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THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY MAKHZAN AL-ASRĀR AND ITS IMPORTANCE

BY PRISCILLA SOUCEK

The Spencer Collection of the New York Public Library owns a manuscript (Persian Ms. 41) of great artistic, historical, and literary interest. Artistically and culturally the manuscript exemplifies a fusion of traditions current in the Timurid realms of eastern Iran with those of the Aq Qoyunlu Turkmens in western Iran. Moreover, it suggests the importance of Chinese decorative traditions for the development of the luxury book at fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Iranian courts.

This manuscript is a well-preserved example of such a book designed to delight the eye as well as to engage the mind. It offers the reader a dual message: the text stresses the transience of worldly power and glory, and extols ascetic practice, yet the austerity of this message is considerably softened by the book’s sensual beauty. An impression of opulence is created by blending Near Eastern traditions of calligraphy, illumination, and manuscript illustration with Chinese modes of decoration and painting evident in the manuscript’s cover and in the paper on which it is written.

The manuscript measures 10.5 centimeters by 18 centimeters. The dark brown leather binding is well preserved on the exterior, although the marbled paper of the doublure is probably of recent date. The flap has been lost, but its imprint is still visible on folio 2a. The book contains 35 folios of gold-sprinkled, highly-sized pale blue paper further embellished by three compositions: a landscape scene and two different depictions of a pair of birds in a flowering tree. The manuscript also contains two pairs of illuminated pages and one text illustration. The text is arranged in two columns of eleven lines per page bounded by inner and outer frames. The written surface measures 5.8 centimeters by 12 centimeters. The marginal rulings are of gold bordered on the inside by one narrow black line and on the outside by two black lines. The folios are arranged in gatherings of three sheets or six pages.

This discussion will first consider how Spencer Persian 41 fuses the artistic and cultural traditions of the Timurid and Turkmen realms and will then turn to the features that link the Near East with China.

In the study of fifteenth-century Iranian illustrated manuscripts, it is customary to deal separately with the art of the eastern Timurid and western Turkmen realms, yet an analysis of this manuscript demonstrates that the two regions have much in common. First published as the Makhzan al-asrār of the Persian poet Nizāmî of Ganja (1140–1202), whence a designation as Persian Ms. 41, it is actually in Chaghatai, a literary form of Turkish used in Central Asia between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries. Inscriptions within the illuminated frame of the opening text page identify both the text and its author (Fig. 2):

3b. Makhzan al-asrār Afšāh al-mutakallimīn
4a. Mawlānā Ḥaydar ‘alayhi al-raḥmat
3b. Treasure-trove of mysteries [by] the most eloquent of wordsmiths

The opening lines of the text confirm that it is the Makhzan al-asrār of a mystical poet known as Ḥaydar Khwārazmī and closely associated with the Timurid dynasty, especially with Shāh Rukh (r. 1410–47). This particular text, however, was composed for another Timurid renowned as a patron of artists, Iskandar b. ʿUmar Shaykh b. Timūr (b. 1384–d. 1415). A eulogy of this prince is included in the manuscript (fols. 5b–7a). Ḥaydar’s Makhzan al-asrār echoes Nizāmî’s earlier text of the same name in both content and structure. In form it consists of essays alternating with anecdotes, both intended to inculcate religious and moral values. This particular paraphrase contains eight pairs of essays and anecdotes. Most of them illustrate the superiority of the spiritual over the material world through confrontations of two individuals, usually an ascetic and a person of wealth and power. These stories usually involve archetypal characters, but the most vivid anecdote describes how Timur was inspired by the persistence of a wounded ant who managed to climb a wall only after a seventh attempt, to bear his own injuries with fortitude and persevere in his aims.

In both theme and structure, Ḥaydar’s text is representative of the taste of his epoch. Moraliz-
ing texts imitative of Nizamí’s poems were composed by many fifteenth-century Iranian poets. What gives this particular copy added interest is the patron for whom it was prepared and the physical beauty of the book itself. It opens with a glittering double-page dedication, which is executed in several tones of gold and framed with jewel-like illumination that contains the patron’s name and titles (Fig. 1):


3a. 3a. al-sultân ibn al-sultân Abû Mu’azzar Ya’qûb Bahâdur Khân khalâda lilâhu ta’âlâ mulkahu wa sulţânahu.

2b. [This book has been prepared] By order of the treasury of the great and generous sultan lord of the necks of the peoples the one who has been singled out for the solicitude of God the Benefactor.

3a. the sultan son of a sultan Abû Mu’azzar Ya’qûb Bahâdur Khân May God the Exalted make his kingdom and power endure.

The name and title of the patron, Abû Mu’azzar Ya’qûb Bahâdur Khân, combined with the colophon date, 25 Jumâdâ I 883/24 August 1478 (fol. 33a, Fig. 3), shows that this manuscript was prepared for the Aq Qoyunlu ruler Ya’qûb ibn Hasan, who ruled western Iran between 883/1478 and 896/1490. Furthermore, the scribe, Sultan ‘Ali, signs with the epithet “al-Ya’qûbi,” written in gold letters, indicating that he belonged to the sultan’s entourage. The colophon reads as follows:


The book, Makhzan al-asrâr, was completed by Sulţân ‘Ali al-Ya’qûbi, the poor, destitute slave, on the twenty-fifth of Jumâdâ the first of 883.

The information given in the frontispiece and colophon thus confirms that this copy of Haydar Khwârazmî’s Makhzan al-asrâr was prepared for Ya’qûb Aq Qoyunlu during the month of his accession to the throne (Jumâdâ I 883/August 1478), a mere six weeks after his supporters had defeated and killed the previous ruler, Khalîl Sulţân ibn Uzun Hasan, in a battle near Khoy in northwest Iran.

The manuscript thus provides insight into the cultural and artistic climate surrounding Ya’qûb at the beginning of his reign. It suggests that he already possessed a kitâbkhâne, or workshop, capable of producing luxury manuscripts in the first weeks of his rule. Possibly the text’s theme of the superiority of the spiritual realm over secular authority, which appears somewhat ironic in this instance, was intended as moral advice for the new sovereign. It is of interest that the earliest known manuscript prepared for the Timurid prince Bûysungur is a didactic text that contains admonitions for rulers.

In view of Ya’qûb’s youth (he was only fourteen at the time of his accession to the throne) one can suspect that his choice of texts or even his selection of a calligrapher may reflect the influence of one of his advisors. A logical candidate would be Qâdi ‘Isâ Sâvâji, the man who had been Ya’qûb’s tutor and spiritual advisor, and who became one of the most powerful members of his administration.

Qâdi ‘Isâ gained a considerable reputation for his patronage of poets, including some who lived in the Timurid realm. Among the latter group was ‘Abd al-Rahmân Jâmi (1414–92).

The Qâdi also corresponded with Mir ‘Alî Shîr Nava’î (1441–1501), a leading political figure of Timurid Herat and a poet who wrote chiefly in Chaghatai. In his biographical treatise, Majâlis al-nafâ’is, Nava’î reproaches Qâdi ‘Isâ for wasting the opportunities afforded to him by his position; with his power (and hence wealth) he should have been able to finance many important buildings, but instead he focused his attention on poems and poetry. Despite this criticism, Nava’î chose to send the Qâdi a gift of “precious volumes” from his own library. One of these was to be the Kulliyât, or Collected Works, of Jâmi. The envoy was one of Hûsâyn Bâyqarâ’s amîrs, Kamâl al-dîn Ábîvardî, who had previously spent some years at Ya’qûb’s court. Unfortunately, Nava’î’s librarian gave the envoy a religious text that resembled Jâmi’s Kulliyât in size and binding. When Kamâl al-dîn appeared before Sulţân Ya’qûb and Qâdi ‘Isâ to present the gifts, he described how Jâmi’s poems had given him solace on his journey and proudly announced that he had brought a copy of them for the Qâdi. These rhetorical flourishes must have intensified Kamâl al-dîn’s embarrassment when the true identity of the volume was revealed. This incident so angered ‘Alî Shîr that the envoy was afraid to return to Herat and instead took refuge in Balkh.

Sultân Ya’qûb appears to have shared Qâdi ‘Isâ’s enthusiasm for the culture of Khurasan and in particular for the poetry of Jâmi. He sent the poet a lavish gift, and the latter reciprocated by
dedicating his poem Salāmān ve Absal to Yaʿqūb. The album Hazine 2153 in the Topkapi Palace Library also preserves a number of shorter works by Jāmī copied for Sulṭān Yaʿqūb by his court calligraphers.

Whether the Makhzan al-asrār now in the New York Public Library was or was not commissioned by Qāḍī ʿIsa, it exemplifies the close cultural ties between eastern and western Iran in this period. Even works written in the eastern Turkish dialect, Chaghatai, were appreciated in western Iran. Another example of this interest in western Iran is a manuscript of the Chaghatai Divān of ‘Alī Shir Navaṭī dated to 876/1471–77 and copied by ‘Abd al-Rahim al-Khwārazmī, who worked for several members of the Aq Qoyunlu dynasty. Its paintings are also very similar to those in a Divān of Hidayat made for Yaʿqūb’s brother Khālīl Sulṭān. These manuscripts confirm the contention of Iranian literary historians that dynamic and even linguistic differences between regions were less significant than the shared heritage that united them.

Links between Herat and Tabriz are also suggested by the career of Sulṭān ‘Ali, the calligrapher responsible for the New York Public Library Makhzan al-asrār. The length of his service at the Aq Qoyunlu court is evidenced by the substantial number of calligraphy samples and manuscripts signed not only “Sulṭān ‘Alī al-Yaʿqūb” but also “Sulṭān ‘Alī al-Rustāmī.” The latter formula indicates that Sulṭān ‘Ali also served Sulṭān Rustam Aq Qoyunlu (r. 898/1493–902/1497). In view of his close association with the Aq Qoyunlu dynasty, it might be assumed that Sulṭān ‘Ali was born in their domains. Other evidence shows, however, that he was a native of eastern Iran and closely associated with the culture of Herat, for that was where he began his career and where he ultimately ended his days. One indication is the nisba al-Qāʾimī that he uses in a manuscript copied at Tabriz in 882/1478.

An assurance that “Sulṭān ‘Alī al-Qāʾimī” and “Sulṭān ‘Alī al-Yaʿqūb” are one and the same is provided by the biographer Dūst Muḥammad:

Mawlānā Sulṭān ‘Alī al-Qāʾimī was in the service of the late Sulṭān Yaʿqūb.

The nisba al-Qāʾimī suggests that ‘Ali or his family came from the town of Qāʾīn, or Qāyīn, in Qūhīstan, a province southwest of Khurāsān.

Direct evidence of Sulṭān ‘Ali’s connection with Herat is provided by ‘Alī Shir Navaṭī in his biographical treatise, Majālis al-nafāʾis. He describes “Darvish Sulṭān ‘Alī al-Qāʾimī” as a youth (javān) who had been part of the entourage of Jāmī, adding that Sulṭān ‘Ali specialized in copying the works of Jāmī and was attracted to the ascetic life.

The style of Sulṭān ‘Ali’s calligraphy provides another link with Herat, for it closely resembles the hand of important Timurid calligraphers such as Jaʿfar al-Baysunghūrī and Aẓhar al-Ṭabrīzī. This link is confirmed by a piece of calligraphy preserved in Istanbul that Sulṭān ‘Ali claims to have copied from “our teacher Kamāl al-Dīn Jaʿfar al-Baysunghūrī.”

The circumstances that led Sulṭān ‘Ali to leave Herat for Tabriz are unknown, as is the date of his journey. The earliest indication of his connection with the Aq Qoyunlu dynasty is a manuscript of Irāqī’s Lāmiyāt, a mystical text copied by Sulṭān ‘Ali for Yaʿqūb in 882/15 April 1477–3 April 1478 and thus before the latter’s accession to the throne. Inscriptions state that it was prepared for “Abū al-Muẓaffar Ghāzi Shāh Jihān Yaʿqūb” by “order of the Royal Treasury” (bi-rasm-i kihzānat-i shāhī). It is significant that Yaʿqūb is not described as “Sulṭān” but as “Shāh-i Jihān” (World Ruler), a grandiose but less official title. It is uncertain whether this manuscript was produced during Uzun Ḥasan’s last illness or during the unsettled period following his death on 30 Ramaḍān 882/5 January 1478.

There is no direct evidence as to when Sulṭān ‘Ali’s connection with the Aq Qoyunlu dynasty was severed or of when he returned to Herat, but various manuscript colophons provide some information about his activities. Most direct is the colophon in the Upsalla manuscript of Aṣafī’s Jamāl va Jalāl. It states that the manuscript was copied “in the city of Herat” during 908/1502–3 by “Sulṭān ‘Ali.” Both the formulas used in the colophon and the scribal hand suggest that the calligrapher was Sulṭān ‘Ali al-Qāʾimī.

Although both the text and the scribe of the Makhzan al-asrār are connected with eastern Iran, the manuscript’s illuminations and its sole illustration reflect the artistic currents that emerged in western Iran under the patronage of the two dynasties that ruled the area after the collapse of Timurid control: the Qara Qoyunlu and Aq Qoyunlu Turkmens. The illuminations are located on folios 2b–3a (Fig. 1), containing the manuscript’s dedication, and on folios 3b–4a, containing the opening of its text (Fig. 2). The manuscript’s sole illustration is on folio 27b (Fig. 6).
Both pairs of illuminated pages are dazzling in their brightness. A shimmering surface is created by using several tones of gold. The most spectacular and original composition is that of the dedication pages (Fig. 1). Ya'qub's titles are inscribed on the radiant central medallions. The letters are of yellow gold outlined with a fine black line and surrounded by a red-gold field highlighted by a golden arabesque scroll delicately shaded with red and black. This luminous core is balanced by the rest of the page, where tooled gold is contrasted with strong colors (blue, green, purple, dark orange, brown and red) shaded with white so as to create arabesque leaves almost tactile in their substance. The frame is composed of a purplish-red arabesque band set against a blue ground and punctuated by green trilobed leaves. Each color is outlined in gold, and the whole medallion with its foliated terminals is edged with blue. This impressive central unit is complemented by the dynamic tension of a framing arabesque scroll. The golden vine bears cloud-like leaves of voluptuous sensual appeal in shades of blue, violet, purplish-red, and cinnamon-brown. These colors are modulated with touches of white and contrasted with gilded split palmettes with tooled accents. A sense of tactile presence is created by the use of shading and by the manner in which the tips of the leaves appear to grasp the stem on which they grow. The composition is completed by a frame consisting of a central gold band bordered by two narrow blue ones.

The presence of a gilded frontispiece may have an ideological significance in addition to its obvious visual appeal. Since the production of this manuscript coincides with Sultan Ya'qub's accession to the throne, the radiant pages giving his name and titles may allude to the divine charms of kingship, the *farr-i izadi* or *farr-i illahi*, often said to be a visible radiance. Its appearance made manifest a ruler's legitimacy, whereas its departure signaled his downfall.24 This ancient Iranian tradition was still popular in the Islamic period, and there are frequent references to it in literary and historical texts.25 Thus, the poet Jami speaks of Ya'qub's acquisition of the *farr-i illahi* in the dedicatory verses of *Salâman ve Absal*. A secondary implication of the radiant frontispiece may be the common association of a ruler with the sun. This image is used by Ya'qub's court historian Fadl Allah al-Kunjî in the dedication of his text.27

The opening text pages (Fig. 2) are also resplendent with gold and covered by delicate arabesques, but their design is more traditional than that of the dedication pages. Finely drawn red-gold lines create a network, almost a shimmering cloud, around the black letters of the text, and the framing illumination has alternate zones of yellow- and red-toned gold. The deeper hue appears in the wide outer border covered with arabesques and in the panels above and below the body of the text. Yellower gold is used for the framing guilloche band and the inscription cartouches, as well as for the vertical panels flanking the text. The vegetal ornament in these panels is in gold of contrasting tones and texture. Large gilded areas have a matte finish, whereas their ornament and frames are burnished and outlined in black.

