained in the Xixia style (but not necessarily Xixia themselves) survived the conquest they worked at the site for at least a generation or two after the Mongol conquest. Therefore, late Xixia-style painting actually dating from the early Mongol (but pre-Yuan) period may be expected to have existed. It would not be surprising if such work had been done by a local artist even under Mongol rule: the region was and still is famous for the heterogeneity of its ethnic minorities. I think the best we can do is to conclude that the chamber was closed in the early to mid-thirteenth century.

The suggestion made above for the reason the reliquary chamber was closed has the merit of
staying within the limits of Buddhist practice known to have prevailed in nearby areas from the period in question down to the present. It accepts the "later" material as an ordinary and potentially normal part of the items enclosed, requiring no million-to-one improbabilities to account for the existence of certain objects. However, it does not change the objects or their importance to students of Buddhism and art history.

It is unfortunate that there is no direct method by which the hypothesis may be tested. We simply have to accept the fact that Wang Yuanlu and his workers disturbed the arrangement of the material so that no particular sequence or stratigraphy could be observed in it. I can conceive of only one indirect method of attempting to test this theory. If either of the two unopened stūpas on the hill to the east of the site, or one of the similar ones on top of the cliff in which the caves are located, were opened and found to contain a similar cache of materials, it would constitute strong proof that a sequence of events of the sort described above had occurred. Until such time as this is done, the foregoing suggestions will have to be regarded as simply an alternate view to the "closing-in-the-face-of-conquest" hypothesis.
Notes


2. Actually, identifying Cave 17 as a "cave" is a misnomer. It is not a cave at all but a side chamber opening into the north wall of the entry corridor of Cave 16, and this must be kept in mind. While it is formally termed a cave by the Dunhuang Institute and therefore appropriately so called by all writers, I shall endeavor to remind the reader of its subordinate position to Cave 16 by referring to it as a "chamber" throughout.

It is useful to append here a chronology of the Dunhuang Region from the Tang through the Yuan, based primarily on Terukazu Akiyama, "The Tun-huang caves and their wall paintings," in Terukazu Akiyama and Saburo Matsubara, Arts of China: Buddhist Cave Temples, New Researches, trans. Alexander C. Soper, Tokyo and Palo Alto, 1969, pp. 242, 244:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tang</td>
<td>618-781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibetan</td>
<td>781-842 (or 848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang</td>
<td>848-915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cao</td>
<td>920-1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xixia</td>
<td>1035-1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongol</td>
<td>1227-1279/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan</td>
<td>1279/80-1368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4. A general view of the entrance has been published recently, however. See Chugoku Sekkatsu: Tomk Bokó Katsu, v. 4, Tokyo, 1980-82, pl. 125. There follow as well plates showing Hong Bian's statue and the two wall paintings that flank it.

5. Roderick Whitfield, The Art of Central Asia: The Stein Collection in the British Museum. 3 v., Tokyo, 1982-85, v. 2, p. 347 and pl. 83. If at all possible the reader should refer to the magnificent color plate of the work published here when reading the following section.


8. The other is a painting of the "Traditional Image (King Udayana of Kauṣāmbi's Image)" of the Buddha in the Royal Ontario Museum's Tibetan collection, no. 921.1.129. Since in both cases the figurative images are rigidly specified, only the landscape elements may be compared.


14. See Akiyama, op. cit., pp. 220-21 and pl. 64.


16. One must remember that in China virtually any piece of paper with writing or drawing on it had great sanctity. This attitude would account for the many apparently minor and secular documents found in the hoard.


Glossary

a. 敦煌
b. 莫高窟
c. 西夏
d. 王圆箓
e. 甘肅
f. 洪繡, 洪繤, or 洪繡
Fig. 1. Tara, from the Dunhuang hoard found in Cave 17. British Museum, London.
Fig. 2. Unidentified free-standing stūpa on hill east of the Dunhuang cave site.

Fig. 3. A second unidentified free-standing stūpa east of the Dunhuang cave site.
Fig. 4. A third unidentified free-standing stūpa east of the Dunhuang cave site, showing partially opened entrance.

Fig. 5. Interior of stūpa shown in Figure 4. Rear wall with monk's statue and flanking paintings.
A LITTLE-KNOWN CAITYA HALL AT JUNNAR

BY SURESH VASANT

JUNNAR, A VILLAGE IN PUNE DISTRICT, Maharashtra (India), lies ninety kilometers to the northwest of Pune and about twenty-five kilometers east of the crest of the Sahyadri Mountains. Junnar was an important center on the ancient trade route through the Naneghat Pass, linking the seaports of Sopara, Kalyan, and Cheul on the west coast of India to Paithan, Ter in the east, and Ujjain in the north. In ancient times, between the first century B.C. and the second century A.D., Junnar was the largest Hinayana Buddhist monastic establishment in western India. The site consists of 184 excavations, of which ten are caitya halls, 115 are rock-cut cisterns, and the rest are viharas (residences of monks) and minor caves. In the caves there are thirty-six well engraved inscriptions that throw light on the social and religious conditions of the time. The ten caitya halls are of different type—circular, apsidal, square, and quadrilateral—and they constitute a landmark in the evolution of rock-cut architecture in western India.

Of the caves at Junnar, one in particular deserves special notice, for it has not been thoroughly studied by scholars. It is one of the caves in an isolated and unnamed group five kilometers to the north-northeast of the town of Junnar and 1.06 kilometers to the east of the Ganesh Leni hill. This small group, not visible from a distance and extremely difficult to approach, is rarely visited and is barely mentioned in earlier works.

The caitya hall under study is cut into the secluded scarp of a hill that overlooks a narrow valley. It is unique in many respects, perhaps the only one of its kind in the whole series of caves in western India. I shall first describe the caitya hall and later compare it to other examples in western India in order to ascertain its date.

The facade of the caitya hall faces roughly southwest and is cut into the almost perpendicular face of the scarp (Fig. 1). The height of the facade is 7.62 meters, and the width is 6.10 meters. The partially unfinished interior is apsidal in plan (Fig. 2). The whole facade (Fig. 3) can be divided into two parts: a lower half, consisting of the entrance door, and an upper half, which has a large caitya window. The two halves are separated by a horizontal member, the so-called “tie-beam.” The door is 1.06 meters wide, surmounted by a caitya arch in relief with an unadorned semicircular space underneath. The arch itself is flanked by two other caitya arches in relief. The inner surfaces, or soffits, of the side arches are adorned with rock-cut ribs and beams. These three arches are joined by a horizontal railing (vedika), which, like so many of the motifs around the entrance door, is almost totally ruined.

The exquisitely carved upper half of the facade is mostly intact. It is dominated by a large caitya arch, whose inner opening measures 2.44 meters high. The surface of this caitya arch is carved with a series of six-petaled rosettes interconnecting in all directions (Fig. 4). Along the periphery of the arch is a neatly cut margin. The flat tip of the caitya arch touches the overhanging roof. Near the apex of the roof is carved a triratna (three jewels) motif, flanked by full-blown lotuses. The inner surface of the arch contains seventeen cross beams, or end rafters, and two vertical posts, or struts, over the sill, all imitating wooden architecture. The great caitya arch occupies nearly three-fourths of the entire surface of the upper facade: on either side of the arch are carved several other railing motifs and geometrical patterns. The uppermost segment includes two miniature caitya arches in relief, each containing a monolithic stupa crowned by a stone umbrella. The two courses of roll moldings, showing a jali (perforated screen) pattern, are carved in imitation of woodwork. An unfinished quatrefoil pattern appears to the left of the great arch, while on the opposite side a series of triskelions is carved. The latter is a most unusual motif, rarely found in western Indian rock-cut architecture; its significance will be discussed below.

From the sill under the great arch the gallery extends forward about 1.67 meters to the horizontal member, or coping, which rests on the entrance door and is carved with a railing motif. Along this extension, the left side wall contains a series of six caitya arches in relief (Fig. 1). Of these the upper one contains a stupa in relief. The next two form a plain pair, while the fourth is decorated with a bodhi tree 45 centimeters high, which rests on a pedestal (Fig. 5). Below this, another pair of smaller, partly ruined arches is visible. In addition to the triskelion noted above, another
interesting motif appears on the outer portion of the arch containing the bodhi tree. This motif is comprised of the svastika pattern arranged in a large square (Figs. 7 and 8). The right hand wall is decorated exactly as its counterpart, except that in the lower of the two larger arches we find a well executed dharmacakra (Wheel of Law) motif, resting on an amalaka-shaped abacus that in turn rests on a pedestal below (Fig. 6). The dharmacakra has sixteen spokes radiating from its center. This is perhaps the earliest dharmacakra motif at Junnar. Another, carved in cave 45 in the Bhut Leni group on Manmodi Hill at Junnar, is more elaborate and probably later. At Bedsa, the eighth pillar on the right side in the caitya hall is carved with a similar motif having eight spokes and resting on a pedestal. The depiction of the bodhi tree, dharmacakra, and triratna motifs carved at strategic points on the façade of the isolated caitya hall at Junnar is noteworthy.

The stūpa in the apse is three meters high and complete except for the base molding, which remains unfinished (Fig. 9). The height of the drum is 1.37 meters, that of the dome 1.09 meters, and that of the harmikā (crowning member of the stūpa) 53 centimeters. The drum is surmounted by a vedikā that is 30 centimeters tall. On the upper plate of the harmikā a triangular frill (notched or indented) is carved; this seems to be the earliest such frill at Junnar (Fig. 10). It was used again at Junnar in the Shivneri group of caves, which lies east of the town. In all probability this particular design was developed from the stepped-merlon motif. On the flat surface of the harmikā is a socket 20 centimeters square to receive the danda, or wooden shaft of the umbrella. There is, however, no evidence to show that it was ever installed.

The interior of the cave is 7.80 meters long, measuring from the entrance door to the rear wall in the apse, 2.64 meters wide, and 5.97 meters high to the vaulted roof. That the well executed and smooth vaulted roof was to acquire the embellishment of wooden rafters and cross-beams is suggested by the projecting ridge over the triforium (Figs. 11 and 12). Since the cave is unfinished, it is understandable that there is no evidence to show that rafters were installed. The nave proper, measuring from the entrance to the stūpa, is 5.53 meters long. The thickness of the wall (1.67 meters) on either side of the entrance door should be noted (Fig. 2). All of these dimensions relate to the caitya hall’s apsidal interior, which has the expected vaulted roof but lacks the expected colonnade. The overall unfinished nature of the caitya hall’s interior is very informative to the student of cave architecture. In general, scholars would classify this hall as belonging to the “astylar” type. But even though the apsidal interior hall is astylar in its present form, I believe that it was intended to be of the traditional design, with a colonnade and side aisles. This will become clear if we consider the method of excavation.

First we should examine the interior shaping of the Junnar caitya hall in detail. The left wall under the vaulted roof is carved with a triforium that projects slightly from the surface of the stone below. This triforium area undoubtedly was to be used to fix wooden rafters across the vaulted roof, as we see in the Bhaja and Karla caitya halls. We find similar examples in cave 18 at Nasik and in the Bedsa caitya hall (Figs. 13 and 14), and others in Ajanta caves 9 and 10.

In our “isolated” caitya hall, the chiseling of the triforium on the right wall was in progress, while that on the left wall appears almost finished. The process of widening the circumambulatory path along the wall surface is also evident in the rear right-hand corner, where the chiseling was being done step by step. The treatment of the chiseled area is very revealing (Fig. 12). The lower part of the walls near the nave bulge out and then taper upwards. In other words, the distance between walls at floor level is less than the space between the two triforia on either side. This suggests that pillars were to be carved here, either of the broad-based octagonal type found in such caves as Ajanta 9 and 10, Bhaja, and the Pitalkhora caitya halls, or of the type found at Nasik cave 18 and Junnar Ganesh Leni cave 6, where the pillar base is comprised of a vase (kumbha) motif on a stepped pedestal. The unusual thickness of the rock on either side of the entrance of the Junnar “isolated” caitya hall (Fig. 1) suggests that two additional pillars were meant to be excavated at this point too, just as they are in Nasik cave 18, Ajanta cave 9, and the Bedsa caitya halls.

A comparative statement of the measurements of three sites, Ajanta cave 9, Nasik cave 18, and the Junnar “isolated” caitya is given in the table on the facing page. This comparison shows that although the overall measurements of the caves listed in the table differ slightly depending on the total height and depth of the cave, the general format of the exterior and interior is more or less the same. All the proportions are interrelated. In the first two examples, we see that the total width
Comparison of Three Sites: Ajanta cave 9, Nasik cave 18, and the Junnar "Isolated" Caitya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Facade (w. x h., in m.)</th>
<th>Interior (l. x w. x h.)</th>
<th>Nave (l. x w.)</th>
<th>Triforium (height)</th>
<th>Stûpa with harmikā (height) (diameter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajanta cave 9</td>
<td>9.0 x 10.82</td>
<td>13.72 x 6.93 x 7.01</td>
<td>8.84 x 3.35</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>3.96 x 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rectangular, pillared)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ratio=2:1:1)</td>
<td>(ratio=3:1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasik cave 18</td>
<td>6.7 x 8.08</td>
<td>11.84 x 6.58 x 7.09</td>
<td>7.62 x 2.74</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.81 x 1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(apsidal, pillared)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ratio=2:1:1)</td>
<td>(ratio=3:1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junnar &quot;isolated&quot; caitya</td>
<td>6.1 x 7.62</td>
<td>7.8 x 2.64 x 5.97</td>
<td>5.53 x 2.64</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.0 x 1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(astylar)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ratio=2:1)</td>
<td>(ratio=2:1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the cave interior, including the aisles, is slightly less than the exterior width; the ratio is roughly 2:1:1. The ratio of the nave proper is 3:1. The Junnar "isolated" caitya hall has an interior ratio of 3:1:2 and that of the nave proper is 2:1. We have already noted a 1.67 meter thickness of the rock near the entrance of this hall, and the fact that the side aisles and pillars are absent. Had the interior been finished, we certainly would have found approximately the same ratio as in the first two examples, 2:1:1 for the interior, 3:1 for the nave. This indicates that the Junnar "isolated" caitya hall, if finished as intended, would have conformed to the traditional astylar caitya hall design, with colonnade and side aisles.

I can provide a few more examples from other sites in western India to support my hypothesis. Caitya halls 10 and 12 at Pitalkhora have interiors similar to the Junnar "isolated" caitya hall. Note the measurements of nave proper and court complex of these two caitya halls at Pitalkhora. A careful comparison of the court and the interior complex of these Pitalkhora examples with the completed caitya hall 13 at the same site (now mostly ruined) supports my hypothesis. With respect to the Bhaja caitya hall pillars, Burgess rightly observed that "these rake inwards about 5 inches on each side, so that the nave is 15 feet 6 inches wide at the top of the pillars and 16 feet 4 inches at their bases." All of this suggests that in the initial stage of excavation the craftsmen carved the side and rear walls in the nave and apse, respectively, then cut the triforium and finally defined the pillars. The interior complex of the Bhut Leni caitya hall (no. 40) at Junnar provides an excellent example of this procedure, which I have discussed elsewhere.

In my opinion, an example of the true astylar type could be the roughly contemporary caitya hall at Nadsur. However, the loose stratum of soft rock (red bole) found in the middle of the Nadsur caitya hall might have militated against the excavation of pillars. The cramped position of the vihāra on either side of the Nadsur caitya hall also suggests that the space for the pillars was lacking. The astylar type of apsidal caitya hall belongs to the last phase of Hinayāna rock-cut architecture in western India: examples can be found at Karad cave 6, Yerphal near Karad, and Pohala near Kolhapur. On the basis of stylistic considerations scholars have generally assumed that these caves were excavated sometime during the latter half of the second or early third century A.D.

Returning to the "isolated" caitya hall at Junnar, our primary problem is to determine the date of its excavation. Unfortunately, the caitya hall lacks a donative inscription that would fix the date on palaeographic grounds. Based on stylistic considerations, however, I am of the opinion that it is related to Ajanta cave 9, Nasik cave 18, and to some extent to the Bedsa caitya hall. In terms of chronological sequence, the Nasik caitya hall would follow Ajanta cave 9. It has also been observed that the excavation of the Nasik caitya hall was accomplished in two phases. Stylistic features indicate that the facade was begun in the late first century B.C., and, after an unexplained hiatus, the interior was finished some time in the first century A.D. Inscriptions on the facade and on the two right-hand pillars in the hall provide palaeographic corroboration for this view. I would place the
Junnar “isolated” caitya hall in the period separating Ajanta cave 9 and Nasik cave 18, or slightly later. The remainder of my investigation will examine some of the similarities between these monuments.

The large central caitya arches of the early examples, such as Pitalkhora cave 3, Bhaja, Kondane, and Ajanta cave 10, have wide openings, and their lower ends curve out. In contrast, the caitya arches of Ajanta cave 9, Nasik cave 18, and our Junnar example are more developed, and their lower ends are incurved. Moreover, these arches (or windows) rest on the horizontal member, the coping or so-called “tie-beam.” It is during this period that we find the introduction of the gallery in front of the arch along with the entrance door surmounted by the smaller caitya arches in relief. Hence, all of these additions or innovations can be said to constitute the second stage of development in the rock-cut architecture of the early period.

The entrance door in the lower half of the facade of Ajanta cave 9 is flanked by two windows and the coping is surmounted by five small caitya arches in relief. At Junnar three caitya arches occupy that same space, while the design of Nasik cave 18 incorporates only one. The decoration on the facade of Ajanta cave 9 and the Junnar caitya hall contains mainly geometric and other motifs, while at Nasik cave 18, in addition to these, animals, reptiles, and pilasters with inverted bell-shaped capitals are introduced. There are half-lotus medallions within the caitya arch in Ajanta cave 9, while Nasik and Junnar show four- and six-petaled rosettes on their facades. Burgess has noted that the frame of Bhaja’s great caitya window has numerous pinholes arranged in three rows, about 170 in all, which indicated that some ornamental wooden facing covered the caitya arch. I think that the caitya arch surface of the Bhaja example was decorated with applied wooden rosettes similar to those found in stone on the Junnar caitya arch. These pinholes would otherwise constitute inexplicably ugly pockmarks in an arch meant for decoration.

A most curious motif, which helps fix the date of the Junnar “isolated” caitya hall is the triskelion design carved on the facade to the right of the large caitya arch. (Fig. 15). In the entire series of western Indian caves this motif is to be seen elsewhere only on the right side of the great arch of Nasik cave 18 (Fig. 16). “Triskelion” literally signifies a symbolic figure consisting of three legs, arms, or branches radiating from its center. It also means “three-cornered” or “triangular.” The motif first appears on the ancient coins of Lycia in Asia Minor around 480 B.C. It was then adopted for coinage in Sicily by Agathocles (317–07 B.C.). The Greeks connect the symbol with the cult of Apollo, which was very popular and of great antiquity in Lycia. The motif is found on Assyrian coins and also as a countermark on the coins of Alexander the Great (333–23 B.C.). According to some scholars it was recognized to be a variant of the tetraskele (four-armed symbol), or a variety of svastika, and was originally a sun symbol. The triskelion silver trappings have been found in the royal tomb at Craiova, Romania, decorating the bridle of a local Thracian prince’s horse. The type is Scythian and is dated to the third or fourth century B.C. All this would seem to suggest some Greek influence in western Indian rock-cut architecture. Indeed, this is borne out by the mention of Yavana donors in several inscriptions on stone at the Nasik, Karla, and Junnar caves.

Another interesting motif is the svastika carved on the facade of the Junnar caitya hall. The style of the carving is most unusual and imitates perforated wooden screens (Fig. 8). The motif does not occur at Nasik or elsewhere but is common to several stone inscriptions in western India, engraved at the beginning or end or both, evidently because it is an auspicious symbol.

From the foregoing analysis we have seen that the occurrence of certain motifs in different caves suggests their contemporaneity. The dates of the monuments discussed above would be somewhere between the last two decades of the first century B.C. and the first two decades of the first century A.D. The most probable sequence of these monuments is: Ajanta cave 9, Nasik cave 18, and then the Junnar “isolated” caitya hall.

We do not know the reason that the excavation of the interior of the Junnar “isolated” caitya hall remained unfinished. Nevertheless, as it stands today, with its exquisite facade, it is undoubtedly one of the finest examples of its type in the whole series of western Indian caves.
Notes

1. All of the rock-cut caves are excavated on different hills around the town of Junnar. The local names of the groups are: Tulja Leni, Shivneri East, West, and South; Bhimashankar, Amba-Ambika and Bhut Leni on Manmodi Hill; and Ganesh Leni.

2. The first brief notice of this isolated group of caves was given by John Wilson, "Memoirs on the Cave-Temples and Monasteries, and other Ancient Buddhist, Brahmanical, and Jaina Remains of Western India," Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, v. 3, pt. 2, 1851, pp. 36-107; "... beyond this hill to the eastward, is another cave which contains many figures of the Duhgob, and also of wheel with foliage. Several of the apartments are inaccessible" (p. 62). This description was copied almost verbatim by James Burgess in Memorandum on the Buddhist Caves at Junnar, Bombay, 1874, p. 10; and Indian Antiquary, v. 6, 1877, p. 39; and by Burgess and James Fergusson, Cave Temples of India, London, 1880, pp. 257-58. It is unfortunate that except for these few lines no further account of this cave is available. Recently it has been mentioned by S. Nagaraju in Buddhist Architecture of Western India, Delhi, 1981, pp. 170-71, and 302, nn. 38 and 39.

3. Fergusson and Burgess, Cave Temples of India, pl. 7, fig. 7.

4. Ibid., pl. 24, figs. 3 and 4; Burgess, Report on the Buddhist Cave Temples and their Inscriptions, (Archaeological Survey of Western India, v. 4), London, 1883, pl. 11.


6. Fergusson and Burgess, Cave Temples of India, p. 224.


12. Fergusson and Burgess, op. cit., pp. 225-26; Burgess, Archaeological Survey of Western India, v. 4, p. 7, fig. 7.


16. Lüders’s List nos. 965, 1093, 1096, 1140, 1154, 1156, and 1182. In this connection the surface find of a fragment of carved alabaster depicting the birth of Eros in an eggshell at Junnar is also noteworthy. See Suresh Vasant Jadhav, op. cit., p. 64, pl. 2, fig. D.

17. Wilson, The Swastika, pp. 43-44.
Fig. 1. Junnar, general view of the "isolated" caitya hall.
Fig. 2. Junnar, "isolated" caitya hall, plan and section.
Fig. 3. Jurnar, "isolated" caitya hall, facade.
Fig. 4. Junnar, “isolated” caitya hall, facade, rosettes on the arch.

Fig. 5. Junnar, “isolated” caitya hall, facade, bodhi tree.

Fig. 6. Junnar, “isolated” caitya hall, facade, dharmacakra and svastika.
Fig. 7. Junnar, "isolated" caitya hall, facade, svastika and triskelion motif.

Fig. 8. Junnar, "isolated" caitya hall, facade, svastika motif.
A LITTLE-KNOWN CAITYA HALL AT JUNNAR

Fig. 9. Junnar, "isolated" caitya hall, interior.

Fig. 10. Junnar, "isolated" caitya hall, interior, stupa, detail.
Fig. 11. Jumma, "isolated" caitya hall, interior.

Fig. 12. Jumma, "isolated" caitya hall, interior, detail of chiseling technique.
Fig. 13. Nasik, caitya hall, interior.

Fig. 14. Bedsa, caitya hall, interior.
Fig. 15. Junnar, "isolated" caitya hall, facade, triskelion motif.

Fig. 16. Nasik, caitya hall, facade, triskelion motif.
THE SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES ANVÂR-I SUHAYLI: THE ILLUSTRATION OF A DE LUXE MUGHAL MANUSCRIPT

BY JOHN SEYLLER

One of the most endearing Mughal miniatures of the sixteenth century is this scene of a monkey paradise, which belongs to a copy of the Anvâr-i Suhayli dated 22 Rabi‘II/23 September 1570 now preserved in the School of Oriental and African Studies (S.O.A.S.) in London (Fig. 1). Though many art historians have expressed delight at the Mughal artist’s keen observation of these creatures and commented upon the style of the painting, they have never addressed the function of such a painting as an illustration of a didactic story.2

This picture is closely linked to the text of the story, for the passages near the top of the folio relate the return of the monkey king to his island realm rid of invaders. But the problem of the function of images in the illustration of the narrative of the S.O.A.S. Anvâr-i Suhayli goes beyond the simple matching of a painting to the text around it. Rather, this issue encompasses the place of an illustration within both a given story and the manuscript as a whole.

This painting is the second within the lengthy story of the heroic Maymûn sacrificing his life to lead the bear usurpers away from the monkey island to their death in the fiery desert. The crucial episode of the self-mutilated monkey begging the bears with the promise of a surprise attack upon the monkeys appears two folios earlier.3 Yet the result of this deception, the climactic destruction of the bears in the desert, is left unillustrated in this manuscript. Instead, we find this idyllic scene, whose subject is so inexplicit that it has never been identified as part of the story of Maymûn. Our investigation of the illustrations in the S.O.A.S. Anvâr-i Suhayli begins with a rather simple questions: Why is a picture devoted to this insignificant episode in the story?

The answer is suggested by the modern viewer’s response, which bypasses this painting’s illustrative aspect to dwell on its outright pictorial charm. I shall argue that the miniatures are and were intended to be enjoyed primarily for their painterly accomplishment rather than for their didactic function. Moreover, I shall demonstrate that the Mughal artists who created the twenty-seven miniatures of the S.O.A.S. Anvâr-i Suhayli took unprecedented liberties with the subjects, size, and format of these paintings to enhance the appeal of their work.

The text of the Anvâr-i Suhayli is the Persian version of a collection of fables intended for the education of princes and was known throughout the ancient world in Sanskrit, Pahlavi, Syriac, and Arabic versions. The Arabic version by Ibn al-Muqaffa’ (d. 757) was written largely for the pleasure of literary connoisseurs, but gave rise to numerous popular corruptions, among them a Persian translation entitled Kâhilah wa Dimnah by Naṣr Allâh Abu’l-Ma‘âlî sometime after 1144.4 Naṣr Allâh’s simple prose version was eclipsed by the florid style of the Anvâr-i Suhayli, the work of Ḥusayn Vâ’iz Kâshîfî (d. 1504). The Anvâr-i Suhayli proved to be especially popular in India, the source of its tales, although Akbar disliked its ornate style so much that he ordered Abu’l-Fâżîl ‘Allâmî to compose a new version, the ʿIyâr-i Danish, a work completed in 996/1587–88.

The drift of the images in this early Mughal manuscript away from strictly illustrative concerns represents a departure from the traditional didactic function of illustrations in this text.5 Two reasons emerge for this new conception of the manuscript illustration. The first is that the importance of the actual narrative details of the text of the Anvâr-i Suhayli was diminished by the very familiarity of the stories, which by the mid-sixteenth century had developed a strong iconographic tradition over the course of three centuries of frequent illustration.6 In most cases, the artists of this manuscript were not compelled to formulate a direct visual response to the text, as were much earlier artists or contemporary Mughal illustrators of new texts.7

While most illustrated manuscripts of this period draw upon well-established pictorial traditions, few give their paintings so much autonomy from the text. Thus, a second and more important reason for the distinctive quality of the miniatures of the S.O.A.S. Anvâr-i Suhayli lies not in the nature of the text, but in the nature of this particular Mughal manuscript. The idea of different types of illuminated manuscripts in Mughal India has been proposed by Cary Welch and Robert Skelton, but its most thorough formulation is advanced by
Pramod Chandra, whose argument I summarize here.8

Chandra distinguishes three basic types of illuminated manuscripts during the reign of Akbar (1556–1605). The first comprises profusely illustrated manuscripts whose paintings are generally considered to be the work of individual artists; the paintings are not elaborate and vary considerably in quality.9 A second type of manuscript has collaborative works of two or three artists and even longer painting cycles, often numbering more than one hundred paintings; the paintings in these manuscripts regularly achieve a higher and more uniform level of quality.10 The S.O.A.S. manuscript belongs to a third category of manuscripts, a select group of de luxe manuscripts illustrated during Akbar’s reign.11 The S.O.A.S. Anvār-i Suhayli, the earliest major manuscript of this type, shares with other de luxe manuscripts the relative paucity (usually many fewer than forty-five paintings) and high refinement of its paintings; like the ascribed paintings in these later manuscripts, which are almost all poetical texts, it is probable that the S.O.A.S. illustrations too are the work of individual artists. No ascriptions exist to identify the artists of the S.O.A.S. miniatures, but the painters seem to be few in number.12

Chandra remarks that we must understand the category of a manuscript before placing the manuscript’s paintings in the increasingly detailed chronological development of Mughal painting of this period.13 In this article I will reverse the direction of inquiry into the de luxe category of illuminated manuscripts, for my purpose is not to refine further the place of the paintings of the S.O.A.S. Anvār-i Suhayli in the overall stylistic development of Mughal painting, but to elucidate the process and effects of the illustration of an early de luxe Mughal manuscript. I will try to answer two basic questions: What is implied by the position of the miniatures within the stories they illustrate? And what factors affect the layout of the text and the miniature on the page?

First, the very brevity of the S.O.A.S. painting cycle, which must have been determined before the manuscript was begun,14 fundamentally shapes the relationship of the images to the text; in all but two instances, a single image carries the narrative burden of illustrating the story.15 This design alone suggests that the visual recounting of the story is not the purpose of the S.O.A.S. miniatures, as it is in more heavily illustrated contemporary copies of the same text, the Prince of Wales Museum (P.W.M.) Anvār-i Suhayli and the Beatty Library ‘Iyār-i Dānish, both of which will be examined below.16 Given the limited number of illustrations in the S.O.A.S. manuscript, the point at which the scribe breaks the text column for the illustration takes on great importance. If some of the S.O.A.S. paintings seem quite unrelated to the principal narrative developments of the fables, nearly all follow directly the content of the passages written immediately above.17

Second, the S.O.A.S. paintings increase in size during the course of the manuscript’s production. Together with this change in the shape of the miniatures are modifications in the framing of the images and the standardization of the amount of text on the page. I will show that these developments in the S.O.A.S. Anvār-i Suhayli bespeak the new prominence of the miniature in de luxe Mughal manuscripts.

Let us begin with a list of the miniatures.

1. Fol. 28r. The hawking falcon demonstrates the advantages of travelling when he wins the favor of the king (Eastwick, p. 61).18
2. Fol. 36r. The darvish who sees the royal falcon feed an injured raven forgets the maxim, “Who labors is God’s friend” (Eastwick, p. 78) (Fig. 19).
3. Fol. 40r. The meddlesome monkey is caught in the carpenter’s wedge and is punished (Eastwick, p. 86) (Fig. 5).
4. Fol. 75r. The wolf, jackal, and lion plot to devour the innocent camel (Eastwick, p. 157) (Fig. 20).
5. Fol. 88r. The bear lifts a rock to kill the flies on the face of his friend the gardener (Eastwick, p. 184).
6. Fol. 93v. The greedy fox watches the kite fly off with a piece of skin with which he had not been content (Eastwick, p. 194) (Fig. 16).
7. Fol. 119r. The lascivious falconer is punished for his false accusation of his lord’s wife when the falcon tears out his eyes (Eastwick, p. 244).
8. Fol. 123r. The concerted action of the pigeons effects their escape from the fowler’s net (Eastwick, p. 252) (Fig. 3).
9. Fol. 131r. The camel-riding rescues a snake from a desert only to be threatened by him (Eastwick, p. 265).
10. Fol. 137v. The wolf who resolves to hoard the bodies of the hunter, deer, and boar.
and to gnaw on the bowstring alone is killed when the bowstring snaps (Eastwick, p. 276) (Fig. 8).

(11) Fol. 148v. The crow’s ruse of attacking the deer lures the hunter away from the captured tortoise so that the mouse may release him (Eastwick, p. 295).

(12) Fol. 168v. The Gurgānī rogues trick the devotee into believing that his goat is a dog (Eastwick, p. 331).

(13) Fol. 172r. Alarmed by the sight of a thief, the merchant’s wife finally responds to her spouse’s advances (Eastwick, p. 337) (Fig. 7).

(14) Fol. 174r. The quarreling of the demon who wished to murder the devotee and the thief who sought to steal his buffalo awakens the devotee and his neighbors (Eastwick, p. 339).

(15) Fol. 176r. The carpenter’s wife and her lover deceive the cuckold beneath the bed (Eastwick, p. 342).

(16) Fol. 181v. Maymun the patriotic monkey appears before the king of the bears with a false plan of revenge (Eastwick, p. 350).

(17) Fol. 183v. The monkeys return to the bliss of their island homeland (Eastwick, p. 353) (Fig. 1).

(18) Fol. 199v. The wise thief thwarts the efforts of the foolish monkey sentinel to stab the ants on the king’s breast (Eastwick, p. 379) (Fig. 17).

(19) Fol. 206r. While riding on the back of the tortoise, the monkey discovers his friend’s plan to tear out his heart (Eastwick, p. 388) (Fig. 4).

(20) Fol. 211v. The fox reproaches the weak lion for failing to slay the beguiled ass (Eastwick, p. 397).

(21) Fol. 222r. After the king kills his hawk for spilling his cup of water, a stirrup-holder discovers the body of a serpent whose saliva has poisoned the water (Eastwick, p. 414).

(22) Fol. 232r. The farmer’s unfaithful wife is abandoned by her lover in her hour of need (Eastwick, p. 431) (Fig. 12).

(23) Fol. 266v. The chamberlain is ordered to cast the sultan’s mistress into the Tigris (Eastwick, p. 494).

(24) Fol. 280r. A lynx observes a horseman killing a hunter in a quarrel over a skin (Eastwick, p. 518) (Fig. 14).

(25) Fol. 320v. King Hilar orders the perfidious brahmans to be trampled to death by elephants (Eastwick, p. 595).

(26) Fol. 333r. A monkey spirits away from thieves the hoard of goods stolen from a pilgrim who had rescued him from a pit (Eastwick, pp. 618–19).

(27) Fol. 334r. Seeing an ornament of the king’s slain daughter in the possession of his former rescuer, the goldsmith treacherously accuses the pilgrim of the murder of the princess (Eastwick, p. 619) (Fig. 18).

The pictorial tradition of the basic text is manifested in the S.O.A.S. Anvār-i Suhaylī in a variety of ways. The very choice of the stories to be illustrated in the S.O.A.S. manuscript is the broadest of these, with at least fifteen of the manuscript’s miniatures depicting stories illustrated in earlier copies of the basic text. The painting cycles of only a few of the major illustrated copies of the text show a direct borrowing from one another. More common in these manuscripts is a pervasive awareness of motifs which have been used repeatedly and exclusively to illustrate these fables. Such motifs are rarely constant in form or style, but constitute the core of illustrations in a variety of styles.

Many of the S.O.A.S. scenes incorporate these established motifs into settings of extraordinary elaboration. For example, in the story of the pigeons who are urged by a ringdove to use concerted action to escape from the fowler’s net, two separate moments are chosen for illustration in copies of the Kalilah wa Dimnah and the Anvār-i Suhaylī; the first is the instant of the astonished fowler watching or pursuing the ensnared pigeons aloft, the second, the mouse releasing the pigeons. An illustration in the Victoria and Albert Museum (V.&A.) Anvār-i Suhaylī is representative of the use of the motif of the netted pigeons escaping from the fowler (Fig. 2). The S.O.A.S. painting follows the traditional diagonal structure of this motif with a composition which includes the fowler, the pigeons flying away in the net, and the onlooking crow (Fig. 3). The Mughal artist embellishes the basic pictorial elements of the illustration with such descriptive details as the fowler’s axe and netted baskets, and emphasizes the diagonal movement of the birds with a dark
sward and fanning rocks. Even as the action depicted in the image resembles that of many earlier representations, it follows the development of the narrative as it is written in the eight lines of text above the painting, falling between the ringdove’s exhortation and the pigeons’ ascent.

The pictorial tradition of another fable is similarly fused with the Mughal artist’s heightened interest in naturalistic description in the S.O.A.S. illustration of the popular story of the monkey riding the tortoise (Fig. 5). The basic motif of the monkey and tortoise is so similar to the compositions of the National Museum Kalilah wa Dimnah (Appendix, Ms. D, fol. 108v), the Rampur Raza Library copy of the same text (Appendix, Ms. E, fol. 168v), and the V.&A. Anvar-i Suhaylī (Appendix, Ms. G, fol. 255v) that the existence of a pictorial model cannot be denied. Despite a simple diagram of the monkey seated on the tortoise in a body of water would meet the literal illustrative requirements and would easily fit within the area bounded by the text column, the S.O.A.S. artist keeps the scale of the central pair small so that he may populate the surrounding waters and burgeoning shores of the enlarged painting with aquatic creatures and fowl. And while the actual position of the image in the story is less critical in this case because the tortoise’s intrigue is revealed over a number of lines of text, the illustration coincides with the beginning of the monkey’s queries about the tortoise’s hesitation to proceed.

These two examples testify to the close adherence of certain S.O.A.S. miniatures to inherited pictorial formulae, such as the traditional motifs of the nettled pigeons and the monkey astride the tortoise. But other miniatures depart from standard representations in more substantive ways. The third miniature in the S.O.A.S. manuscript illustrates the story of the meddling monkey who becomes caught in the carpenter’s wedge (Fig. 5). The short and unambiguous story begins at the end of the second of the four lines above the miniature:

Kalilah said, It is related that a monkey saw a carpenter sitting on a piece of wood which he was cutting. He had two wedges, one of which he had beaten into the split so as to facilitate the cutting and widen the way for the saw.

The two lines below the painting continue:

When the split had passed a certain point, he drove in another [wedge] to facilitate the splitting and [then] drew out the former. In this manner, the carpenter worked while the carefree monkey looked on. Suddenly, the carpenter in the middle of his work . . .

An illustration in the Egyptian National Library Kalilah wa Dimnah, which may be taken as a typical example of the traditional imagery of this frequently illustrated story, depicts a carpenter beating a single monkey trapped in a half-sawn wedge (Fig. 6). The S.O.A.S. artist adopts this motif, but has mistakenly transposed the monkey over a young tree and has added another monkey, thereby obfuscating the reason for the action of the beating. Because the text on the page ends before the monkey is trapped or beaten, the action of the illustration is quite unrelated to the text above. Hence, it is clear that the S.O.A.S. miniature is not a representation of a different text moment, but an inadvertent iconographic corruption of a familiar motif. This erroneous departure from the information provided by either the pictorial tradition of the story or the text itself is unique in the S.O.A.S. manuscript.

The artist of the S.O.A.S. scene of the story of the merchant’s wife and the thief is more ingenuous in his modification of the fable’s traditional iconography (Fig. 7). After years of spurning the advances of her doting husband, the young wife clutches her spouse in terror when she catches sight of a thief in their bedchamber. The surprised merchant begs the intruder to take whatever he wishes because his arrival has made the woman affectionate at last. Other manuscripts depict the alarmed woman reacting to the thief kneeling beside the bed or the thief standing behind the curtain; such images appear immediately below textual accounts of either the thief’s entry or the merchant’s entreaty. In the two examples noted above, the action of the illustration corresponds to that of the text written immediately above the miniature. By contrast, the illustration in the S.O.A.S. manuscript appears earlier in the story, amid the old merchant’s frustrated lament and prior to the thief’s entry and unexpected reception. But here the relation of the image to the text is not literal, for the artist shows a supine young couple still unaware of the thief crouching at the foot of the bed. At this point in the story, the thief has not even been mentioned in the text. Like the artist of the S.O.A.S. painting of the monkey and the carpenter (Fig. 5), this artist disregards the narrative moment specified by the text. His decision seems to be a well considered one, for the plaintive dismay of the estranged husband has limited possibilities of pictorial action. Instead, this artist chooses to represent the penultimate action of the drama—the moment before the sight of the thief makes the woman hasten to
her husband’s arms. He embellishes this chamber scene, which fits wholly within the area reserved by the scribe for the illustration, by adding a large extension above and to the left of the painting. In the corner of an elaborate courtyard sits a sleeping guard, unaware of the intruder. The mastery with which this artist handles both the dramatic aspect of the illustration, which quickens the anticipation of the climax of the story, and such descriptive details as the thief’s apprehensive pose and expression makes his work stand out among the paintings in the S.O.A.S. manuscript.

A more revealing change in the iconographic tradition of the fables occurs in the S.O.A.S. illustration of the story of the greedy wolf (Fig. 8). After shooting a deer escaping from his snare, a hunter becomes engaged in a mutually fatal confrontation with a boar. A hungry wolf who comes upon the three victims resolves to hoard them all and begins to satisfy his appetite with the hunter’s bowstring. When the bowstring snaps, the ends of the bow pierce the wolf’s heart. The two lines of text above the S.O.A.S. painting relate the entrapment and escape of the deer:

A gazelle fell into captivity. Then he [the hunter] came out from the hiding place in order to retrieve the snare. Out of fear for its life, the gazelle made an effort, tore up the snare, and ran onto the plain.

Hence, the image of a hunter taking aim at his prey illustrates quite literally this one episode of the story. Yet in illustrating the preceding textual passage, this miniature foregoes a well established model—the sprawling corpses of the man, deer, and boar with the onlooking or slain wolf—which summarizes the narrative and appears in all but one illustrated version of the story. Why does the S.O.A.S. artist abandon the concise and established iconography of the story to introduce at this point a basic hunting scene?

The most obvious explanation for his divergence of the S.O.A.S. illustration from the established iconography of the story is that the pictorial tradition of the story itself is inherently conditioned by the writing of the text in each of the manuscripts in which this story is illustrated. Each of the miniatures that enlist the composition of the dead trio of deer, hunter, and boar follows exactly the narrative development to that point in the manuscript. For example, the written account of the same story in the V.&A. Anvar-i Suhayli breaks for illustration at the point of the wolf’s rejoicing at his good fortune (Fig. 9). Consequently, it seems, the wolf is depicted overlooking his prospective repast. Similarly, when in the National Museum Kalilah wa Dimnah the illustration precedes the narrative development of the wolf’s demise, the wolf is not included among the dead (Fig. 10). We can tentatively conclude that the breaks in the written narratives of these fables outweigh iconographic tradition in governing the precise subjects of the illustrations.

This explanation is quite plausible on the level of a series of individual miniatures, but is less convincing when one considers the process of selecting the stories and episodes to be illustrated in a manuscript of this text. Is it sheer coincidence that the designers of every other manuscript illustrating this story chose to leave room for an image at the point at which the wolf surveys his victims or dies? If the designer of the S.O.A.S. manuscript had wanted to maintain both the traditional iconography and the literalness of the illustration of the greedy wolf, could he not have had more text written above the painting field so that the passage relating the wolf’s fortuitous discovery of the three corpses would immediately precede the image?

This choice of illustrating a particular passage or the whole of a story becomes acute only occasionally in the S.O.A.S. manuscript. Like the S.O.A.S. scene of the frolicking monkeys (Fig. 1), which appears in the aftermath of the story of Maymūn, the S.O.A.S. illustration of the hunter giving chase to the deer at the beginning of this story is unrepresentative of the story as a whole, particularly in this case because it is the sole image attached to the fable. The scene of the hunter and deer in a developed landscape is an attractive painting, but presents such standard hunting imagery that it tells us nothing of the narrative resolution of the story. Once again we ask, why does the S.O.A.S. artist illustrate a relatively insignificant episode in this story?

By way of answering this fundamental question, let us examine another Mughal response to the problem of providing a literal illustration to a specific passage or presenting a comprehensive illustration of an entire story. ‘Āsi’s illustration of this same story in the Beatty Library ‘Iyār-i Dānish employs a hunting scene similar to that of the S.O.A.S. illustration (Fig. 8), but advances the action to have the hunter actually shooting the deer (Fig. 11). The slight modification in the action of the hunt is predicated by the narrative development of the story as it is written in the uppermost of the three text panels on the page. At the same time, however, ‘Āsi takes up the traditional model of the four corpses in the
space alongside and beneath the conclusion of the story. The legibility of this example of continuous narration is facilitated by the pronged shape of the painting field, which helps separate the two parts of the illustration from one another.

The device of continuous narration, which is used so successfully in the example above to alleviate the choice of episodes to be illustrated, appears just once in the S.O.A.S. manuscript, in the illustration of the story of the farmer’s unfaithful wife (Fig. 12). A prince comes upon the beautiful wife of an old farmer who is sleeping and persuades the woman to elope. The farmer awakens to find his spouse about to ride off with the youth, and begs her to remain. The young couple rebuke his entreaty and ride for some time before pausing to rest beneath a tree near a stream, where the woman goes to perform her ablutions. When a lion seizes her there, the prince flees in terror, leaving the fate of the unfaithful woman to be discovered by her spouse. The S.O.A.S. depiction of the lovers beside a stream conforms exactly to the narrative development on the page, but is accompanied on the left by a scene of the frightened prince abandoning his newfound lover, an episode which does not occur in the story until several lines later. Allowing the woman’s clothes and the horse to change color in their double representation, the artist creates an integrated composition by using an unobtrusive ridge to divide the two halves of the large rectangular painting.

Unlike the S.O.A.S. painting of the merchant’s wife and the thief (Fig. 7), which may be characterized as a synopsis, and the illustration of the story of the greedy wolf (Fig. 8), which is strictly literal, the image of the farmer’s unfaithful wife and the prince discussed above is both a synopsis and a literal illustration. Lâla’s illustration of this story in a copy of the Anvari Suhayli dated 1005/1596–97 and preserved in the Bharat Kala Bhavan also serves this dual illustrative function (Fig. 13). The image appears in the text at the moment of the prince’s flight, but signals the story’s conclusion by including the onlooking farmer. A version in an illustrated copy of the text in the British Library restricts the scene to the prince’s faintheartedness during the lion attack and places the image after the concluding maxim.27 All three examples reduce the narrative to a singular rectangular illustration surmounted by a small text panel.

Thus far we have examined two basic approaches in Mughal manuscripts to the problem of narrative illustration in the Anvari Suhayli. The first approach—the dominant one in the S.O.A.S. Anvari Suhayli—uses a single image to summarize the narrative of a fable (Figs. 3, 4, and 7), often depending upon the judicious placement of the illustration to combine the utility of the pictorial tradition of the story with the timeliness of a literal representation of a crucial episode or the climax of a story. The second approach divides the burden of representing the narrative of a story into smaller pictorial units. This is most commonly achieved by the device of continuous narration, which shows separate episodes of a story within a single painting. This occurs just once in the S.O.A.S. manuscript (Fig. 12).

A third approach to narrative illustration in Mughal manuscripts of the sixteenth century uses large numbers of images to represent many different episodes of a story. This use of images to isolate separate narrative moments of a story is precluded in the S.O.A.S. Anvari Suhayli by the brevity of the painting cycle, which almost always allot a single illustration to a story. This third approach is best exemplified by the multiple illustrations of two contemporary copies of the text, the P.W.M. Anvari Suhayli and the Iyär-i Danish. The former illustrates the story of the farmer’s unfaithful wife with four separate images which punctuate the development of the narrative. The first scene shows the farmer with his wife; the second, the farmer crying out as the lovers ride away; the third, the lion attack; and the fourth, the mauled body of the woman.

This serialization also characterizes the triple illustration of this story in the ‘Iyär-i Danish.28 The first of these images depicts the farmer’s wife leaving in spite of her husband’s entreaties. In the second, the prince flees while the lion devours the woman. The third concludes the sequence with the farmer discovering his dead spouse. The subject of each of these images coincides with the narrative development of the story at the break in the text column above the illustration. The lengthy text panels on the many illuminated folios of the ‘Iyär-i Danish consistently relegate the paintings to a subordinate physical position on the page, so that in most cases the paintings bracket the text column. I will demonstrate below that the number of paintings and the proportions of text and image on the illuminated page are intimately bound up with the conception of the function of images in a given manuscript.

I have noted the many paintings employed in the illustration of the story of the farmer’s
unfaithful wife in these two manuscripts because my investigation of manuscript illustration points to the sheer number of images in a manuscript as the most critical factor in determining the function of miniatures in narrative illustration. A comparison of the short painting cycle of the S.O.A.S. Anvär-i Suhaylī with the far more extensive ones of the P.W.M. Anvär-i Suhaylī and the 'Iyār-i Dānish suggests that the role of the individual miniature in narrative illustration is cast largely by the length of the cycle to which it belongs. Though neither of these latter cycles has survived intact, enough paintings have been preserved so that we may note that the tremendous difference in the number of illustrations is not commensurate with the number of stories illustrated. For example, while the number of images in the P.W.M. copy is nearly nine times that of the S.O.A.S. manuscript, the number of stories illustrated increases only twofold. Small in size and usually limited to the protagonists of a single episode, the multiple illustrations of the P.W.M. manuscript relate the narrative in successive stages, existing almost as a visual parallel to the text. By contrast, the much larger miniatures of the S.O.A.S. Anvär-i Suhaylī display a narrative succinctness which occasionally verges on ambiguity, as in the stories of Maymūn (Fig. 1) and the greedy wolf (Fig. 8).

This profound difference in the way images are used in the lengthy and illustratively explicit paintings of the P.W.M. Anvär-i Suhaylī and the 'Iyār-i Dānish and in the terse painting cycle of the S.O.A.S. Anvär-i Suhaylī is nowhere more obvious than in the illustration of a story of retribution with which a lynx admonishes the lion who has been devouring his animal brethren. The sequence of aggression begins with a mouse gnawing on the root of a tree; the mouse is then eaten by a snake. A hedgehog, fox, dog, leopard, hunter, and horseman assume in succession the respective roles of predator and victim until the horseman finally breaks his neck in a fall. Bypassing the long sequence of animal agents, the S.O.A.S. artist depicts the lynx watching the envious horseman as he shoots the hunter over the prized leopard skin (Fig. 14). Unlike the stories of the monkey and the carpenter or the greedy wolf, there is no one traditional motif firmly associated with this story to compete with the text as a source of inspiration. Yet the artist’s response to the text is less literal in this S.O.A.S. illustration than in the earlier hunting composition (Fig. 8), for the text written above the painting lauds the prowess of the hunter shooting the leopard. Altering the weapon wielded by the horseman against his rival from a sword to a bow, the artist produces a painting so reduced in narrative distinctiveness that it has been mistaken for a prince and his servant at a hunt. This use of an equivocal hunting scene rich in painterly description as the sole illustration of the story underscores the conception of the images in the S.O.A.S. manuscript as something other than visual explanations of the text.

Whereas the S.O.A.S. painting abbreviates the lengthy sequence of retributive actions into a single hunting scene, the nine illustrations of the P.W.M. Anvär-i Suhaylī isolate nearly every episode of the story. Among these are two scenes of the lynx recounting the tale and images of the encounters of the snake and mouse, hedgehog and snake, dog and fox, leopard and dog, and the horseman falling from his mount. The outcome is represented in scenes of the unrepentant lion attacking the deer and then returning to his den to find his own progeny slaughtered.

Five illustrations in the 'Iyār-i Dānish present the story in a similarly episodic fashion. 'Asī contributes two paintings which adjoin long panels of text relating the respective accounts of the snake attacking the mouse and the dog killing the fox. Sankara Gujarāti then details the fate of the leopard and its predators in three separate scenes on a single page (Fig. 15). The uppermost of these is demarcated as a separate composition by the rulings of the text panel immediately beneath it, but the lower two use only the area of another text panel to divide the space of their common landscape. Nanda Gvāliyāri depicts the demise of the horseman in the fourth painting, while in the last, yet another artist represents the lion resuming his hunt of the deer. Each scene articulates a separate phase of the narrative sequence, whose visual continuity is underscored by the appearance of the lynx, the narrator of the tale, in each of the seven scenes.

The disparity in the number of images in various illuminated copies of texts such as the Anvär-i Suhaylī has three important results. First, when painters are encouraged to spend more time on fewer miniatures, there is an obvious rise in the quality of their work. The S.O.A.S. paintings far exceed the illustrations of the P.W.M. Anvär-i Suhaylī and the 'Iyār-i Dānish in overall fineness of execution. Second, there is a definite loosening of the illustrations from their literary referents. This aspect, which I have
demonstrated above, is far more apparent in the prose text of the Anvār-i Suhaylī than in poetical manuscripts whose painting cycles and quality place them in the de luxe category of illuminated manuscripts. Whereas the paintings of most poetical manuscripts refer obliquely to bits of verbal imagery rather than to the ostensibly action of the poem, both the dramatic junctures of the stories and the pictorial tradition of the Anvār-i Suhaylī encourage narrative specificity. But the S.O.A.S. illustrations are consistently less informative about their stories than are those of the P.W.M. Anvār-i Suhaylī and the ʿIyār-i Danish. Third, paintings in de luxe manuscripts come to occupy a significantly larger proportion of the page, with the amount of text on the illuminated folio decreasing until the full-page miniature is virtually the rule.

The images in the S.O.A.S. Anvār-i Suhaylī mark the initial stage of the process of the physical emancipation of the miniature from the text; by the end of the sixteenth century, this process produces manuscripts such as the Bharat Kala Bha-van Anvār-i Suhaylī, which has a preponderance of full-page miniatures. Each S.O.A.S. painting is accompanied by at least one text panel, with only folios 93v (Fig. 16) and 168v approximating full-page miniatures. In comparison to contemporary Mughal manuscripts, the space reserved for the illustrations is relatively generous. Nonetheless, twenty-two of the twenty-seven miniatures occupy a compositional field considerably larger than the one originally set aside by the scribe. This monumentalization of the painting field must have been deemed sufficiently important to override the difficulties of obliterating portions of the frames and incorporating the text column into the compositions. Unlike the large text panels of the ʿIyār-i Danish and the Darabnamah, the latter a contemporary manuscript which also shows this modification, the few lines of text on most illuminated pages of the S.O.A.S. Anvār-i Suhaylī leave ample room for successful compositions within the area bounded by the text column. But the twenty-two larger miniatures are clearly designed to fill the newly expanded compositional field, though the expansion is not occasioned by illustrative requirements.

A few examples of the modifications to the frame will point up the ambivalent approach to the original and revised borders of the painting field. Whereas most S.O.A.S. compositions include a panel of text in the upper part of the painting, the original painting field of folio 93v is bounded by a text panel only at the bottom (Fig. 16). In contrast to another artist’s decision to obliterate the original frame in folio 168v, this artist retains large segments of the upper border and paints freely over the upper left and almost entire right border. The marginator casts a new rectangular frame around the expanded composition, but allows the edge of the violet rock in the lower right and two boughs of the banyan tree to interrupt his border.

Both text and frame are incorporated into the architectural framework of the painting on folio 172r (Fig. 7). The artist makes the chamber’s columns and brackets contiguous with the vertical members of the original frame, which he does not disturb. By placing crenellations atop the upper text panel, he transforms the area occupied by the six lines of text into an ornamental wall surface. He retains the left gold ruling of the text column to reinforce the separation of the chamber scene from the walled courtyard. I attribute to this artist two more miniatures which exhibit this same composition (Figs. 17–18). The basic architectural formula is employed in both of these later works, but is refined in two details. The artist eliminates the segment of the original frame from the painting field and leaves the lower edge of the octagonal courtyard as the corner of the painting. The marginator in turn adjusts the frame to this angle.

These refinements in the framing of miniatures painted when the manuscript was well under way are the fruit of more radical experiments undertaken at the outset of the manuscript. A violet knoll and grassy area swell over the left border of the original painting field of folio 36r, the second painting in the manuscript (Fig. 19). We know that the artist conceived the composition in the enlarged format because the two birds who stir the darvish take shelter in the tree rising alongside the text column. Yet the artist demonstrates his uneasiness with the new painting field by extending the streaky blue sky to the edge of the folio and by inserting a rudely painted rock cluster between the right border of the text column and the right edge of the folio, practices repeated for the most part in folio 75r, which may be attributed to him on the basis of style (Fig. 20). The marginator, too, is unaccustomed to this type of pictorial expansion. In the lower left of both paintings, his new border neither continues the line of the original frame nor meets the painted surface. And on the right of folio 36r (Fig. 19) there is no border at all to check the painting.
We draw closer to understanding the internal development of the S.O.A.S. Anvār-i Suhaylī as we trace the treatment of the painting field and frame from its most tentative expression (Fig. 19) to its most assured (Fig. 18). Once again, the amount of text on the folio is a key issue. A telling factor in the initial decision to enlarge the painting field must have been the unusually small area left on folio 36r by the ten lines of text. The artist dutifully takes the text, which ends with the falcon feeding the injured raven, as the inspiration for his scene, but precociously envelops it with a greatly expanded compositional field. The visual impact of a painting field redoubled in size seems to have elicited a favorable response in the Mughal atelier, for the enlarged format is employed not only in the face of similar spatial limitations imposed by the text (fols. 75r, 123r), but also in the presence of large unbroken painting fields (fols. 93v, 168v).

The adoption of the enlarged format also gives us some idea of the pace at which the manuscript was produced. Four of the five small paintings in the manuscript appear among the first seven illustrations; thereafter only one chamber scene restricts the painting field to its original limits of the width of the text column. That an innovation first advanced in the second painting in the manuscript (Fig. 19) is employed systematically by the eighth (Fig. 3) suggests that the illumination proceeded slowly enough to allow the artists to react quickly to each other’s work.

The new physical prominence of the image in the S.O.A.S. manuscript is enhanced by another refinement in the presentation of the miniature. Perhaps as a result of the earlier expansion of the painting field, the scribe gradually reduces the amount of text on the folios to be illuminated from the maximum of ten lines on folio 36r. Most of the first eight illuminated folios distribute their six or more lines of text among panels of irregular number and length. The next seven illustrations contain consistently fewer lines of text in panels which still vary in size. In all but two of the remaining eleven paintings, this varied format becomes standardized as two panels of two lines each. The steady reduction of text on illuminated pages leaves little doubt that the scribe, Muhīb Allāh b. Hasan, was writing out the text of the Anvār-i Suhaylī even as the paintings were being executed. The size and regularity of the text panels on the later illustrations achieve the practical result of minimizing their obtrusiveness in the compositions. More important, they suggest that a standard configuration of text and image in which the latter is predominant has come to be valued at least as much as the direct juxtaposition of a specific text passage and its illustration. Everything possible is being done to highlight the miniatures.

This interest in effecting the configuration of text and image to enhance the miniature may well be responsible for the surprising placement of illustrations within several of the stories discussed above. In this light, the unexpected representation of the monkeys playing on their island paradise (Fig. 1) is probably an accidental result of the writing of the text. A large-scale, literal illustration of an insignificant episode of the story seems to have been preferable to a much smaller one of the narrative climax, for the bears’ destruction is related low on folio 183r. The formal interest in the layout of text and image on the folio appears most obviously in the scene of the hunter and deer in the story of the greedy wolf (Fig. 8). In this case too, it is not the literalness of the illustration which is overthrown, but rather the application of an established pictorial model. Finally, the relative standardization of the size of the text panels into two panels of two lines each also must have occasioned the representation of the minor, albeit literal scene in the story of the farmer’s unfaithful wife of the prince and the farmer’s wife resting beneath a tree (Fig. 12).

All these measures, which are undertaken to make the paintings more prominent in the manuscript, are concomitant with the increasingly realistic description of everything from brushwood fences to monkey antics. Changes in the layout of the paintings reinforce the predominance of these pictorially ambitious images within the manuscript; the painting field expands even as the text panels shrink. By the end of the sixteenth century, these developments take hold of many more Mughal manuscripts, but their initial conjunction in the School of Oriental and African Studies Anvār-i Suhaylī grants these early Mughal miniatures a rare degree of pictorial autonomy and forms the initial expression of a de luxe mode of manuscript illustration.
Notes


2. Gray, Indian Painting, pp. 81–82, remarks the naturalism of these chattering monkeys. A further-reaching discussion of the style of the S.O.A.S. paintings appears in Chandra, The Tūtī-Nāma, p. 73. He convincingly attributes f. 28r to Shahm Muzahib on the basis of four signed works in the British Library Gulistan of Sa'di dated 975/1567–68. A brief but systematic discussion of the manuscript, including the first published mention of the expansion of the painting field, appears in Losty, The Art of the Book in India, p. 87.

3. Folio 181v. See Note 1 for publications reproducing this painting.


5. The text seems to have been intended for illustration. The foreword of the Arabic translation expresses the desire to increase the appeal of the text and to convey its moral more effectively through the incorporation of color illustrations, a recommendation repeated in the Persian translation by Naṣr Allah. See T. Arnold, Painting in Islam, New York, 1965, p. 26.

6. See the Appendix for a list of representative illustrated copies of various Persian recensions. Arabic and early Persian illustrated copies are cited in E. Atl, Kalīla wa Dīmna: Fables from a Fourteenth-century Arabic Manuscript, Washington, D.C., 1981. G. Meredith-Owens, “A Persian Manuscript of the Reign of Bāyezīd II with Ottoman Miniatures,” Prince of Wales Museum Bulletin, v. 10, 1967, p. 28, overestimates the strength of this tradition, remarking that “the two artists . . . were following a convention which governed all Kalīla wa Dīmna illus- trations throughout Islamic history from which they could not deviate even if they had wished.”

7. See O. Grabar, “Pictures or Commentaries: Illustrations of the Maqamat of al-Ḥarīn,” in Peter J. Chelkowski, ed., Studies in Art and Literature of the Near East in Honor of Richard Ettinghausen, New York, 1974, pp. 85–104, for a discussion of this issue in thirteenth-century Arabic manuscripts. Mughal artists illustrated a variety of new texts in the 1580s and 1590s, including translations of Hindu texts such as the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa, and historical texts such as the Bābur nāmah and the Akbar nāmah. For a discussion of the straightforward literal visualization of the Mahābhārata in the Jaipur Razm nāmah and changes in the illustrations of subsequent copies, see Seyller, “Model and Copy: The Illustration of Three Razmnama Manuscripts,” Archives of Asian Art, v. 38, 1985, pp. 37–66.

8. The idea of different types of Mughal manuscript illumination is mentioned by S. C. Welch, “Miniatures from a Manuscript of the Diwan-i-Hafiz,” Marg, v. 11, 1958, pp. 56, 61; and by R. Skelton, “Two Mughal Lion Hunts,” Victoria and Albert Museum Yearbook, v. 1, 1969, p. 39. While these two scholars limit their discussion of de luxe manuscripts to poetical works, Chandra, The Tūtī-Nāma, pp. 59–60, cites the S.O.A.S. manuscript and the National Museum Dauwal Rani Khizr Khan or “Ashiqād dated Muharram 976/June–July 1386 as the earliest de luxe Mughal manuscripts. This view is accepted by Welch, Imperial Mughal Painting, p. 47.


12. In addition to the two artists working in a Bukharan style (ff. 28r, 40r), the hands of approximately eight more artists can be identified. Though I have broached the issue of attribution in a few instances, this problem of connoisseurship lies beyond the scope of the paper.


14. Faint marginal sketches appear on folios 7v, 15r, 21v, 24r, 31r, 33r, and 46v; their style suggests that they may be contemporary with the manuscript's paintings. Their subjects—groups of animals or figures hunting or conversing—are in keeping with those of the paintings. Thus far I have not been able to establish their connection with the action of the adjacent text passages. Thus far I have not been able to establish their connection with the action of the adjacent text passages. Until they are proved to be so, they cannot be considered part of a planned cycle of illustrations.

15. Two images illustrate the story of Maymūn (ff. 181v, 183v) and the travails of the kind pilgrim (ff. 333r, 334r).

16. See the Appendix, Ms. H and L.

17. Only once has the scribe altered the even writing of the nasta'liq on the page preceding an image to achieve this; after thirteen regular lines, the text on folio 168r tapers to one-quarter of the width of the text column. The decoration of the two narrow panels is limited to a simple gold ruling. The miniature which follows on folio 168v
has no text panel at the top and accords precisely with the subject of the first line of text in the panel below the image.

18. Page references are to Anvar-i Suhaili, or the Lights of Canopus, trans. E. Eastwick, Hertford, 1854.

19. See the Appendix for a chart of these.

20. An example of this rare type of relationship between manuscripts is the Rampur Kalila wa Dimnah (Appendix, Ms. E), which is directly modeled after the fragmentary Istanbul University Library paintings of the same text (F. 1422). Paintings from the latter manuscript are widely published, notably in A. Sakisian, La miniature persane du 12e au 17e siècle, Paris, 1929. Complete references and a thorough discussion of the manuscript may be found in Jill Cowen, "The Istanbul University Kalila wa Dinna: an Il-Khanid Masterpiece," Ph.D. thesis, New York University, Institute of Fine Arts, 1980.


22. Folio 156r in the manuscript listed in the Appendix as Ms. G.

23. See also Walzer, "The Topkapu Saray Manuscript of the Persian Kalila wa-Dinna," figs. 30, 43.

24. For other examples of this frequently illustrated scene, see E. Grube, "The School of Herat 1400-1450," in B. Gray, ed., The Arts of the Book in Central Asia, Paris, 1979, figs. 91 and pl. 59; Walzer, "The Topkapu Saray Manuscript of the Persian Kalila wa-Dinna," figs. 18, 38.


26. See Walzer, "The Topkapu Saray Manuscript of the Persian Kalila wa-Dinna," fig. 27, for another example of the traditional imagery. Apart from the S.O.A.S. painting, the sole exception to this tradition known to me is a Qajar Anvar-i Suhayli dated 1203/1788-89, f. 63v. The image is published in Treasures of Persian Art after Islam: The Mahboubian Collection, New York, 1970, no. 928.

27. Anvar-i Suhayli, British Library, Add. 18579, f. 339r. The ms. is listed in the Appendix as Ms. K; the painting is published in Wilkinson, Lights of Canopus, pl. 31.


30. "Iyâr-i Dânish, nos. 76-80.

31. For a discussion of the relationship of text and image in a de luxe Mughal poetical manuscript of 1588, see A. Schimmel and S. C. Welch, Anvarî’s Divan: A Pocketbook for Akbar, New York, 1983.


33. Losty believes that this expansion may have been an afterthought limited to details of setting (The Art of the Book in India, p. 87). But the expansion is deliberate in all twenty-two paintings; in at least six paintings (Figs. 1, 3, 4, 7, 17, and 18), only elaborated settings or figures peripheral to the action of the illustrations occupy the additional area.

34. This awkward type of joint is resolved later in the manuscript. See folios 123r, 131r, 137v, 148v, 168v, 181v, 183v.

35. Folio 176r.
APPENDIX

MANUSCRIPTS DISCUSSED

Manuscript A

Manuscript B

Manuscript C

Manuscript D

Manuscript E

Manuscript F

Manuscript G

Manuscript H
Anvâr-i Suhayli, ca. 1575, Prince of Wales Museum, no. 73.5. Most of the text has been cut away from the 231 painting fragments which have survived the ravages of fire. The manuscript awaits full publication, but two miniatures are reproduced in M. Chandra, Indian Art, Bombay, 1974, pl. 30–31.