These four pages exemplify the extraordinary quality of illumination found in manuscripts prepared for the Turkmen rulers of western Iran. The historical development of this style has not yet been analyzed, but the illumination of the *Makhzan al-asrâr* has clear affinities with that in texts prepared for the Qara Qoyunlu ruler Pir Budaq in Shiraz and Badhdad as well for various Aq Qoyunlu patrons. Two distinctive features of these manuscripts are the use of gold-on-gold illumination and the dominance of arabesque vines in the structuring of the illumination. Whereas Herat illuminators preferred to base their designs on geometric figures, usually interlacing circles, some Turkmen illuminators used the undulating contours of the arabesque to shape medallions and fill the design fields. The illuminated pages of the *Makhzan al-asrâr* demonstrate this principle.28

The characteristic forms of this style of illumination appear to have evolved during the twenty-year period that marked the development of Turkmen patronage. Both the use of gold-on-gold illumination and the central importance of the arabesque are seen in illuminations prepared for Pir Budaq, such as the 'umwâns, or headings, for sections of a *Khamsa* of Niẓâmi dated to 866/1461. The heading for *Haft Paykar* is particularly fine, having two lateral roundels of gold-on-gold arabesques set in a blue field (Fig. 4).29

A virtuosic use of the arabesque is also evident in the illuminated frontispiece from a *Divân* of Qâsim copied for Pir Budaq in Shiraz in 863/1458–59.30 The tradition is carried forward in the 'umwân illumination of an *Anthology* copied at Shamakha in 1468 where the titles are written on gold fields framed and defined by gold arabesques of a deeper hue. These gilded areas
are bounded by regions of blue (Fig. 5). In many respects this manuscript is an important link between the patronage of the two Turkmen dynasties. It was copied by Sharaf al-din Ḥusayn, a calligrapher whose career demonstrates how artistic continuity can exist in a period of dynastic change. He worked first for Pir Budaq Qara Qoyunlu and after the latter's death appears to have moved to Shamakha, where he copied this manuscript for a member of the Shīrwānshāh dynasty. Shortly thereafter he is associated with the Aq Qoyunlu dynasty, who were allied with the Shīrwānshāhs by marriage. The album Hazīne 2153 contains several pages that he copied for Sulṭān Yaʿqūb Aq Qoyunlu, ranging in date from 883/1478-79 to 889/1484-95. An enthusiasm for gold-on-gold illumination balanced by areas of intense blue and for the arabesque vine as the determining element of illumination structure continued among western Iranian illuminators into the sixteenth century.

The illuminated pages of Makhzan al-asrār are thus clearly linked to the major currents of western Iranian illumination, but they also display certain distinctive features. Both pairs of pages are unusual in their use of large areas of gold without the counterbalancing zones of blue; but the execution of their illumination is in two different styles, and this may indicate that they were produced by two individuals. Whereas the opening text pages are conventional in the drawing and structure of their ornament, the dedication pages are perhaps unique in using the gold-on-gold scheme to highlight Yaʿqūb's titles—another indication that this illumination was also intended to convey a particular message. Furthermore, the dedication pages are executed in a more idiosyncratic, painterly style. Parallels between these pages and the manuscript's sole illustration suggest that they may have been executed by the same person (Figs. 1 and 6). The pages exhibit a similar use of shaded colors and tooled gold, as well as arabesques of related design and execution.

That painting occurs in the eighth anecdote of the text that describes an encounter between Sulṭān Mahmūd of Ghazna and a dervish whom the monarch meets during a hunting expedition. Mahmūd, dismounting before the anchorite, urges him to take up residence at his capital, Ghazna, where he will be protected from the winter cold. Rejecting his offer with vehemence, the old man argues that God will provide his sustenance and suggests that Mahmūd is the one who is unprepared for his own fate, that is, death. In anger the sultan asks the dervish how carefully he has prepared for this eventuality. As a response the ascetic dies quietly with a smile on his lips, leaving Mahmūd in awe of the recluse's spiritual force and purity.

Anecdotes of this type were popular in the period in both literary and historical texts. The Safavid historian Iskandar Beg Munshi recounts a story about Tīmūr and his encounter with Khwāja 'Ali in which the ascetic rebukes him:

What need have the princes of the world of poverty and spirituality of any trappings of this world? What business do the kings who possess the tawdry baubles of this world have in the market where the priceless pearls of divine knowledge are sold? The theme of this illustration is in harmony with the high regard in which such luminaries at Yaʿqūb's court as Qādī ʿĪsā held ascetic values and could also be viewed as an appropriate admonition for a young ruler. An examination of the preceding pages shows that the calligrapher was at pains to arrange the text so that the illustration could be centered on the page and framed by the lines of text that describe how Sulṭān Mahmūd stood before the ascetic but the latter took no notice of his presence (Fig. 6).

The shah, seeing [him], jumped to the ground from his horse [and] stood politely for a long while. The old man bestowed no courtesy upon him. He neither said "sit down" nor did he say "go."

This placement of the painting necessitated arranging the preceding pages so that fewer verses fill the page. Normally, pages contain eleven couplets, but folio 26b has ten and folio 27a has only seven.

Divided vertically by the structure where the recluse sits, the illustration in the New York Public Library Makhzan al-asrār alludes to the contrast between the spiritual and secular realms, without trying to portray Ḥaydar's text with exactitude (Fig. 6). The key figures in Ḥaydar's narrative, the unnamed hermit and Sulṭān Mahmūd of Ghazna, must be the two figures in the center of the painting. Their importance is, however, somewhat diminished by the artist's introduction of subsidiary themes. In the lower left corner are a pair of bearded men, one with his hand on the shoulder of the other, both seemingly engaged in disputation with a youth who kneels before them. The youth, holding a whip in one hand and the bridles of his mule and of the sultan's horse in the
other, looks toward the two gesticulating men, but little sense of communication is conveyed. A third group is at the upper right horizon where two men, perhaps courtiers, stand silhouetted against the golden sky. They appear to be conversing with each other about the panorama before them; once more communication between the two figures is suggested by having one person place his hand on the shoulder of the other.

This painting is executed in an idiosyncratic style where texture is expressed through the use of parallel striations. These are particularly evident in the drawing of beards and the coats of horses. Another distinctive feature is the depiction of garments. The figures have looped belts at their waists, and the garments have side slits folded back to reveal a lining of strongly contrasting color. The landscape around Mahmud of Ghazna is pale pink, the shaded contours emphasized by touches of dark red and white. The structure containing the dervish has a frame painted in a deep vibrant blue with small tile panels in green and orange. Its dome is ornamented by white polylobed medallions linked by golden arabesque vines shaded with red and similar in execution to the arabesques surrounding the sultan’s name and titles on the dedication pages (Fig. 1).

Although both sides of the illustration are executed in a similar style, small details reinforce the message of the contrast between the simple world of the ascetic and the worldly pomp of Sultan Mahmud. The three ascetics wear simple unadorned garments, whereas the sultan and his courtiers wear gold jewelry and gold-ornamented garments fastened by golden buttons. Many of these touches of gold are made more conspicuous by tooling, which catches the light. Even the accoutrements of the sultan’s horse and his page’s mule are embellished with tooled gold.

The stylistic features of this illustration are also evident in album pages signed by or attributed to painters associated with Ya’qub Beg Aq Qoyunlu. One of the closest is a page of painted studies attributed to “Faḍl Allah Divāneh” in the album Hazine 2160 (Fig. 7). It resembles the New York illustration in its portrayal of a youth drawn in profile and in its technique of drawing hands, particularly outstretched palms. A pair of hands visible in the lower left corner of the “Faḍl Allah Divāneh” page, which may depict a Buddhist mudra, resemble those of the ascetic in the lower left corner of the New York painting. This page of sketches also has arabesque leaves drawn in a modeled three-dimensional style reminiscent of those in the Makhzan al-asrār frontispiece.

An inscription in the lower left corner of this page of painted sketches describes it as “the work of Faḍl Allah Divāneh” (‘amal Faḍl Allah Divāneh) has been rejected as spurious. It is noteworthy, however, that the Safavid connoisseur Sām Mirzā mentions a certain “Divāneh Naqqāsh” who was a poet and painter associated with Ya’qub Aq Qoyunlu:

He is from Tabriz and it is said that he was an intimate companion at the gatherings of Sultan Ya’qūb. This page ascribed to Faḍl Allah and others in Istanbul similarly attributed also contain another element relevant for the taste of the Makhzan al-asrār manuscript. They have exotic creatures and motifs of Far Eastern origin that relate to the scenes depicted on the Makhzan al-asrār binding. Other facets of the Makhzan al-asrār illustration are more easily linked with works ascribed to Shaykhī (or Shaykhī Naqqāsh, “Shaykhī the Painter”), another painter associated with Sultan Ya’qūb by pictorial and documentary evidence. The Istanbul albums Hazine 2153 and Hazine 2160 contain seventy-one works signed by or attributed to him as well as many unsigned works in a similar style. A scene showing the public humiliation of three men, attributed to Shaykhī Naqqāsh, shares a number of features with the Makhzan al-asrār illustration. They include the depiction of bearded men, several of whom closely resemble the three ascetics in the New York painting, as well as a donkey very similar to that held by Sultan Mahmūd’s page.

Artistically and historically, the most important works associated with Shaykhī Naqqāsh are six paintings that illustrate the Ḥaft Paykar section in a magnificent copy of Niẓāmi’s Khamsa, Hazine 762 in the Topkapi Palace Library. The attribution of these paintings to Shaykhī was first made by Filiz Çağman, who used a combination of stylistic and textual evidence. The latter came principally from an unusual postscript in Hazine 762 that recounts the stages in the manuscript’s creation. The most important phases for the Makhzan al-asrār are those sponsored by the Aq Qoyunlu princes Khalil Sultan and Ya’qūb when paintings were executed by Darvīsh Muḥammad and Shaykhī Naqqāsh. Despite their larger format and more ambitious character, the Ḥaft Paykar paintings have several details that show a close connection with the Makhzan al-asrār. Most useful as a comparison is
the highly unusual scene of Bahram Gur Enthroned, in which the ruler, seated on an elaborate golden throne, is attended by his court (Fig. 8). It resembles the New York painting in both compositional elements and figurative style. In each case the most important figure is placed on the left-hand side of the page, but the viewer’s attention is distracted by numerous figures arranged in small clusters who communicate by touching each other. One of the most prominent figures in the enthronement scene is a youth seated in the center of the painting. He is very similar in posture and physiognomy to the kneeling page in the New York painting (Figs. 6 and 8). Both figures have a slightly sway-backed pose, and their faces are smooth, convex surfaces barely indented by their features. The structure in which the dervish sits is very similar to the one occupied by a woman in the upper right corner of the enthronement. Small idiosyncracies, such as a fondness for garments with looped belts and contrasting linings, are also evident in both illustrations.

Yet despite their evident similarities, the New York and Istanbul illustrations belong to different phases of Sultan Ya'qub’s life. The Makhzan al-asrär coincides with the beginnings of his rule, and the Haft Paykar with the consolidation of his power. The text was completed on 25 Muharram 886/17 March 1481, so the Haft Paykar illustrations must have been executed at least two and one-half years after the illustrations in Makhzan al-asrär. They also belong to the period when Sultan Ya’qub began to exercise increased personal authority and to reveal a taste for opulent living, much to the distress of Qadi ‘Isa. These circumstances may account for the emphasis on royal ceremony and lavish display seen in Hazine 762.

Thus, despite its simplicity, the Makhzan al-asrär illustration is an important document for the development of painting at the Turkmen courts. Whether the illustration in the Makhzan al-asrär was painted by Fadl Allah, Shaykh Naqqash, or some other individual, it is clear that the style they used was already well established at the beginning of Ya’qub’s reign.

Even though it is possible to define the stylistic features that characterized paintings created for Ya’qub Aq Qoyunlu, little is known about the painters themselves. Despite the impressive number of works signed by or attributed to Shaykhbayi by circumstantial evidence, his personal life remains a mystery. Bayani mentions, but does not publish, an ‘arza-dâght, or letter of petition, written by Shaykh Beg Naqqash and preserved in the album of calligraphy and paintings assembled for the Safavid prince Bahram Mirza by Dus Muhammed in 1544. Although the sixteenth-century author Sam Mirza refers to a certain “Shaykh Kirmani” who is said to be “incomparable in painting and perfect in mulla-hood,” there is at present no confirmation that this Shaykhi is to be identified with Sultan Ya’qub’s painter.

The message conveyed by the text, illumination, and illustration of Sultan Ya’qub’s Makhzan al-asrär is only one aspect of the book’s significance. The volume is equally noteworthy for its binding and the paper on which it is copied.

This binding gives the first signal of the splendors that await the reader (Fig. 9). Although the flap is now missing, the front and back leaves are well preserved. They show different but related landscape scenes. The doublure of these leaves is now covered with marbleized paper, but originally they may have had cut-leather filigree ornament. The combination of an exterior ornamented with a pictorial scene and a doublure with cut-leather decoration is found in a number of fifteenth-century luxury bindings.

The exterior of each leaf has a lush landscape setting, populated by a variety of birds, animals, and insects, most of which are grouped in pairs. These creatures dominate the landscape because they are large in size and because they are accentuated by means of gold or silver paint. Insects are particularly conspicuous by their size. The surface density of the composition does not allow for a sense of space; but the upper edge of each scene is bounded by a layer of clouds, and a small pool is located in the lower left corner of the back binding. On the right (front) side, the central foreground is occupied by a doe and stag, and above them a heron attacks a tortoise. Originally, the heron was gilded and the tortoise was high-lighted in silver. To their right are two felines, one perched on a rocky outcropping; to their left is a monkey holding up a branch. A large spreading tree with both leaves and blossoms extends diagonally across the upper half of the surface. The sky zone is demarcated by two large gilt insects on the left and two flying geese on the right, one silver and one gold. On the left or back portion of the binding, the central composition shows a lion attacking a stag. The latter, with its delicate limbs and curving horns, is drawn with great sensitivity. Originally, the lion was gilded and the stag was painted with silver. Over them, two geese fly up carrying branches in their beaks.
and two bears play on a rock. This scene is framed by two trees: on the left an oak with two monkeys and a bird in its branches; on the right a flowering tree on which sit two birds. The oak tree is flanked by two pairs of animals, silver felines above and golden rabbits below. Above and to the right bears play under the flowering tree, and in the lower right corner two geese swim, one gilded, the other painted with silver.

The scenes on this binding were probably produced with the aid of a metal mould into which the leather was pressed after first being dampened. A close examination of the Makhzan al-asrār binding, however, suggests that the background may have been deepened by use of a punch. In the clarity of its design, this binding approaches the precision of cut-leather designs commonly used on a doublure.

Block-pressed leather was widely used in Egypt and Syria to decorate the doublures of bindings, but the use of plates to create landscape settings appears first in fifteenth-century Iran. The earliest published example with a pictorial binding is a manuscript of 'Attār’s poetry made in Herat for Shāh Rukh in 841/1438. Except for its shallow relief, the scene on this binding is very close to that of the Makhzan al-asrār. It shows a landscape filled with birds and animals grouped in pairs. The exotic character of the landscape is underscored by the presence of monkeys, dragons, and quadrupeds modeled on the Chinese ch’i-lin. This binding’s doublure is embellished with vignettes of animals surrounded by foliage executed in cut-leather filigree placed over a contrasting blue paper ground. The parallelism between the exterior and interior decoration is particularly striking on the flap of the binding.

The ‘Attār manuscript is undoubtedly not the first to be so ornamented. Its exterior binding resembles one on a manuscript dated to 833/1429 and copied for Shāh Rukh’s son Bāysunghur in Herat. Documentary and literary evidence suggests that the art of making luxury bindings was introduced to Herat about 1420 by a craftsman from Tabriz named Qawwām al-dīn Tabrīzī. The sixteenth-century artist and historian Dūst Muhammad characterizes the contribution of Qawwām al-dīn this way: “Munabbat-kārī on bindings is his invention.” This passage has been understood to mean that Qawwām al-dīn “invented cut-pattern work (filigree),” which is probably the thrust of its meaning, but a closer reading of this text reveals some important nuances. Dūst Muḥammad does not claim that Qawwām al-dīn “invented” munabbat-kārī but that he was the first to use it on binding. Also, the translation of munabbat-kārī as “filigree” somewhat disguises its basic meaning of ornament, particularly vegetal or floral, which is carved or cast in low relief. It is thus possible that this term was used to describe both the moulded decoration on the exterior and cut-leather designs on the doublure of bindings.

The pictorial themes on the ‘Attār manuscript of 1438 were also used on several other luxurious bindings from Herat. That on a binding of a manuscript copied in 856/1452 offers important parallels to the Makhzan al-asrār one. Both landscape scenes have a horizontal rather than vertical orientation, and compositional parallels include the drawing of main figure groups, such as the stag and doe or the bear cubs, as well as details in the depiction of landscape and vegetal patterns. The bindings differ, however, in the technique of their execution. The 1452 example is executed in gold tooling against a black leather ground, so that it has more the appearance of a painting. Another manuscript from Herat, this one dated to 887/1483, has a cut-leather doublure closely analogous in design to the New York binding in the drawing of both landscape and animals.

Pictorial bindings were also made in western Iran during the 1430s and 1440s, particularly at Shiraz, but their compositions differ from those produced at Herat. The exterior scene on one, for instance, shows a youth in close combat with a bear, in a landscape occupied by various exotic creatures. Pointed ogival medallions containing a pair of exotic creatures were particularly popular in Shiraz on both the exterior and doublure of bindings.

The only western Iranian bindings where the landscape setting is clearly analogous to that used on the Makhzan al-asrār manuscript are subsequent in date, as for example that on a Shiraz manuscript of 896/1491. Even here the compositions lack the density and decorative richness of the New York example. All the available evidence, therefore, reinforces the conclusion that the Makhzan al-asrār binding follows an eastern rather than western Iranian tradition. Indeed, were it not for the clear evidence connecting the Makhzan al-asrār manuscript with Tabriz, it would be assumed that its binding had been created in Herat. Because of the volume’s small size, however, the central section lacks the usual framing border of a running vine or arabesque.

It is probable that the design for the binding or the plate from which it was made was brought from Herat by the volume’s calligrapher, Sulṭān...
‘Ali, and it is even possible that he produced the design himself. No source describes him as a painter, but the album Hazine 2153 contains two well-executed paintings in a Herat style signed in gold letters, ‘Abd al-‘Abd Sultan ‘Ali, “The work of the slave Sultan ‘Ali.” One of them shows a theme related to the binding’s landscape, a horseman spearing a dragon that is attacking a stag. Other calligraphers are known to have been trained in supplementary crafts. For example, another fifteenth-century manuscript with a binding containing vignettes of animals in a landscape setting bears a notation that one individual, a certain Zayn al-‘Abidin b. Muhammad, was its calligrapher, illuminator, and binder.

From this brief survey it can be seen that the Makhzan al-‘asrār binding belongs to a well-defined group that was produced over a period of several decades—from the 1420s to the 1480s. A number of sketches and drawings preserved in albums also depict landscape settings inhabited by a variety of creatures. A scroll-like painting originally at least 18 centimeters in height and over 2 meters in length but now cut into pieces is particularly useful as a comparison with the Makhzan al-‘asrār binding. A portion of this scroll now in Kansas City demonstrates the close affinity of the painting and binding (Figs. 9 and 10). Bears cavorting on a rock, seen on the front cover, are reminiscent of those in the upper left corner of the painting. Two groups on the back cover—the flying ducks in the upper left corner and the paired felines in the lower left one—are both closely paralleled in the painting. Both scenes also contain insects that are disproportionately large in relation to their setting. Most of the other figural and landscape elements from the Makhzan al-‘asrār binding are also found in other portions of the scroll still in Istanbul.

The inclusion of exotic creatures such as the dragon, the phoenix, and the ch‘i-lin in the landscapes found on bindings has led art historians to label them as “Chinoiserie,” and the general assumption has been that they were a manifestation of “fashionable taste” first used by craftsmen at the Timurid courts. It is said that they were adopted in the same spirit as in eighteenth-century Europe as a conscious taste in Chinoiserie, in the exotic art of a people who were greatly admired for their half-understood civilisation…

At the same time it is acknowledged that during the fifteenth century this “taste” emerges as a dominant theme with the adoption of Chinese motifs as decoration for every kind of object… Chinoiserie is the key note of the design of the finest bindings…

Although certain basic facts about the Near Eastern imitation and assimilation of Chinese designs have been established, other facets of the relationship have yet to be explored. No clear motive for the imitation has been identified, nor has the Near Eastern understanding of the designs themselves been analyzed. Beyond these issues there remain questions about how and when these designs reached Iran as well as about how and why they were transmitted from one generation to another with so little change.

The last question is probably the easiest one to answer. The pictorial consistency of the bindings and drawings over an extended period of time suggests the use of master drawings that could be used not only as models for other paintings but to create master moulds and patterns for cut-leather work. This practice is confirmed by the information contained in a document probably written at the Timurid court workshop in Herat about 1430 that describes the activities of its members for their patron. One member of the workshop, Khwāja ‘Abd al-Rahīm, is said to be making “patterns” (furrāb) for the “binders, gilders, tent-embroiderers and tile cutters.”

This practice of using patterns is undoubtedly a major source of the compositional consistency in ornamental designs of the Timurid and later periods. Even so, the pictorial continuity in works depicting the kind of inhabited garden shown on the Makhzan al-‘asrār binding is unusual. Indeed, an examination of bindings and drawings shows that the same theme of an inhabited landscape garden continued to be used with little change throughout the sixteenth century and even into the seventeenth.

The replication of designs such as those on the Makhzan al-‘asrār binding was also probably encouraged by the understanding that such designs formed a specific and identifiable artistic repertoire. The most complete discussion of this genre of painting is in the Qānūn al-swār, or Canon of Painting, composed by the Safavid painter Šādiq Beg Afshār toward the end of the sixteenth century. He makes a clear distinction between paintings that represent people (jūnāl-garī) and those that depict other creatures (jūnāl-sāzī). A painter of human figures should strive to work from nature because “only a fool would think to parody the works of past great masters.” However, in the
painting of other animate creatures, the opposite is true. Although he warns of the monotony of exact replication of patterns, nevertheless

a solicitude for past models is at a premium. There is no swerving here from the principles established by the masters of old; here artful imitation (taabbū’) is the way that must be pursued.²²

He, moreover, distinguishes two different modes of this genre: one focused on a specific group of exotic creatures, namely, the simurgh-bird, azhdar-dragon, hizarb-lion, and gāv-i ganj or “guardian-bovine”; the other depicted conflicts between these creatures. This type is called
girfi-a gir, which is to say, the “give and take” of animals locked in battle.²³

Şādiqi Beg’s testimony confirms the impression gained from visual evidence that studies of exotic birds and animals were understood to be a specific genre with its own logic and tradition. Frequently, these compositions focus on a pair of creatures in combat, such as the lion attacking the deer on the front cover of the Makhzan al-āsrār.

Şādiqi Beg does not specifically identify these themes as Chinese, but the exotic creatures he mentions are connected with China by other Persian sources. One of the most useful accounts is that of Ghiyāth al-dīn Naqqāsh, who spent the years from 1419 to 1422 on a journey from Herat to Beijing. His most explicit description of related ornament comes in an account of a reception at the new imperial palace in the latter city. The building was decorated with stone carvings of “azhdar (dragons) and simurgh-i khitā’i (Chinese simurghs).”²⁴ He also describes the imperial throne and its cover of yellow satin ornamented in gold with “dragons (azhdarhā), simurghs, and Chinese designs (nuqūsh-i khitā’i).”²⁵ The notion that certain motifs such as the dragon or simurgh were associated with rulers of China must have been known in Iran during the Mongol period because extensive use was made of these themes in the decoration of Ilkhanid palaces.²⁶

The identification of the fenghuang (phoenix) with the simurgh provided an important semantic link between the Imperial symbolism of China and that of Iran. In China this winged creature developed a particular association with female members of ruling dynasties,²⁷ whereas in Iran the simurgh was the protector and benefactor of the ruler himself and as such was sometimes associated with the sun.²⁸ The Mongol ruler Uljaytu is thus compared to the simurgh in the dedicatory section of the chronicle of his rule composed by Abū l-Qāsim al-Qāshānī.²⁹ Although it is certainly an exaggeration to assume that all decorative motifs of Chinese origin had a royal connotation in Iran during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the appearance of such ornament in a royal context in both Iran and China must have enhanced its prestige and made it appropriate for important secular figures.

The various types of exchanges, both diplomatic and commercial, between Iran and China during the fifteenth century must have familiarized those at the Timurid and Turkmen courts with such “Chinese designs.” For example, an envoy who arrived at Herat in 820/1417 is said to have brought ālāt-i čini (“Chinese objects”) in addition to satin and brocade.³⁰ Unfortunately, the objects in question are not identified, but it is probable that they included pieces of lacquer furniture because Iranian fourteenth- and fifteenth-century paintings appear to depict Chinese carved lacquer tables, footstools, and even thrones.³¹ It is furthermore likely that smaller lacquer ware also reached Iran either as gifts or through trade, and it is probable that such objects were an important catalyst in the development of book bindings with “relief decoration” (munabbat-kārī). A link to lacquer ware is particularly evident in the design of doublings that use cut-leather motifs silhouetted against a ground of blue- or gold-colored paper. One of the most popular designs for this ornament was a pointed-oval medallion containing two creatures, often two phoenix or “Chinese simurghs,” shown against a dense floral background and framed by flowering vines (Fig. 11).³² The appearance of such medallions and their technique strongly suggests that the source of inspiration was a form of carving in which different layers have distinct colors. A logical candidate would be a type of carved lacquer ware in which lacquer was applied in layers of differing color. When the object was carved, the design cut through these layers, thereby creating a strong contrast between different levels of the decoration. During the fifteenth century the most popular color combination used black for the top layers, red for the intermediate zone, and yellow for the lowest levels; but other combinations, such as red over black, are known.³³ Many surviving polychrome, carved lacquer objects are ornamented with designs closely analogous to those found on the doublings of Iranian bindings. A good example is the carved lacquer tray now in the Sackler gallery that has a pair of fenghuang surrounded by blossoming plants
and where the raised red portion is contrasted against a lower yellow one (Fig. 12). The pointed-oval frame surrounding the pair of simurghs on the binding is also frequently used in Chinese lacquer compositions.84

Even the feature of animal combats (girjft-o gfr) used in Persian ornament may have a direct Chinese source. When Ghiyât al-dîn Naqqâsh looked at the canopy over the Chinese emperor’s throne, he saw “four azhdar (dragons) who are attacking each other.”85 Thus, the Chinese tendency to use pairs of creatures in ornament86 may have led Iranian craftsmen to assume that they were in conflict with each other. This is particularly true when one or both creatures were dragons, which in Iran were traditionally viewed as fearsome, ill-tempered creatures inhabiting desolate regions.87 It is easy to imagine how an Iranian viewer would interpret the juxtaposition of dragon and phoenix on a Chinese object as a battle between them. Indeed, the combat of dragon and simurgh is one of the central themes of Iranian “Chinoiserie.”88

Several aspects of this “Chinoiserie” tradition remain to be explored. One is whether the pictorial consistency in depictions of a luxuriant landscape containing a variety of creatures during the fifteenth through seventeenth centuries also reflects a conceptual continuity. The stability and popularity of this theme does suggest that it had a meaning for the Near Eastern viewer beyond “fashionable taste.” Another problem is how the visual theme of the inhabited garden originated: did it really appear only in the fifteenth century, as is commonly assumed, and did it originate in Iran or is there a Chinese source for the composition as a whole?

Regarding the question of the significance attached to images of the inhabited garden, there are several clues. One comes from a passage in the Timurid workshop document mentioned above. A member of the group, Mawlâná Qawwâm al-dîn, is said to be working on a pictorial binding. He has completed its “arabesque border” (hâshiyat-i истем) and is working on the “scene of joy” (aysh-tamâshâ) in the center of “text” (matn) of a binding.89 This Qawwâm al-dîn is assumed to be the individual discussed above who was remembered as the person who first used “relief decoration” (munabbat-kâri) on bindings.90 It is possible, therefore, that he was creating a binding with a scene of cavorting animals and birds similar to that on the Makhzan al-asrâr binding. Such scenes may have been considered amusing and pleasurable to the viewer.

The luxuriant vegetation depicted on fifteenth-century Iranian bindings may also have carried a message. Other texts indicate that Persians credited the Chinese with a particular skill in depicting flowers and vegetation. Iranian painters recognized a special vocabulary of floral ornament known as khîâtî, or “Chinese,” which was primarily understood as a lifelike rendering of certain kinds of flowers.91 In his discussion of the history of painting, Qâdi Ahmad cites verses crediting the Chinese with its invention, and he describes their first work as a page covered with flowers of extraordinary verisimilitude:

It was not a page embellished, / It looked like a tray filled with tulips and roses.92

Texts also suggest that the predominating aim of using vegetal ornament was to create luxuriant designs with paradisiac connotations. This is evident in the statement made by Şâdîq Beg about his teacher Muâzaffar ‘Alî, who was noted for skill in decorative painting. When he executed floral designs “the fabled gardens of Iran arose recreated a-fresh on earth.”93

Another ingredient in the Iranian understanding of the inhabited garden theme may come from the long-standing association of “the gardens of Iran” with China. This place, mentioned in the Koran (Sura 89:3), was popularly believed to contain a palace and garden built in imitation of paradise.94 A linking of Iran with China is evident in a passage from the eleventh-century poem Vis u Râmin, which equates the adorning of a beautiful woman with the creation of a paradisiac garden:

She painted that beautiful idol as Chinese painters the gardens of Iran; she made that blessed one as perfect as Rîzvan the Huris in Paradise.95

This passage adds the further complication of considering the “gardens of Iran” as a metaphor for human beauty as well as for paradise and typifies the anthropocentric understanding of nature often expressed in Iranian literature.96

If there was a literary association of China with lush, paradisiac gardens, how was that association translated into visual terms? A clue is provided by a copy of Rashîd al-dîn’s Jâmî’ al-Tawârîkh dated to 706/1306–7 and probably prepared for presentation to the Mongol ruler, Uljaytu. It contains an illustration of the garden and city of Iran that has important analogies to the Makhzan al-asrâr binding. The painting contains a Chinese pavilion set in a dense garden of blossoming trees and plants. A stream of water flows from behind
the building (Fig. 13). This painting establishes a link between the literary association of China with paradisiac gardens and the lush landscapes in Iranian "Chinoiserie," but it lacks the living creatures that are so prominent in those settings. Some of those creatures, such as the dragon and simurgh, may have royal connotations; but others convey no obvious message. It is most likely that these groupings of animals, birds, and insects portray a kind of royal game park where animals were kept for the king's entertainment. The theme is an old and well-established one in Iranian art and appears in both reliefs and objects of the pre-Islamic period.

The theme was also known in China. Compositions showing birds, animals, and insects surrounded by flowering plants are found on several objects preserved in the eighth-century treasures of the Shōsōin. The most important is a lacquer-covered ewer, inlaid in silver with many small motifs of birds, animals, insects, blossoming plants, and ornamental stones. Its shape is clearly modeled on that of Iranian ewers, and its decoration may also reflect Iranian precedents. The Shōsōin objects thus suggest that the theme of a luxuriant garden inhabited by animals, birds, and insects was already established as a compositional type by the eighth century in both Iran and China. Unfortunately, it has not yet been determined whether this theme had a continuous history between the eighth and fifteenth centuries or was reinvented at some point during this interval.

For the history of this pictorial theme in China, it may be significant that several of the Shōsōin objects showing animals in a stylized landscape are covered with lacquer. The garden theme is used in later inlaid lacquers, such as a small box inlaid with mother-of-pearl and dated to 1487. It is decorated with landscape vignettes showing birds, plants, and insects.

One important factor encouraging the survival of the pictorial theme of a royal hunting preserve was the popularity of such preserves among the rulers of both the Near East and China. Their enthusiasm for such preserves may have led to the practice of decorating their residences with depictions of such game parks. Landscapes containing animals decorating the walls of eleventh-century tombs at Ch’in-Ling are thought to reflect wall paintings from a contemporary palace of the Liao dynasty. Textual descriptions of palaces built for Mongol rulers suggest that they were ornamented with depictions of birds and animals. Marco Polo’s description of Qubilai’s summer palace focuses on its decoration. The rooms are painted with figures of men and beast and birds, and with a variety of trees and flowers, all executed with such exquisite art that you regard them with delight and astonishment.

The instance of Qubilai’s palace is particularly important because the palace had a special kind of hunting preserve, which is also described by Marco Polo:

Round this palace a wall is built, enclosing a compass of 16 miles, and inside the Park there are fountains and rivers and brooks, and beautiful meadows with all kinds of wild animals (excluding such as are of ferocious nature), which the Emperor has procured and placed there to supply food for his falcons and hawks, which he keeps there in mew.

This setting of a garden provided with flowing water and stocked with game is strikingly reminiscent of the compositions used on Iranian bindings, except for the absence of predators.

Another indication that scenes of animals in garden-like settings were used in the palaces of Chinese rulers comes from a group of carved stone reliefs excavated on the site of a banqueting hall from the palace of the first Ming emperor, Hung Wu, at Nanking. These panels show pairs of animals in a landscape setting. Two of them are strikingly similar in both design and execution to the Iranian compositions. One panel even shows a pair of bear cubs playing on stylized rocks. Above them are birds, flowering plants, and trees. Another panel shows a pair of deer in a similar setting. The doe bends over to drink water. The decoration is deeply carved and even appears undercut in some places. These reliefs are so similar to the designs on Iranian bindings that the latter’s compositions may well be closer to a Chinese pictorial source than is usually believed.

Another indication that the scenes on bindings are derived from an established compositional type is provided by a manuscript illustration (Fig. 14). It comes from the well-known copy of Khwâju Kirmâni’s poetry prepared in 1396 for Sultan Aḥmad Jalâyîr (British Library Add. 18113). In a royal reception set in a spring garden, the throne is hung with a textile that may well be of Chinese origin. It has a green ground and golden decoration depicting the kind of landscape seen on Persian bindings. A fox chases a deer in a setting of trees, rocks, and flowers; and ducks are seen swimming in a stream below and flying in the clouds above. Although the Chinese origin of this textile cannot be proven, it is
well known that gold-decorated silks were among the gifts sent by Chinese emperors to Iranian rulers. Furthermore, the manuscript of 1396 was executed during the time an envoy sent by Hung Wu was visiting various Iranian rulers and giving them gifts. Thus the landscape scroll now in Istanbul, of which a portion is in Kansas City, could even be emulating a textile of this type (Figs. 10 and 14).

Art historians have usually assumed that designs such as those on the *Makhzan al-asrār* binding were first used in Iran during the Timurid period, but as was demonstrated above, both the Chinese and Near Eastern evidence suggest that the tradition had its roots in earlier epochs. The question of whether it had an unbroken pictorial continuity in the Near East remains to be investigated.