Manuscript I

Manuscript J

Manuscript K

Manuscript L
Illustrated Scenes in the S.O.A.S. Manuscript also illustrated in other Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hawk and falcon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Darvish and divine help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carpenter and monkey</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sacrifice of the camel</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gardener and bear</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fox and kite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lying falconer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pigeons and the fowler</td>
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<td>9</td>
<td>Camel rider and snake</td>
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<td>10</td>
<td>Wolf, deer, boar, and hunter</td>
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<td>11</td>
<td>Crow, mouse, deer, and tortoise</td>
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<td>12</td>
<td>Sheep mistaken for a dog</td>
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<td>13</td>
<td>Wife and thief</td>
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<td>14</td>
<td>Thief and div</td>
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<td>15</td>
<td>Carpenter and wife</td>
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<td>16</td>
<td>Monkey tricks bears</td>
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<td>17</td>
<td>Monkeys at play</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image here" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>King, monkey, and thief</td>
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<td>19</td>
<td>Monkey rides tortoise</td>
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<td>20</td>
<td>Fox, lion, and ass</td>
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<td>21</td>
<td>King and hawk</td>
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<td>22</td>
<td>Farmer's unfaithful wife</td>
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<td>23</td>
<td>Sultan of Baghdad and Chinese wife</td>
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<td>24</td>
<td>Lynx and lion</td>
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<td>25</td>
<td>King and brahmans</td>
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<td>26</td>
<td>Thieves thwarted by monkey</td>
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<td>27</td>
<td>Traveller and goldsmith</td>
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</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Anvar-i Suhaylî, School of Oriental and African Studies, Ms. 10102, fol. 183v. 25.8 by 18.7 cm.
Fig. 2. Anwar-i Suhaylî, Victoria and Albert Museum, I.S. 13 (1-126) 1962, fol. 156r.
Fig. 3. Anvar-i Suhayli, S.O.A.S., fol. 123r. 26.4 by 19.3 cm.
Fig. 4. Anvar-i Suhayl, S.O.A.S., fol. 206r. 28 by 20.1 cm.
Fig. 5. *Anvar-i Suhayl*, S.O.A.S., fol. 40r. 14.3 by 11.3 cm.
Fig. 6. Kallah wa Dimnah, Egyptian National Library, Litt. pers. 61.
Fig. 7. Anwar-i Suhayli, S.O.A.S., fol. 172r. 26.6 by 20.6 cm.
Fig. 8. Anvar-i Suhaylî, S.O.A.S., fol. 137v. 23.3 by 18.3 cm.
Fig. 9. Annār-i Suhaylî, V.&A., fol. 171v.
Fig. 10. *Katlah wa Dimnah*, National Museum, New Delhi, fol. 114r.
Fig. 11. 'Jā'ar-i Dānish (dispersed), Chester Beatty Library, Ms. 4, no. 22. 14.8 by 10.2 cm.
Fig. 12. Anvâr-i Suhaylî, S.O.A.S., fol. 232r. 24.1 by 19.3 cm.
Fig. 13. *Anvār-i Suhaylī*, Bharat Kala Bhavan, no. 9069, fol. 171r. 24.5 by 14.2 cm.
Fig. 14. Anvar-i Suhayli, S.O.A.S., fol. 280r. 26.7 by 18.3 cm.
Fig. 13. 'Iyār-i Dānish (dispersed), Chester Beatty Library, no. 78.
Fig. 16. Anvār-i Suhaylī, S.O.A.S., fol. 93v. 23.8 by 19.3 cm.
Fig. 17. Anvar-i Suhayli, S.O.A.S., fol. 199v. 27.7 by 21.5 cm.
Fig. 18. Anvār-i Suhaylī, S.O.A.S., fol. 334r. 27.3 by 19.8 cm.
Fig. 19. Anvar-i Suhayli, S.O.A.S., fol. 36r. 29 by 22.4 cm.
Fig. 20. Anvar-i Suhayli, S.O.A.S., fol. 75r. 28.5 by 22.3 cm.
A SĀMĀNID TOMBSTONE FROM NĪSHĀPŪR

By Paul E. Chevedden

Among the many fine specimens of Islamic art in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art is a tombstone (no. M.73.5.246) which is of great interest not only for its fine craftsmanship but also because of its ornamental and epigraphic features (Fig. 1). Some of the most elaborate types of ornamental Arabic script were first developed on tombstones, and this tombstone is a rare example in stone of one of the many and varied foliated scripts developed by the artisans of Nishāpur in eastern Iran during the tenth century.

The tombstone is now only 30 cm. high, and lacks its original upper portion, but by comparison with similar pieces of like provenance, it is possible to reconstruct the missing section and estimate the original height of the stone at 50 cm. (Fig. 2). The tombstone received brief mention in the 1973 catalogue of the Heeramanек Collection and was published in a recent book by Anthony Welch with fuller commentary. It has been attributed in both cases to tenth-century Egypt. Welch does not discuss the reasons for his attribution, but it is clear that he bases his judgement on the stylistic features of the inscriptions, as Pratapaditya Pal had done previously. There are two Arabic inscriptions on this tombstone, one in an outer panel bordering a central frame, and another inside this frame. Since there is very little else in the way of ornamentation by which to determine the provenance of this tombstone, an analysis of the epigraphic features of these inscriptions provides a major means of defining its origin and date.

Both inscriptions are composed of foliated Kufic, a style of Arabic script in which the terminations of the letters consist of floral motifs. Foliated Kufic is thought to have evolved first in Egypt in the early ninth century, followed soon after by foliated Kufic. From Egypt these new styles of script spread East. Due to the prymacy of Egypt in the development of foliated and floriated Kufic, the choice of Egypt as the provenance of this tombstone is not without some foundation. To determine the origin of this tombstone more firmly we must first examine the inscriptions.

Outer Panel

Foliated Kufic in high relief (0.5 cm.), maximum height of letters 2.5 cm. No diacritical marks or vocalization signs.

Central Frame

Foliated Kufic in high relief (1.2 cm.), maximum height of letters 2.5 cm. The last ten of the original fourteen lines of this inscription remain. No diacritical marks or vocalization signs.

In the name of God, the Compassionate, the [Merciful.
"Say: 'He is God, One, God, the everlasting Refuge, who has not begotten, and has not been begotten, and equal to Him is not any one.'” (Qur'an 112:1-4)

1) [In the name]
2) [of God, the Com-]
3) [passionate, the Merciful.]
4) [There is no god but G-]
5) od, Muhammad
6) is the Messenger of God,
7) God bless
8) him and
9) grant him salvation, this
10) is the grave of Mu‘awi-
11) yah ibn Šālih,
12) may God be merciful to him,
13) grant him pardon, and
14) whiten his face.
The letters of this inscription that received the most decorative attention are the tall vertical letters, ʿalif and ʾām, which in most cases take the form of a three-lobed half-palmette (see Figure 3). The palmettes of the ʿalif and ʾām face in opposite directions, the ʿalif to the right and the ʾām to the left, so when they are paired back to back, in the definite article al- as in al-raḥman, al-raḥim in the outer panel, and in the name of God (ʿAllah), they form a full palmette. One of the short vertical letters, baʿ, also takes the form of a three-lobed half-palmette in the basmalaḥ of the outer panel, in qabr in line 10 and in ibn in line 11, where it is paired with the ʿalif to form a full palmette. These are the only instances in which a short vertical letter is treated decoratively as a long vertical letter. In all other examples the terminations of the short vertical letters (baʿ, sin, and yaʿ) are composed of two-lobed half-palmettes of medium height. The circular letter forms (fāʿ, qāf, mim, hāʾ/ḥāʾ marbūṭah and wāw) have scalloped or indented outer edges. The rectangular letters (dal, ḍhal, sād, dād and kāf) are basically of identical shape. The rectangle of the ḍal/ḥal, and kāf is open on the left and surmounted by a pointed stem (except for the kāf of kufiʿan in the outer panel, which is topped by a two-lobed half-palmette), while the rectangle of the sād and dād is closed and surmounted by a two-lobed half-palmette, in the case of ʿallā in line 7 and ʿAlīḥ in line 11, or a straight vertical shaft, as in bāyyada in line 14. The oblique letters (ʾin, hāʾ, ʿayn, and ʿghayn) are not affected by any decorative devices except for the bifurcation of the horizontal and vertical lines of some of these letters. This feature is also seen on some of the alif and raʾs and terminal dād, ʿām, mim, and mīn. The low letters (raʾ and terminal mīn) are of identical form and are modified versions of the raʾ and terminal mīn of simple Kufic, which take the shape of an undersized L facing backwards. The vertical shaft is bent at a 45° angle with a wedge on its underside, while the horizontal line has a wedge on its upper side. The wedges almost connect to form a circle. The terminal raʾs have an added horizontal bar below the base line. The only unattached floral ornament within the inscription frame is a rosette placed at the end of line 8.

The most striking feature of these two inscriptions, besides the decorative character of the script, is the extraordinary high relief of the letters. The tallest letters are only 2.5 cm high, yet the letters of the central frame are cut to a depth of 1.2 cm., and those of the outer panel to a depth of 0.5 cm. The proportion of letter height to the elevation of the relief is remarkable for inscriptions carved in stone, but generally characteristic of inscriptions carved in brick or stucco. This fact suggests that this tombstone is likely to have been produced in a region with a tradition of brick and stucco carving. If this is the case, Iran rather than Egypt is the more likely choice of provenance for this tombstone; further analysis will substantiate this judgement. Another feature to be noted is the continuity of the baseline in both inscriptions and the horizontal elongation of the letters.

Islamic tombstones vary greatly in shape and ornamentation from region to region and from period to period, and even those of a particular area and period of time may not conform to a uniform type. Although the tabular stele, the most common type of funerary stone throughout the Islamic world, appears to be the oldest kind of Islamic grave marker and has continued in use up to the present, its specific form and decorative elements differ from one area to another and from one period to the next. However, since such features conform to the wider artistic traditions of any particular locality, it is possible to group the tabular steleae regionally and chronologically according to their shape and ornamentation. As a good number of these tombstones still remain in situ, and most contain the date of the deceased’s death, the provenance and date are easily verifiable. In the case of this tombstone, which has no known find-spot and no date, the task of determining its provenance and approximating its date must rely upon stylistic comparison.

Other Nishāpūr Steleae

The group of tombstones that the stone in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art most closely resembles is composed of three extant examples. Two of the tombstones in this group have been uncovered in Nishāpūr, in the northeastern Iranian province of Khurāsān, and the third has been attributed to Nishāpūr. The earliest tombstone of this group is most probably the one formerly in the collection of Nazare-Aga and now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, no. 34.152 (Fig. 4). Although its find-spot is not known and it has no date, Gaston Wiet, who first published it, attributed it to Iran and dated it to the middle of the ninth century at the latest. It was later published in the Survey of Persian Art, where it was attributed to the tenth century. The
Metropolitan Museum of Art states its provenance as Iran, probably Nishāpūr, and has attributed it also to the tenth century. It is a small alabaster tombstone in the form of an elongated rectangle, measuring 26.7 cm. in height and 13.5 cm. in width. The epitaph on it is enclosed within a pointed arch set in a rectangular field. This form is imitative of a mihrab. The arch is formed of three fillets and topped at the apex by a two-lobed palmette. The inscription is composed of thirteen lines of simple Kufic in high relief with no diacritical marks or vocalization signs.

"بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم"
(1)
الله الراحم
(2)
الرحيم
(3)
الله الآللله
(4)
محمد رسول
(5)
الله هذ
(6)
ا قبر يوسف
(7)
بن يعقوب
(8)
رحمة الله
(9)
و غفر له و
(10)
بض و
(11)
جه و نو
(12)
ر له في ثور(ه)
(13)

1) In the name of G-  
2) od, the Compassionate,  
3) the Merciful. There is no  
4) god but God,  
5) Muhammad is the Messen-  
6) ger of God. This is  
7) the grave of Yūsuf  
8) ibn Ya’qūb,  
9) may God be merciful to him,  
10) grant him pardon,  
11) whiten  
12) his face, and illumine  
13) nate for him (his) grave.  

Wiet’s dating of this tombstone rests primarily on the fact that two of the invocations of the inscriptions, bayyada wajhabahu wa-nawwara lahu fi qabrthi, “[May God] whiten his face and illumine for him his grave,” are found on nine tombstones ranging in date from 179/795 to 251/865. All of the examples he cites are of Egyptian origin and only one contains both of the invocations. This obviously shows that such invocations were being used during the eighth and ninth centuries in Egypt, but does not rule out the possibility of their use on Iranian tombstones of a later date.

The second tombstone of this group was excavated at Nishāpūr and is now in the Museum für Islamische Kunst in West Berlin (Fig. 5). Only the upper 17.3 centimeters of this tombstone remains, and it has been attributed to the tenth or eleventh century. It is said to be marble, but may very well be alabaster, since these two stones are easily confused. The epitaph of this tombstone is enclosed within a pointed arch set in a rectangular frame. The arch is composed of a pattern of leaves terminating at the apex of the arch in a palmette. This palmette is flanked by three palmettes on either side which are attached to a scrolling vine beneath. The capitals below the arch are filled with a series of lozenges bordered by horizontal bands. The first seven lines of the inscription on this tombstone are intact; they are carved in simple Kufic in high relief with no diacritical marks or vocalization signs.

"بسم الله الر
(1)
حمان الرح
(2)
يم لا الإالله
(3)
محمد رسول
(4)
الله صلى
(5)
عليه وسلم
(6)
(7)

1) In the name  
2) of God, the Com-  
3) passionate, the Merciful.  
4) There is no god but God,  
5) Muḥammad is the Messenger of G-  
6) od, God bless  
7) him and grant him salvation.

The third tombstone of this group is in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (no. 36.20.27) and was excavated at Nishāpūr by the Museum in 1936 (Fig. 6). The tombstone was found in two fragments. The lower portion is completely intact, but sections of the upper portion are missing. It is composed of alabaster and is in the shape of an elongated rectangle 76.2 cm. high, 44.5 cm. wide, and 6.4 cm. thick. The design of this tombstone is a more elaborate version of that found on the other Nī shāpūr tombstone in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Instead of fillets, the columns of the arch consist of a pattern of leaves, similar to
the pattern on the arch of the tombstone in the Museum für Islamische Kunst. The capitals of the arch are filled with lozenges as well, and there are remains of a row of palmettes above the arch, corresponding to the central palmette on the West Berlin tombstone. With these common features it is fairly certain that the missing upper portion of this tombstone was nearly identical to the tombstone in the Museum für Islamische Kunst. However, the reconstruction of this tombstone by the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Fig. 6) does not allow enough space for the missing arch. The original height of this tombstone was, therefore, in excess of its present restored height, probably exceeding 80 cm. Just below the springing line of the main arch are two other arches, one set within the other. The outer arch is slightly pointed and the inner one is lobed. The original mihrab design on this tombstone was then composed of three arches set within each other. The earliest extant example of a mihrab with multiple recesses like this is a flat mihrab in the Mosque of Ibn Tulun in Cairo, which Creswell considered to be contemporary with the construction of the mosque, built between 876 and 879.20 This type of mihrab appeared later in Iran, in the flat as well as the concave variety, and the design was also used on tombstones, the earliest example being this very stone.21 The inscription originally consisted of fifteen lines and is composed of simple Kufic in high relief with no diacritical marks or vocalization signs.22

1) [In the name of]
2) [God, the Compassionate,]
3) [the Merciful.] There is no g-
4) [od but] God,
5) Muḥammad
6) is the Messenger of
7) God.
8) This is the grave of
9) Fuḍayl ibn
10) Mūsā,
11) may God be merciful to him,
12) grant him pardon,
13) whiten his face,
14) and illuminate for him
15) her [sic] grave {waw-alif} 

A comparison of the form, decorative elements, epigraphic features, and contents of the inscriptions of the tombstones discussed above indicates that all four are roughly contemporaneous and were produced in the same locality. Since the find-spot of two of these tombstones is Nishāpur, it is reasonable to assume that the other two were also produced there.

Although only one of the tombstones is completely intact it is evident that all four were shaped in the form of an elongated rectangle. This can be postulated for the tombstone in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art simply by reconstructing the Qur'anic inscription of the outer panel and the upper portion of the inscriptions in the central frame (see Figure 2). The tombstone in the Museum für Islamische Kunst can also be assumed to have been of similar shape since on the first tombstone in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (no. 34.152) the area between the springing line of the arch, where this tombstone is broken off, and the apex of the arch contains approximately one third of the inscription. On this basis the inscription would originally have run approximately twenty lines. There is no doubt that the inscription on the tombstone in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art was enclosed like the other three in a pointed arch since there are the remains on the upper left side of the lozenges that form the capital, as on two of the other tombstones.23 The use of lozenges as a decorative border dates at least as far back as Sasanian times and can be found on stucco panels from Nishāpur dating from the second half of the tenth century.24 All of these tombstones are in the form of a mihrab, a design widely used on tombstones throughout the Islamic world, and the earliest extant examples of such tombstones from Iran are these four from Nishāpur.25 Another
decorative element that two of these four tombstones share is the use of fillets to form borders. This feature is found on the first tombstone in the Metropolitan Museum of Art and on the tombstone in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. A pattern of leaves is used to decorate the arch on the tombstone in the Museum für Islamische Kunst and the columns on the second tombstone in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The only novel features on the Los Angeles tombstone are the outer inscription panel and the use of foliated Kufic. However, except for the foliation of the letters, the script of this tombstone is identical to that found on the other three tombstones of this group, and all of the inscriptions are carved in high relief.

An examination of the contents of the four inscriptions shows that they adhere to a standard schema which consists of five basic elements: 1) the basmalah (“In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful”), 2) the shahādah or profession of faith (“There is no god but God, Muḥammad is the Messenger of God”), 3) the introductory formula hādhā qabru . . . (“this is the grave of . . .”), 4) the name of the deceased consisting solely of a proper name (ism ‘alām) and a pedigree (nasab) limited to one ancestor (i.e., the father) introduced by the word ibn (“son of”), and 5) a series of invocations for the deceased. The invocation of God’s blessings upon the prophet Muḥammad (the tasliyah), sala Allāh ‘alayhi wa-sallam (“God bless him and grant him salvation”) found on the West Berlin and Los Angeles tombstones is optional. The series of invocations following the name of the deceased are formulaic and arranged in a standard order on all of the tombstones except on the West Berlin fragment, which is missing this portion of the inscription. Both tombstones in the Metropolitan Museum of Art contain four identical invocations arranged in the same order (raḥimahu Allāh wa-ghafara lahu wa-bayyada wajhahu wa-nawwara lahu fi qabrīhi, “May God be merciful to him, grant him pardon, whiten his face, and illuminate him for his grave”) and the Los Angeles tombstone has all but the last of these invocations arranged in exactly the same order. This systematic arrangement of standard invocations gives further indication of the homogeneous character of this group of tombstones. The tombstone in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art is the earliest extant Persian tombstone to have an outer panel containing a passage from the Qurʾān. This feature later became widespread and saw its fullest development during the twelfth century in the region of Yazd, where tombstones were embellished with multiple outer panels containing verses of the Qurʾān. The most elaborate tombstone of this type with four outer panels was produced by Abū’l-Qāsim al-Kharrāt in 533/1138 and is now in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Fig. 7). The Los Angeles County Museum of Art has a miḥrab in its collection signed by the son of this artisan, ‘Ali Aḥmad b. Abī’l-Qāsim al-Kharrāt (Fig. 8).

The simple purpose of inscriptions on tombstones, be they plain or elaborate, is to record the name of the person buried, give witness to that person’s faith (through the shahādah and quotations from the Qurʾān), and to invoke God’s blessings upon the deceased. Although many tombstones record the date of death of the deceased, the four extant examples of this group of tombstones do not. The dating of these tombstones, consequently, presents a problem.

Nīshāpūr, where these tombstones were all most probably produced, was a major commercial, cultural, and artistic center of eastern Iran during the mediaeval period and reached its greatest prosperity during the tenth century under the Sāmānīd dynasty, which controlled all of eastern Iran and Transoxiana. Nīshāpūr, however, was unfortunate to be located on the path of conquering armies and suffered repeated destruction, most grievously at the hands of the Mongols in 1221. The city was also devastated by several earthquakes. After each of these manmade or natural disasters, Nīshāpūr was rebuilt on a site near to partly overlapping its former location. As a result there is little remaining of medieval Nīshāpūr and scant material that can be used to determine the date of these tombstones. However, many pieces of pottery were uncovered during excavations conducted by the Metropolitan Museum of Art at Nīshāpūr between 1935 and 1939, and again in 1947. A good deal of this pottery is decorated with inscriptions, some of which are composed of foliated Kufic that provides evidence for dating the inscription on the tombstone in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. There are a number of Sāmānīd bowls with rectangular, circular, and low letters composed of three-lobed half-palmettes. Two bowls with inscriptions decorated in this fashion are in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (Figs. 9 and 10). Both inscriptions on these two pieces consist of the word barakah (blessing) repeated in succession with the low letter, ṭaʾ, and the rectangular letter, kāf, terminating in a multilobed half-palmette. These letters
receive the same decorative treatment as the vertical letters on the tombstone. On other inscriptions found on bowls from Nishāprū the vertical letters are decorated. One contains an inscription derived from the word *barakah* with the vertical letters composed of three shafts of diminishing height topped by circular additions, and the vertical letters of another inscription are similar except for the fact that the apices of the three shafts are hooked to the left. Vertical letters composed of half-palmettes are found on two bowls, one with the paired vertical shafts composed of two-lobed half-palmettes, and another, attributed to the end of the tenth century, on which the *nūms* of *al-yumm* (happiness) and a series of *alif*-like letters are composed of three-lobed half-palmettes.

A bowl from Nishāprū in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art decorated with a ram and four birds has four sets of paired vertical letters in the form of three-lobed half-palmettes along its side wall (Fig. 11).

The decorative device of the three-lobed half-palmette on the apices of vertical letters is believed to have developed first in Egypt during the ninth century; subsequently it was applied to other letters. Whether a similar development occurred in Iran is a matter for speculation, but nevertheless by the tenth century this device was used simultaneously on a variety of letters. The Sāmānid artisans also developed a new decorative script in which the letter forms were plaited or interlaced. This script was first used on pottery beginning around 935 and about the same time letters were embellished with floriated decoration as well. Often both decorative devices were used in combination in inscriptions on pottery. An early example of floriated script is found on a bowl in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art which has been attributed to Sāmarqand (Afrāsiyāb). The Kufic inscription running horizontally across the field of this bowl contains two low letters that extend to form a three-lobed half-palmette (Fig. 12).

Aside from pottery there are few historical remains in Nishāprū that can provide a means of determining the approximate date of the tombstone in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. One important remnant that offers such a possibility is an inscription fragment excavated by the Metropolitan Museum of Art from a building in the mound called Sabz Pūshān at Nishāprū. This fragment contains the letter *lām* in foliated Kufic similar in form to that found on the tombstone. W. Hauser has attributed this fragment to the late eighth or early ninth century, but based on the style of script it is far more likely to be contemporary with the stucco panels in the same building dating from the second half of the tenth century. This inscription also shares a number of features with the foliated Kufic inscriptions in the Masjid-i Jāmī' at Nā'in in western Iran, which dates from the second half of the tenth century. The foliation of the letters is more highly developed at Nā'in than on this tombstone, but there are many similar features, including the presence of unattached rosettes (Fig. 13). The evidence available indicates that the Los Angeles tombstone was most probably produced during the second half of the tenth century.

The other tombstones of the group discussed here were produced approximately at the same time or earlier in the tenth century, most probably in the order in which they have been discussed, corresponding to a shift from a simple to a more complex style. The time span between the earliest and latest of these tombstones need not have been very long, judging from the development of other groups of tombstones. Among twelfth-century tombstones from Yazd there is a span of forty years between the simplest and most complex design.

These tombstones are among the earliest extant Islamic tombstones from Iran. Although the content of their inscriptions is rigid and adheres to a stereotyped vocabulary, their decorative elements are quite varied and innovative. The main decorative features found on these tombstones—the mihrab-shaped design, the mihrab with multiple recesses, the outer inscription panel containing a Qur'ānic text, and foliated Kufic script—were later used and further developed on tombstones throughout both eastern and western Iran. The artistic creativity of the Sāmānid period was tremendously vast and varied in scope, and produced a number of decorative styles that were modified and developed in succeeding centuries. One of the most noteworthy achievements of this period was the development of the inscribed word as a decorative form in its own right, exhibited most fully on ceramics from Nishāprū and Sāmarqand. The inscription on the tombstone in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art has the distinction of being the only known example of foliated Kufic script in stone to have survived from the Sāmānid period.
Notes

1. Width, 13 cm., thickness 2.7 cm. Gift of Joan Palevsky. The Department of Preservation at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art has analyzed this stone and determined that it is alabaster. It had been identified previously as marble.

2. Pratapaditya Pal, ed., Islamic Art: The Nasli M. Heeramaneck Collection, Los Angeles, 1973, p. 176, no. 347. The tombstone is identified as an inscribed tablet. I would like to thank Dr. Pal, Dr. Robert Brown, and Dr. Thomas Lentz of the Department of Indian and Islamic Art at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art for assisting in the preparation of this article.

3. Welch, Calligraphy in the Arts of the Muslim World, Austin, 1979, p. 46, no. 2. Roy P. Mottahedeh of Princeton University provided Welch with a translation of the inscriptions on this tombstone.

4. The script has been identified in Pal, loc. cit., as floriated Kufic. The difference between foliated and floriated Kufic is discussed by A. Grohmann “The Origin and Early Development of Floriated Kufic,” Ars Orientalis, v. 2, 1957, pp. 183–213. The distinction is often subtle but in essence very simple. In foliated Kufic the terminations of the letters consist of floral motifs (half-palmettes and two- or three-lobed leaves). In floriated Kufic floral motifs, tendrils, and scrolls grow out of or extend from the terminations of the letters and fill in the blank spaces of the inscription.


6. The inscriptions in this article have been transcribed and edited according to the Leiden Bracket System, as adapted to Arabic epigraphy by M. H. Burgoyne and A. Abul-Hajj, “Twenty-four Medieval Inscriptions from Jerusalem,” Levant, v. 11, 1979, pp. 112-13.

7. This last line was not translated by Mottahedeh (Welch, loc. cit.).

8. The only exception is the alif of Muṣawwir (line 10), which faces left and is connected to the wāw that follows.

9. The two-lobed half-palmette atop the sād of Sāliḥ could also be considered as the alif following the sād, which then connects to the lām. However, alifs are frequently omitted from proper names, “al-Qāsim” and “Ismā’īl” being two prime examples.

10. The analysis of the alphabet of the inscriptions on this tombstone according to the form of its letters is based on the reduction of the Kufic alphabet into five basic forms devised by Lisa Golombek (Volov), “Plaited Kufic on Samanid Epigraphic Pottery,” Ars Orientalis, v. 6, 1966, p. 112.

11. See the article “Kābr” by J. Sourdel-Thomine in Encyclopædia of Islam, 2nd ed., who discusses this topic at greater length and provides reference to the scholarly literature on Islamic tombstones.


14. I am grateful to Ms. Carolyn Kane of the Department of Islamic Art at the Metropolitan Museum of Art for this information.

15. The transcription and reading of this inscription is taken from Wiet, op. cit.

16. Ibid., p. 1. Only RCEA no. 260 has both invocations; RCEA no. 164 has bayyadah wajhahu and the remainder (RCEA nos. 56, 57, 71, 404, 455, 550, and 560) have either "nawwara 'alayhi gabrahu" or nawwara lahu/ha fi qabrī/ha. There is another Egyptian tombstone, published by G. C. Miles, dated 238/853, that also contains both invocations: "nawwara hufratahu wa-bayyadah wajhahu" ("Early Islamic Tombstones from Egypt in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston," Ars Orientalis, v. 2, 1957, p. 218). The tombstone of Mahīmad I at Ghazna, dated 421/1030 but considered to be a later addition to the tomb, also has the same two invocations (S. Flury, "Le décor épigraphique des monuments de Ghazna," Syria, v. 6, 1925, pp. 87-89, pl. 24). The invocation nawwara [Allah] gabrahu, "May God illumine his grave," is found on twelfth-century Persian tombstones from the area of Yazd published by Iraj Afshar, Ydgdahr-i Yazd, 2 v., Tehran, 1348–54/1969–75: v. 1, pp. 81–269, 489, no. 42; pp. 208–09, 537, no. 130; v. 2, pp. 278, 1080, no. 64/2; and pp. 867–68, 1302 (unnumbered). It also occurs on two tombstones from Isfahan dating from the middle of the twelfth century (G. C. Miles, "Epitaphs from an Isfahani Graveyard," Ars Islamica, v. 6, 1939, pp. 151–57, and pp. 152 and 154), and on three tombstones from Bust dating from the late twelfth and mid-thirteenth centuries (J. Sourdell-Thomine, "Stèles arabes de Bust (Afghanistan)," Arabic, v. 3, 1956, pp. 285–306; no. 2, pp. 292–94; no. 3, pp. 296–998; and no. 5, pp. 300–01).


18. The two tombstones of this group in the Metropolitan Museum of Art are composed of alabaster: no. 34.152, which was first described by Wiet as marble (op. cit., p. 1; RCEA, no. 548), and no. 36.20.27, discussed below. The tombstone in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art was also first thought to be of marble (Pal, op. cit., p. 176, no. 347; Welch, op. cit., p. 46, no. 2).

19. Unpublished. I am grateful to Ms. Carolyn Kane for calling my attention to this tombstone and for providing me with the essential data on it. My description of the tombstone and reading of the epitaph is based on a xerox of a photograph which Ms. Kane kindly sent me.

21. Mihbrabs with multiple recesses are discussed by G. Feherværi in two articles: “Two Early Mibrabs outside Shiraz,” Bulletin of the Asia Institute of Pahlavi University, v. 1, 1969, pp. 3–11; and “Tombstone or Mibrab? A Speculation,” in R. Ettinghausen, ed., Islamic Art in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1972, pp. 243–44. A number of tombstones produced in the area of Yazd during the late eleventh through twelfth centuries have mihbrabs with multiple mihbrab: Afshar, op. cit., v. I, pp. 85, 491, no. 44/3; v. 2, pp. 267, 1074, no. 57/2; pp. 277–78, 1079, no. 64/1. See also Wiet, op. cit., pp. 26–27 and pl. 9, no. 21 (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, no. 31.711); S. Ferber, ed., Islam and the Medieval West, Binghamton, 1975, no. 18 (Cleveland Museum of Art, no. 50.9); and Sourdel-Thomine, op. cit., pp. 292–94, no. 2, pl. 4 (a tombstone from Bust dating from the late twelfth century).

22. I would like to thank Marie Lukens Swietochowski for granting me permission to publish this inscription. The reading is my own.

23. Museum für Islamische Kunst, no. 1, 1/261 and Metropolitan Museum of Art, no. 36.20.27.


25. See Feheřæví, “Tombstone or Mibrab?” p. 241, for a brief discussion of the origin of mibrab-decorated tombstones and their use throughout the Islamic world. Later examples of mibrab-decorated tombstones from Iran are found in the area of Yazd, the earliest of which date from the second half of the eleventh century. Iraj Afshar has provided a convenient list of most of these tombstones in “Two 12th Century Gravestones of Yazd in Mashad and Washington,” Studia Iranica, v. 2, 1973, pp. 204–07, and Yadgar-i Yazd, v. 2, pp. 909–17; most of them are published in the two volumes of Yadgar-i Yazd. Some of the tombstones published by Sourdel-Thomine and Miles, referred to in note 16, are also in the form of mihbrabs.

26. The obligatory kaswala is found on two of the tombstones (Metropolitan Museum of Art no. 34.253 and Museum für Islamische Kunst no. 1. 1261), and can be assumed to have been on the other two.

27. The shahâdah appears on all the four tombstones in full or in part.

28. This introductory formula is found on all of the tombstones except the one in the Museum für Islamische Kunst, which is broken off at line 7. Haḍhäuser would begin line 8 of this inscription. According to Sourdel-Thomine haḍха qabr “appears on a third of the earliest Islamic steles in Egypt, [and] became the sole formula used without exception in later epitaphs from Ifriqiya, al-Andalus, Syria, Anatolia and even eastern Iran” (Kabar, Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd ed., p. 353).

29. The name of the deceased has survived on three of the four tombstones: those of Yûsuf b. Ya’qûb (Metropolitan Museum of Art no. 34.152), Fudayl b. Musû (Metropolitan Museum of Art no. 36.20.27), and Mu’âwiya b. Sahî (Los Angeles County Museum of Art no. M.73.5.246).

30. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, no. 31.711. This tombstone was first identified as a mibrab by Mehmet Ağa-Ogлу, who read the name of the artisan as Abu’l-Qâsim al-Harrâni (“An Islamic Tombstone and Mibrab of the Twelfth Century,” Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts, v. 31, 1933, pp. 42–44. Wiet correctly identified it as a tombstone and offered two possibilities for the artisan’s name: Abu’l-Qâsim al-Jarrûr or Abu’l-Qâsim al-Harrâni (op. cit., no. 21, pp. 26–27, pl. 9; RCEA, no. 3094). Anthony Welch published the texts of the inscriptions on this tombstone based on the readings of R. P. Motahebed, who identified the artisan, Abu’l-Qâsim al-Kharrât, as the deceased, ʿUmar ibn Qâsim al-Harrâni,” by misreading the word preceding the name, ʿanâl (“the work of”), as ʿUmar (Welch, op. cit., no. 38, pp. 108–09). This artisan’s name is also found on a tombstone in the Masjid-i Jâmi in Abrandâbâd, in the vicinity of Yazd, which carries the same date as the tombstone in the Museum of Fine Arts: Muḥarram 533/8 September–7 October 1138 (Afshar, Yadgar-i Yazd, v. 2, pp. 47–48, 931, no. 3/1. All previous studies on the tombstone in the Museum of Fine Arts have neglected to mention that the inscription within the central frame containing the name of the deceased has been completely effaced.

31. Los Angeles County Museum of Art no. M.73.7.1; Pal, op. cit., pp. 179, 177, no. 353. This mibrab has previously been identified as a tombstone. It is unquestionably a mibrab since the inscriptions on it are entirely Qur’anic in content and it also has the takbir (the exclamation Allâhu akbar, “God is most great!”) engraved on it. The takbir is commonly used on mihbrabs of the Yazd area but is never found on tombstones. The Qur’anic verses on this tombstone, starting from the outermost panel, are 10:62–64, 9:21–22, and 3:18–19. The rectangular field above the arch contains the shahâdah bordered by Qur’ân 112:1–4. Enclosed within the arch is Qur’ân 17:78–79. Although this mibrab is not dated there are tombstones of similar design dating from the third decade of the sixth century A.H. (1135–45), which would indicate that this mibrab also dates from this period. See Afshar, op. cit., v. 1, pp. 76, 484, no. 39/1, dated 533/1138; v. 2, pp. 47–48, 931, no. 3/1, dated 533/1138; and pp. 913–14, 1309, no. 35, dated 538/1143 (in the Seattle Art Museum, no. 44.68); and see Museum of Fine Arts no. 31.711, dated 533/1138 (references in note 30).

33. A bowl attributed to the late tenth century (ibid., pp. 94–95, 111, no. 5) has an inscription repeating the word barakah ("blessing"), in which the same decorative device that is used on the alif-flam of the inscription on the tombstone in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, a three-lobed palmette, is applied to the kāf and ta‘ marbatah. Three-lobed half-palmettes occur on other pieces similarly inscribed (pp. 219, 226, no. 11; pp. 96, 113, no. 14; pp. 218, 225, no. 9; and pp. 219, 226, no. 12).

34. Ibid., pp. 218, 226, no. 10 a–b.

35. Ibid., pp. 219, 226, no. 11.

36. Ibid., pp. 14, 39, no. 40.

37. Ibid., pp. 218, 225, no. 9.
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43. S. Flury and H. Viollet, "Un monument des premiers siècles de l'hégire," Syria, v. 2, 1921, pp. 226–34 and Flury, "La mosquée de Nāyīn," Syria, v. 11, 1930, pp. 43–58. In addition to the similarity in script, many of the carved stucco borders in this mosque are composed of a number of different patterns made up of lozenges (ibid., fig. 6).

44. The earliest extant example of this group was made in 492/1098–99 (Afshar, op. cit., v. 2, pp. 623, 1163, no. 142/5). The most elaborately decorated tombstone in this group is the one dated 533/1138 in the Museum of Fine Arts (see note 30).
Fig. 1. Fragment of an alabaster tombstone, Nishāpur (Iran), second half of the tenth century. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, no. M.73.5.246.
Fig. 2. Reconstruction of the Nishapur tombstone in Los Angeles.
Fig. 3. Alphabet of the inscription on the Nishâpur tombstone in Los Angeles.
Fig. 4. Alabaster tombstone, Nishâpur, tenth century. Metropolitan Museum of Art, no. 34.152.

Fig. 5. Marble(?), tombstone, Nishâpur, tenth century. Museum für Islamische Kunst, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, West Berlin, no. I. 12/61.
Fig. 6. Alabaster tombstone, Nishapur, tenth century. Metropolitan Museum of Art, no. 36.20.27.
Fig. 7. Marble tombstone, region of Yazd (Iran), dated Muharram 533/September-October 1138, signed by Abu'l-Qasim al-Kharrat. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, no. 31.711. 94.2 cm. high, 69.9 cm. wide.
Fig. 8. Marble mihrab, region of Yazd, ca. 530–40/1135–45, signed by 'Ali Ḥmād b. Abu'l-Qāsim al-Kharrat. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, no. M.73.7.1. 76 cm. high, 44 cm. wide, 7 cm thick.
Fig. 9. Bowl with black slip under transparent glaze, Nishapur, tenth century. Diameter 26 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, no. M.68.37.3.

Fig. 10. Bowl with Kufic script in brown slip on dark brown slip under pale green transparent glaze, Nishapur, tenth century. Diameter 23 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, no. M.68.37.5.

Fig. 11. Bowl with yellow, black, and purple slip under lead glaze, Nishapur, tenth century. Diameter 18 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, no. M.73.5.239.

Fig. 12. Bowl with white and brown slip under transparent glaze, Samarkand, tenth century. Diameter 22 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, no. M.73.5.295.
FIG. 13. Drawing of a section of inscription frieze in carved stone (Qur'an 5:10, Majid Jamā'ī, 'Nūr, ca. 960. After Viollet and Puzy.)
BOOK REVIEWS


Shinzö: Hachiman Imagery and Its Development is the first monograph written in English on Shinto sculpture. Christine Guth Kanda introduces the Western reader to the problems of the long-neglected field of Shinto art by focusing on the Hachiman cult and its imagery. The appearance of the Shinto god Hachiman, commonly represented in the guise of a Buddhist monk with shaven head, underlines the syncretic nature of Shinto art and the importance of Buddhism in its formation. Kanda makes the point, however, that we can understand these works only by exploring the strands of native beliefs, commonly termed Shinto, that lie at their core. The multifaceted approach taken by Kanda in this book, which is a revision of her Ph.D. dissertation (Harvard, 1976), introduces the reader to the methodologies of such eminent Japanese scholars as Naomi Oka, Shuichi Murayama, and Haruki Kageyama.

Kanda divides her monograph into two parts. Part I provides a general introduction to Shinto imagery and places the Hachiman cult in its chronological context. The four chapters in this section survey Japanese attitudes toward the kami (Shinto gods), the rise of anthropomorphic images, the two main types of iconography (courtly and synthetic, or Buddhist), the formal development of Shinto wood sculpture, patronage, and devotional practices. A discussion of the Hachiman cult at Usa Shrine, Todai-ji, Iwashimizu Shrine, and Tsurugaoka Shrine provides background for the later examination of specific cult objects.

Part II focuses on three important works of the Hachiman cult: a Hachiman triad in To-ji, another triad in Yakushi-ji, and a single statue in Todai-ji. Using these three case studies Kanda discusses the development of Shinto wood sculptural techniques and styles from the ninth through the thirteenth century. The To-ji triad represents wood-core lacquer-style statues of the early Heian period, the Todai-ji image, dated and signed by Kaikei, exemplifies the naturalistic joined-wood style of the Kii school in the early Kamakura period. Many other sculptures from the Buddhist and Shinto traditions are also cited to clarify stylistic and iconographic points. The figures provide a wealth of material for reference that is difficult to find otherwise.

Although Kanda’s broadly based survey in Part I is especially useful as an introduction to the subject, more detailed examination of certain problems included here still remains to be done. For example, Kanda discusses the origins of Shinto sculpture and classifies the earliest images into two broad types: courtly and syncretic (or Buddhist). Both appear in early Hachiman triads, which are comprised of one male deity dressed as a Buddhist monk and two female deities appearing in courtly garb, and it would be useful to seek the sources of these iconographies. Hachiman, as Kanda notes, was probably not the only Shinto deity to be represented as a Buddhist monk. What do we know about some of the other early wood sculptures of Buddhist deities, such as Jizo and Monju, who also appear as monks? Are there grounds for believing that some of these figures, which appear outwardly as Bodhisattvas, were actually Shinto deities underneath? In his book on Shinto sculpture Naomi Oka repeatedly points out that the earliest Shinto sculptures appear to be linked to shrines associated with immigrant clans and that the images themselves may be tied to ancestor worship. Ongoing research on folk traditions in China and especially Korea may uncover possible sources of influence for these early life-sized wooden court-style Shinto images.

A dearth of documentation and a lack of comparative materials stand as formidable barriers against establishing a precise chronology for Shinto sculpture. We can see this in the problems associated with the dating of the two Hachiman triads discussed in Part II. Although a consensus of Japanese scholarly opinion dates both the To-ji and Yakushi-ji triads to the ninth century, these two sets of images exhibit great differences in scale, technique, and style. The To-ji triad seems consistent with other mid-ninth century wood sculpture. The problem lies with accepting a late-ninth century date for the Yakushi-ji images. Oka, the leading authority on Shinto sculpture, attributes this triad to the late tenth or early eleventh century based on his reading of pertinent documents and stylistic comparisons. Kanda, finding that the documentary evidence does not fully support either opinion, assigns this triad to the early tenth century. Her view that this triad inaugurates the wood-style statuary of the late Heian period, however, suggests that Oka’s later dating may have validity.

Kanda’s monograph on Shinto sculpture falls squarely within a newly developing trend in Western scholarship on Japanese religion and religious art. For many years scholars have tended to emphasize the continental Buddhist tradition, while neglecting the contributions of nature religious developments. Recently, however, scholars have begun placing more emphasis on the indigenous aspects of the Japanese religious tradition, specifically including the intermingling of the great tradition of Buddhism with native Japanese beliefs. The two go hand in hand and must be considered together. Studies on Japanese folk religion, the honji suijaku theory, and shugendo make up an important part of this trend. So, too, do studies on Shinto art. Shinzo: Hachiman Imagery and Its Development, complementing Kanda’s other work in the field of Shinto art, makes an important contribution to the body of research that is leading towards a clearer picture of the early development of Japanese religious beliefs and a more penetrating analysis of the most definite statement of these beliefs, the visual arts.

BRUCE DARLING


So long has Surkh Kotal held a prominent position in Central Asian archaeology, history, and linguistics that the final report
on the excavation of the temple and its precinct offers few fresh insights, only some more detailed descriptions than hitherto available. Indeed, its appearance now, more than a decade after the death of the director of the excavations and five years after the death of the architect Le Berre, is owing chiefly to efforts of a younger colleague, Gérard Fussman, who worked at the site only during the last two of the sixteen seasons. It is owing as well to D.A.F.A.'s commendable commitment to the publication of all its field work. Fussman has gathered together the loose ends, and most important, has published the customarily excellent architectural plans and drawing of M. Le Berre at adequate scale. The Delegation is to be praised as well for its return to a large format, permitting it to dispense with envelopes stuffed with awkwardly folded plans. These present volumes represent archaeological publishing at its highest standard today.

Schlumberger was one of the last great Asian archaeologists who was a thinker before a practitioner. In his thoughtful and respectful introduction, Fussman has acknowledged some of the shortcomings in the Surkh Kotal archaeological record. Some of these were the result of inadequate staff and funding for work at a site which, in the 1950s, was remote from even the basic necessities of life. But another part reflects, I believe, Schlumberger's position within the humanist tradition that placed greater emphasis on discovery and interpretation than upon some of the more nagging aspects of recording. Most of what Schlumberger would have written in his final report of the excavations at Surkh Kotal, conducted between 1952 and 1963, is contained in his detailed preliminary reports, which appeared in the Journal Asiatique (bibliography in text volume, page viii). And I concur with Fussman (p. 5) that we may accept as Schlumberger's synthetical final statement on the art historical significance of Surkh Kotal his "Descendants non-méditerranéens de l'art grec" (Syria, v. 37, 1960), a study which with precision, brilliance, and deep intuition brought to a sudden, decisive end decades of speculation on "the problem of Hellenism in Bactria and India," to quote the author's own words. His conclusions were all the more remarkable for having been made before the discovery of the Hellenistic city of Ay Khanum on the Amu Darya, and other Kushan sites in Turkestan and northern Afghanistan.

The present text volume is based in part on Schlumberger's notes, short descriptions of the excavated structures, and field notebooks and logs of Le Berre and other participants, inevitably of varying exactitude. No major attempt at elaboration of these records is made and this decision is both honest and wise. Fussman's own substantial contributions are clearly identified, and in addition to descriptive chapters concerned with aspects of the excavations for which there were no, or inadequate, notes, he has contributed a valuable chapter on the interpretation of the site and its position in the Indo-Iranian world of the first and second centuries. This arrangement is essentially the plan adopted in the posthumous publication of Schlumberger's earlier excavations at Lashkari Bazar (MDFAE, v. 18, 1976), and presumably the same plan will be followed in the publication of the Surkh Kotal surveys and excavations not included in the present volumes: the small fort, the investigations in the plain below the sanctuary ridge, minor exploratory excavations of the secular structures adjacent to the temple on the ridge top, and surveys in the immediate region. Almost no archaeological excavation is completed in detail, and it is surely the most singular fault of the Surkh Kotal excavations that comparatively little of the ridge-top community (if that is indeed what it was) was cleared. While temples and palaces are by far the most exciting structures to unearth, they almost always lack the data necessary to place them in their immediate social contexts. But these questions anticipate further final reports which may alter current judgment.

Because of the nature of this report, its catalogue and summary of what remained to be reported, and summary recapitulation of what had already been published, it has an insufficiency which can be compensated for only by familiarity with the extensive site literature. It would, therefore, have been useful to include a full bibliography of the scores of articles published since 1952 on Surkh Kotal. That this has been done selectively for the inscriptions (pp. 132f.) certainly reflects Fussman's own linguistic interests. While most of the inscriptions have been extensively published and analysed by many philologists in dozens of journals, references to many of which are cited, it would have been appropriate to include transcriptions of the inscriptions here, even though the photograph of SK 4M, "the great inscription" (plate 71), is fairly clear. These texts belong here, for, most of all, they are an essential part of a final publication.

The sculptural fragments, of stone and mud, in relief and in the round, are fully published for the first time, and this is an important contribution. We can see at last the full range of objects that contributed to the formation of Schlumberger's theories concerning the inheritors of Greek art in the East.

The final chapter is concerned with the basic function of the structures at the site, particularly the ambiguous Temple A, the largest architectural complex. Schlumberger maintained to the end that this monumental structure was a fire temple, even if it did embody elements of a cult sanctuary, and Schlumberger's intuitions have always been keen. While it is unlikely that we shall ever certainly know the true nature or function of this building, Fussman's arguments against its identification as a fire temple are persuasive, even though these alternative interpretations are in themselves necessarily ambiguous and uncertain.

Schlumberger had a remarkable career in archaeology, and all his excavations were conducted at remote sites under taxing physical conditions. At Qaṣr al-Hāyjr al-Gharbī, in the Syrian desert, water had to be brought from Palmira in skins on camelback. Yet he found there a precious hoard of Umayyad carved stucco and wall paintings. At the eleventh-century Ghaznavid palaces at Lashkari Bazar in southwestern Afghanistan, before the amenities of the nearby community of Lashkar Gah existed, he again discovered wall paintings and carved stuccos. At Surkh Kotal, besides the numerous manifestations of Hellenized Kushan art, he found substantial texts in a language previously known only from short coin legends. He was always an archaeological pioneer. His contribution to the discovery and preservation of Afghan historical patrimony exceeded that of any other foreigner, and his vision remains in those who had the great good fortune to study and work with him.

This posthumous work on Surkh Kotal is not a final report in the traditional sense, but it is likely a final statement on the long project and is important for that reason. It can serve only as a starting point for anyone wishing to study the site. It stands as well as testimony, though elegantly attired, to archaeological projects left unfinished by those most critically concerned with their results.

WILLIAM TROUSDALE

Oleg Grabar has set out to answer two fundamental questions about the Maqamat of al-Hariri: Why was this text, which is notable for its verbal and graphic playfulness rather than for narrative qualities, illustrated at all? And how did the painters go about illustrating for such a text?

It must be said at the outset that the effectiveness of Grabar’s analysis is seriously undermined—and its evaluation hampered—by the illustrative apparatus provided. The laudable decision to reproduce all 722 miniatures from eleven manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (plus one miniature from a later manuscript in Şan’a’) dictated the use of microfiche: although few scholars have private microfiche readers, the inconvenience of relying on library equipment should have been more than compensated for by the sheer quantity of material made available at a reasonable price.

It is disappointing, then, that a further decision was made to publish the reproductions entirely in black and white; it surely would have been preferable to use color, as was done for the Edinburgh fragment of the Ja’il al-tawārikh, even though it might have meant a higher price. Still, even black-and-white documentation would have been acceptable had the reproductions not been so poor and dark that they are frequently illegible (for example 4G9, 5A6, and 5D1–2, all from British Library Or. 9718). This criticism is particularly applicable to just those manuscripts that have been least accessible, the ones in Leningrad and Istanbul. That some miniatures are in bad condition or have been tampered with does not account for the problem; to cite only a few instances, 1D11 and 6C8, from the Leningrad copy, have been published in excellent color plates in Richard Ettinghausen’s Arab Painting, and 2F1, from the Istanbul copy, has been reproduced more clearly in black and white in Grabar’s own earlier article in Ars Orientalis, volume 5. Other reproductions are out of focus (8F9, from Vienna Nationalbibliothek A.F. 9) or mislabeled, like 1A9 and 1A12. It is unfortunate that, quite apart from obvious difficulties in identifying the pictorial elements discussed by the author, scholars must continue to rely for other purposes on materials published incompletely and unevenly elsewhere.

Grabar’s study of the Maqamat had its genesis in a seminar conducted by Kurt Weitzmann at Princeton University in 1951–52, and concerns related to Byzantine and Western manuscript traditions have determined the starting point and to a considerable extent the direction of the analysis here: the search for “types” and “models” that might define a coherent set of choices for the illustration of a given text, in this instance the Maqamat. At the same time the author has rejected “classical art historical methods,” with two main exceptions: technical iconographic investigations of the sort common to the study of mediæval Christian art, and limited use of composition as an analytical device. He has thus largely excluded from consideration the findings of his predecessors, particularly those related to the provenience and stylistic interrelations of the manuscripts under discussion, preferring to admit on those points only “vital statistics”: colophons, inscriptions, and other evidence extraneous to the miniatures themselves. In this way, he has sought to free himself from the constraints of tracing chronological development and defining regional characteristics, which have traditionally shaped studies of Islamic painting.

The method Grabar has adopted instead involves an essentially ahistorical analysis of the thematic and iconographic aspects of the miniatures along three distinct dimensions, the first of which is the degree to which the miniatures depend upon the text. He summarizes the narrative of each of the fifty maqamat in turn, indicating which moments have been illustrated in each manuscript, commenting on the accuracy of each miniature in relation to the text, and providing a detailed explanation of the iconographic features present. This analysis serves, on one hand, to confirm a point already widely recognized: that, because the text is inherently resistant to visual interpretation, the paintings are to a considerable degree independent of it. Much more original, on the other hand, is the discovery, which could have emerged only from such an analysis, that there was no common program for illustrating the Maqamat, that the painters of each manuscript made individual choices about subjects for illustration.

Having established that most aspects of the paintings cannot be explained by the text alone, Grabar turns to a search for “types,” defined by such details as costume, pose, position, and attribute, that would provide the reader with consistent means for visual identification. The analysis here is geared to specific categories, not necessarily mutually exclusive but chosen for their relevance to the text: representation of the protagonist, Abū Zayd; of the narrator, al-Hariri; of crowds; of women, children, and youths; of power and authority; of natural and man-made settings; and of “actions” such as speaking and eating. He concludes that, though some devices seem to have been preferred by illustrators of particular manuscripts, they did not reach beyond the level of prototypes. It is in this section that the reader begins to experience some discomfort with the method of analysis adopted. For example, a survey of the illustrations suggests that categories such as “representation of economic life” or “kinds of social gathering” might provide more sensitive tools for approaching the questions posed at the beginning of the book, but such categories would lead the investigation away from “types” in the technical sense adopted by the author.

In the third section the unit of analysis is the individual manuscript taken as a whole; Grabar argues with considerable sophistication that, though the illustrative program of each manuscript is independent, both of the others and of any clearly established typology, all are nevertheless dependent upon models. In his view, the Leningrad and Istanbul manuscripts must be considered “earliest” in that they belong to a “key set” the models for which cannot be demonstrated to be earlier copies of the Maqamat. This key set, in which he also includes the more idiosyncratic copy by al-Wāṣiṭī, is characterized by emphasis on highly developed architectural settings, manipulation of crowds, a usually clear relation to the text, and little interest in animals or natural settings. All the other known manuscripts can be defined in relation to this key set, which belongs to the first half of the thirteenth century.

At this point Grabar admits concrete historical considerations into his argument for the first time, refocusing his search for “types” to encompass thirteenth-century manuscript painting in general. He finds that the settings and compositions of the Leningrad and Istanbul manuscripts are largely formulaic, based on general Mediterranean traditions rooted in Antiquity. For certain images he suggests more specific sources—the princely cycle, the shadow theater, “fantastic” literature, technical manuals, Christian illustrations, and ceramic figurines—some of which the reader may find more convincing than others. There can be no doubt, however, about his most striking conclusion: that most elements in the miniatures are
inventions, inspired by the thirteenth-century painter's observation of the world, rather than by prior models. Furthermore, he notes that the field of observation was defined by those aspects of the world that engaged the "Arab bourgeois male"—to the exclusion, for example, of raw nature, women, the military, and foreigners.

Grabar then returns to the two questions posed initially. He concludes, first, that the Maqâmât was illustrated because, in the Near East in the second half of the twelfth century, there had been a change of taste in favor of images and representations; such representations were not dictated by the text but were simply imposed on it, probably by bookmakers aiming at an "Arab bourgeois" market. This explanation begs the question, however, for it is precisely this new popularity of images that must be explained if the illustration of the Maqâmât is finally to be understood. Unfortunately, the author does not deal with this issue, perhaps because his method of analysis is, by itself, too blunt an instrument for the purpose. Indeed, an approach confined to the relation between illustrations and text is perhaps least revealing when that relation is most attenuated.

Grabar's answer to the second question, that images were partly drawn from preexisting models and partly invented, seems equally unsatisfying. One reason may be that he has devoted little attention to the professional milieu in which the Maqâmât came to be illustrated. He comments in one place (p. 19) that "painter and copyist were probably the same in most instances"; here he has clearly been influenced by al-Wâṣîtî's colophon, in which it is stated explicitly that both copying and illustrations were completed by him in 634/1237. Yet in connection with this same manuscript Grabar remarks (p. 21), after one of his few ventures into "stylistic" analysis, that ateliers may have "functioned in such a way that the planning and execution of certain miniatures could if necessary be entrusted to more than one individual." Furthermore, it is implicit in his observations on the interests of the "Arab bourgeois" and the rarity of motifs drawn from the princely cycle that the manuscripts in the key set were not illustrated in court workshops. It could in fact be argued that, in a civilization in which illustration of religious books was precluded and a period in which the evidence suggests there were no courtly or institutional scripторia, even for copying the Qur'an, there was no arena in which the kind of typologies Grabar is seeking could have developed. Whether thirteenth-century manuscripts were illustrated in commercial workshops or by artist-scribes individually commissioned, the question remains: to the extent that landscape and other elements were drawn from earlier traditions observable in Christian art, by what means were these traditions made available? Did bookshops, public libraries, and private collections contain quantities of illustrated Christian books, and did artists have free access to them? Did they thus accumulate sketches to be worked up subsequently into compositions reflecting their individual skills and predilections?

As for the other factor in the equation, the patrons, were they simply passive targets for the marketing strategies of the bookmakers, as Grabar seems to imply, or did they play a more active role in determining the nature of illustrations? He has demonstrated convincingly that artists continued to flourish after the Mongol invasions in the thirteenth century. Could the puzzling failure of the fashion for images to "take root" be explained instead by the disruption of the expansive mercantile class to whose tastes it had appealed?

The Illustrations of the Maqâmât is a thorough and illuminating examination of one aspect of this complex subject: the relation of the illustrations to the text. It is all the more valuable because this relation has too often remained unexplored in studies of Islamic manuscript painting. As for the two more general questions that inspired this study, satisfying answers must await more broadly based investigation, in which a varied array of method can be brought to bear.

**Estelle Whelan**

_Persian Lustre Ware._ By Oliver Watson. 207 pp. (numbered to 209), 148 figures, 16 color plates, 3 appendices, bibliography. London: Faber and Faber, 1985. £40.00.

Collectors, connoisseurs, and scholars have long admired the virtuosity and sophistication of Iranian luster-painted ceramics. But up until now they have been limited to brief descriptions in such classic works as Arthur Lane's surveys of Islamic ceramics.1 Oliver Watson's new monograph, _Persian Lustre Ware_, provides a sober and detailed study of this luxury ware, which flourished in Iran from the late twelfth to the mid-fourteenth centuries.

In the first three chapters of introductory material, Watson describes the ceramic background and outlines the intricate process of production. The expensive materials and involved manufacture used suggest that production was limited to a few sites, and Watson argues, correctly in my view, that the only site for which production can clearly be established is Kâshâñ. The middle chapters (5–8) treat the major stylistic types. Luster vessels and tiles fall into two chronological groups separated by the Mongol invasion. Watson discusses each of the three pre-Mongol styles (the monumental style, the miniature style, as he calls them, and the Kâshâñ style, which was brilliantly delineated by Richard Ettinghausen some fifty years ago). He then treats the Ilkhanid wares.

From styles the author turns to types of objects. He devotes a short chapter to the enigmatic figures produced in the pre-Mongol period and then moves to a lengthy discussion of the three types of tiles: those with niches, used either as mihrabs or tombstones; friezes; and star-and-cross tiles. Watson uses the decoration of the tiles to help explain their function. The tiles carry two kinds of inscriptions: Qur'anic excerpts or verses, including quotations and paraphrases of epic poetry. These inscriptions often have no direct relationship with the images on the tiles. For example, verses on the pain of separation from the beloved often accompany images from the "princely cycle." To explain the divergence between text and image, Watson examines the context in which the tiles were used. Almost all he argues, were found in tombs for Shi'ites, and he suggests that text and image offered mystical allegories to contemporary Shi'ites, many of whom were Sâfs.

Luster production virtually stopped in the mid-fourteenth century, and Watson's last chapter deals with the few pieces produced since then. Three appendices—listing luster potters and their works, buildings decorated with luster tiles, and dated pieces—complete the text.

This book is a solid, competent manual, clearly written, well illustrated, and soundly documented. I disagree with the author only in his interpretation of luster tiles, since not all buildings with luster tiles were Shi'ite tombs. Luster tiles also exist in the town of Sarab, situated halfway between Tabriz and Ardabil in eastern Azarbajan. The shabistân (night mosque) of the congregational mosque there contains fragments from a
mihrab with a luster framing band and turquoise-glazed niche and spandrels. Other fragments of luster frieze tiles decorated with birds, reportedly from the same mihrab, now decorate the nearby Masjid-i Uch Guzali (Mosque of the Three Springs). 2

Unfortunately the name of the patron has been destroyed, but on stylistic grounds the fragments can be attributed to the early fourteenth century. Although the fragments were probably reused in both buildings, it is unlikely that they originally came from a Shi'ite tomb, for a contemporary geographer, Hamd Allah Mustaufi Qazvini, tells us that the townspeople were Sunnis. 3

Moreover 'Abd al-Šamad, the Suhrawardiyya shaykh buried at Naṭanz, where luster tiles once lined his tomb chamber, was not a Shi'ite. His disciple, ʿIzz al-Din Maḥmūd Kāshānī, wrote a treatise while residing at Naṭanz. Its description of the traditions and duties of fasting and prayer show that he was a Sunni who adhered to the Shāfi'i school of law. 4 ʿIzz al-Din, incidentally, was the brother of the luster potter Yusuf b. ʿAli, the last known member of the Abu Tāhir family of potters.

Watson was misled by the phrase “ʿAli is the friend of God,” found on the facade of the Kānahqāv of ʿAbd al-Šamad at Naṭanz. Interpreting the phrase as the Shi'ite profession of faith, he assumed that it showed ʿAbd al-Šamad and his order to have been Shi'ites. Instead, it was part of a general veneration of the Prophet’s family by contemporary Shi'is. Like his Suhrawardiyya counterpart, the most famous Kubraviyya shaykh of the day, ʿAla’ al-Din Simnānī, was a Sunni Muslim who venerated the Prophet’s family. Another order, the Safaviyya, flirted with Shi'ism at this time before embracing it later. 5

Texts mention that other tombs, such as the one built for Sultan Ulijaytī at Sulzānāyī, also had luster tiles. Abu’l-Qasim al-Kāshānī (author of the sole surviving description of pottery making and yet another brother of ʿIzz al-Din, mystic at Naṭanz, and Yusuf, luster potter) says that the doors and walls of this tomb were studded with gold, pearls, and gems. 6 Pietro della Valle describes the walls as enriched with gold and embellished with fine porcelain, and Friedrich Sarre collected fragments of luster star tiles from the local inhabitants at the end of the nineteenth century. 7

These abandoned tombs made ideal plunder spots for looters seeking tiles around the turn of the century, and it is no surprise that most of them were stripped of their furnishings. Shi'ite shrines, in contrast, are still venerated in present day Iran and have guardians to protect their furnishings from theft. Thus the preservation of tiles in Shi'ite shrines is an accident of survival and not an accurate reflection of mediaeval patronage. Excavation of sites such as the Ikhānād palace at Takht-i Sulaymān shows that the use of luster tiles was more widespread than Watson suggests.

To fully understand the taste for luster in the mediaeval period we must further examine the types of people who ordered it. For this, and for other questions about lusterware, Persian Luster Ware gives us a firm foundation on which to build.

Notes


Sheila Blair


The second volume of final reports on the excavation of Siraf, the trading port on the Persian shore of the Gulf, appears five years after the first (reviewed in Ars Orientalis, v. 13). It is largely catalogues, appendices, indexes, and a concordance (for the coins), and is hence a sober work—the short contribution on “The Mint of Kangān” by Siraf’s excavator, David Whitehouse, is its dramatic high point.

The drama of the coins lies in the story they tell even to a nonspecialist, while their significance for the archaeology of the site is, of course, their stratigraphic context. The story is that of an entwined story with the entire civilized world: there are coins from the Byzantine Empire, the Spanish Umayyad Caliphate, and China, as well as hundreds of Persian coins from fifteen dynasties. 1 The impressive bulk of lead coins may pass unnoticed in this company because nearly all of them are illegible, but they reflect Siraf’s inland trade with south Persia and Baluchistan, where lead was mined and smelted. 2

The archaeological significance of the coins—the context in which they were found and the architecture and artifacts they provide dates for—naturally receives little emphasis here. These matters belong in other sections of the series of reports (fifteen further volumes are projected). But it is becoming difficult to reconcile the description of coin finds and their contexts among the three sources so far available: Siraf III: The Congregational Mosque and other mosques from the ninth to the twelfth centuries; Siraf XV; and the interim reports in Iran. The coins from the highly important fill of the platform on which the Great Mosque was built are of the greatest general interest, since the fill provides evidence for the sequence of development of ninth-century Mesopotamian pottery. It is thus startling to read that silver coins of the Buyid period (minted as late as A.D. 1048) were found in this deposit (p. 5), the more so as there seems to be no mention of them in Siraf III. One must follow out the reference to the interim report of 1970 to find that these coins were found in the fill
under the extension to the mosque (“A cache of seven coins, concealed before the extension was built”). In the volume on the Great Mosque, however, the extension was dated to the first half of the ninth century on the basis of earlier coins (Sīrāf III, p. 19), though admittedly without proof that it could have been built later (ibid., p. 9). No doubt this confusion can be cleared up easily and will prove to be unconnected with the dating of the fill of the original mosque platform (the really important deposit), but it is distressing nonetheless, and it is disappointing that one cannot dispense with the interim reports even while reading the final ones.

Among the monumental inscriptions, a fragmentary stone tablet recording unspecified construction, probably on the mosque, carries the greatest historical interest. Although it dates from the second half of the twelfth century on epigraphic grounds, the amir whose work it commemorates was probably a descendent of the Bayyid family, which had lost power in Fars a century before. The inscription thus testifies to the tendency of powerful families to retain local power whether they were involved in the larger politics of the region or not. As they were patrons and members of the cultured elite it is of considerable interest simply to identify these people, even if their personal taste cannot be specified yet. There is much work still to be done in matching objects with their owners; perhaps someone can identify a piece of metalwork that belonged to this Abāl-Ma‘ālī Kāmūr b. Hāzarāsh b. Kāmūr.[1]

If only because of the value of this sort of evidence it is a shame that more funerary inscriptions referring to Sīrāf’s monied residents do not survive. Among the 64 funerary inscriptions recorded here few indicative names survive (though no. 14 includes another Daylamite name, and there are interesting possibilities in others). Still, this class of inscriptions includes the material that is most interesting visually: the inscribed grave covers (a term it is gratifying to see used here in place of the more common but inaccurate “sarcophagus” or “cenotaph”). Contemporary grave covers in the same general form (a crested block suggesting an actual sarcophagus, called ʿundīq, or “chest” in Persian) are found from Ghazni to Morocco, and there is some good calligraphic stonecutting in the Sīrāf examples. But the same form of grave cover occurs at Sīrāf in stucco as well, and I wonder whether in this part of the world carved stone is only stucco in another medium.

Sīrāf XIV is thus another tool for the understanding of the site, while the synthesis of architecture and small finds one expects in a final report awaits publication.