For Iran there are indications that the theme of a garden-like setting inhabited by birds and animals was popular during the Mongol period, when it was used in the decoration of palaces as well as objects. The strongest visual evidence comes from the ruins of a Mongol palace at Takh-t Sulaymān erected for Abaqā (r. 1265–82). Its walls were revetted with ceramic panels, probably made by Iranian craftsmen, that show clear evidence of Chinese taste in their motifs. In addition to the chambers ornamented with *simurghs* and dragons mentioned above, there were also panels showing birds, animals, and hunters in a tangle of trees and blossoming plants that evoke the theme of a hunting preserve and tiles with simpler versions of the landscapes from Hung Wu’s palace; the latter show a deer or a lion, silhouetted against dense vegetation, placed above a water source. The palace of Uljaytu at Sultanīyya is said to have included a room decorated like a garden, but no physical traces of it survive.

The depiction of the “gardens of Iram” from the 1306 *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh* manuscript may provide a glimpse of such ornament, but it lacks the animal inhabitants of the later Iranian examples (Fig. 13). An indication that settings of animals and landscapes comparable to those seen in the Hung Wu panels were known in Mongol Iran comes from a basin now in the Victoria and Albert Museum for which a date of 1300–20 has been proposed. The decoration, now hard to decipher because of the loss of inlays, contains most of the elements found in the fifteenth-century bindings. There are ducks swimming and flying among clouds, bear cubs climbing on rocks, deer drinking at a stream, gesticulating monkeys or apes, a pair of hares sitting on rocks, running gazelles, and a stalking cheetah. These vignettes are, however, in separate panels rather than in a unified landscape setting. In that respect they are closer to the panels from Hung Wu’s palace than to the gold-ornamented textile in the painting of 1396 (Fig. 14).

A different union of animal depictions with exotic Chinese vegetation also appears on a few pieces of inlaid metalwork from fourteenth-century Syria. The most impressive is a box now in the Louvre Museum made for a ruler of Aleppo, probably in 773/1371, that shows lions pursuing quadrupeds in a dense garden-like setting with flying birds and vegetation that includes large lotus blossoms.

The history and evolution of the compositional type of an inhabited garden in both Chinese and Iranian art needs further investigation, but certain points can be established. The binding of the *Makhzan al-asrār* manuscript belongs to an artistic and cultural tradition that mixes Near Eastern and Chinese elements. Its compositional elements probably derive from a palatine tradition that grew up in regions where Chinese and Near Eastern cultures interacted. The Iranian interpretation of such compositions probably also reflected this dual heritage. It was a theme that called to mind the linking of China to paradisiac gardens such as that of Iram and also alluded to the royal hunting preserves of Near Eastern rulers. It is this dual significance that explains the juxtaposition of animal combat with a setting of blossoming trees and plants filled with creatures both familiar and legendary. Timurid compositions have links to earlier Near Eastern visions of this setting; but they also reflect both the form and content of Chinese models, and these probably included objects or designs already used in the Ilkhanid period as well as those of Ming date.

The *Makhzan al-asrār* manuscript is also remarkable for the light-blue, gold-sprinkled and gold-painted paper on which it is written. The use of colored and decorated paper is an important innovation of the luxury book in Iran during the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries. The practice also spread to Central Asia, India, and Turkey during the sixteenth century. Decorated paper is employed for a few entire manuscripts during the fifteenth century, but in later periods it appears most frequently as a frame around the central portion of the page that contains the text or illustration. Decorated borders are particularly
elaborate in albums (murāqqa’s) containing specimens of calligraphy and painting. The use of decorated borders reaches a climax in Mughal India, where marginal paintings were evidently produced by leading court artists (Fig. 24).  

To date, no systematic study has been made of the role played by decorated paper in the aesthetic evolution of the Islamic book, but both physical and literary evidence indicates that this fashion was initiated by the introduction of colored and decorated paper from China. A clear statement about the uses of Chinese paper is contained in a versified treatise on calligraphy by the leading Timurid calligrapher, Sultan ‘Ali al-Mashhadi, which was probably composed in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. He extols the merits of Chinese paper and alludes to the various colors in which it was available:

Writing on it is good, it is also good for gold. It is excellent and it embellishes good writing. For writing, slightly tinted (nimāng) paper is suitable. That it should be restful to the eye. The red, green, and white colors Strike the eye, like looking at the sun. Darkish colors suit colored writing.  

Sultan ‘Ali’s verses imply that Chinese paper was available in a wide variety of hues, and this is confirmed by extant manuscripts and isolated pages preserved in albums. Zeren Tanind has counted seventy-four pages of calligraphy and one painting executed on colored paper in the two albums Hazine 2153 and 2160. The colors represented include green, violet, light blue, dark blue, and pink. Many of these pages are also flecked with gold, and most of them were copied for the Qara or Aq Qoyunlu rulers.

Colored and gold-sprinkled paper appears to have been particularly favored by members of these dynasties for official documents and correspondence. Examples include a fermān of Sultan Ya’qūb Aq Qoyunlu written by his chancery scribe (munshi), ‘Abd al-Hayy b. Hāfiz Shaykh Muhammad al-Bukhārī, in black and gold ink on deep mauve, gold-sprinkled paper (Hazine 2153, fol. 74b) and another on white, gold-sprinkled paper written by Ya’qūb’s vizier, Najm al-dīn Mas’ūd (Hazine 2153, fol. 86b).

The Turkmen were not the first to use colored paper for official correspondence. Hazine 2153 contains two fourteenth-century documents on colored paper. One, on grey paper, is dated to Muharram 727/December 1326; the other, on pale-pink paper, was copied in Kirmān during Ramaḍān 791/August–September 1387.

The practice of copying whole manuscripts on colored, decorated paper appears to have begun only during the fifteenth century. The earliest documented examples are two copies of the poetry of Farid al-dīn ‘Aṭṭār made for the Timurid ruler Shāh Rukh. One, now in the Topkapi Palace Library (A. 3059), is dated to 17 Shawwāl 841/9 April 1438. This volume is also well known for its binding, which is decorated with the landscape scenes mentioned above.  

A second copy of ‘Aṭṭār’s poetry was also made for Shāh Rukh and so must be earlier than 850/1447. It now belongs to the Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art (T.I.E.M. 1624).

No pages from these manuscripts have been published, but both A. Sakisian and M. Aga-Oglu have given brief descriptions of their appearance. Sakisian mentions that they contain “des paysages, des fleurs ou des arbres chinois,” and Aga-Oglu states that the Topkapi Saray manuscript is written on heavy paper of various colors, undoubtedly of Chinese manufacture, for it is speckled in gold or decorated in gold with river and valley landscapes, branches of fruit trees, and other motifs of Chinese pictorial art. The text of the book was subsequently executed over the gold illumination.

There are also three undated Koran manuscripts written on similar colored gold-sprinkled paper: one in the Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art (Y. 41), another in the Topkapi Palace Library (M. 100), and a third in the Detroit Institute of Arts (30.323).

Although there is no certainty that these three Korans were also produced in Herat during the reign of Shāh Rukh, they resemble the two ‘Aṭṭār manuscripts both in the type of paper on which they are written and in their dimensions. The ‘Aṭṭār manuscript of 841/1438 is 42.5 centimeters in height and 35.5 centimeters in width, and contains 1469 folios. The text is arranged in six columns of twenty-five lines each. The other ‘Aṭṭār manuscript is somewhat smaller (35 centimeters by 26 centimeters), but it contains the same number of lines per page.

The Topkapi Koran is 46.5 centimeters by 36 centimeters and contains 366 folios, each with eleven lines 25 centimeters in length. Exact dimensions are not available for the Koran now in the Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art; although it is substantially smaller than the museum’s ‘Aṭṭār manuscript, it too has eleven lines of text per page. The Detroit Koran measures 44.5 centimeters by 37.6 centimeters and has fifteen lines, 26.7 centimeters in length, per page.
When this group of manuscripts is compared to the *Makhzan al-asrār*, the discrepancy in size becomes obvious: the latter measures only 18 centimeters by 10.5 centimeters and contains a mere 35 folios. Several other manuscripts from the second half of the fifteenth century executed on gold-sprinkled or gold-painted paper have comparable dimensions. Another volume, a treatise on Sufism by a certain Abu ‘l-Vafā’, auctioned in 1977, is virtually identical in size with the *Makhzan al-asrār*. It measures 18 centimeters by 11 centimeters and contains 52 folios. The painted decoration on this paper also appears to be very similar to that of the *Makhzan al-asrār*. The manuscript on Sufism differs, however, from the *Makhzan al-asrār* because it is copied on several colors of paper, “pale blue, mauve, green, purple, apricot, and yellow ochre.” Nevertheless, these two small manuscripts may be of similar date and provenance.

Two manuscripts copied on ivory-colored, gold-sprinkled paper and linked to the patronage of Ya‘qūb’s brother and predecessor, Khalil Sulṭān, are also small-scale. The *Divān* of ‘Ali Shīr Nava’i now in Cairo and dated to 876/1467-72 measures 20 centimeters by 13 centimeters and contains 67 folios. The *Divān* of Hīdāyat in Dublin, which is dedicated to Khalil Sulṭān, measures 17 centimeters by 12 centimeters and contains 71 folios.

Three more manuscripts appear to link the Turkmen examples with the ‘Aṭṭār manuscripts produced for Shāh Rukh. The most important is a *Divān* of Ḥāfiz Shīrāzī copied in 851/1451 by Sulaymān Fūshāngī on tinted paper that is both gold-sprinkled and gold-painted. These paintings include seven with designs of bamboo, willows, pomegranates and other plants and twelve others with typical Chinese landscapes including such subjects as a pagoda set against a background of mountains and lakes.

This manuscript is strikingly similar to the *Makhzan al-asrār* in its dimensions. It contains 144 folios measuring 17.2 centimeters by 10.7 centimeters. The second is a *Divān* of Kamāl Khūjandī copied in 856/1453, apparently in Herat, which has already been mentioned because of the similarity between its binding and that of the *Makhzan al-asrār*. It measures 24 centimeters by 14.5 centimeters and contains 221 folios of gold-sprinkled paper. The third is the well-known poetic *Anthology* in the British Library copied by Sharaf al-dīn Ḥusayn “at Shamakha” in 873/1468. It measures 22.9 centimeters by 12.7 centimeters and has 89 folios. The paper on which it is written appears to be very similar to that used for the ‘Aṭṭār manuscripts and Korans mentioned above. The paper is ornamented with large flakes of gold and is colored lavender, purple, deep blue, chartreuse green, yellow-ochre, orange, light brown, and mauve.

The evidence currently available suggests that Chinese colored, gold-sprinkled paper was available in greater quantity at Herat during the reign of Shāh Rukh than in western Iran under the Turkmens. In both areas, however, it was clearly a material treasured by rulers and was used to prepare books of the highest quality. It is known from literary sources that decorated paper was produced in China as early as the Tang period. It was particularly prized for the writing of Buddhist *sutras*. Both yellow and dark blue paper was used for this purpose. The enthusiasm for colored and decorated paper also spread to Japan, where it was also used for secular texts.

A careful examination of manuscripts and single pages copied in Iran could also yield information about Chinese decorated paper. The small size of the *Makhzan al-asrār* manuscript makes it feasible to reconstruct the appearance of the paper from which it was made. An examination of the manuscript confirms that here, as in the ‘Aṭṭār manuscripts, the paper had been painted before it was cut into sheets. In most places the paintings appear rather haphazardly as the background of the text. An example of this is the small section of a leafy branch visible on the right side of the dedication pages (Fig. 1). In a few places, however, a substantial portion of the painting is visible at the center of a gathering (Fig. 18).

Working with photographs of the most highly decorated pages makes it is possible to reconstruct both the compositions of the paintings and the original dimensions of the paper on which they were painted. This reconstruction demonstrates that the original sheet was equal in height to twice the width of the sheet of a bifolium. Each individual page is 11 centimeters wide and the bifolium was 22 centimeters wide, so the original sheet must have been at least 44 centimeters high. Since a small part of the design also seems to be missing on the joints between pages, it is probable that the original sheet was 45 or 46 centimeters high. If all the pages were cut so that two fit into the width of the original sheet, the total length needed to create these 35 folios would have been at least 3.24 meters. An examination
of the paintings suggests, however, that the book was made from two separate sheets: one approximately 44 centimeters by 280 centimeters, used for folios 1 through 19; the other at least 144 centimeters in length, used for folios 20 through 35. The latter piece was probably somewhat longer than this minimum length because one of the pages at the center of a gathering (Fig. 18, fol. 20a) was cut from the length rather than width of the page.

Until the other Iranian manuscripts written on gold-spinkled or gold-painted paper are examined more closely, it will be uncertain whether they were made from paper of similar dimensions. There are, however, hints that such was the case. For example, the British Library Divān of Hāfiz (Add. 7759) is almost identical to the Makhzan al-asrār in its dimensions (17.2 centimeters by 10.7 centimeters versus 18 centimeters by 10.5 centimeters). Furthermore, the only published page of Add. 7759 appears to have been cut from the width of the Chinese paper in a fashion analogous to the Makhzan al-asrār pages.134

In the Makhzan al-asrār, the paper used for folios 1 through 19 has gold sprinkling on both sides, and one side also has a painted composition of two long-tailed birds with delicate plumage perched on facing branches of a blossoming fruit tree. The painting is executed with great skill, and the sensitive line used conveys the feeling of texture as well as a sense of volume (Fig. 15).

The theme of birds perched on the branches of blossoming fruit trees had a long popularity in Chinese painting. Compositions of this type were especially favored by painters in the Sung period, and their works were often imitated by later artists as well. The drawing of foliage and plumage as well as the composition used on these sheets of paper correspond very closely to a painting now in Cleveland that is linked to Ch‘ien Hsūn (ca. 1235–1300) (Fig. 16).135 This artist, evidently a professionally trained painter who became a scholar-recluse after the fall of the Sung dynasty in 1279, was noted for his depictions of flowers, birds, and animals. His work is said to have been avidly copied during and after his lifetime.136

The tradition of flower-and-bird painting was also practiced by such painters at the Ming court as Pien Wen-chien and Lü Chi, as well as by many lesser artists.137 The painting of birds on a flowering tree in the Makhzan al-asrār reflects this well-established and popular mode of Chinese painting.

The later folios, 20 through 35, were written on paper that already had paintings on both sides. They are oriented in opposite directions, so that the top of one composition is located over the bottom of the scene on the reverse (Fig. 20). One shows a landscape setting; the other, a loosely executed sketch of birds perched in a flowering tree. The painting of birds has compositional affinities with the more finely executed scene of birds discussed above but is painted in a sketchier manner (Figs. 15 and 19). This painting could even have been made by an Iranian craftsman, but this is unlikely because the tone of gold in which it is executed coincides with that used in the other paintings and so all the paintings must have been completed at the same time.

The landscape setting combines features found in various media of Chinese art. Some details of the composition have affinities with styles used by important landscape painters in their horizontal and vertical scrolls, but others are more reminiscent of gold-painted lacquer or wood-block prints. Furthermore, these elements provide somewhat contradictory visual signals (Fig. 17). Certain parts of the landscape, such as the rocky island that occupies the foreground, are drawn in a manner that suggests mass and weight, but the surrounding sea of gold-speckled paper negates any feeling of recession or depth. Similarly, the background shows a cluster of buildings surrounded by pine trees against barren hills. Here too these elements appear to both arise from and merge with the surrounding surface of gold-spinkled, blue paper. Linear wisps of clouds float above the hills to symbolize a zone of sky. Except for two birds—one flying, the other perched on a rock to the left of the rocky islands—the landscape is uninhabited.

The mixture of styles in this scene makes comparison with works by recognized Chinese painters difficult. The cluster of hills in the background has several overlapping layers arranged one in front of the other. The flatness of this arrangement is further accentuated by the interior modeling of these hills, which consists of short strokes parallel to the outer contours—a linear technique of depicting a range of hills that recalls the schematic renderings of landscapes in wood-block prints (Fig. 21).138 This landscape scheme also appears indebted to a passage from Huang Kung-wang’s Dwelling in the Fu-ch’un Mountains of 1347–50, where there is a foreground promontory and a low range of hills that fades out to the left.139 Despite some compositional links to Huang
Kung-wang’s painting, the flat and linear quality of the Makhzan al-asrär painting is more reminiscent of the style of his follower Ma Wan. The latter’s Spring Hills after Rain of 1366 (Fig. 22) contains features also found in the Makhzan al-asrär painting—low hills with multiple inner striations topped by sketchily executed pines or clusters of dots and a grove of pine trees rendered by parallel horizontal strokes. The Makhzan al-asrär painting is, however, rendered in a much simpler and more schematic manner.

If the background zone of the Makhzan al-asrär painting carries echoes of the style of Huang Kung-wang transformed into a formalized pattern and almost devoid of space, the foreground unit of a rocky promontory with undercut banks evokes another venerable Chinese landscape tradition. The handling of the concave surface of the left shoreline with its pronounced vertical strokes and of the foreground boulders with strongly accented angular highlights is reminiscent of works by early Ming painters who emulated aspects of the southern Sung landscape tradition represented by Ma Lin and Hsia Kuei. Similar forms are seen in Tai Chin’s The Hermit Hsù Yu Resting by a Stream, now in Cleveland (Fig. 23). Thus, in various ways the gold paintings in Makhzan al-asrär echo major themes in Chinese painting that are known to have been in vogue during the early Ming period. A fuller determination of their origin must await the collection of more information both from comparable Iranian manuscripts and from Chinese sources.