Notes

1. The 59 Chinese coins may be compared with the 54 Chinese coins, covering the same span of time, recovered at Qal‘at al-Bahrain, where they comprise over four-fifths of the total coin finds: Arlette Negre, “Coins found at Qal‘at al-Bahrain,” in Monik Kervran, Arlette Negre, and Michele Pirazzoli t’Serstevens, Fouilles à Qal‘at al-Bahrain: Ière partie (1977–1979), Bahrain, 1982.


Terry Allen


Waqf (deeds of endowment) of the reign of the Mamlûk sultan Qā‘īt Bay (r. 872–901/1468–96) have already been the subject of scholarly attention for the descriptions of architecture they contain. Mona Zakarya has chosen for her study two documents of this period containing architectural descriptions of the same general sort: a detailed bill of sale and an act of exchange of property. Both were written by appraisers who describe the palaces in question room by room, as part of comprehensive tours of inspection. Removable parts of the decoration (wooden ceilings, marble revetment) are described, but so are the valuable parts of the structures themselves (squared stone walls, granite door sills). The documents are thus fascinating inventories of the decoration of these lost buildings, but also valuable evidence for the way in which experienced appraisers saw them.

Each description is given its own chapter, as they vary somewhat in style. The first text is more detailed than the second, but both emphasize materials, techniques, and (implicitly) market value, rather than style or quality of workmanship. The appraisals are descended from the Ayyūbid bills of sale preserved in the Cairo Geniza and published by S. Gotein, which Zakarya does not cite. To the reader acquainted with the considerable quantity of later Mamlûk architecture (most religious, to be sure) the two palaces will seem tantalizingly familiar, and one expects the author to deal with this evidence on its own terms: to identify the materials and techniques mentioned in the texts by comparisons with extant buildings, to estimate how the major rooms compare with others of the period, and to try to understand how the interior decoration struck the writers of the appraisals.

Zakarya does not ignore these questions, but neither does she ask the texts directly the questions they seem prepared to answer. Instead she takes the reader through an intelligent but mannered essay in interpretation for each document, laboriously considering every aspect of each building and its description. After presenting each text, almost unannotated, in Arabic script and French translation, she discusses the location of the parcel described (dubious for the first, secure for the second), and the plan of the building. (While the second palace is described in terms that make a reconstruction of the plan feasible, her detailed drawings of the first building are overspecific.) She redescribes each building in her own words, still without much comparison with extant buildings, and follows with a less detailed consideration of the various sorts of rooms mentioned, and their decoration. It is curious that the appraiser of the second building (near the Citadel) entered by the service entrance, which was nevertheless the portal of the building’s main facade, behind which the servants (mamlûks) lodged, and that the formal entry, on the Citadel side, was at the end of an alley. Each of the first two chapters concludes with a generalized synthesis of lesser value (though there are some interesting remarks on p. 84).

The third chapter ascends to a remarkably general level, and is entirely out of place here. There is simply not enough evidence in two descriptions of destroyed buildings to approach “fundamental principles” of architecture such as “Verticality and Horizontality” or “Axes and Symmetry.”

The book concludes with an interesting illustrated glossary, in which the very contemporary examples left aside in the
bulk of the text are employed to explain some of the terms encountered in the documents. It is regrettable that the illustrations are generally not identified. Some of the definitions may be anachronistic: few bibliographic citations are included and the bibliography indicates that the author has employed modern oral sources as well as Mamlük manuscripts. Nevertheless this is as useful a part of the book as any other save the texts themselves.

This book is well written, presents important evidence, and deals explicitly with issues of interpretation that need to be brought to the attention of scholars who wish to use such documents. Its faults stem from the assumption that the descriptions of two unseen buildings are sufficient to support a discussion of all general questions related to architecture, but they are more than offset by the sound judgement of the author and her familiarity with the subject matter. The illustrated glossary, despite its apparent confusion of sources, is a fine idea that deserves to be expanded.

Notes
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Calvin Leonard French, 1934-1986
IN MEMORIAM: CALVIN LEONARD FRENCH

BY RAND CASTILE

Calvin Leonard French, professor of Japanese Art in the Department of the History of Art and member of the Faculty of the Center for Japanese Studies, The University of Michigan, was a determined gardener in Ann Arbor. In his place near the campus he labored over the plantings as faithfully, as competently, as he nurtured his scholarship and that of the numerous graduate students whose work now does him further honor.

Cal died on October 6, 1986. He was fifty-two years old, victim of a cruel disease which outset he survived but one year.

Professor French proved his academic interests early, being graduated from Phillips Exeter the month of his fifteenth birthday, and followed this with the B.A., from Brown University, and B.F.A., from the Rhode Island School of Design, both of which were granted before Cal was twenty.

Military service then took Professor French to Scott Air Force Base in Illinois and, eventually, to Japan where he served first in the Army Education Center at Zama and, finally, at Kanoka Naval Base. An abiding interest in Japanese art and literature was confirmed there as the course for his graduate studies.

Leaving the armed forces in 1956 Cal went around the world in the first of the extensive travel that was to be, he said, both his great pleasure and "primary" education. He returned to the United States in 1957 and entered Columbia University with an East Asian Institute Language Scholarship. Eventually he would receive some twelve scholarships, grants, and fellowships, including those of the Ford Foundation, the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Social Science Research Council, the Metropolitan Center for Far Eastern Art, the Japan Foundation, and, as well, the Horace H. Rackham Faculty Fellowship and Research Grant from The University of Michigan. His Master’s Degree and the Certificate of the East Asian Institute came to him in 1958.

Cal completed his work for the Ph.D. at Columbia University in 1966. He studied also at Waseda University, Tokyo, and lectured widely in the United States, but he was best known here and abroad for his publications and exhibitions.

His doctoral dissertation was on the subject of Shiba Kōkan, and this work he later adapted as Shiba Kōkan: Artist, Innovator, and Pioneer in the Westernization of Japan for publication by Weatherhill Press, New York and Tokyo, 1974. Thoroughly researched and felicitously written this well-presented book is perhaps that with which Professor French is most frequently identified.

The subject—an artist-champion of the foreign in an isolated and wholly homogenous society—appealed to Professor French. This, in some ways, reflected the writer’s own view of himself, for while Cal was a productive and respected scholar in the fine arts, the very origins of this scholarship are found not in the study of painting and sculpture but in the discipline of Japanese literature. The professor most frequently mentioned as influential in his own work by Dr. French was the distinguished Columbia University scholar and translator Donald Keene. The introduction to Professor French's major work on Shiba Kōkan credits his Columbia University mentor thusly: "It was he who introduced me to Far Eastern studies, and from him I received my training."

As early as 1965, Professor French published "Zeami’s Nishiki-gi, A New Translation" for "Drama Survey". He continued this with a contribution to Professor Keene’s Twenty Plays of the Nō Theatre, 1970, and, while a good knowledge of the literature of Japan is an essential tool for the art historian dealing professionally with the country, Cal was unusual among his colleagues in being rooted there. This contributed, no doubt, to the precision of his commentaries, the grace of his lectures, and the splendid access he commanded to the force of subject in Japanese painting and prints.

He was a literatus who turned with perfect ease and understanding to the bunjinga in an important catalogue and exhibition entitled The Poet-Painters: Buson and His Followers, 1974. The exhibition was seen at the University of Michigan Museum of Art, the Seattle Art Museum, and the Asia House Gallery.

The successful exhibition and catalogue point to still another aspect of the work of Professor
French. The project resulted from an intensive seminar at the University. The students in the seminar made important contributions to the catalogue, and they are credited first in their professor’s “Acknowledgements”. That was the way he wanted it to be, for he cared personally for his students and went further than most to ensure their successful completion of studies and their placement upon graduation. Among the many graduate students whose scholarship he nurtured are Stephen Addiss, now of the University of Kansas, Bruce Darling of Tufts University, Maribeth Graybill of the University of California, Berkeley, Melinda Takeuchi of Stanford University, and Michael Browne of Ann Arbor.

Calvin French’s last major work was the 1977 publication and exhibition Through Closed Doors: Western Influence on Japanese Art 1639–1853. This he organized with then-curator of the Namban Museum in Kobe, Tadashi Sugase, and the curator of the Meadow Brook Art Gallery, Kiichi Usui. After Meadow Brook, the exhibition traveled to the Denver Art Museum and the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco.

Active in the College Art Association, for which he served as Chairman of Far Eastern Art Sessions in 1974, Cal French also contributed to the field as a long-time member of the Art Advisory Committee of Japan House Gallery, as a Research Associate, from 1968, of the Freer Gallery of Art, where he had worked with his friend and colleague, the late Harold P. Stern, as a member of the Committee on Museum Exchange of the United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Exchange, and as Visiting Professor of Far Eastern Art at Scripps College in 1985. In the last post he was able to review, again and at his leisure, the collections of two of the distinguished friends he most admired, Peter Drucker and Willard Clark.

Bless the man, and his garden.
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CALVIN LEONARD FRENCH
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KUNIYOSHI'S MINAMOTO RAIKÔ AND THE EARTH SPIDER: DEMONS AND PROTEST IN LATE TOKUGAWA JAPAN

By MELINDA TAKEUCHI

To judge from the paucity of supernatural subjects in the canon of art historical literature in Japanese, one might conclude that the artists of that country rarely depicted ghosts and demons. Japanese art historians view such themes as whimsical curiosities peripheral to the mainstream of “serious” art. A major exhibition of ukiyoé held at the Tokyo National Museum in 1984, for example, included only four works depicting spirits or monsters among the 698 objects on display.1 Recently, however, Western scholars have begun to discover this treasure trove of fascinating material.2 Indeed, the wealth of demonic imagery so vividly portrayed in the legends, paintings, prints, and netsuke of Japan offers a rich source of information about important artistic and cultural issues of its day.

The depiction of supernatural themes reached an apogee during the nineteenth century, an age when artists vied with each other to satisfy the public’s quickened appetite for images of the bizarre and the macabre. In response to the challenge, illustrators turned back into their own cultural past, outwards towards the art of other lands, and inwards to the realm of the imagination.

This article will explore some of the iconographical and political ramifications of supernatural imagery around the middle of the nineteenth century as revealed in the famous triptych by Utagawa Kuniyoshi2 (1797–1861), *Minamoto Raikô and the Earth Spider* (*Minamoto Raikô kôkan tsuchigumo saku yôkai no zu*; Fig. 1 and 2), issued in 1843.3 The array of monsters in the background of Kuniyoshi’s composition comprises a virtual *vade mecum* of East Asian demonology. Where did the artist acquire such a cornucopia of motifs? And what did the images mean? To pursue these questions we will consider Kuniyoshi’s biography and œuvre, sources of his imagery, the cultural context of the supernatural during Kuniyoshi’s times, and historical circumstances at the time of the triptych’s release, *Raikô and the Earth Spider* represents anything but a frivolous array of amusing images. It had considerable meaning to the Edo population at the time of its release; it even became something of a *cause célèbre* in the 1840s. The conception and reception of *Minamoto Raikô and the Earth Spider* also raise the larger issues of government censorship of art, and of social protest by artists at the end of the Tokugawa (or Edo) period (1600–1868).

Kuniyoshi’s Biography and Œuvre

Utagawa Kuniyoshi typified the proverbial “child of Edo” (the *Edokko*). Because his biography has been given in English elsewhere,4 we will concern ourselves here primarily with a general overview of his career, centering our attention upon those aspects relevant to *Minamoto Raikô and the Earth Spider*. Kuniyoshi was born into an artisanal family who lived in Nihombashi, the plebian downtown of the capital known as the *shitamachi* or low city. His father was a dyer of fabrics, and thus as a member of the townsman (or *chônin*) class, the family occupied a low status in the Tokugawa Confucian class system of samurai-farmer-artisan-merchant; in essence the family combined the occupations of the two lowest classes.

Because he showed early promise as a draughtsman, Kuniyoshi was accepted into the studio of Utagawa Toyokuni5 (1769–1825) probably around 1811, at the age of fourteen (by Western count). Kuniyoshi remained there until he was about eighteen and then struck out on his own. Some accounts suggest that there may have been trouble between Toyokuni and Kuniyoshi because of Kuniyoshi’s intractable disposition.5

One contemporary source, the *Mumei-ô zuihitsu*, a compilation of biographies of ukiyoé artists, states that after receiving a few commissions early in his career (more precisely, around the Bunkai era, 1804–18), Kuniyoshi gave up printmaking until late in Bunsei5 (1818–30), when he was awarded a commission to produce a set of *108 Heroes of the Popular Suikoden* (*Tsûzoku suikoden gôketsu hyakuhachinin*; Fig. 3).6

This series, published by Kagaya,7 was begun in 1827, when Kuniyoshi had attained the relatively advanced age (for an unknown artist) of twenty-nine. It was based on the Ming novel *Outlaws of the Marsh* (*Shuihu zhuan*), a work in vernacular Chinese which had been reworked and translated into Japanese by the novelist and poet Takizawa...
Bakin” (1767–1848) in 1805. The novel treated a brotherhood of bandits bound together by superhuman strength, phenomenal accomplishment in the martial arts, and disdain for the constraints of conventional society. These Robin Hoods acted according to their own elaborate code of chivalry. Their dramatically improbable triumphs over corrupt officials or bullies in the government constituted the focus of the action. The theme appealed mightily to the anti-social ethos of the Edo townspeople, just as it had done to their counterparts in Ming China: Edo townspeople were quick to see parallels with their own ongoing battle against a draconian political regime. Kuniyoshi’s larger-than-life heroes earned him an enthusiastic following almost overnight. His illustrations for Suikoden established his reputation in the world of ukiyo-e and demonstrated that his genius and temperament lay in depictions of heroic swashbucklers doing battle with both human and supernatural forces. This subject he exploited with great effect to the very end of his career. By a process typically Japanese, Suikoden was expanded to include a corresponding set of 108 Japanese heroes. The enjoyment of prints glorifying mighty warriors of the past was very likely calculated to annoy and embarrass the emasculated samurai class, whose martial prowess had declined during the long Tokugawa peace to the point that the successor to the fifth shogun Tsunayoshi (1646–1709) could not even hold a military inspection due to the deterioration of the shogunal weaponry. The noble way of the warrior had become an empty cliché by Kuniyoshi’s day.

Kuniyoshi’s own character seems to have been something like that of the warriors he loved to depict. He was described by his contemporaries as being an oyabun—a word used to describe the boss of a gang of toughs. Another source speaks of the braggadocio of his demeanor (dembō hada). He quite literally cut a colorful figure, for he had designs of warriors tattooed all over his body. Indeed, the vogue for full-body tattoos among the townspeople that swept Edo in the late 1820s and 1830s was based on Kuniyoshi’s Suikoden designs. Kuniyoshi may well have been the one to start the fad, which probably was inspired by the vivid descriptions of the tattoos in the original Shuihu zhuan. Tattooing, a custom which had begun with the branding of criminals, was (predictably) discouraged by the Tokugawa government. It became especially popular among the manual laborers whose work required them to expose their bodies. Although it is true that Kuniyoshi frequented circles of practitioners of comic verse, his relatively low position even in Edo townsman society is underscored by the fact that one of his daughters married a fishmonger, and the other, a fortune teller.

Even the most cursory survey of Kuniyoshi’s art reveals a fertile imagination and extraordinary versatility. Although he never assumed its leadership, as one of the prominent artists of the Utagawa School he produced paintings, in addition to designs for prints (including privately published, high-quality commemorative prints known as surimono), and illustrated books. Kuniyoshi incorporated into his works Western techniques, as well as styles taken from Tosa, Rimpia, and Maruyama painting. His eclecticism is typical of late Edo-period art.

This admixture of many styles is evident, for example, in his portrait of Oboshi Yuranosuke Yoshio (Fig. 4), from the series Portraits of Loyal Warriors. It combines the traditional sense of strong design, facility for meticulous detail, empirical observation of a living model, and Western techniques such as foreshortening and shading. The latter is particularly effective in the variety of flesh tones modelling the face, which are not visible in reproduction. The artist employed a muted range of colors, with a dark blue background, yellow breastplate, black outer robe, green formal trousers, and greyish-purple accents. Kuniyoshi has designed an ennobling tribute to Yuranosuke, the leader of the forty-seven masterless samurai whose revenge for the wronging of their lord (he was forced to commit suicide by the government) constituted one of the most important events in Edo cultural history. The event marked one of the few occasions when Tokugawa-period samurai lived up to the townspeople’s image of the ideal warrior. The government, as usual, was cast as the villain.

Few of Kuniyoshi’s works show such tasteful restraint, however. Kuniyoshi was active when the so-called “decadent” style was at its peak. Almost all the literature—in Japanese and in English—treated popular art and culture of the late Edo period parrots the notion that the society was in the final stages of decay (taihaiso). Proliferation in the number of ukiyo-e prints (the sign of healthy finances), sheer technical virtuosity, as well as the vitality and energy of nineteenth-century townsman culture argue against this assessment; farmers and samurai may have been impoverished and demoralized by fiscal and natural misfortunes, but the urban class
on the whole thrived. Whatever the complex reasons for the stylistic change in ukiyo-e, as the nineteenth century dawned the limpid, rarified elegance of Utamaro’s (1754–1806) style gave way to an amplified boldness, the demand for elaboration and the application of brilliant—and to modern eyes, jarring—color. Thanks to new kinds of dyes, prints now could rival paintings in their chromatic intensity. To gratify the new nineteenth-century taste for layered complexity, artists merged unrelated subjects into a single work. This is seen, for example, in the numerous nineteenth-century prints pairing famous actors or courtesans with various stations on the Tōkaidō road, just as noh and kabuki plays had kaleidoscopically brought together events from different historical periods.

Because Kuniyoshi was associated in the public’s mind with portraits of warriors (musha-e), he earned the nickname “Musha-e Kuniyoshi.” The epithet masks his enormous versatility. His interest in depicting demons probably went hand in hand with the genre of warrior prints (since legends often demanded that warriors battle supernatual forces), but Kuniyoshi developed the rendition of monsters into an independent genre. His demons were often the outlet for playful parody, as, for example, in sets like his Bake-mono chūshingura, a depiction of the forty-seven masterless samurai as humorous monsters. In addition to his numerous supernatural images, Kuniyoshi produced many landscapes, which range in style from works heavily influenced by Western art to those that are purely Japanese in theme and presentation. A large body of his work shows a keen sense of humor, a sharp eye for observing the familiar world around him, and a disregard for traditional subject matter: I know of no other Japanese artist, for example, who recorded graffiti. Cats comprise one of Kuniyoshi’s favorite motifs and appear in contexts ranging from monsters, parodies of inmates of the Yoshiwara brisels, and erotica. “Sparrow”-cats, for example, shows Kuniyoshi’s use of cats to symbolize the man-about-town (known as a “sparrow” because of his ubiquitous hopping around) being met at the dock by his kitten courtisan (Fig. 5). Such works fall under the rubric of giga, “playful painting,” which often have strong overtones of social satire, as seen, for example, in the most famous of such works, the Animal Frolic Scroll of the late twelfth century. Other subjects to which Kuniyoshi turned his brush included beautiful women, actors, depictions of the classical poets, historical themes, famous places, flowers, fish and waterlife of all kinds, and miscellaneous sketches. A measure of his success can be gleaned from his productivity: his output has been estimated at fifteen to twenty thousand designs.

Raikō and the Earth Spider: Iconography

The subject of the triptych is one of the legends surrounding Minamoto Yorimitsu (948–1021; Raikō is the Sino-Japanese pronunciation of the characters Yorimitsu). Raikō was a member of the Seiwa Genji branch of the Minamoto, a family known as the “teeth and claws” of the dominant Fujiwara clan. He attained a high rank in the sumptuous court of Fujiwara Michinaga because of his legendary skill in the martial arts. Over the centuries Raikō’s biography became overlain with accounts of miraculous feats against supernatural forces; his deeds were celebrated in genres as varied as the classical Heike monogatari, medieval noh and tale literature, and Edo period kabuki.

The scene Kuniyoshi depicted in Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider (Fig. 1) comes from one of these narrative embellishments, Tale of the Earth Spider (Tsuchigumo sōshi), dating from the Muromachi period (1333–1573). It depicts an episode in which Raikō has been overpowered by the evil magic of the vicious Earth Spider and has fallen into a dream-like trance. He will not be able to recover until his retainers (known as the “Four Guardian Kings,” or Shitenno) have slain the monster.

Raikō, asleep at the right, and his strongsmen are arranged across the foreground in a composition that fills all three sheets. The names of the retainers are identified in cartouches: from right to left are depicted the elegant Urabe Suetake, the fierce Watanabe Tsuna, the formidable Usui Sadamitsu, and the demonic-looking Sakata Kintoki (act. ca. 1000)—who physically resembles traditional depictions of the four guardian kings and is colored red. The Earth Spider and his rabble of fifty hideous creatures compose a dense curtain of tangled forms that erupt across the surface in a dramatic diagonal just behind Raikō and his warriors. The Earth Spider is shown in the act of raising his web to enmesh the slumbering Raikō and drag him into the nether zone. The spider and his diabolical horde are invisible to the retainers. Watanabe Tsuna and Sakata Kintoki while away the time playing go, oblivious to the
menace, while on either side of the competing companions, Urabe Suetake and Usui Sadamitsu sense something disturbing in the air and are straining to detect it. To enhance the sense of unnatural goings-on, the color scheme is especially restrained for *ukiyo* in the 1840s: browns, greys, subtle reds, and flesh-tones are used for the figures of Raikō and the retainers, while the demons in the background are rendered primarily in monochrome. Kuniyoshi heightened their grotesqueness by touching their lips and the insides of their mouths with eerie pink accents.

At first glance, the narrative element in *Raikō and the Earth Spider* seems simple and straightforward: Raikō sleeps, the retainers keep watch, and the demons mass their forces for an attack. In actuality, however, Kuniyoshi has conflated two motifs, the legend of Minamoto Raikō and an ancient theme entitled *The Night Parade of a Hundred Demons* (*hyakkai yakō* or *yagō*). The identification of this iconography appears in a number of nineteenth-century sources, including an entry for 1845 in a compilation of biographies of Utagawa-school artists, the *Ukiyo eshi Utagawa retsuden*.

The kaleidoscopic admixture of unrelated elements in a single work is, as we have seen, one of the hallmarks of the so-called “decadent” style.

No scholar has yet made the connection between the theme of the nocturnal parade of demons and an episode in the Chinese legend of Zhong Kui (known to the Japanese as Shōki), a failed examination candidate of the Tang dynasty (618–906). Zhong Kui committed suicide in frustration and shame, but his continuing story must surely be the origin of the *Night Parade* motif. Zhong Kui’s troubled spirit returned to the court of the Ming-huang emperor (r. 713–756), where he served as a queller of demons and took on a demonic guise himself. One of the central anecdotes of the Zhong Kui legend concerns Zhong Kui’s changing residences by dead of night. *Zhong Kui’s Night Excursion* by Gong Kai (1222–ca. 1304) is a Chinese version of this scene (Fig. 6). The unlikely nocturnal entourage consisted of Zhong Kui’s demons, his sister, his various pets, his household possessions, and a pleasingly abundant supply of wine.

The conception of the nocturnal activities of the hundred demons entered the repertoire of Japanese superstition during the late Heian period. An entry for 1144 in the *Taiki* mentions a sighting of the hundred demons: the Kamakura-period *Shūkaishō* lists unlucky days, ascertained by *yin-yang*, divination, when people were compelled to refrain from going out at night because of the danger of encountering the demon parade.

Kuniyoshi’s demons comprise a motley array of jostling, grimacing, leering monstrosities based on a prodigious number of literary and artistic sources. The artist included humans of distorted and sinister mien, skeletons in partial or total decomposition, composites of animal, vegetable, or utensil-shaped heads on human bodies, and a bestiary comprised of malevolent-looking horses, tigers, frogs, or snakes. Some of the creatures are decidedly phallic in character (Figs. 2–5, 2–6, 2–10, and 2–26).

Many of these monsters can be traced to traditional Japanese sources. A cluster of copies of what is probably a late twelfth-century original depicting various kinds of demonic creatures survives. The most celebrated among these is the so-called *Handsscroll of the Night Parade of a Hundred Demons*, dated to the sixteenth century and once attributed to Tosa Mitsunobu (ca. 1439–1521, Fig. 7). A related version from the Edo period has labels appended to the creatures and thus provides precious clues to the rationale behind the designation of the various categories of such monsters.

Although the demons in this group of traditional representations do not necessarily resemble the physical form of Kuniyoshi’s creatures, they indicate the generic types. Creatures in this category include the hairy flea-faced creature in the central sheet, identified in the Edo-period copy as a “great ant demon” (*ōari yōkai,* Fig. 2–7), the “snail demon” (*katasumuri yōkai,* Fig. 2–21), the bug in court makeup (*shikome,* Fig. 2–17), and the “bird-helmet demon” (*torikabuto no yōkai,* Fig. 2–15). The bird-helmet demon stems from the ancient Japanese belief that tools and utensils transform themselves after a hundred years into animate and often sinister creatures.

This belief helps to explain other demons in Kuniyoshi’s triptych, including the commander’s standard (*umajirushi,* Fig. 2–4), which has sprouted nine skulls, and the various swords and clubs that thrust forward with a seeming life of their own. The creature in the lower left of the central sheet is the “one-eye” (*hitotsume,* Fig. 2–13), a kind of East Asian cyclops, described in the labelled version of the *Night Parade of a Hundred Demons*.

Komatsu Shigemō believes that many of the images in this cluster of so-called *Hundred Demons*
scrolls were originally inspired during the Heian period by the Han dynasty Classic of Mountains and Seas (Shanhai jing⁵).²¹ By the nineteenth century they had become totally assimilated into Japanese folklore. The long-nosed tengu (Fig. 2–6) was originally a Chinese bird-headed demon. Creatures which resemble bird-headed tengu appear in Gong Kai’s Chinese rendition of Zhong Kui’s entourage (Fig. 6). The characters for tengu appear in one of Japan’s earliest historical documents, the eighth-century Chronicles of Japan, which depends totally on the Chinese language.²² by the nineteenth century, however, the tengu too was thoroughly domesticated.

Other of Kuniyoshi’s demons are associated with Buddhist imagery. Indeed, the very theme of Kuniyoshi’s triptych strongly calls to mind renditions of the legend of the attack of Māra, the demon king, upon Shākyamuni, as seen, for example, in the eighth-century Sutra of Past and Present Kārma, one of the earliest surviving depictions of demons in Japan (Fig. 8). In this episode of the Buddha’s biography, just as he reached enlightenment he was set upon by the forces of darkness and ignorance. Grotesque creatures, self-propelled weapons, and natural elements such as fire and wind (the latter in anthropomorphic form as the Wind God) converge upon the meditating figure, in the same way that the Earth Spider’s motley group attempts to engulf Raikō.

Actual demons common to the two works include the elephant (Fig. 2–20), a chicken-headed creature (Fig. 2–29), and one of the Kings of Hell (standing to the lower left of the Buddha in the early sutra, Fig. 2–22).²³ Another Buddhist monster traditionally associated with hell scenes, and also found in Zhong Kui’s Night Excursion (Fig. 6), is the horned oni (Fig. 2–1), who administered sadistic tortures in verbal and pictorial descriptions of the Buddhist hells. In keeping with the nineteenth-century taste for intensification, the face of Kuniyoshi’s oni is painted with designs used in Chinese and Japanese theater to symbolize strength or power. Also Buddhist in inspiration are the skeletons in the central and left-hand sheets (symbols of the transience of earthly existence) and the red-headed transi (Fig. 2–25), a corpse in decomposition, who represents a hungry ghost (gaki) in Japanese, see Fig. 10. To the right of the King of Hell is a haradashi no yōkai or “belly-sticking-out demon” (Fig. 2–19), which presents a disturbing image read either as an unsightly female head with deformed pink gums, surmounted by a smaller feminine head and shoulders, or a small woman with a monstrous face in her belly. This creature may trace its origins to a type of figure with corresponding disfigurations of anatomy depicted in a ninth-century Chinese rendition of Māra’s Attack on the Buddha.²⁴ The Red-Robed Daruma (Fig. 2–24), of course, is the First Patriarch in the pantheon of Zen Buddhism; here his normal grotesqueness has been intensified by the glowering face and the company he has been made to keep. He appears to be inciting the unsavory crowd forward with his whisk. Traditional depictions of emaciated arhats (ascetic disciples of the Buddha) may have inspired the glaring wrath with the beetle brows in the bottom right of the central sheet (Fig. 2–3).

With an ironical touch, Kuniyoshi also included three of Japan’s “Seven Lucky Gods,” Daikoku (Fig. 2–9), Ebisu (Fig. 2–11), and Fukurokuju (Fig. 2–10). These deities have been depicted as anything but lucky, however: Fukurokuju has been furnished with a third eye in the middle of his forehead and an angry expression on his face, Daikoku wields a sword, and Ebisu, although smiling, offers instead of his usual fish (a symbol of his bounty) a tray of skulls. Daikoku appears to have a snake wrapped around his head.

Snakes, toads, and tigers (Fig. 2–23 and 2–14) are traditionally associated with witchcraft or magic. Such animals were considered temporary manifestations of other entities and were thought to be capable of transforming themselves at will. The toad in this context goes back at least as far as the Han dynasty, where it appeared as an attribute of Xiwangmu (Japanese: Seiobo), the Queen Mother of the West. Xiwangmu was believed to have mastered the secrets of immortality by means of her magic powers.²⁵ Toads accompanied Taoist hermits and famous sorcerers as well. Kuniyoshi has invested his snagle-toothed toad with particular maleficence.

Besides calling upon an ancient repertoire of demonography, Kuniyoshi also used images of Edo-period vintage. Lantern demons such as that shown at the top of the left-hand sheet (Fig. 2–16) probably owe their conceptual origin to the “lantern night festivities” of Zhong Kui, but became extremely popular in Japan with the performance of the kabuki play Tokaidō Yotsuya Ghost Tales (Tokaidō yotsuya kaidan). Pride of place among the newly-created demons is given to the skull-topped, long-necked, hideously grinning figure at the top of the central sheet (Fig. 2–8). This is an exotic rokurokubi, one of the “fly-
ing heads” proscribed in a governmental edict of 1808. We will return to this edict below. The most recent newcomer to Japan’s array of phantasmagoria, the rokurokubi was discovered by artists and storytellers in the Wakan sansai zue of 1713 (Fig. 9), a compilation based on the Ming encyclopedia Sancai tuhui. Listed under the section on “Barbarians,” the rokurokubi, inhabitants of the imaginary land called Daishaba, were described as creatures capable of stretching their necks to any length; some species could even detach their heads completely, while the rest of the body slept, to roam nocturnally in search of food. Once it took hold in the popular imagination, the rokurokubi appeared frequently in nineteenth-century ukiyoe, usually clad as courtiers and entertainers.

Some of the images may well be of Kuniyoshi’s own devising. These include the monstrer with the upside-down face in the left-hand sheet (Fig. 2–18) or the creature described in a contemporary diary as a “toothless” (ka no naki, Fig. 2–5).

When we consider the number of sources Kuniyoshi brought together in this triptych, the scope is astonishing. No single modelbook could have provided the artist with such an array of images, and no one legend or cluster of legends can supply a rationale for the appearance of such a diversity of creatures. Does this circumstance represent mere artistic extravagance, or did Kuniyoshi have something specific in mind when he created Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider?

Cultural Context: The Multilayered Associations of the Supernatural in Tokugawa Society

At this juncture of the search for meanings in Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider, it is useful to broaden the discussion to the various functions and implications of the supernatural in Kuniyoshi’s times—to move from iconography (the identification of images) to iconology (their conceptual or symbolic significance). Traditional Japanese took for granted the interpenetration of different realms of existence as a wholly natural phenomenon, a concept central both to Shinto and to Buddhist belief. The Scroll of Hungry Ghosts (Fig. 10), dated to the latter half of the twelfth century, gives graphic visual form to the notion of the intermingling worlds of humans and spirits. Pathetic red-haired figures of starved beings from the Realm of Hungry Ghosts, one of the Six Levels of Existence in Buddhist cosmology, are depicted mingling invisibly with the residents of the Realm of Human Beings, the latter blissfully unaware of their hideous companions. The assumption of the coexistence of different levels of reality in a single place and time is evident in Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider.

The employment of the supernatural as entertainment, however, lies outside the sphere of orthodox religious belief and is tied to the concept of the bakemono, which lies in the gray zone along the border of religion and superstition. The two Chinese characters which make up the compound mean literally the “transformation” (ba is another reading for the character ka) of “things” (mono), that is to say, “things which change their shape.” Yoshida Yūji characterizes the bakemono as follows:

According to modern usage, the word bakemono might properly be translated as “monster” or “hobgoblin;” in an earlier and more general sense, however, it refers to “shape-changes,” and to creatures or objects which have mysteriously assumed (or seemed to assume) forms or a state of animation not normally their own. Thus, it is scarcely surprising to find in Japanese ghost stories and tales of the supernatural, both ancient and modern, a relatively large role played by assorted bakemono, some quaintly whimsical, and others more horrific.

As Yoshida’s discussion reveals, the bakemono was closely linked in the Japanese mind with entertainment. Superstition frequently joined hands with sensationalism, as seen in medieval handscrolls such as the Tales of Ghosts (Fig. 11). In the section reproduced here, a woman is shown roasting chestnuts on a hibachi in a dilapidated mansion at night—the ideal setting for a ghost story. Suddenly a disembodied white hand appears over the edge of the hearth to beg a share of the delicacies. In the interest of a good scare, even benevolent deities could become the subject of narratives devoid of didactic, allegorical, or pious aspects, as seen in the tale, Monster Jizō (Obake jizō). Here the traditional protector of women and children is transformed into a hideous and terrifying creature. Indeed, monstrous or transformed creatures, including inanimate objects, are at the crux of the Japanese enjoyment of the supernatural.

Japanese distinguish between bakemono (also called yōkai), which are demonic creatures, on the one hand, and human ghosts (yūrei), on the other. This distinction has a parallel in Chinese practice, although the Chinese use different terminology: gui for demons, and
shen by for ghosts. In Japan the types of monsters in the former category are said to number in excess of five hundred. Certain animals such as toads, tigers, and snakes, believed capable of transforming themselves into other forms at will—the essence of the bakemono—are also classified into the category of demonic creatures.

Renditions of demonic creatures coincide virtually with the earliest surviving Buddhist painting in Japan and were didactic in nature. The seventh-century Tamamushi Shrine depicted the temptation of Siddhartha in a former incarnation by Indra in the guise of a demon. Human ghosts, however, although popular in pre-Edo Japanese literature—one thinks immediately of the venetous Lady Rokujō in the Tale of Genji—had to wait until the nineteenth century for their hour to arrive in art. Indeed, some of the most spectacular ghosts ever devised by the human imagination appear in Edo ukiyoe and kabuki. Kuniyoshi’s depictions of human ghosts, however, almost never rise above the routine. His single-sheet print showing Oiwa, the deformed spectral heroine of the kabuki play Tōkaidō Yotsuya Ghost Tales, (Fig. 12), for example, simply reproduces Oiwa’s traditional guise on the stage. Kuniyoshi expended very little creative imagination on the image, which is almost indistinguishable from depictions of Oiwa by minor ukiyoe artists of the time, such as one created about ten years earlier by Shunkōsai Hokushû (act. 1808–32). Kuniyoshi evidently viewed the production of the human ghosts of kabuki as a routine matter. Conversely, however, none of Kuniyoshi’s contemporaries could rival his superb renditions of the older type of demonic monsters. These were the natural adjunct of the warrior prints which had so fired his creative imagination. Needless to say, it is the demonic creature (as opposed to human ghost) who populates the background of Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider; the inscription labels these monsters as yōkai.

For reasons that are not entirely clear, there was an enormous upsurge in the popularity of supernatural themes around the beginning of the nineteenth century. This phenomenon is tied to a parallel development on the Chinese mainland slightly earlier. Yuan Mei (1716–97) became widely acclaimed as a writer of ghost stories, and his friend Luo Ping (1733–99) gained fame painting ghosts. The rise of interest in the supernatural in Japan coincided with the proliferation in production of ukiyoe prints (indicative of a mass audience) and with the coming of age of vaudeville theater (yose)—in short, with the heyday of Edo townsman culture. A pronounced taste for the morbid flourished in many guises. The nineteenth century, for example, saw a boom in the number of curiosity shows (misemono) on the dusty streets of Edo, many of which featured gruesome or necrophilic themes. One exhibit in this vein by a certain Izumiya Kichibei featured a wildly successful haunted teahouse. Spurred by the profits, this designer (whose specialty was kabuki stage sets for ghost plays) installed another exhibit displaying mannekins in the postures of those who had met violent deaths—a veritable chamber of horrors (Fig. 13). Shin-e (literally “death pictures”), commemorative ukiyoe prints of celebrated actors issued upon their demise, became the rage. Such prints often showed the actor appearing as a ghost or descending into hell. Popular broadsheets reported all manner of preternatural events and phenomena as if they were actual items of news. The flippant necrophilia of the times is underscored by the appearance of the the great master of supernatural drama, Tsuruya Namboku (1755–1829), on the kabuki stage in his own coffin. A special genre of ghost tale, the kaidan banashi, was purveyed both in vaudeville theaters and in private residences. Hayashiya Shōzō was the most celebrated of such raconteurs. The “Hundred Tales” (Hyaku monogatari) became an institution. Participants would gather by the light of one hundred candles and regale each other with ghost stories. At the conclusion of each tale, one candle would be extinguished until the room was plunged into darkness. A charming rendition by Kuniyoshi’s pupil Kawanabe Gyōsai depicted a family settling in under a quilt for an evening of pleasurable horror.

In trying to reconstruct how the vast array of supernatural beings was perceived by the Edo audience, we would do well to keep in mind at least three factors that impart special complexity to the endeavor: 1) the relation between the intensity of a given belief and the frequency with which it appears in art; 2) conventions of linguistic usage, and 3) evolution of imagery over time.

First, the intensity of belief in certain subjects is not always mirrored in the frequency of their depiction. Hell scenes, for example, numerous during the Kamakura period (1185–1333) when religious evangelism was at a peak, became a rarity in Edo-period art. Their numerical de-
cline, however, does not indicate a corresponding diminution in the belief in hell. On the contrary, the rural imagination continued to burn brightly with notions of diabolical underworlds; populist preachers dilated upon the subject with considerable efficacy. It was upon being taken to hear one such terrifying disquisition as a young child in the countryside, for example, that Hakuin Ekaku$^9$ (1685–1768), the great Zen prelate, decided to become a monk.$^{10}$ Rather than attribute the decreased production of hell scenes in the Edo period to lack of serious belief in the subject, reasons might be sought in the general reduction of the production of orthodox Buddhist paintings. The plethora of demons and ghosts in nineteenth-century Japanese art, by the same token, does not in itself comprise prima facie evidence for a widespread belief in the supernatural.

Second, supernatural imagery was part of everyday parlance employed metaphorically in Japan and China. The Mustard Seed Garden Manual of Painting, a seventeenth century Chinese woodblock printed book that gained currency in Japan in the eighteenth century, for example, cautions budding painters not to allow “demons to gain control of the tip of one’s brush.”$^{11}$ This is an ancient concept in China that goes back at least as far as the Han period to the writings of Huainanzi$^9$ (d. 122 B.C.).$^{12}$ Such conventions persist in the spoken Japanese language today. When, after suffering injury to one’s face, one is said to look like Otwa, the disfigured ghost-heroine in the kabuki play (Fig. 12), it cannot be presumed that the speaker believes in ghosts.

The third point in understanding the reception of the supernatural in nineteenth-century thought is the change in attitudes towards given imagery over time. Oni, the horned demons who wreak havoc on earth as well as administering various tortures in the Buddhist underworld, for example, were considered truly terrifying during the heyday of orthodox Buddhism. By the nineteenth century, however, they appeared in comical roles including gymnasts, meditating monks, debuchers in the Yoshiwara brothel district, and advertisers of stomach-ache medicine.$^{13}$ As the Edo townspeople became more sophisticated and cynical, they became less credulous. Records of supernatural hoaxes perpetrated on the public indicate that in the tough-minded atmosphere of nineteenth-century urban life, as opposed to the rural environment from which Hakuin sprang, manipulation of the supernatural for profit by Kuniyoshi and his contemporaries may have contributed to a fundamentally pragmatic attitude towards it. One might call to mind the incident wherein the illustrious Hiraga Gennai$^9$ (1729–79) and the storyteller Utei Emba$^9$ (1743–1822) painted a magical formula (nembutsu$^9$) on a black calf and exhibited it as a supernatural portent.$^{14}$ The carnival side-show atmosphere that often accompanied the Edo-period experience of the supernatural no doubt brought about a certain degree of de-mystification.

There was at least, however, one agency about whose reception of the supernatural there is no doubt: the officials of the Tokugawa shogunate. This class promoted Chinese Confucianism, which held unflinchingly that since the supernatural was unknowable, people would do better to focus their attention on matters of this world. Echoes of such sentiments can be found in governmental proclamations. Officials of the government claimed the right to curtail any activity potentially deleterious to public morals, and excessive pleasure in supernatural themes evidently fell under this rubric. In 1808 a proclamation was issued banning stories about “flying heads, animal goblins, serpent monsters, fire demons, and accounts of the atrocities and manners of vicious women.”$^{15}$ When we consider the traditional animosity between the government and the townspeople, it is tempting to think that the shogunate’s official disapproval of interest in the supernatural may well have been a major factor in the spread of its popularity.

Thus we see that the implications of the supernatural in nineteenth-century Japan quite exceed the modern Western notions of the word “supernatural”$^{16}$ as “existing or occurring outside the normal experience or knowledge of man.”

The Meaning and Reception of Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider

Few art historians have written about Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider; those who do simply mention in passing that it represents a satire on the Tempo Reforms$^9$ of 1841–43.$^{17}$ No one has made a comprehensive study of the style, iconography, intentions of the artist, or the issue of the relationship between artists, satire, and censorship at the end of the Edo period. The fullest investigations into Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider have been carried out by the historian Minami Kazuo,$^4$ in a Japanese historical journal,
and Suzuki Jūzō, a retired librarian. By combining the fruits of their labors with the other kinds of evidence we have just investigated—biographical, stylistic, and iconographic—we can proceed with a fuller reconstruction of the meaning and reception of this remarkable legacy of Edo townsman culture.

The triptych was released during the Tempō Reforms. These measures, instigated under the senior councillor Mizuno Tadakuni (1794–1851), were devised in response to a widespread series of domestic crises precipitated by a confluence of crop failures, natural disasters, rural unrest, and economic imbalance. In characteristic Confucian fashion, Tadakuni tried to restore economic order by invoking moral order. He instituted a campaign of austerity and frugality. Samurai in particular were warned off luxuries. Sumptuary laws were enforced with a vengeance. Since in Confucian terms the raison d’être of the Edo townsman was to purvey to the needs of the ruling class, when the samurai cut back on their demand for goods and services, the townsman economy suffered deeply. Many townspeople were forced to return to the countryside. Prices were fixed, merchant associations abolished, debts cancelled, and production of luxury items curtailed. Entertainments were contravened; even depictions of actors, prostitutes, and geisha were forbidden. Kuniyoshi himself was fined for violating this proscription by including hidden portraits of actors in a street scene. As a final indignity, shopkeepers were forced to donate money to shogunal coffers. The population at large deeply resented the Tempō Reforms.

There is no documentary evidence definitively establishing the meaning Kuniyoshi intended for his images in Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider. Prior to the release of the triptych, however, precedent had been established for the association of the subject of Raikō with Mizuno Tadakuni, the author of the reforms. An earlier, although undated, illustration in a puppet-play book had already showed one of Raikō’s four retainers with the lagoon crest of Mizuno on his sleeve.

Precedent also existed for the use of the motif of the spider in his web as a metaphor for Tokugawa rule, as a hanging scroll by Ukita Ikkei (1795–1859) suggests (Fig. 15). This delicately beautiful, innocent-looking nature study is entitled The Web of Government. Ikkei was an artist of the Revivalist Yamato-e movement (Fukkō yamato-e), a group which sought to oust the Tokugawa regime and restore the emperor to power.

In addition to the subject of the spider, the draughtsmanship of the demons also supports the suggestion that Kuniyoshi intended the work as a satire. As we have seen in the portrait of Ōboshi Yuranosuke Yoshio (Fig. 4), Kuniyoshi was capable of keenly observed naturalism. At about the same time that he designed Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider, he depicted a number of yōkai monsters in extremely realistic fashion, including the dramatic Takiyasha the Witch and the Skeleton Specter (Fig. 16). Although Kuniyoshi took liberties in fabricating this anatomical assemblage, the attempt at convincing drawing suggests that Kuniyoshi may even have consulted the sort of Western anatomy books that had begun to influence Japanese artists in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. His demons in Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider, in contrast, are drawn with a sketchy boldness common to effective satirists from Honoré Daumier (1808–79) in France to the modern Chinese political cartoonist Feng Zikai (1898–1975).

When we consider all the evidence, there are many points in favor of the argument that Kuniyoshi himself intended Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider as a work of satire, particularly in view of the timing of the release of the triptych. Kuniyoshi had a feisty disposition, and he himself had suffered under the Tempō Reforms. He had already showed a penchant for playful parodies of the world around him (Fig. 5). The style of drawing certainly lends itself to the interpretation of caricature. The depiction of contemporary events under the guise of historical legend had a long precedent in the Edo period as a device to escape political reprisal. Public attitudes towards the supernatural were highly charged: people employed it pragmatically, the images had lost the philosophical meanings they once had, and the awareness that the subject was frowned upon by the government no doubt added to its piquancy. It is likely that the puzzlingly complex iconographical scheme was devised to make identifications of specific demons with specific contemporary people or groups more difficult.

Whether or not Kuniyoshi himself intended Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider as a satire on the Tempō Reforms, there is no question that his contemporaries interpreted the triptych that way. Three anonymous contemporary diaries, the Fujiohaya nikki, Tempō zakki and Ukiyo
no arisama\textsuperscript{46} chronicled the public reception of Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider.\textsuperscript{57} As soon as the triptych reached the printseller’s shelves, it touched off a stir. The Fujiokaya nikki referred to the work as a rebus or picture-puzzle (hanji mono\textsuperscript{46}). The game of linking specific demons with specific individuals or groups became such a source of amusement to the populace that officials of the government became concerned.

The soporific figure of Raikō was interpreted by one unidentified source, appropriately enough, as the impotent shogun leyoshi\textsuperscript{4d} in the Fujiokaya nikki Raikō is cryptically identified as a certain “bigshot” (oyadama\textsuperscript{46}). The retainer second from right playing go was thought to be Mizuno Tadakuni. The demons were seen as the various unfortunates, primarily townsmen, to whom the reforms brought hardship, or, alternatively, as officials of the Edo government.

The Tempō zakkō dwell at length upon townspeople’s interpretation of the various demons as particular victims of the reforms. It is difficult to detect the rationale, if any, behind the identifications. The Edo rage for punning seems to have been a primary consideration: and many of the characters were linked to specific popular heroes about whom nothing is now known. The elephant (zō\textsuperscript{4d} in Japanese, Fig. 2–20), for example, was identified with “Nanzoin Zojo-ji.” Zojo-ji was one of the shogunal mortuary temples; Nanzoin might be the name of a prominent individual at or in the neighborhood of Zojo-ji.\textsuperscript{58} The guiding principle of the assigned meaning was probably the play on the homophone zō. The “toothless” (ha no naki, Fig. 2–5), a play on the word hanashi,\textsuperscript{46} “story,” became linked with Edo’s famous vaudevilian storytellers (like Hayashiya Shôzô), whose business was severely disrupted by the reforms. The sparrow (Fig. 2–12) was interpreted as referring to dancers (because of the sparrow dance?), whose performances had been curtailed: the three-eyed Fukurokuju (a symbol of wealth, Fig. 2–10) was seen as suggesting moneylenders, stockholders, and landlords. The wooden fish (used in temples to summon priests, Fig. 2–2) was linked to religious associations. Interpretations of other creatures are more obscure: the “flying head” (Fig. 2–8) was identified with women and children, the nine-skulled banner (Fig. 2–4) with houses of prostitution, the catfish (Fig. 2–28) with restaurants, the oni demon (Fig. 2–1) with lacquer shops, and the kappa (Fig. 2–27) with “pretty people and actors” (which probably means actor-prostitutes). The lantern-demon (Fig. 2–16) was equated with the “four-handed palanquin,” which, of course, since it required the luxury of two more bearers than the two-handed kind, had become a forbidden form of conspicuous consumption. It is curious that the spider was not mentioned at all.

Neither Kuniyoshi nor the publisher Ibaya\textsuperscript{4d} expected or welcomed such a flood of attention. There were various accounts of the consequences: one version of the story indicated that Kuniyoshi and the publisher were called in and grilled by the authorities, but somehow managed to establish their innocence. According to the Fujiokaya nikki, the publisher voluntarily agreed to take back the blocks, and thus he and Kuniyoshi escaped punishment. But it was too late. Editions of the work circulated as far as Osaka and Kyoto, where according to Ukiyo no arisama, two thousand copies were sold in each city.

Kuniyoshi and Ibaya were fortunate to have been let off so lightly. Variant versions of Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider appeared, and the parties responsible were punished with varying degrees of severity. According to the Fujiokaya nikki, Gountei Sadahide\textsuperscript{4d} (1807–73) produced a picture book as well as a triptych on the subject of Raikō; the latter sold for thirty-six coppers (mon\textsuperscript{4d}). Sadahide designed another triptych, which sold for one hundred mon. Both the publisher and Sadahide were arrested, fined, and confined to handcuffs for twenty days. Utagawa Yoshitora\textsuperscript{4d} (act. ca. 1850–80) created a set of twelve small-sized prints depicting Raikō. In this case the publisher and distributor were arrested, fined, and handcuffed. Yoshitora escaped with only a fine.\textsuperscript{59} An anonymous poster (banzuke\textsuperscript{4m}) treating the Raikō/Earth Spider/Hundred Demon theme appeared in 1851.\textsuperscript{60} Censorship, which had gradually become lax (the original edition of Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider had no censor’s seal), was tightened. As time elapsed, the furor subsided. In 1855 Kuniyoshi himself issued another illustration of Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider (Fig. 17). This one lacked the demons but bore a censor’s seal. The motif had passed quietly into public domain.

Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider and Social Protest by Late Tokugawa Artists

Seen in the context of its times, Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider represents part of a widespread ventilation in late Tokugawa times of dissatisfaction with social ills. Once one begins
looking, one finds a proliferation of visual material dating from this epoch that can be interpreted as a critical commentary on contemporary society. This surprising fact runs counter to common modern perceptions of the Tokugawa government's legendary ruthless regulation of the actions and attitudes of the citizenry. The dreaded shogunal network of spies was a familiar reality of daily life, as was the system of collective responsibility whereby an entire neighborhood would be punished (or even an entire extended family executed) for the misdeed of a single individual. An illustration from a woodblock book banned during the Tokugawa period shows the various punishments meted out to those unlucky enough to run afoul of government regulations (Fig. 18). Clockwise from the upper right are depicted: parading miscreants through the streets for public humiliation; handcuffs (a popular—and one might imagine, effective—punishment for artists); beating; confiscation of estate; decapitation; and exile. The government's heavy-handed (if intermittent) censorship of ukiyoe prints and kabuki plays was but one of the manifestations of this absolutist regime's regulation of artistic activity. Yet the government seems at times to have been remarkably permissive. The laws were enforced just laxly enough to give artists courage to flout them.

In the fifth month of 1804, for example, the government ruled it illegal for townspeople to depict any Japanese military leader since 1573, which included all the Tokugawa shoguns and Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1537–98), whose hegemony had been usurped by the Tokugawa: the great Utamaro released a relatively innocuous triptych showing Hideyoshi viewing flowers and was promptly imprisoned. Utagawa Yoshitora drew an even more defiant satire, which showed the deified founder of the Tokugawa regime, Tokugawa Ieyasu (Fig. 19) as a usurper, exploiting for his own ends the fruits of the labors of his predecessors Oda Nobunaga (1534–82), Akechi Mitsuhide (d. 1582), and Toyotomi Hideyoshi—an illustration of the popular saying that Nobunaga pounded the rice, Hideyoshi made the cake, and Ieyasu simply sat back and ate it. The inscription, a seventeen-syllable haiku, seems innocent enough:

Kimi ga yo o
Tsukihatsutemari
Haru no mochi

Pounding rice
For the glorious reign of our sovereign—
Spring mochi (rice cakes)

The poem implies that Ieyasu is eating the emperor's cake. The title in the cartouche, moreover, refers to samurai who have "stepped outside the Way." Yoshitora and the publisher were fined and spent fifty days in handcuffs, but, as we saw above, this contretemps did not deter Yoshitora later from taking advantage of the notoriety generated by Minamoto Raiko and the Earth Spider. The rewards of social satire evidently outweighed the punishments.

Yoshitora's print represents a relatively rare and extremely blatant form of political satire; many other artists indulged in more discreet forms of social comment. An untitled page from volume twelve of the famous printed sketchbooks (manga) by Katsushika Hokusai offers a trenchantly-observed commentary on the hierarchical nature of Tokugawa-period social relationships (Fig. 20). This whimsical slice of daily life presents a noble samurai camping beautilfully in an outhouse, while the retainers required respectfully to attend his every need wait upwind nearby and hold their noses in disgust. Another assault on samurai dignity was produced by Watanabe Nangaku (1767–1813). This artist painted a pair of six-fold screens showing frogs aping the grand procession of a feudal lord. Although this would fall into the category of "playful painting" (giga), it also crossed the border into ridicule. There is no record of Hokusai or Nangaku being punished. Artisans who did run afoul of the officials, like Utamaro, Kuniyoshi, Sadahide and Yoshitora, were fined and humiliated, but were frequently released to become repeat offenders.

Indeed, poking fun at the samurai class seems to have been a pastime widely tolerated in Tokugawa society, as witnessed by the plethora of satirical humorous works of popular fiction (gesaku) such as Portrait of a Feudal Lord (Daimyo-katagi) by no less a luminary than the councillor Matsudaira Sadanobu (1758–1820), in which a feudal lord was ridiculed for his excessive attention first to the civil arts and then to the military. The Bunshin Dainyo Infatuated with Comic Theater, (Kyoren-zuki yabo dainyō) took this kind of satire yet a step further. The ongoing popularity of works like the Suikoden stemmed, no doubt, from the tone of its assessment of the ruling class. "Those big-hat officials are the cause of all the trouble in this world," proclaimed one of the heroes, leaving no doubt where the author's sympathies lay.

Artists higher up the social scale than Hokusai and Nangaku also criticized society, but with
very different results. Among the samurai, the distinguished patriot, scholar, and painter Watanabe Kazan (1793–1841) dared to object to the shogunate’s policy of national seclusion and paid with his life: he was confined to house arrest for several years and then forced to commit suicide. Members of the Revivalist Yamato-e movement, which sought to restore the power of the emperor also were subject to serious reprisals.\textsuperscript{66} Ukita Ikkei’s Web of Government, (Fig. 15), was produced in this milieu. A painter in Ikkei’s circle, the courtier Reizei (or Okada) Tamechika\textsuperscript{67} (1823–64), was driven into exile for his political activities. He proved so miserably inept at intrigue (thus jeopardizing his own cause) that he was actually assassinated by someone on his own side.\textsuperscript{67} It is very clear that a distinction was drawn between the probably wholesome ventilation of the kind of discontent considered endemic to the city-dweller’s lot, on the one hand, and protests leading to the undermining of the actual political system itself, on the other.

Conclusion

Looking at the theme of \textit{Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider} in the broad context of East Asian art, we find that the triptych takes its place in a venerable tradition of using creatures from the other world to point up the ills of this one. The use of demonic imagery for social satire has an ancient pedigree in China and Japan. Because Zhong Kui expelled demons, the late thirteenth-century Chinese handscroll, \textit{Zhong Kui’s Night Excursion} (Fig. 5), has been interpreted as a metaphor for ridding China of the Mongols.\textsuperscript{68} The Japanese handscroll \textit{Tale of the Tengu} (Fig. 21), by coincidence also a late thirteenth-century work, showed these bird-headed supernatural creatures satirizing the antics of corrupt priests. In the section reproduced here the \textit{tengu} parody the descent of the Buddha of the Western Paradise. The artist implied that monks have become so arrogant they have usurped the functions of the very gods themselves.

To pursue the subject of social protest in the Edo period to its logical conclusion, it is natural to inquire whether works like \textit{Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider} actually contributed to the downfall of the Tokugawa regime in 1868. The answer to that question is most likely negative, for it is abundantly clear that townspeople like Kuniyoshi possessed no political influence whatsoever.\textsuperscript{69} Nor was it likely that they ever conceived of any system other than that of samurai-farmer-artisan-merchant.\textsuperscript{70}

The study of objects like \textit{Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider} documenting social protest by artists in late Tokugawa, however, does provide a window directly into the milieu of the vital popular culture of the day. Such works often turn out to be rich repositories of ancient folklore, history, legend, and iconography. They reveal the Edo townsman’s fascination with the past, as well as his plucky refusal to submit to the fetters of the present. And they illuminate universal problems concerning the relationship between artist, satire, and censorship.
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Toyokuni, Kuniyoshi's teacher. They are discussed on p. 
187.

32. For a good account of early Chinese thought concerning 
demons and ghosts see Donald Harper, "A Chinese 
Demonography of the Third Century B.C.," Harvard 
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59. Yoshitora was fined three han. Because the value of money fluctuated so widely, it is difficult to know precisely what these figures mean. A mon, or monme, was worth 3.75 grams of silver; a han equaled approximately 1000 monme. A fine of three han, therefore, was not inconsequential.
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**Glossary**

| a. 浮世絵 | a. 綱吉 |
| b. 歌川国芳 | b. 親分 |
| c. 源流光公館士卿作妖怪図 | d. 豊臣秀吉 |
| e. 川端義介 | e. 伝法肌 |
| f. 下町 | f. 剣の物 |
| g. 町人 | g. 琳派 |
| h. 歌川豊国 | h. 円山 |
| i. 無名翁蓬筆 | i. 大星由良之助良雄 |
| j. 文化 | j. 退廃 |
| k. 文政 | k. 通俗水滸傳豪傑百十八人 |
| l. 通俗水滸傳豪傑百十八人 | m. 加賀屋 |
| n. 淺沢竹琴 | o. 東海道 |
| p. 藤原 | q. 小松茂美 |
| r. 部野 | s. 土佐 |
| t. 琳派 | u. 円山 |
| v. 大星由良之助良雄 | w. 退廃 |
| x. 韓國 | y. 留民 |
| z. 武者絵 | aa. 化物忠臣蔵 |
| ab. 魏画 | ac. 吉原 |
| ac. 吉原 | ad. 源順光 |
| ae. 清和源氏 | af. 稲荷 |
| ag. 藤原道長 | ah. 平家物語 |
| ak. 藤原道長 | al. 土螺草紙 |
| am. 漢井隆光 | an. 坂田金時 |
| ao. 百鬼夜行 | ap. 浮世絵師歌川列伝 |
| ar. 台記 | as. 藤原聯長 |
| at. 拾芥抄 | au. 陰陽 |
| av. 土佐光信 | aw. 大随妖怪 |
| ax. 歌川国芳 | ay. 蟹牛妖怪 |
| az. 鳥兜の妖怪 | ba. 馬印 |
| bb. 一萬目 | bc. 小松茂美 |
| bd. 山海経 | be. 天狗 |
| bf. 鬼 | bg. 鬼 |
| bh. 腹出の妖怪 | bi. 達摩 |
| bj. 大黒 | bk. 恵比須 |
| bl. 福禄寿 | bm. 東海道 |
| bn. 東海道四谷怪談 |
| bo. 飛頭霧 |
| bp. 韓國 |
| bq. 大関 |
| br. 大関 |
| bs. 化物 |
| bt. 吉田友之 |
| bu. お化地蔵 |
| bv. 妖怪 |
| bw. 妖怪 |
| by. 神 |
| bz. 六条 |
| ca. 奥岩 |
| cb. 春好斎北洲 |
| cc. 荒牧 |
| cd. 羅聘 |
| ce. 寄席 |
| cf. 見世物 |
| cg. 泉屋吉兵衛 |
| ch. 死絵 |
| ci. 鳥居南北 |
| cz. 怪談話 |
| da. 蟹牛妖怪 |
| db. 林屋正藏 |
| dc. 百物語 |
| dd. 可親好也 |
| de. 白鳥慧鶴 |
| df. 淮南子 |
| dg. 平賀源内 |
| dh. 鳥原馬 |
| di. 信伝 |
| dj. 天保 |
| dk. 天保 |
| dl. 南和男 |
| dm. 鈴木重三 |
| dn. 水野忠邦 |
| do. 浮田一寛 |
| dp. 復古大和絵 |
(c) 豊子喬
(c) 藤岡屋日記
(da) 天保雑記
(db) 浮世の有様
(dc) 刺し物
(dd) 家慶
(de) 親玉
(df) 象
(dg) 南蔵院増上寺
(dh) 話
(di) 伊塚屋
(dj) 五雲亭貞秀
(dk) 話
(dt) 歌川芳虎
(dm) 番付け
(dn) 豊臣秀吉
(do) 徳川家康
(dp) 織田信長
(dq) 明智光秀
(dr) 漫画
(ds) 葛飾北斎
(dt) 渡辺南岳
(du) 課作
(dv) 大名形気
(dw) 松平定信
(dx) 狂言好野暮大名
(dy) 渡辺華山
(dz) 冷泉(岡田)為恭
Fig. 1. Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider. By Utagawa Kuniyoshi. 1843. Triptych, oban-sized polychrome print, each sheet 39 x 26 cm. Courtesy Raymond A. Bidwell Collection, Museum of Fine Arts, Springfield. (60.D05.951).
Fig. 2. Outline drawing of demons in Minamoto Raiko.
Fig. 3. Yan Qing, from 108 Heroes of the Popular Suikoden. By Utagawa Kuniyoshi. Oban-sized woodblock print. Courtesy Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto. (926.18.1032).
Fig. 4. Ôbei Yuranosuke Yoshio, from the Store-house of Loyal Retainers. By Utagawa Kuniyoshi. Ōban-sized woodblock print. Private collection, Japan.
Fig. 5. "Sparrow"-cats. By Utagawa Kuniyoshi. Oban-sized, fan-shaped woodblock print. Tokyo National Museum.

Fig. 6. Zhong Kui's Night Excursion, section 3. By Gong Kai (1222–ca. 1304). Handscroll, ink on paper, H: 32.8 cm. Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C. (38.4-3).
Fig. 7. *Night Parade of a Hundred Demons*, detail. Attributed to Tosa Mitsumohu (ca. 1439–1521). Probably sixteenth century. Hands scroll, ink and colors on paper, H: 33 cm. Shinjuan, Kyoto.
Fig. 8. Attack of Mara from the Sutra of Past and Present Karma, detail. Anonymous. Eighth century. Handscroll, ink and color on paper, H: 26.4 cm. Hōonin, Kyoto.

Fig. 9. Page from Wakan sansai zue, detail. Orig. ed. 1713, 1929 reprint. Woodblock book. (Figure on left is "flying-head").

Fig. 13. *House of Unnatural Death* (from *The Hundred Tales Picture Book* (Ehon hyaku monogatari), v. 5. By Takehara Shunsen (act. mid. nineteenth century). 1841. Woodblock book, 22.6 x 24.2 cm. Ravicz Collection, Pacific Palisades.

Fig. 14. *Gyōsai’s Illustrated Hundred Tales* (Gyōsai hyakki gadan). By Kawanabe Gyōsai (1831–89). Orig. ed. 1890, 1895 reprint. Woodblock book, 22.6 x 15.9 cm. Ravicz collection, Pacific Palisades.
Fig. 15. *The Web of Government*. By Ukita Ikkei (1795–1859). Hanging scroll, ink, light color, and gold wash on paper, 168 x 58.9 cm. Koshimoto Koichi Collection, Hyogo.
Fig. 16. Takiyasha the Witch and the Skeleton Specter. By Utagawa Kuniyoshi. Ca. 1845. Oban-sized woodblock print. Courtesy Helen Forrester Spencer Museum, University of Kansas. Photograph by Jon Blumb.
Fig. 17. Minamoto Rakkō and the Earth Spider. By Utagawa Kuniyoshi. 1855. Oban-sized woodblock print. Private collection, Japan.
Fig. 18. Illustrations of Edo Period Punishments, from Hompô shimbun shi.
Fig. 20. *Samurai and Retainers* from *Hokusai Sketchbooks (Hokusai manga)*, v. 12. Woodblock book, 22.2 x 15 cm. Private collection, Woodside, California.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES IN SHENSI DURING THE last thirty-five years have uncovered from T'ang dynasty (618–906) tombs a significant number of line-engraved representations on stone. With few exceptions, the line-engravings adorn three specific funerary stone furnishings: the epitaph tablet, the tomb-chamber doorway, and the coffin casket. None of these works bears any signatures of artists or stone engravers, but in both execution and achievement, the human figures depicted on the stone reliefs compare favorably with the famous tympanums of Ta-yan ta5 (Great Gander Pagoda)7 and the floral motifs with the embellishments on the Stele of Priest Ta-chih6 at the Stelae Forest Museum2 in Hsian. Such an artistic phenomenon indicates the existence in the T'ang dynasty of a category of stone relief art that was as viable as its mural painting. My purpose is to study this particular type of pictorial representation on stone, exploring its place in the spectrum of two-dimensional T'ang art as well as its evolution in the context of the art of Chinese stone relief.

At this writing, published archaeological reviews have reported fourteen T'ang tombs that contain all three, or at least two, of the stone furnishings mentioned above (see Table A on following page). Securely dated from A.D. 630 to A.D. 745, the line-engraved stone reliefs, therefore, represent a cross-section of the development of the art form from its beginning in Early T'ang to full blossoming in High T'ang.5 Their importance as typical examples of this particular category of T'ang art is underscored by the fact that such stone reliefs are found only in tombs belonging to deceased persons of high rank, some of whom were awarded the privilege of being interred in the imperial cemetery of one of the T'ang emperors.4

Table A shows that archaeological data reveal that the privileged burials consist mainly of two groups: family members of the royal house, and meritorious statesmen who were decorated with the highest honors of the nation. The difference between them is shown not only in the size of the tomb structure, the content of burial objects, and the paintings on the walls, but also in the quantity of the line-engraved tomb furnishings. Invariably the former received all three and the latter just two, eliminating generally the coffin casket.

The three line-engraved stone furnishings in these tombs exhibit one of the richest repertoires of T'ang two-dimensional art. The epitaph tablet, consisting of a cover and a base (Fig. 1), has border embellishments of floral or foliage motifs frequently encircling images of real and mythical animals or the twelve zodiac animals (Figs. 2 and 3).5 The tomb-chamber doorway has tympanum, transom, jamb, and threshold profusely decorated with floral scrolls, animals and birds, and its two door panels with a pair of standing guardian figures (Fig. 4).5 The coffin casket is constructed with stone slabs in the shape of a tile-roofed gable-house. It has on one long side engraved simulations of the front door, complete with door attendants, at the center7 (Fig. 5) and flanked by windows (all amid a proliferation of floral scrolls), while on each one of the vertical wall panels (the inside surface of all walls and the outside of only the end walls) at least one standing attendant figure (mostly female) is placed in an abbreviated garden setting (Fig. 6).

Of primary significance to this study are the stone reliefs of the house-like coffin casket. It is not only the largest of the three tomb furnishings, thus the most abundantly decorated with human figures, but is found in tombs in which the interior wall surfaces have paintings of similar representations. Such tombs are those of Li Shou6 (A.D. 630), Prince 1-te6 (A.D. 706), Princess Yung-t'ai6 (A.D. 706), Prince Chang-huai7 (A.D. 706), and Wei Chiu6 (A.D. 708),8 whose funerary adornments were carried out on imperial orders by artisans attached to the imperial workshops,9 the best talents available at the T'ang capital. That the two types of two-dimensional art, incised stone reliefs and brush painting, are found existing so prominently side-by-side strongly suggests a parallel achievement of equal importance. The expertise in their execution can be observed in comparisons of analogous representations.

Comparing the depictions from Princess Yung-t'ai's tomb, a standing female attendant on one of the inside wall surfaces of the coffin casket (Fig. 6)10 with one of the female attendants from the best preserved wall painting in the antechamber (Fig. 7),11 several corresponding
TABLE A
Line-engraved Stone Reliefs from T’ang Dynasty Tombs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Occupant</th>
<th>Location of Tomb</th>
<th>Burial Date</th>
<th>Epitaph Tablet</th>
<th>Tomb-chamber Doorway</th>
<th>Coffin Casket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Li Shou</td>
<td>San-yüan hsien</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>Tortoise-shaped</td>
<td>Front (c)</td>
<td>Outside (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chang Shih-kuei</td>
<td>Li-ch’üan</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>Front (a)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Wei-ch’ih Ching-te</td>
<td></td>
<td>658</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>Front (a)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cheng Jen-t’ai</td>
<td></td>
<td>664</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Outside (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Li Feng</td>
<td>Fu’-ping (Hsien-ling)</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Li Meng-chiang</td>
<td>Li-ch’üan</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>Front (a)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Li Chung-jun</td>
<td>Ch’ien hsien (Ch’ien-ling)</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>Front (d)</td>
<td>Outside (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Li Hsien-hui</td>
<td></td>
<td>706</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>Front (b)</td>
<td>Outside (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Li Hsien</td>
<td></td>
<td>706</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>Front (a)</td>
<td>Outside (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Wei Chiung</td>
<td>Ch’ang-an (Jung-hsien ling)</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Outside (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Wei Hsü</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unclear, mostly (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Li Chen</td>
<td>Li-ch’üan (Chao-ling)</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>Front (a)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Yang Ssu-hsü</td>
<td>Ch’ang-an hsien</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Inside (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Su Ssu-hsü</td>
<td>Wan-nien hsien</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>Square, Border (b)</td>
<td>Front (a)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) line-engraving (hsien-tiao)
(b) reduced-background flat relief (chien-ti p’ing-tiao)
(c) bas relief (fu-tiao)
(d) not described

Information on tomb occupants will be found in Note 4 at the end of this article.
pictorial features become sharply apparent. Both
the stone-relief and painted figure show a one-
to-one relationship in thematic configuration and
individual characterization. The stone relief, de-
spite its medium, shows a figure equally well-
articulated and as well-represented as the paint-
ing, standing at perfect ease within a believable
space. More importantly, the unique T'ang
achievement of a personal animation in figure painting\textsuperscript{12} is superbly captured and expressed. As
shown in their faces, the first female attendant is
focusing her attention on the branch of cutflower
in her right hand, perhaps reflecting on its sym-
bolism or enjoying the beauty of nature, and the
figure of the antechamber is so totally absorbed
in her own thoughts that she is hardly aware of
the stemmed cup in her hands.

Yet the most striking feature of all is the linear
quality in the two representations. Both are ren-
dered in the formula of a fine even-width continu-
ous line which recalls the hallmarks of the Six Dy-
nasties figure master, Ku K'ai-chih\textsuperscript{6} (ca. 344–ca.
406), whose works were admired by early T'ang
painters, especially Yen Li-pen\textsuperscript{7} (d. A.D. 673) who
produced the celebrated portrait series of schol-
ars and ministers during the seventh century.\textsuperscript{13}
The half-length portrait-like excerpts from the
same sources in Princess Yung-t'ai's tomb (Figs. 8
and 9) show that the stone carver clearly demon-
strated a keen interest in brushwork. Although
the incised line, hampered by the nature of the
granite stone and chisel, is somewhat less sinu-
sous, it nevertheless displays a gradual thinning to
a sharp point, a distinctive characteristic of Chi-
nese brushwork. It is seen in the single stroke de-
noting the shape of the chin and the two crease
lines on the neck. Moreover, those short reiter-
ated strokes that mark the hairline around the
face even show an exquisite variation in length,
width and delineation. Such delicate calligraphic
nuances, so expertly carved, define the smoothly
combed bouffant hair style more effectively than
the brush strokes of the painted image. Evi-
dently the stone carver had wielded his chisel on
the stone surface much as his counterpart, the
painter, wielded his brush, to impart the quality of
a brush line. His depiction incised on stone is
thus a skillfully rendered parallel of the image
painted on the tomb wall.

This kind of intaglio stone relief, where the
background area remains flush with the surface
of the image, predominates in the Shensi T'ang
tombs. Described as hsien-tiao\textsuperscript{1} (line-engraving)
in Chinese, the technique was used for represen-
tations of the human figure (Figs. 6 and 8) on
the inner wall surfaces of the coffin casket (Table
A, Nos. 1, 7–10, and 13) and on the door pan-
els (Fig. 4) of the tomb-chamber doorways (Ta-
ble A, Nos. 2–3, 6, 9, 12, and 14).\textsuperscript{14} As the
line-engraved rendering of the image on the flat
stone surface is barely visible to the naked eye,
reproduction for publication in traditional Chi-
nese ink rubbing or ink squeeze\textsuperscript{15} is usually made.
The t'a-pen\textsuperscript{5} or ink-imprint of the line-engraving,
as exemplified by the illustrations for this study
(Figs. 4, 6 and 8), shows the image in white lines
on an inked background and thus reveals clearly
the high level reached in this category of stone
relief art. The engraved representation, though
appearing in reverse in the rubbing, is analogous
to a painting delineated in black ink on white pa-
paper.

A somewhat different stone relief technique is
also found on the stone furnishings in the T'ang
tombs. Here the image remains flat with in-
cised linear definitions but the background is
slightly reduced by repeated small and shallow
gouge cuts. Known in Chinese as chien-ti p'ing-
tiao\textsuperscript{6} (reduced-background flat relief),\textsuperscript{16} the tech-
nique is commonly employed for the floral em-
bellishments on the borders of the stone epitaph
(Figs. 2 and 3).\textsuperscript{17} For depiction of the human
figure, so far as is known, it is found only in the
tomb of Princess Yung-t'ai where it is used for
the representations on the outside wall surfaces
of her coffin casket (Fig. 10) and the two door
panels of her tomb-chamber doorway (Fig. 11).

The different rendering technique of these
stone reliefs is apparently related to the tradi-
tional practice of tomb decoration. Remnants
of paint have been found on the outside wall
reliefs of the coffin casket as well as the tomb-
chamber doorway in the earlier tomb of Li
Shou,\textsuperscript{18} precisely the two locations of Princess
Yung-t'ai's stone furnishings that are executed in
the reduced-background flat-relief technique. It
may be assumed, then, that this technique was
specifically chosen for the purpose of having fin-
ishing touches of colors applied to the incised
images. Though no traces of coloring have been
found on any one of these or other stone rel-
iefs in Yung-t'ai's tomb, a comparison of one of
the male guardian figures on her tomb-chamber
doorway (Fig. 11) with one of the attendant fig-
ures from among a group painted on a wall (Fig.
12) in Prince I-te's tomb\textsuperscript{19} seems to support the
theory. The lightly carved background conjures
up an appropriate simulation of the plain back-
ground in T‘ang figure painting. Delineations of the facial features, drapery folds, and other details of the figure carried out in incised lines share a kinship with the wall painting. Obviously, the hard stone surface did not prevent the stone carver from producing a successful rendering of the image, whether it was designed for eventual coloring or not. This T‘ang mastery of the line-engraving technique had certainly brought the relief art form to its peak achievement.

It becomes obvious, then, that the line-engraved representation from the Shensi T‘ang tombs is a distinctive form of artistic expression. Wang Tzu-yün wrote in his article, “T‘ang dynasty line-engraved stone pictures” (1956):

The line-engraved stone picture is one of China’s indigenous art forms. The representation, achieved in the line-engraved technique, is a product of the ishu chiang-shih, the exceptionally skillful artisan, who plied his sharp too-p’ or “knife brush” directly on the smooth surface of the stone.

Thus Chinese pictorial stone relief, or Chinese stone-picture, is entirely different from the bas-relief in Western art. The difference, already inferred in the above discussion, comes essentially from the artist’s fundamental approach to his art rather than his stonecarving technique. The Western relief artist seeks to chisel a plasticity that protrudes forward towards the viewer, a technique which Chinese writers termed fu-tiao (bas relief). His representation results in an elevation of curved surfaces with numerous undercuttings that undermine the multi-level deeply recessed background. The Chinese relief artist, however, conceives his image in a linear configuration, in exactly the same manner as the Chinese painter: his image is incised on the stone surface and kept flush with the background, or kept flat and differentiated from a slightly reduced background. Even though the Chinese line-engraved picture is closely related to its painted counterpart in conception and linear execution, it is nevertheless a specific form of relief art with a history that began in the Han dynasty (220 B.C.—A.D. 221).

History of T‘ang Line-engraved Stone Relief

Both types of line-engraving technique on stone, as found in the T‘ang tombs, were employed for Han funerary art (Figs. 13 and 14). The hsien-tiao or line-engraved technique, as revealed by archaeological sources, was used for the pictorial stone reliefs excavated from tombs in Fei-ch‘eng, Shantung (A.D. 83), and P‘ei-hsien, Chihsiu (A.D. 151). The chien-ti p‘ing-tiao or reduced-background flat-relief technique, relatively more common, is exemplified by the reliefs of the famous Wu Family Shrines in Shantung (erected between 145–168), the first scientifically excavated tomb at I-nan, Shantung (the final years of Han), and the pair of richly decorated tombs at Mi-hsien, Honan (shortly after the fall of Han). Among these three examples, the reduced-background of the Wu Family Shrine relief is distinguished by having a network of finely chiseled striations instead of a web of shallow gouge-cuts. The I-nan reliefs, wherein the incised figures are differentiated from the roughly hewn background (Fig. 14) is clearly a close prototype of the T‘ang works. And Tomb No. 2 at Mi-hsien, which has walls embellished with stone pictures as well as painted with murals, manifests a precedence for the schema of interior decoration of the T‘ang tombs in Shensi.

Yet it is among the Han tombs in northern Shensi that the most direct ancestor to the T‘ang pictorial stone reliefs have been found. At Sui-te and nearby Mi-chih tombs dated by inscription between A.D. 96 and A.D. 107 have yielded doorways embellished with stone reliefs that are not only executed in the reduced-background flat-relief technique but also painted with colors. Here the reduced ground is cut slightly deeper, but following the established Chinese stone relief carving tradition, it is meticulously kept on a level plane so as to correspond with the flat-relief images (Fig. 15). Significantly vermilion red, most frequently mentioned by the Chinese in their archaeological reports, appears as the dominant color. It is found on the Red Bird of the South carved on the door panels of the main entrance to the tomb and on the sun disk located on the upper right corner of certain doorways or on the ceiling of one of the tomb chambers. Vermilion’s counterpart color, white (sometimes black), adorns the matching moon image, and also appears in dots on a green ground in a geometric pattern. Details too small for incisions, such as the Black Crow symbol on the sun disk, the Toad on the moon disk, the facial features and drapery folds of a door guard, the feathers of the Red Bird of the South, the reins of a horse, and the window slats and wheel spokes of a horse carriage are all delineated with ink brush strokes. This practice, a combination of painting and sculpture, continued into the Pre-T‘ang period (265–618).
A recently discovered Northern Wei (386–535) stone coffin from a suburb of Loyang, Honan, had one short end partly painted and carved to simulate the entrance to a dwelling. The two door panels with their "pu-shou hsiien-huans" (monsters-head-biting-a-ring) door knobs were rendered in vermilion red. The door guards standing at the sides of the entrance and the images at the top framing the doorway, a pair of phoenix-like birds flanking a pearl enthroned on a lotus pedestal (a Buddhist emblem of salvation), are line-engraved on the surface of the granite stone. The painting in red, the Chinese archaeologist reported, was found to be bright and fresh but later was completely washed off by a downpour at the site.

Another remarkable example is the Sui dynasty (581–618) stone coffin belonging to Li Ho’s (A.D. 518–522) discovered in 1966 at San-yuan, Shensi. This coffin has sumptuous carvings on all of the exposed surfaces. The cover, the four sides, and the edges of the cover and base are executed in the three types of relief techniques described above. While all edges are rendered in line-engraving, the cover and the two long sides are rendered in reduced-background flat reliefs, with the short sides in Western-style bas relief. The schema of decoration, which adheres to the Chinese tradition in having the images of the four directional animals depicted on its sides, has the simulation of an entrance to a mansion carved on one short side and the representation of the Black Warrior, a tortoise entwined with a snake, on the other. The principal pictorial features were polychrome: the door guards standing at the sides of the entrance and the pair of phoenix-like Red Birds poised above the door on the south end, and on the north end, the Black Warrior amid a pattern of swirling clouds inhabited by a bird at the top and a deer at the bottom. The front entrance was adorned with colors (the archaeological report did not specify which ones) combined with gold. The back or north side had a deep red applied to the tortoise shell and black ink lines defining the designs of the snake body. At the time of excavation, it is reported, the colors were still brilliant but much of the gold had peeled off.

Apparently political and economic changes during the pre-T’ang period had fostered a new burial custom in North China. The cost of building a stone tomb and adorning its interiors with pictorial stone reliefs was eliminated; the artistic program shifted to the stone coffin interred inside an earthen-tomb chamber. The best known example in Chinese art history is the stone sarcophagus (ca. 525, presumably from Loyang) engraved with illustrations of six paragons of filial piety in the Nelson Gallery of Art, Kansas City. Wang Tzu-yün’s pioneering research on ancient Chinese pictorial stone reliefs published in 1957 has made known additional examples of stone coffins belonging to Northern Wei, found in Loyang; Northern Chou (557–580), from Hsien-yang; Shensi; and Sui, also from Loyang.

Strikingly evident in the three examples illustrated in Wang’s text is a continuation of the Han tradition in both the schema of decoration and the relief carving technique. All of them bear the same major theme of embellishment rendered in traditional Chinese stone relief. Focusing on the directional animals of Han cosmology, the sprawling images of the Green Dragon of the East and the White Tiger of the West are depicted on the long sides, and the compact ones of the Red Bird of the South and the Black Warrior of the North on the short sides. The carving technique, interestingly, anticipated that of T’ang: all three show a preference for the hsien-tiao line-engraving on the flat surface of the stone.

**History of Stone Funerary Furnishings**

Thus there seems to be no question that the T’ang burial custom, as part of T’ang culture and civilization, was formulated on an eclectic selection of the outstanding achievements of the previous centuries. In addition to the adoption of Northern Wei’s institution of imperial cemetery sites, the provision of three funerary stone furnishings in burials of the upper class is a case in point. First of all, the square epitaph tablet of two parts dates back to late Northern Wei. This tablet consists of the cover, on which the name and title of the deceased is carved, and the base on which the long and detailed eulogy is incised. Its typical square shape (Figs. 2 and 3), with border embellishments rendered in the reduced-background flat relief technique on the four slanted sides of the cover and four upright edges of the base, was already well established at that time. Second, the installation of a richly carved tomb-chamber doorway, complete with images of door guards on the two door panels, had its prototype in the Sui dynasty. As shown by the example from Li Ho’s tomb (Fig. 16), even the schema of incised relief decoration on the framing members of the doorway, the...
transom, jambs and threshold, anticipates that of T'ang (Fig. 4). Third, the use of a tile-roofed house-like coffin casket in royal burials likewise had its precedence in the Sui dynasty. The one discovered in the tomb of Li Ching-hsun\(^4\) (A.D. 608), though used as a coffin and encased in a coffin casket made of undorned stone slabs (Figs. 17 and 18), has a shape exactly like that of a T'ang coffin casket.\(^5\) Furthermore, the placement of the carved simulations of the front door flanked by a pair of side windows on one of the long sides neatly foreshadows the T'ang practice.\(^6\) Thus, in terms of the art of stone relief, the evidence of a cultural and artistic lineage from Northern Wei to T'ang is found in the usage of stone tomb furnishings, the major schema of decoration on these objects, and the two types of line-engraving techniques.

Several features of Li Shou's tomb, the earliest of T'ang date discovered so far, reflect a heritage clearly indebted to the pre-T'ang age, in particular to the preceding Sui dynasty. Although Li Shou's epitaph tablet is shaped like a tortoise (Fig. 19),\(^7\) the characters for the name and title of the deceased are arranged in a square format and carved on the cover in the reduced-background flat-relief technique (Fig. 20), as had been traditionally established in the Northern Wei dynasty. His tomb-chamber doorway, somewhat different from the Sui norm, has relief representations on both sides of the two door panels, yet the two pairs of confronting birds within the upper and lower divisions of the two door panels on the outside—the Red Bird of the South in the upper and peacock in the lower,—were inherited from the Han dynasty.\(^8\) And the images on the inside, a pair of Heavenly Guardians (described as T'ien Wang and not illustrated in the archaeological report),\(^9\) most probably resemble the palace guards represented on the doorway panels in the Sui tomb of Li Ho (Fig. 16). The feature that corresponds precisely in theme and structure with that of Li Ho is the pair of stone lions carved in the round, set on pedestals, and placed outside the doorway at the base of the door jambs.\(^10\) However, quite unlike Li Ho's burial, including those of Northern Wei and Northern Chou, is the use of a tile-roofed house-like stone coffin casket instead of a stone coffin. In structure, Li Shou's coffin casket (Fig. 21) is strikingly similar to the Sui stone coffin found in Li Ching-hsun's tomb (Fig. 18).\(^11\) Constructed entirely of stone, using stone slabs as walls fitted snugly into the sides of the square stone pilasters, it also appears as a three-by-one-bay building with a stone cover carved in simulation of a tile roof. Later coffin caskets in the burials of Prince I-te, Princess Yung-t'ai, Prince Chang-huai, and Wei Chiung,\(^12\) which are shaped exactly like that of Li Shou, seems to suggest that the transition from its usage as a coffin to a coffin casket took place in the beginning of the T'ang dynasty.

A further demonstration of a direct linkage between the T'ang burial custom with that of the pre-T'ang age is the application of colors on some of the stone relief representations. It is found on the reliefs decorating the tomb-chamber door and the simulated entrance of the house-like coffin casket belonging again to Li Ho.\(^13\) These areas, executed in the Western relief technique, have been adorned with not just colors but also gold, a practice that immediately recalls the entrance side of the Sui stone coffin belonging to Li Ho. Undoubtedly, the custom of embellishing the entrance facade with colors has come down from the Han dynasty, as exemplified by the doorways in the tombs at Sui-te and Mi-chih.

The evidence in Li Shou's burial, however, has prompted a Chinese scholar, Su Bai,\(^14\) to believe that all of the line-engraved stone reliefs in the T'ang tombs were originally colored and that their long years of interment has caused all of the colors to disappear.\(^15\) Because Chinese archaeologists, who are meticulous in their descriptions of the excavated burial objects, have not reported any traces of color on the line-engraved stone reliefs in any of the other T'ang tombs, one is inclined to accept his theory. But if centuries of burial had erased colors on the line-engravings in the T'ang tombs, it should have also removed those in the tomb of Li Shou and the earlier Sui tomb of Li Ho. One could argue that the use of the Western-style relief technique in these two tombs had contributed to the retention of colors. If so, then, it would be difficult to reconcile the finding of pigment on the line-engraved stone reliefs in the even earlier Han burials at Sui-te and Mi-chih. Many of these Chinese-style stone reliefs, as already discussed, have retained not only their vermilion red, white, and green pigments but also the black ink brushwork.

**T'ang Line-engraved Stone Relief**

Because such a large number of Chinese-style stone reliefs have surfaced from the T'ang tombs, I believe that by that time, line-engraving was no longer a mere imitation or reproduction of
painting, but had an existence of its own. Of significance here is the increased preference for the line-engraved technique. The early T'ang coffin casket of Li Shou, though similar in structure to the Sui casket of Li Ching-hsun, had engraved, rather than painted, inside surfaces with images of female figures (Figs. 22 and 23). Furthermore, the representations on the outside surfaces of the coffin caskets belonging to both Prince I-te and Prince Chang-huai are not (like those of Princess Yung-t'ai) rendered in reduced-background flat-reliefs but instead are all depicted in line-engravings.56 The same technique was put to use later to adorn the coffin caskets of Wei Chiung and Wei Hsu'ac (A.D. 718).57 Finally, the door-guard images on the tomb chamber doorway in all known T'ang tombs (except Princess Yung-t'ai's), are done in line-engravings. These pictorial reliefs, as with the written scripts incised on the epitaph tablets, appear to have been executed for the sake of permanence.

The practice had apparently begun in the Sui dynasty. For example, the intaglio border embellishments of animals roaming in the mountains as well as the eulogy text of several hundred k'ai-shu6d standard script forms on the base of Li Ho's epitaph tablet (Fig. 24), technically match the pure line-engraved images found in the T'ang tombs. On close examination, one finds that the landscape vistas were evidently inscribed on stone, like the standard script forms, for posterity; the incised overlapping landscape motifs, represented in a manner usually seen in a monochrome painting, do not require an application of color for aesthetic enhancement, but perhaps took a filling-in of gold or white for legibility. Gold was used as a filling for the scripts carved on the stone ai-ts'e6e (eulogy plaques) of Prince I-te,60 and white is generally seen as the most suitable contrasting color for the engraved inscriptions on the dark stone stele or other monumental stone tablets. In light of such precedents, one is inclined to believe that the line-engraved representations on the coffin casket of Prince I-te had fillings for legibility. One can then imagine how the line-engraving would appear to the viewer: each palace attendant would be as clearly discernable as a written script in its linear configuration of golden brushstrokes against the dark ground of the granite surface.

Besides the similarity in visual presentation, the two forms, written and pictorial, shared a common principle in technical execution. The reduced-background flat-relief and the line-engraved techniques employed for the pictorial representations (Figs. 10 and 6 respectively) were also used for the written scripts. Most clearly demonstrated in the epitaph tablet, the name and title of the deceased, written in an ornate seal script, was executed in reduced-background flat relief on the cover (Fig. 2) and the eulogy, in standard script, in line-engraving on the base (Fig. 3). The former is usually described by Chinese writers as yang-k'o6f and the latter yin-k'o.6g Significantly the same terms have been used for the corresponding techniques in pictorial stone relief art.6f The line-engraved representation, therefore, has a far greater intrinsic kinship with the inscribed scripts than has ever been realized before.

There is evidence that the engraving of the representations as well as the inscriptions in the T'ang tombs were possibly carried out by the same group of stone carvers. Both the Chiu T'ang Shu6h (Old T'ang History) and Hsin T'ang Shu6i (New T'ang History) mention a division in the Central Government, the Chen-kuan shu,6j which employed artisans to produce "stone carvings and ceramic ware" such as "stone chimes, stone sculptures of human figures, horses, and other animals; stone stele, columns and grinders; bricks and tiles, vases and urns; and funerary needs, which included ming-ch'ak (burial objects)."62 The best talents in the various arts and crafts, including the engravers for the three funerary stone furnishings, could have been assembled from all over the country, as was done for painting,65 to serve the imperial household in the T'ang capital. It is not known whether any specialization was practised among the stone carvers but since brushwork is fundamental to both artistic forms, adept artists could have carried out the representational as well as the inscriptive engravings; such a practice seems to have been enforced during the Han dynasty, as shown by the stone reliefs in the Sui-te tombs (Fig. 15).6f

The most significant factor in this regard is that the technique for engraving the inscriptions on stone, like its pictorial counterpart, also had a history that dates back to ancient times. From the very beginning, the incised or line-engraved technique was used. The characters, usually written in vermilion red on the smooth dark granite stone surface,65 were incised and gouged away: if a rubbing is taken of the relief, the calligraphy would appear in white on an inked background. The earliest pre-Han examples most often cited by writers are the so-called ten
Stone Drums and the tablets erected by Ch’in Shih Huang (r. 221–210) to commemorate the unification of his empire.  

Han dynasty inscribed stones proliferated as standard literary texts and memorial monuments. The former consists of the entire collection of Confucian classics carved on stone for the purpose of preservation and diffusion of knowledge, and the latter the pei⁶ (stelae), which commemorated important historical events or meritorious deeds of noted individuals, and the grave tablets, which preserved the memory of the dead. The grave tablet, when buried in tombs, became known as mu chih⁶⁶ (epitaph tablet) and was standardized in late Northern Wei in the form of a square with a cover and a base, the type that persisted into the Sui and T’ang dynasties. By far the largest number of inscribed stones were those made from the fifth century onward for the preservation of Buddhist sutras which Buddhist monks had diligently and laboriously translated from Sanskrit. ⁶⁷ Carved more frequently on the precipices of mountains and walls of grottoes than on stone stelae, the texts were written in fine quality standard scripts. In the T’ang dynasty, as Taoism developed into a religion, undoubtedly influenced by the engravings of Buddhist canons, the Taoist classic Tao-te-ching⁶⁸ was engraved on stone more than once.⁶⁹

An important underlying cause for the development of inscription engraving in T’ang was the demand for reproductions of outstanding models of calligraphic writing. It stimulated the production of k’o-t‘ieh⁶⁹ (carved calligraphy) whereby the outlines of the original written scripts on paper were carefully traced and then transferred to stone so that reproductions in rubbings could be taken of the finished products.⁷⁰ Such carved inscriptions on stone, made purposely and solely for the transmission of calligraphy, also preserved the rare written scripts of old masters. The “Eight Famous Inscriptions” in its present compilation consists of ink rubbings taken from rare T’ang stone engravings⁷¹ and has preserved the standard script styles of the greatest calligrapher of all times, Wang Hsi-chih⁶⁶ (303–379), and his son, Wang Hsien-chih⁶⁹ (344–386), as well as two early T’ang masters, Yü Shih-nan⁶⁶ (558–638) and Ch’u Sui-liang⁶⁶ (596–658).

During the T’ang dynasty, noteworthy written scripts were zealously perpetuated on stone. A rubbing of a poem composed and written by the second T’ang Emperor T’ai-tsung⁶⁶ (r. 627–650) was found at Tun-huang⁶⁶ by Paul Pelliot.⁷¹ The emperor, an accomplished calligrapher, was a prime promoter of the preservation of model calligraphy written by famous masters. In his reign old masterpieces were collected from all over the country, and the famous work, the Lan-t‘ing hsii⁶⁶ (Orchid Pavilion Preface), by Wang Shih-chih was reproduced in k’o-t‘ieh engraving on stone.⁷² Certainly, the largest single collection of T’ang engravings of the different modern script styles written for the Confucian classics, memorial, epitaph, and k’o-t‘ieh tablets, kept today at the Hsian Stelae Forest Museum, attest to a highly active and flourishing program of inscription engraving. Most notable are the engraved k’ai-shu scripts by such luminaries as Ou-yang Hsün⁶⁶ (557–645), Yen Chen-ch’ing⁶⁶ (709–785), and Liu Kung-ch’üan⁶⁶ (776–865) and the ts’ao-shu⁶⁶ (cursive script) by the monk Huai-su⁶⁶ (aa. 535–850).⁷³

Among the engraved stones kept at the Museum, a number of the stelae have border embellishments related to those on T’ang epitaph tablets. The best known are the Stele of Priest Tai-chih, already mentioned, and the famous Shih-t’ai hsiao-ch’ing⁶⁶ (Filial Piety Stone Stele), which carries an engraved version of the text of the Canon of Filial Piety written with commentaries by Emperor Hsüan-Tszung⁶⁶ (r. 713–755). The last mentioned stele, more relevant of the two to the T’ang tomb engravings, is still well preserved since it was erected as a major monument in A.D. 745. It stands on a stone pedestal whose four sides are engraved with embellishments of the type encountered in the T’ang tombs. Rubbings of two details of the sides (Fig. 25) show border embellishments in the typical T’ang grandiose repertoire of sumptuous leafy floral scrolls encircling some fabulous creatures.⁷⁵ Executed in the reduced-background flat-relief technique, the rendering technique, the quality of the art work and the schema of decoration are closely matched by the border embellishments found on Princess Yung-t’ai’s epitaph tablet (Fig. 3). Here is a piece of evidence which remarkably supports the theory that the stone carvers attached to the emperor’s workshop had produced stone reliefs for imperial monuments to be erected above ground as well as for funerary objects to be buried in underground tombs. It proves that the engraved stone relief found in the T’ang tombs, like T’ang painting, is unquestionably a distinctive artistic achievement of the time.

Additional proofs are provided by rare surviving examples. The recently discovered thresh-
old fragments at the former site of the southern city gate, Ming-te men, of the T’ang capital, Ch’ang-an, bear engraved leafy scroll embellishments that are very similar to the two examples just mentioned. The representations engraved on the stone base of the Stele of Priest Tao-yin (A.D. 663) show features commonly seen in T’ang figure painting (Figs. 26 and 27). The characteristic bold but sinuous line that defines form, the calligraphic flexes that denote volume in space, the mastery of a brushwork that confers three-dimensionality, are skillfully produced in line-engraving.

Perhaps figure masters such as Yen Li-pen, Wei-chih I-seng (act. ca. 660–710), and Wu Tao-tzu (ca. 689–after 758), who were celebrated in Chinese painting history for their superb brushwork, had contributed to the development and achievement of the line-engraved stone relief art. Their masterpieces, long lost, but in their times shining models of figure painting, must have provided inspiration as well as impetus to the stone carvers to strive for an equal achievement.

More eloquently than words could describe, the T’ang line-engraved stone reliefs from Shensi have emphasized the close relationship between the two branches of the Chinese art of the brush. Despite the fact that the artists who executed the original representations on the stone surfaces of the tomb furnishings are not known, the line-engraved representations, because they are permanent records, bear testimony to the accomplishments of the master painters in the same way that the inscriptions on stone proclaim themselves models for script styles of the great calligraphers. In the absence of authentic originals by T’ang figure masters, these line-engraved stone reliefs, which reflect so admirably the achievements in contemporary painting, constitute a valuable corpus of reference materials for the study of T’ang figure painting.
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Glossary

| a. | 大雁塔 | ag. | 隱刻 |
| b. | 大智 | ah. | 舊唐書 |
| c. | 李壽 | ai. | 新唐書 |
| d. | 賓客 | aj. | 領官署 |
| e. | 永泰 | ak. | 明器 |
| f. | 章懷 | al. | 砥 |
| g. | 韋嗣 | am. | 墓誌 |
| h. | 順德之 | an. | 道德經 |
| i. | 間立本 | ao. | 側帖 |
| j. | 綺靡 | ap. | 王義之 |
| k. | 揚本 | aq. | 王獻之 |
| l. | 糸底(地)平難 | ar. | 處世南 |
| m. | 王子雲 | as. | 禪達氏 |
| n. | 藝術匠師 | at. | 太宗 |
| o. | 刀筆 | au. | 敦煌 |
| p. | 荒難 | av. | 閩亭序 |
| q. | 肥城 | aw. | 欧陽詢 |
| r. | 鄰縣 | ax. | 順真卿 |
| s. | 济南 | ay. | 柳公權 |
| t. | 密縣 | az. | 草書 |
| u. | 綏德 | ba. | 資素 |
| v. | 米脂 | bb. | 石台孝經 |
| w. | 鋪首御環 | bc. | 玄宗 |
| x. | 李和 | bd. | 長安 |
| y. | 三原 | be. | 道因 |
| z. | 咸陽 | bf. | 屋邊乙齋 |
| aa. | 李靜調 | bg. | 呉道子 |
| ab. | 宿白 | ac. | 韋頊 |
| ac. | 謑書 | ad. | 慕書 |
| ae. | 袁術 | af. | 開刻 |
Fig. 1. Stone epitaph tablet from Princess Yung-t'ai's tomb, Ch'ien-ling, Shensi. Dated A.D. 706. 119 x 119 cm.

Fig. 2. Stone relief rubbing of Princess Yung-t'ai's epitaph tablet cover. Dated A.D. 706. (After Nishikawa, Seian hirin, pl. 177.)
Fig. 3. Stone relief rubbing of Princess Yung-t'ai's epitaph tablet base. Dated A.D. 706. (After Nishikawa, Senju hirin, pl. 178.)
Fig. 7. Detail of female attendant from "A Group of Palace Ladies," right half of east wall, antechamber of Princess Yung-hsia's tomb. Dated A.D. 706. (After T'ang Yung-t'zu, Chang-ju mu pu shu, pl. 2.)

Fig. 6. Stone relief rubbing of female attendant from the mural, left panel on west wall of Princess Yung-hsia's coffin cabinet. Dated 41 B.C. 706. H. 138 cm. (After Nashikawa, San' un haku, pl. 20.)
Fig. 8. Stone relief rubbing. Close-up of a female attendant, inside, center panel of west wall of Princess Yung-t'ai's coffin casket. Dated A.D. 706. (After M. Kitagawa, "Tomb of Princess Yung-t'ai" Kobijutsu, no. 10, September 1965, pl. 10.)

Fig. 9. Close-up of a female attendant from a detail of "A Group of Palace Ladies," right half of east wall, antechamber of Princess Yung-t'ai's tomb. Dated A.D. 706. (After M. Kitigawa, "Tomb of Princess Yung-t'ai," Kobijutsu, no. 10, September 1965, pl. 5.)
Fig. 10. Stone relief rubbing of two female attendants, outside, left panel on south wall of Princess Yung-t’ai’s coffin casket. Dated A.D. 706. H: 138 cm. (After Nishikawa, Sān hsin, pl. 209.)
Fig. 11. Stone relief rubbing of a male guardian figure, right door panel of Princess Yung-t'ai's tomb-chamber doorway. Dated A.D. 706. H: 104 cm. (After Nishikawa, Seian horen, pl. 211.)

Fig. 12. Male guard. Detail of "A Group of Guards," west wall in tomb path of Prince I-te's tomb. Dated A.D. 706. (After T'ang Li Chung-jun, pl. 26.)
Fig. 13. Stone relief rubbing from a Han tomb, Fei-ch'eng, Shantung. Dated A.D. 83. (After Wen Wu, 1958, 4, pl. 2.)

Fig. 14. Stone relief rubbing from a Han tomb, I-nan, Shantung. Ca. A.D. 211. (After I-nan ku hua-hsiang, pl. 34, left section.)
Fig. 15. Stone relief and rubbing from Kuo Chih-wen's tomb, Sui-te, Shensi. Dated A.D. 105. (After Shen-pie, pl. 74.)
Fig. 16. Stone relief rubbing from Li Ho's tomb-chamber doorway. Dated A.D. 582. (After Wen Wu, 1966, 1, fig. 44.)
Fig. 17. Stone coffin casket encasing house-like stone coffin from Li Ching-hsun’s tomb, Western suburb of Hsian, Shensi. Dated A.D. 608. H: 161 cm., L: 263 cm., W: 110 cm. (After T’ang Ch’ang-an pl. 3.2.)

Fig. 18. House-like stone coffin from Li Ching-hsun’s tomb, Western suburb of Hsian, Shensi. Dated A.D. 608. H: 122 cm., L: 192 cm., W: 89 cm. (After T’ang Ch’ang-an, pl. 11.)
Fig. 19. Tortoise-shaped stone epitaph tablet from Li Shou's tomb, San-yüan, Shensi. Dated A.D. 630. H: 64 cm., L: 166 cm., W: 96 cm. (After Wen Wu, 1974, 9, fig. 28.)

Fig. 20. Stone relief rubbing from Li Shou's epitaph tablet cover. Dated A.D. 630. (After Wen Wu, 1974, 9, fig. 29.)

Fig. 21. House-like stone coffin casket from Li Shou's tomb, San-yüan, Shensi. Dated A.D. 630. H: 220 cm., L: 355 cm., W: 185 cm. (After Wen Wu, 1974, 9, fig. 7.)
Fig. 22. Stone relief rubbing from the inside, right-end panel on west wall of Li Shou's coffin casket. Dated A.D. 630. (After Wen Wu, 1974, 9, fig. 31.)
Fig. 23. Stone relief rubbing from the inside, left-end panel, north wall of Li Shou's coffin casket. Dated A.D. 630. (After Wen Wu, 1974, 9, fig. 32.)
Fig. 24. Stone relief rubbing from Li Ho's epitaph tablet base. Dated A.D. 582. (After Wu Wen, 1966, I, fig. 43.)
Fig. 25. Stone relief rubbing from sides of pedestal, Filial Piety Stone Stele, Dated A.D. 745. (After Wang Tzu-yiin, Chung-kuo, pi. 28.)
Fig. 26. Stone relief rubbing from side of pedestal, Priest Tao-yin's Stele. Dated A.D. 663. H: 37 cm., W: 43 cm. (After Wang Tzu-yün, Chung-kuo, pl. 23.1.)

Fig. 27. Stone relief rubbing from side of pedestal, Priest Tao-yin's Stele. Dated A.D. 663. H: 37 cm., W: 43 cm. (After Wang Tzu-yün, Chung-kuo, pl. 23.2.)
EARLY MING PAINTERS IN NANKING AND THE FORMATION
OF THE WU SCHOOL

BY HOU-MEI SUNG ISHIDA

Introduction

Early Ming, from the beginning of the Hung-Wu era (1368–1398) to the end of the Hsüan-te reign (1426–1435), is a relatively short span of sixty-seven years in Chinese history. Yet, this period holds the most important key to our knowledge of the formation of the Wu School (Wu refers to the region surrounding Suchou, also known as Wu-hsien). Although the literati tradition in the area can be traced to the Yüan dynasty, Shen Chou (1427–1509) is usually accredited as the founder of the School in the late fifteenth century. However, as the following discussion indicates, it was dramatic changes in political institutions in the early Ming that were largely responsible for this rapid transition in painting. Thus, this study will focus on the fundamental political changes in the early Ming which directly affected the painters' positions and set the basic patterns for all the following periods. It will also examine the significant role of Wang Fu and a group of early Ming scholar painters and their initial development of the forthcoming Wu School. Finally, it will examine the geographic center for the School, the early Ming capital Nanking where, before the removal of the capital to Peking in 1421, a significant group of both the court painters and scholar painters had gathered.

Historical Background

Although the dominant trend of late Yüan literati painting (wen-jen hua) continued into the early Ming, there were some significant changes that marked this new era and influenced the painters' status and activities.

In the thirty-year Hung-wu reign (1368–1398), the establishment of Nanking as the capital gradually moved the center of painting from the Suchou area to Nanking. The turmoil of the late Yüan, the Hung-wu emperor's lack of interest in art and his hostile attitude toward the Chiangnan region put an end to the thriving artistic gatherings and activities there. At the same time, the newly designated capital, Nanking, grew rapidly into the political and cultural center. Even after the capital was moved to Peking in the later Yung-lo era (1403–1424), Nanking continued to play an influential though secondary role.  

The most significant turning point in the evolution of the structure of the Ming government occurred in 1380. In this year, the Prime Minister, Hu Wei-yung, was put to death on charges of plotting a rebellion. After this, the Hung-wu emperor abolished the office of the Prime Minister and the whole superstructure of the Secretariat (Chung-shu sheng).  

This case directly contributed to the misfortune and death of many painters, among them Wang Fu and Wang Meng. Wang Fu was banished to Ta-tung around 1380, staying there for more than ten years. Wang Meng was imprisoned in 1380 and died in 1383. It also led to the loss of political power and prestige for scholar officials.

After the destructive stage of the Hung-wu period, some constructive developments followed in the succeeding Yung-lo reign. It was during this time that we find a definable new phase of the early Ming. The Yung-lo emperor, though not particularly interested in art, was much better educated and showed less of the insecurity that dominated his predecessor. One major device used by Yung-lo to control and gain the support of the scholar-gentry was the patronage of scholarship. The compilation of the Veritable Record (Shih-lu) of the Hung-wu and Chien-wen (1398–1402) periods and the more famous Yung-lo Encyclopedia (Yung-lo ta-tien), were both completed under Yung-lo's reign. These compilations, especially the Yung-lo Encyclopedia, brought together a large number of scholars to the court. Along with the scholars, many calligraphers were selected for copying these books, scholar painters among them. The result was a flourishing scholastic environment in the court.  

Another change that improved the position of scholar officials was the rising political power of the Grand Secretaries (Ta-hsüeh-shih). The Grand Secretaries began to assist the emperor in administrative paperwork. A Grand Secretary of the Yung-lo era, Yang Shih-ch'i (1365–1444), wrote:

After Ta-tsun成功ed to the throne, he paid much attention to literary scholars . . . soon he selected seven
officials from the Han-lin Academy and placed them in the Grand Secretariat (Nei-ko). They were in charge of all important matters. All the memorials and drafting were left to them.

The seven officials were: Hsieh Chin, Hu Kuang, Huang Huai, Hu Yen, Yang Jung, Yang Shih-ch'i and Chin Yu-tzu.6

This situation was rather unique to the Yung-lo era, because in Hsüan-tsung’s reign (1424–1434) the eunuchs gained increasing power and eventually replaced the roles of the Grand Secretaries. Significantly, the growing influence of Yung-lo scholar officials was directly responsible for the greater activity of scholar painters in Nanking. This was at the highest level, as the Grand Secretaries became important patrons for both the court and scholar painters.

Painters in the Early Ming Court: Scholar Painters and Court Painters

Since so little is known about early Ming painters and their activities, it is very difficult to make a thorough and systematic study of them. Harrie Vanderstappen’s significant article, “Painters at the Early Ming Court (1368–1435) and the Problem of a Ming Painting Academy,” surveyed their positions at the court. He concluded that there was no painting academy in the Ming until the seventeenth century. However, in searching for a “Painting Academy” based on the Sung definition, Vanderstappen did not distinguish the professional court painters, such as Pien Wen-chin and Hsieh Huan from the scholar painters, such as Wang Fu and Hsia Ch’ang who served in the court as officials. Both groups were considered as court painters by Vanderstappen. To clarify this situation I have divided the two groups and list them as follows:

Court Painters

(selected or recommended for their abilities solely as painters)

Hung-wu reign (1368–1398)
Chang Yen-t’s’ai
Chao Yu-an
Cheng Chao-fu
Ch’en Yu-an
Ch’en Wei
Chou Wei
Hsiang Li
Shen Hsi-yüan
Sheng Chu
Sun Wen-tsung

Wang Chung-yü
Yung-lo reign (1403–1424)
Chang Tsu-shih
Chao Lien
Chiang Tsu-ch’eng
Fan Hsien
Fang Ch’ang-ling
Han Hsiu-shih
Hsieh Huan
Hu Liang
Kung Yung
Kuo Wen-t’ung
Pien Wen-chin
Shang-kuan Po-ta
Wang Shun

Scholar Painters

(entering the court, especially the Han-lin Academy, as scholar-officials or calligraphers)

Hung-wu reign (1368–1398)
Ch’en Yu
Chu Fei

Yung-lo reign or later (from 1403)
Chang I
Ch’en chi
Ch’en Tsung-yüan
Chin Tun
Chin Wen-ting
Cho Ti
Chu K’ung-i
Hsia Ch’ang
Hsia Heng
Hsia Ping
Hsieh Chin
Huang Meng
Su Fu
Wang Fu

Scholar painters did not belong to the “Painting Academy” (Hua-yüan), a term that will be used here for convenience. (Painting Academy will refer to the loosely organized court painters, especially those who worked in the palace building known as the Wu-ying tien.) Their qualifications and duties were those of scholar officials. For them painting was a leisure time activity and they had no obligation to paint for the emperor or senior officials. It must be emphasized, however, that the above lists of the two groups of painters are far from complete. They include only those who are known to have served in the court through available biographical information.8 One exception is the case of Chao Yüan. Chao was a late Yüan scholar painter, yet
he was "summoned to serve in the Chung-shu" in the early years of the Hung-wu era. As discussed below, before 1380 all court painters served in the Wu-ying tien, which was then controlled by the Secretariat (Chung-shu sheng). Therefore, Chao, though a scholar painter under the Yüan, served as a court painter in his late years. The serious misunderstanding concerning these two groups of painters in the past may have been caused by two factors. First, the confusing title Drafter in the Secretariat (Chung-shu she-jen) was applied to both groups in the early Ming without any indication of their different nature. Second, both groups received the same patronage from the Grand Secretaries during the Yung-lo era. This common patronage brought the two groups of painters closer in both their personal relationships and styles. Thus the problem concerning the "Painting Academy" of the early Ming is partially resolved by a clearer definition of the term. In comparison with the well organized Sung Painting Academy, the Ming dynasty court painters were a less cohesive group, especially in the early Ming when all institutions were still in the process of reconstruction.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to make a thorough study of the loosely organized "Painting Academy". The major purpose here is: to distinguish the court painters assigned to the Wu-ying tien, and later, other palace buildings, the Jen-chih tien and Wen-hua tien, from the scholar painters who served in the Han-lin Academy as Drafters in the Secretariat (Chung-shu she-jen), a distinction based upon their different positions, qualifications, duties and painting activities; to study the relationship of these two groups of painters during the Yung-lo reign when both groups were under the patronage of the Grand Secretaries; to investigate the role of the Nanking scholar painters in the formation of the Wu school.

**Court Painters of the Early Ming (1368–1424)**

The Hung-wu reign (1368–1398) was marked by a lack of organization and regularized system for many offices. For example, although the examination system was restored, many officials entered government service through recommendations (chien-chhi). On the other hand, it is also understandable that in the beginning of the new dynasty, there would naturally be a great demand for painters to decorate the new palaces, and to make new paintings for the halls or residential quarters. The emperor, for example, commissioned portraits of meritorious ministers, and ancient sages for his own use. All these required professional painters to be employed in the court. Unfortunately little information is available concerning these painters and their activities. The early Ming also adopted the Yüan practice of summoning noted painters to the court and giving them official titles and imperial commissions. Some painters were employed in the court, such as Sheng Chu, Chou Wei, Chao Yüan and Shen Hsi-yüan. Some were only temporarily in the court. They were rewarded and sent home after their commissions expired—for example, Hsiang Li and Sun Wen-tsung.

The official titles of Hung-wu court painters often reflected where in the palace they worked. Painter-in-attendance (Tai-chao) was a traditional title for court painters. According to Sun Ch'eng-tse (1592–1676), from the beginning of the Ming, all the court painters who received the tai-chao worked in the palace building known as the Wu-ying tien. The title Drafter in the Secretariat (Chung-shu she-jen), received by Shen Hsi-yüan, was an unconventional title. As will be mentioned later, this title should be more precisely called Wu-ying-tien Chung-shu she-jen and should be differentiated from the same title offered to scholar painters like Chu Fei in the Hung-wu era or Wang Fu in the Yung-lo era. Thus, this reinforces the idea that court painters of the Hung-wu era were assigned to the Wu-ying tien. Sun also claimed that the Wu-ying tien was like the Sung dynasty Academy of Painting (Hua-hsüeh) and the Wen-hua tien was like the Sung dynasty Academy of Calligraphy (Shu-hsüeh) except that they did not have the same competitions and contests as those of the Sung Academies.

Yung-lo (1403–1424), as we might expect from an improved cultural milieu, showed more interest in painting than his father. It was recorded that he once viewed the imperial painting collection with T'eng Yung-heng and some other scholars in the court. His tastes in painting were not limited to portraits and wall decorations that pleased Hung-wu, but extended to such themes as animals and landscapes. For example, he commissioned the painting of a Giraffe (Ch'i-lin t'u) in 1414, and he showed a special interest in the landscape style of the court painter Kuo Wen-t'ung (an example of his work is shown in Fig. 1). As a result, painters in the Yung-lo court (see list
above) increased in both number and specialty. There were painters for flowers and birds (Fan Hsien and Pien Wen-chin); animals (tiger-painter, Chao Lien, and horse-painter, Han Hsiu-shih); for portraits (Ch’en Wei); Buddhist and Taoist figures (Shang-kuan Po-ta and Chiang Tsu-ch’eng); and landscape (Kuo Wen-t’ung, Chang Tzu-shih and Hsieh Huaan).

Our knowledge concerning the titles received by the Yung-lo court painters continues, however, to be scanty and brief. Pien Wen-chin was known to have received his title Wu-ying-tien tai-chao during this period. Han Hsiu-shih was recorded as “serving in the Inner Palace” (Kung-shih nei-tien) without any specific title. Kuo Wen-t’ung was serving as Director of the Construction Office (Ying-shan-so ch’eng).15 Kuo’s other title, Attendant of the Office for Audience Ceremonies (Ko-men-shih), as recorded by Tu Ch’iung and Hsü Yu-chen was offered to him later, in 1425.16 In addition to the Wu-ying tien, the Jen-chih tien and the Wen-hua tien were also designated for court painters either during the Yung-lo era or shortly afterwards.17 Although some Ming records suggested that Ming painters of the Wu-ying tien or Jen-shih tien were working under the supervision of the Eunuch Directorate (T’ai-chien) or Palace Treasury (Nei-fu ya-men),18 this is only applicable to the official system after Hsüan-te when the eunuchs gained strong political power in court.

Drafters in the Secretariat and Scholar Painters in the Early Ming Court

Drafters in the Secretariat (Chung-shu she-jen) is a title essential to our understanding of the early Ming painters’ positions in the court. The title had undergone so many changes from Hung-wu to Yung-lo that it has caused a great deal of confusion.

In the beginning of the Hung-wu reign, the government structure was divided into administrative, surveillance and military hierarchies. The three institutions in charge of these responsibilities were: the Secretariat (Chung-shu sheng), the Tribunal of Censors (Yü-shih l’ai) and the Military Commission (Shu-mi Yuan). However, the Secretariat, controlled by the Prime Minister, was in general charge of government administrations. The Secretaries (Sheng-sha-jen) were first established as assistant officials in the Secretariat in 1374, with the duty of supervising the dispatch of imperial orders, proclamations, edicts and honorable mentions. On special occasions, they were commissioned to introduce guests to the court, to attend to high officials, or to take charge of other ceremonial functions. In 1376, the title Secretary (Sheng-sha-jen) was changed to Drafter in the Secretariat (Chung-shu she-jen) and the rank was raised (7a in the Nine Ranks System). Those who were appointed to this title usually had a Metropolitan Graduate (Chin-shih) degree. Sometimes, it was offered to sons or brothers of very high officials, such as Sung Sui, the son of Sung Lien. The only scholar painter of the Hung-wu era who received this title was Chu Fei. Chu was serving as a Compiler in the Han-lin Academy (Han-lin pien-hsiu) in the early Hung-wu reign before he was promoted to become a Drafter in the Secretariat (Chung-shu she-jen) in 1376. It was clearly stated that he was qualified to serve under this title by his training in the classics and calligraphy, not his ability in painting.19

This administrative structure lasted until 1380, during which time the ministerial authority was concentrated in the hands of the Prime Minister, Hu Wei-yung. As mentioned above, the Hung-wu emperor considered this a serious threat to his own status. In 1380, he put Hu to death on a charge of treason and abolished the Secretariat. The title of Chung-shu she-jen, however, remained in use, but the power and responsibilities originally connected with it were divided among the six Ministries and became less significant. It is therefore necessary to explain its use as applied to three different groups of officials in the early Ming era: the Central Drafting Office (Chung-shu k’o); the Drafters in the two Halls (the Wu-ying tien and the Wen-hua tien); and in the Grand Secretariat Nei-koh Chung-shu.

Chung-shu she-jen Under the Central Drafting Office (Chung-shu k’o).

Central Drafting Office was a term used after 1380 for the twenty Chung-shu she-jen who took some of the old duties of the Secretariat (Chung-shu sheng).

However, this group seldom used this title except for the occasions when they worked in conjunction with the Six Ministries.20 In these instances, they referred to this title on their official seals. This group of Chung-shu she-jen was selected from Metropolitan Degree (Chin-shih) graduates or from some of the Licentiate (Chu-jen) graduates who had won the imperial reward by their compilation work. Sometimes the
title was given to sons of meritorious ministers as an imperial favor. They could be promoted to the Censorate and positions in the Ministries.

**The Drafters in the Two Halls (Liang-tien Chung-shu).**

The second group were called Drafters in the Two Halls (Liang-tien chung-shu). They were the Chung-shu she-jen who worked in the Wu-ying tien and Wen-hua tien, the "two halls". They did not belong to the Central Drafting Office (Chung-shu k'o). Those who worked in the Wen-hua tien were mainly responsible for copying and collating books. Those who worked in the Wu-ying tien were responsible for painting.

As mentioned before, Sun Ch'eng-tse compared the Wu-ying tien to the Sung Academy of Painting and the Wen-hua tien to the Sung Academy of Calligraphy. Although this comparison may be superficial, it is important to note that the court painters in the early Ming were assigned to the Wu-ying tien under various titles (such as Tai-chao and Chung-shu she-jen). It is also helpful to learn that Chung-shu she-jen offered to court painters (such as Shen Hsi-yüan or Chang Tzu-chün) was a title attached to the Wu-ying tien and should be more precisely called Wu-ying-tien Chung-shu she-jen in order to be distinguished from the same title offered outside the Wu-ying tien.

**The Chung-shu she-jen Assigned to the Grand Secretariat (Nei-ko).**

The third type of Chung-shu she-jen was assigned to the Grand Secretariat (Nei-ko). Before the central government reorganization in the 1380's, these Drafters in the Secretariat (nei-ko chung-shu) had been attached to the Secretariat (Chung-shu sheng). After 1380, when the Central Drafting Office (Chung-shu k'o) replaced the Secretariat, they became independent. Their duties included editing and drafting the imperial decrees, letters and credentials. Generally, only Licentiate (Chü-jen) graduates were selected for this office. In the beginning of the Yung-lo era (1403-1424) when the seven Han-lin officials were placed in the Grand Secretariat, a group of scholars were selected for their skill in calligraphy as assistants. These calligraphers were later given the title Chung-shu she-jen. Although in all historical records this group of Chung-shu she-jen serving in the Yung-lo era were not distinguished from the earlier Drafter in the Grand Secretariat (Nei-ko chung-shu), their qualifications and duties were slightly different from those with the same title under the Hung-wu reign. The Yung-lo Drafters were directly attached to the Grand Secretaries. Most of them were not Licentiate (Chü-jen) graduates and entered the court only through the recommendations of the Grand Secretaries. Also, their duties were reduced to only copying work.

Yet, this group of Chung-shu she-jen serving in the Grand Secretariat after the Yung-lo reign concerns us the most when we discuss the positions of the Yung-lo scholar painters. This is because most of the scholar painters of the early Ming, including Wang Fu, Chu K'ung-i, Chin Tun, Chin Wen-ting, Ch'en Tsung-yüan, and Hsia Ch'ang, all served in this position.

Other than the copying work, the Drafters in the Yung-lo Secretariat were ordered to practice the calligraphy of Wang Hsi-chih and his son Wang Hsien-chih under the supervision of the Grand Secretary, Huang Huai. In 1412, most of them received the title Chung-shu she-jen as an imperial favor from the emperor. This was recorded by Yang Shih-ch'i:

One day the emperor ordered K'ung-i (Chu K'ung-i) to write the title piece of the Ts'ai-shan hall. Chu picked up his brush and immediately finished the writing. The emperor was so pleased that he offered the title, Chung-shu she-jen to Chu on the same day. On the following day the emperor ordered that all the calligraphers working in the Han-lin be promoted to the same title.

Yang Shih-ch'i also pointed out that this was an exceptional departure from the usual way of offering this official title since none of these calligraphers had a Metropolitan Graduate (Chin-shih) degree and they entered the Han-lin Academy without going through the Ministry of Personnel (Li-pu). Yang further specified that the offering of an official title based on the skill of calligraphy started with this case of Chu K'ung-i.

There were also a few scholar painters who received this title through recommendations as a reward for their participation in the compilation work of the Yung-lo Encyclopedia. They included: Huang Meng, Hsia Ping, Hsia Heng, Liu Wei-hsin, Ling An-juan, and Ch'eng Nan-yüan. Chin Wen-ting was the only scholar painter who had a Chung-shu she-jen title but never served in the court. Chin received this as an honorary title through his son Chin Tun, who served as Chung-shu she-jen in the Yung-lo era.

It is interesting to note that there was an informal training in the preferred calligraphy style of Wang Hsi-chih and Wang Hsien-chih for
this group of Chung-shu she-jen in the Han-lin Academy. The influence of this prevailing style practiced by these Drafters was reflected in the widespread trend in early Ming calligraphy of a neat, precise style which later degenerated to the so-called “examination-hall style” (kuan-ko t’i). This association of calligraphy skill with the title Chung-shu she-jen continued throughout the Ming. What deserves our attention here is that the title Chung-shu she-jen offered to the scholar painters who worked as calligraphers in the Han-lin had nothing to do with painting. Instead, their duties and qualifications were directly related to their skill in calligraphy. Very likely, the popularity of the idea of perfecting the three arts of poetry, calligraphy and painting (san-chüeh) at this time encouraged many early Ming scholars to apply themselves to painting as a pastime.

From the above discussion, it is clear that the title Chung-shu she-jen is enormously complicated, not only because of the successive changes in its application, but also because of multiple usage of the identical term. In the Hung-wu era, it was bestowed on the court painter Shen Hsi-yüan and likewise on the scholar painter Chu Fei. In the Yung-lo period, it was offered to many scholar painters who worked in the Han-lin Academy as calligraphers such as Wang Fu, Chu K’ung-i, Ch’en Tsung-yüan, Hsia Ch’ang, Chang I, Hsia Heng, Hsia Ping, Huang Meng and Chin Tun. Although the title was the same, the actual positions, qualifications and duties of court painters were distinctly different from those of the scholar painters.

**The Grand Secretaries as Patrons of Painters in the Yung-lo Court**

The Yung-lo era in particular was a period of close relationship between scholarly officials and painters. Most of the painters (including both scholarly painters and court painters) entered the court through the recommendations of scholarly officials. For example, Wang Fu was recommended by Hu Kuang, Shih Chin by Wang Ching, Hu Yen by Hsieh Chin, Shen Tu by Yang Pu, Hsia Ping by Yang Jung, Ch’en Chi by Yang Shih-ch’i, and Ch’en Tsung-yüan by Huang Huai. Many of the Han-lin officials were amateur painters themselves, such as Hu Yen, Liang Yung-hsing, Wang Ju-yü, Ch’eng Nan-yün, Su Po-hou, Yao Kuang-hsiao and Ku Lu. Powerful Grand Secretaries were valued patrons. In addition to sponsoring scholar painters (not as painters but as scholarly officials), they also had close ties with court painters working in the Wu-ying tien, for the Wu-ying tien remained under their control. This situation lasted until the Hsüan-te period when the eunuchs gained control over it. The following list of the six most active Grand Secretaries clearly indicates the special relationship they had with various painters.

**Yang Shih-ch’i** (1365–1444)

*Ming: Yu, hao: Tung-li, a native of Kiangsi.*

Yang Shih-ch’i entered the Han-lin Academy under the Chien-wen reign (1399–1402) through the recommendation of Wang Shu-ying. In the Yung-lo era, he was promoted to the position of Grand Secretary which he held from 1421 to 1444. He continued to serve under Emperors Hsüan-tsung and Yang-tsung. Yang was known for his wise judgement of character and his generosity in patronizing scholars without any recognized background. It was said that he recommended such a great number of officials that many of them were those he had never met.

Yang’s strong interest in calligraphy and painting was indicated by the large number of paintings and calligraphy works he owned or inscribed. Although it was not clear how many painters were recommended by him, he had a close relationship with most of the painters in the early Ming court. In the scholar painter group, Wang Fu, while working in the Han-lin during the Yung-lo period, painted Bamboo and Rock (Chu-shih t’u) for Yang. At least four of Wang Fu’s works: *Farewell at Feng-ch’eng* (Feng-ch’eng chien-yang; Fig. 2), *Ink Bamboo* for Tseng Ch’i, *Ink Bamboo for Chung Tsu-chin* and *The Pure Wind Studio* (Ch’ing-feng lou t’u) were inscribed by Yang. Another scholar painter, Chu K’ung-i, who also served as a Chung-shu she-jen during the Yung-lo, painted *Returning Home* (Kuei-t’ien t’u) for Yang. Among court painters, Hsieh Huan had an especially close relationship with most of the Grand Secretaries in the early Ming, including Yang Shih-ch’i. This is testified by Hsieh’s surviving handscroll, *Literary Gathering in the Apricot Garden* (Hsia-yu-ya-chi), portraying a literary gathering in the spring of 1437 in Yang Jung’s garden. All the participants of this gathering have been identified by Yang Jung’s preface to the scroll. As shown in the version now owned by Wango H. C. Weng (Fig. 3), Yang Shih-ch’i is the central figure of the three elderly officials sitting in front of
a rock screen. Yang’s eminent status and his interest in painting are well depicted by Hsieh who placed Yang Shih-ch’i next to the host, Yang Jung (the one sitting next to the desk on the left) and a young attendant holding a scroll. Other than this extant work of Hsieh, there are also many recorded paintings that reveal Yang’s relationship with Hsieh and other early Ming painters. In 1437, the same year Hsieh painted the Literary Gathering in the Apricot Garden, he also painted Joy of a Snowy Night (Hsiųeh-yeh ch’ing-hsing) for Yang Shih-ch’i in memory of a poetic gathering of Yang Shih-ch’i and Yang Jung. Although both these paintings were done in the Hsüan-te era, Hsieh started his service as a court painter in the early Yung-lo reign.48

Another favorite court painter of Yang Shih-ch’i was Chang Tzu-chun. Yang often wrote poems to Chang in exchange for Chang’s paintings, and in 1433 Chang made him a copy of Li Kung-lin’s Confinucius and His Disciples (Shengche hsiang).59 Other early Ming works bearing Yang’s inscriptions include: Sun Ts’ung-ch’i’s Ink Plum Blossom, Hsü Ching’s Ink Plum Blossom, Chu Meng-yüan’s Elegant Gathering at the Western Garden (Hsi-yüan ya-ch’i), Ch’‘en Shu-ch’i’s Landscape and Hsia Ch’ang’s Bamboo at the Hsiang River (Hsiang-chiang yü-i).50

Yang Jung (1371–1440)51

Tzu: Tsung-yü, hao: Chieh-an, a native of Yung-chia, Chekiang.

In 1400, Yang Jung (cf. Fig. 3) became a Chin-shih graduate and was offered the title Junior Compiler (Pien-hsiu) in the Han-lin Academy. In the early Yung-lo era, he entered the Wen-yüan ko and was promoted in 1419 to Grand Secretary and concurrently Han-lin Chancellor. He was one of the most trusted advisors of the Yung-lo emperor. Under his recommendation, Hsia Ping, brother of Hsia Ch’ang, was released from Yunnan where he was banished in the late Hung-wu era and entered the Han-lin in the Yung-lo reign.51

Yang collected at least four recorded paintings by Wang Fu: Pavilion in the Clouded Mountain (Yün-shan ts’ao-t’ang),52 Ten Thousand Trees (Wanmu t’u), Old Pines on the River (Ku-sung liu-shu) and Old Junipers in the Valley (Lao-kuei ch’ang-yai).54 The first two were both done in memory of Yang’s father, Yang Po-ch’eng. Other painting of Wang Fu inscribed by Yang Jung include Eight Views of Peking, in the Historical Museum, Peking (Fig. 4), although the colophon is not visible on sections reproduced here.55

Yang Jung was on intimate terms with many other scholar and court painters. Ch’en Tsung-yüan presented at least two paintings to him based on the theme of Farewell at Chi-men, Chi-men sung-pieh and Chi-men pieh-i.56 Other than Hsieh Huan’s portrait of Yang Jung and eight colleagues in his apricot garden (cf. Fig. 3), Yang also inscribed Kuo Wen-t’ung’s Eight Views of Chin-t’ai,57 Hsia Ch’ang’s Bamboo at the Hsiang River,58 Ch’en Tsung-yüan’s Hung-yai’s Mountain Retreat (Hung-yai shan-jiang),59 and Pien Wenchin’s Flowers and Birds (Hua-mu ling-mao).60

Huang Huai (1367–1449)

Tzu: Tsung-yü, hao: Chieh-an, a native of Yung-chia, Chekiang.

Huang Huai became a Chin-shih in 1397 and served as Chung-shu she-jen in the Hung-wu court. In the beginning of the Yung-lo, he entered the Wen-yüan ko as Junior Compiler (Pien-hsiu) and was later promoted to Grand Secretary of the Wu-ying tien in 1407. As mentioned before, he was the supervisor for the group of calligraphers who worked in the Han-lin to assist the Grand Secretaries. Under his recommendation, Ch’en Tsung-yüan was removed from the artisan rank to join this group of calligraphers in Han-lin.61 Huang Huai was also a patron for the court painter Hsieh Huan and his teacher Ch’en Shuch’i. Ch’en was an old friend of Huang’s father, Huang Hsing,62 who sponsored the only extant painting by Ch’en, Autumn Feelings at Hsiao and Hsiang (Hsiao-Hsiang ch’iu-i; Fig. 5 a and b), in 1412. The later half of this painting was completed by Wang Fu (Fig. 6). Huang Huai’s patronage of Ch’en Shuch’i is revealed by his presenting Ch’en’s paintings to other Grand Secretaries such as Yang Shih-ch’i.63 It is very possible that Hsieh Huan entered the court during the early Yung-lo era through the recommendation of Huang Huai, since Hsieh was the favorite student of Ch’en Shuch’i,64 and both Hsieh and Ch’en came from Yung-chia, the hometown of Huang Huai.

Chin Yu-tzu (1568–1431)

Ming: Shan, hao: T’ui-an, a native of Ch’ing-chiang, Kiangsi.