The ‘Aṣṭār manuscripts in Istanbul are said to contain landscapes that show mountains and rivers; but since they remain unpublished, it is impossible to ascertain whether those scenes are similar to the one from Makhzan al-asrär.

There are, however, two more examples that closely resemble the New York manuscript. One, an isolated light-blue, gold-painted page in Hazine 2153 on which Sultan ‘Ali al-Ya’qubi has copied poetry, shows two ranges of mountains rising out of a body of water. This page could well have come from another section of the paper used in the latter half of Makhzan al-asrär.

The other instance is the treatise on Sufism, mention above, that was recently sold at auction. A page illustrated in the sale catalogue shows two ranges of mountains rising out of a body of water and is executed in a style closely analogous to the isolated page in Istanbul. Other portions of the manuscript contain depictions of “blossom and twig” and may thus be analogous to the first portion of the Makhzan al-asrär.

The high esteem in which colored, decorated paper was held appears to have stimulated Iranian craftsmen to produce their own imitations of it. Biographical information contained in the treatise of Qādi Ahmad suggests that craftsmen at the Timurid court in Herat were producing their own colored paper during the reign of Shāh Rukh. ‘Abbās al-Haravī, one of the students of the chief Timurid calligrapher, Ja‘far Tabrizī, is said to have been proficient in this craft. ‘Abbās Allāh was active from the 1440s to the 1460s. There is no indication of how he learned to create colored, decorated paper. One of ‘Abbās Allāh’s contemporaries, Simī Nishāpūrī, was also known for his skill in gold-sprinkling. The technique was probably even more widely practiced in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Qādī Ahmad mentions several men noted for their skill in gold-sprinkling and in the production of colored papers: Muzaffār ‘Ali, Muhammad Ghiyāth al-dīn Muhammad Mudhahhib, and Muhammad Amīn Jadval-kash.

At present there is no way of distinguishing between the colored and decorated paper produced in Iran and that imported from China. Some of the calligraphy samples and manuscripts listed above may have been written on paper of Iranian manufacture. Gold-painted paper used in sixteenth-century albums and manuscripts that is ornamented in an Iranian style is assumed to be of local manufacture. There are also instances of calligraphy executed over gold-painted paper where the effect is reminiscent of the combination of images and text seen in the Makhzan al-asrär. One such example is the page of calligraphy by the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century calligrapher Khālīl Allāh al-Husaynī that is written over a gold scene of two birds perched in a blossoming fruit tree. During the sixteenth century, however, colored and decorated paper is usually confined to the borders of pages. One of the most popular themes of these borders are landscape settings closely analogous to those on the Makhzan al-asrär binding. The vogue also spread to India, and landscape scenes of this type are used in some Mughal albums, such as a page from one of Jahāṅgīr’s albums now in the Freer Gallery, Washington (Fig. 24).

Only some of the scenes depicted on Chinese decorated paper were imitated by Persian artists. Landscapes such as that on the paper used for Makhzan al-asrär do not appear to have been
copied, but birds perched on blossoming trees are commonly seen in Persian paintings. One instance, executed in the style used by Shaykhī Naqqāsh and now in the Nelson-Atkins Museum, depicts a couple under blossoming trees inhabited by several pairs of birds (Fig. 25). The shape of the trees and the drawing of the birds recall those in Chinese bird-and-flower paintings such as the one in the Makhzan al-asrār.

Despite its small size, the Makhzan al-asrār is an important example of an Iranian court manuscript. It is at once conventional and personal, typical and unique. A specific message for a specific patron was created from traditional ingredients. The personal elements, such as the possible allusions to royal charisma in the illumination and the ascetic message of the illustration, are only comprehensible when the historical situation surrounding the manuscript’s creation is considered. The “Chinese Paradise” or “Royal Hunting Preserve” of the binding carries a less specific message but one certainly in keeping with other facets of the book. Although it is difficult to assign a particular significance to the use of Chinese gilded and painted paper, the obvious beauty of the material and its value as an exotic item of prestige are in harmony with the other qualities of this book. Ya’qūb Aq Qoyunlu’s copy of Makhzan al-asrār exemplifies how the use of luxury manuscripts as a vehicle for the expression of royal prestige—a particular feature of Iranian book manufacture during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries—was enhanced and perhaps even stimulated by the presence of Chinese objects and designs.
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Fig. 22. *Spring Hills after Rain*. By Ma Wan. 1366. Section of a handscroll. National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 23. *Hermit Hsü Yu Resting by a Stream*. By Tai Chin. Ming Dynasty. Hanging scroll. Cleveland Museum of Art, The John L. Severance Fund, 74.75.

Fig. 24. Leaf from an album made for Jahāngīr with marginal drawings of a garden with animal combats. Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 56.12-1a.
Fig. 25. Couple under Flowering Trees. Tabriz, ca. 1480. William Rockhill Nelson Gallery, Atkins Museum of Fine Arts, 49-85. Gift of Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Nichols.
FĀṬIMID JEWELRY, ITS SUBTYPES AND INFLUENCES

By MARILYN JENKINS

In most cultures throughout the long history of art, jewelry crafted from the noblest of all metals was an important element of costume, especially for women but often also for men. As such, gold jewelry was presumably in constant use throughout the life of the cultures where it was made and where it was highly coveted as an element of adornment, and must have been subject to many of the same changes in fashion we have witnessed during our own lifetimes. Jewelry, like ceramics and other media, should therefore be an ever-present yet constantly changing guide to the time and place of manufacture. However, this is not so as regards the gold jewelry of the Islamic world; for although much of the jewelry has survived, dated pieces and those bearing inscriptions that would permit a secure attribution to a particular provenance are practically nonexistent, and as most of the extant pieces were unearthed in clandestine excavations, the possibility of determining the age and provenance from context has been lost forever. The would-be historian of Islamic jewelry is thus faced with a relatively large body of material containing few objects of secure date and provenance with which to reconstruct the history of the jewelry of the Muslim world.

This article will first present one of the few groups of Islamic jewelry that can be placed in a firm historical context. Then, with the objects in this group as a basis on which to build, other pieces related either by construction techniques, iconographical motifs, or both will be added to them; and the resulting, considerably enlarged, group will be presented as a series of subtypes heretofore unrecognized. Finally, the influence exerted by this important group on the jewelry of other periods and countries will be briefly discussed.

Fifty-eight years ago, an earthenware vase containing a cache of jewelry and eighty-two gold coins was found in Ifriqiya, present-day Tunisia. This important find is presently in the Bardo Museum, Tunis. Each of the coins bears the name of one of three Fāṭimid caliphs who ruled from Cairo (al-Hākim, al-Ẓāhir, or al-Mustanṣir) and dates from between 1003–4 and 1044–45. Seventy-three of the eighty-two coins were struck in the province of Ifriqiya during the period in which it was ruled by the Zirids dynasty in the name of the Fāṭimids (six in the city of Mahdiyya, and sixty-seven in the Zirid capital, Sabra-al-Mansūrīyya); one was minted in Cairo; eight do not bear any mint name. Fifty-seven bear the name of the caliph al-Mustanṣir and were minted between 1038–39 and 1044–45.

Georges Marçais and Louis Poinsot, the French scholars who published this material, were of the opinion that the treasure was constituted in Ifriqiya, in the region of Qayrawân, and must have been buried at the end of the Muslim year 436 or during the first few months of the year 437, which began on 19 July 1045, as there were fourteen coins dated 436 and none dated 437. They were also convinced that the reason for the burial of this hoard was the Shī‘ite persecution in Ifriqiya that culminated in 1049–50 in the striking of coins that did not mention the Fāṭimid overlords at all and in the eventual unleashing of the Arab hordes on Ifriqiya by the Fāṭimids in 1050–51 to punish their rebellious subordinates. Marçais and Poinsot thought that the owner of the hoard must have been one of the Fāṭimid faithful fleeing the pogrom of his peers and that he may have been on his way to a refuge in Ḥammādīd territory in present-day Algeria when he was overtaken and forced to bury his treasure.

Whatever the circumstances of the burial, we may assume that the latest coins constitute a terminus ante quem for the jewelry; and since all of the latter is, as we shall see, related by means of construction techniques, iconographical motifs, or both, we may further assume that all the jewelry is more or less contemporary. It also seems quite likely that the jewelry and the coins are closely related in time. As to the provenance, we cannot be certain whether the jewelry was made in Ifriqiya or Egypt, but since we do know from Geniza documents that the Zirīd royal family (specifically, the mother of al-Mu‘izz) imported jewels from Egypt in the 1030s, an Egyptian provenance seems a strong possibility.

Thus, the two bracelets, three earrings, six triangular elements, and eighty-two beads found in the earthenware jar may be seen as having been produced in the Fāṭimid period before the end of the year 1045, and very likely in Egypt.

The six triangular elements (Fig. 1) are all identical. Each one consists of two open-work
triangular pieces connected to one another, as well as separated from one another, by thin strips of gold. One of the strips is placed around the sides of the triangle and bears nine evenly spaced gold loops. The other strips surround the variously shaped openings in the triangle. The box-like construction of these gold elements and the use of gold loops for supporting strings of pearls or semiprecious stones are hallmarks of Fāṭimid jewelry. An open-work surface, in this case formed of gold wires bent into S-curves, is also, as we shall see, a very common feature of the gold jewelry of this period. It should be noted that the small S-curves must have been supported in the same way as the open-work decoration on another object from this hoard—by an arrangement of small gold strips on the back of the open-work area. The original publication makes no mention of the fact, but a support of some sort would have been needed for any such totally filigree-constructed piece. Since the stick-like strip support is peculiar to Fāṭimid jewelry, it seems reasonable to assume that these triangular elements were constructed with such supports (the present author, however, has not been able to examine these pieces closely).

One of the three earrings found in the Ifriqiya hoard (Fig. 2) has the same box-like construction seen on the triangular elements as well as the same gold loops on the gold dividing and connecting strip, and there are three additional loops on the two decorated surfaces, from which small pendants may have been suspended. These decorated surfaces, semicircular in form, consist solely of an open-work design formed of twisted gold wires supported by an arrangement of gold strips that in this case is mentioned in the original French publication. Furthermore, most of these twisted wires are laid in pairs, giving somewhat the effect of braided gold wire. The other two earrings in the hoard (Fig. 3), forming a pair, also exhibit the box-like construction and gold loops, which, as may have been the case with similar loops on the earrings mentioned above (Fig. 2), may have been for the suspension of small pendants. Here, however, the loops occur only on the faces of the earrings. Each earring is composed of seven crescents formed of gold sheet and sparsely decorated with twisted wires. The two hemispheres decorated with a granule fused to a circle of twisted wires are another decorative device often found on the jewelry of this period.

Five beads are the other pieces from the hoard relevant to the present discussion. Each of them is composed of two, six-part floral designs constructed of gold wire fused over a domed hexagonal sheet (Figs. 4a–b).

These fourteen objects exhibit a number of characteristic features seen on many gold objects that have not been found in a datable context, namely the following: the box-like construction, the open-work surface with a strip support, the use of gold loops, S-curves, single or paired twisted wires, the crescent shape, hemispheres surmounted by a granule fused to a circle of twisted wires, and the arabesque motif. With these features as a basis on which to build, an attempt will now be made to enlarge considerably this group of datable Fāṭimid jewelry.

The six triangular elements, three earrings, and five beads that have just been discussed bear no granulation, their decoration being effected solely in filigree. As such, they represent the “last phase” of what Marc Rosenberg has called “the battle of granulation and filigree,” in which the latter, according to Rosenberg, finally triumphed. Further examples of this particular phase may be seen in two pendants now respectively in the collections of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and the L. A. Mayer Memorial Institute for Islamic Art, Jerusalem (Figs. 5a–b and 6). The pendant in the Metropolitan Museum exhibits the box-like construction, crescent shape, gold loops (though here made of fused coiled wire), open-work design with strip support, S-curves, and paired twisted wires that are seen on the Ifriqiyan objects, as well as a quite highly developed arabesque design. The set stone and cloisonné inset panel, however, are decorative devices that are not found on this material. The Jerusalem pendant also has a cloisonné inset and employs the box-like construction, open-work design with strip support, S-curves, and single and paired twisted wires found on the Ifriqiyan objects; another point of comparison is the trilobed floral design, which is found on the five beads.

A pair of earrings now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Figs. 7a–c) bears decoration that incorporates some granulation and therefore represents a somewhat earlier phase in Rosenberg’s “battle” than either the objects from the hoard or the two pendants that have just been discussed; but how much earlier a phase, assuming his progression, it is impossible to say. In addition to the box-like construction, crescent shape, gold loops (here also of fused coiled wire), open-work decoration with a strip support, S-curves, paired twisted wires, and an arabesque design incorporating the
same trilobed floral motifs seen on the beads in the hoard, there are hemispheres decorated with a granule fused to a circle of twisted wires similar to the ones on two of the earrings from the Ifrīqiyan hoard (Fig. 3).

Another group of objects (Figs. 8–11) represents a still earlier phase in Rosenberg’s progression; all the objects belong to his “middle phase” when the granules were placed on paired wires with the result that the filigree and granulation could be said to be on an equal footing. All the elements incorporated in these objects have been met with before. The strip support that has been discussed above may be seen very clearly on the obverse of the pendant where the original cloisonné inset has fallen out (Fig. 8a).

The last group of Fātimid jewelry that will be discussed represents the earliest recognizable phase in Rosenberg’s “battle” as regards the jewelry of this period. Granulation not only is more prominent on this particular group of objects but also occurs in more than one size and, therefore, vis-à-vis Rosenberg’s “battle,” still holds the upper hand in this phase. The objects in this group (Figs. 12–17) are also finer in every way than any of the objects discussed so far, and their decoration is the most complex. The characteristic features of Fātimid jewelry mentioned above have been incorporated in these objects, and the hemispheres on the reverse of the earrings (Fig. 12) are closer to those comprising the beads from the hoard than others that have been discussed. The ring in this group of objects (Fig. 13), in addition to the features described above, incorporates figural iconography within the familiar arabesque decoration, in the form of a large-tailed bird that may be seen on the left shoulder of the object. This iconography may also be seen on the necklace element within the group (Fig. 14).

Although Rosenberg’s lead in seeing an historical progression in the battle between granulation and filigree has been followed in the preceding discussion, there remains the possibility that the various groups were contemporary but made in different workshops. Even if one accepts the theory that there is an historical progression, the close similarity among the objects in the various groups makes it highly likely that the “battle” was a quick one, at least in the case of Fātimid Egypt.9

Let us now turn to a brief discussion of the influence exerted on the jewelry art of other periods and countries by the Fātimid group that has just been isolated and described.

A bead now in the L. A. Meyer Memorial Institute for Islamic Art (Fig. 18) must be considered if not a later then at least a simpler version of the open-work granulated bead that was part of a cache found in Caesarea and now in the Israel Museum (Fig. 17).10 The former bead, constructed as it is of two cones of gold sheet decorated with twisted wires, leads us directly into the last section of our discussion.

A pendant from a Nasrid Spanish necklace (Figs. 19a–b) now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, exhibits not only the decoration of twisted wires on a gold sheet such as was seen on the Fātimid bead (Fig. 18) but the two most common features of Fātimid goldwork: the box-like construction and the gold loops. On such pieces, which are usually dated to the fifteenth century,11 not only has the amount of work necessary to execute the front of the pendants been simplified but the decoration on the back has been accomplished by simply burnishing a gold sheet over the decorated front side of the pendant.

Another pendant in the New York Metropolitan Museum (Figs. 20a–b) is also Spanish. It is a richer version of the one just discussed and perhaps also an earlier one for its open-work and granulated decoration and cloisonné inlays are even closer to the Fātimid prototypes.12

A bead executed in Nasrid Spain (Figs. 21a–b) now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art also shows an indebtedness to the earlier Fātimid beads, being similarly constructed of wires fused to a gold sheet.

As might be expected, however, the strong Fātimid influence on Spanish jewelry appears to have begun much earlier than the Nasrid period. A group of jewelry (Figs. 22a–b) now in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, was, according to the dealer, found at Madīn al-Zahrā’,13 the Umayyad royal residence outside Cordova destroyed in 1021. This terminus ante quem fits quite well with the one of 1045 established for the Ifrīqiyan cache, as the al-Zahrā’ group contains seven gold pieces (five fish elements and two crescent-shaped pendants) that are very closely related to the Fātimid objects discussed above. These seven pieces (Fig. 22a), while incorporating many of the features discussed in connection with the Fātimid group, also contain certain peculiarities that are not found on objects in this group. At this stage in our knowledge, it is impossible to say for sure whether these seven elements were manufactured in the same center as the Fātimid objects were or in Spain. On the other hand,
the seven star-shaped elements in the al-Zahrā’ group (see, for example, Fig. 22b), though showing Fāṭimid influence in the box-like construction and the gold loops, differ enough from the Egyptian pieces that they should probably be seen as contemporary Spanish products exhibiting techniques that were continued on the Nasrid work, such as wire decoration on gold sheet, granulation strewn on a surface, and cloisonné insets.¹⁴

A group comprising both coins and jewelry (Fig. 23) was found in Spain and entered the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, in 1870.¹⁵ The coins date from the eleventh and twelfth centuries; one element of the jewelry (the uppermost element in Fig. 23) has the same star-shaped configuration, wire decoration on gold sheet, hollow hemispheres, and box-like construction seen on the Madinat al-Zahrā’ group. An object (Fig. 24) from the same period was excavated in the 1880s near Granada at Madinat Elvira,¹⁶ which, like al-Zahrā’, was destroyed in 1021 during a civil war. This element bears such a close resemblance to the pair of earrings from the Ifriqiyan hoard that one may assume it was imported; if in fact it was, it would be evidence for how Spanish jewelry came to be so strongly influenced by that from Fāṭimid Egypt.