In 1400 Chin Yu-tzu received his Chin-shih degree. In the beginning of the Yung-lo era, he entered the Han-lin Academy and was soon promoted to the position of Expositor-in-waiting (Shih-chiang). Chin accompanied the six imperial trips of the Yung-lo emperor to Peking from
1409 to 1424. In 1420, he became the Grand Secretary of the Wen-yüan ko and four years later the Grand Secretary of the Wu-ying tien. Chin reached the peak of his career in 1425 when he was promoted to be the Minister of Rites (Li-pu shang-shu).

Chin’s favorite painter was his friend, Hsü Ching. Hsü was a plum painter from Chin’s hometown, Ch’ing-chiang. One of the paintings Hsü presented to Chin is Plum Blossom in Snow (Hsüeh-mei t’u), which must have been done in a style similar to the only extant work of Hsü, The Pure Whiteness of Winter (Sui-han ch’ing-pai).

Fig. 7), now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Chin was also an associate of Wang Fu. His inscriptions are found on Wang’s Eight Views of Peking. Their friendship is revealed in two poems Chin wrote in memory of Wang Fu. Chin wrote the epitaph for Ch’en Chih-chung who was the father of Wang Fu’s follower, Ch’en Tsung-yüan.

His patronage of the court painter Kuo Wen-t’ung is recorded by the account he wrote of Kuo’s studio, P’u-ch’ao and three poems on Kuo’s painting Eight Views of Chin-t’ai. For Hsieh Huan, Chin wrote an account of Hsieh’s studio, Ching-lo hsüan. In 1422, Chin received from Hsieh a painting for his brother entitled The Joy of Life (Hsing-lo t’u).

HU KUANG (1370–1418)

Tzu: Kuang-ta, hao: Kuang-an, a native of Chi-shui, Kiangsi.

In 1400, Hu Kuang received a Chin-shih degree and entered the Han-lin Academy as a Compiler. In 1416, he was promoted to Grand Secretary of the Wen-yüan ko and maintained this position until his death.

As a scholar, Hu was known for his expansive knowledge in the classics, his literary talent in writing and his running script calligraphy. After recommending Wang Fu to the court in 1403, his association with the artist was long and constant over a period of fourteen years. After Wang died he wrote his epitaph. In 1414, both Hu and Wang joined the imperial trip to Peking, where Wang Fu painted Eight Views of Peking for him.

Another painting Wang dedicated to Hu was A Pavilion Among the Autumn Trees (Ch’iu-lin t’ing-tzu).

HU YEN (1361–1443)

Tzu: Jo-ssu, hao: I-an, a native of Nan-ch’ang, Kiangsi.

Hu Yen graduated as Ch’u-jen in 1387, and after passing the metropolitan examination in the following year, received an appointment as Instructor (Chiao-yü) in a district school in Hua-t’ing. In the beginning of the Yung-lo reign, Hu Yen was selected along with six other Han-lin officials to enter the Wen-yüan ko and perform Secretarial and advisory duties for the emperor. In 1404, he was promoted to be Chancellor of the National University (Kuo-tzu chi-chiu) and held the position for over twenty years.

Hu Yen was also known as a calligrapher and painter. As a painter, he was known for his ink bamboo, bamboo and rock, orchids as well as ink sketches of sheep and deer.

Hu’s interest in painting can be traced to the Hung-wu era. In the late Hung-wu period, he requested Chao Wen to paint his studio, Chin-ch’ing-hsüan, and Fang Ts’ung-i to paint his dwelling, I-an. During the Yung-lo era, Hu asked Wang Fu for a painting depicting his future retreat on Mt. Hung-yai. After Wang excused himself for his poor health, Hu then turned to Wang’s student, Ch’en Tsung-yüan for the same painting. Ch’en then produced the painting Hung-yai’s Mountain Retreat (Hung-yai shan-fang), now in the Peking Palace Museum (Fig. 21). Other paintings Hu inscribed include three by Wang Fu: Farewell at Feng-ch’eng (Fig. 2), Eight Views of Peking (Fig. 4), and Ink Bamboo; he also wrote on Kuo Wen-t’ung’s Eight Views of Chin-t’ai (Chin-t’ai referring to one of the eight views of Peking).

The interests and tastes of these Grand Secretaries were reflected in the paintings of their proteges who included both scholar and court painters. Such patronage brought the two groups closer in their painting activities. The collaborative work by Pien Wen-chin and Wang Fu, Bamboo and Cranes (Chu-ho shuang-ch’ing; Fig. 8), in which Wang painted the ink bamboo and Pien added two cranes, is a good example. Upon the request of Huang Huai, Wang Fu also collaborated with Ch’en Shu-ch’i, the teacher of Hsieh Huan, in Autumn Feelings on the Hsiao and Hsiang (Hsiao-hsiang ch’iu-i; Figs. 5 and 6). Besides, the court painter Kuo Wen-t’ung’s Eight Views of Chin-t’ai may well have been inspired by Wang Fu’s Eight Views of Peking for the two had almost identical lists of inscribers.

In view of the foregoing observations, it is clear that in spite of the dominant trend of the late Yuan tradition, the significant political changes in the early Ming created a new environment for
both scholar-painters and court painters. Starting from the Yung-lo era, most scholar painters of the Wu area gathered in Nanking and served as Chung-shu she-jen in the Han-lin Academy. Working as calligraphers under the supervision of the Grand Secretaries, these scholar painters received strong support from the Secretariat officials for their paintings. Through the Grand Secretaries, they also built a closer relationship with the court painters. In general, we do not find the polarized opposition between the scholar painters and court painters that was later so much emphasized in the theories of Tung Ch’i-ch’ang (1555–1636). Instead, a close relationship led to a fresh and open attitude toward past traditions.

For instance, among scholar painters in Nanking, Wang Fu, Ch’en Yu and Chu Fei all followed Southern Sung academic styles in some of their works. Nor was there necessarily a marked change outside the court. Although few of their paintings survive today, Shen Yu, Wang Li and Chang Chin were all recorded as choosing the Ma-Hsia tradition as the major source of their works.

The Formation of the Wu School—Nanking Stage

In the discussion of the Wu school, most past research has concentrated on developments beginning with Shen Chou and Wen Cheng-ming. However, if the Wu school can be considered as established during the mid to late fifteenth century by Shen Chou in Suchou itself, its roots must be searched out within a group of scholar painters in Nanking, and a complete study of the formation of the Wu school should specify two stages of development.

The early stage, which includes the whole Yung-lo era (1403–1424), may accordingly be called the Nanking stage, for both the political and cultural center was in that city, and as will be discussed later, it was the scholar painters there who played such an important role. The second stage should be called the Suchou stage. This starts with the Hsian-te reign (1425–1435) and is to be directly connected with a recognizable first, second and even third generation of Suchou Wu school masters, with such well-known names as Tu Ch’iung, Liu Chüeh, Shen Chen, Shen Chou and Wen Cheng-ming. In this stage, the political capital was in Peking but the cultural center for scholar painters had settled in Suchou, the area that gave the Wu School its name.

This development may be directly related to the decline of the political power of the Grand Secretaries, who were gradually replaced by the eunuchs, and was followed by the increasing corruption in the court. It was a situation that discouraged most scholars and scholar painters from serving in the court. As a result, while Nanking as a secondary capital remained a center for court painters, most of the scholar painters retired to Suchou. The discussion here will focus on the first Nanking stage only.

Early Ming Collectors and Patrons in the Wu Area

In spite of the fact that the painting activity of this stage (1403–1424) was centered in Nanking, the Wu area to the southeast of Nanking had continued from the Yüan dynasty to be important for painters and collectors. Scholar painters in Nanking thus travelled frequently to the area and received constant support there. It is important to review this patronage.

Shen Cheng (1376–1463)

Tzu: Meng-yüan; hao: Chieh-hsüan or Chien-an; lived in Hsian-ch’eng.

The most important collector-patron in Suchou for the early Ming scholar painters was Shen Chou’s grandfather, Shen Ch’eng. He lived in Hsian-ch’eng, about ten miles northeast of Suchou city. His friendship with the artists Chin Wen-ting, Hsieh Chin, Shen Yu, Su Fu, Ch’en Chi and very possibly Wang Fu, and his relationships with local collectors Ch’én Meng-fu, Shun Ts’un-keng and Chu Yung-nien contributed greatly to the formation of the school that was to be fully established in his grandson’s generation. In 1406, Shen Ch’eng was recommended to the court where he served for a short time. Just before he was to be offered an official title, he retired because of illness. However, while he was in the court, he had the chance to meet and hold numerous gatherings with scholar painters who served there or lived in Nanking.

The most important gatherings, however, were those held at Hsi-chuang, Shen’s dwelling outside Suchou. One such meeting, in the year 1416, was later recorded by Tu Ch’iung and painted by Shen Yu. Half of the members of this particular gathering were Yung-lo scholar painters from Nanking: Chin Wen-ting, Ch’en Chi, Hsieh Chin, and Su Fu. The other four, Wang Ju-yü, Chin
Wen, Chang K’en and Chin Yung were all Han-lin officials of the Yung-lo court who had very close relationships with these scholar painters. Although Wang Fu did not participate (Wang died in Peking early in the same year), he must have known Shen during the years they worked together in the court. Furthermore, among Shen’s friends, Shen Ts’un-keng, Ch’en Meng-fu, indeed most of the members comprising the Hsi-chuang gathering of 1416 were all close associates of Wang Fu.95

CH’EN MENG-FU (d. 1410)

Hao: Meng-fu.

Another well known collector in Suchou was Ch’en Ch’ien, more commonly known by his hao, Meng-fu. He was a retired scholar from the late Yüan who worked as a physician. During the Hung-wu era, he suffered the same fate as Wang Fu, being the victim of a political purge, and was banished to Ta-t’ung, near the great wall in northern Shansi. The two built a close friendship during their hardship at this distant military base. Ch’en, however, returned to Suchou a few years earlier than Wang Fu.86 A poem by Wang, written on the occasion of Ch’en’s departure from Ta-t’ung, and an Ink Bamboo Wang sent to Ch’en in 1400 recorded their lasting friendship.87 Ch’en was known for his painting collection which included two of the most well-known old paintings in the early Ming: Yen Wen-kuei’s *Early Autumn Morning at the Ch’u River* (Ch’u-chiang ch’iu-hsiao) and Chao Meng-fu’s *Lofty Scholar* (Kao-shih t’u). Both paintings had long inscriptions by famous Yüan and early Ming scholars.88 It was through this interest in painting that Wang Fu became a friend of Shen Ch’eng. In fact, Wang Fu’s *Ink Bamboo* of 1400 was later presented by Ch’en to Shen Chou’s uncle, Shen Chen, and eventually was inscribed and collected by Shen Chou.89 The family friendship thus continued to the next generation for there is evidence that Shen Chou (Shen Ch’eng’s grandson) and Ch’en Ch’i (Ch’en Meng-fu’s grandson) often viewed and inscribed each other’s painting collections.90 Yen Wen-kuei’s *Early Autumn Morning* had colophons by Tu Chi’ung (dated 1470), Ch’en K’uan, Liu Chüeh and Shen Chou.

Ch’en Meng-fu’s home in Su-chou was frequented by scholars and painters based in Nanking, among these we know of Hsieh Chin, Wang Fu, Wang Hsing, Ou Huan and Chu Yung-nien. On one of Hsieh Chin’s paintings done at Ch’en Meng-fu’s dwelling, the artist wrote that Ch’en’s interest in painting was shared by Ch’en’s uncle and even extended to his servants. On this occasion, a boy attendant at Ch’en’s house requested a painting by Hsieh as a reward for his dusting and wiping Hsieh’s chairs.91 Ch’en Meng-fu died in 1410,92 when Wang Fu was in Peking.

SHEN CH’ENG-P’U (ca. 1360s–1420s)

Ming: Jui; Hao: Ts’un-keng.

When we move to near-by Wu-hsi, the best known collector there in the early Ming was Shen Ch’eng-p’u. Shen was known for his possession of Wang Meng’s handscroll, the *Rain-listening Pavilion* (T’ing-yü-lo t’u), which had an introduction by Wang Ta,93 a scholar official from the same city. Shen’s role as a patron for local scholars was mentioned in another composition by Wang Ta, his account of Sh’en’s studio, *Ts’un-keng l’ang* (Ts’un-keng l’ang chi).94 Shen was a member of the Bamboo Stove Gathering (*Chu-lu ya-chi*) initiated by Wang Fu, who of course was a native of Wu-hsi, and the monk Hsing-hai of the Hui-shan temple there. It was joined by local scholars including Wang Ta, and Han I.95 Some of these gatherings were depicted by Wang Fu in the now lost *Spring Rain at Chiang-nan* (Chiang-nan ch’un-yü t’u)96 and *Bamboo Stove Scroll* (*Chu-lu t’u*). On one of his visits to Shen, Wang Fu painted ink bamboo on the wall of his studio, *Lai-ch’ing lou*.97

The friendship between Shen Ch’eng-p’u of Wu-hsi and the collector Shen Ch’eng of Suchou was revealed when Shen Ch’eng-p’u presented his most important painting, Wang Meng’s *Rain Listening Pavilion*, to him. By 1480 Shen Chou had inherited the painting. He showed it to Ch’en Ch’i and received an inscription from him. Although this painting is lost today, it remains one of the most well documented works in the Ming period.98

CHU YUNG-NIEN (act. 1360s–1420s)

No other names recorded.

A less known collector in Suchou was Chu Yung-nien. Yet he is worth mentioning if for no other reason than that he owned the Suchou painter Chang Hsün’s *Outline Bamboo* (*Kou-le chu*, Fig. 25) of 1349 which contains numerous inscriptions by Han-lin officials of the Yung-lo era.99 The painting is still extant and is now in the Peking Palace Museum. From the scroll we learn—from Liang Yung-hsing—that Chu was one of the most important early Ming collectors in the Wu area. Chu also knew both Wang Fu and Ch’en Meng-fu.100
Early Ming Scholar Painters in Nanking

Now turning to Nanking itself and to scholar painters active there during the Yung-lo era who, I believe, were responsible for the early beginnings of the Wu school, eight are of particular significance: Wang Fu, Hsieh Chin, Hsia Ch’ang, Chin Wen-ting, Ch’en Shu-ch’i, Ch’en Tsung-yüan, Cho Ti and Su Fu. Among them, Ch’en Tsung-yüan and Hsia Ch’ang were both Wang Fu’s students. Ch’en Shu-ch’i is included in this group even though he did not live in Nanking. This is because of the strong patronage he received from Huang Huai, the Grand Secretary of the Wu-ying tien. Ch’en’s association with Yang Shih-ch’i, Hsieh Huan and Wang Fu also connects him with Nanking developments.

As will be discussed shortly, this group of painters was bonded together by friendship, common patronage from scholarly officials in the court or from collectors in the Wu area as well as by their literary activities. They also shared common interests and approaches to painting. Unfortunately, among these painters, Wang Fu is the only one with enough extant paintings to indicate both the development of his individual style and the tendencies of the period. Hsia Ch’ang, a follower of Wang, left us many ink bamboo paintings which indicate a close relationship to Wang Fu. Hsieh Chin, Ch’en Tsung-yüan, Chin Wen-ting, Ch’en Shu-ch’i and Cho Ti have only one, or at most a very few extant works. As for the remaining artist, Su Fu, none of his paintings appears to have survived. Taken as a whole, paintings by these artists show the same tendencies as those seen in Wang Fu’s works. As a group, together with Wang Fu, they formed a link from the immediate past to the well known Wu masters of the next generation.

Wang Fu (1362–1416)

Ts’u: Meng-tuan, hao: Yu-shih-sheng, Chiu-lung shan-jen and P’o-yen-chai, a native of Wu-hsi.

Among the scholar painters in Nanking, Wang Fu was the most important. This is seen in the significant amount of his extant paintings, as well as his achievements in both landscape and ink bamboo. However, a full investigation of Wang’s leading role in the early development of the Wu school has been presented elsewhere. Here, only a brief introduction is necessary. In his time Wang was probably the first to adopt an art historical approach directed extensively to all the leading Yüan masters. His choice of Chao Meng-fu along with Huang Kung-wang, Wu Chen, Ni Tsan and Wang Meng as his major models indicates a definite influence on future Wu painters who were to follow the same stylistic sources. He was especially responsible for the elevation of Ni Tsan (see his Retreat in the Autumn Woods of 1401, Fig. 9) and Wu Chen into the later grouping of the so-called “four masters of Yüan”. Although Huang Kung-wang and Wang Meng were already well established masters and were widely followed even before the end of Yüan, Ni Tsan and Wu Chen did not share that same popularity until Shen Chou’s time.

In composition, Wang Fu’s spatial arrangements, further flattening all the motifs and stacking them vertically as surface patterns in the picture plane, was one solution for the problems of fitting traditional landscape compositions into the more elongated hanging scroll (tiao-fu) format. Although this trend became popular in the late Yüan, it was Wang’s predilection for this format in both landscape and ink bamboo that generated many original compositions which were shared by most of the later Wu school painters. In addition, he can be said to have invented the “ink bamboo landscape” by placing the closely focused ink bamboo against a landscape background in a long handscroll as seen in his Thousands of Bamboo in Autumn (Wan-chu ch’iu-shen; Fig. 10). Indeed, Wang Fu’s influence on both landscape and ink bamboo paintings, his innovative compositions in the hanging scroll or handscroll and his personally formulated brush techniques developed by creatively combining the brush modes of late Yüan models in landscape and ink bamboo reached far beyond the Wu school. Many of the so-called “Che School painters” adopted the same trend in their works as well.

Wang Fu’s direct relationship to many of the early Wu masters can be documented. As Tu Ch’iu-chung pointed out, Wang Fu was the first early Ming painter to be chosen as his model for learning painting. This certainly must have been helped by the fact that Tu Ch’iu-chung’s early teacher, Liu Min, was a longtime colleague and friend of Wang Fu. Since Tu was also a close associate of Shen Ch’eng and the teacher of Shen Chou, he formed another link in the chain between Wang Fu and the Wu School. Another teacher of Shen Chou, Chao T’un-ju, was the grandson of Chao Yu-t’ai, who together with his brother, Yu-t’ung, were both intimate friends of Wang Fu. Finally, Wang’s student, Hsia Ch’ang, further strengthened Wang’s relation to the Wu School. Hsia was not only a well respected
Hsien Chin (ca. 1370–after 1431)

Tzu: K'ung-chiao, hao: K'uei-ch'iu, Lan-t'ing sheng, Hsi-yin, Shen-ts'ui tao-jen and Tieh-shan, from Suchou.

Hsien Chin was both a poet and painter. His childhood friends included the well known scholars Ch'en Chi and Chin Wen. As a landscape painter, Hsien was known for his piled up mountains and abundant vegetation. This characteristic earned him the nickname “mountain piling Hsieh” (Hsieh tieh-shan).

According to the Su-chou Gazetteer (fu-chih), Hsien was sent to the capital at Nanking to be an artisan painter (hua-kung) by the local officials of Suchou, because they were irritated by his arrogant and aloof manner. He then stayed in the capital for more than twenty years and was finally released because of his poor eyesight. This account seems to be questionable. Hsien indeed lived in Nanking for more than twenty years, although according to Tu Ch'iung, he never served in the court. Instead, he was a frequent guest of many scholar officials there. He was no doubt popular and known among his associates as a very sociable, friendly and humorous person. Among contemporary painters, Hsien had a close relationship with Wang Fu, Chin Wen-ting, Shih Chin, Shen Tu, Chu K'ung-i, Su Fu, Ch'en Chi and Chang Chin. Perhaps one of these painters was responsible for the now lost and unsigned painting of 1389 depicting Hsien's studio, Deep Green Pavilion (Shen-ts'ui hsüan). To this painting were attached numerous inscriptions of Yung-lo scholars or officials. As mentioned previously, Hsien was a member of the Hsi-chuang gatherings, and he portrayed this well-known retreat of Shen Chou's grandfather in a scroll painted during a more prolonged visit there in 1427.

In landscape painting, Hsien, as had Wang Fu, followed mainly the Yüan masters. Among them, he especially favored Wang Meng and Chao Yüan: the painting is still extant on Chao Yüan's Reading in the Summer Mountains (Hsia-shan t'u-shu) now in the Honolulu Academy of Art. Furthermore, two of Hsieh Chin's own extant paintings, listed below, show a strong stylistic dependence on his two favorite Yüan masters.

As for the dates of Hsieh's life, they must fall between the 1370's and 1430's. Hsieh's known painting activity is recorded from 1389 to 1431. His close associates, Chin Wen-ting (1351–1436) and Shen Meng-yüan (1376–1463) and his childhood companions, Ch'en Chi (1370–1434) and Chin Wen (1370–1448) were all born in the 1370's. In addition, Ch'en Chi's 1480 inscription on Hsieh's Hsi-chuang scroll claimed that Hsieh had passed away over forty years earlier. Therefore, we can postulate dates of Hsieh's life as: ca. 1370–after 1431.

Among the paintings attributed to Hsien, four have been selected to represent his style and are presented here in catalogue fashion:

Poetic Feelings about Tu Fu

(Shao-ling shih-i t'u), dated to 1418, hanging scroll, ink and slight color on paper, 108.2 x 50.1 cm., three seals of the artist, Chekiang Provincial Museum (Fig. 11).

Artist's inscription: The old home at Wan-li ch'iao in Ch'eng-tu, the T'sao-t'ang (Tu Fu's dwelling) north of Pai-hua t'an, is far away from here. At the door, one finds no district clerks pressing for taxes. Inside, there is a neighbor friend to dispel loneliness. Shadows of the pine trees cover the yard during the day. The fragrance of tea drifts around us as we sit. Deeply I regret that Tu Fu has become a poet of history, and laugh at Yang Hsüng's work Chieh-ch'iao. Yung-chia (Tu Ch'üng) is a descendant of Shao-ling and a learned scholar. He has devoted himself to poetry and painting. Learning that I was going home, he came to request my painting and inscription. Hsien Chin from K'uei-ch'iu inscribed on the third day of the third month, 1418.

This painting is the earliest extant dated work by Hsien. It also significantly reflects the intimate relationship between Hsien Chin and the early Wu School master, Tu Ch'üng.

In both composition and brushwork, Hsien followed the style of Wang Meng. The composition reminds us of Wang Meng's Alchemist's Terrace at Spring Dawn (Tan-t'ai ch'un-hsiao) now in Taipei's National Palace Museum (Fig. 12). In the foreground, a scholar's retreat is revealed through
a screen of pine trees. On the right, a visiting scholar holding a walking staff is arriving at the door. Rising above the pines are towering mountains. Despite these marked similarities to Wang Meng’s work, a distinction can be made in the more exaggerated foreground, especially the trees. Both the foreground and background are further flattened and compressed. The lack of interest in creating a depth in space causes the central mountain to loom forward. These compositional features help define a period style and are the same tendencies found, for example, in Wang Fu’s Mountains and Rivers (Kao-shan liu-shui) now in the Shantung Province Museum (Fig. 13).120

In terms of brushwork, Hsieh’s painting reveals fundamental features of Wang Meng as seen in the rich variety of trees, dense and luscious vegetation, repeated fibrous texture strokes and the crowded dark dots. However, instead of the Yuan painter’s emphasis on the impulsive yet firm directional movement of the mountain ridges, Hsieh shows marked interest in surface patterns formed by his wavy hemp-fiber (p’ima) and lotus-leaf (ho-yeh) texture strokes and the leafy clusters of dots on the mountains. The blunt, forceful and undulating brushwork in turn forms a unique individual expression. Like Wang Fu, Hsieh succeeded in building his style by creatively combining and interpreting the styles of a late Yuan master.

Hermit Fisherman with Autumn Trees

(Ch’iu-lin yu-yn), hanging scroll, ink on paper, dimensions unknown, signature and seal of the artist, present collection unknown; formerly Pang Yuan-chi collection, Shanghai (Fig. 14).


Other inscriptions: A poem inscription has been added by Hsieh’s friend, Ch’en Chi (1370–1434), the Hanlin academician who was the teacher of Shen Chou’s father and uncle.121

Although this painting is not dated, Ch’en Chi’s inscription makes it possible to date it before 1434, the year Ch’en died. This inscription further reminds us of Hsieh’s role as a direct link between the early painters in Nanking and the first generation of the Wu School. According to Hsieh Chin, the painting was dedicated to Liu Kang, who was a Chin-shih graduate. Checking through Ming biographies, we find four scholars with this name. All four had the same degree.122 Of these, judging by known dates, the Liu Kang who received his Chin-shih in 1433 was most likely the one who had met Hsieh and Ch’en and received this painting. He was a native of Shantung.

The composition of Hermit Fisherman is that of a typical river scene of the late Yuan, as often seen in paintings of Wu Chen or Sheng Mou. In the foreground, a group of trees stand prominently on a riverbank accompanied by a fishing boat. A distant mountain is placed above and beyond the river. Chao Yung’s Picking Water Chestnuts (Ts’ai-ling t’u) now in Taipei (Fig. 15) offers an excellent comparison. The landscape composition is amazingly similar but there are significant developments. First of all, Hsieh’s foreground extends higher up on the picture plane and appears much closer to the viewer. Also noticeable in Hsieh’s work is the vertical stacking of the foreground and background that literally run into each other. In Chao Yung this tendency is already visible, yet there are still indications that suggest a diagonal movement from the foreground to the background. This effect is carried out by the opening up of the space from the lower left to the upper right. In Hsieh’s work, the distant mountains are placed directly over the foreground river bank. The boat on the lower left no longer acts as a diagonal movement toward the distant mountains. This device of stacking the foreground and background vertically, without any suggestion of the diagonal spatial recession in between, is the same characteristic found in Wang Fu’s Retreat in the Autumn Woods (Ch’iu-lin yin-chü: Fig. 9) or Farewell at Feng-ch’eng (Fig. 2).123

Some of the characteristic brushwork seen in the previously discussed Poetic Feelings is also found here. The forceful, wavy texture lines and, the firmly controlled brush strokes of bare branches are all comparable. Both paintings exhibit Hsieh’s interest in rich texture and heavy vegetation.

Visiting a Friend in the Spring Mountain

(Ch’un-shan fang-yu), hanging scroll, ink and slight color on paper, 93 x 34.3 cm. Signature and three seals of the artist. Private collection, Hong Kong (Fig. 16).124

Artist’s inscription on the upper right corner: Visiting a Friend in the Spring Mountain, Hsieh K’un-chiao, K’uei-ch’iu, painted this for Liu Kang who was a Provincial graduate (Hsiao-lien).125
Other inscriptions: A second inscription was written by the early Ming scholar, Ch'ing-chen tao-jen (Wang Ning). 126

Adding to the confusion in the sorting of early Ming names, the Liu Kang here (Kang written with a “metal” instead of a “silk” radical) is not the same Liu Kang as the recipient of the Hermit Fisherman scroll. He is found, however, in the writing of Wang Fu 127 who had close associations both with him and his father, Liu Min. The latter was the early teacher of Tu Chi'ung. 128 Again we see connections leading to the early Wu masters.

The painting, depicting a screen of mountains rising from the middle ground and a river bank at the lower right, is not markedly different from Poetic Feelings. Judging from the reproduction available, the densely woven clusters of dark vegetation and rich variety of trees indeed remind us of Hsieh's other works. The overall effect produced by the brushwork, however, is slightly unfamiliar. In his Hermit Fisherman (Fig. 14) and Poetic Feelings (Fig. 11), the outlines or texture lines on the mountains and rocks are bold, vigorous and spontaneously moving. Here in Visiting a Friend, they are softer and more reserved. Especially noticeable is the different appearance produced by the texture lines and dry washes on the folded layers of rocks on the major mountain peak, a brush treatment not seen in Hsieh's other works. The clustered dots on the mountains and rocks are also rendered in a looser manner from those in Poetic Feelings or Hermit Fisherman. Could these unfamiliar features be the result of Hsieh's later development? Such questions must await a close examination of the original.

Landscape in the Style of Tung Yuan

(Fang Tung Yuan shan-shui), hanging scroll, dimensions and collection unknown, (Fig. 17).

Inscriptions: The painting has inscriptions by the artist and four early Ming scholars: Hsü Yung, Tsu Hsüan, Hu Chang and Yu-lan sheng.

This painting attributed to Hsieh Chin was not known until the twentieth century. It was recorded only in Ta-feng t'ang shu-hua-chi (collection of Chang Ta-ch'ien) and reproduced in Ming-jen shu-hua-chi. The composition is similar to Hermit Fisherman (Fig. 14) except that the foreground is moved to the left. The style of this painting, however, is quite far from that of the three Hsieh paintings discussed above. The brush lines are evenly thin and light. The flourishing vegetation, formed with dark ink dots, has lost its firm and vigorous qualities. The same quality is found in the texture strokes. The tall and slender pine trees in the foreground create a sharp contrast with those in Poetic Feelings (Fig. 11). Despite the fact that some of the weak appearance may be resulted from the poor reproduction, the unfamiliar approach in brushwork still suggests that it is likely a later copy.

Hsia Ch'ang (1388–1470)


Hsia Ch'ang became a Chü-jen in 1414 and a Chin-shih in 1415. At this time, for reasons not completely understood, he used the surname, Chu, calling himself Chu Ch'ang. 129 During the Yung-lo era, he served as a calligrapher in the Han-lin Academy and won great favor with the emperor because of his skill at regular script (k'ai-shu). In 1422, he received a transfer to the new capital in Peking. Three years later, he entered the Wen-yüan ko through recommendation and continued to serve under Hsüan-tsung (1425–1435) and Ying-tsung (1435–1449) retiring in 1457 when he was seventy sui.

Although Hsia was mainly known as an ink bamboo painter, he actually learned both landscape and ink bamboo from Wang Fu. 130 His later independent achievement as a bamboo painter, however, is not our present concern. Rather, we will focus directly on Hsia's debt to Wang Fu and relationships to other early Wu school masters.

In his painting of bamboo, he often followed closely the theme, composition and brush techniques of Wang Fu. In fact, he even helped to preserve some compositions of Wang's now lost works. For instance, Hsia's Pine, Bamboo and Rock on a Riverbank (Sung-ch'iian chu-shih), now in the Shanghai Museum, according to his own inscription, was a faithful copy of a Wang Fu original done for Shen Tu. 131 Another of Hsia's paintings, A Branch of Bamboo (Pan-ch'uang ch'ing-ts'ui), in the collection of the National Palace Museum, Taipei, is very likely based on Wang Fu's Bamboo on a Clear Day (Ch'ing-chu t'u) which has survived only through an incised stone copy still in Wu-hsi. 132 The bamboo in Hsia's 1446 Bamboo and Bodhisattva (Chu-lin ta-shih; Fig. 18) also recalls that of Wang's Ink Bamboo dated 1403 (Fig. 19).

In his later years, Hsia Ch'ang became a well respected senior scholar-painter among the Wu school masters Tu Ch'iung, Liu Chüeh, and Shen Chou. Hsia's friendship with them was
strengthened by the fact that his sons-in-law, Hsū Shih-liang\textsuperscript{133} (the son of Hsū Yu-chen) and Wu Wei-ch'i'en \textsuperscript{134} were close associates of all three, while the granddaughter of Hsia Ch'ang was to become Wen Cheng-ming's wife.\textsuperscript{135} These personal connections must have contributed to the strong influence of Wang Fu and his pupil in Suchou painting of that time.

**Chin Wen-ting** (1351–1436)

*Ming: Hsūan, hao: Shang-su, a native of Huating.*

Chin Wen-ting was a scholar skilled in both painting, poetry and calligraphy. Under the Hung-wu reign, he was summoned to the capital and was recommended for a position in the court. Chin refused on account of his mother's old age. In the Yung-lo era, he was offered the honorary title of Drafter in the Secretariat (Chung-shu she-jen) because of the court position of his son, Chin Tun.\textsuperscript{136} Although Chin Wen-ting did not actually serve in the court during the Yung-lo era, he lived in Nanking and was frequently engaged in painting or literary activities with the other Nanking scholars or painters, most prominent among them being Wang Fu, Hsieh Chin, Ou Huan and Shen Meng-yüan.

As a painter of his time, Chin again shows us a strong dependence on the Yüan. He is recorded to have followed the styles of Huang Kung-wang, Wang Meng and a little known painter of the fourteenth century, Chang I-wen. However, the only known surviving painting attributed to him, *The Joy of Fishing* (Yu-lo tu')\textsuperscript{137} from the Hua Shu-ho collection in Taipei, stems directly from Wu Chen and Wu Chen's *Fishermen* (Yu-fu tu') handsccroll a painting known in two versions—one in the Freer Gallery in Washington, the other in Shanghai.\textsuperscript{138} In theme, format, brushwork and even the sixteen poems, one written after each boat, Chin Wen-ting's scroll closely follows the Yüan master.

Chin's strong interest in the late Yüan literati tradition is also reflected in his painting collection. His most famous possession was *Twenty Albums of Twelve Yüan Masters.*\textsuperscript{139} At the end of these, Chin wrote a long inscription, dated to 1413, in which he stated the history of his collection and affirmed his special interest in Yüan paintings. His collection had started in 1383 with five paintings by Huang Kung-wang and Wang Meng. One of them, Wang Meng's *Writing Books under the Pine Trees* (Sung-hsia chu-shu) bears his seal and is now in the collection of Mrs. A. Dean Perry in Cleveland.\textsuperscript{140} By the time of Chin's 1413 inscription, his collection had reached one hundred paintings. Chin also mentioned that he was influenced by his senior collector friend, Ch'i'en Shun-fu, who not only favored Yüan paintings over Sung, but painting on paper and album leaves as well. As Ch'i'en told him:

*Painters are not comparable to Yüan painters in terms of literary spirit (wen-t's'ai). Silk paintings are not as subtle in brushwork and ink (mien-yüan) as paintings on paper. Handsccrolls are not as convenient to view as albums.*\textsuperscript{141}

Chin wrote a second inscription in 1414, mentioning that in order to master painting one should study the past. For Chin himself, the twelve masters found in his *Twenty Albums* were all his teachers.

The friendship between Wang Fu and Chin Wen-ting was immortalized by their creation of Chin's Pure Wind Studio (*Ch'ing-feng lo*). It all occurred one day in 1412 when Wang Fu visited Chin in Nanking. After wine, Wang was so elated that he picked up a brush and painted numerous ink bamboo on the surrounding walls. The two then decided on the studio's name. The Pure Wind Studio became a frequent stopping place for scholars, poets and painters in Nanking. Poems and essays written about it included: two introductions by Liang Ch'i'en and Wang Hung, five poems by Yang Shih-ch'i, and poems by Tsou Chi, Hsieh Chin and P'ing Hsien. All these writings were later mounted into one handsccroll together with Shen Tu's title piece.\textsuperscript{142} As a close friend Wang Fu, of course, must have been familiar with Chin's painting collection.

Chin's association with Hsieh Chin can be confirmed from several recorded paintings by the latter's hand. Their titles suggest characteristic themes: *Mountain Retreat* (Shan-chü t'u), *River Retreat* (Hsi-yin t'u) and *Spring Rain in the Mountain* (Hsi-shan ch'uen-yü t'u).\textsuperscript{143}

Finally, Chin Wen-ting's association with Shen Ch'eng's Hsi-chuang gatherings must not be forgotten. These established a background for later relations between Shen Chou and Chin Wen-ting's son-in-law, Hsū Yung-mei. After Chin passed away, the *Twenty Albums* were inherited by Hsū Yung-mei who in turn showed them to Shen Chou. The result was an inscription in which Shen wrote that Chin's paintings indeed had followed the styles of these Yüan masters and that Shen Chou himself had also learned painting from them as well as from Chin's own works.\textsuperscript{144} The latter is not surprising since Shen Chou's
teacher Tu Ch’iung also chose Chin as one of his major models. At least one painting by Chin was listed in the recorded collection of Shen Chou.  

Ch’en Shu-ch’i (d. ca. 1412)

Other names not recorded; scholar painter from San-shan, Fukien, but lived in Yung-chia in his late years.

Ch’en’s name is briefly listed in Ming hua-lu, but in other sources has been mistaken as Chang Shu-ch’i and Ch’en Pu-ch’i. However, even Ch’en’s name would probably not be known today if he had not collaborated with Wang Fu in the painting Autumn Feelings on the Hsiao and Hsiang (Hsiao-Hsiang ch’iü-i t’u; Figs. 5 and 6), now preserved in the Peking Palace Museum. Ch’en, however, was actually a well known artist in the early Ming who had studied painting with the Yüan master, Chang Shun-tzu. Although Ch’en did not serve in Nanking, he achieved recognition as a painter in the Yung-lo court through the patronage of the Grand Secretary, Huang Huai, and his father Huang Hsing. His friendship with Huang Hsing, lasted for more than twenty years. In his late years, he often visited and stayed in Huang’s home in Yung-chia. Sometime before 1412, Ch’en began the painting of Autumn Feelings on the Hsiao and Hsiang for Huang Hsing, but unfortunately he died before he could complete it, a circumstance we learn from Huang Hsing’s colophon on the scroll. In that year, 1412, Huang Hsing brought the painting to Nanking and asked Wang Fu to complete it. Wang then, according to Huang Hsing, painted all the scenes that follow after Wild Geese Descending to Sandbars (P’ing-sha lo-yen).

Ch’en’s section of this work (Figs. 5a and 5b) reveals the conservative trend of painting in the areas of Fukien and Chekiang. The expanse of the ink-washed lakeshore and the shadow-like dark trees set around the evening mist are linked to the painting of the Hsiao-Hsiang theme associated with Tung Yüan and Mi Fu. The trees formed with horizontal brushstrokes and ink washes refer to the Mi Fu mode. These sources are also affirmed by the early Ming scholars, Sung Na (1311–1390) and Wang Ju-yü (1349–1415). Sung noted that Ch’en’s landscape followed the styles of both Tung Yüan and Li-Kuo (Li Ch’eng and Kuo Hsi) and was comparable to that of the Yüan painter, T’ang Ti. Wang recorded one of Ch’en’s works painted in the style of Mi Fu. In painting rocks, Ch’en’s thick, dark and angular outlines resemble closely that of his teacher Chang Shun-tzu (Fig. 20). Like Chang, Ch’en was also known for the subject of pine and rock (sung-shih) by using the calligraphic technique of “flying white” (fei-pai).

The relationship of Huang Huai to Ch’en Shu-ch’i highlights the significance of Huang’s influence on painting. Huang inscribed many of Ch’en’s works and presented some to other scholar officials in the Han-lin Academy. As mentioned earlier, it is very likely that Ch’en’s favorite student, Hsieh Huan, the painter of the Apricot Garden (Fig. 3) entered the Yung-lo court through the recommendation of Huang Huai. According to Yang Shih-ch’i, Hsieh started to learn painting with Ch’en as a young boy. Ch’en soon recognized his talent and taught him all his skills without any reservation.

Ch’en Tsung-yüan (ca. 1370–1430)

A native of T’ien-t’ai (Chekiang).

Ch’en Tsung-yüan, was a descendant of Ch’en Kang-chung and the son of Ch’en Chih-chung. In the early Yung-lo court, Ch’en Tsung-yüan was merely an artisan of ink (mo-chiang) until, as mentioned above, the recommendation of Huang Huai, freed him from the low social status of the artisan class and he was invited to enter the Han-lin Academy. There he joined the group of Chung-shu she-chen and worked as a calligrapher. This provided Ch’en with the chance to learn painting with Wang Fu. Ch’en stayed in the court for about twenty years before he retired and returned home. His only extant work, Hung-yai’s Mountain Retreat, now in the Peking Palace Museum, was done for Hu Yen. It depicted Hu’s future retreat at Mt. Hung-yai.

Although available reproductions are poor (Fig. 21), it can still be seen, as we might expect, that, this landscape of Ch’en faithfully followed the style of Wang Fu. The composition may remind us of a section of Wang Fu’s Study at Hu-shan (Hu-shan shu-shu) in the Liaoning Provincial Museum (Fig. 22). Similarities also characterize the brushwork and motifs of this painting and those found in Wang Fu’s Pavilion Among Clouds and Trees (Tsao-t’ang yün-shu) in Taipei (Fig. 23). This is especially true of hemp-fiber and lotus-leaf texture strokes, the loose dots on rocks or mountains, and the structure of the rocky cliff and tree branches. Perhaps even more telling is the striking stylistic resemblance between this work and Wang Fu’s Eight Views of Peking (Fig. 4)—compare, for instance the brushwork in rendering the tree branches, the rocks, and the
distant hills. As discussed elsewhere, I believe Wang Fu’s Eight Views of Peking is very likely a faithful copy made by a Ming artist. There is therefore the possibility that Ch’en Tsung-yüan was the actual painter of this work.\textsuperscript{155}

Two more works by Ch’en have been recorded. They are both on the theme of Farewell at Chi-men (Chi-men sung-pieh and Chi-men pieh-i).\textsuperscript{156} Chi-men refers to one of the eight views of Peking.

Cho Ti (ca. 1380–1430)

_Tzu:_ Min-i, _hao:_ Ch’ing-yüeh, a native of Feng-hua, Chekiang.

During the Yung-lo reign, Cho Ti was selected to enter the Han-lin Academy as a calligrapher because of his skill in seal script. After serving only three years, he returned home to take care of his mother.\textsuperscript{157}

Very little is known about Cho as a painter. It is recorded that he once learned painting with Chu Tzu-fang, a painter from Cho’s native town, whose landscapes followed the Sung painters Kuo Hsi and Fan K’uan. We only know Cho’s work in a single painting, the well-known theme featuring the famous fourth century calligrapher, Wang Hsi-chih, Orchid Pavilion (Lan-t’ing hsii-ch’i t’u; Fig. 24).\textsuperscript{158}

be linked to the tradition of Fan K’uan in its depiction of monumental and solid mountains covered with a texture of dense vertical dabs of the brush known as “rain-drop” texture strokes (yü-tien ts’un). Yet, the more compressed spatial arrangement and the sketchy, calligraphic approach in the brushwork of the trees, rocks and figures clearly reveal the painting’s closer relationship with the late fourteenth century tradition. This painting, formerly in Ch’ien-lung’s imperial collection, though not dated, was very likely done between 1403 and March 1413, for the following reasons. It was painted when Cho was still serving in Nanking, since he mentioned in his inscription that it was done in the Official Residence of Chin-ling (Chin-ling kuan-shé). Although the date Cho left Nanking for his home is not clear, it can be estimated because of a poem by Wang Fu written on the occasion of Cho’s departure. The latest date Wang Fu stayed in Nanking, before joining the imperial trip to Peking, where he was to remain until his death in 1416, was in March 1413. Cho’s departure and his Orchid Pavilion must be placed before that time.\textsuperscript{159} As to the theme, it is at least interesting to recall, as mentioned above, the preferred calligraphy style of Wang Hsi-chih among the Chung-shu she-jen in the Han-lin Academy. The only other hint about a Cho Ti painting comes from Tu Ch’iung in recording a long scroll of twenty paintings by famous Yung-lo masters then in Shen Chou’s collection. Among them is a painting by Cho Ti whom he characterizes as a landscape specialist. While the painting is not described, it is noted that it had a seal of Wang Fu, proof that it was once in the latter’s possession. Tu Ch’iung also takes this occasion to mention the close friendship and mutual respect of the two artists.\textsuperscript{160}

Su Fu (ca. 1380–1430)

_Tzu:_ Hsing-ch’u, _hao:_ Mien-chou, a native of Su-chou.

Su started as a Tribute Student (Kung-sheng) in the National University and served later as the Prefect of Mien-chou, Szechuan. His early paintings followed the style of Sheng Mou. However, after he returned home from Mien-chou, he started to paint the scenery of Szechuan and Shensi and was said to have changed his style completely. He was also known as a very slow painter. Sometimes he spent more than one year over one painting.\textsuperscript{161} Probably for this reason, none of his works is known to us through written records or extant paintings. Yet, Su was an influential scholar painter of the early Ming and a member of Shen Ch’eng’s Hsi-chuang gatherings. His painting was praised by Tu Ch’iung as rich in content (yü-i shen-yüan).\textsuperscript{162} As for Su’s dates, it is only known that he was younger than both Wang Fu and Hsieh Chin. Wang Fu once wrote to Su stating, “You have just reached the prime of your life, but my hair is turning white.”\textsuperscript{163} Hsieh also encouraged Su as a young promising scholar when he dedicated a poem to Su’s studio, “Study Amidst Autumn Woods” (Ch’íu-lín hsüeh-shé).

**Conclusion**

From the above discussion, it is clear that even though this group of scholar painters in Nanking during the Yung-lo era did not form a school; their unique political and social background, prompted by the removal of the capital to Nanking and some important institutional changes, set them apart from the late Yüan scholar painters. On the other hand, their close personal relationship as well as their common attitude toward past traditions formed a dominant trend. All of them followed the late Yüan literati painting tradition and emphasized a more individual interpretation of this tradition. Although
not all of them have enough extant works to elucidate a full development, a common approach to painting seems clear in their stylistic sources either as recorded in the literature or visible in extant works. The patronage they received from scholar officials or local collectors indicated the same tendency. What is more significant is that they were directly connected with a recognized line of Wu masters extending from Tu Ch'üang, Shen Chen and Liu Chüeh through Shen Chou and Wen Cheng-ming in both personal and stylistic relationships. Thus, although the Wu school was securely established in later Suchou, one can claim that it was first developed by this group of scholar painters in Nanking during the Yung-lo reign.
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Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Name</th>
<th>Pinyin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chang Chin</td>
<td>章瑾</td>
<td>Zhang Jین</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Hsün</td>
<td>张滦</td>
<td>Zhang Lan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang I</td>
<td>张益</td>
<td>Zhang Yi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang I-wen</td>
<td>张以文</td>
<td>Zhang Yiwen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Shih-lü</td>
<td>张世禄</td>
<td>Zhang Shilu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ang-shu</td>
<td>陈翀</td>
<td>Chen Chong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Shu-ch'i</td>
<td>张叔起</td>
<td>Zhang Shuqi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Shun-tzu</td>
<td>张舜咨</td>
<td>Zhang Shuntu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Tzu-chin</td>
<td>张子俊</td>
<td>Zhang Zijun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Tzu-shih</td>
<td>张子時</td>
<td>Zhang Zishi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Yen-t's'ai</td>
<td>张彦才</td>
<td>Zhang Yantei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Lien</td>
<td>趙련</td>
<td>Zhao Lian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Meng-fu</td>
<td>趙孟頫</td>
<td>Zhao Mengfeng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao T’ung-lu</td>
<td>趙同魯</td>
<td>Zhao Tonglu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Wen</td>
<td>趙文</td>
<td>Zhao Wen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Yu-t'ai</td>
<td>趙友泰</td>
<td>Zhao YouTai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Yu-t'ung</td>
<td>趙友同</td>
<td>Zhao Yo Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Yüan</td>
<td>趙原</td>
<td>Zhao Yuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Yung</td>
<td>趙雍</td>
<td>Zhao Yong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng Chao-fu</td>
<td>陳昭甫</td>
<td>Chen Zhaofu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Chi</td>
<td>陳繼</td>
<td>Chen Ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Ch'i</td>
<td>陳頊</td>
<td>Chen Qian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Chih-chung</td>
<td>陳智仲</td>
<td>Chen Zhizhong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Chung-shu</td>
<td>陳仲述</td>
<td>Chen Zhongshu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Kang-chung</td>
<td>陳剛中</td>
<td>Chen Gangzhong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Meng-fu</td>
<td>陳孟敘</td>
<td>Chen Mengxu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Pu-ch'i</td>
<td>陳步起</td>
<td>Chen Bupi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Shu-ch'i</td>
<td>陳叔起</td>
<td>Chen Shuxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Tsung-yaun</td>
<td>陳宗潤</td>
<td>Chen Zongrun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Wei</td>
<td>陳穀</td>
<td>Chen Gu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Yü (Chung-hsing)</td>
<td>陳遇(中行)</td>
<td>Chen Yu (Zhongxing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Name</td>
<td>Pinyin</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Yuan (Chung-fu)</td>
<td>Ch'en Yuan (Chung-fu)</td>
<td>陳遠(中復)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'eng Nan-yün</td>
<td>Ch'eng Nan-yün</td>
<td>程南雲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'eng-tu</td>
<td>Ch'eng-tu</td>
<td>成都</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-men pieh-i</td>
<td>Chi-men pieh-i</td>
<td>赤門別意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-men sung-pieh</td>
<td>Chi-men sung-pieh</td>
<td>赤門送別</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'i-lin t'u</td>
<td>Ch'i-lin t'u</td>
<td>青麟圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-shui</td>
<td>Chi-shui</td>
<td>吉水</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang-nan ch'un-yü t'u</td>
<td>Chiang-nan ch'un-yü t'u</td>
<td>江南春雨圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Tzu-ch'eng</td>
<td>Chiang Tzu-ch'eng</td>
<td>蒋子成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiao-yü</td>
<td>Chiao-yü</td>
<td>教誘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chieh-ch'ao</td>
<td>Chieh-ch'ao</td>
<td>解嘲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chien-an</td>
<td>Chien-an</td>
<td>薦舉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chien-chü</td>
<td>Chien-chü</td>
<td>錢順甫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien Shun-fu</td>
<td>Ch'ien Shun-fu</td>
<td>建文</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chien-wen</td>
<td>Chien-wen</td>
<td>琴清軒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'in-ch'ing hsüan</td>
<td>Ch'in-ch'ing hsüan</td>
<td>金陵官舍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin-shih</td>
<td>Chin-shih</td>
<td>進士</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin-t'ai pa-ch'ing</td>
<td>Chin-t'ai pa-ch'ing</td>
<td>金台八景</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin Tun</td>
<td>Chin Tun</td>
<td>金銘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin Wen</td>
<td>Chin Wen</td>
<td>金問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin Wen-ting (Hsüan)</td>
<td>Chin Wen-ting (Hsüan)</td>
<td>金文鼎(錫)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin Yu-tzu</td>
<td>Chin Yu-tzu</td>
<td>金幼孜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ing-ch'eng tao-jen</td>
<td>Ch'ing-ch'eng tao-jen</td>
<td>清範道人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ing-chiang</td>
<td>Ch'ing-chiang</td>
<td>清江</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ing-chu t'u</td>
<td>Ch'ing-chu t'u</td>
<td>晴竹園</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ing-feng lou</td>
<td>Ch'ing-feng lou</td>
<td>晴風樓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ching-lo hsüan</td>
<td>Ching-lo hsüan</td>
<td>靜樂軒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'iu-lin t'ing-tzu</td>
<td>Ch'iu-lin t'ing-tzu</td>
<td>秋林亭子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'iu-lin yin-chü</td>
<td>Ch'iu-lin yin-chü</td>
<td>秋林隱居</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'iu-lin yü-yin</td>
<td>Ch'iu-lin yü-yin</td>
<td>秋林漁隱</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiu-long shan-jen</td>
<td>Chiu-long shan-jen</td>
<td>九龍山人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho Ti (Min-i, Ch'ing-yüeh)</td>
<td>Cho Ti (Min-i, Ch'ing-yüeh)</td>
<td>卓迪(民逸, 清約)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Wei</td>
<td>Chou Wei</td>
<td>周位</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Wen-ch'ing</td>
<td>Chou Wen-ch'ing</td>
<td>周文靖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Ch'ang</td>
<td>Chu Ch'ang</td>
<td>朱景</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Fei</td>
<td>Chu Fei</td>
<td>朱芾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'u-chiang ch'u-hsiao t'u</td>
<td>Ch'u-chiang ch'u-hsiao t'u</td>
<td>菜江秋曉圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu-ho shaug-ch'ing</td>
<td>Chu-ho shaug-ch'ing</td>
<td>竹鶴雙清</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'u-jen</td>
<td>Ch'u-jen</td>
<td>舉人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu K'ung-i (K'ung-yang)</td>
<td>Chu K'ung-i (K'ung-yang)</td>
<td>朱孔易(孔陽)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu-lin ta-shih</td>
<td>Chu-lin ta-shih</td>
<td>竹林人士</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu-lu t'u</td>
<td>Chu-lu t'u</td>
<td>竹爐圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu-lu shan-fang</td>
<td>Chu-lu shan-fang</td>
<td>竹爐山房</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu-lu ya-chi</td>
<td>Chu-lu ya-chi</td>
<td>竹鶴雅集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Meng-yüan</td>
<td>Chu Meng-yüan</td>
<td>朱孟潤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu-shih t'u</td>
<td>Chu-shih t'u</td>
<td>竹石圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Tzu-fang</td>
<td>Chu Tzu-fang</td>
<td>朱自芳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Yuan-ming</td>
<td>Chu Yuan-ming</td>
<td>祝允明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Yung-ning</td>
<td>Chu Yung-ning</td>
<td>朱永年</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'un-ming meng-yü-lu</td>
<td>Ch'un-ming meng-yü-lu</td>
<td>春明夢餘錄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'un-shan fang-yu</td>
<td>Ch'un-shan fang-yu</td>
<td>春山詩友</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung-shu</td>
<td>Chung-shu</td>
<td>中書</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung-shu k'o</td>
<td>Chung-shu k'o</td>
<td>中書科</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung-shu she-jen</td>
<td>Chung-shu she-jen</td>
<td>中書舍人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung-shu sheng</td>
<td>Chung-shu sheng</td>
<td>中書省</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung Tzu-ch'in</td>
<td>Chung Tzu-ch'in</td>
<td>鍾子勤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erh-ch'uan</td>
<td>Erh-ch'uan</td>
<td>二泉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Hsien</td>
<td>Fan Hsien</td>
<td>范遲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan K'uan</td>
<td>Fan K'uan</td>
<td>范寛</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang Ch'ang-ling</td>
<td>Fang Ch'ang-ling</td>
<td>朋昌齡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang Hsiao-ju</td>
<td>Fang Hsiao-ju</td>
<td>朋孝儒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang Ts'ung-i</td>
<td>Fang Ts'ung-i</td>
<td>方從義</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang Tung Yüan shan-shai</td>
<td>Fang Tung Yüan shan-shai</td>
<td>仿東源山水</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fei-pai</td>
<td>Fei-pai</td>
<td>飛白</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng-ch'eng Chien-yung</td>
<td>Feng-ch'eng Chien-yung</td>
<td>鳳城競詠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng-hua</td>
<td>Feng-hua</td>
<td>奉化</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han Hsü-shih</td>
<td>Han Hsü-shih</td>
<td>韓秀實</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han-lin</td>
<td>Han-lin</td>
<td>岺林</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han-lin chien-t'ao</td>
<td>Han-lin chien-t'ao</td>
<td>翰林檢討</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han-lin pien-hsiu</td>
<td>Han-lin pien-hsiu</td>
<td>翰林編修</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi-chuang t'u</td>
<td>Hsi-chuang t'u</td>
<td>西莊圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi-yin t'u</td>
<td>Hsi-yin t'u</td>
<td>滬陰圖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Alias (Pinyin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Ch'ang (Chung-chao, Tzu-tai ch'ü-shih)</td>
<td>夏景 (仲昭, 自在居士)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Kuei</td>
<td>夏奎</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Ping</td>
<td>夏屏</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiang-ch'eng</td>
<td>相城</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiang-ch'eng yü-i</td>
<td>相江雨意</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiao-hsiang ch'iu-i</td>
<td>潘湘秋意</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiao-lien</td>
<td>孝濂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsieh Chin (K'ung-chao, K'uei-ch'ü, Lan-t'ing sheng, Hsi-yin, Shen-ts'ui tao-jen, Tich-shan)</td>
<td>谢信 (孔昭, 戚丘, 蘭庭生, 言隠, 深翠道人, 叠山)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsieh Huan</td>
<td>谢环</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsing-hai</td>
<td>景海</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsing-lo t'u</td>
<td>行乐图</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsing-yüan ya-chi</td>
<td>享国雅集</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiu-ch'i t'u</td>
<td>修禊图</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiu-chuan</td>
<td>修撰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsü Ching</td>
<td>徐敬</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsü Shih-liang</td>
<td>徐世良</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsü Yu-ch'en</td>
<td>徐有贞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsü Yung</td>
<td>徐 Uttar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsü Yung-mei</td>
<td>徐用美</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsüan-te</td>
<td>宣德</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsüan-tsung</td>
<td>宣宗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hšieh-mei t'u</td>
<td>雪梅图</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hšieh-yeh ch'ing-hsing</td>
<td>雪夜清兴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu Chang</td>
<td>胡畅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu-chou</td>
<td>湖州</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu Kuang (Kuang-ta)</td>
<td>胡廣 (光大)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu Liang</td>
<td>胡良</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu-shan shu-wu</td>
<td>湖山书屋</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu Wei-yung</td>
<td>胡惟庸</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu Yen (Jo-ssu, I-an)</td>
<td>胡隄 (若思, 願庵)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hua-hsüeh</td>
<td>花學</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hua-kung</td>
<td>花工</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hua-mu ling-mao</td>
<td>花木翎毛</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hua-t'ing</td>
<td>花亭</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hua-yüan</td>
<td>花院</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Hsü</td>
<td>黃性</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Huai (Tsung-yü, Chichan)</td>
<td>黃淮 (宗豫, 介庵)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Meng</td>
<td>黃蒙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui-shan</td>
<td>惠山</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung-wu</td>
<td>洪武</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung-yai</td>
<td>洪崖</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung-yai shan-fang t'u</td>
<td>洪崖山房圖</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-an t'u</td>
<td>頭奄圖</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen-chih tien</td>
<td>仁智殿</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen-tsong</td>
<td>仁宗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ju Hung</td>
<td>蘇洪</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'ai-shu</td>
<td>跡書</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao-shan liu-shui</td>
<td>高山流水</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao-shih t'u</td>
<td>高士圖</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko-meng shih</td>
<td>閣門使</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kou-le chu</td>
<td>勾勒竹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku-sung liu-shui</td>
<td>古松流水</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku-an-k'o t'i</td>
<td>賴闕體</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'uei-ch'ü</td>
<td>戚丘</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kui-ch'ien t'u</td>
<td>歸田圖</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'un-shan</td>
<td>崑山</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kung-sheng</td>
<td>貢生</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kung Yung</td>
<td>慶庸</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuo-tzu chi-chiu</td>
<td>國子祭酒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuo Hsi</td>
<td>郭熙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuo Wen-t'ung (Ch'ŭn)</td>
<td>郭文通 (純)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lai-ch'ing lou</td>
<td>來青樓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao-kuei ts'ang-yai</td>
<td>老懷蒼崖</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Kung-lin</td>
<td>李公麟</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang Ch'ien</td>
<td>梁倩</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang-ch'iu t'ang</td>
<td>麗損</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang-ch'iu t'ang</td>
<td>兩秋堂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang-tien chung-shu</td>
<td>長善中書</td>
<td>Shao-ling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang Yung-hsing</td>
<td>梁用行</td>
<td>Shao-ling shih-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ling An-jan</td>
<td>凌安然</td>
<td>Shao-hsing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Chien</td>
<td>劉鎭</td>
<td>Shen Ch'eng-fu (Ts'un-keng)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Chu-ch</td>
<td>劉珏</td>
<td>Shen Chou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Kang</td>
<td>劉綱</td>
<td>Shen Ch'eng (Meng-yuan, Chieh-hsuan, Chien-an)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Min</td>
<td>劉敏</td>
<td>Shen Hsi-yuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Wei-hsin</td>
<td>劉維新</td>
<td>Shen Ts'ui-hsuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mei-hsieh hsuan</td>
<td>梅書軒</td>
<td>Shen Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meng-tuan</td>
<td>孟端</td>
<td>Sheng ch'iao pi-wan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi Fei</td>
<td>米芾</td>
<td>Sheng-che hsiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mien-chou</td>
<td>綿州</td>
<td>Sheng Chu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mien-yuan</td>
<td>綿遠</td>
<td>Sheng Mou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming-shih lu</td>
<td>明實錄</td>
<td>Sheng she-jen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo-chiang</td>
<td>墨匠</td>
<td>Shih Chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo-chu</td>
<td>墨竹</td>
<td>Shu-hsūeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nei-fu ya-men</td>
<td>內府御門</td>
<td>Shu-mi yüan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nei-ko</td>
<td>內閣</td>
<td>Su-chou fu-chih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nei-tien</td>
<td>內殿</td>
<td>Su Fu (Hsing-ch'u)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni Tsan</td>
<td>寧州</td>
<td>Su Po-hou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ning-chou</td>
<td>宁州</td>
<td>Sui-han ch'ing-pai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai-hua-t'an</td>
<td>百花潭</td>
<td>Sun Ch'eng-tse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan-ch'uang ch'ing-ts'ui</td>
<td>半窗晴翠</td>
<td>Sun Yung-chih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pao-en suu</td>
<td>鄧恩寺</td>
<td>Sun Lung (Ts'ung-chi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pei-ching pa-ching</td>
<td>北京八景</td>
<td>Sun Wen-tsung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pei-yung chih-yin</td>
<td>貝嶼之印</td>
<td>Sung-ch'uan chu-shih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pi-shih so-ts'ang</td>
<td>碧水所藏</td>
<td>Sung Hou-mei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pien Wen-chin</td>
<td>邊文進</td>
<td>Sung Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'ing Hsien</td>
<td>平顯</td>
<td>Ta-feng-t'ang shu-hua chi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'ing-sha lo-yen</td>
<td>平沙落雁</td>
<td>Ta-hsueh shih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'o-yen chai</td>
<td>破研齋</td>
<td>Ta-shan tien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu-chai</td>
<td>樸齋</td>
<td>Ta-t'ung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San-chüeh</td>
<td>三絕</td>
<td>Tai-chao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San-shan</td>
<td>三山</td>
<td>T'ai-ch'ang shih-chia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shang-kuan po-ta</td>
<td>上官伯達</td>
<td>T'ai-chien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'ai-p'ing</td>
<td>太平</td>
<td>Wang Shu-yung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan-chung Yu-wei</td>
<td>潘中有味</td>
<td>Wang Shun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan-t'ai Ch'un-hsiao</td>
<td>丹台春曉</td>
<td>Wang Ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'ang Ti</td>
<td>唐棣</td>
<td>Wang Ying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'ao I</td>
<td>陶伯</td>
<td>Wen Cheng-ming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'ao Yuan-ming</td>
<td>陶潤明</td>
<td>Wen-hua tien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'eng Yang-heng</td>
<td>膳用亭</td>
<td>Wen-jen hua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiao-fu</td>
<td>蕭軒</td>
<td>Wen-ts'ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ting-yü-lo t'u</td>
<td>聆雨樓圖</td>
<td>Wen-yuan ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts'ai-ling t'u</td>
<td>採菱圖</td>
<td>Wu Chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts'ao-t'ang</td>
<td>草堂</td>
<td>Wu Cheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts'ao-t'ang yün-shu</td>
<td>草堂雲樹</td>
<td>Wu-hsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsou Chi</td>
<td>鄭錡</td>
<td>Wu Wei-ch'ien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsou Liang</td>
<td>鄭亮</td>
<td>Wu-yung tien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts'ou-hsüan</td>
<td>祖暄</td>
<td>Yang Hsiung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts'un-keng-t'ang chi</td>
<td>存耕堂記</td>
<td>Yang Jung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu Ch'iüung</td>
<td>杜瓊</td>
<td>Yang Po-ch'eng (Shih-mei)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu Fu</td>
<td>杜甫</td>
<td>Yang P'u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'ui-an</td>
<td>退閑</td>
<td>Yang Shih-ch'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'ui-ssu chai</td>
<td>退思齋</td>
<td>Yao Kuang-hsiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tung Yüan</td>
<td>董源</td>
<td>Yin-ch'ang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan-chu ch'iu-shen</td>
<td>焉竹秋深</td>
<td>Yin-fen-kuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan-li ch'iao</td>
<td>焉里橋</td>
<td>Ying-shan-so-ch'eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan-mu t'u</td>
<td>焉木圖</td>
<td>Ying-tsung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Ch'eng</td>
<td>王儔</td>
<td>Yu-lan sheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Chih</td>
<td>王直</td>
<td>Yu-shih sheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Ching</td>
<td>王景</td>
<td>Yu-i shen-yüan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Chung-yü</td>
<td>王仲玉</td>
<td>Yü-shih t'ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Fu</td>
<td>王俀</td>
<td>Yü-shui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Hsi-chih</td>
<td>王羲之</td>
<td>Yün-shan ts'ao-t'ang t'u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Hsien-chih</td>
<td>王獻之</td>
<td>Yung-chia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Hung</td>
<td>王洪</td>
<td>Yung-lo ta-tien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Ju-yü</td>
<td>王汝玉</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Kung</td>
<td>王恭</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Li</td>
<td>王瓊</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Meng</td>
<td>王蒙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Ning</td>
<td>王寧</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MING PAINTERS IN NANKING**

99
Fig. 1. Landscape in the Blue-Green Manner: The Red Cliff. By Kuo Wen-t'ung (Kuo Ch'un). Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 161 x 95.3 cm. Collection of Wen-wu shang-tien, Peking.

Fig. 2. Farewell at Feng-ch'eng (Feng-ch'eng chien-yung). By Wang Fu. Hanging scroll, ink on paper, 91.4 x 31 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei. Inscriptions: Yang Shih-ch'i (upper left), Hu Yen (upper right).
Fig. 3. A Literary Gathering in the Apricot Garden (Hsing-yuan ya-chi). By Hsieh Huan. Dated 1437. Section of a handscroll, ink and color on silk, 36.6 x 240.6 cm. Collection of Wang H. C. Weng. The two central figures (left to right) are Yang Jung and Yang Shih-ch'î.
Fig. 4. *Eight Views of Peking*. By Wang Fu. Dated 1414. Sections of handscroll, ink on paper, 28 x 821 cm. Historical Museum, Peking.
Fig. 5 a, b. Autumn Feelings on the Hsiao and Hsiang (Hsiao-hsiang ch'iu-i). Sections by Ch'en Shu-ch'i. Dated 1412. Handscroll, ink on paper, 24 x 473 cm. Peking Palace Museum.
Fig. 6. Autumn Feelings on the Hsiao and Hsiang. Sections by Wang Fu.
Fig. 7. The Pure Whiteness of Winter (Shui-han ch'ing-pai). By Hsu Ching. Dated 1441. Hanging scroll, ink on silk, 149 x 75.6 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Fig. 8. Bamboo and Cranes (Ch'iu-ho shuang-ch'ing). By Wang Fu. Dated 1401. Hanging scroll, ink on paper, 95 x 32 cm. Bunkacho, Japan.

Fig. 9. Retreat in the Autumn Woods (Ch'iu-lin yin-chu). By Wang Fu. Hanging scroll, ink on paper, 109 x 44.6 cm. Peking Palace Museum.
Fig. 10. Thousands of Bamboo in Autumn (Wan-chu chiu-shen). By Wang Fu. Dated 1410. Sections of handscroll, ink on paper. The Freer Gallery of Art.
Fig. 11. Poetic Feelings About Tu Fu (Shao-ling shih-i).
By Hsieh Chin. Dated 1418. Hanging scroll, ink and light color on paper, 108.5 x 50 cm.
Chekiang Provincial Museum.