The strong traditionalism in the Mediterranean basin, as regards jewelry at least, extends in time far beyond the Nasrid dynasty. In nineteenth-century North Africa we find beads, both round and biconical, as well as triangular elements that are very similar to what must ultimately have been their Egyptian prototypes crafted eight hundred years earlier (Figs. 25–27).

The intent of this article has been to provide the reader with a clearer picture of one of the few datable groups of Islamic jewelry as well as some idea of its influence on the jewelry art of other countries, an influence that has persisted into our own time.¹⁷
Notes

The author wishes to thank Manuel Keene, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, for his valuable suggestions and Dr. Zdenka Munzer for her kind assistance with various sources consulted. This article was originally delivered as a lecture during the annual meeting of the American Research Center in Egypt held in Detroit in May 1977 and subsequently submitted in its present form to Kunst des Orientes in the winter of 1978. The following represents and remains the author's first work on the subject of Islamic jewelry in general and Fatimid jewelry in particular, her subsequent work in this medium notwithstanding (Marilyn Jenkins and Manuel Keene, "Djawhar," The Encyclopaedia of Islam, supplement to v. 2, new ed., Lieden, 1982, pp. 250–62; idem, Islamic Jewelry in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1983; Marilyn Jenkins, "Architectural Ornament and Decorative Arts," Treasures of Islam, exhibition catalogue, Musée Rath, Geneva, London, 1985, pp. 200–7; and idem, "Mamluk Jewelry: Influences and Echoes," Muqarnas, v. 5, 1988).

1. The only Islamic jewelry known to the present author that bears such an inscription is a pair of bracelets, divided between the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (Accession No. 57.88a–c) and the Freer Gallery, Washington (Accession No. 58.6). The bracelets incorporate in their decoration four thin gold discs with inscriptions created by burnishing the discs over a coin bearing the name of the 'Abbasid caliph al-Qadi billa (991–1031), which, according to the late George Miles, was probably struck in Nishapur, Iran, and is in the style of those minted during the reign of Mahmud of Ghazna. The only other exception to this statement appears to be the well-documented manufacture of jewelry in India and other Middle Eastern countries during the last two hundred years.


4. Four additional triangular elements found in Algeria may be added to this group of six. Two are in the Musée Stéfan Gsell, Algiers; the others are in the Musée Gustav Mercier, Constantine. Only one of the four is appreciably different from the others; the triangles are composed of two gold sheets decorated with wire instead of two open-work pieces.


7. The various subtypes of Fatimid jewelry are illustrated here with selected examples. The groups presented, therefore, do not profess to be complete.

8. Marc Rosenberg, Abteilung: Granulation, v. 3 of Geschichte der Goldschmiedekunst auf Technischer Grundlage, Frankfurt, 1918, pp. 96–103. See the following discussion for the present author's conclusions as to the validity of Rosenberg's chronology.

9. This flowering of the granulation technique during the first one hundred years of the Fatimid period is an enigma. One is unable to point to other similarly fine granulation in the area after the Hellenistic period; and the technique of filigree construction, not to mention its further elaboration with granulation on the wires, seems to have had no precedent and to have died out after this particular group ceased being made. However, as we shall see in the piece illustrated in Figs. 20a–b, somewhat the same effect is achieved by putting a line of granules between plain wires on a background of pierced and cut-away gold sheet.


12. Rosenberg, Abteilung: Granulation, p. 154, attributes this pendant to ca. 1325. See also n. 9 above regarding the closeness of this piece to its Fatimid prototypes.


14. We know that jewelry was made by expert craftsmen at Madinat al-Zahrā’ for distribution by the caliph to his wives, favorites, and important visitors; see E. Lévi-Provençal, Historie de l'Espagne musulmane, Paris and Leiden, 1950, v. 2, p. 129


17. It will be obvious to those familiar with recent jewelry from the central and eastern Islamic lands that this long chain of continuity in design and construction was not confined to the Maghrib.
Fig. 1. One of six identical triangular elements from a cache of coins and jewelry found in Ifriqiya (present-day Tunisia). (After Marçais and Poinssot.)

Fig. 2. Earring from a cache of coins and jewelry found in Ifriqiya. (After Marçais and Poinssot.)

Fig. 3. One of a pair of earrings from a cache of coins and jewelry found in Ifriqiya. (After Marçais and Poinssot.)

Fig. 4a. One of five identical beads from a cache of coins and jewelry found in Ifriqiya. (After Marçais and Poinssot.)

Fig. 4b. Drawing of half of the bead in Figure 4a.
Fig. 5a. Pendant with cloisonné inset. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Fig. 5b. Reverse of Figure 5a.

Fig. 6. Central element from a necklace. Courtesy, L. A. Mayer Memorial Institute for Islamic Art, Jerusalem.
Fig. 7a. One of a pair of earrings. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Fig. 7b. Side view of Figure 7a.

Fig. 7c. Reverse of Figure 7a.
Fig. 8a. Pendant. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Fig. 8b. Reverse of Figure 8a.
Fig. 9. Pair of pins. Courtesy, L. A. Mayer Memorial Institute for Islamic Art, Jerusalem.

Fig. 10. Ring. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Fig. 11. Double-headed eagle. Courtesy, L. A. Mayer Memorial Institute for Islamic Art, Jerusalem.
Fig. 12. Pair of earrings. Courtesy, L. A. Mayer Memorial Institute for Islamic Art, Jerusalem.

Fig. 13. Ring. Courtesy, L. A. Mayer Memorial Institute for Islamic Art, Jerusalem.
Fig. 14. Element from a necklace, obverse. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Fig. 15. Bracelet. Courtesy, The Detroit Institute of Arts.

Fig. 16. Spacer. Courtesy, L. A. Mayer Memorial Institute for Islamic Art, Jerusalem.
Fig. 17. Bead. By courtesy of the Israel Department of Antiquities, exhibited in the Israel Museum.

Fig. 18. Bead. Courtesy, L. A. Mayer Memorial Institute for Islamic Art, Jerusalem.
Fig. 19a. Pendant. Spanish, Nasrid period. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Fig. 19b. Reverse of Figure 19a.
Fig. 20a. Pendant. Spanish, Nasrid period. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Fig. 20b. Reverse of Figure 20a.
Fig. 21a. Bead. Spanish, Nasrid period. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Fig. 21b. Underside of Figure 21a.

Fig. 22b. Star-shaped elements from Figure 22a.
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Fig. 224. Jewelry said to have been found at Madīnat al-Zahra', destroyed 1021. Courtesy, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore.
Fig. 23. Cache of coins and jewelry from an eleventh/twelfth century site, Spain. Copyright, Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
Fig. 24. Element, from Madinat Elvira, destroyed 1021. (After Gómez-Moreno.)

Fig. 25. Bead. North African, nineteenth century. (After J. Besancenot, Bijoux Arabes et Berbères du Maroc, Casablanca, n.d.)

Fig. 26. Bead. North African, nineteenth century. (After Besancenot.)

Fig. 27. Fibula. North African, nineteenth century. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE ALONG THE MONGOLIAN ROAD TO DADU

BY NANCY SHATZMAN STEINHARDT

The residential architecture of the Mongolian steppe where Chinggis Qan (Khan) was born in the mid-twelfth century consisted exclusively of tents. These tents had cylindrical bases and conical tops. The floors of the tents were covered with mats, and the walls and roofs with animal skins. Everyone from the tribal chieftain to the most lowly of men had this type of dwelling, and for formal occasions the chieftains had “great golden tents” decorated with gold leaf on the thresholds, which hosted more than one hundred people. In addition to residential tents, tents were erected for the hunt, for war, and for the reception of guests. Groups of tents were arranged in a circle around the tribal chieftain’s. In the Secret History of the Mongols, no Mongolian dwelling other than a tent is mentioned. In descriptions of Mongolian camps written by non-Mong ol visitors, tent dwellings are also described.

A change occurs in the architecture of the steppe before the death of Chinggis Qan in 1227. Accounts of Mongolian settlements after the time of Chinggis record structures of more permanent materials standing alongside tents. By the thirteenth century Mongolian tents had wooden doors. But with the exception of the brief period during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries when the Mongols ruled China and lands to the west, the residential architecture of the Mongolian steppe was that of tents. Even today pre-Chinggisid style settlements can be observed, and except for a few modern cities like Ulaan Baatar (Ulan Bator) Hohhot, or Erenhot, neither individual buildings nor urban patterns approach the scale or complexity of what stood in the Mongolian People’s Republic or the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region between the mid-thirteenth and mid-fourteenth centuries.

The transformation of the Mongols from steppe nomads to sedentary lords in the thirteenth century has been discussed and interpreted. Equally remarkable was the return of the Mongols to a primarily nomadic lifestyle on the steppe, one that included tent dwelling, after native forces reconquered China in 1368. Interpretations vary regarding the degree of Sinification that occurred among the Mongols in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; but even though it is a fact that behind the walls of the Mongol occupied Chinese capital Dadu, whose ruins are today beneath the Chinese capital Beijing, shamanistic rites of the steppe were enacted and Mongolian princes-of-the-blood slept in tents, it is also a fact that city construction was part of the Mongolian vision of empire building. The purpose here is to investigate the plans and architecture of cities and towns built by imperial Mongolian patronage, and the building traditions to which these former tent-dwelling patrons turned for their urban forms, between the mid-thirteenth and mid-fourteenth centuries.

Imperial Mongolian construction began at Qara Qorum (Khora Khorum). Although the city was used by the Mongols at the time of Chinggis, who may even have resided there occasionally, Qara Qorum’s most important patrons were Chinggis’ third son and successor Ögedei (r. as Qaghan [Khaghan], 1229–41), Ögedei’s son and successor Güyük (r. 1246–48), and Chinggis’ grandson, Möngke (r. 1251–59). In 1256, Qubilai (Khubilai), not yet Qaghan, built the second important Mongolian capital, at Kaiping Fu, nearly four hundred kilometers northeast of modern Beijing in the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region. Qara Qorum, Kaiping Fu (known as Shangdu, the upper capital, after 1264), and Dadu were the three major imperial Mongolian achievements in urban architecture. Each was distinct from the other two, and each served a different purpose.

Between them, along the Mongolian road from Qara Qorum to Dadu, stood other capitals, lesser imperial seats, princely residences, and temporary imperial residences—Almaliqu, Yingchang Lu, Anxi Wang Fu, and Kondui, among others (Fig. 1). Each of them, and the three main capitals, has been at least partially excavated. Archeology not only has revealed their locations but has confirmed that city building of the Mongolian empire in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was far more widespread and complex than would have been warranted by the necessities of government-administrative centers of steppe nomads.

Qara Qorum

The location of Qara Qorum was still unknown
at the beginning of the nineteenth century. In 1817 a site was suggested by Abel-Rémusat. Several years later, Iakinf Bichurin, best known for his translations of Chinese texts into Russian, mentioned the site of Qara Qorum in his writings. Excavation at Qara Qorum began at the end of the century under the supervision of A. M. Pozdneev, and a second excavation team was headed by V. V. Radlov. At approximately the same time, Henri Cordier wrote an article on Qara Qorum based on literary material. The late nineteenth-century excavators relied on the same texts to confirm the authenticity of what they found.

One of the most widely used texts was Friar William of Rubruck’s account of his journey to Mongolia, which had included an audience with Möngke Qaghan at Qara Qorum. Friar William’s record of the events of the spring of 1253 is the only description of Möngke’s audience hall, and even the most recent Soviet excavation at Qara Qorum in the mid-twentieth century consulted it.

The passage that has been of greatest interest to archeologists is the following:

And the palace is like a church, with a middle nave, and two sides beyond two rows of pillars, and with three doors to the south, and beyond the middle door on the inside stands the tree, and the Khan sits in a high place to the north, so that he can be seen by all; and two rows of steps to lead up to him; by one he who carries his cup goes up, and by the other he comes down. The space which is in the middle between the tree and these steps by which they go up to him is empty: for here stands his cup-bearer, and also envoy bearing presents; and he himself sits up there like a divinity. On his right side, that is to the west, are the men, to the left are the women. The palace extends from the north southward. To the south, beside the pillars on the right side, are rows of seats raised like a platform, on which his son and brothers sit. On the left side it is arranged in like fashion, and there sit his wives and daughters. Only one woman sits up there beside him, though not so high as he.

The Persian historian ‘Ala-al-Din ‘Ata-Malik Juvayni, who resided in Qara Qorum for a little over a year from 1252 to 1253, also left a description of the palace in his writings:

Hither artisans were brought from Khitai, and likewise craftsmen from the lands of Islam; and they began to till the ground. And because of Qa’an’s great bounty and munificence people turned their faces thitherward from every side, and in a short space of time it became a city. Above the town a garden was built for Qa’an with four gates, one for the passage of the World-Ruling Emperor, another for his children and kinsmen, another again for the princesses, and a fourth for the entrance and egress of the populace. And in the midst of that garden Khitayan artisans reared up a castle with doors like the gates of the garden; and inside it a throne having three flights of steps, one for Qa’an alone, another for his ladies and a third for the cupbearers and table-deckers; and on the right and left houses for his brothers and sons and the taguy [i.e. day-time imperial guards], [the walls of these houses being] painted with pictures. And in the quarters of the cupbearers they placed vats which could not be moved because of their weight and other utensils in like proportion, besides elephants, camels, horses, and their attendants in appropriate numbers, so that when a public feast was held they might lift up the various beverages . . . . Twice in the year would Qa’an alight in this pleasant abode . . . .

From the following century survive several epigraphic references to Qara Qorum, one of which contains construction dates and building names for the city. That one, carved in stone in 1346, has been known by Mongologists since the end of the nineteenth century and was fully translated by Francis Cleaves in 1952.

The inscription provides a chronology for the city: It was established in 1220 by Chinggis; Ögödei built the first palace there and commenced the construction of a Buddhist structure completed by Möngke, who added more Buddhist buildings to what became the monastery Zhihuan (Jetavana) Si, one of whose buildings was a five-story pavilion (ge²) of seven bays square with images on each interior side; this structure was repaired by Büyük Qaghan (Wuzong) in 1311; between 1342 and 1346 a pagoda from the same monastery was repaired and the pavilion was enlarged and surrounded by a new wall, at which time its name was changed from Dage (Great Pavilion) Monastery to Xingyuan (Rising Yuan) Monastery.

Soviet excavation of Qara Qorum beginning in 1948 under the directorship of Sergei Kiselev yielded more evidence of the city’s history. The earliest dated objects uncovered by Kiselev’s team were from the Tang dynasty (618–906) in China. They proved that the site had been inhabited by followers of the Buddhist faith who used Tang-crafted objects of devotion. Kiselev’s findings confirmed that Qara Qorum had been a commercial and handicraft center, as well as a military camp, during the time of Chinggis. The walled city and halls inside, however, were not built until the reign of Ögödei, in 1235. The occupation of Qara Qorum as a semi-permanent, imperial Mongolian site in the generation after Chinggis is further confirmed by Kiselev’s excavation of some tombs, one of which contained a child’s wooden coffin on
one plank of which was carved  newItemType, an emblem restricted to blood relations of Chinggis.\(^17\)

The city Qara Qorum stood on an artificial hill composed of alternate layers of sand and clay. Surrounding it was an earthen wall some one thousand meters on the north side, approximately one and one-half times that distance on the west, and twice the distance on the east.\(^18\) Water, channeled in from the east by a canal whose ultimate source was the Orkhon River more than five kilometers away, surrounded Qara Qorum's outer wall (Fig. 2). Ögödei's palace area, further enclosed by a wall, was situated in the southwestern part of the greater walled city (Fig. 5). Permanent and non-permanent structures of the inner city were arranged in relation to an architectural line that ran northwest to southeast. Its dimensions along the diagonals from northwest to southeast and northeast to southwest were approximately the same (255 and 225 meters, respectively). When Kiselev excavated the site at mid-century he estimated that the inner wall had been about a meter high, with a thickness from fifteen to eighteen meters.\(^19\) One peculiarity of it was a double-wall portion on the north(west) side. A pond in the southeast of the palace area was joined to the outer city moat. Near the southwest corner of the inner city was a gate that measured thirty-six meters across and seventeen meters in depth (Fig. 3, no. 1). The entry corresponded to the main south gate, positioned in the south center of the south wall of a traditional Chinese imperial city, such as the Vermillion Sparrow (Zhuque \(\text{qiao}^2\)) Gate of the Tang capital at Chang'an or the Meridian (\(\text{Wu}^4\)) Gate of the Forbidden City in Beijing. A second, similarly sized gate stood behind this entry on the same axis (Fig. 3, no. 2). Northwest of the two gates were two large and permanent halls (Fig. 3, nos. 3 and 4), one of which may have been, according to Kiselev, Wan'an Gong' (palace-complex), a building group mentioned by Rashid al-Din (whose source was Juvayni, quoted above), which was built in 1235 and had reception chambers for official banquets or guests.\(^20\)

The first hall (Fig. 3, no. 3) measured forty by eleven meters and was raised on a platform three-quarters of a meter high. The second (Fig. 3, no. 4) was more than twice as large, eighty by fifty-five meters perhaps, but slightly to the east of the main axis. The platform on which the second hall stood was more than three meters high. The third platform (Fig. 3, no. 5), occupying an area of thirty-eight by twenty-five meters, was elevated two and one-half meters. It was aligned with the two halls and gates southeast of it. The three platforms were connected by paved ways raised twenty to thirty centimeters above ground level. East and west of the main route were excavated four symmetrically placed mounds, two on each side (Fig. 3, nos. 6a–6d). Small objects, but no architectural fragments, were found on them. A low circular mound was also uncovered at the northernmost portion of the main axis (Fig. 3, no. 7).