Fig. 12. Alchemist’s Terrace at Dawn of Spring (T’ien-t’ai ch’un-hsiao).
National Palace Museum, Taipei.

Fig. 13. Mountains and Rivers (Kao-shan liu-shui).
By Wang Fu. Hanging scroll, ink and light color on paper, 180.5 x 85.5 cm.
Shantung Provincial Museum.
Fig. 14. Hermit Fisherman with Autumn Trees (Ch’iu-lin yu-yin). By Hsieh Chin. Hanging scroll, ink on paper. Location unknown.

Fig. 15. Picking Water Chestnuts (Ts’ai-ling t’u). By Chao Yung. Dated 1542. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 107.6 x 35.1 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 16. Visiting a Friend in the Spring Mountain (Ch’un-shan fang-yu). By Hsieh Chin. Hanging scroll, ink and light color on paper. Private collection in Hong Kong.

Fig. 17. Landscape in the Style of Tung Yuan (Fang Tung Yuan shan-shui). By Hsieh Chin. Hanging scroll, ink on paper. (After Ming-jen shu-hua chi, v. 25, pl. 1.)
Fig. 18. Bodhisattva and Bamboo (Chu-lin ta-shih). By Hsia Ch'ang. Dated 1446. Hanging scroll, ink on paper, 113.8 x 38.6 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei.

Fig. 19. Ink Bamboo (Mo-chu). By Wang Fu. Dated 1403. Hanging scroll, ink on paper, 127.2 x 40.2 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 20. Ancient Trees and Flying Cascades (Ku-mu fei-ch’üan). By Chang Shun-tzu. Ink on silk, 146.3 x 89.6 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 21. Hung-yai's Mountain Retreat (Hung-yai shan-fang). By Ch'ien Tsung-yuan. Section of handscroll, ink on paper, 27 x 107.3 cm. Peking Palace Museum.

Fig. 22. Study at Hu-shan (Hu-shan shu-wu). By Wang Fu. Dated 1410. Sections of handscroll, ink on paper, 28 x 821 cm. Liaoning Provincial Museum.

Fig. 23. Pavilion Among Clouds and Trees (Ts'ao-t'ang yün-shu). By Wang Fu. Hanging scroll, ink on paper, 18 x 38.7 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 24. Purification at the Orchid Pavilion (Hsiu-ch'i t'u). By Cho Ti.
Sections of handscroll, ink on paper. Private collection in China.
Fig. 25. Bamboo (Ming, 1349).

Handscroll, ink on paper, 43.5 x 667.4 cm. Peking Palace Museum.
MEDIEVAL NARRATIVE SCULPTURE AND THREE KRŚṆA PANELS

BY DONALD M. STADTNER

Preserved within the Thakur’s palace at Sohagpur (Shahdol Dist., M.P.) are three sculpted slabs bearing scenes from the life of Krśṇa. One panel has received some recent attention, but the other two have been largely unnoticed since their discovery. The scenes on one frieze conform to conventional depictions of Krśṇa. The other two friezes, on the other hand, reveal a rich and complex rendition of the career of Krśṇa that raise significant issues about the nature of artistic expression within the medieval sculptural workshop. These two panels also afford a rare opportunity to compare works of sculpture that were based upon the same illustrated model. The three panels, in addition, highlight a fundamental transformation in the structure of narrative sculpture that occurred in north India during the late medieval period.

Although there are a number of sculpted representations based on the career of Krśṇa (krśṇacarita), it is difficult to determine which literary text, if any, provided the source for any certain depiction. Sculptors almost certainly did not base their compositions directly on texts themselves but rather drew their inspiration from illustrated pattern books or standardized representations learned in the atelier. The connection between artists’ models and the written krśṇacaritas must have varied considerably, but despite what must have been a constantly changing relationship the sculpted works exhibit a remarkable unity that reflects a basic core story that remained fairly stable. Moreover, the episodes from Krśṇa’s career that are generally depicted in sculpture occur in each of the principal texts, helping to explain the difficulty in assigning individual texts as sources for the majority of friezes. Certain incidents from Krśṇa’s career were never depicted in sculpture, since they were of lesser importance or were intrinsically difficult to translate into stone. In this latter category would probably be such episodes as Krśṇa swallowing the forest fire or the disappearance of Krśṇa and Balarāma caused by Brahmā. Other incidents, on the other hand, achieved such popularity that they were represented in stone long before the compilation of the first extant text in which they are mentioned. The most notable example is the butter-thievery episode (navanītacārya) that is found as early as the Gupta period, centuries before its appearance in the surviving texts. Certain incidents represented in stone have little or no firm textual source, such as a tenacious artistic tradition that includes a woman, probably Devaki or Yaśodā, or a man, probably Nanda, who participate in the transfer of newborn children between Mathura and Gokula that should involve only Krśṇa’s real father Vasudeva.

One krśṇacarita that may have been important in the medieval period is contained in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, a work probably dating to the ninth or tenth century from south India. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa reflects material from at least two earlier Sanskrit texts, the Harivamsa and the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, but it drew upon a great number of episodes that were not included in the earlier krśṇacaritas but that had developed over centuries and had widespread currency. The Harivamsa is a northern work that should belong to the first three centuries of the common era and is considered an appendix to the Mahābhārata. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa, compiled probably in the north during the fifth century, drew directly upon certain portions of the Harivamsa but has a distinct flavor of its own. Another work is the Bālakarita, a drama that seems to date between the seventh and ninth centuries and belong to the Deccan. The play contains select episodes of the earlier krśṇacaritas but is generally closer to the Harivamsa. The depictions of Krśṇa from north India suggest that sculptors drew upon a wide variety of sources, such as local traditions and pictorial conventions devised in ateliers, that nonetheless had a firm but indirect connection with the surviving texts.

“Twin Trees” and the Bhāgavata Purāṇa

The first relief from Sohagpur focuses on the birth of the deity, his transfer in the night to Yaśoda’s side in Gokula, and the heroic exploits in his infancy and youth. This phase of the biography formed only a small portion of the complete story that includes Krśṇa’s defeat of Kaṁsa and his career as leader of the Yadu clan. Its emphasis on the early exploits conforms to the majority of krśṇacarita friezes in which the
narrative is rarely taken beyond the defeat of Kaṃsa.

The panel is divided into two horizontal registers that are filled with fourteen niches (Fig. 1). In the niche on the left in the lower register is a recumbent female surrounded by two attendants that probably represents Kṛṣṇa’s real mother, Devaki, at the time of his birth (kṛṣṇajanma), or his adopted mother Yasodā. In the neighboring niche Kaṃsa holds aloft the infant daughter who has been transferred to Devaki. The infant is also shown cast down to her death at Kaṃsa’s feet. This child is reborn and warns Kaṃsa of his inevitable destruction, and in the guise of a goddess appears at the top of the niche as a small seated female. Kṛṣṇa is shown in the adjacent niche riding upon the snake-demon Kāliya (kālyādamana) who has poisoned the River Yamunā shown in the background. The neighboring panel features Kṛṣṇa holding Mt. Govardhana (govardhanadhārana), while the next scene represents Yasodā at the churning stick and Kṛṣṇa reaching into the pot. In the next niche is probably Yasodā suckling Kṛṣṇa. The last scene in this register is probably not Kṛṣṇa fluting, although it may provide an erotic allusion to the embracing couple in the upper register on the left. The next niche contains the defeat of bull-demon Arīṣṭa (ariṣṭavadha). The neighboring panel depicts the twin tree incident (yamalārjunodhāra) in which Kṛṣṇa releases two brothers imprisoned in two trees; their small faces can be seen at the tops of the trees. To the right is the stealing out at night by Kṛṣṇa’s father who is shown with the infant Kṛṣṇa in his arms crossing the Yamunā. Kṛṣṇa is shown next with the demoness Pūtanā (pūtanāvadha). The cart-tilting incident (sakatābhangha) follows. The scene in the last niche has been identified as Kṛṣṇa demanding the butter-tax (dān lilā) from a cowherdess, although it is more likely that the depiction reveals Kṛṣṇa in his playful contact with Yasodā or the other village women.

Little attempt was made to coordinate the order of incidents with the correct life sequence of the deity, since only three of the episodes (the transfer, pūtānāvadha, sakatābhangha) are disposed in the correct order. Even the placement of these three scenes probably did not reflect a direct dependence on a textual source so much as a desire to cluster together in a logical fashion incidents that were strongly identified with the deity’s infancy. All of the incidents were to be appreciated individually with little direct narrative connection among them.

The episode of the twin trees can provide an insight into the complex nature of the evolving interchange between text and sculpted image and the textual source for this particular panel. The story’s earliest form is found in the Harivamśa and is repeated later in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa. A mortar, tied to Kṛṣṇa by Yasodā in order to restrain the rambunctious child, became lodged between two trees that are felled by the deity’s strength. The caper forms one of the early signals to Yasodā of the divine prowess of the infant. In both texts no reference is made to the brothers trapped in the trees. The Bālacarita, however, associates the trees with two demons, Yamala and Arjuna, whom Kṛṣṇa destroys upon their release from the trees. The later Bhāgavata Purāṇa devotes an entire chapter to this incident, but the figures inhabiting the trees are Kubera’s two sons, Nalakūbara and Manigriva, who assumed the shape of trees as punishment for sporting naked with women in the River Gaṅgā. The brothers are liberated by Kṛṣṇa, who drags the mortar between the trees; the two brothers then praised Kṛṣṇa “with folded palms” and “prostrated themselves before him.”

This type of divine intervention and its emphasis on salvation through devotion permeates the Bhāgavata Purāṇa and Viṣṇu Purāṇa and distinguish these texts from the earlier Harivamśa.

One of the early representations of this episode is found on a pillar of the eighth century Virupākṣa Temple at Pattadakal in the Deccan. The infant is depicted dragging the mortar between two trees from the tops of which emerge two faces. The date of the relief and its location suggest that the two are more likely the demons referred to in the Bālacarita than the reformed sons of Kubera who appear in the later tradition recorded in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, although the relief itself provides no definite confirmation. Conforming to the account in the Bālacarita is a terracotta panel from the eighth century temple at Paharpur in Bangladesh that depicts Kṛṣṇa vanquishing the two demons by placing his feet on their grimacing faces that appear at the bottoms of the trees. Other early medieval depictions omit the faces entirely, and the emphasis is solely upon the infant’s prowess and Yasodā’s astonishment. In these examples, only the context can determine which textual traditions are being reflected.

Reliefs on two early eighth century pillars from Madhya Pradesh demonstrate the coexistence of two different aspects of the myth. Correspond-
ing to the spirit of the Bālacarita, two male figures have been released from the trees and are being subdued by Kṛṣṇa; in the Gwalior relief, Kṛṣṇa is assisted by a companion, perhaps Balarāma (Figs. 2 and 3). The incident is continued, however, in another roundel. Kṛṣṇa stands before one of the men who reaches for a vessel; on Kṛṣṇa’s opposite side is a kneeling figure who may be engaged in some form of ritual activity in front of a similar vessel (Fig. 3). Next to each of the two men is the tree from which each has emerged. The character of this representation strongly suggests the reform of Kubera’s two sons and their supplication, and, it thus conforms in spirit to the account in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. These unique representations seem to reflect a tradition that combined elements found in the Bālacarita with the later Bhāgavata Purāṇa. That so few north Indian images reflect the account in the Bālacarita indicates that this version was never strong in the north.

By the late medieval period in north India the twin tree incident is rarely sculpted with such graphic narrative detail. A conventional representation emerged during the tenth and eleventh centuries that is shown on the Sohagpur panel (Fig. 1). Kṛṣṇa stands, or sometimes squats, between two trees whose tops are commonly adorned with small faces. In this conventional depiction there is no suggestion of the mortar or Yasodā’s involvement. By this time also, the incident was frequently removed from its proper position within the infancy scenes and included among the heroic exploits in Kṛṣṇa’s adolescence. Its placement among later episodes can be seen within a tenth or eleventh century frieze from Padhavali in Madhya Pradesh whose scenes generally follow the correct sequence (Fig. 4). In a tenth century lintel from Khajuraho, however, it occurs in the correct sequence (Fig. 5). The incident is also depicted among the twelve kṛṣṇacarita images in the interior of the Lāṣmaṇa Temple at Khajuraho where no correct sequential order was adopted. In this case two small faces are seen emerging from the tree tops. In the lintel from Khajuraho and the work from Padhavali no faces are shown, but this omission is probably due to space limitations.

In each of these later medieval examples there is no suggestion of the mortar or of the episode’s connection to Yasodā that the earlier relief stress. Even the dramatic release of the two brothers emphasized in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa has been compromised for a conventional representation that is frequently removed from the correct sequence in order to highlight the deity’s strength during his later youth. Although the scene has been abbreviated in the later medieval period, the context makes it clear that the incident relates to traditions which are reflected in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. The same is true for depictions in the early medieval era that represent only the infant tied to the mortar in the presence of the trees.

This change in narrative sculpture is apparent in other incidents that had also become by the late medieval period abbreviated and standardized in ways that suggest little of their original narrative matrix. Another notable transformation is the cart-tipping. Gupta and early medieval depictions place Kṛṣṇa prone beneath an entire cart that is upended by his feet, a description found in all of the texts. The famous Gupta relief from Deogarh and an example among the late ninth century Kṛṣṇa scenes in the porch of the Chaturbhuj Temple in Gwalior indicate the widespread and conservative nature of the sculpted versions. By the tenth and eleventh centuries, however, the incident is generally depicted in the manner shown on the first panel from Sohagpur (Fig. 1). The cart has been reduced to one or two axles that are held by the standing Kṛṣṇa who usually places a foot on one wheel. At Padhavali the sculptors have discarded the cart but have followed earlier traditions by placing Kṛṣṇa in a prone position. The scene can be identified only by the axle and wheel placed at his feet (Fig. 4). This composition appears to be unique, but it reflects a transitional stage in which sculptors were simplifying the incident. Too few late medieval examples are known to permit generalizations, but it seems that the cart episode, unlike that of the twin trees, was retained in sculpted versions in more or less its correct textual sequence, that is, joined closely with the pūtanāvadha. This is true for the friezes at Padhavali and Sohagpur.

Inasmuch as the scenes on this Sohagpur panel are so conventionalized, the sculptor probably drew upon sources for which specific textual sources played only an indirect role. Although no single text explains this frieze, the traditions that solidified in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa probably provided the background in which the sculptor was working. An examination of the other two panels at Sohagpur proves that traditions associated with this text were current in the region during this period.
Two Related Panels

In comparison with the first frieze, the other two works reveal the full genius and sophistication of the medieval sculptor. As a measure of its complexity the second relief contains nearly fifty-five figures in two narrow parallel registers, while the third frieze, which is roughly twice the height of the second, boasts over a hundred characters in four wide horizontal bands (Figs. 6-9).

The two registers of the smaller frieze correspond almost identically to the two top bands on the larger panel (Fig. 6 and 8). Although it is possible that one sculptor copied his composition directly from the other, it is much more likely that both based their individual works on a single source. Such a close correspondence between two sculpted narrative works is extremely unusual in medieval art from north India. The panels are not by the same hand, but their general stylistic agreement suggests that the works were probably products of the same atelier active in the Sohagpur region. Both sculptors adhered closely to the original model, although their individual aesthetic temperaments unfold in their perceptible different interpretations of the same model. The sculptor of the smaller panel was the more accomplished. His figural style is marked by greater contrapposto and internal modelling. Ornaments and drapery are also more finely rendered.

Both friezes concentrate upon Kṛṣṇa’s later childhood and adolescence. The early portions of the deity’s life were probably depicted on missing slabs that were placed to the left of the two extant panels, since the direction in which the narrative proceeds is from left to right. Shallow, narrow holes intended for metal clamps at the tops of the reliefs indicate that the panels were at one time affixed to other slabs. Since sculpted kṛṣṇacaritas rarely describe events after the defeat of Kamsa, it is unlikely that additional slabs accompanied these on the right.

The closest textual source for the two reliefs is the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. The original illustrated model was probably not based completely upon this text or any of the extant kṛṣṇacaritas, since the details of one episode relate exclusively to a description in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa and the Harivamṣa. However, the unusual fidelity to textual descriptions suggests that the model derived directly from a lost kṛṣṇacarita text or at least was based on an oral tradition whose character was remarkably rich with details that had a textual basis.

Unlike the first relief, the incidents on both friezes are organized in a logical pattern. A major division on the larger relief is indicated by a vertical row of pilarettes (Fig. 7). The scenes to the right of this division generally involve Kṛṣṇa’s encounters in Mathura, while to the left appear his earlier heroic adventures. Beneath the smaller panel was almost certainly another slab that mirrored the two lowermost registers of the larger frieze. The vertical division created by the pilarettes on the larger panel has been shifted to the left two entire niches on the smaller panel to include two scenes that are not represented on the larger one (Fig. 6; a thin pilarette can be seen on the far left in the upper register). Since these two scenes are not present on the larger panel, an analysis of the reliefs is made more meaningful by beginning in the upper register on the right where two similar scenes can be compared.

Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma are first shown in dancing poses prior to the wrestling episode that is foreshadowed in the niche below by the elephant that is encountered immediately before entering the wrestling arena (Figs. 6 and 8). In the same niche is the incident of the bow-snapping (dhanurbhanga) in which Kṛṣṇa breaks a special bow belonging to Kamsa. The scene in the adjacent niche is the encounter of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma with the hunchback Kubjā who holds her vessel containing unguents. Since all of the texts place the Kubjā episode (kubjānugraha) immediately before the bow-snapping incident, the scenes were designed to be read in correct sequence from left to right. The bow episode is represented rarely in north India, and its inclusion here in the correct order makes it evident that the original model was based on a narrative that strictly adhered to descriptions in all of the texts.

The Kubjā story is elaborated upon in the niche below in both slabs (Figs. 6 and 8). On the left she is shown in her deformed condition, Kṛṣṇa touching her upon the head. On the right she is depicted again, now straightened, her hand grasping a segment of Kṛṣṇa’s clothing, suggesting the flirtatiousness of this encounter that appears in all of the texts. Kṛṣṇa is shown again, standing above the scene, flanked by two representations of the snakehooded Balarāma who should be understood to be with Kṛṣṇa for each of these separate events. Kṛṣṇa’s right arm is extended upward in a gesture emblematic of the deity in his apotheosized form.
Since Kṛṣṇa is described in the texts as placing one hand on Kubjā's chin and stepping on her foot to effect her cure, the original model departed perhaps from the textual descriptions. This incident is infrequently represented in medieval north India, but there is one early medieval example from Batesar in Madhya Pradesh that clearly shows Kṛṣṇa stepping on Kubjā's foot (Fig. 10).

The composition of this incident provides an instructive comparison of the way in which each sculptor at Sohagpur interpreted differently the same model (Figs. 6 and 8). In the topmost register of the smaller panel all of the figures are skillfully posed to enhance the drama between Kṛṣṇa and Kubjā. Balarāma, holding a club or plowshare, is paired with a second representation of Kṛṣṇa who holds a small garland. The garland represents the flowers that are given to Kṛṣṇa by the flower seller who meets the brothers immediately before the encounter with Kubjā. In the larger panel, however, the snake- hooded Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa turn outward in a fashion that forms an independent scene unconnected with the Kubjā episode. The small garland held by Kṛṣṇa in the smaller panel is replaced by a wide garland that stretches to the ground.

The sculptor working on the smaller panel used the original source in a more sophisticated fashion by conflating these two separate incidents into a single composition that has a greater degree of visual unity and vitality. On the other hand, Kṛṣṇa's garland is so small that the episode is scarcely recognizable; the impact of the garland incident has been sacrificed for an effective spatial composition.

Within the same long niche, Kṛṣṇa is represented crawling about on the ground with Yaśodā kneeling behind him. The Harivanśa and the Viṣṇu Purāṇa refer in passing to Kṛṣṇa creeping on the ground, and it is only within the context leading up to Yaśodā's fastening the mortar to Kṛṣṇa. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, on the other hand, devotes nearly an entire chapter to this incident which culminates by Yaśodā looking into Kṛṣṇa's mouth for dirt that he ate while on the ground. In Kṛṣṇa's gaping mouth a vision of the universe presents itself to Yaśodā to demonstrate that Kṛṣṇa symbolizes the Supreme Lord ("Mahāpurusa"). In the shrine behind Yaśodā stands an image of Kṛṣṇa in his apotheosized state, his right arm raised. Since this incident is only important in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, the model here was based upon traditions reflected in that text. The standing male figure turned toward the shrine is probably the flower seller in Mathura who in all of the texts recognizes the divinity of Kṛṣṇa and pays him homage.

The juxtaposition within this single niche of scenes from the earliest and latest parts of Kṛṣṇa's career in the Mathura area is also significant, since it departs so greatly from the true sequence of the deity's career to which the friezes generally conform. This special arrangement suggests in a poignant visual fashion the divinity of Kṛṣṇa and his unique relation to Yaśodā and others in the community, and at the same time his emergence as an adolescent who was both a performer of miracles and a flirtatious cowherd. Moreover, depictions of Kṛṣṇa crawling are unprecedented in north India during this period, and its presence is an additional reason for thinking that the model was based closely upon a fairly complete kṛṣṇacarita that was close to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.

The remaining scenes within the top band are connected thematically also, and they suggest the way in which two separate incidents involving Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa must have been linked in lost oral traditions (Figs. 6 and 8). In the course of a children's game, Balarāma is abducted on the shoulders of the demon Pralamba who had disguised himself as a cowherd. Balarāma then crushes the demon by powerful blows to the head. A parallel incident involving Kṛṣṇa is the defeat of the whirlwind demon Trnāvarta who also assumed human guise to carry on his shoulders the infant Kṛṣṇa. The demon flew away with the infant, but in the air Kṛṣṇa grew to vast proportions; he took Trnāvarta by the throat and the demon "fell dead on the ground." Unlike the Pralamba incident which occurs in all of the texts, the caper with Trnāvarta is found only in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa and takes place immediately after the cart-tilting incident in Kṛṣṇa's infancy.

The episodes are so similar that it is likely that the Trnāvarta incident was included in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa as a foil to Balarāma's defeat of Pralamba. No firmly identified representations of the Trnāvarta episode date to the Gupta period or earlier, which suggests that the incident emerged only after the compilation of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa during the fifth century.

The whirlwind incident does occur in art, however, before the compilation of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, and it is also paired with depictions of the Pralamba episode. Although the Trnāvarta adventure takes place during Kṛṣṇa's infancy, sculptors saw little inconsistency in placing it next
to the Pralamba incident that occurs during the children’s adolescence.

The work from Batesar represents the two brothers astride their demons in nearly identical fashion (Fig. 10). Since the other two scenes on this panel (the elephant Kuvalayāpīḍa and Kubjā) are from Kṛṣṇa’s later career, the sculptors have chosen to remove the early Tṛṇāvarta incident from the correct sequence and place it with the Pralamba episode that occurs toward the end of the narrative. In other medieval works the parallel scenes are placed at the beginning of the narrative; in these examples the Pralamba episode has been been removed from its correct chronological position to be paired with the earlier whirlwind scene. In these examples and others, the depictions of the brothers differ so little that it is impossible to distinguish between the two, but the context makes it evident that two separate episodes are being represented. In the frieze from Padhavali, the Tṛṇāvarta incident is omitted and the Pralamba episode occurs in more or less the proper sequence (Fig. 4). Balarāma, recognized by his snakehood, rises above the wrestlers. His position in the air is probably as much a result of the cramped nature of the frieze as it is a loose association with the whirlwind incident. In the lintel from Khajuraho the large Tṛṇāvarta figure is shown carrying the small child on his shoulders (Fig. 5). That this must be identified as the whirlwind episode and not be mistaken for Pralamba is clear from its correct sequential position on the lintel and the fact that there are no other depictions of Balarāma.

The Sohagpur examples furnish sufficient details to determine the identity of both incidents (Figs. 6 and 8). The larger frieze contains both scenes in the top register on the left. The smaller panel bears only one scene, on the left within top register; the missing slab originally joined to the smaller frieze would have contained the same episode preserved on the larger panel on the top left. The position of the two scenes among the later episodes of kṛṣṇacarita suggests that the whirlwind incident was removed from incidents relating to Kṛṣṇa’s infancy and placed with the Pralamba episode that occurs later in the narrative.

On the smaller frieze in a separate niche Balarāma rides upon Pralamba’s shoulders, and Kṛṣṇa stands in the center of the niche holding a broken club. The composition represents the brothers as equal partners. Kṛṣṇa and the two other cowherds are carefully poised to create a unified drama. In the other panel, however, Balarāma and Pralamba dominate the center of the niche. Kṛṣṇa is perhaps merely the tallest of the male figures among the group of boys witnessing the event. The sculptor of the larger relief simplified the composition again to suit his sensibilities, but the original model is probably more correctly reflected in the other relief.

In both scenes at the top of the niche is the bhañdira tree in the vicinity of which the incident is said to have taken place. That this tree appears in no other representations of this episode and that it plays a negligible role in all of the texts is another reason for thinking that the model was based directly upon either a written version or an oral tradition that was replete with details.

The adjacent niche on the smaller frieze depicts Kṛṣṇa astride the whirlwind demon with the snakehooded Balarāma beside him. The ogre’s severed head is seen in the corner of the niche, although the demon is strangled to death according to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. At least one other medieval north Indian example shows Kṛṣṇa beheading the whirlwind demon, and it would not be surprising to find among newly discovered examples that this type of depiction was common. The beheading may represent a variation of the myth in a lost tradition or more likely reflect a solution that sculptors adopted to differentiate this scene from the Pralamba episode with which it was frequently matched.

Beneath the Tṛṇāvarta representation in a separate niche is a group of female figures whose identities cannot be determined (Fig. 6). This scene was not planned on the other slab, but it can be assumed that it would have appeared on the missing panel.

The next niche contains a representation of Kṛṣṇa supporting Mount Govardhana to protect the villagers from the rains sent by Indra (Figs. 6 and 8). Both sculptors have followed the model closely, since the same number of male and female attendants and even the same number of cows are placed at their feet. The long snake at the bottom of the niche may represent the episode of demon Aghāsura that occurs only in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. This incident occurs when Kṛṣṇa is an infant, but the model may have conflated these scenes.

The next niche depicts the reconciliation with Indra that occurs in all of the texts after the lifting of the mountain. Indra is shown astride his elephant consecrating Kṛṣṇa with water from a jar held over his head. In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa,
a special wishyielding cow, Surabhi, plays an important role in the consecration by “sprinkling her milk on him [Krṣṇa].”28 The single cow to the right of Krṣṇa in both reliefs probably represents Surabhi.

In the niche to the right of the Kubjā incident sits Kaṁśa on his throne with a group of attendants. Its placement here foreshadows his death that occurs following the defeat of the elephant that is featured in the adjacent niche. At the same time, its placement, like the Kubjā incident next to it, is linked in a vertical fashion to the top register, for it is Kaṁśa’s bow which is broken within his palace compound.

In the larger panel the niche containing the defeat of the elephant is lengthened to include at the bottom a second representation of the elephant, legs bowed and thus defeated. In both examples Balarāma stands behind Krṣṇa who holds in his upraised hand one of the elephant’s tusks that is mentioned in each of the texts. The elongated niche containing the elephant episode has been reduced in size on the smaller panel.

The incident of Krṣṇa slaying the horse-demon Keśi (keśoadvha) is found on the left in the third register of the larger slab (Fig. 9). All of the krṣṇacaritas refer to this episode, but only the descriptions in the Harivaṃśa and the Viṣṇu Purāṇa conform directly to this representation by emphasizing the splitting of the beast in half. Krṣṇa placed his arm down the throat of the charging horse-demon that tore him “asunder like a tree struck by lightning.” The demon “lay separated into two portions, each having two legs, half a back, half a tail, one ear, one eye, and one nostril.”29 The horse is shown neatly severed, each half complete with entrails. This manner of depiction is not only unprecedented among the numerous sculpted examples of this incident, but it reflects traditions closer to the earlier texts than to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa that describes the demon’s death in much the same way but without any reference to the splitting into two.

In the conventional representation of this incident Krṣṇa stands before the horse-demon who is balanced on its two hind legs. The horse’s mouth is normally shown at Krṣṇa’s folded left arm, his other arm raised above his head. This composition occurs on the lintel from Khajuraho and on the frieze from Pādvali (Figs. 4 and 5). This mode of depiction begins at least as early as the Gupta period and proved resistant to change throughout the medieval era.

The scene in the long register to the right perhaps represents Krṣṇa’s departure for the wrestling contest in Mathura (Fig. 9). The eight standing figures, divided by their poses into two equal groups, may depict the brothers’ entrance into Mathura and their reception by the women of the town. In five miniature pavilions are small female figures, some with garlands, who probably also represent the women of Mathura who after “climbing to the highest terraces of the mansions . . . showered flowers on Balarāma and Krṣṇa.”30 To the left of the pavilions is a small image of Kārttikeya upon his peacock, while on the other side is depicted Śiva upon Nandi, Śiva in his dancing pose and a seated bearded figure that probably represents Brahmā.31

The last niche in this register contains Balarāma and Krṣṇa wrestling with Kaṁśa’s men. This incident occurs in the texts immediately after the defeat of Kaṁśa’s elephant that is rendered in the niche above. After the wrestling, Krṣṇa and Balarāma are shown dancing, in agreement with the texts. In the bottom register on the left is an unidentified snakehooded male (?) figure holding a small child and surrounded by four attendants (Fig. 9). Its position to the left of the pillar probably suggests that the incident belongs more properly with episodes that occur prior to the adventures in Mathura.

The remaining scenes take place in Mathura and depict the defeat of Kaṁśa and the restoration to the throne of Ugrasena (Fig. 9). On the left, Krṣṇa seizes Kaṁśa’s crown in conformity with all of the textual descriptions. This composition, Krṣṇa reaching out for the crown with his outstretched left arm, was of some currency during this period.32 In a narrow band beneath this scene is an image of the slain king.

The scene to the right of Kaṁśa’s death signifies the stirring moment when Krṣṇa “bowed down with great modesty” before his real parents, Vasudeva and Devaki, whom he liberated from Kaṁśa’s prison.33 The long tableau below represents the cremation of Kaṁśa that is arranged by Krṣṇa. In this unprecedented depiction, his corpse is shown being taken to the funeral pyre represented on the right; his small head and feet are seen emerging from either side of the neatly stacked pile of wood. In shallow relief directly beneath the pyre are waves of water inhabited by fish that probably suggest an immersion of Kaṁśa’s ashes that the texts omit. The large scene in the lower right corner forms the logical conclusion to the narrative, for it de-
These general tendencies in medieval sculpture can be attributed to the fact that traditions of narrative sculpture were never strong in north India. Despite a seemingly large sample of kṛṣṇacarita friezes, the number of sites in north India at which such narrative reliefs are found is meagre. Narrative sculpture based on the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata is also relatively infrequent. Historical incidents that would lend themselves to narrative sculpture, such as important battles or coronations, are virtually unknown.

Part of the explanation for this lack of much narrative sculpture is that stone work intended for the exterior walls of Hindu temples was largely reserved for separate icons that were removed from a broad, connected narrative context. Individual images placed on temple walls symbolized complex narratives, such as Śiva slaying Andhaka or Durga defeating Mahisa, but they were designed to be understood in a single glance: iconographic conventions radically compressed the narrative content. Many of the kṛṣṇacarita reliefs still in situ, for example, were not designed for parts of the temple that were of principal religious focus but were rather placed in positions associated with the temple porch. Thus, the overall sculptural program of the temple did not favor sculpture with a continuous narrative content. It would therefore be surprising to discover that the Sohagpur panels were included among the major images on temple walls.

Buddhist sculpture was perhaps more concerned with narrative qualities at its inception, but the attention to narration witnessed at Sanchi or among the Gupta life-stones from Sarnath is generally absent by the beginning of the Pala period in the eighth century. This development in Buddhist art has long been noted, but it is no less true for Hindu art.

To judge from a number of medieval kṛṣṇacarita friezes, the sequence of episodes is normally designed to be read from left to right. That the direction of all Indic scripts is the same may have provided a key impetus for this enduring preference in sculpture; artists’ pattern books would have naturally reflected this fundamental mode of visual organization. Testimony to the early preference for this direction are the reliefs on the architraves of the gateways at Sanchi. Over time, sculptural traditions and written texts mutually reinforced each other to standardize the direction of narrative sculpture. Greek and Roman narrative sculpture follows a similar pattern for perhaps the same reason; of course

Structure and Sources of Narrative Sculpture

All three panels were designed to embellish temples constructed during the tenth and eleventh centuries, but it is impossible to associate the three reliefs with any specific shrine. By the tenth century a distinctive sculptural style had arisen in the Sohagpur area under the patronage of the Kalacuri dynasty whose capital, Tripuri, was near Jabalpur. There are no firmly dated images in the area with which to compare the three reliefs, but the two related panels should belong to the first half of the tenth century. The more assured workmanship of the smaller relief relates closely to images that represent the zenith of work in this area that can be dated to ca. A.D. 925. The first panel should be dated considerably later, to perhaps the late tenth or eleventh centuries.

The differences between the first panel and the two related friezes highlight an important shift in narrative sculpture that took place throughout north India by the eleventh century or the late medieval period. By that time, craftsmen had grown less concerned with representing a compelling narration; episodes that were depicted earlier with more narrative detail and diversity were represented in an abbreviated and conventionalized manner. In addition, the correct ordering of events became nearly completely ignored. Early medieval reliefs that had generally been based on the correct sequence, such as the eighth century panels at Osian or the friezes at the ninth century Chaturbhuj Temple in Gwalior, were succeeded by sculptural traditions in which the correct sequence was of marginal importance. That the correct sequence of episodes had become increasingly less important by the tenth century is evidenced by the frieze from Padhavali and the images within the Laksmana Temple at Khajuraho. The latest Sohagpur panel, for example, contains so few connected episodes that it is an exaggeration to consider this narrative sculpture. An identical development has been observed among a special genre of free-standing pillars that are devoted to Kṛṣṇa iconography.35

picts Ugrasena restored upon his throne and surrounded by attendants. The king’s pose and the placement of this scene in this position forms a poignant juxtaposition with the enthroned Kamsa in the second register that is directly above.

DONALD M. STADTNER
notable exceptions occur in the early West and in India.38

The text that best explains all three reliefs is the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. The only major divergence from that text is the depiction of Kṛṣṇa that relates slightly more directly to the Harivamsa and Viṣṇu Purāṇa. The pairing of the whirlwind incident with the Pralamba episode does not occur in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, but this probably reflects oral traditions, if not a sculptural convention. The Khajuraho lintel is clearly based on traditions congruent with the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, since the Tṛṇavarta caper occurs only in that text and it appears on the lintel in its correct sequential position. On the other hand, episodes of major importance in all of the texts, such as the subduing of Kāliya or the raising of Mount Govardhana, were omitted entirely from the lintel in favor of relatively minor incidents such as the defeat of Arīṣṭa and Kṛṣṇa. In the Padhvalī frieze the Govardhana incident is represented, but its placement is totally out of the correct order. In the examples from Padhvalī and Khajuraho, a woman or an extra man participates in the transfer of children, a feature uncorroborated in any of the major texts. These few examples suggest that sculptors had a repertoire of Kṛṣṇa incidents that could be manipulated with great latitude.

The uniqueness of a number of incidents and the fidelity with which the story is translated into stone make the two related panels from Sohagpur highly unusual within the history of medieval sculpture and the tradition of kṛṣṇacarita depictions. This fact may suggest that the model was never intended to be used by sculptors but was employed in a different context that permitted and encouraged greater attention to narrative qualities and textual detail. The model, in fact, may have served originally as a large painted cloth used to instruct the kṛṣṇacarita to worshippers. Details from the texts that are represented here for the first time, such as the horse that is split in half and the bhāndira tree, may have acted even as mnemonic embellishments to enhance an oral narration. Thus the conflation of incidents in the top register that stressed the connection between the deity’s infancy and his later career would have formed a vivid denouement before describing the defeat of Kamsa in the bottom registers. If the model were not a large painted cloth, then perhaps it was a much smaller illustrated palm leaf manuscript.

Such an unusual and close dependence on a model may also reflect the status of a newly formed workshop in which master sculptors from a different region worked side by side with less experienced apprentices who were instructed to work from illustrations. That the Sohagpur area lacked the longstanding artistic traditions of the Jabalpur District in which the Kalacuri capital was located lends some support to this interpretation.

The more senior and accomplished artist responsible for the smaller panel probably felt freer to make some important modifications of the model. The most significant was the shifting to the left of the vertical row of pillars to include the two scenes not represented on the larger slab. Since this frieze is longer than the other, it perhaps made more sense to place the vertical juncture at this point. The apprentice sculptor, on the other hand, felt compelled to conform to the model more literally. The more complex miniature shrine in the top register, for example, probably echoes the original model with greater fidelity. Other details reveal the same forces at work, but to reconstruct the precise appearance of the entire model is difficult. One significant feature in the larger relief is the way in which a number of figures deliberately overlap the narrow vertical bands that separate the niches. This attempt to create depth and further link the scenes is a feature more likely to be found in a painted model in which overlapping is far easier to realize than in stone. The experienced sculptor contained his compositions within niches, perhaps realizing the inherent difficulties of such overlapping in the stone medium.

Another indication of the larger relief’s closer adherence to an illustrated model is the small water scene sculpted in shallow relief on the flat border beneath Kamsa’s funeral pyre. The incorporation of such additional narrative detail in this fashion is more appropriate to two dimensional illustration in which it can be easily inserted within an empty border. Moreover, this particular type of juxtaposition of high and low relief sculpture is unknown in medieval sculpture, thus providing another strong indication that the sculptor sought to translate onto stone compositions borrowed from painting.

Many of these same pictorial conventions can be found in later illustrated manuscripts, most notably in a type surviving in Nepal from the late sixteenth century. In this tradition, scenes are also separated by both unornamented vertical and horizontal registers and occasionally thin pillalettes. In the same manner as the the two related panels, episodes are also contained
in a number of rectangular niches of unequal sizes that occur on the same folio. Moreover, portions of figures overlap the registers, and there are even examples of separate, additional narrative details painted within wide horizontal borders in the same fashion as the water scene is sculpted on the larger panel. Although the examples from Nepal are a great deal later than the Sohagpur panels, their pictorial conventions probably refer to much earlier traditions.\textsuperscript{39} That many of these pictorial devices reflect a great antiquity is witnessed among the earliest surviving Jain palm leaf manuscript covers (\textit{pattis}) from western India that date to as early as the twelfth century and subsequent Jain illustrations painted on paper.\textsuperscript{40}

The number of unique scenes represented on the two related panels at Sohagpur underscores the fact that the majority of other sculptors throughout the medieval period were not as concerned with depicting the \textit{kr\textsuperscript{\textit{nacarita}} with such detailed veracity. Less emphasis was also placed upon representing the correct sequence of episodes. The lintel from Khajuraho, the frieze from Padhvali, and the latest of the Sohagpur panels reveal that strong tendencies arose by the later medieval period that favored abbreviated and standardized representations. The complex religious and cultural forces that motivated these significant changes in narrative sculpture in north India remain to be explored.
Notes
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1. The reliefs were first noted in R. D. Banerji, The Hastahayas of Tripura and Their Monuments, Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, no. 23, Calcutta, 1951 (cited as The Hastahayas), pp. 100–106, pls. 42 b, 43, 44. One panel has been discussed in John Stratton Hawley, Krishna, The Butter Thief, Princeton, 1983 (cited as The Butter Thief), pp. 69, 354–55. The same panel has been treated in P. Banerjee, Life of Krishna in Indian Art, Delhi, 1978, fig. 10, S. K. Bhattacharya, Kṛṣṇa-Cult, Delhi, 1978, pp. 100–101, and Rahman Ali, Art and Architecture of the Kalacuris, Delhi, 1980, pp. 131–33. I would like to acknowledge John S. Hawley for reviewing the manuscript and for making a number of useful suggestions.


3. In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa Vasudeva encountered Nanda at the banks of the Yamūṇa on the night of the transfer, but he is unobserved by Nanda who is bringing tribute to Kaṁsa in Mathura. In the Hariṇaṁśa and the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Vasudeva witnessed no one. In the summary of the kṛṣṇa-carīta in the Agni Purāṇa, it is Yasoda who delivered her infant daughter to the couch of Devaki.

4. This summary of the texts has been drawn from Hawley, The Butter Thief, pp. 23–35. The most recent and complete discussion of the purāṇas in general and the literature pertaining to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa is Ludo Rocher, The Purāṇas, v. 2, Fasc. 3 of A History of Indian Literature, ed. Jan Gonda, Wiesbaden, 1980.

5. The slab measures 90 cm. in length and 56 cm. in height. Where my interpretations of the scenes differ significantly from others, this is indicated in the notes.

6. Hawley has interpreted this as Balarāma’s defeat of the ass-demon Dhenuka; see Hawley, The Butter Thief, p. 354. Since that episode is relatively rarely represented in medieval north India, it is probably safer to assume that it is the much more popular arisvadvadhā.

7. The figure to the right of the river is bearded, while the male (?) figure on the other side is not. The same is true for the transfer scene on the Padhavali frieze. On the Khajuraho lintel a woman is shown presenting a child to a man.

8. Hawley has interpreted this scene as the incident from much later literature in which Kṛṣṇa demands a butter-tax from the village women; see Hawley, The Butter Thief, pp. 60, 69. It probably represents no specific incident but rather depicts the general ambiance of the kṛṣṇa-carīta that was populated by playful pastoral women.

9. G. V. Tagare, tr., The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Delhi, 1978 (cited as Bhāgavata Purāṇa), Pts. 1–4, Pt. 4: 10, 10, 28, 45.

10. Hawley, The Butter Thief, fig. 11.

11. For Parshurāpa, see Benjamin Premiado-Solís, The Kṛṣṇa Cycle in the Purāṇas, Delhi, 1984 (cited as The Kṛṣṇa Cycle), pl. 38.

12. For example, see the Chaturbhuj Temple, Gwalior, illustrated in Premiado-Solís, The Kṛṣṇa Cycle, pl. 56.

13. The pillar in the Archaeological Museum, Gwalior (no. 327) is normally considered to be originally from Tumain, Guna District, M. P. In the vicinity of the Vijayamāṇḍa Temple, Vidisha, are two unpublished pillars. One bears Kṛṣṇa imagery, while the other seems largely devoted to Śaiva themes. Certain similarities between the pillar in Gwalior, two pillars in Tumain, and the other in Vidisha suggest that artists were either using the same pattern books or that the works were products of the same atelier. The pillar from Gwalior is partially illustrated in Anna L. Dallapiccola, ed., Kṛṣṇa: The Divine Lover, London, 1982, p. 105, fig. 99.

14. Within a separate roundel on the Gwalior pillar the incident is portrayed again. Kṛṣṇa is shown pulling the mortar between two trees. In a smaller niche on this pillar is a seated image of Kubera, his left hand holding his long treasure sack. Kneeling beside him is a female figure and behind them both is a tree, perhaps a reference to the twin tree incident shown elsewhere on the pillar.

15. From left to right the scenes can be identified as follows: the escape from prison (?), Yasoda suckling Kṛṣṇa, the transfer of children, govardhanadhāmana, putanāvadhā (top), churning (bottom), sukātuhāngas (bottom), dancers, kesīvadhā (top), arīṣvadhā (bottom), yamālārjunodihāna, pralambāsuravadhā (top), wrestlers (bottom), and wrestlers. In another register within the same porch but unconnected to this frieze, the wrestling scenes are continued and culminate on the far right by a depiction of Kṛṣṇa grasping Kaṁsa’s crown with his left hand.

16. This lintel has been discussed briefly in Urmila Agrawal, Khajuraho Sculptures and the Their Significance, Delhi, 1964, pp. 39–40, fig. 16. The best illustration of this work is found in B. L. Dhamu, A Guide to Khajuraho, Bombay, 1927, pl. 11 a. From right to left the scenes read as follows: Vasudeva (?), Yasoda suckling Kṛṣṇa, the transfer, churning, putanāvadhā, trṇavartavādhā, yamālārjunodihāna, arīṣvadhā, kesīvadhā, and wrestlers.


20. The smaller panel measures 1.5 cm. in length and 53 cm. in height. The larger slab is 90 cm. in length and 1 m. in height. Banerji described both friezes but was unable to identify any of the scenes; see Banerji, The Hastahayas, pp. 103–6. To my knowledge the iconography of these two related panels is discussed in no previous publication.
21. This incident is shown at least once at Osian (Harihara Temple, no. 2). It is virtually hidden, since it occurs on a narrow lateral portion of one of the projecting panels on the exterior of the temple. Meister did not include it in his study, but it is placed between panels labelled K and L; see Michael Meister, “Krṣṇālīla from Wadhwan and Osian,” *Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art* n.s. 5, 1972–1973 (cited as “Krṣṇālīla from Wadhwan”), p. 31, pl. 13, fig. 7.

22. This pose was probably derived from the *gevadhana-dhāraṇa*, but by the medieval period it seems to have been associated in a symbolic fashion with the deity in general. Depicted on a lintel at Khajuraho that is devoted to the principal *avataaras* of Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa is represented with one arm raised and with a prominent cow, probably Surabhi, at his shoulder; see Dhama, *A Guide to Khajuraho*, pl. 11 b. Another representation of Kṛṣṇa in this mode is found among subsidiary figures on a medieval *kārma avataara* panel in Gwalior; see Kalpaṇa S. Desai, *Iconography of Viṣṇu*, Delhi, 1973, p. 69, fig. 57.


25. For two Gupta terracottas that probably represent the Prahamba incident, see Preciado-Solis, *Krṣṇa* Cyle, p. 29, and Amy Poster, *From Indian Earth: 4,000 Years of Terracotta Art*, Brooklyn, 1986, p. 162, pl. 6. That the whirlwind caper finds no mention in the summary of the *krṣṇārātīra* in the *Agni Purāṇa* is another reason for thinking that the incident was added sometime after the Gupta period.

26. Examples occur among the panels at Osian; see Meister, “Krṣṇālīla from Wadhvan,” p. 31, pl. 13, fig. 5. Meister associated these figures with the Prahamba incident, but in light of the close adherence to the order of the texts among these reliefs it is much more likely that the figures represent the whirlwind incident alone (represented in a continuous fashion).

27. Donald M. Stadtner, “The Tradition of Kṛṣṇa Pillars in North India,” *Archives of Asian Art* (forthcoming; cited as “The Tradition of Kṛṣṇa Pillars”). In this portrayal Kṛṣṇa is shown astride the demon with his severed head in his hand. This representation occurs on a tenth century pillar from Gurh, Rewa District, M. P.


31. References to Śiva are found throughout the major *krṣṇārātīras*. In some *purāṇas*, such as the *Kārma Purāṇa*, the relationship between Kṛṣṇa and Śiva forms an extended myth. The connection between the *krṣṇārātīra* and śākti elements is explored in Charlotte Vaudeville, “Krṣṇa Gopala, Radha and the Great Goddess,” in John Stratton Hawley and Donna Marie Wulff, eds., *The Divine Consort*, Berkeley, 1982, pp. 1–12.

32. Perhaps another variation portrays Kṛṣṇa slaying Kaṃsa with a plowshare, an important attribute of Balarāma. This type of depiction is shown on the pillars from Vindhyā and Gwalior; the Gwalior relief clearly depicts the trīśūka headdress normally associated with Kṛṣṇa. In other examples, however, a snakehooded figure with a plowshare slays a seated figure who wears a yogapatta. One such composition from Khajuraho has been identified as Balarāma’s defeat of the sage Lomaharsana that occurs only in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*; see Deva, “Krṣṇa-Lilā in Lakshmanā,” pp. 83–84. J. Hawley and I have discussed the possibility that such depictions should probably represent the triumph over Kaṃsa, although the shaver has been given two attributes associated with Balarāma, the snakehood and the plowshare. No logical ordering occurs for the images in the Lakṣmāna Temple at Khajuraho, but the Kṛṣṇa friezes among the Osian temples, including the sun temple on the Sacciyama Hill, place such depictions in the correct sequence to suggest that they represent the slaying of Kaṃsa, albeit one that does not conform to any of the texts.


37. The Vessantara jātaka on the north gateway is the major exception. The ordering from left to right of the seven “mānas” Buddhas on many of the architraves is another indication that narration proceeded in this direction from a very early time.

38. George M. A. Hanfmann, “Narration in Greek Art” and Peter H. von Blankenhagen, “Narration in Hellenistic and Roman Art,” *American Journal of Archaeology*, v. 61, 1957, pp. 71–78, 78–83, respectively. The Kṛṣṇa scenes on the exterior of the Osian temples read from right to left. This unusual disposition was adopted to conform to the correct direction of circumambulation; the narratives begin on the north side of the Harihara Temples nos. 1 and 2 which face west and on the southern wall of the Harihara Temple no. 3 which faces east.

39. This tradition in Nepal is witnessed in a manuscript now in the University Library, Cambridge. The work folds out in accordion fashion and is designed to be viewed lengthwise; each paper folio is glued together lengthwise to produce two sheets that are to be seen simultaneously. This format had the advantage of doubling the area on which interconnected scenes and explanatory inscriptions could be placed. Sheets are frequently divided into multiple vertical and horizontal registers of unequal sizes in the same fashion as the two related Sohagpur panels. Inasmuch as the narrower palm leaf manuscript was presumably in use during the time of the panels, each separate leaf probably would have comprised a prominent, single horizontal register with a number of small niches of unequal sizes. This complex type of organization is best demonstrated on the lowermost
register of the larger panel. The original leaves may have been connected visually by the vertical row of pillarettes and by the few related scenes, such as the encounter with Kubjā that occurs on the top register and in the niche beneath it. A discussion of this Cambridge University manuscript is found in Pratapaditya Pal, “A Kalāpustaka from Nepal,” Bulletin of the American Academy of Benares, 1, November 1967, pp. 23–33, figs. 41–58, and throughout his Vaisnava Iconology in Nepal, Calcutta, 1970.

40. For illustrations of some of the earliest Jain works, see Sarabhai M. Nawab, Jain Paintings (Paintings on Palm-Leaves and Wooden Book-Covers Only), Ahmedabad, 1980. Even within these narrow palm leaves dating to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, niches of unequal sizes organized into two horizontal registers appear commonly. Representative examples of later Jain paintings on paper with similar conventions are reproduced in Karl J. Khandalavala and Moti Chandra, New Documents of Indian Painting—A Reappraisal, Bombay, 1969.
Fig. 1. Kṛṣṇa panel. Sohagpur, Shahdol District, Madhya Pradesh.
Fig. 2. Krishna pillar, detail. Vijayamandala Temple, Vidisha, Vidisha District, Madhya Pradesh. (Courtesy, American Institute of Indian Studies, Varanasi.)

Fig. 3. Krishna pillar, detail. Archaeological Museum, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh. (Courtesy, American Institute of Indian Studies, Varanasi.)
Fig. 4. Krishna frieze, ceiling member in porch. Padhavali, Morena District, Madhya Pradesh. (Courtesy, American Institute of Indian Studies, Varanasi.)
Fig. 5. Kṛṣṇa lintel. Archaeological Museum, Khajuraho. (After B. L. Dhama, A Guide to Khajuraho, pl. 11, a)

Fig. 6. Kṛṣṇa panel. Sohagpur, Shahdol District, Madhya Pradesh.
Fig. 7. Kṛṣṇa panel. Sohagpur, Shahdol District, Madhya Pradesh.
Fig. 8. Kṛṣṇa panel, detail of upper half.

Fig. 9. Kṛṣṇa panel, detail of lower half.

Fig. 10. Kṛṣṇa frieze. Batesar, Morena District, Madhya Pradesh.
KRISHNA AND THE BIRDS

By JOHN STRATTON HAWLEY

The oldest series of friezes representing the story of Krishna’s childhood adventures in Braj (kṛṣṇacarita) that has survived to the present day is the one carved on the Gupta doorframes from Mandor, near Jodhpur in Rajasthan. The series dates from sometime in the late fourth or early fifth century A.D. One of the most charming images in this group is a panel portraying the incident in which the infant Krishna kicks over a cart (sakata) under which his foster mother Yaśodā has placed him so that he can sleep safely while she goes about some necessary business (Fig. 1). In one text it is said that she goes off to bathe; in another, that she has guests to welcome. Whatever the occasion for her absence, she returns to find that her son, despite his tiny size, has managed to overturn the cart in his rage to be fed at the breast. It is apparently just this that we see at Mandor. The infant lies on his pallet with his foot raised, and the cart is pushed so far askew that we see not only its sides but also the horizontal wooden slats that hold it together from beneath. Next to the child reclines a woman who leans forward as if to offer the boy her breast. One of his arms reaches out and crooks around her breast in a gesture of acceptance.

So much is consistent with what puranic accounts of the sakhatabhāṅga (“cart-breaking”) episode would lead one to expect. But there is another figure on the scene whose presence cannot be so easily explained: a bird, which the child holds by the neck with his free hand. There is nothing in the texts to suggest why it should be there. If this bird appeared only at Mandor, one could perhaps dismiss it as the idiosyncratic fancy of a single sculptor or the product of a provincial legend that died too soon to be recorded in the texts. Such, however, is not the case. This bird, or some equally mysterious avian presence, appears in sculptural representations of the kṛṣṇacarita with a persistence that makes it the focus of perhaps the most difficult problem in the iconography associated with narrations of Krishna’s childhood. It will be our purpose in this essay to review the most important sculptural evidence relating to this bird and to attempt some determination of its function and identity. But that will mean taking up a series of related iconographical puzzles as well, and it will mean calling into question one of the most widely held assumptions about where one turns to understand visual representations of Krishna’s life.

The Sculptural Evidence

The Mandor sculptures form one of two sequences from the Gupta period in which the incident with the cart is included. The second, now visible in the National Museum in New Delhi, was originally to be seen along the base of the Viṣṇu temple at Deogarh (Fig. 2). Once again the bird appears as an adjunct to the cart-breaking scene, and again it looks almost like a doll or plaything. The child’s relation to the woman on the scene has changed—this time she seems simply to observe—but the bird is still firmly a part of the action. As at Mandor, Krishna grasps its neck with his right hand. Nothing in this rendition of the sakhatabhāṅga episode adds to our information about why the bird should be present.

We may well expect that matters will come clearer when we have more detailed representations of Krishna’s childhood to consult, and these do indeed become available in the sixth and seventh centuries at Badami, in the southwestern Deccan. Unfortunately, things only become more complicated. Four elaborate kṛṣṇacaritas are to be seen at Badami—two of them in what are usually referred to as Caves II and III; one on a Viṣṇu temple that has conventionally come to be called the Upper Śivālaya; and a final one on a series of three slabs that form a narrative unit and are now housed in the Badami Archaeological Museum. Gary Tartakov has made the very plausible suggestion that this last group of sculptures would originally have been seen on the lintels of what is usually called the Lower Śivālaya in the northern fortress area. In the caves no bird appears, but it is clearly visible in the sequences belonging to both the Upper and Lower Śivālaya.

The problem is that the bird does not remain fixedly associated with the episode of the cart. That scene is found in Cave II and in Cave III, but no bird is present. In Cave III Krishna is shown kicking the cart from his pallet or cradle, as at Mandor and Deogarh. In Cave II, however, as on the seventh-century Calukyan temple of
Svarga Brahma at Alampur, this convention is abandoned. In Badami’s Cave II he seems to crawl out from under the cart; at Alampur he stands up to give it a healthy kick. In none of these cases does a bird intrude upon the scene.

A superficial glance might lead one to say the same thing about the one remaining sakataabhaniga at Badami, which forms the concluding episode in the first of the three reliefs that would originally have displayed the krṣṇaaraṇita on the Lower Śivālaya (Fig. 3). More careful scrutiny, however, reveals that the bird is indeed at hand. In somewhat the same manner as is suggested in the sakata scene in Cave II, the child leans or crawls on the ground and kicks the cart from there, but this time it is clear that he grasps a bird with his free hand. This is not, however, the end of the matter. If one moves chronologically backwards—that is, from right to left—through the episode in which Krishna is bound to a mortar (ulūkhalabandhana), past the incident in which he sucks the life-blood from the demoness Pūtanā (pūtanāvadha), and beyond the churning scene in which he once stole butter more plainly than he does today, one comes upon what is apparently a swinging cradle that hangs in a tree. Some of the tree’s foliage is visible in low relief on both sides of the cradle. Krishna is recumbent in this cradle, as in both the Gupta examples we have seen, and once again he holds onto a bird—probably by the neck, as seems typical, though the carving is no longer sharp enough that one can be certain. It is as if the two structures that were present in the sakataabhaniga scenes at Mandor and Deogarh—the bed and the cart—have been pulled apart, and the bird has been carried along with each. Note that in Krishna’s hanging cradle, the bird is depicted above him, rather than below.

Two other versions of this scene also appear in the northern fort at Badami. One closely resembles what we have just seen and may have come from the same site (Fig. 4). It is a single panel, however, or part of a series whose other members have been lost, and it has fared less well at the hands of time than its larger cousin. In this panel the cradle-and-bird scene is directly juxtaposed to the one that depicts the defeat of Pūtanā. The churning scene that intervened between these two on the krṣṇaaraṇita from the Lower Śivālaya, and which serves both there and on the Upper Śivālaya as a kind of filler to reinforce the viewer’s sense of the pastoral environment, is gone. Instead the cradle scene and the Pūtanā scene seem to be construed as elements of a single icon.

On the Upper Śivālaya too there is the suggestion that Pūtanā and the bird belong in relative proximity. Just before the viewer comes to the scene in which Pūtanā shrieks in defeat, lifting her hands heavenward, one encounters the familiar cradle (Fig. 5). Again the bird has made his entrance—this time from the opposite direction—and again the tiny Krishna is holding him fast by the neck. The cart is now totally absent, but this scene is like the sakata panel from Mandor in that attention is paid to a woman in the bird’s immediate vicinity, and again, particularly, to her breast. Whether she is meant to be understood as a friendly presence (Yaśodā, presumably) or an unfriendly one (Pūtanā) is debatable.

There is nothing to indicate malevolence on the part of the woman who observes the sakataabhaniga scene at Deogarh, and nothing encourages us to make that judgement about the woman who attends the similar scene from Mandor. Quite the contrary, both these figures seem natural depictions of Krishna’s foster mother returning to her son. Yet the close association between Pūtanā and the cradle scene both on the Upper Śivālaya and in the isolated sculpture from the northern fortress may suggest that we rethink the matter. This is particularly so because Pūtanā herself, according to the Hariwaṃśa, made her entry into Krishna’s Braj as a bird of prey (śakuni). In the puranic versions of the Pūtanā story, however, she is merely said to be a female who preys upon children. It seems unclear whether or in what way the sculptors of Badami were aware of the connection between woman and bird.

Subsequent treatments of these motifs do little to dispel the uncertainty. Within another century or so we meet three more krṣṇaaraṇitas—two at nearby Pattadakal and one at Ellora—but the relation between Pūtanā and the bird remains in doubt. On a pillar inside the temple of Virūpaṅka at Pattadakal the plot thickens slightly, since the sakata scene is interposed between Pūtanā and the bird (Fig. 6). This relief is to be found on the west side of the pillar, and the manner in which its scenes are ordered, in addition to its relation to other krṣṇaaraṇita reliefs on the north and south sides of the same pillar, makes it clear that it is meant to be read from left to right. This places the bird-and-crade scene before the overturning of the cart, and that before the battle with Pūtanā.
It is worth noting that by this point in time the cart is no longer simply a cart. It has become a genuine adversary of Krishna, a full-fledged demon, and shows its true nature by the presence of a head whose hair has the same unruly, bushy appearance as that of the bona fide demoness Putana. A similar transformation took place in literature of approximately the same period. Whereas the cart was a simple, inanimate implement in the old Harivamsa and in the Visnu Purana (written perhaps in the fifth century A.D.), by the time one comes to the Jain Harivamsa of Jinasena, dated saka 705 (A.D. 783), the cart had been transformed into a demon (piśāc).7

In the kṛṣṇacarita that appears as part of the Mahābhārata frieze on the temple of Kailāsanātha at Ellora, such a demonic characterization seems clearly to have been applied to the bird as well. In the scene where it appears (Fig. 7), the bird and cradle are immediately juxtaposed to a large figure who emerges from their midst and falls to the ground in a manner of a defeated demon. (Note the similarly crouched, limp pose on the part of demonic King Kansa at the extreme right of the same register, Fig. 8.) In the general arrangement of the scene, the antetype for this figure seems to be the attendant woman we observed on the Upper Śivalaya and at Deogarh; but the sense of the action is quite different.

At Ellora the bird-and-craddle scene is separated by an intervening panel from Krishna’s encounter with the cart (Fig. 8). The connection is not quite so distant as one might suppose, however, since the episode that intervenes—the apotheosis of the girl-child whom Kansa kills, thinking it to be Krishna—is assigned that position on account of its relation to the scene immediately below it, not because it genuinely separates the cart and cradle scenes. Just below the scene in which the female baby reveals her true identity as the goddess Devi/Kātyāyanī, one sees the incident in which she makes her entry into the story by being exchanged for Krishna, and I have argued elsewhere that this vertical alignment was intentional on the part of the sculptors at Ellora.8

A similar alignment, in fact, brings the scene containing the bird into close relation with the one that portrays the death of Pūtanā, which appears just beneath it in the lower register. Although the sculpture is damaged, one can make out a child lying on his bed and reaching up toward the distended breasts of a figure who must be Pūtanā.9 She raises her arms in moribund horror as Krishna suckles the life-blood out of her. Indeed, there is something oddly bird-like about her—her arms almost seem wings—and there are other elements as well that tie the Pūtanā episode to the one depicted above it. In both one finds some sort of bed and a recumbent child.

As at Deogarh and Badami’s Upper Śivalaya, the bed in the upper register is clearly anchored to the ground. By contrast, the pallet in the lower register seems suspended in air, as on the Lower Śivalaya at Badami. There is some suggestion that we are meant to perceive it as hanging from the branch of the banyan tree that is such a unique invention of the sculptors of Ellora. Thus it appears that the two conventions used to depict Krishna’s crib have been rearranged. The hanging cradle, formerly associated with the bird, has been assigned to the Pūtanā scene, and the freestanding cradle is associated with the bird. Their evidently close relation draws the two pericopes together, yet they must have been understood as distinct, since the bird emits a demonic presence of its own, one that seems to exist quite apart from that of Pūtanā.

It is a short jump from the observation that this bird has an identity separate from both the cart and Pūtanā, to the best known puranic story in which Krishna becomes involved in an independent battle with a bird. In the Bhāgavata Purana it is reported that Krishna once vanquished a demon that came in the form of a heron (bakāsura).10 According to the story, this bird attacked the young Krishna while he was out herding his cattle and succeeded in swallowing him before he was aware of its menacing intent. Ultimately, however, it was the heron who lost the battle, for the heat generated by the boy’s divinity so scorched the heron’s throat that the bird was forced to disgorge its prey. Once outside, Krishna seized his aggressor by the beak and tore him asunder.

One of the damaged sculptures from the lintel of the Lakṣmaṇa temple at Sirpur may possibly illustrate this motif,11 and it is very likely bakāsura we see in the kṛṣṇacarita carved on one of the pillars in the Viśvanātha temple at Pattadakal (Fig. 9). The identity of the bird depicted in the scene second from the right in the upper register at Pattadakal is clearly suggested by the manner in which Krishna forces its two beaks apart. It has been reported that the heron is again depicted among the Krishna reliefs recently uncovered in the temple complex of Jagannātha at Puri; these extend from the main temple onto the bhogamandapa.12 And bakāsura is again to be seen
in the *kṛṣṇacarita* on the temple of Hoysalesvara at Halebid (Fig. 10). As in the Viṣṇanātha temple at Pattadakal, Krishna wrenches his beaks apart and does so from a standing position. As at Pattadakal, Krishna’s size seems to imply that he is more than an infant, in accord with the *Bhāgavata*’s telling of the bakāśura story.

Both in the temple of Viṣṇanātha and in that of Hoysalesvara the bakāśura scene is immediately juxtaposed to that of the cart, which adds an element of confusion to the question of what age these sculptors conceived Krishna to be when he met the heron, yet the signal motif in the tale—the breaking of the beak—seems clearly to establish its identity. Can the heron, then, be the bird we have been seeing all along?

If one might have thought so on the basis of these two temples, the matter becomes increasingly obscure as one looks at three other Hoysala temples on which bakāśura appears. Each of them is somewhat later than the Hoysalesvara temple—the relevant portions were all carved in the thirteenth century—and each of them contains a reference not only to the heron but to another avian presence as well. It is not *prima facie* impossible that the heron be shown twice, since repetitions do occasionally occur in Hoysala depictions of the *kṛṣṇacarita*, but in each of the sequences with which we are concerned something more seems to be involved.

On one of the temples, it must be conceded, the birds do bear a definite resemblance to one another and are modelled in an almost identical way. This is the temple of Lakṣminārāyaṇa at Hosaholalu. Still, there are differences. In one case (Fig. 11) Krishna prises the beaks apart, as one expects in the bakāśura encounter, but in the other (Fig. 12) he assumes a more generalized fighting pose such as is frequently seen in his battles with the horse-demon Keśi or the snake demon Kāliya. Also, his method of attack seems diametrically opposed to what he adopts with the heron: he clamps the beaks together. It seems awkward to suppose the sculptor intended to portray the same bird, particularly since he introduces a scene to separate them. The intervening presence is that of Devī as mahiśāsuramardini, who does not by rights belong in the *kṛṣṇacarita*, though there is some precedent for her inclusion as Kātyāyani.

In short, the iconography is somewhat puzzling.

The Krishna reliefs on the temple of Amṛṭesvara at Amritapura present a contrasting pair of panels depicting Krishna in conflict with birds. One of them, again, is clearly bakāśura: Krishna forces his beaks apart (Fig. 13). The other panel is totally different (Fig. 14). It shows Krishna struggling with a pair of birds as three guards look on; one of them is evidently felled in the fray. The public setting and to some degree the appearance of the birds suggest that perhaps these are cocks, a proposal first put forward by M. H. Krishna. One of the puranas does indeed provide a text that could be taken as relevant, for the *Padma Purāṇa* reports that Krishna once killed a cock demon (*rākṣasa* . . . *kukkuṭa*). A third, and still different, scene of Krishna with birds is presented at the temple of Mallikārjuna at Basral, supporting the idea that representations of bakāśura do not seem to exhaust the avian legacy in the *kṛṣṇacarita*. In this sequence Krishna entertains only one foe who is obviously a bird, and this one is probably to be understood as the heron, since Krishna seems once again to be pulling its beaks apart (Fig. 15). A second scene, however, forcibly calls to mind the prototype set by the bird whose identity is still a mystery to us, particularly as depicted at Badami (Fig. 16). This is the initial scene in the *kṛṣṇacarita* as a whole, and perhaps it is merely intended to convey a picture of the infant Krishna in his cradle. Yet the pose, with leg uplifted, strongly suggests some knowledge of earlier depictions of the *sākaṭabhāṇga*, and perhaps the damaged mass above the child’s head at the extreme right of the swinging cradle was once a bird.