Kiselev has suggested that the four mounds (Fig. 3, nos. 6a–6d) were the sites of tents.\(^21\) The three more permanent foundations bear a close resemblance to the Chinese architectural formation reserved for high-ranking building complexes, the gong\(^6\) plan, named for the similarities between the character and the architectural arrangement. The scheme of three main halls, the front and back of which are longer in the east-west (in this case northeast-southwest) dimension and are either joined by a covered way or have a smaller building mid-way between them, is the predominant imperial plan for audience and banquet halls or main residential imperial or even religious structures of any Chinese setting from as early as building remains are known. This formation is in evidence in the plans of China's pre- and post-Mongolian period imperial cities, as well as in the imperial city of Dadu (Fig. 4, nos. 13, 14, 16, and 17).\(^22\) The enclosure of an inner palace-city within the outer wall, the enclosure of the outer city by a moat, the excavation of what Kiselev believed to have been four corner towers of the outer wall, and the gong plan all point to China as the architectural source for the city that Ögödei built in Mongolia in 1235. Certainly the architectural forms were different from anything that had previously stood at Qara Qorum, with the possible exception of a Tang garrison town that may have been the source of some of the Buddhist remains uncovered by Kiselev.

Architectural components and fragments again all point to Chinese sources. Each main hall was supported by regularly spaced pillars lodged into stone bases (Fig. 5). Stone tortoises, bases for imperial stele since the last centuries B.C. in China, were found at the site (Fig. 6). Roof decoration included Chinese ceramic dragons (Fig. 7) and dragon- or demon-faced stone architectural members, of the kind probably employed in Qubilai's main hall of audience thirty or forty years later at Dadu, were also uncovered in great numbers (see Figs. 13 and 23).\(^23\) Kiselev was so convinced of the Chinese nature of architecture at Qara Qo-
rum that he suggested that every building had a Chinese-style roof.24

The majority of porcelain objects found by Kiselev’s team at Qara Qorum were Chinese wares, including Gzhou and blue-and-green porcelains of the Song dynasty (960–1279), the period that preceded Mongolian rule in China.25 The excavated material is evidence of the opening line from Juvaini quoted above, in which craftsmen from China (Khitay) are singled out among the foreign craftsmen in the city. Indeed, the impact of Chinese wares on the city and its non-Chinese beholders must have been profound; and the visual splendor, completely foreign to the now imperial Mongolian patrons of the city, may have enhanced their perceptions of themselves as Chinese-style rulers.

If one turns to the goods of non-Chinese manufacture during the reigns of Ögedei and Möngke, however, one finds evidence of a different circumstance of Mongolian rule in Asia. Excavation behind the palace sector of Qara Qorum confirmed that objects representing almost every craft in Asia in the thirteenth century were being produced.26 It is a fact that craftsmen were among the lucky few spared death during the Mongolian conquest of Eurasia, and that these men, capable of divinely inspired creation in the eyes of their captors, were transferred from place to place as the Mongolian building program dictated. The most famous non-Mongol craftsman-slave of the Qan at Qara Qorum may have been Guillaume Boucher, immortalized by Friar William of Rubruck’s confirmation of his presence and a twentieth-century study of the man and his craft; but much drier history names others, and captive-taking of the sort described in the historical record is further confirmed by visual evidence.27 Yet even the foreign craftsmen at Qara Qorum were quartered in a building with a central heating system, a feature that, like the rest of Qara Qorum’s architecture, must have been learned almost exclusively from China.28 Thus it is in the portable goods made by these craftsmen, almost exclusively, that the multinationality of the Mongolian empire, and its presence in the city, can be observed.

Interior walls of some of Qara Qorum’s buildings were decorated with Buddhist deities whose schools of origin appear to have been Chinese and Central Asian, an assessment based on facial features, line quality, and shading (Fig. 8).29 Other wall paintings, such as the seated prince (Fig. 9), however, reveal provincial Iranian models, perhaps those of Soghdian sites such as Pendzhikent.30 The multinational makeup of Qara Qorum’s community of craftsmen is also confirmed by the excavation of beads: they were produced by Turkic-speaking Muslims from the Bulgar region.31

The confirmable presence of craftsmen from the westernmost regions of Asia and from most of the sedentary civilizations between there and China emphasizes the fact that the purposes of architecture, ceramics, and the other decorative arts were each different. Chinese ceramics no doubt enhanced the Mongols’ perception of themselves as Chinese-style rulers, but they were technically among the most sophisticated produced by any Asian civilization up to that time and thus were prized not only because they were Chinese but because they were beautiful. Other crafts supplied the artifacts lacking in the Mongols’ nomadic culture and simply reflected the nationalities of craftsmen transferred there. Architecture, however, had an especially deeply rooted purpose in the imperial Mongolian grand plan. Thus, while the Mongols turned to many international sources in creating the artifacts lacking in their nomadic tradition, in creating the permanent architecture that was to express their imperial ambitions, it was to China that they turned for the most powerful visual imperial symbols offered by Asia.

It is almost ironic that such visually splendid, culturally identifiable, and highly symbolic architecture was as simple to construct and as easily adaptable as was any complex architectural system in thirteenth-century Eurasia. Behind the walls and beneath the glazed tile roofs that projected over them, any lifestyle, including tent dwelling,32 and any decorative system could be hidden and maintained. The easily constructed post-and-lintel structure could be enlarged, limited, or reorganized to accommodate animal skin wall hangings and felt floor mats.33 Even were it not so unobtrusive to their native lifestyle, the Mongols probably would have built Chinese halls and cities anyway. The architecture of China’s cities, seen by the Mongols in the first decades of the thirteenth century during their conquest of the non-Chinese dynasty Jin, then reigning in north China, had been employed since the eighth century by earlier empire builders in East Asia, including the Jin, seeking to establish Chinese-style dynasties.34 From Qara Qorum the Mongols would turn to China again as Chinggis’ descendants made their way along the road to Dadu.

**Shangdu**

The history of the city at Kaiping Fu, later to
become the upper capital Shangdu, began in 1256 with the issue of an order by Möngke Qaghan to his younger brother Qubilai, already in East Asia, to found a city nine 里 northwest of what is today Dolonnur in the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region. Qubilai authorized his Chinese minister Liu Bingzhong to supervise the construction.\textsuperscript{35} This first city of Qubilai in East Asia served as his main imperial capital until the construction of Dadu, which began in 1267.

Shangdu was a three-walled city, consisting of a palace-enclosure known as gongcheng, an administrative sector that enclosed the palace-city called huangcheng,\textsuperscript{4} literally imperial city, and the great outer walled area, dacheng (Fig. 10).\textsuperscript{56} Oriented seven degrees east of due north, its outer wall spanned nearly two and one-half kilometers on each side and was four to six meters in height. The wall was made according to the Chinese rammed-earth (bangtuo) technique, in use in China more than two millennia before the Mongolian period. Both curved and straight-edged battlements were built into the wall, and the fortifications were especially frequent along the southeastern wall corner. The outer wall was pierced by four gates, two at the north, one at the west, and one at the south. The more heavily fortified southern and eastern wall segment defined the lengths of the imperial city huangcheng. The imperial-city walls were also made of rammed-earth, faced with liparite. Like the outer city wall, the huangcheng rose four to six meters, and it was six to eight meters thick. Within the second wall were monasteries and the administrative offices of Qubilai’s government. The palace-enclosure (gongcheng) was located in the north center of the imperial city (huangcheng). Its walls measured about six hundred meters east to west and six hundred and seventy-five meters north to south.\textsuperscript{57} This is probably the palatial complex described by Marco Polo as “a vast palace of marble cunningly worked out and of other fair stones, which with one end has its boundary in the middle of the city, and with the other with the wall of it. The halls and rooms and passages are all gilded and wonderfully painted with pictures and images of beasts and birds and trees and flowers and many kinds of things.”\textsuperscript{58}

The buildings of Shangdu’s palace-city (Fig. 11) are easily compared with those of earlier Chinese capital cities. The main architectural compound consisted of five parts, each connected to another by a covered corridor. The most important and largest was the main central hall. To its east and west were smaller side halls. Joining them at the south were another pair of side halls. The inverted-U formation calls to mind the main audience hall of the Tang emperors, Hanyuan Hall, built in the seventh century.\textsuperscript{39} The Shangdu palace-complex was probably Da’an Ge,\textsuperscript{41} named in literary sources as the main palace-city hall constructed under the supervision of southern Chinese craftsman and painter Wang Zhenpeng, who eventually would paint in Qubilai’s court at Dadu.\textsuperscript{40}

A few more details about Shangdu’s palace-city survive in contemporary literature, although they cannot be verified by excavation. A poem of Zhou Boqi says that Da’an Ge was moved to Shangdu from the Northern Song capital Bianliang, where the hall had been called Xichun Ge.\textsuperscript{41} The poet also writes of a Crystal Hall (Shuijing Dian) and an official banquet hall called Kuizhang Ge.\textsuperscript{42} The triple wall plan, the inverted-U-shaped main hall, individual hall names, and the association of at least one building with the last native Chinese capital in north China all suggest that the city laid out seven years before Dadu was architecturally implemented in accordance with Chinese tradition and symbolism.

Yet an even more basic association between the city Shangdu and classical Chinese symbolism was part of the initial architectural conception. In the northeast and northwest corners of the imperial city have been uncovered the remains of two Buddhist monasteries, Huayan Si and Qianyuan Si, respectively. They were two of eight Buddhist or Daoist monasteries designated in the initial plan of the city proposed and supervised by Liu Bingzhong to occupy the “eight corners” (the four cardinal directions and the four corners between them). Minister Liu’s scheme was designed as an architectural manifestation of the eight fundamental trigrams of the classical text the Book of Changes (Yi Jing). Thereby a correspondence was made between the new city of the Mongols turned Chinese-style rulers and a text whose origins could be traced to the Zhou dynasty of the first millennium B.C. Huayan Si and Qianyuan Si were specifically associated with the trigrams gen and qian, representing, respectively, the northeast and northwest quadrants, just where they were located in the palace-city.\textsuperscript{45}

Some ten years later Qubilai again turned to Liu Bingzhong for a design of his great capital Dadu. At that time a scheme from a second classical text, the Record of Trades (Kagong Ji), part of the Rituals of Zhou (Zhou Lü), was chosen.
Ironically, such explicit classical symbolism had never before been so clearly invoked in the plan of a Chinese imperial city, but for the Qaghan-
turned-emperor Qubilai, for whom and for whose ancestors Chinese-style architecture had proved successful vehicles of legitimation of rule, the most ancient and pedigreed urban forms were resurrected.\textsuperscript{44}

The building foundations and objects uncovered at the ruins in Dolonmnur attest to the Chinese quality of Qubilai’s first capital in East Asia. Glazed roof tiles and other ceramic architectural decoration; ceramic plates and bowls; dragon-faced, interlocking architectural members; and dragon-capped, tortoise-footed imperial stele were among the remains (Figs. 12–14). Among the Chinese materials, each could have been exchanged with one excavated at Qara Qorum. Missing were objects of non-Chinese inspiration—the wall paintings of Iranian princes or Central Asian Buddhhas, the glass beads, or metalwork—found at the earlier Mongolian imperial city. Clearly, the city architecture and goods confirm that the Mongols were well on their way to Dadu and all that it was to represent.

**SHANGDU AFTER 1267**

Although literary references to events that took place at a certain hall in a certain year may be found in the poetry of Zhou Boqi, it is impossible to assign a building date to any Shangdu structure. Moreover, much of what survives presents a sharp contrast to the sole identifiable palace-city hall, Da’an Ge, or the monasteries, all of which seem to have been traditional Chinese-style buildings.

In fact, contemporaries of Zhou Boqi contradict the descriptions of architecture found in his poems. The conflicting evidence suggests that the function of Shangdu may have been different from that of Qara Qorum and Dadu, a fact obscured by the common designations given Shangdu and Dadu—summer and winter capital, respectively—after the construction of the latter.

Marco Polo describes the outer city of Shangdu, where no permanent architectural member has been excavated, as a huge game reserve:

... And from this [marble] palace is built a second wall which in the direction opposite to the palace, closing one end in the wall of the city on one side of the palace and the other on the other side, encloses and surrounds quite sixteen miles of plain land in circuit, in such a way that unless one starts from the palace he cannot enter into that close; and it is fortified like a castle; in which wall are fountains and rivers of running water and very beatiful lawns and groves enough. And the great Kaan keeps all sorts of not fierce wild beasts which can be named there, and in very great numbers, that is harts and bucks and roe-deer, to give to the gersfalcon to eat and to the falcons, which he keeps in mew in that place, which are more than two hundred gersfalcon without the falcons. And he always goes himself to see them in mew at least once every week. And the great Kaan often goes riding through this park which is surrounded with a wall and takes with him one tame leopard or more on the crupper of his horse, and when he wishes he lets it go and takes one of the aforesaid animals ... And he does that often for his pleasure and for amusement. And certainly this place is so well kept and adorned that it is a most noble thing of great delight. And ... in the middle place of that park thus surrounded with a wall, where there is a most beautiful grove, the great Kaan has made for his dwelling a great palace or loggia which is all of canes, upon beautiful pillars gilded and varnished, and on the top of each pillar is a great dragon all gilded which winds the tail round the pillar and holds up the ceiling with the head,\textsuperscript{45} and stretches out the arms, that is one to the right hand for the support of the ceiling and the other in the same way to the left ... The roof of this palace is also all of canes gilded and varnished so well and so thickly that no water can hurt it, and the paintings can never be washed out ... Moreover the great Kaan had made it so arranged that he might have it easily taken away and easily set up, ... for when it is raised and put together more than two hundred very strong ropes of silk held it up in the manner of tents all round about ... \textsuperscript{46}

Other impermanent structures are mentioned in Wang Shidian’s\textsuperscript{47} Notes on Forbidden Cities (Jin Bian\textsuperscript{48}) of the fourteenth century. It is believed that halls (dian\textsuperscript{49}) named Hongxi,\textsuperscript{50} Chongshou,\textsuperscript{51} Ruisi,\textsuperscript{52} Renshou,\textsuperscript{53} and Muqing\textsuperscript{54} were tents.\textsuperscript{55} Qingning\textsuperscript{56} Dian, which may have been built of more permanent materials, was a “traveling palace,” as the word xinggong\textsuperscript{57} is sometimes translated, for overnight or other temporary stays during imperial travels.

Persian historian, physician, and advisor to Il-Khanid rulers Rashid al-Din’s brief discussion of Shangdu in his Compendium of Histories (jami’ al-
tawārikh) further attests to its function as a hunting park. He writes, “There are three roads to that place from the winter residence. The first, reserved for hunting matches, is allowed to be used only by ambassadors,”\textsuperscript{58} suggesting, perhaps, that the important function of the upper capital as a hunting reserve, described by Marco Polo as inaccessible from the imperial-city sector of the marble palace, was not well advertised.

Even though Shangdu had both ancestral and family temples (taimiao\textsuperscript{59} and jiamiao\textsuperscript{60}) and at
least twelve mosques, its primary function after Qubilai's move south into China proper in 1267 was, it is suggested here, a hunting reserve and pleasure ground for the imperial Mongols. When Qubilai had Shangdu built, it was, as he intended, a Chinese-style imperial city from which he could make his bid for Qaghan of a universal Mongolian empire that drew heavily from the spoils of the greatest empire in the world, China. The initial building period, before 1267, thus reflected Qubilai's personal needs as a ruler and therefore included the eight monastery scheme and in all likelihood the construction of Da'an Ge. Having secured his position in China, certainly by the 1280s and the last decade of his life when Marco Polo would have visited Shangdu, Qubilai transformed the upper capital into a private pleasure area, a place where the imperial Mongols could hunt and enjoy other recreation such as might only have been possible on the Mongolian steppe. The enclosure of the palace-city by eight monasteries might have been a Chinese-style facade for a city more Mongolian in taste than Qara Qorum. When after 1267, if ever, the permanent structures were maintained or repaired is recorded in no known document. The northern Mongolian city of privacy and relaxation was used by the Mongols as many as six months each year, and the Mongolian rulers had other hunting retreats also. Shangdu was burned by the Chinese army of the future Ming emperor in 1359.