At a fourth Hoysala temple approximately contemporary with these three we find yet another variation on the theme. The extended *kṛṣṇacarita* depicted on the temple of Lakṣminārashimha at Nuggihalli displays two scenes that could possibly be interpreted as bearing a reference to a struggle between Krishna and a bird (Figs. 17 and 18). Though they are not contiguous, the two echo one another closely; yet neither conforms to the iconography of bakāśura. Instead—insofar as one can judge from the worn shapes that remain—they refer to the cradle-and-bird scene, if indeed a bird is present at all. The placement of these scenes just after the defeat of Putanā in the one case and just before the overturning of the cart in the second, with only a moment of nurturing at the breast of Yaśodā to intervene, would be consistent with the positioning of the bird in other sculptures we have seen.

It seems plain that none of the thirteenth-century Hoysala sculptors whose work we have observed felt Krishna’s involvement with birds was limited to his encounter with bakāśura, so we
are still faced with the question of who these birds were. Or if it was a single bird, who was he? Or if he was in some way a form of Pûtana, who was she?

**Three Possible Solutions**

**Bakâsura**

It has already become clear that we have considerable cause for skepticism when the name of bakâsura is suggested. If we accept that the heron is the only bird the Bhâgavata Purâna mentions, the question remains as to whether one should accept the prestigious Bhâgavata as the natural text to consult in explaining figures that appear in narrative sculptures of Krishna. If one turns away from the Bhâgavata as one’s text of first resort, the heron no longer seems the most probable option for identifying the bird we have so often seen.

The Bhâgavata does indeed enjoy a special status among the purânas, but it is not always such as to make it the most reliable reference text for brahmanical sculpture. In a number of ways, indeed, the Bhâgavata stands apart from the puranic mainstream until it becomes influential enough to divert the mainstream toward itself. Recent work undertaken by Ludo Rocher in regard to puranic literature has cast doubt on the assumptions and methods that have in the past been used to establish dates and distinguishing features for individual purânas. Rocher argues that the purânas are far more closely intertwined as a group than has customarily been acknowledged and that their relative dating, particularly as whole entities, is a very delicate matter—perhaps even impossible in the final analysis. Yet even Rocher concedes that one purâna, the Bhâgavata, stands apart from the rest on the basis of its style and content, and that it can confidently be dated to the ninth or tenth century A.D. and assigned a southern provenance.

Given that this is so, one should exercise great caution when one claims that a given sculpture corresponds to a story narrated in the Bhâgavata if that sculpture appears before the ninth century or in a part of India separated by any distance from the Tamil country. Much of the material that appears in the Bhâgavata, of course, is older than the purâna itself, as has recently been noted in regard to several of the motifs it presents.

But the Bhâgavata’s “catchment area” for non-Sanskrit materials was evidently confined to Tamil Nadu. To propose that an early sculpture from the North represents a tradition recorded in the Bhâgavata but not in other purânas is to make a bold claim. The prestige of the Bhâgavata was certainly acknowledged in many places across the subcontinent by the middle of the second millennium A.D., but it is as yet unclear how much earlier its influence was felt outside the South.

This means that quite a number of identifications traditionally accorded to sculptures depicting scenes in Krishna’s life must be reevaluated. Some of these are minor. For example, when one has an image of Krishna doing battle with a bovine figure it generally becomes appropriate to identify this animal as the bull Ariśa rather than the calf Vatsa (whose name means simply “calf”), since the latter is mentioned only in the Bhâgavata, whereas the former is described in all the relevant Sanskrit and Prakrit accounts. Of course, if one could point to an instance in sculpture when Krishna fights this demon at just the point he is said by the Bhâgavata to have engaged Vatsa in battle, then one might be persuaded that Vatsa is the better identification. In sculptures dating to about A.D. 1500 from across the subcontinent, however, this does not seem to happen.

The accounts of the disturbances caused by Ariśa and Vatsa do not differ so markedly that great confusion is caused by labelling a given sculpture after the latter rather than the former, though it is true that Krishna’s throwing the calf into the air sounds more like his confrontation with the ass demon Dhenuka than with Ariśa. There are other instances, however, in which to assume the Bhâgavata’s catholicity or to treat it as in some sense primordial is to reach conclusions that seem improbable to a more cautious eye. A minor example is provided by a small fragment discovered on the site of the Gupta temple at Deogarh, in which a woman’s hands are shown clasped across her breasts. M. S. Vats, the site archaeologist, suggested that this piece might originally have formed part of a representation of the scene in which Krishna stole the gopis’ clothes as they bathed (vastrâharana). This is not impossible, but it is rendered less probable than Vats seems to have allowed on account of the fact that the vastrâharana episode is another of the incidents unique to the Bhâgavata among Sanskrit and Prakrit accounts of the Krishna story. It comes as no surprise, then, that the first unambiguous attestations of this pericope in sculpture—on the temple of Jagannâtha at Puri and the temple of Kedârâsvara at Halebid—
come from the twelfth century, by which time the prestige of the Bhāgavata had clearly begun to spread at least through southern and coastal portions of the subcontinent. The temple at Deogarh is seven centuries older and much farther north.

Another instance in which the Bhāgavata has been “read back” into sculptures that predated it is provided by Krishna Deva’s suggestion that three rather unusual reliefs, whose similarity he quite rightly noticed, be identified as portrayals of Balarāma dealing the death blow to Śūta Lomaharṣaṇa. One is an eighth-century relief from Dholpur that is now housed in Bhārat Kalā Bhavan (Fig. 19); another comes from a lintel of the Laksṇa temple at Sirpur (ca. seventh century A.D.); and the last occurs along the circumambulatory path surrounding the sanctum of the Lakṣmaṇa temple at Khajuraho (mid-tenth century A.D., Fig. 20). Krishna Deva’s interpretation is most ingenious, accounts for much of the iconographic detail—in particular, the presence of the nāga hood one expects to associate with Balarāma and his characteristic implement, the plow—and certainly cannot be discounted. A note of caution is warranted, however, since it is again only the Bhāgavata that reports this episode. As it happens, furthermore, there exist a series of sculptures from the south and west of India that are sufficiently similar to these three that they might suggest a different identification. In Cave II at Badami and in each of the kṛṣṇa-arvita reliefs at Osian (Fig. 21) one finds similar tableaus used apparently to depict the struggle in which Krishna and his brother defeat Kāṁsa. The narrative context makes the general intent clear, even when certain iconographic details remain puzzling, especially the fact that Balarāma, not Krishna, seems to be the main protagonist. Unlike the struggle with Lomaharṣaṇa, of course, the battle with Kāṁsa is a prominent feature of every textual rendition of the kṛṣṇa-arvita, not just that provided by the Bhāgavata.

In the last several paragraphs we have repeatedly given voice to two concerns: the matter of the Bhāgavata’s date and provenance and the important issue of narrative sequence. These considerations are crucial as we turn again to the question of whether the mysterious bird whom Krishna fights should be labelled bakāṣura. Such an identification seems doubtful in both respects. Wherever a narrative sequence can be established, it seems clear that sculptors perceived the episode with the bird as belonging to Krishna’s infancy rather than to his youth; the Bhāgavata’s treatment of the heron episode would imply the contrary. This does not, however, close the case. A complication is introduced by the fact that even when there seems to be a more or less clear iconographical reference to the bakāṣura story, such as one finds in the temple of Viśvanātha at Paṭadal and in subsequent examples we have seen, the sculptors group that episode with events pertaining to the very early stages of Krishna’s childhood. Both in the Viśvanātha temple and on the Hoysalesvara temple the narration proceeds with an evident logic, and in neither case is the bakāṣura scene where it should be according to the Bhāgavata. One concludes, perhaps, that what textual critics call “contamination” has occurred: the Bhāgavata’s heron story has been hybridized with one that originally concerned another bird.

Alternatively one can see the Bhāgavata’s bakāṣura story as a particular version of a legend whose more commonly accepted outlines are not quite what the Bhāgavata implies. That more common story, then, which remains merely hypothetical on the basis of the texts, is what we would be seeing in sculpture. Both texts and sculptures, of course, are precipitates of a cultural heritage whose age and diffusion have made it sufficiently complex that such confusions are apt to occur. So one hardly ought to assume that every extant sculpture can be exactly matched with some episode in an extant text, any more than one ought to assume that the textual record we have inherited is necessarily prior to the sculptural. As we shall see, however, the textual resources for interpreting Krishna’s mysterious avian adversary are by no means exhausted when the heron has been dismissed or adjudged at best a distant possibility.

Trnavaṛta

Another potential resource for identifying our as yet unnamed bird on the basis of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa itself is Trnavaṛta. It is attractive to consider this demon as relevant to our iconographical quandary because the author of the Bhāgavata introduced him into the Krishna story at precisely the moment when sculptures display the bird, namely, in close association with Pūtāṇa and the cart. According to the Bhāgavata it is just after these two incidents occur that Trnavaṛta, a whirlwind demon, assaults the baby Krishna by picking him up and drawing him into a dusty vortex. Krishna, because he is divine,
is possessed of such mountainous weight that he soon causes Tīrṇāvarta to fall back to earth and smash himself to death.\textsuperscript{28} Paintings based on the Bhāgavata—much later in date than any of the sculptures we have been considering—sometimes show Tīrṇāvarta revealing his true demonic form at this moment, as he crashes to the ground and breathes his last (Fig. 22).

There is much in the Bhāgavata's depiction of Tīrṇāvarta that could be correlated with the bird demon we have observed in sculpture. That he is capable of hovering in the air goes without saying, but there are more specific details as well. Particularly at Ellora, but elsewhere too, the whirr of wings associated with our mystery bird suggests a cyclonic force. And most critical of all, perhaps is the gesture with which Krishna forces the whirlwind demon to defeat: the Bhāgavata says he grasps him firmly by the neck, as in so many of the sculptures we have seen.

As with bahāṣura, it is possible that Tīrṇāvarta represents a version, perhaps a merely local or regional extension, of a more widely disseminated story of Krishna encountering a bird in infancy. To this extent Tīrṇāvarta and the bird could be correlated. But it would be going too far to propose that the bird we see actually is Tīrṇāvarta. When the whirlwind demon does clearly appear in visual representations of the Krishna story—much later, in paintings—he seems to bear no resemblance to a bird. On occasion it has been proposed that Tīrṇāvarta appears in sculpture too. Krishna Deva interpreted one of the reliefs in the Laksmaṇa temple at Khajuraho (Fig. 25) in this way, but a more conservative approach to that image would suggest Pralamba as relevant instead.\textsuperscript{29} Pralamba, it will be recalled, was a demon who insinuated his way into a jumping game and proceeded to transport Balarāma into the air as Krishna, riding his friend Śrīdāma, watched. Pralamba is known not only in the Bhāgavata but in all the extant Sanskrit texts that could have been in existence by the time the Laksmaṇa Temple was fashioned. Indeed, Pralamba can be seen in sculptures dating as far back as the fifth century A.D.\textsuperscript{30}

The matter does not come to so easy a conclusion, however, for in another relief from Khajuraho that is now housed in the site museum one meets what is apparently the same motif. This time it is tempting to identify it as Tīrṇāvarta. Indeed, Donald Stadtnner has done so in a contribution to this issue of Ars Orientalis (see his Fig. 5). Stadtnner does so in part because he believes this relief can be related to other sculptures in which, as he argues, the Pralamba incident has been paired with an iconographically similar incident that can best be understood as representing Tīrṇāvarta. After an extended and very illuminating correspondence with Stadtnner, I find I am still somewhat skeptical about this invocation of Tīrṇāvarta. The pairs of "piggy-back" figures at Osian, which Stadtnner cites in evidence, seem to me to be most easily understood as representations of Krishna atop Śrīdāma and Balarāma atop Pralamba. It is true that at Pattadakal and in the later temples at Osian, this scene is advanced to a position in the narrative that corresponds closely to the one chosen for Tīrṇāvarta in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, but in other instances the order of scenes presented at these temples differs from what the Bhāgavata would demand. Furthermore there is nothing iconographically specific in these or cognate reliefs that would indicate Tīrṇāvarta, unless one is persuaded by Stadtnner's argument about the severed head to be seen at Sohagpur.\textsuperscript{31} Many puzzles remain in analyzing this series of reliefs, and until they are solved I would prefer the textually more conservative identification: Pralamba. Yet even if one takes the opposite tack and is persuaded by Stadtnner's ingenious arguments, one is still met with a tradition of representing Tīrṇāvarta that seems to have nothing to do with the birdlike images that are our primary concern.

**Pūtāna**

Once one has considered the possibilities that the Bhāgavata would present and has discarded them as unlikely, one is forced to reconsider a figure described in all the venerable Sanskrit and Prakrit sources, a figure whose nature has something birdlike about it. This is Pūtāna, and a closer attention to the way in which she is depicted in sources other than the now-standard Bhāgavata is richly repaid. In a brief but cogent discussion published in 1968, Daniel H. H. Ingalls established beyond a reasonable doubt that among the puranic accounts of the story of Krishna goḍāla it is the Harivamsa's that must be regarded as the oldest. Indeed, he characterized it as belonging to a genre of literature, mahākāvya, that separated it from the other purāṇas and pointed to its origins in an epic milieu. Ingalls demonstrated the priority of the Harivamsa's narrative in comparison to that of the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata Purāṇas by showing that it was simpler than the others, that
the others assumed it, and that it retained an understanding of the nomadic environment in which the Braj cycle of Krishna stories must have originated. Such an understanding was lost in later accounts.\(^{32}\)

As it happens, Ingalls singled out the story of Pūtānā to make his point, and two of the details that he enumerated in distinguishing the Harivaṃśa's account of Pūtānā from later versions are of particular interest to us. First, to the narrator of the Harivaṃśa Pūtānā is a bird. Although she first appears as a nurse (dhātrī) in the court of Kaṁsa, she transforms herself into a bird to fly to Braj, and it is in that form that she offers her breast to Krishna. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa (together with its close counterpart the Brahma Purāṇa) and the Bhāgavata Purāṇa have this airborne presence change back into a woman, but not the Harivaṃśa. Second, when the Harivaṃśa's avian Pūtānā arrives in Braj, she is said to alight on the axle of the cart (sāhataṅka) where Krishna seems to be sleeping. It is evidently from this position that she offers Krishna her breast. He responds by taking it and biting it off, with the result that she shrieks in terror and the inhabitants of the nomad encampment come running to offer Krishna aid, only to find that none is required: Pūtānā is dead on the ground.

Obviously it is some distance from this conception of Pūtānā to the more familiar accounts offered by the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata Purāṇas. In them Pūtānā's lactational capacities are rationalized by turning her back into a woman upon her arrival in Braj. Indeed it is not specifically mentioned that she was ever a bird; that identity seems to have been for the most part forgotten. In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa she is described instead as a woman who brings harm to children (bālaghatīni), and in the Bhāgavata similar terms are used (ṣīśūṃśacārā nighnantī), though it is mentioned that she was able to move through the sky (khecaryekadopreyā).\(^{35}\) It appears that even in later versions of the Harivaṃśa itself it was thought necessary to remind readers that Pūtānā was a bird of prey, for a number of manuscripts add a verse that begins "a hawk by the name of Pūtānā" (pūtānā nāma sākunī) in explicating the tale.\(^{34}\)

It is entrancing to consider the possibility that the sculptors of Mandor and Deogarh knew the Pūtānā story in a form similar to what has been preserved in the Harivaṃśa rather than in one of its later incarnations. Nothing in the Bhāgavata or Viṣṇu Purāṇas could account for the presence of a bird in Krishna's hand as he kicks over the cart, but if the sculptor was familiar with something like the Harivaṃśa's vision of Pūtānā, the bird no longer seems so strange. At both Mandor and Deogarh it is shown at the bottom of the panel, as if dead on the ground, and in both cases it is situated beneath a cart. Indeed, because the cart is a definite part of the Pūtānā story in the Harivaṃśa, it is possible to understand how these two episodes might have been conflated. Or to put it another way, they may have been seen as two phases in a single sequence that one might entitle something like "adventures of the cart."\(^{35}\)

As one moves away from the Harivaṃśa's nomadic environment in time and space, people evidently found it hard to conceive of a cart as a place where a baby could sleep. Instead we begin to see depictions of swing-like cradles, first at Badami and on a regular basis thereafter. Once cradle and cart were dissociated, the logic of representing Pūtānā and the sāhataṅhana in a single scene was lost.

In subsequent tellings, in fact, the cart and Pūtānā stories were typically told in the reverse order from what the Harivaṃśa had set out, and often with a chapter division between them. The Bhāgavata even provides a separate Sītā im Leben for the sāhataṅhana story. Krishna's prodigious kick is apparently presented as a miraculous extension of a normal child's newly gained ability to turn over in bed. A ceremony solemnizing the latter (auṭhāṇika) is made the occasion for Krishna to demonstrate his unusual powers.\(^{36}\)

In roughly the same period, the texts that came to be the mainstream of the brahmanical tradition forgot that Pūtānā was a bird, and indeed in none of the sculptures from Badami onward is she represented precisely as such. Yet the memory of some predatory bird in Krishna's infancy was not entirely lost. This is by now plain to us from sculpture, but it can also be observed in texts, provided one is willing to look beyond the standard brahmanical sources. Brahmans were not the only ones to transmit the Krishna story, the Jains had their version too; and in the short synopses presented in two Jain documents, the eighth-century Harivaṃśa of Jinasena and the twelfth-century Triaṣṭiśalākāpurusacarita of Hemacandra, we find clear reference to a bird of prey (śakunta, sākunī).\(^{37}\) In both cases, the attack of this bird on Krishna is closely associated with the incidents involving Pūtānā and the cart. Jinasena arranges these three sequentially, but
Hemacandra draws them together into a single episode. The way in which he does so is quite different from what the old Harivaṃśa reported, but his sense of the relation between cart, vulture, and demoness is equally strong. Jinasena clearly conceives Pūtana and the bird as separate beings: he has Krishna kill one by the breast and the other by the beak, yet the way in which he introduces these two suggests that he too is aware of their connection. Once he has discussed the bird, he finds it unnecessary to produce any further note of identification or explanation in introducing Pūtana, as if there were something birdlike about her too. Hemacandra makes their relation explicit. He states that the malevolent bird (śakuni) and Pūtana are sister demons and he pictures them as acting in concert. The bird stands on the cart and calls out to Krishna from above, while Pūtana thrusts her poison-smeared breast into Krishna’s mouth. According to Hemacandra, Krishna kills them both by striking them with the cart.

The sense one gets from looking at sculptures from Badami and Ellora is that one has entered a mythological medium not far from that known by Jinasena, and indeed these sculptures are roughly contemporary with Jinasena’s work. In these reliefs Pūtana and the bird demon have distinct identities, yet they are associated by various means, sequential narration being the minimum. In later sculptures, however, one does not find so clear an indication of the relation between Pūtana and the bird as is maintained in Hemacandra’s account. On the contrary, it seems that the logic of the original story became ever more obscure and the tie between the demoness and the bird was increasingly loosened, and sometimes entirely cast aside.

An additional complication was apparently introduced by the Bhāgavata’s story of the heron demon, to which several of the Hoysala sculptors felt obliged to make reference. That the Bhāgavata was clearly known in at least some parts of the Hoysala domain is implied not only by these references to bhakāsura but by the depiction at Somnathapura of what must be the snake demon Aghāsura, another Bhāgavata peculiarity. Though Hoysala sculptors were aware of the heron demon, however, they seem at the same time to have preserved a sense that Krishna dealt with a bird demon not at the point in his story when the Bhāgavata says he fought bhakāsura, but early in his infancy. On the temple of Hoysalaeśvara this evidently produced a hybrid depiction: the iconography of the heron was adopted but the position occupied in the story by the hawklike bird of prey was maintained. In later Hoysala temples, it appears, the two traditions were not so neatly merged. Hence we find references made to two separate birds in the double images we have seen—even if, at Basal, one of them may have been blank.

As the variety of these later Hoysala examples makes clear, it is not always possible to say just how the sculptors conceived these birds. It remains a strong probability that their perceptions were conditioned by local and regional legends of which we now have no direct record. The crowlike appearance of some of these birds, for instance, suggests the bird who would most commonly have been seen about the countryside picking after animal and vegetable remains, and the crow is indeed introduced into the mythology of the child Krishna in vernacular accounts. In a poem probably contributed to the Śūr Śāgar in the eighteenth or early nineteenth century, in fact, such a crow is explicitly made out to be a demonic messenger from Kaṃsa and is illustrated with every inch the interest lavished on earlier representations not directly tied to a known text (Figs. 24 and 25).

Other birds that prey on defenseless children are portrayed under different names in the popular legendry that one meets throughout the subcontinent. And sculptors of the kṛṣṇacarita, whatever age they belonged to, doubtless had similar tales at hand.

Before we assume, however, that sculptors simply felt free to rely upon whatever local traditions they knew, a final observation is in order. It can be shown from a broad study of kṛṣṇacarita reliefs dating from the middle of the first millennium A.D. to the middle of the second that remarkable continuities of iconographic convention were observed, even in the absence of any clear textual warrant. The existence of sculpture as a self-conscious medium related to but independent from texts seems unarguable. Pilgrimage is a venerable phenomenon in Hindu culture, and many sculptors must have travelled to a number of temples upon which they could observe motifs that they themselves would later be called upon to reproduce. If they did not go themselves, perhaps they had access to artists’ notebooks that recorded such icons, or to individual drawings or paintings that pilgrims kept as memorabilia of their journeys. Such images are mass-produced in the present day, and it seems hard to conceive that they had no antetypes in an age whose
technological capabilities were different. However the effect was achieved, it is plain that sculptors studied sculpture and were not merely guided by texts.42

That reality must have played a considerable role in keeping Krishna's bird alive. The fact that it had been there before must have argued on many occasions that it should be there again. Hence even though the great texts of the brahmanical tradition forgot that Pūtanā was a bird, that bird continued to exist in the visual tradition to which each new generation of sculptors was heir, and could not be argued away. Doubtless locally known myths could be brought to bear to explain, at least in a loose way, what was unarguably there in the stone. But it is worth considering the possibility that at times sculptors were able to retain and reproduce what they had seen precisely because they were not required to rationalize such things in words, as tellers of tales and writers of texts have always been forced to do. For that reason sculpture could sometimes be an even more conservative medium than text. And there may well have been times when sculptors were able to hold onto what they knew even if they did not quite know—in words—what they knew.
Notes

Thanks are due to Richard Salomon and, as the reader will see, to Donald Stadtner for thoughtful reactions to earlier drafts of this essay.

1. An index to published information relating to this and other sites discussed below can be found in Appendix B of J. S. Hawley, Krishna, the Butter Thief, Princeton, 1983 (cited as Butter Thief), pp. 338–375.


4. No cart scene now appears on the Upper Śivalaya, and it is unlikely that any ever did. Though some of the panels have been damaged beyond recognition and others removed, none of the narrative lacunae that they create comes at a point that could logically have belonged to the śaktaḥbhāṣaṇa scene.

5. Harivaṃśa 50.20. The śisupāla-vadha section of the Mahābhārata, into whose orbit the Harivaṃśa was ultimately attracted as a supplement, also uses this term (Mahābhārata 2.38.6).


7. Jinasena 35.44. For this work I cite Darbārī Lālā Nyāyārthīrī Sāhī, ed., Harivaṃśapuṛāṇa, Bombay, ca. 1950.


9. I am grateful to Michael Meister for first suggesting this identification to me.

10. Bhāgavata 10.11.45–58; cf. also 10.50.17b. This incident is also reported in Padma Purāṇa 6.272.100–101. In all likelihood at least this portion of the Padma Purāṇa is even more recent than the Bhāgavata, as has been argued by Walter Ruben and is suggested by a number of additional details that Ruben does not specifically mention. See Ruben, Krishna: Konkordanz und Kommentar der Motive seines Heldenlebens, Istanbul, 1944, pp. 271–272; cf. Hawley, Butter Thief, pp. 25–26. For the Padma Purāṇa 1 cite R. S. V. N. Mandlik, ed., Padmapuṛāṇa, Poona, 1893–1894.

11. See Krishna Deva, “Lakshmana Temple at Sīrpur,” Journal of the Madhya Pradesh Ikhas Parishad v. 2, 1960, pp. 35–56. Contrary to what I have stated on p. 549 of Butter Thief, the hākṣara scene, if so it be, occurs directly next to that of kālīṇadvamana. It is second from the right among the Krishna scenes at Sīrpur. Cf. American Institute of Indian Studies photographs 238.79 and 324.42. The factors preventing a confident identification are the absence of the beak through breakage and the inclusion of a small third figure as part of the action.


14. These, however, seem almost entirely confined to scenes of an “atmospheric” nature. On both the Keśava temple at Somanathapura and the temple of Lakṣmīnarasimha at Nugghihalli, there is considerable use of similar scenes depicting life in the forest. These show the movement of people and cars and the transportation of milk products. At Nuggihalli, in addition, a number of forest ascetics are shown; and at corners one often sees what appear to be teaching scenes, in which a guru and a student seem to be depicted. In none of these, however, is a definite episode in Krishna’s life portrayed more than once. It is almost exclusively in connection with Krishna’s theft of butter that one finds a great elaboration of what is known in the puranas as a single moment. When one is dealing with Hōysala images of Krishna that are not intended to be perceived as a narrative sequence, of course, the situation is quite different. The same icon can be seen a number of times on a single temple.

15. On several occasions sculptors of the kṛṣṇacarita show Devi/Kātyāyanī resuming her divine form after having been slain by Kāma as a child born to Yāsodā. Though her placement on the Upper Śivalaya at Badami clearly implies that moment, she is depicted as an independent icon of the Goddess might be (see Hawley, Butter Thief, Fig. 8). The surprising appearance of a tiger as the second scene in the kṛṣṇacarita on the temple of Mallikārjuna at Basaral may have something to do with the fact that the tiger is Devi’s vehicle. It is unclear from the sculpture whether the beast is to be interpreted as an antagonistic presence or whether it is being heralded with a garland.


17. Padma 6.272.87a. The fact that the sixth book of the Padma Purāṇa exists only in the southern recension and that no Sanskrit text before the Padma reports this encounter lends credence to the identification.


22. The sequences in which the demon 1 have called Arista appears are listed in Appendix A of Hawley, *Butter Thief*.


25. It is possible that this motif is to be seen on an eleventh-century pillar now forming a part of a temple at Marāi, but the identification is not certain. See R. D. Banerji, *The Harihāyas of Tripuri and Their Monuments*. *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India* v. 23, 1931, pp. 97–98, pl. 58b.


27. See J. S. Hawley, *Butter Thief*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1977, pp. 210–211. Slightly more problematical is a sculpture on the Krishna pillar at Gurh that belongs to the same sequence (see Donal M. Stadtnner, “The Tradition of Kṛṣṇa Pillars in North India,” *Archives of Asian Art*, forthcoming, fig. 3, the fourth relief from either top or bottom. Here no proper narrative sequence can be discerned but the range is clear: Krishna and Balarāma appear as young men immediately above the relief in question, and below it they encounter Kamāśa’s dyer(ō), his elephant Kuvalayāpāda, and Kubjā, the hunchback of Mathura. In private communications (February 27, May 8, and May 25, 1987) Donald Stadtnner has drawn my attention to iconographically cognate sculptures from Batesar and Vidisha. The latter is published in Fig. 2 of his “Medieval Narrative Sculpture and Three Kṛṣṇa Panels,” in this issue of *Art Orientalis*. Again it is associated with a scene that could be interpreted as depicting the events at Mathura. This time it is Krishna defeating one of Kamāśa’s wrestlers, and Kamāśa seems to watch as his own death impends.

28. *Bhāgavata* 10.7.18–32; cf. 10.30.16a. The story is not known in other Sanskrit or Prakrit sources that could have predated the fifteenth century.


30. *Harivamsa* 58.1 ff.; *Viṣṇu* 5.9; *Bālaścarita*, act 3; *Bhāgavata* 10.18; *Padma* 6.272.140–143. *Pralambha* is omitted, however, in the Jain texts. The early sculptural example is from Abichatta: see S. C. Kala, *Terracottas in the Allababad Museum*, New Delhi, 1980, p. 102, fig. 280.


33. Viṣṇu 5.5.7; *Bhāgavata* 10.6.2–4.

34. *Harivamsa*, p. 343.

35. This still does not explain the exact form accorded to the bird, which seems to be as close to that of a peacock as to that of a hawk or jay. It is possible that already by Gupta times the precise identity of the bird had been obscured, at least in certain parts of the country, with the result that the avian type most common to sculpture was used to represent the unknown bird. The peacock is Skanda’s vehicle and appears in other contexts as well. I am grateful for Joan Raducha’s observation, for example, that the peacock was inserted at various points in Kusāna Buddhist sculpture where there is no evident textual justification for its presence (personal communication, May 7, 1983). On the Indian peacock, see P. Thakappan Nair, “The Peacock Cult in Asia,” *Asian Folklor Studies*, v. 33, no. 2, 1974, pp. 94–170.

36. I am grateful to Donald Stadtnner for suggesting this connection (personal communication, May 25, 1987). See *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* 10.7.4–8.


38. In Periyālvâr’s Tirumoli, for example, a crow is twice introduced into the story of Krishna’s childhood (Tirumoli 2.5, 2.6), but in neither case is it pictured as a dangerous bird.

39. This poem, no. 667 in the 1972 edition of the first volume of the Sūr Sāgar published by the Kāśi Nāgarīpracāraṇī Śabāh, does not occur in manuscripts dating before 1700 A.D. On stylistic grounds, however, the manuscript in which it is illustrated has been ascribed to approximately the eighteenth century by the staff of Bharat Kala Bhavan in Varanasi, where it is now housed. Apropos of the proliferation of bird myths associated with Krishna, it is worth noting that in Śabāh no. 674, a relatively old poem, Patāna is referred to as bāki, i.e., a heron.

41. An example of a case in point is the episode of Krishna stealing butter, as discussed in Chapter 2 of Hawley, *Butter Thief*.

Fig. 1. Segment of one of the doorframes from Mandor. Top: Krishna stealing butter (navanitacaurya); bottom: Krishna breaking the cart (jakatabhanga). Ca. A.D. 400. Sardar Museum, Jodhpur.

Fig. 2. Krishna breaking the cart (jakatabhanga), from the plinth of the Viṣṇu Temple at Deogarh. Ca. A.D. 500–550. National Museum, New Delhi. (Photograph by American Institute of Indian Studies.)
Fig. 3. First segment of the _krṣṇacarita_ from the Lower Śivālaya, Badami. From left to right: Vasudeva and Devaki in prison; the exchange of babies, and Krishna killing a bird demon, stealing butter, killing Pūtāṇa, rescuing Yamala and Arjuna, and breaking the cart. Early seventh century A.D. Archaeological Museum, Badami. (Courtesy, Archaeological Survey of India.)

Fig. 4. Isolated relief from a _krṣṇacarita_. Left: Krishna and a bird demon; right: killing of Pūtāṇa. Early seventh century A.D. Archaeological Museum, Badami.
Fig. 5. Segment of the *krṣṇacarita* from the western basement of the Upper Śivalaya, Badami. Left: attendant figure (?); right: Krishna in cradle with bird demon. Early seventh century A.D.

Fig. 6. Scenes from the *krṣṇacarita*, west face of a pillar in the temple of Virūpākṣa, Pattadakal. From left to right: Krishna fighting a bird demon, breaking the cart, killing Putana, releasing Yamala and Arjuna, demanding butter (*dāna līlā*), defeating the horse demon Kesi. Ca. A.D. 735–745.
Fig. 7. Krishna and a bird demon, from the *kṛṣṇacarita* that occurs in conjunction with scenes from the *Mahābhārata*, temple of Kailāsanātha, Ellora. Ca. A.D. 750–770. (Photograph by Rex Studios, Aurangabad.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Krishna and a bird demon</th>
<th>Devī/Kātyāyani victorious over death</th>
<th>Śakatābhanga</th>
<th>Kaṃsavadha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8. *Kṛṣṇacarita*, temple of Kailāsanātha, Ellora. (Photograph by Rex Studios, Aurangabad.)

- D: Life in Gokula: Putanavādha
- C: Rejoicing in Gokula
- B: Deliverance from jail
- A: Kṛṣṇajanma
Fig. 9. Scenes from the *kṛṣṇa-carita* on a pillar in the temple of Visvanātha, Pattadakal. Upper register, left to right: Krishna stealing butter, breaking the cart, killing the heron demon (*bakaśura*), releasing Yamala and Arjuna. Lower register, left to right: Krishna defeats the bull Arīṣṭa, the ass Dhenuka, and Pūtanā. Ca. A.D. 600.

Fig. 10. Scenes from the *kṛṣṇa-carita* on the temple of Hoysalesvara, Halebid. From left to right: Krishna kills *bakaśura*, breaks the cart, and drags the mortar between the two *arjuna* trees (*ulūkhalabandhana*). Ca. A.D. 1121.
Fig. 11. Krishna kills kakásura, from the kṛṣṇacarita on the temple of Laksminarāyaṇa, Hosaholalu. Ca. A.D. 1250.

Fig. 12. Krishna battling a bird demon from the kṛṣṇacarita of the temple of Laksminarāyaṇa, Hosaholalu. Ca. A.D. 1250.
Fig. 13. Krishna killing bakasura, from the kṛṣṇacarita on the navarāga of the temple of Amṛtesvara, Amritapura. Ca. A.D. 1225-1250.

Fig. 14. Krishna fighting cocks (?), from the kṛṣṇacarita of the temple of Amṛtesvara, Amritapura. Ca. A.D. 1225-1250.
Fig. 15. Krishna killing bakasura, from the *krsnacarita* of the temple of Mallikärjuna, Basral. A.D. 1234.

Fig. 16. Krishna in his cradle, attended by Yasoda (?), from the *krsnacarita* of the temple of Mallikärjuna, Basral. A.D. 1234.
Fig. 17. Segment of the kṣṇaśāraṅga of the temple of Lākṣminarāśimha, Nuggihalli. From right to left: the defeat of Pūtana, Krishna in his cradle (with bird ?). A.D. 1246.

Fig. 18. Segment of the kṣṇaśāraṅga of the temple of Lākṣminarāśimha, Nuggihalli. From left to right: Krishna in his cradle (with bird ?), Krishna breaking a cart, scene with teacher and pupil. A.D. 1246.

Fig. 19. Death of Kaṁsa at the hands of Balarāma (?), Dholpur. Courtesy, Bharat Kalā Bhavan. (Photograph by American Institute of Indian Studies.)
Fig. 20. Death of Kamsa at the hands of Balarama (?) from the circumambulatory path around garbagrha of the temple of Lakṣmana, Khajuraho. Ca. A.D. 950.

Fig. 21. Death of Kamsa at the hands of Balarama, from the kṛṣṇacarita of the temple of Surya (alternatively called Saciya Matā), Osian. Ca. A.D. 750.
Fig. 22. Defeat of Trnāvarta, from an illustrated Sūr Śāgar. Ca.
eighteenth century A.D. (Courtesy, Bhārat Kālā Bhavan, Varanasi.)

Fig. 23. Defeat of Pralamba (?) from the circumambulatory path around
the garbhagṛha of the temple of Laksmanā, Khajurāho. Ca. A.D. 950.
Fig. 24. Defeat of a crow demon (Part I), from an illustrated Sūr Sāgara. The text given, palanā syām bukhāvati ānānī (“His mother swings Syām in his cradle”), Sabha 662, is evidently not illustrated, but rather represents the text accompanying figure 25. Ca. eighteenth century A.D. (Courtesy, Bharat Kalā Bhavan, Varanasi.)

Fig. 25. Defeat of a crow demon (Part II), from an illustrated Sūr Sāgara. The text is kāg rāp ik danuj dhāraya (“A demon took on the form of a crow”), Sabha 677. Ca. eighteenth century A.D. (Courtesy, Bharat Kalā Bhavan, Varanasi.)
Among the masterpieces of medieval South Indian architecture, the Rājarājesvara Temple at Tanjore is without parallel. Completed in 1010 by the Cola king Rājarāja I (regnal period ca. a.d. 985–1014), this structure represents the culmination of early eleventh century political and artistic thinking in Tamilnadu (Fig. 1).

It is not necessary to recount here all the features of the Rājarājesvara Temple. Even the most casual visitor to the site will, however, be struck by the large, skillfully-carved images of Hindu deities which are placed in niches along the lower level of the temple exterior (Figs. 2 and 3). Less conspicuous but of equal interest is the row of figures installed higher up, around the second level of the mahāmandaṇḍapa (a large hall), ardhamandaṇḍapa (a half-hall), and vimāṇa (the main, tower-like segment of the temple). Thirty in number, they are almost life-size and virtually free-standing (Fig. 4). Two standard poses are employed in the rendering of this second group of figures: the pratyāldhāsana, the canonical posture of the warrior, in which the deity stands in a kind of contrapposto (tribhāṅga), with the left knee projecting and the right leg drawn back (Fig. 5); and a second pose, in which the left leg is flexed at the knee and raised while the foot rests upon a small, low, circular platform (Fig. 6). Although a few of these images now appear to possess only three arms, it is reasonable to assume that originally all had four. The surviving four-armed deities display forms of the trident (triśūla), bow (dhanu), arrow (bāṇa), and battle axe (paraśu), attributes which identify the carvings as representations of Lord Śiva as Tripurāntaka, the form of Lord Śiva in which he destroys the citadels of the three asuras demons.

The story of Lord Śiva Tripurāntaka comprises a popular segment of the vast Saivite mythological canon. Briefly, the myth describes the successful battle of Śiva against three powerful demons whose citadels could be destroyed only by a single arrow shot from the bow of Mahādeva (Śiva). Thus, this form of Śiva embodies the concept of the warrior par excellence. While the Tripurāntaka sculptures are the most conspicuous representations of the subject on the Rājarājesvara Temple, other versions are to be found elsewhere in this structure.

An impressive fresco panel in the passageway surrounding the garbhagriha of the temple depicts the actual battle. Lord Śiva Tripurāntaka is shown standing in his chariot—which is driven by Brāhma himself—as he prepares to dispatch the demon hosts with a single shot of his all-conquering arrow. The intensity of this rendering offers a dramatic contrast to the iconic character of the stone carvings.

Still another example of the Tripurāntaka subject has been identified with the Rājarājesvara Temple. An inscription carved on two niches in front of the temple states that Rājarāja I’s queen Pañchavan-mahādevi donated some metal sculptures to the temple. One of these is referred to as Taṅjaiyavagar; it is described as four-armed and trampling upon a figure of Maṣalagan. R. Nagaswamy identifies the sculpture as a representation of Tripurāntaka; he also claims that it is, in fact, this image which is now in the collection of the Tanjore Art Gallery (Fig. 7). Whether Nagaswamy’s attribution is accepted or not, a comparison of the monument with the image and the stone sculptures of Tripurāntaka on the temple exterior leaves no doubt that, stylistically, the figures belong to the same period and school. They share the physical characteristics which exemplify the “heroic style” of Tanjore Temple sculpture—broad shoulders, tapering waist, massive thighs, manneristically bulging knee joints, a full face with a long, wedge-shaped nose. And although it is somewhat difficult to trace the detailing of the Tripurāntaka carvings—they are quite high up, and modern painted color schemes tend to camouflage the finer cuttings—a comparison of the bronze with one of the main devakosha (a niche for a deity) sculptures reveals a distinctive finishing technique (compare Figs. 6 and 7).

Recently, one more depiction of the Tripurāntaka story has been identified on the Rājarājesvara Temple. On the eastern parapet of the southern sōpāna (stairway) attached to the
ardhamandapa is a relief carving which in many details repeats the composition of the fresco panel described above. It is unique, however, in that the standard story line is supplemented by a syncretistic Buddhist/Vaishnavite component. This feature will be discussed below.\(^1\)

Finally, a stone carving which undoubtedly refers to Śiva Tripurāntaka has also been observed recently. In the ardhamaundapa, to the right of the dvārapāla which guards the right side of the entrance to the garbha grha, stands a devakostha figure in tribhanāga (Fig. 8). It carries a bow (dhanus) in the left front hand, an unfinished detail intended to be the deer (mīga) in the rear left hand, an axe (paraśu) in the rear right hand and, a sakti—a weapon in the form of a spear—in the front right hand. These attributes identify the image of Tripurāntaka, although K. R. Srinivasan suggests that this figure, along with its “partner” on the left side of the doorway “may be two Tripura asuras who,” according to local South Indian Śaivite mythology, “became dvārapalas” as a consequence of their conversion to Saivism.\(^2\)

While it is obvious that the Tripurāntaka subject has been accorded singular prominence both outside and inside the temple, it is also a fact that no mention of the carved and painted depictions of this deity has been found in the wealth of inscriptions engraved on the structure.\(^3\) It has been left to modern researchers to deal with the question of the meaning and importance of the Tripurāntaka motif on the Rājarājesvara Temple.

In his far-ranging exploration of the arts of India, C. Sivaramamurti has noted the phenomenon of dynasts personally selecting various divinities to symbolize important cultural concepts.\(^4\) The Tripurāntaka motif on the Rājarājesvara Temple has not escaped his notice, nor indeed, that of others. But it is curious that, in view of its obvious importance, with one exception speculation as to its meaning has been restricted to the repetition of a single basic idea. This thesis can be summarized by quoting two passages from Sivaramamurti’s writings. Speaking of the Rājarājesvara fresco, he says:

The Cholas being great warriors and conquerors, and Rājarāja himself the greatest of them all,\(^5\) it is in the fitness of things that the theme of Tripurāntaka, the mighty warrior-god, is glorified here, virtually as the keynote of the Chola power.\(^6\)

In another place, the author, commenting on the stone carvings, observes that “in the tiers above, repeated in several niches, are a number of Tripurāntaka forms of Śiva as the ideal warrior.”\(^7\)

It is important to acknowledge that this personification of the ideal warrior occurs elsewhere in South Indian temple art.\(^8\) It is also true that other iconographical types are treated in three mediums at the Rājarājesvara, most notably depictions in stone, paint, and metal of Śiva as Natarāja, Lord of the Dance.\(^9\) Nevertheless, the ambitious cycle of exterior stone carvings and the versions in stone relief, paint, and metal of the Tripurāntaka subject give this deity an emphasis unmatched on any comparable structure.

To my knowledge, K. R. Srinivasan is the only authority who has postulated a more subtle meaning for the Tripurāntaka theme at the Rājarājesvara. Through a consideration of “indigenous Śaivite Tamil literature,” and looking into a broader frame-work of Indian temple art, he connects the Buddhist/Viṣṇu elements in the relief carving on the eastern parapet of the south stairway with the concept of the chakravartin, that is, “the tradition that the king represents Viṣṇu, the protector and sustainer on earth.” This view led to the notion of the king as a divine conqueror along the lines of Varāha, Nārasimha, and Trivikrama. Thus, according to K. R. Srinivasan, “Rājarāja’s predilection for Tripurāntaka-Śiva as his favorite god was only logical.”\(^10\)

While K. R. Srinivasan’s theories are unique contributions, it is possible to explore further the question of the significance of the Tripurāntaka theme at the Rājarājesvara by considering the matter in a more comprehensive context.

A ruler as successful as Rājarāja I in creating an empire which made its influence felt throughout much of South India might well consider instituting the Tripurāntaka imagery to illustrate his conquests and to promote himself. There is, however, little evidence to support the idea that Cola kings used large scale temple sculpture and painting to aggrandize themselves personally or politically. It is true that both kings and private individuals with sufficient means often commissioned stone and metal “portrait” sculptures which were dedicated to temples and shrines:\(^11\) inscriptions on the Rājarājesvara include references to such acts of devotion.\(^12\) The Rājarājesvara frescos contain figures which have been interpreted as portraits of Cola dignitaries.\(^13\) All these extant examples are, however, modest in scale.\(^14\) It would seem that the prominence of the Tripurāntaka motif on the Rājarājesvara Temple has an addi-
The Rājarājeśvara Temple and the Military Accomplishments of Rājarāja I

Some important questions will address the relationship between the construction of the Rājarājeśvara Temple and the military accomplishments of Rājarāja I. What (insofar as can be determined) was the military record of Rājarāja I before the planning and construction of the temple? Was it one which would justify the creation of a unique, extensive iconographical symbology? What does this record seem to have been after the dedication of the Rājarājeśvara? In view of the paucity of historical data, such questions cannot be conclusively settled. Historical records of the period from South India present many difficulties of interpretation and dating. The language of inscriptions is often hyperbolic, making it difficult to ascertain the exact nature of events. Yet it may be possible to arrive at a fairly accurate reconstruction of the historical circumstances if one proceeds from the general toward less specific particulars.

N. Subrahmaniam notes that Rājarāja I’s military career “began early in his reign with an attack on the Chera country,” i.e., Kerala. In all probability, this event, which can be estimated to have occurred 988–989, took place simultaneously with campaigns in other parts of South India. The period 990–1000 saw increased Cōla military activity, including expansion to the north.

Campaigns of equal or greater importance were waged in the following two decades, at which time Rājarāja I’s son Rājendra I emerged as a gifted and effective general. During and after the dedication of the Rājarājeśvara Temple (a.d. 1010) a number of campaigns were begun. One of these, the conquest of Ceylon, was successfully concluded by Rājendrā I after his father’s reign, in 1024.

It seems reasonable to infer from this simplified account of Rājarāja’s military that the king’s activities in the field were continuous, comprehensive, and impressive throughout his career. At no point during his reign would a conquest, or a series of conquests, have represented a focus of sufficient importance to inspire the Rājarājeśvara Temple project with its numerous Tripurāntaka references. Stated another way, one need not question the wish of a king of Rājarāja I’s lineage, means, and ambition to construct a shrine of such proportions and complexity. One can, however, ask if his military record would have been impressive enough to justify the Tripurāntaka innovation when the temple was, for all practical purposes, completed at the end of the first decade of the eleventh century. This question takes on an even sharper focus when one recalls that construction, which began ca. 1004, would have been preceded by an undetermined period of planning. As the time factors bearing on the construction of the Rājarājeśvara keep unfolding backwards, it becomes apparent that Rājarāja I would have had relatively little time to compile the kind of military record that would seem necessary to justify the Tripurāntaka theme as we now see it. One must look elsewhere for alternative interpretations of the “military question.” Numbers often assume a special significance in the mythology and religion. Clearly, the story of Tripurāntaka suggests that the number three needs to be scrutinized carefully. Among the many “sets of three” which are of significance to South Indian culture, those that bear upon geography and dynastic rule seem most relevant to our study. One of these sets is that of the “Crowned Kings” (mudi-arāšar) the Cērā, Cōla, and Pāṇḍya of the period preceding the sixth century A.D. It is a set which may have some traditional relationship to a Cōla morphology of conquest. K. K. Sarkar writes that the three southern kingdoms of Pāṇḍya, Kerala, and Simhala were allied against the Cōla before the reign of Rājarāja I, an alliance which was still in effect when Rājarāja I ascended the throne. Professor Sarkar also notes that an inscription refers to the conquest of kings of Kollam, Killadeśam, and Kodungolūr. Finally, early in his reign, Rājarāja I entitled himself Mummadicōla after conquering three southern kingdoms. Mummadicōla means “thrice famed Cōla.”

Still another aspect of the Cōla political and military situation requires examination. Could the Tripurāntaka theme have been, at least in part, the choice of a king who inherited an empire still deeply humiliated politically, and beset by economic difficulties? It is known that earlier in the tenth century the Cōlas had suffered a reduction of their territories; indeed, in some cases they experienced serious defeats in the field. But authorities differ in their opinions of the condition of the empire which Rājarāja I inherited in 985. K. A. Nilankanta Sastri depicts
an emperor who took over “a relatively small state . . . that had hardly recovered from the disasters of the Râṣṭrapâla invasion.” More recent assessments view the situation differently. N. Subrahmaniam states:

even during Uttama’s period (Uttama Câla, ca. A.D. 973–985) the kingdom had recovered from the impact of the Rashtrakûta invasions, and so Râjâraja acceded to a fairly well-established and peaceful government. 40

Douglas Barrett is even more certain of a stabilized economic situation. He observes:

By the accession of Uttama Câla in A.D. 969–970, 41 the re-establishment of a settled and prosperous social and economic life seems to have been complete. On its basis Râjâraja I . . . was able to realize a vast imperial design, welding together the whole of South India into a second empire more extensive and enduring than the first. 42

It is possible to verify Barrett’s contentions by considering the number of temple construction projects which can be assigned both to the reign of Uttama Câla, and to the first part of Râjâraja I’s reign. The amount of construction was, indeed, prodigious and would not have been possible in a society still in the process of economic recovery.

Each of the postulated socio-economic situations would have a specific bearing upon the decision of Râjâraja I to build the Râjârajeśvara Temple. It is conceivable that he would have chosen to construct such a costly monument in spite of desperate economic circumstances. The project would have symbolized a new, much-needed sense of aspiration and destiny. The Tripûrântaka theme might have been deliberately chosen to represent the king’s courage and the promise of a new age. If, however, Barrett’s analysis of the situation is (as seems probable) correct, the Râjârajeśvara project would have functioned as a logical extension of the ambition of a competitive dynasty. If this was the case, however, the emergence of the Tripûrântaka motif seems even less explicable. It will be necessary to explore still other aspects of the problem; to return, in fact, to the military interpretation.

It has been noted above that, although the extensive treatment of the Tripûrântaka theme at the Râjârajeśvara is unique, the subject appears in a number of forms in South India previous to the reign of Râjâraja I. Thus, it can be assumed that this aspect of Śiva as the ideal warrior was available to any number of rulers. Yet, although Imperial Câla 43 history prior to the reign of Râjâraja I abounds with accounts of important territorial aggressions—Parântaka I’s record is a good example—no previous ruler appears to have adapted the Tripûrântaka motif as a specific reference to military prowess. It is possible that the idea simply did not occur to anyone until Râjâraja I appeared. But if the Tripûrântaka theme was adopted only to celebrate the military exploits of Râjâraja I and to express the might of the Câlas, why was this motif ignored by the successor of Râjâraja I, his son Râjendra I? Historical data indicate that Râjendra’s achievement as a military conqueror actually surpassed that of his illustrious father. 44 In fact, one can ask the question with reference to Câla predominance in South India up to the thirteenth century. This was a period of incessant military activity in which any number of Câla rulers could have chosen to rally under the banner of the Supreme Warrior.

It would seem entirely proper for the son at least to appropriate from the father this emblem as a symbol of his own prowess and the continuity of the empire—unless that emblem had a significance exclusive to the person of Râjâraja I; this is a matter which will be touched upon subsequently. In the construction of his new capital at Gaṅgaikondacolapuram, however, Râjendra sponsored the erection of a magnificent temple, the Brhadeśvara, a building almost as large as the Râjârajeśvara at Tanjore, but did not include any references in stone or paint to Tripûrântaka. Of course, it is possible that Râjendra I simply had no desire or need to duplicate a scheme which was his father’s innovation. This explanation seems, however, unconvincing.

**The Râjârajeśvara Temple and Other South Indian Art**

It is useful at this point to focus once again upon the Tripûrântaka type as it appears in South Indian art. We have noted that this image has been identified in the sculptural programs of a number of South Indian temples besides that at Tanjore. 45 Similarly, a considerable body of South Indian representations of this deity in metal exists in temple, national, and private collections. Many of these bronzes are of the highest artistic and technical quality. Unfortunately for art historians, their portability and the lack of adequate historical documentation relating to their manufacture has made it possible to assign secure dates to only a handful of these magnificent icons. Thousands of images have been assigned rather arbitrarily determined dates. 46 The task of dating South Indian metal images can, however,
be undertaken with considerable success through stylistic comparisons with stone sculptures whose dates can be established by epigraphical evidence. One such study has analyzed and dated almost one hundred bronze images from various locations in South India. It is significant that of the eleven Tripurântaka figures included in this selection, eight are dated to the reign of Râjarâja I, three predate this period, and none are datable after 1010. It is not practical here to treat all the metal representations of Tripurântaka that appear to belong stylistically to the period of Râjarâja I. Only two important examples in the collection of the Tanjore Art Gallery will be discussed to demonstrate the methodology of stylistic dating.

The first image is a casting from the Râjagopalswami Temple in Tanjore (Fig. 8). When we compare it to the bronze image of Tripurântaka from the Râjarâjeswara Temple (Fig. 7), it is clear that both representations are characterized by the “heroic” physique and facial type which I have identified as the dominant stylistic inclination of the period of Râjarâja I. In each, the sensitive, delicate rendering of details enhances without endangering the fluid and graceful articulation of the bodies—another feature of the “heroic style” of the period. Both images display the two poses which are invariably associated with Tripurântaka representations, and which have been described in the introductory section of the present study.

In addition to the bronze Tripurântakas referred to above other metal images of the deity can be assigned on stylistic grounds, to the reign of Râjarâja I. It would appear that the proliferation of Tripurântaka motifs in metal and stone associated with the regnal period of Râjarâja I cannot be explained simply as a propagandistic ploy on the part of the king. Thus, it will be necessary to consider yet another aspect of the historical situation.

Historians of South Indian art have tended to assume that projects of the type represented by the Râjarâjeswara Temple at Tanjore were, in the words of George W. Spencer, undertaken only by a “centralized, coercive state.”

Spencer observed, however, that recently revisionist theories suggest that South Indian temple construction of the medieval period may have in fact functioned as “a system-maintaining mechanism of a weakly organized polity.” He states:

This revision has been in the direction of a greater appreciation of the problems faced by dynastic rulers in their attempts to come to terms with the relatively autonomous character of the major groups and institutions in Indian society. The “authority” which Chola kings exercised over their territories did not so much involve the routinization of bureaucratic function, as has conventionally been thought, as did the manipulation of pre-existing, non-political institutions and the use of various methods of propaganda and persuasion in order to secure desired human and economic resources for political purposes.

He goes on to say:

In order to understand the importance to Râjarâja of patronage to the Tanjore temple, we must recognize that such patronage, far from representing the self-glorification of a despotic ruler, was in fact a method adopted by an ambitious ruler to enhance his very uncertain power.

Spencer believes that the development of bhakti in South India, particularly during a period of consolidation such as that represented by the reigns of Râjarâja I and his son Râjendra I, fostered the ruler’s recognition that religious enthusiasm could be tapped for political purposes. The popularity of the Tripurântaka theme during Râjarâja I’s reign could be regarded as evidence of the king’s conscious assimilation of the divine and royal roles.

[... ] gods were made to appear king-like, while the king was made to appear god-like. This was accomplished by means of publicizing the image of the ruler-as-devotee, by celebrating his sponsorship of the temple.

If Spencer’s views are accepted, it will be necessary to re-evaluate the purely military significance accorded the Tripurântaka imagery on the Râjarâjeswara Temple. A brief review of Cola history will help in placing Spencer’s theories in a broader cultural context.

The CÔlas

The CÔlas, an ancient, powerful South Indian dynastic line, re-emerged in the second half of the ninth century A.D. after several centuries of political eclipse. Through a series of aggressive conquests and effective alliances, they reached the height of their influence under Parântaka I (907–955). After a humiliating setback at the hands of Râṣṭrâkuṭa KṚṣṇa III in the Battle of Takkâlam (949), however, their empire was seriously diminished. It was not until the accession of Uttama CÔla (973–985) that the reacquisition of some of the lost territories was achieved. One may assume that his successor, Râjarâja I, was determined not only to regain the remaining CÔla lands, but to augment and extend CÔla influence. It was only through such military achievements that he could
hope to restore to his lineage the honor and dignity damaged by the ignominious defeat at Takkolam. With these goals before him, it is, indeed, probable that Räjaräja I looked to Lord Śiva Tripurāntaka as a personal model and patron.

Śiva as Naṭarāja and the saint Caṇḍesvara

It will be useful at this point to consider two additional figures that have been accorded special prominence in the iconographic program of the Rājarājēsvara Temple. The first is Śiva as Naṭarāja, Lord of the Cosmic Dance. A large stone carving of this deity was installed in a devakostha on the south wall of the vimāna (Fig. 2); representations in relief of Naṭajāra’s dance modes known as karanas appear in the vimāna interior, and an impressive fresco of this subject is preserved in the ambulatory of the temple. Stone representations of Nataraja were a standard feature of devakostha sculptural programs in South Indian temples from the second half of the tenth century A.D. onwards. In some of the Rājarājēsvara inscriptions, the king refers to himself, not only as “Śivapādaśekhara,” that is, “adorned by the feet of the lord as his crest jewel,” or “devotee of Śiva,” but he refers specifically to the aspect of Śiva known as “Daksina-Meru-Vitāikar, or Adavallar,” that is, “Śiva as Naṭarāja, Lord of the Dance.”

Another figure of special importance to Rājarāja I was the Śaivite saint Caṇḍesvara. His story dramatizes his piety by recounting the fact that he killed his father so as not to be distracted from his worship of the Śiva lingam. Caṇḍesvara stands as the symbol of supreme devotion to Lord Śiva. Part of the original plans of the Rājarājēsvara Temple included a separate shrine for Caṇḍesvara, constructed next to the northern flank of the main temple. K. R. Srinivasan notes that from 850–950

the ashtaparivara included the shrine of Caṇḍesara or Chandikesvara (or Tandesvara in inscriptions) following the impetus given by the Tevaram hymnists. This became a regular, and dominant feature of the Saiva temples of the Tamil country in the succeeding epochs.

He continues:

It was Rājaraja Chola I who built a prominent and separate shrine for Caṇḍesara... and thereafter it has become a regular feature, occupying the same place in the plan of all Śiva temples till today in the south.

Temple inscriptions refer to important donations of metal images of Caṇḍesvara by Rājarāja I and members of the royal court. Some of these seem to have been very elaborate compositions, perhaps tableaux, suggesting a desire on the part of the royal patron to emphasize the saint’s presence in the temple.

From this discussion, it is clear that the Naṭarāja and Caṇḍesvara images in the iconographic program of the Rājarājēsvara Temple were types fully integrated into the South Indian religious tradition, and cannot be associated exclusively with a specific ruler. Thus, it can be speculated that the unique Tripurāntaka theme at the Rājarājēsvara must bear a special significance on the person of Rājarāja I himself.

At least one writer has postulated a development which could have a bearing on the relationship between the Tripurāntaka motif at the Rājarājēsvara Temple and the religious practices of the period. According to Suresh B. Pillai, epigraphical evidence indicates that during his reign, Rājarāja I may have attempted to fully legitimize a “canonical religion” (i.e., Vedic in origins) which previously shared popularity with non-canonical worship (i.e., Dravidian beliefs) in Tamilnadu. Pillai states that work on the unfinished portions of the Rājarājēsvara Temple after the death of Rājarāja I was abruptly halted, a situation which could, in the author’s view “indicate a religious revolution or confusion in the 29th year (i.e., ca. A.D.1014) of Raajaraaja (sic) I or immediately after, about which inscriptions are discreetly silent.” Pillai’s presentation is, however, general, and does not deal with the representations of Tripurāntaka associated with the Rājarājēsvara Temple.

Epigraphical material is not the only source of commentary available to students of South Indian religion and culture. An impressive body of devotional literature has survived. The role which the Tripurāntaka theme plays in this vast corpus of as yet imperfectly understood writing will be summarized below.

M. A. Dorai Rangaswamy’s monumental study The Religion and Philosophy of Tevaram traces the history of the Tripurāntaka theme in Indian literature from its earliest appearance in the commentary on the Vaśananeyi Saṁhitā of the Kṛṣṇa Yajur Veda through the Mahabhārata and other versions of the myth, into Tamilian tradition. Portions of the classic Cilappatikaram, the Saṅgam anthology Kalittokai, and works such as the Aṁśumadhādha Āgama are shown to include the legend. Rangaswamy also describes a selection of sculptural representations of Tripurāntaka.
from Tamilnadu. T. V. Mahalingam cites specific references of Tripurāntaka occurring in Puram, the Kalittokai, the Tirumurāgāṛuppadai of the Pattuppātu, and the Śilappadikāram (sic). Mahalingam concludes his study by noting that “from thousands of hymns in the Tēvāram we get an idea of the iconography of some of the important forms or aspects of Śiva,” and by observing that the Tripurāntaka myth appears 113 times. Although these textual references verify the antiquity of the Tripurāntaka theme (which in South India was maintained most notably in the sacred Tēvāram), it has not been possible to find either literary evidence of the deity’s preeminence in the tenth and eleventh centuries or specific references to the person of Rājarāja I. One is, as a result, forced to ask the following question: how could such a conspicuous and unique visual manifestation of a significant deity escape all historical and literary notice? The question itself implies a presupposition, namely that what is so remarkable to modern eyes must have been equally remarkable in its own time. It is important to note that the corollary to this position would imply that a thing which was not remarkable in its own time would not require special comment. We can illustrate this “double-edged” proposition by reviewing certain aspects of medieval South Indian temple sculpture which originated in that same period (tenth and eleventh centuries).

In the tenth century the traditional set of five devakostha sculptures placed on the walls of South Indian temples was increased to seven (later, more were added). One can only conclude that some rather important changes in religious ritual must have occurred when decisions were made to periodically augment “canonical” sculpture configurations. Yet, it has been left to modern scholars to speculate on these changes; temple inscriptions take no note of them. Furthermore, no inscriptions explain (or even record) the unusual practice of adding major icons to the original sculptural program of a given temple. Gifts to these temples are, however, listed in inscriptions. It is not difficult to discover a reason for the absence of the kind of sculptural installation and/or renovations we have noted above. It was simply not the custom to record such events. Nevertheless, because temple iconography is generally consistent (variations, of course, do exist), it is reasonable to conclude that the craftsmen followed some kind of formal tradition, either an oral tradition or a tradition recorded in perishable materials, for example, manuscripts. It is important to note the existence of a certain flexibility with regard to the options available to South Indian temple builders. We find significant variations occurring, not only in sculptural programs, but in the configuration of foundation mouldings, wall decorations, and the like.

It seems reasonable to conclude that while temple design, construction, and maintenance in Tamilnadu in the tenth and eleventh centuries proceeded within a directed morphological and iconographical framework, the documentation for which has not survived, the tradition itself was one that permitted a certain amount of experimentation and variation. Yet the specific question remains: why does the image of Tripurāntaka occupy such a prominent place in the sculptural program of the Rājarājesvara Temple?

One final aspect of South Indian medieval culture will be considered for its possible relevance to this question. In our discussion of the proliferation of visual references to Čaṇḍēśvara and the Naṭarāja form of Śiva during the reign of Rājarāja I we have noted evidence of personal attachment to specific deities. In his study, Development of Religion in South India, K. A. Nīlākanta Sastri describes in detail the efflorescence of bhakti movements in Tamilnadu from the sixth century A.D. He emphasizes the atmosphere of fervid devotion to a personal god expressed in hymns which were later collected and which form an important part of the country’s religious heritage. Sastri also traces the worship of gods and the formation of sects in South India as a result of the bhakti movement. He considers customs of worship in the South before the appearance of stone structures and images, and concludes that both literary and archeological data suggest that during this period devotees were free “to choose the particular form of a god that appealed to them most and make that the centre of their devotion” (italics mine). Sastri discusses the emergence of the Imperial Colas in South India and observes that:

By an evolution of which the stages can no longer be traced in detail, there came into existence a considerable body of religious opinion and practice which sought to outgrow the acerbities of sectarian animosity within the Hindu fold and establish harmony among the various groups, a development that belongs more to the sphere of popular practical religion of daily life than the higher speculative side of it. The new practice inaugurated by some unknown genius consisted in the regular daily worship of five gods, viz., Śiva, Viṣṇu, Devi, Sūrya and
In his description of *pañcāyatana pūjā* Thomas J. Hopkins notes that the first two deities are the main sectarian gods, but that the group of five “is truly eclectic, though slightly weighted toward Śiva.” In its domestic form of worship, “the image or symbol of the god whom the worshipper prefers, his īṣṭadevatā (personal deity), is placed in the centre, and the other four are so set as to form a square around the central figure.”

Although the present study will not consider the question of whether or not Rājarāja I included *pañcāyatana pūjā* in his personal devotions, it is important to note that Hopkins’ “five shrine worship” underscores the idea of choice and the very personal nature of such choices. It is equally important to realize that a tradition in which such options were customary, *i.e.*, unremarkable, would be unlikely to record the iconic preferences of even such a distinguished patron as Rājarāja I. It remains to place the various elements of this study into a perspective which will elucidate the use of the Tripurāntaka theme at the Rājarājēśvara Temple.

**Conclusion**

The myth of Lord Śiva Tripurāntaka figures in South Indian art from at least the beginning of the sixth century A.D. but it is during the reign of the Cola king Rājarāja I that we find the most concentrated manifestation of the image of this deity in the iconographic program of the Rājarājēśvara Temple. With the exception of K. R. Srinivasan, modern scholars have assumed that the decision to emphasize an aspect of Śiva as Ideal Warrior on Rājarāja I’s great project was made for reasons of military propaganda. An analysis of the political and economic history of the Cola king’s reign makes it clear that this theory does not convincingly account for the unique proliferation of Tripurāntaka imagery at this time. No Cola king, not even the son and successor of Rājarāja I, the formidable warrior Rājendra I, made a comparable use of the Tripurāntaka motif, a fact which strongly supports the idea that this aspect of Śiva was particularly, perhaps even exclusively meaningful to Rājarāja himself. The *pañcāyatana pūjā* tradition, made it possible for individuals to freely select a particular deity for personal devotion. If one accepts Spencer’s theory of a decentralized rather than a centralized political structure within which Rājarāja I was obliged to function, one must then ask what besides political or economic leverage the king could employ to symbolize his preeminence?

The single force in South Indian culture that transcends political, linguistic, and regional differences is the commonality of religion. Śaivism was the sectarian persuasion of Rājarāja I and his court; it was natural for them to seek an aspect of Mahādeva which would be sanctioned by tradition but which could uniquely dramatize the personality and prospects of the new ruler. The Tripurāntaka legend illustrates above all the qualities of courage and determination, and the triumph of divine power over adversity and evil. One could view the decision to adorn the Rājarājēśvara Temple with images of this newly appointed “religious hero” as a conscious, perhaps even a cynical, act of statesmanship. But it would be more in keeping with the known religious fervor of the Cola dynasty to view Śiva Tripurāntaka as the personal deity, a kind if īṣṭadevatā, of Rājarāja I himself.

At what point during his career did Rājarāja I choose Tripurāntaka as his personal deity? Inscriptions indicate that, before he became king, Rājarāja I served “a long apprenticeship as yuvarāja,” or heir apparent. It is reasonable to assume that he was aware of his future accession and that he prepared himself assiduously for his great responsibilities. Such preparation would undoubtedly have included a devotional component and it may have been before 985 that he embraced Tripurāntaka as a personal deity. The king’s association with Tripurāntaka could, of course, have coincided with his accession to the Cola throne in 985. Finally, the king could have made his choice of Tripurāntaka at the time the Rājarājēśvara Temple project was begun. The first or second possibilities seem to be the most plausible; they also support the stylistic analysis of bronze images which places these sculptures in the period of 985–1010 (see the section entitled *The Rājarājēśvara Temple and other South Indian Art* above). Assuming that Rājarāja I brought his allegiance to Tripurāntaka to the throne, the rest, as it is sometimes said, “is history.” The king’s personal deity could have become easily, unobtrusively, and increasingly popular, could perhaps even have been elevated to the status of a cult. Such a situation would explain the creation of the many metal versions datable to the reign of Rājarāja I. In these circumstances, it would have been a simple and logical
step to integrate the Śiva Tripurāntaka form into the Rājarājeśvara Temple plans. Thus, it is within the context of a personal religious choice made by Rājarāja I—man, king, himself “divine”—that the Tripurāntaka imagery of his reign must be understood.
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1. “Complete” is understood here in the sense that by ca. A.D. 1010, the vimāna and garbhā grha were sufficiently finished to permit the performance of religious worship. An inscription of the 257th day of Rājarāja I’s twenty-fifth regnal year states that the king donated a copper pot to be placed on the pinnacle of the vimāna, indicating that the structure was henceforth ready for worship. See South Indian Inscriptions, edited and translated by E. Hultzsch, v. 2, part 1, Madras, 1891 (cited as SII), p. 9. It is obvious that work continued on the temple past 1010, although it is equally apparent that the mahāmandapa was never finished.


3. T. A. Gopinatha Rao, Elements of Hindu Iconography, Varanasi, 1971 (cited as Hindu Iconography), v. 1, part 1, p. 19. Due to the angle from which these figures must be viewed from the ground, their position is not always easy to ascertain. I believe that a number of them may stand in āṭhebhāsana, in which the placement of the legs is the reverse of pratyālībhāsana.

4. This platform type, double-lotus in shape and with variations, may be a substitution for the small figure of an asura which is usually represented vanquished under the foot of the deity. The sculptors of the Tanjore images, perhaps realizing that the detail of an asura would be almost indistinguishable from the ground, may have elected to provide the present simplified alternative.

5. In a few cases, details of these images are difficult to discern clearly; therefore, a small number may lack an arm, probably because of damage rather than because they represent an iconographical variation.

6. A full description of the Tripurantaka type is included in Rao, Hindu Iconography, v. 1, part 2, pp. 164-171.

7. A color plate of this painting is reproduced as the frontispiece of C. Sivaramamurti’s South Indian Painting, New Delhi, 1968.

8. Compare the color reproduction, ibid. with Figs. 4-6 of the present study.


11. This casting measures thirty-four inches in height. A “bronze” this size must be regarded as “monumental.” I will frequently use the popular designation “bronze” to identify the medieval South Indian images discussed in this study, even though technically speaking, they are brass alloy.

12. Stylistic evaluation of stone carvings which have modern applications of color or other “foreign” materials is problematical at times. In the present study, photographic documentation has been supplemented by on-site examination of these objects.


15. This relief panel is located in a cul de sac whose narrow dimensions make the carving impossible to photograph.

16. Letter and typescript of article sent to me by Mr. K. R. Srinivasan, dated June 4, 1985. Mr. Srinivasan’s article “An Interesting Sculpture in Taṭājāvūr,” has been prepared for publication in a forthcoming commemoration volume dedicated to C. Sivaramamurti.

17. The interested reader can peruse Hultzsch, SII to verify this claim. I have also been unable to find any mention of these representations in other epigraphical materials of the period and region.

18. C. Sivaramamurti, Royal Conquests, p. 29.

19. The claim here that Rājarāja I’s military accomplishments outshone those of all other Cola rulers is exaggerated. Most writers suggest that in fact his son Rājendra was an even more accomplished military commander.


22. C. Sivaramamurti presents an interesting discussion of the Tripurāntaka theme in Indian art, beginning with the Gupta period, in *Royal Conquests*, pp. 5–6.

23. One of the bronze and the stone versions are published in Balasubrahmanyam, *MCT*, Figs. 1 and 15 respectively. Sivaramamurti provides a good color plate of one of the two fresco paintings in *Nataraja in Art*, Fig. 74, p. 223.

24. K. R. Srinivasan as in Note 16.


28. An exception might be the famous and monumental Čap-deśaṅgrahamūrti relief on the north antarāla of the Bhaddeva temple at Gaṅgaiṅkondacolapuram. Some writers identify the recipient of a garland from Lord Śiva as a portrait of Rājendrā I.


31. South Indian princes often assumed official duties as administrators, and as leaders of armies, before ascending to the throne. For example, Rājendrā I, son of Rājārāja I, was made yuvārāja, or heir apparent, in 1012, two years before the termination of his father’s reign in 1014. It is possible that Rājendrā I took on military duties as early as 1008 in a campaign against Udagai (Sastri, *The Colas*, pp. 171–172, and Subrahmanian, *History*, p. 181).


34. The date for the beginning of temple construction is an estimate based upon the observation that it was not until inscriptions of his nineteenth year of reign that the title of “Rājārāja” appears for the great Cola king. See Balasubrahmanyam, *MCT*, p. 14. Barrett also accepts the date of 1004 in *Early Cola Architecture and Sculpture*, London, 1974 (cited as *ECAS*), p. 119. However speculative this date may appear, the interval of six years to the dedication in 1010 (see ibid) makes a great deal of sense. Considering the scope of this temple project, the estimate of six years may in fact be conservative.


41. There are some problems in establishing the regnal dates of the Cola rulers between the years 955 and 985. Subrahmanian, *History*, p. 191, gives 973–985 for the reign of Uṭtama Cola; the date accepted by Douglas Barrett in *ECAS*, pp. 90–108, is 969–985; Sastri cites 970–985, in *HSI*, p. 201. Barrett presents a lucid, reasonable analysis of these problems in *ECAS*, pp. 23–25.

42. Barrett, *ECAS*, p. 120.

43. The designation “imperial” distinguishes the later, i.e., Vijnāyaka lineage (beginning in the third quarter of the ninth century A.D.) from the so-called Śaṅgam period of the very early Christian era.


47. Schwindler, *Dating Sculpture*, p. 94.

48. The eight Tripurāntakaśas dated to the reign of Rājārāja I— which include the Tanjore figure discussed in this study—are those from: Mayyuram (now in the Tanjore Art Gallery and which will be discussed further on in this paper), Vellantur, Kilappahuvur, the William Wolf collection, New York City, the Cleveland Museum of Art, all dated 980–900; Tiruvelikudi, Tirukodikkaṇal, and Tanjore Temple, all dated 990–1010.

49. See Barrett’s discussion of this image in *ECB*, p. 22.
50. Images from Kulakudam, Tranquebar, the Victoria and Albert Museum, and the George P. Bickford collections. Also, the files of the Institut d'Indologie Français in Pondicherry contains images of Tripurāntaka which stylistically fall into the period of Rājarāja I.


52. Ibid., p. 42.

53. Ibid., p. 45.

54. Ibid., p. 45.

55. Ibid., p. 49.

56. Ibid., p. 50.


58. Color plate, ibid., p. 223. The author labels this illustration “Naṭarāja in the golden hall in Chidambaram.” This specific location is made on the basis of the precise architectural details in the painting.

59. C. Sivaramanamurti, Naṭarāja in Art, p. 347.


63. Ibid., p. 181.

64. Hultzsch, SII, no. 12 (also mentioned in the large Leyden grant, see p. 57); two Gaṇḍēvara “groups” and single images, in no. 29, paragraphs 2, ao, and 12; and no. 55, paragraph 2.


66. Ibid., p. 450.


69. Ibid., p. 185.

70. Professor Glenn E. Yocum, Whittier College, a scholar of the Tevāram and Tiruvācakam, holds that as yet, no “concentration” of the Tripurāntaka theme has been noticed in period devotional literature (personal correspondence December 6, 1978). I am grateful for his interest and advice.

71. Barrett has published an excellent survey in ECB, and enlarged it in ECAS. See also T. V. Mahalingam, Studies, pp. 50–54, which traces the same development. I have verified this phenomenon in the field. See Schwindler, Dating Sculpture.

72. It is not practicable to refer to all the epigraphical materials which have been taken from South Indian temples. Interested readers would have to read through a survey such as ECAS, or Balasubrahmanyam, MCT, and then consult the appropriate publications of inscriptions.

73. In certain instances, “portrait” sculptures are referred to in temple inscriptions. An example is found on the central shrine of the Umāmahēsvara Temple at Kōnerirājapuram (see Hultzsch, SII, v. 3, no. 146, paragraphs 1–4).

74. Two examples of comparable temples may be cited as cases in point: the Ůktavēḷisvara temple at Kūṭālam (991) features a Naṭarāja, Gaṇḍēvara, and Agastya on the south wall, from east to west. The Achkuleśvara temple at Tiruvārūr (also 991) reverses this set: Agastya, Naṭarāja, and Gaṇḍēvara. Refer to ECAS, pp. 110 and 111 for discussions of these temples.

75. Sastri, Development. For bhakti movements in Tamilnadu, see pp. 35–48; for hymns to personal gods, see p. 35; for formation of sects, see p. 49–78: for devotion to particular form of a god, see p. 57.

76. Ibid., pp. 60–61.


78. Sastri, Development, p. 61.

Fie. 1. Ejjaratiya Temple, Tanjore, Ca. A.D. 1010. View from the southeast. The entire measures 30.18 m on a side and rises to a height of 63.41 m. (Photograph by Susan L. Huntington.)
Fig. 2. Natarāja. Rājarājēśvara Temple, Tanjore, west wall of vimāṇa. Approximately life-size.

Fig. 3. Candraśēkhara. Rājarājēśvara Temple, Tanjore, west wall of vimāṇa. Approximately life-size.
Fig. 4. Tripurântaka. Râjarâjesvara Temple, Tanjore, north wall of vimâna.

Fig. 5. Tripurântaka in pratyâlidhâsana. Râjarâjâsvara Temple, Tanjore, south wall of vimâna.

Fig. 6. Tripurântaka with knee flexed. Râjarâjâsvara Temple, Tanjore, north wall of vimâna.
Fig. 7. Tripurântaka from the Râjarâjesvâra Temple, Tanjore. H: 86 cm. Tanjore Art Gallery.

Fig. 8. "Dvârapâla." Râjarâjesvâra Temple, Tanjore, north side of entrance to garbha gîtha. (Photograph courtesy Institut Française d’Indologie, Pondicherry, neg. no. 4820-5.)

Fig. 9. Tripurântaka from the Râjagopâlaswâmi Temple, Tanjore. H: 91 cm. Tanjore Art Gallery.

Zeynep Çelik's dissertation, The Impact of Westernisation on Istanbul's Urban Form, 1838-1908, (University of California, Berkeley), won the 1984 Middle East Studies Association' Malcolm H. Kerr Dissertation Award for Scholarship in the Humanities, and its publication as a book has been eagerly awaited by scholars of the architecture and history of the late Ottoman empire. The book is one of the first to address in English, in a serious and comprehensive way, the complex issues involved in the study of the art and architecture of the nineteenth century, and thus begins to fill a huge gap in the literature.

In the introduction, Çelik identifies herself as an architectural historian and sets her goal as contributing to the "history of the fabrics of cities," seeking to explain "societal change and structure" via the "built form" (pp. xxvii-xxviii). She confines herself to the years between 1838 and 1908 for a detailed analysis of Istanbul, although a fair amount of material from both before and after this period is brought in. The book is divided into six chapters and a short epilogue.

The first two chapters present background material on the city, and on the political and economic situation of the nineteenth century Ottoman empire. Chapter One, "An Architectural Survey of the City," first introduces the reader to the Istanbul of 1838 and then summarises its historical development, focusing on such aspects of the city as street patterns, the residential fabric, composition of neighborhoods, urban administration, and architectural style. Although drawn for the most part from readily available published sources, it is nevertheless an extremely useful summary of the city's history.

The background material presented in the second chapter is likewise drawn primarily from already published sources and shows a relatively uncritical acceptance of the standard image of the political and economic decline of the Ottoman empire in the nineteenth century. An examination of the notes and bibliography reveals Çelik's dependence on Shaw, Issawi and Lewis for this section; the inclusion of the work of Donald Quataert (particularly his 1983 book, Social Disintegration and Popular Resistance in the Ottoman Empire, 1861-1908) and Roger Owen could have provided an interesting contrast to the views of Issawi and others. In the second part of the chapter Çelik summarises the growth of the city in terms of both population and physical size, and discusses changes in its administration. She seems to feel herself on surer ground here, and indeed this material is very interesting (although again, she has relied solely on Shaw for her population figures, and considering the confused state of nineteenth century statistics, that seems a surprising decision).

Çelik's extensive research using the archives of the Prime Ministry and the Topkapı Sarayi, as well as material in the Istanbul University and Topkapı Sarayi libraries, and contemporary newspapers, forms the basis of the next four chapters. She has done an outstanding job of presenting this extremely fascinating material, discussing Istanbul in terms of the regularization of its urban fabric (Chapter 3), the development of new systems of transportation (Chapter 4), the grand schemes proposed for its renovation (Chapter 5), and the variety of architectural styles visible in the late nineteenth century (Chapter 6).

Chapters Three and Four together provide a good idea of the changes which took place in the urban fabric during this period. The new urban design principles adopted by the Ottoman rulers, which included the regularization of the street network, the replacement of wood with stone and brick as the primary building materials, and the preservation of historic buildings radically altered some areas of the city. The city was further changed by the construction of new roads, the cleaning of various waterfront areas and the introduction of modern transportation systems: horse-drawn trams, trains, the Tünel or subway, and water transportation. None of the grand schemes discussed in Chapter Five, commissioned by the Ottoman rulers and drawn up by Europeans was ever executed, but they tell us a great deal about the modern, cosmopolitan capital desired by the Ottomans.

Chapter Six is a tantalizingly brief survey of the buildings of the nineteenth century city. This is a subject which deserves more attention than it has so far received, and Çelik does not attempt a complete account of everything built during the century, but instead proposes a tentative classification of the various architectural styles present in Istanbul during this period, and provides examples of each of them. She finds four major styles (although she does say that the styles overlap one another): classical revivalism, Gothic revivalism, Islamic revivalism, and Art Nouveau. Her attempt at some sort of classification is laudable, since such a system perhaps could alleviate the confusion which now reigns in this area, but I am not convinced that she has found the right categories, or at least not the right names for them. Classical revivalism is the first architectural style she considers, but it seems to be a kind of catch-all category for a variety of building types which do not fit into any of the other styles. The term 'classical revival' is usually applied to buildings such as William Strickland's 1818 Second Bank of the United States in Philadelphia, or Vignon's Le Madeleine in Paris (1808-1842), which are fairly straightforward copies or interpretations of classical structures. The Istanbul buildings which Çelik places in this category do incorporate classical elements in their facades, but the overall styles could better be called neo-renaissance and neo-baroque, rather than classical. The fact that buildings in the French Empire style are also included in this category complicates things further; perhaps the influence of Beaux Arts design on most of the buildings of the group should be recognised by calling this category 'Turkish Beaux Arts.' However, despite the problem with terminology, Çelik's presentation of the material in the chapter is well-organised and coherent, and is a useful addition to English publications on this subject.

Considering the inaccessibility of many of Çelik's sources, both written and visual, it is a shame that she does not include any explicit discussion of them. I would have liked to have known, for instance, if she thinks she has more or less exhausted the resources of the Prime Ministry archives, or has only begun to read what is there. Does she consider all of her sources to be equally reliable? Why did she choose to include the particular travellers accounts that she...
cities in the bibliography, and not others? Approximately fifty photographs from the late nineteenth century city are included in the book, a virtual gold mine for anyone interested in early photography in the Ottoman empire, but since they are identified only by their present or published location, not by photographer or original vendor their publication here is of little use for the purposes of the history of photography.

The published sources that Celik used would be easier to track down if they were all listed in the bibliography, instead of some being mentioned only in the notes.

Since all of these remarks spring from a desire to know more about subject of this book, they should not be considered as serious criticism of Celik’s work, but only as an indication of the fascination of her material. The book is over before all of the questions are answered.

The University of Washington Press has done a good job in producing this book. It is well put together and nicely laid out: with one or two exceptions the numerous illustrations are on the appropriate pages. A few of the drawings and maps are a little too light, and difficult to read, but considering the probable quality of the originals, the overall quality of the illustrations is excellent. Thanks to the support of several institutions, the price is extremely reasonable—a pleasant surprise these days.

NANCY MICKLEWRIGHT

Resafa II: Die Basilika des Heiligen Kreuzes in Resafa-Sergiopolis.

The second volume of publications on the German excavations at Rusafa (ancient Sergiopolis), the abandoned pilgrimage city of Christian pre-Islamic Arabs that lies beyond Palmyra in the Syrian steppe, is devoted to the single most important building at the site. The Church of the Holy Cross, dedicated in 559, is a fine structure built in the north Syrian style, largely of the grayish gypsum that furnished building material for the entire city. As this stone spells and splits as it weathers, causing the upper sides of blocks cut from it to mushroom, the fine plans and elevations published here are real achievements in surveying. There is a comprehensive description of the building and its several phases. The church began as a largish basilica with a grand bema, its interior walls decorated with mosaics, painting, and marble revetment, and its floor paved in marble and opus sectile. Hardly any of this interior decoration can be observed today, making these findings especially interesting. The room flanking the aponorthos (the “martyrion”) was renovated as a setting for a ciborium in its center, probably covering a sarcophagus; it was singled out with precious decoration such as insarsia wall revetment. Ulbert considers the possibility that a fragment of the Cross was housed here from the outset, but prefers to think that within two decades it became the new home of the relics of St. Sergios, translated from Basilica B, where they had rested in the previous century. This view is borne out by the remains of small pilgrim flasks from the floor of the room. What we have in this building is the center of the cult of St. Sergios at the time of the Arab conquest.

The church was quickly complemented by other structures. A squarish “Four-Piered Building” resembling in plan the so-called “Audience Hall of al-Mundhir” outside the walls was constructed only a few meters to the southeast. It was decorated in much the same way as the church, but it had a floor mosaic depicting animals and vegetation against a plain ground. Ulbert sees this building as a baptistry or more probably a bishop’s audience hall. About the same time a peristyle was added on the north, larger than the church itself and with an apse at its east end, bespeaking a successful ministry: a two-story chapel was built behind the apse of the main church, connecting it with the squarish building. The church, which soon began to subside (possibly because of an earthquake), was renovated by infilling the very large arches of the nave with lower arcades; outside, buttresses were added, later to be greatly enlarged. The squarish building was rebuilt and doubled in area: tantalizing fragments of fresco decoration were found from this second phase (plate 36, 2).

Finally a mosque was built on the north side of the complex, invading somewhat less than half of the northern peristyle. So far as I know this is the only preserved example of a church at this stage of conversion. Other churches that were divided for the insertion of mosques were soon converted entirely into mosques—yet that never happened at Rusafa. The apse of the church was redecorated with stucco in a style that is not likely to date before the end of the eighth century (and may not be as late as 880, as indicated on p. 131), and repairs continued for centuries.

In fact the religious life of the church was not over: inscriptions of 1093 and 1156 were discovered, and the Church of the Holy Cross seems to have been the last of Rusafa’s great churches to have been abandoned, after a fire apparently caused by the Mongols in the late 1250’s.

Thus in little over a century a structurally unsound basilica was enlarged repeatedly, and not long after was divided in two to accommodate a mosque. The story of religious enthusiasm in this sequence is worth reflecting on in thinking about the rise of Islam. Dr. Ulbert is concerned with the church, not the mosque, and with the cult of St. Sergios; he concludes that the construction of the basilica marks the beginning of the greatest appeal of the Sergios cult. He reconstructs the appearance and function of the complex at most of its stages of growth and decline, providing considerable comparative evidence. He remarks on the iconographic significance of the decoration, explains the significance of the site in the urban history of Rusafa, and reconstructs the importance of the church in the time of its foundation.

Small finds are dealt with in the course of the building description; they are of some interest for determining the function of the martyrion, but do not date the structure. Other contributions, by other authors, deal with subsidiary matters. One documents inscribed drawings on the interior pavement that outline at full scale the plan of the elevation to be erected. Others deal with Greek inscriptions, Greek graffiti, and Arabic inscription and graffiti. Late Antique coins, and the botanical identification of fragments of wood found in the church (black pine, Aleppo pine, Lebanon cedar, and Mediterranean cypress).

All told, this volume is a handsome presentation and appreciation of a building that was one the most important churches in Syria in the seventh century. In view of their six centuries of coexistence, it would have been interesting to read the history of the mosque alongside that of the church, but that would have made an already heavy volume even larger, and complicated the process of publishing this important monument. The mosque, as it now appears after excavation, is a complex and very puzzling structure, and fans of early Islamic architecture should await eagerly its...
publication by Dorothea Sack in this series. Like the basilica, 
this volume will be the basis for understanding the setting of 
the mosque. One may also hope that further investigations in 
Rusafa will expand the very interesting urbanistic discussion 
begun here by Dr. Ulbert. The German Archaeological 
Institute is to be congratulated on its sponsorship of this 
fieldwork and this publication.

**Julfār, an Arabian Port: Its Settlement and Far Eastern Ceramic Trade from the 14th to the 18th Centuries.** (Prize Publication 
Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1985. $ 40.75

Julfār is the ancestor of present-day city of Ra’s al-Khaymah, 
in the Amirate of the same name at the foot of the Gulf. 
It was a modest trading port on sea routes connecting 
Iran, Iraq, and Arabia with the Far East, India, and east 
Africa. Dr. Hansman’s report comprehends several sites 
excavated in the vicinity of the modern town, including one 
he identifies as the Julfār of the fourteenth through seventeenth 
centuries. The Julfār of the thirteenth century and earlier has 
disappeared, perhaps washed away into the Gulf; the Julfār 
excavated by Hansman was abandoned after the Portuguese 
attacked it. Several later military siege camps were also found: 
those of the Persians in the eighteenth century and of the 
British in the nineteenth. A glimpse of life in the Persian 
camp site is provided by finds of fragments of cheap porcelain 
and glass bangles.

Hansman provides a quite full account of the historical 
topography of the area, which will be primarily of local 
interest. He also reports on a small probable mosque and a 
lot, but they are not intrinsically exciting either. The bulk 
of the volume concerns the large quantities of Far Eastern 
ceramics found at the site, including Chinese blue-and-
white porcelain from the fourteenth through the eighteenth 
centuries and sherds from Viet Nam and Thailand. These 
ceramics are the real value of Julfār as an archaeological 
site. Indian cooking pots, simple local wares, and possibly 
East African pottery were found, as well as a few Persian 
imitations of Chinese celadon and blue-and-white, but it is 
the ceramics imported from East and Southeast Asia that are 
of most interest, and they are of interest in connection with 
their own chronologies, not those of the Gulf. It is notable 
that although more than 250 copper coins were found (most 
of the legible ones from regional mints) the imported ceramics 
are not generally dateable from their archaeological context at 
Julfār.

Hansman wisely does not attempt to synthesize this ceramic 
assemble with others from circum-Arabian ports such as 
Qusayr and Sirāf, but adds valuable information toward that 
end. The book has been produced well, with four good color 
plates and a fine color view of a difficult-to-photograph locale 
on the jacket. A book such as this makes it clear that for 
the publication of pottery color is more than worth its cost.

**Sarvistan: A Study in Early Iranian Architecture.** By Lionel 

Hardly any architectural tradition of the first millennium A.D.is 
as murky as that of the Sasanian dynasty in Iran. The 
appearance of a monograph on a well known building, 
thought to be a Sasanian structure of the fifth century, is 
therefore a welcome event. Lionel Bier’s Sarvistan provides 
for the first time reliable plans, elevations, and views of a 
building in southern Iran that has long puzzled architectural 
historians.

The materials and techniques of Sarvistan are discussed 
 exhaustively and inconclusively: as Bier shows, there is little 
consistency in Sasanian architectural technique. He concludes, 
among other things, that the facing stones were always visible, 
without a facing coat of plaster to hide them, as has been 
assumed. I do not follow the argument from technique and 
decoration that leads to regarding Ukhaydir as a terminus 
post quem for Sarvistan, since the materials and results are so 
different. But there are enough hints in the evidence that 
Bier’s dating of the building to ca. 750–950 is convincing (p. 
53).

Far more important is Bier’s apparently correct solution to 
the problem presented by Sarvistan’s unusual plan, which com-
bines many uniquely shaped rooms in an asymmetrical plan 
that has an unusually open circulation pattern, characteristics 
pointed out by Oleg Grabar.1 Grabar had considered the possi-
bility that Sarvistan was a fire temple but could not rule out 
the possibility that it was a palace. Helped by his redating 
of the structure, Bier argues convincingly from the more de-
tailed information now available regarding Takht-e Sula
yan 
that the plan is well suited to Zoroastrian ceremonial. 
And he makes a good argument that Sarvistan’s sitting in a secluded 
locale suits the conditions of the still-active Zoroastrian reli-
gion after its official suppression by the Muslims. On these 
grounds Bier puts Sarvistan into the ninth century, but this 
can be only a guess, and in turn raises the possibility that the 
technique of construction was deliberately archaic.

All this seems to place Sarvistan more securely than before, 
and in a different era. Since the building is less connected 
with other monuments now than it was formerly, it tells us 
very little about Sasanian architecture, which has now lost a 
monument from its corpus. Unfortunately Sarvistan seems 
to say equally little about Islamic architecture in southern 
Iran in the tenth century. Perhaps it would make more sense 
to excavate Sarvistan than to worry about its construction 
technique, but there is still something unfinished here.

**Notes**

1. “Sarvistan, a Note on Sasanian Palaces,” Forschungen zur 
Kunst Asiens: In Memoriam Kurt Erdmann, ed. Oktay 

TERRY ALLEN

*CAVES AT AURANGABAD* By Carmel Berkson. 256 pp., 200 photographs, map, glossary, bibliography. Seattle: University of 

Thousands of people visit the Buddhist caves at Ajanta every 
year, and perhaps even more visit the great cave-site at Ellora, 
some 70 miles away. Most of these visitors also travel through 
the old city of Aurangabad, which, with its crumbling walls 
and its tattered tombs of the Mughal period, lies between 
those famous sites. But how many know about, or ever find 
out about, the fascinating clusters of caves which lie at the
mountainous edge of Aurangabad itself, a half-hour by motor rickshaw from the center of town? On a busy day in the busy tourist season, a few dozen people at the most travel out to see them.

What makes this neglect surprising is not the fact that the caves are so easily accessible, but the fact that they contain some of the most startlingly beautiful groups of sculptured images to be found anywhere in India. The great virtue of Carmel Berkson's handsomely produced new book, The Caves at Aurangabad (subtitled, Early Buddhist Tantric Art in India), is its lavish and sensitive photo-documentation of these richly colored caves. In her photographs, the sculptures speak from the stone with a calm intensity, revealing her appreciation of their meaning and their power.

The same resonance informs the artist/author's descriptions of the “pilgrimage” made by those who, even today, penetrate these deepening sacred structures. Her writing illuminates the now-abandoned architectural “mandalas”, that once were quickened with light and prayer and song. She manages, in her evocative recollections of ancient ceremonies, to bring the images alive both through her writing and her lens.

Admirably, Berkson's interest is not in the specifics of chronology—that Circe whose allure attracts, and sometimes distracts, the typical art historian. The reader should look to her guidance to learn how the artist worked, rather than when, and forgive her for putting Cave 5 too early and Cave 3 too late. Nor, despite her often insightful commentary, does she claim any particular expertise in the complexities of Buddhist iconography, which was evolving in fascinating ways at this time, as tantric influences were penetrating the region from eastern India. She wisely has sought the authoritative counsel of Dr. C. Bhattacharyya for this aspect of her study, although in a number of instances, his identifications appear to have been confused in the editing process. Thus, the bodhisattva to the proper right of the Buddha is sometimes identified as Maitreyas and the one on the Buddha's left as Avalokiteshvara, rather than the other way around, as we would expect; and the seeming misidentification is compounded by the agreement of the text: “Maitreyas, the Buddha to come, stands to the right of the Buddha, bearing a small figure of Aniruddha on his crown . . . and standing to the left of the Buddha is Avalokiteshvara . . . bearing the stupa or chhatra on his head” (p. 80). If such reversals of the conventional identifications were indeed intended by Bhattacharyya, the reader would expect an explanation. By the same token, it is not clear why the unique four-armed figure in Cave 9, with so many “proper” attributes of Avalokiteshvara, even including the antelope-skin (not mentioned), is given a generic classification as “Jatamukuta-Lokeshvara”, why the standing Buddha nearby is referred to as “Buddha Bimba”, or why the guardian naga in the same cave is referred to as Muchulinda (viz.) Buddha.

Berkson's photographs of the imagery in Cave 3—I am thinking particularly of her penetrating studies of the amazing life-size devotees who kneel along the side walls of the shrine—perfectly capture the expansiveness and heady pride of local patronage in the supercharged atmosphere of the last days of the Vakataka empire. Like the colossal Dying Buddha in Cave 26 at Ajanta, with which they are precisely contemporary, the ripening fullness of these devotees, the fullness of pride as of power, in fact predicts their fall. Neither Cave 26 at Ajanta nor Caves 1 and 3 at Aurangabad, equally patronized by the treacherous Asmaka feudatories, who organized the insurrection which brought the Vakataka empire down, were ever finished. With the fall of the Vakatakas, who, during Harishena's reign (A.D. 460–477 A.D.) had supplied the Guptas as India's prime power, the Aurangabad region, like most of India, went into a decline for the next few decades. It was only when the Early Kalachuris, who had proved their stature in the west by sponsoring the Great Cave at Elephanta, took over the area, that the situation improved. By about 550 A.D., a vigorous new phase of Buddhist patronage, apparently tolerated and perhaps supported by the Early Kalachuris, had begun. It was during this latter period, some three quarters of a century from the time when work on Aurangabad caves 1 and 3 had been abandoned, that the majority of the caves at the site were excavated.

One needs to clearly distinguish between these two distinct phases of Mahayana activity at Aurangabad, rather than to merge them together, as is done both in this and most other studies. In this regard it is significant that female bodhisattvas—such key figures in the emergent “tantrism” of the latest caves at Aurangabad (Caves 6 through 9), are nowhere to be found in the Vakataka period excavations (Caves 1 and 5). Even at Ajanta, whose iconographic lead Aurangabad follows in this Vakataka phase, images which can reasonably be identified as “Tara” do not appear until the site is on the very verge of its imminent collapse, just after Harishena's death; and so modest are they in their demands—there are only two of them, both appearing in minor contexts in Caves 26 and 10A—that they have never been published, at least knowingly. By contrast, in Aurangabad Cave 7, somewhat after 550 A.D., having spent a few fertile decades developing in the Konkan, such female bodhisattvas have truly come into their own. As Berkson's reverently ecstatic photographs of the Tara groups in that cave so properly attest, there are no images in the subcontinent which can better serve as embodiments of the authority and beauty of Indian sculpture at its best.

WALTER M. SPINK


Xu Bangda, China's senior authority on matters of connoisseurship, has been writing inclusive books and articles on calligraphy and painting for more than thirty years. While those publications long ago established Xu Bangda's international reputation, the breadth of his expertise has been even more fully appreciated during the years since 1972, when Western specialists have been able to discuss topics of mutual interest with Xu at the Palace Museum in Beijing, where he holds the position of Research Fellow in the Department of Calligraphy and Painting. A major turning point in Xu Bangda's role as China's premier connoisseur came in 1985, when he visited most of the major Chinese collections in the United States. Anyone who had an opportunity to examine Chinese calligraphy and painting with Xu Bangda during that memorable American tour will long remember the succinct, rapier-like precision of his analyses.

In this magisterial four-volume work entitled, Gu shuhua wei e kaobian (Examination and Identification of the Forging of Ancient
Calligraphy and Painting). Xu Bangda sums up a lifetime of research. Readers familiar with the author's publications will note that several of the essays included in the book are essentially reprinted from some of Xu's earlier articles. Careful review of those portions of the book, however, reveals minor changes that reflect Xu Bangda's continuing refinement of his ideas.

Full appreciation of the discussion of individual examples of calligraphy and painting compressed into the forty-eight chapters of these four volumes presupposes familiarity with Xu Bangda earlier books, Gu shuhua jianting gaizhan (Introduction to the authentication of ancient calligraphy and painting) that appeared in 1981. In his earlier single-volume study, Xu defines technical terms, establishes guidelines for stylistic development, and sets forth his own opinions about how Chinese calligraphy and painting should be examined. Readers who have not studied Gu shuhua jianting gaizhan would be well advised to do so before approaching the four-volume work.

As the title, Gu shuhua wei e kaohuan indicates, the thrust of Xu Bangda's research is to identify works whose authenticity is open to question. Consequently, in these forty-eight chapters he analyzes examples of calligraphy and painting that he believes are suspect, drawing upon related works and textual sources for information to support his judgements. The ease with which Xu Bangda untraversed textual and stylistic puzzles reflects his broad knowledge and critical discernment. By contrast, in each chapter Xu Bangda lists works he accepts as genuine with a minimum of detail. On occasion, he mentions genuine examples of calligraphy and painting associated with a particular artist only in passing, or for comparison, as part of his comprehensive discussion of forgeries.

The chapters of Gu shuhua wei e kaohuan are arranged chronologically, beginning with Wang Xizhi (303–361) of the Eastern Jin dynasty and concluding with Jin Nong (1687–1765) of the Qing dynasty. Xu Bangda provides a brief biographical statement for each artist. He also comments upon the availability of works by each person under discussion. In the case of Wang Xizhi, he states, "No genuine examples of Wang Xizhi's calligraphy are extant; discussed here are seven examples of moben (traced copies), fangben (imitations), and juanshen (transmitted works)." Whenever possible, Xu Bangda provides measurements and indicates the present whereabouts of a work. A volume of black-and-white illustrations accompanies each of the two text volumes. The quality of the illustrations varies widely.

Included at the end of the second text volume are four chapters (45–48) that are concerned with broad topics crucial to the study of connoisseurship. In chapter 45, Xu Bangda analyzes inscriptions by Southern Sung emperors and empresses on painting, and calligraphy, as well as on works by court artists. Chapter forty-six presents a fascinating discussion of how examples of early genuine and spurious calligraphy and painting were juxtaposed in handscrolls and albums. In each case the intent of the juxtaposition was to use the genuine portions of the handscrolls and albums to lend credence to the authenticity of the forged segments. With chapter forty-seven Xu Bangda explores problems that arise when the calligraphy of one artist is erroneously attributed to several different personalities. Finally, in chapter forty-eight he looks into the subtleties of Ming and Qing dynasty portraits in which the facial portions of the paintings have been altered.

Xu Bangda's familiarity with traditional texts enables him to propose ideas that are at once exciting and provocative. For instance, he refers to a passage from Wenjuan huolu, juan 27, in which the Song dynasty connoisseur, Shao Bo (act. ca. 1122), records the titles of ninety-five scrolls from the collection of the Southern Tang ruler, Li Yu (r. 961–976), together with notations by a Northern Song dynasty writer indicating the whereabouts of some of those scrolls (I, pp. 153–154). Xu Bangda suggests that two of those paintings formerly owned by Li Yu may be the "Literary Gathering," attributed to Han Huan (I, pl. 27.6), now in the Palace Museum, Beijing, and "Horses and Groom," attributed to Han Gan (I, pl. 27.7), in the National Palace Museum, Taiwan. He goes on to say that the painting style of neither work supports its traditional Tang dynasty date. Xu Bangda proposes that the two paintings might actually have been done by skilled artists in the Southern Tang Painting Academy. He also raises the possibility that all of the works recorded by Shao Bo and identified as having been in the collection of Li Yu might not have been authentic Tang dynasty paintings. In Xu's view, the scrolls may all have been copies by Southern Tang court painters, with the further possibility that some of the titles might refer to original compositions by those same court artists. In another context (I, p. 159), Xu Bangda tersely accepts as genuine southern Tang works, the celebrated scrolls "Lofly Scholar," by Wei Xian, in the Palace Museum, Beijing, and "Early Spring - the Great Maestro," by Zhao Gan, in the National Palace Museum, Taiwan.

So much information, assembled by Xu Bangda over a lifetime of study, is included in these pages that it is impossible to enumerate even a small portion in a review. But several examples should provide some indication of his remarkable erudition and perspicacity. One section of the book that is certain to surprise and intrigue many readers begins with Xu Bangda's brief, instructive comments about the Sung Emperor Huizong's early calligraphy (I, pp. 93, 153). Those comments serve as a prelude for his masterful account of the Emperor's calligraphy and painting (I, pp. 217–233).

Xu Bangda proposes (I, p. 223) that the colorful, meticulously rendered compositions traditionally attributed to Song Huizong actually are the work of Northern Song dynasty court artists. In his view, it is the less complex compositions executed in ink that actually are from the emperor's hand. Expanding that argument, Xu Bangda questions the authenticity of most of the famous scrolls attributed to Huizong. Among those scrolls he identifies as the work of Northern Song court artists are the "Apricot Blossoms and Parakeet" in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (I, pl. 43–8), and the "Auspicious Dragon Rock" in the Palace Museum, Beijing (I, pl. 43–9), and the "Auspicious Cranes" in the Liaoning Provincial Museum, Shenyang (I, pl. 43–10a–b). Moreover, Xu notes that all three scrolls are of approximately the same size and include inscriptions written in Huizong's celebrated "slender-gold" calligraphy. Xu Bangda suggests the three scrolls might originally have been included in an album Xuanhe ruilan ji, mentioned in Chinese texts as containing paintings by Northern Song court artists which portray the myriad exotic creatures, rocks, flowers, etc., preserved to Huizong.

Xu Bangda also questions whether a painting in the Palace Museum, Beijing, believed to depict Emperor Huizong playing the guin (I, pl. 43–11), actually a self-portrait. He believes Huizong probably added the inscription and his cypher to a painting done by a court artist. Xu also refers to the description of this hanging scroll in the Qing imperial catalogue, Shiha baoji, sanbien, as a "handscroll." He explains that description as based on the scroll's original mounting, which consisted of Song dynasty yellow silk and white Korean paper inscribed by Huizong with a three-character title. Xu Bangda also reports that the painting was said to have been
presented to a Qing dynasty imperial prince and, during the Guangzu period (1875–1907) when it was returned to the imperial collection, the scroll was remounted. Unfortunately, the Song paper and title by Huizong were removed during that remounting.

To support his view that several ink scrolls attributed to Huizong actually were painted by the emperor, Xu Bangda notes their elegant, yet "awkward" brushwork, which, he believes greatly exceeds the quality of the scrolls executed in exquisite color and fine detail. Emphasizing that Emperor Huizong was not a professional artist, Xu finds it understandable that elegance and a slight awkwardness of execution should characterize works that are from his hand.

As an example of the elegance Huizong attained in his ink paintings, Xu Bangda offers the "Autumn Evening by a Pond," in the National Palace Museum, Taiwan (I, pp. 43–17a–c). At the same time, Xu believes the Huizong cypher and seal affixed at the end of the scroll to be spurious, perhaps having been added when the latter portion of the scroll, with the original cypher and seal, were removed. Xu also believes the present painting presents only the beginning of the original composition. In addition, he questions the authenticity of the colophons by Fan Yu (which included the date 1132) and Deng Yicong (dated 1177) that appear at the end of the handscroll. Looking at earlier records of paintings by Huizong, Xu Bangda suggests that the present title for the National Palace Museum handsroll is not the original. Rather, he proposes that the scroll might actually be the opening section of an original Huizong handsroll recorded in a Ming dynasty text under the title, "Lotus, Heron and Stirred Fish.

Another handsroll of this type that Xu Bangda accepts as a genuine example of Huizong's work is "Willow and magnolias" in the Shanghai Museum (I, pp. 43–19a–b). Mounted together with "Willow and magnolias" is another composition executed in ink, "Reeds and ducks" (I, pp. 43–20a–c). Xu Bangda rejects the latter painting as being an original work by Huizong. He also questions the authenticity of the colophons signed by Fan Yu and Deng Yicong that are appended to the composite handscroll.

One of the most intriguing subjects included in Xu Bangda's discussion of connoisseurship involves the rearranging or reassembling of portions of a composition. For instance, after studying the handscroll, "Ladies with flowers in their hair" attributed to Zhou Fang, in the Liaoning Provincial Museum (I, pp. 19–1a–c), Xu Bangda notes that during a "recent" remounting specialists found that the composition consists of three lengths of silk, on each of which appear a woman, a female attendant or an animal (I, pp. 120–121). Examination of the silk also indicates that the small dogs and the crane were moved to their present positions in the composition during an earlier remounting. Xu Bangda concludes that the handsroll contains only a portion of the original composition and suggests that the individual portions of the composition might initially have been mounted as separate but contiguous screens.

Given Xu Bangda's emphasis upon meticulous scholarship and connoisseurship, it is not surprising that when discussing the different versions of the "Dwelling in the Longmian Mountain" scrolls attributed to the Northern Song master, Li Gonglin (ca. 1049–1106), he speaks scathingly of the contributions of Du Ruikuan, whose Gu Gong ge shuhao ji (preface dated 1881) contains so many forgeries (I, p. 199). Among the scrolls that Du accepts as genuine is the version of "Dwelling in the Longmian Mountain" now in the Palace Museum, Peking. Xu Bangda dates that painting to the Southern Song period.

One of the scrolls associated with Li Gonglin that Xu accepts as genuine is "Pasturing Horses" (I, pp. 41–5a–b), which according to a two-column inscription written in small seal script in the upper right corner, was a copy by Li Gonglin of a composition by the Tang artist Wei Xian (I, p. 198). Curiously, Xu Bangda makes no mention of the justly celebrated "Five horses" handsroll that usually dominates any study of Li Gonglin's oeuvre.

For specialists who emphasize questions of style when analyzing Chinese calligraphy and painting, Xu Bangda's many references to complementary aspects of connoisseurship should be enlightening. He corrects readings of seals and misidentifications of the owners of seals (I, p. 18). He remarks on the size of Tang dynasty paper (I, p. 91). There are keen observations about how Chinese forgers treat paper and silk to make them appear older (I, p. 22), and he cites many examples of calligraphy being removed from one scroll and added to another (I, pp. 49, 62, 65, 124, 138, 146).

Xu Bangda also proposes some new attributions to well-known scrolls. For instance, he questions the Zhao Boju (d. ca. 1162) attribution of "Autumn Colors on Rivers and Mountains" (I, pp. 43–14a–b), the exquisitely painted blue-and-green style handsroll in the Palace Museum, Beijing (I, p. 228). He believes the scroll is the work of a Northern Song artist in Huizong's imperial painting academy.

Xu Bangda also describes the Wang Fu (1562–1416) inscription and the painting style of the "Bamboo and rocks" handsroll in the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art (II, pp. 24–1a–d) as unreliable (II, pp. 105–106). Xu suggests that scroll actually is a copy by Wang Fu's student, Xia Chang (1588–1470).

Matters of connoisseurship become increasingly more complex when discussing scrolls by artists who lived during the Ming (1368–1644) and Qing (1644–1911) dynasties. Xu's presentations of the Ming dynasty masters, Shen Zhou (1427–1509) and Wen Zhengming (1470–1559) are masterful in their detail and analysis (II, pp. 114–135). Both Shen Zhou and Wen Zhengming were extremely prolific and, in addition, many copies of their calligraphy and painting are extant. Xu notes that one of the people who served as daiji ("substitute brush") for Shen Zhou, to help the master respond to the many requests for his work, was his nephew, Shen Tan (I, p. 115). Xu also provides information supporting the theory that Xie Shichen (1487–after 1567), who worked in Shen Zhou's manner, also made forgeries of his work. So convincing were copies of Shen Zhou's calligraphy and painting, even those produced during his own lifetime, that Wen Zhengming, who knew Shen Zhou's style at first hand, also found it difficult to differentiate between genuine and spurious examples (II, pp. 114–115).

With characteristic emphasis upon detail, Xu Bangda begins his comments about Wen Zhengming by mentioning that he and his three brothers were named after stellar divisions: bi, kui, and shi (II, pp. 123, 132; II, p. 28–15). He then goes on to say that the character for bi, which Wen Zhengming used as his given name early in his career, should be written with the "earth" radical; spurious signatures are frequently written with the "jade" radical.

Xu Bangda mentions Wen Peng (1498–1573), the eldest son of Wen Zhengming, as having executed works for his father's signature (pp. 123, 125; II, p. 28–6). Xu also identifies Wen Peng as an artist who produced forgeries of
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The publication of Professor Suzuki Kei's studies on the history of Chinese painting comes at an interesting juncture in the context of the field in the West. It is not so much a narrative account, Old Testament style, of the parade of Chinese masters and masterpieces addressed to the beginner as it is a group of studies centered on specific problems addressed to the advanced student and specialist. In this sense it is a most welcome and timely publication. The studies are ranged in chronological order and cover the one-hundred and seventy-eight years between 1101, Huizong's ascension to the throne, and 1279 when Lu Xianfu, carrying his infant emperor, leaped into the sea. The book offers a minute examination of certain themes in three chapters which cover more than 320 pages of text and notes. It comprises principally a long chapter (9) dealing with various aspects of Southern Song painting, a short chapter (10) on the Dali Kingdom's iconic handscroll of Buddhist deities, and a chapter (11) on painting of the Liao and Jin. (Yuan dynasty painting presumably forms part of Volume III).

Because of Japan's uniquely rich holdings of Southern Song painting, it is especially apt to have this period of China's history minutely presented here by a Japanese scholar. Suzuki's work is at the same time both an interesting overview and critique of recent studies, chiefly American and Japanese, and a reflection of new directions of recent Japanese scholarship in the field.

The field of Chinese painting may be said in some ways to have suffered some setbacks over the past two decades and a few comments may be appropriate here before presenting Suzuki's book in the international light it deserves. While great strides have been made on several levels, it may be observed that a synthesis of Eastern and Western methodologies in the study of Chinese painting remains largely unrealized. In America, many more scholars than before are now fluent speakers of Chinese, an increasing number have acquired command of "classical Chinese" and, not the least, a greater number than ever before have visited Chinese museums and examined ancient paintings first hand, often in the company of Chinese colleagues. An increasing number of Western scholars, notably those of the United States, have thus been drawn into the Chinese sphere of connoisseurship. This is to say that, increasingly, American scholarship would appear to be informed by a Chinese perspective, one which is largely post-Dong Qichang and literati-oriented, one which has dominated Chinese tastes certainly since the fifteenth century. This perspective is for Japan, of course, a relatively recent, or post-eighteenth century phenomenon which has not gained much acceptance in Japanese circles until after World War II.

In light of Japanese history of Chinese painting and Japanese scholarship to date, it would appear that the wenren-based Chinese perspective is a restrictive one largely conditioned by considerations of lineage and brushwork quality. Although this inbred aesthetic has been degenerating over the last three centuries into what may be considered a wenren cataract where literati tradition and pronouncements have tended to form the parameter for the history of Chinese painting, this value system has nevertheless tended
to be adopted by the Chinese orthodoxy in the judgment of all painting. And to this day, its influence is visible in Chinese scholarship and the American scholarship spawned by America's increasing mastery of the Chinese language and adoption of Chinese perspectives.

The Japanese, on the other hand, have for centuries cherished aspects of Chinese painting no longer surviving in China and have, so to speak, preserved to this day the dark side of the moon of Chinese art: the other, integral side of its history which, in spite of belittling from certain Chinese quarters, provides highly informative and sobering insights. Japanese scholarship in Chinese art is valuable for the cross-checking it affords our methodology and our notions of period style, especially pre-Ming.

Suzuki's work represents a transition in Japanese scholarship which now swings, via American tendencies and perhaps unintentionally, closer to traditional Chinese notions. He belongs to the generation of scholars to emerge in the wake of titans like Tanaka Toyozo and his student Shimada Shūjiro whose training had been informed by German analytical methodologies. Suzuki's approach reflects a post-war, United States-oriented trend. More than references to European studies, his writing reflects keen awareness of the judgments and opinions of his American colleagues. As a great plus for the field at large, this American orientation is seen also in his massive photography project of Chinese paintings in non-Chinese collections which follows that pioneered by James Cahill and Laurence Sickman where Palace Museum holdings in Taiwan were photographed for American university archives. For the University of Tokyo's photographs of Chinese painting, Suzuki has single-mindedly seen to the project's completion as the world's largest photographic archives. He has further published the archives in catalogue form (see Suzuki, Kei. Comprehensive Illustrated Catalogue of Chinese Paintings, five volumes, Tokyo, 1982) for the convenience of students the world over. Suzuki will long be remembered for his tireless devotion to the modernisation of the field in Japan and for his service to the world.

The text volume of Chigoku Kajishi Ha carries the subtitle of Chigoku Kaiga no shiteki hōjutsu (Historical Investigation of Chinese painting) and is a continuation of the text in Chigoku Kajishi 1. It grapples not only with the larger works by Siren and Cahill, but particularly with individual studies, conference papers and journal publications. His approach is relatively discursive if not consistently analytical. He seeks in the book to describe the evolution of various styles by focusing on specific works which, to him, represent certain phases or particular problems.

Significant for this post-war period of Japanese scholarship, Suzuki has allowed himself to come under the sway of certain less brilliant tendencies in some American circles. That is, that curious blending of avowedly objective analytical methodology and the more abstruse mysteries of traditional Chinese connoisseurship, the latter being often obscured by acquisition-based interests of collectors or benefactors. Here the active ingredient would appear to be a type of high-pressure legitimating process where authenticity is imposed upon works in a benefactor's collection by dint of high sales or donation value, or by dint of lavish and weighty scholarly catalogues. In such catalogue entries, authenticity of individual works have sometimes tended to become an unchallenged and untested assumption, and scholarly efforts are relegated to elucidation of the artist's intent, the expression of his age, signs of social change, influences of patrons, etc. — these

coached in the interpretative language customarily reserved for museum curators who are occasionally obliged to explain untested works to the public as if genuine. Yet and, surely, authentication cannot be bought, but must be proven in each new instance beyond reasonable doubt.

Weary of such practices, distinguished European scholars increasingly have left the area of Orthodox wren ren painting to work on the more solid aspects of Chinese art such as Buddhist painting. A glance at the bibliography of studies produced over the past decade in Europe and America amply illustrates this growing divergence, reflecting a vote of no confidence on the part of European scholars.

In the past, Japanese collectors have not had the same financial clout, and works in public or private collections have tended to serve more objective appraisal by scholars who would examine particular works in connection with particular problems. The well-known Southern Song-related paintings from documented fourteenth and fifteenth century Japanese collections comprise an invaluable counterfoil to Chinese collections of twelfth and thirteenth century material recorded mostly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Japanese holdings are found in monastic and shogunal collection records up to the early sixteenth century. Many had entered Japan in the Yuan period.

Stylistically, Southern Song paintings from Muromachi collections offer a composite profile with a remarkable degree of consistency. Compared to works attributed to the Southern Song and Yuan periods in Chinese collections, say, in the National Palace Museum Collection, Taipei, they speak of a more clearly definable period style, one with fewer internal contradictions such as are evident in the wren ren-biased Qianlong Palace Collection. In terms of historical accretions, sporadic works of later periods which had been accepted into major collections subsequently acquired what I have termed functional authenticity, that is, works which in turn became models for subsequent forgers. These occur more often in Chinese collections than they do in Japan. For in China already since the fifteenth century, following the universal rise in prestige of the wen ren style, Ming connoisseurs had begun to view painting in terms of brushwork-oriented wren ren dicta and had come to accept contemporary productions of Song and Yuan works.

On the other hand, Japan's experience of Chinese painting had by-passed the wren ren phase for nearly five hundred years till the eighteenth century when new treaties and paintings caused a reconsideration of their history in Chinese-oriented styles, culminating in the Nanga movement. For this reason, the study of pre-Ming painting finds a most important source for checks and balances regarding period style in works from Muromachi and pre-Muromachi collections. And it is most apt, therefore, that a history of Southern Song painting be written by a Japanese scholar steeped in Japanese collections.

Suzuki represents a Japanese scholar of significant American persuasion. In his eagerness to expand the frontiers of Chinese painting for Japanese students, Suzuki reveals a more worldly approach and has made much use of "new" material gleaned from Western collections which he has been able to examine in some detail during his historic photographic project. But in so doing one wonders if he has not allowed himself to fall into the American benefactor-trap when, for example, the stylistic development at the end of the Northern Song is illustrated with the handscroll of figures in a landscape, The Later Red Cliff Ode (Hou Chi bi fu), attributed to Qiao Zhongchang, formerly in the Crawford Collection, now in the
Nelson Gallery-Atkins Museum, Kansas City. It is a work entirely at odds with the structural and morphological profile of mid-Song painting as evinced in Japanese collections. With this work he is not able to offer any relationship or comparisons with any paintings in Japanese collections, nor utilize any of the considerable Japanese experience in Song painting. In his discussion of the image, therefore, Suzuki ranges outside Japanese collections and draws comparisons, all topical and none morphological, with Guo Xi, Wen Tong, Su Shi, Zhao Menggu, Yan Hui, Zhu Derun, Dong Yuan, Juran, Wu Zhen (sic), Wang Wei, Lu Hong, and Li Gonglin, in short, the cream of early painting. Such comparisons become meaningless, of course, in an investigation of the evolution of a particular tradition. And though Suzuki finds no prototype or tradition for the work, he evidently has felt obliged to affirm its legitimacy and in the book concludes, based on untested seals, that it is a rare example of a painting in ink on paper from the end of the Northern Song. "Seen in this light, together with the seals of Liang Shicheng ... the work must be considered to date from the middle of the Xuanhe era" (p. 11).

The tremendous strengths of the book lie in Suzuki's sinological skills and experience with works in Japanese collections. The study of the Southern Song Academy provides addenda to Yu Jianhui's chart of 1936. For example, Suzuki lists Xiao Zhao as daichaou under Emperor Gaozong while Yu had listed him as of "unknown rank" active between the Huizong and Gaozong courts. He considers Yu's listing of no less than thirty daichaou in the court of Liang as most unusual, as under other Southern Song emperors, though often serving in families of father and son, or brothers, the active daichaou were usually much more modest in number. On the other hand, while Yu lists only nine members for Gaozong's academy, Suzuki lists twenty-one. Both men presumably relied on Zhou Mi's fourteenth century Fanyan guoyuan lu and the eighteenth-century compilation about the Southern Song Academy by Li E, Nan song yuan hua lu. Unfortunately, Suzuki does not discuss the discrepancy between the two lists. It is clear, however, that aside from standard art records he has made further searches through official histories, Hangzhou gazetteers as well as literary miscellanies.

With customary courage, Suzuki prefers to grapple with problems rather than avoid them. Concerning the controversy on Li Tang attributions, for example, he examines major candidates including the handscroll Gathering Herbs (Gaiweitu) about the virtuous brothers, and The Return of Duke Wen of Jin (jin wenwong fuguotu). And although dating all these works to the early Southern Song, Suzuki remains scrupulously reluctant to assign them to the hand of a single master. Moreover, his remarkable professional honesty and humility free him from defensive insistence on previously published opinions. For example, Suzuki discusses the seemingly perennial dilemma of the two Li Tang attributions, the large coloured silk Soughing Pines in Myriad Valleys (Wanhe songfeng) in the National Palace Museum, Taipei and the pair of landscape hanging scrolls, also on silk, Autumn and Winter Landscape (Shanshui) in the Kotoin of Daitokuji, Kyoto which had been designated Song and Ming respectively by one group of scholars at the first post-war international conference in New York in 1960, and squarely opposed by another. This, writes Suzuki, demonstrates how American scholarship in Song painting was then remarkably "insufficient." He and Richard Barnhart at the time had followed the scepticism voiced by Shimada and Loehr regarding the Soughing Pines. However, Barnhart's subsequent publication in The Burlington Magazine accepting both works has convinced Suzuki who now writes, "I hereby retract my opinion of that time." It is not every established scholar who is willing to amend and contradict his own earlier judgment. And it is these scholars who, continually vigilant and thoughtful, move the field. We may expect continuing researches from Suzuki, who usually tackles interesting and difficult problems.

On particular painters or paintings, Suzuki cites significant publications by Japanese and Western (usually American) scholars and then argues his own case, creating throughout a sense of lively academic interchange. Works attributed to Mi Youren are introduced in terms of studies by Ogawa Hiromitsu (p. 73 ff.) and Li Chu-tsing. Figure paintings ascribed to Fanlong and Zhiyong are examined with reference to studies by Thomas Lawton (p. 96 ff.) and Shimada (p. 98).

On the academy of Xiao Zong, Suzuki delves into problems of the Ma family, of Yang Meizi, Xia Gui, Li Di, Li Songnian, and Liang Kai. Because of Japan's stronger holdings in this area, Suzuki is able to provide glimpses into Japanese records such as the Kundaikan saya choki (1559 version) which viewed Xia Gui's work, for example, as hoary and antique, dripping with inkwash, in accordance with fourteenth and fifteenth century shogunal collections. Such visual and textual consistency forms a significant contrast to the long handscroll on paper, Pure and Remote View of Stream and Mountains (Qishan qingyuan tujuan) in the National Palace Museum, Taipei. Here Suzuki also notes the discrepancy in paper-length of the segments, speculating on insertions, ubiquitous retouches as well as losses. The change in the shape and function of the axe-cut stroke, and the difference from other Xia Gui or even Ma Yuan attributions in the liming of trees and bridge do not agree with the more coherent cluster of Xia attributions in Japan. The long scroll exists even today in several versions and the Taipei version cannot be, according to Suzuki, an original by Xia Gui. Many scholars will be interested to learn further about the date and persona with which he would associate this tantalizing work. The Nelson Gallery-Atkins Museum's Twelve Views (Shanshui shierjing tujuan) handscroll on silk attributed to Xia Gui is discussed (p. 151), however, almost entirely in terms of the authorship of the calligraphy (Yang Meizi, Liizong or Ningzong).

Flower and Bird painting requires far more technical command and allows less innovative freedom in brushwork. Considering attributions to Huizong in this genre, Suzuki believes, as had the Yuan scholar Qian Weishan, that traces of his brush have long ceased to be extant (Qian Weishan writing in Jiang yue songfengji (Collected Writings by the Pine Breeze of the River Moon) says "As to the brush traces of the Emperor Huizong, there are no longer any extant," quoted on p. 180.) On subjects in which Japan has virtual monopoly, like Liang Kai, Muqi and Yujian, Suzuki is able to display Japanese scholarship in its proper brilliance. Intriguing discussions occur on Liang Kai and Yujian but space prevents their presentation here. Let the examples of Muqi suffice:

The earliest Chinese sources on Muqi, aside from late Southern Song monastic records, for example, survive in the late Yuan writer Wu Taisu's The Pine Studio's Manual on Pines Painting (Songzai meipi). This book is no longer extant in China proper but survives, in several fragmentated versions, in Japan. On the controversy over Muqi's native place, Suzuki believes him to have been a native of Sichuan who eventually went to Zhejiang where he benefitted from tuition in painting from Jiangnan masters. There has been a further
controversy (p. 209) between Fukui Rikichirô and Tanaka Toyozô on whether the “Taiokujî Tripthych” (Guanyin flanked by Gibson and Crane) had been intended as a set originally or whether they were so assembled in Japan. Hints into Muqi Faching’s clerical life had been dug up by Tamamura Takeji in his monumental Literature of the Five Zen Mountains (Gosen bungaku), using medieaval Japanese sources such as the Onyûkên nichiroku and the Kundaikan sayû chûki among others. Tani Shinichi had actually done the basic work on Muqi in Japanese sources before Tamamura. Surprisingly, Suzuki skips over this major contribution: see Tani Shinichi, Murômachi jûjû bijutsu-shiron (Studies in Art History of the Muromachi Period), Tokyo, 1942. It is surprising to find that while Takeji’s studies on Muqi in Japanese records are cited, no attention has been drawn to the publication by Sato Toyozô of the document Murômachi-dono gyo hô ozaseki, a record of the exhibition presented for the Imperial visit to Ashikaga Yoshinori’s residence in the tenth month of 1437, which includes a note on the Eight Views of Xiao and Xiang later ascribed to Muqi, saying “Muqi paper”; this implies that in 1437 the attribution to Muqi of this work had not been firmly established, while by the time of Kundaikan sayû chûki of the early sixteenth century, a definite attribution was given to Muqi. A summary of Takeji’s studies on the 1437 document was presented in the important catalogue Higashïkuma Gyonotsu (The Ashikaga Collection) which accompanied the landmark exhibition in 1976 organized by the Nezu and Tokugawa Museums.

Suzuki collects an admirable wealth of contemporary Chinese and early Japanese comments on Muqi’s paintings and presents them with clarity. He concludes that Muqi must have been a Chan monk painter long active in Chan circles. Lining up the accepted ones among Muqi’s attributed paintings in accordance with the dates of monkish encomia, Suzuki postulates an artistic life which culminates in the free-wheeling sugar-cane husk rough ink style, to be followed thereafter in quiescence by more contemplative works. The line-up begins with the Shrimp Eater (inscribed between 1254 and 1256) which, according to Suzuki, shows rough, reed brush (warafude) usage around the waist, and gentle brushwork around the limbs in agreement with Songzai meipu descriptions. Interestingly, Suzuki has included the Mynah Bird on Pine as a genuine specimen even though in structural morphology it contradicts the compositionally relatable Gibbon on silk, presumably because it fits the warafude criterion. The Tiger and Dragon pair is considered a good, direct copy of Muqi’s late style. The unsigned Lohan seated in meditation is ascribed directly to Muqi, not to a Muqi School, in spite of notably inferior brushwork compared to the Guanyin, and placed along with the “tripthych” in time of execution.

As to the Vegetable handscroll in the Palace Collection, Taipei, Suzuki’s Japan-trained eye for Southern Song inkwash rejects it outright as a Muqi original, as he does those of the Peony, Persimmons (which in Western circles has acquired near iconic status) and Chestnut Branch, relegating the latter three to the rushed hand of an impatient copyist unable to handle ink surfaces.

The Eight Views of Xiao and Xiang fragments are assigned to the Southern Song, in the tradition of Dong Yuan, Mi Youren, and Mr. Li of the Dream Journey on the Xiao and Xiang, but not to Muqi as it does not relate stylistically, according to Suzuki, to his above mentioned works.

Suzuki discusses the Dalî Kingdom’s handscroll of Buddhist images in the Palace Museum, Taipei with keen interest in previous studies by Helen Chapin, Li Lincen, Sekiguchi Masayuki and Matsumoto Moritaka, even though these scholars were not all aware of each other’s works (p. 229). Suzuki offers a concise summation of Matsumoto’s studies which have been the most detailed and insightful, involving not only reports on cuts, mistakes in reassembling the figures, extensive sutra studies as well as minute examination of graphological irregularities in the labels and inscriptions. Suzuki also challenges the attribution of the entire scroll to the single hand of Zhang Shengwen, citing at least three distinct manners in the hainiao techniques. There is no comment, however, on possible problems presented by the Qing copy by Ding Guanpeng, which offers some differences in sequence and figural grouping, and should provide possibly significant clues about the original state of the ‘Taipei scroll.

For Liao painting, the dearth of attributions indicate patience, with the hope that future excavations may reveal something significant. Suzuki’s brief overview discusses Chinese influence in possible retouching or copying, and dismisses, rightly, as a post-Zhe School, post-Lü Ji the bird and flower painting presently ascribed to a Xiao Rong (ill. 177).

The discussion of the more sinicized Jin culture and its painting is far more energetic. Suzuki cites significant studies by Susan Bush and Chiang I-han in defining stylistic features, but chides Richard Barnhart in his method of identification-by-elimination in the gathering of twenty-three works which simply did not fit “either Northern Song, nor Southern Song, nor Yuan, nor early Muromachi Nankokuchô, nor even ‘Korean’” criteria (p. 248-9). Suzuki argues for more rigorous definitions and presents Jin painting in terms of figure painting, landscape as well as literati painting, presenting no more than eleven works.

In conclusion we must be grateful to Professor Suzuki for his untiring and minute pursuit of good problems, and for his concern with Chinese and American scholarship. His book is, as usual, challenging, thoughtful, and well documented. The notes reveal prodigious probing into sources Chinese and Japanese. As more international exchanges take place, it may become increasingly apparent that American scholarship of the last decade has gone out of bounds in credulity. Hopefully it will soon become clear that the consistent European reserve, as well as earlier American scepticism, agree far more with traditional Japanese views of pre-Ming Chinese painting. In the last analysis, however, the basic step forward in the field must be taken from within China, when Chinese scholars themselves become conversant with foreign methodologies, with Buddhist and Japanese collections, and eventually overcome their own wenren-oriented myopia of the past three centuries.

Notes

1. The negatives from this project are currently in the Palace Museum Archive, part of the Asian Art Archives in the Department of the History of Art at The University of Michigan.

2. In museums, objects in a display case can and often do assume a symbolic role, standing in for the genuine article, and the public’s interest becomes not so much one in the authenticity of particular works as in their “message,” “meaning” or “beauty.”

4. That is, forgeries which had already evolved beyond the initial rise of brushwork-dominance and begun to reduce spatial depth, tilting the groundplane upward and turning masses into increasingly frontal planes. I have demonstrated acceptance by Ming collectors of Ming-originated works ascribed to Wu Zhen in my doctoral thesis. See below.


6. *Gathering Herbs* is reproduced in four versions. From the illustrations it would appear that no. 12, taken from *Yiyuan yizhen*, could have been reproduced from another negative of the version in the Fujii Yurinkan, no. 10.


8. Suzuki points out (p. 208) that an inscription by Xiang Yuanbian following a handscroll of *Vegetables* ascribed to Muqi now in the Palace Museum, Taipei, in quoting passages from *Tuhui baojian* and *Songshai meipu*, documents the existence of the latter text in China as late as Xiang’s lifetime in late sixteenth century.

9. The scroll is reproduced in part and discussed by Shen Gu in *Yiyuan Duoying* no. 6, October, 1979. It had evidently remained in the Palace collection until Puyi removed it during his abdication, and did not surface until 1945. It is now in the Jiling Provincial Museum.

**Joan Stanley-Baker**