Mongolian Territories and Cities in the Post-Chinggisid Period

The size of the territory that fell to Mongolian rule between the establishment of Qara Qorum as an administrative center and capital city in the 1220s and 1230s and the founding of Qubilai's capital Dadu in 1267 was unprecedented in prior world history. Even when Chinggis died in 1227, the lands controlled by the Mongols were too vast to be overseen from a single urban center. Yet rather than watch their father's conquered legacy fall back to its former owners or fight to the death among themselves for total control, Chinggis' four sons held the confederated tribes and sedentary lands together by dividing the "empire" into four ulus (appanages), orchestrated by Chinggis before his death. Chinggis' oldest son Jochi, whose legitimacy had always been questioned, had early on been charged with the Mongolian campaign farthest west. After his death in the early 1240s, his sons, including Batu and Orda, continued the conquest of territory that would span the Qipchak steppe from the Black Sea on the west to the Irtyshe River on the east. In the 1240s a city known as Sarai-Batu, or New Sarai, was established on the Volga River by Batu Qan, and this ulus was known as the Golden Horde. His brother Ordu's ulus was centered around the Aral Sea and farther east into Siberia. Mongolian power in these territories survived until the late fourteenth century. But since the ulus of Jochi's descendants are far removed from Qara Qorum, Dadu, and the cities that lie between, their architecture will not be discussed here.

Chinggis' second son Chaghadai had fought both in China and the West. He was on better terms with his father and received an ulus closer to the Mongolian steppe. The Chaghadai Qanate included much of what is today the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region and lands to its north and west, former Chinese Turkestan and Russian Turkestan. Chaghadai inherited capital cities from several of the great Central Asian kingdoms of pre-Mongolian days, including the Uygur Turks and the Qara-qitai, or Western Liao. The capital of Chaghadai's ulus was Almalig, located on the Yilii (Il) River. The Chaghadai Qanate survived until the 1330s, when its territories were divided into two parts, with the capital of the eastern portion at Almalig.

Chinggis' third son, Ögödei, was his father's chosen successor and thereby became ruler from Qara Qorum of the entire "Mongolian empire." The fourth son, Tolui, according to Mongolian custom, received the lands closest to his father's birthplace, which included the Onon and Kerulen valleys. Although Ögödei and his son, Güyük, were the second and third in the line of succession beginning with Chinggis, it was Tolui's sons who played the most important roles in the Mongolian world in the generation after Ögödei. Tolui's sons, Möngke and Qubilai, became the fourth and fifth Qaghan, respectively; and Qubilai's direct descendants became the Yuan emperors of China. Tolui's son Arigh-Böke maintained a stronghold around Qara Qorum when Qubilai was building Shangdu and strengthening the Mongolian position in East Asia, a rift between the two brothers fueled by Qubilai's enthusiasm for things Chinese. A fourth son of Tolui, Hülegü, led campaigns in the Muslim East. His successors remained in control of Iran as the Il-Khâns from the time that Mongolian power in the east passed from Möngeke to Qubilai until the
1370s. Using Tabrız, Sultāniyah, and Marāghah as their main capitals, the Il-Khāns, like the Golden Horde and Chaghadai Qanate, initially recognized Dadu as the supreme capital of their empire. By the fourteenth century, however, Dadu was primarily the capital of China, the allegiances of the Golden Horde and Chaghadai Qanate having changed considerably earlier, in the second half of the thirteenth century. Like the cities conquered and used by the Golden Horde and its neighboring Mongol controlled territories in the West, the Il-Khānate cities were subject primarily to the influences of nearby sedentary civilizations, in the latter case Muslim Iran. Almaliq, too, was primarily influenced by its Turkic and Central Asian neighbors. But since it was for a brief period in the thirteenth—and in recent centuries, including this one when limited excavation has been conducted—part of the Chinese sphere, its architectural remains will be discussed here.

Almaliq

The urban center of the Chaghadai Qanate is believed by Chinese archeologists to be near the bank of the Yili River about thirteen kilometers east of modern Huocheng in the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region. It is a site visited by the thirteenth-century Daoist master Qiu Changchun (Quji) (1148–1227) en route to an audience with Chinggis Qan, and sought and discussed in writing in the nineenth century by the Chinese scholars Xu Song (1781–1848) and Wang Guowei (1877–1927). Based on the thirteenth- and nineteenth-century writings, Chinese archeologists began in 1958, much in the manner of Russian and Soviet archeologists in search of Qara Qorum earlier in the century, digging in the vicinity of the site called Yili in the Tang dynasty and inhabited even during the Han dynasty.

No plan of Almaliq was published as the result of the 1958 excavation, and no archeological team has returned to the site since then. Among the 1958 finds were silver, gold, bronze, ceramic, and stone objects, and silver coins with Arabic inscriptions, one with the clearly visible date that corresponds to 1357. Another extremely important type of find were tombstones of people believed to have been Nestorian Christians. One had an inscription stating that the man to whom it was dedicated had been born in 1330 and had later been converted to Islam. The materials uncovered in Huocheng Xian (county) support a suggestion made by T. W. Thacker in 1967 that a tombstone in the Gulbenkian Museum, Durham University, with a date corresponding to 1326, is from Almaliq (Fig. 15). The Gulbenkian Museum stone is one of nearly six hundred inscribed stones found in the last decades of the nineteenth century by Russian archeologists in the region known as Semirechiye (so-called Russian Turkestan east of the Syr-Darya River), part of the Chaghadai Qanate. Those with inscriptions had dates ranging from 1186 to 1345. Russian archeologists believed that most of them came from a cemetery that served Almaliq during the Mongolian period.

Mongolian Princely Towns

Of the decade when Möngke Qaghan was in power, it has been said that "the basic territorial ordering of the Mongol empire may be pictured as a composition of three loosely integrated parts. At the bottom were the conquered sedentary areas, centers of agriculture and crafts production and commercial organization. At the top were the Mongol rulers and their military forces . . . occupying the steppe interstices . . . . In between and linking the two economically were the Mongol court towns, controlled by the Khaghan and the princes, and located in the steppes or steppe margin . . . ." The walled towns referred to were those today in the vicinity of Qara Qorum in Mongolia. One at Kondui and a second one near the Khirkhira River have been excavated and redrawn in plans by Soviet teams. Closer to Dadu, Mongolian towns have been excavated by Chinese teams from the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region and Shanxi province. Enough survived at two of them, both princely towns like Kondui and the Khirkhira River site, for plans to have been drawn. Since more is known about the Mongolian towns in the Chinese sphere, they will be discussed first.

Yingchang Lu

The palace-complex and surrounding walled town at Yingchang Lu, two kilometers southwest of what is today Lake Dalai Nur in the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region, was begun in 1270, before the completion of Dadu. In that year, according to the History of the Yuan Dynasty (Yuan Shi), ten thousand households were transferred to the site established as Yingchang Fu, three hundred li (about 150 kilometers) northeast of Shangdu. In 1285 the place name was changed to
Yingchang Lu. The most famous recipient of the palace-complex was the elder sister of the Prince of Lü, Princess Sengge (ca. 1283–1331), whose connection with the city is confirmed by a stele found on a hill southeast of Lake Dalai Nur. The stele inscription is summarized, but not published, in the excavation report about Yingchang Lu. Its date corresponds to 1325.63

The earthen outer wall of Yingchang Lu, perhaps in place before the time of Princess Sengge, was six hundred and fifty meters north to south by six hundred meters east to west. It was oriented ten degrees west of due north. The wall had three gates, one each at the south, east, and west center. From each gate a main road cut across the interior of the town. The east-west road was ten meters wide and the north-south one was twenty meters wide (Fig. 16). What are assumed to have been the palace buildings of Yingchang Lu were all north of the east-west division. The assumption is based both on excavated remains and the plans of pre-Yuan Chinese imperial cities, specifically the famous Sui-Tang imperial capitals Chang’ an and Luoyang. Although unique among surviving cities of China from the Yuan period, a plan with palace and imperial buildings concentrated in the north center of the greater city was one of three urban schemes that dominated Chinese capital planning beginning in the first millennium B.C. Yingchang Lu is probably the latest example of the implementation of this scheme, and one of the Sui-Tang or contemporary Japanese or other East Asian capitals is probably the second to last.64

The main palace-complex of Yingchang Lu was enclosed by its own wall, three hundred meters north to south by two hundred meters east to west. Within this wall stood three main halls along a north-south line that was defined on either end by gates (Fig. 16, nos. 2–4). The south center entry to the palace-city was Ming65 Gate (Fig. 16, no. 1), which was five bays across and one bay deep. At the time of excavation, stone lions stood on either side of the stairway approach to the gate, probably similar to those that stand at the remains of Houying Fang (see Fig. 26). Continuing north, the next building was a pillar-supported structure approximately thirty meters square, which was five bays by four and elevated on a platform three meters high (Fig. 16, no. 2). The platform was approached from the south by its own stairway, which combined with it to give the building plan a T-shape. Each pillar of the hall was implanted into a base one and one-half meters in diameter. The columns stood about two meters (1.8 meters) apart in the north-south dimension, and one and one-third meters (1.3 meters) separated them from east to west. Behind this main hall was a square-shaped hall or perhaps a pavilion (Fig. 16, no. 3), supported by only four pillars. The rammed-earth (hangtu) platform on which it was raised was almost seven meters (6.7 meters) square. The third hall was three bays square (Fig. 16, no. 4) and elevated on a hangtu platform two meters high. Two interior pillars from what would otherwise have formed a perfect column grid were thus eliminated. Four interior pillars were similarly eliminated from the interior column grid of the first hall of the Yingchang Lu palace-city. This feature of interior hall construction was typical of Chinese timber frame buildings by the seventh and eighth centuries, the time from which the earliest pillar foundations and wooden architecture, respectively, survive. These had a continuous history in north China through the Yuan dynasty, after which Chinese halls typically had a complete interior column grid.66 Not only, then, do the pillars, bases, and green glazed ceramic tiles uncovered in this area of the Yingchang Lu excavation define these buildings as purely Chinese in style, but, more specifically, the elimination of interior pillars connects the Yingchang Lu halls with Yuan and earlier medieval Chinese architecture of north China. The final building along the main north-south axis of Yingchang Lu was a gate (Fig. 16, no. 5) whose dimensions were the same as those of the south gate of the palace-complex (Fig. 16, no. 1).

The arrangement of the three main halls of Yingchang Lu’s palace-city, like that of the palace-complexes Daming67 Gong (Fig. 4, no. 13), Yanchun68 Ge (Fig. 4, no. 14), Longfu69 Gong (Fig. 4, no. 16), and Xingsheng9 Gong (Fig. 4, no. 17) of Dadu, was copied after the ancient Chinese architectural formation, the gong plan, referred to above. It is not as clear from excavated remains of the halls along the main axis at Qara Qorum whether that palace-city adhered to this Chinese scheme, but it is clear that the princely towns in its vicinity, to be discussed below, were built with the gong plan in mind.

On either side of the five, axially placed structures at Yingchang Lu were three pairs of roughly symmetrically placed foundations (Fig. 16, nos. 6–11). Pillar foundations were uncovered only in two locations (nos. 8 and 9), suggesting that they were the locations of permanent buildings and that the other four mounds may have been tent
sites. The placing of tents in restricted areas symmetrical to the main building line was a pattern established at Qara Qorum. (The areas restricted to tent dwelling at Shangdu and Dadu have been mentioned.) With the additional evidence from Qara Qorum and Yingchang Lu, one must conclude that whether as large as the outer city of Shangdu, as small as the enclosure at Dadu, or on unwalld mounds symmetrical to the main building axis, a tent dwelling section was a standard feature of imperial Mongolian city planning.

Detached wall-enclosed areas were located northwest and southeast in the northern half of Yingchang Lu (Fig. 16, nos. 12 and 13). At both building sites stone lions and tortoises, presumably pieces of imperial stele, were uncovered. The southern portion of Yingchang Lu was residential and commercial. The most prominent building group to emerge from excavation there was a school of Confucian learning (Fig. 16, no. 14). This architectural complex was identified by an inscribed stone stele atop which were imperial Chinese dragons carved in a manner similar to the ones on the stele excavated at Shangdu (Fig. 17 and see Fig. 14). A Tibetan-style pagoda believed to be from the Yuan period was also uncovered in the vicinity of Yingchang Lu.

The late Yuan-early Ming history of Yingchang Lu is recorded in the Yuan and Ming official histories, Yuan Shi and Ming Shi. At one time in the late Yuan period the town was eliminated, but it was rebuilt in 1354. Indeed, the last Mongolian emperor of China fled from Dadu to Yingchang, where he died during the fourth moon of 1370. A month later Ming general Li Wenzhong attacked the town.

**Anxi Wang Fu**

The second Mongolian princely city excavated by the Chinese is Anxi Wang Fu, three kilometers northeast of Xi’an (north of the present street known as Qinjia jic). In the Tang dynasty, it was part of the city Chang’an. Excavation in 1956 and 1957 uncovered a pounded-earth wall, ranging in thickness from just over eight meters to ten meters (8.2 to 10 meters), that ran about six hundred meters north to south and some sixty meters less than that east to west (603 meters by 542 or 534 meters). The outer wall had four corner towers and a gate near the center of the south, east, and west wall faces. It was oriented three degrees west of due north (Fig. 18).

In roughly the center of the outer wall, an enclosed palace-city was elevated on a platform. Although Anxi Wang Fu was situated only two kilometers east of Chang’an, the palace-complex was much simpler than the Tang dynasty Daming palace-complex. All the archeological evidence suggests that here three main halls were built along a north-south line, similar to the palatial cores of Qara Qorum and Yingchang Lu. The configuration of the three together probably was a gong scheme, such as the one implemented at the Dadu palace-city and at Yingchang Lu.

The first of the three Anxi Wang Fu palace halls was twice as wide as it was long (185 by 90 chi, a chi being about 34 centimeters in the Yuan period). This width to depth proportion of just over two to one is almost identical to the proportions of Daming Dian, the main hall of Qubilai’s imperial city Dadu, which the fourteenth-century writer Tao Zongyi listed as being four hundred and ten by two hundred chi (127 by 62 meters; see Fig. 4, no. 13). The elevation of the Anxi Wang Fu hall, however, was equivalent to that of Daming Hall, each being about ten chi above grade. Since the height of a building platform was a sign of rank in the Yuan period, the degree to which the Anxi Wang Fu main hall was raised signified the imperial association between its occupants and those of the Mongolian capital Dadu.

The first Yuan period recipient of the title Anxi Wang (Prince of Anxi), also known as Qin Wang, was Mangalai (Qubilai’s third son by his first wife), who was awarded the region of Jingzhao, otherwise known as Guanzhong, as his fief in 1272 or 1273. This region had been Qubilai’s own fief in his youth. Whether the palaces of Anxi Wang Fu had been built anew or restored when Marco Polo saw them several years later in 1275, they were resplendent:

And now the son of the great lord who is called Mangalai is lord of it and king, for his father has given him that kingdom and has crowned him king of it. It is a very great town of great trade and great industry. They have silk in very great quantity . . . . All equipments which are needed for the armies of the great Kaan are made there . . . . And about five miles outside the town is the palace of the lord who is called king Mangalai . . . . Which is so beautiful and so great . . . . For it is in a great plain where there are rivers which run in and around it and lakes and pools and springs enough. And first of all it has a very great thick and high wall which is five miles round, and that wall is all with battlements round about and well made; where are many wild animals and also birds of the chase . . . . and there are most beautiful hunting parks and places for hawking. And in the middle of this wall is the
platform of the king so large and so fair that none could devise it better. It has many beautiful halls and great and many beautiful large rooms all pictured and painted with beaten gold, with finest azures, and with other different colours and with infinite columns and marbles... And he Mangalai is a rich and noble lord and takes much pleasure in grandeur and a noble court, so that his court is of great magnificence. The armies of the king Mangalai stay round the palace and they have great enjoyment there with fowling and hunting.\footnote{69}

Three years later, in 1278, Mangalai died and his son Ananda succeeded him as Anxi Wang. A devout Muslim whose religious affiliation (in spite of his birth name) is made evident by the famous Arabic magic square excavated at the palace site, the second Anxi Wang did not fare as well as his father.\footnote{70} At the time of the final illness of Qubilai's heirless successor Temür (Chengzong) in 1307, the ruler's widow summoned his cousin Ananda to Dadu with the intention of making him the next Qaghan. Unfortunately for Ananda, his nephew Qaishan (later to be Wuzong) and his supporters prevented him from entering the palace and put him in prison, where he was forced to commit suicide. Sixteen years later, in 1323, after Qaishan had been succeeded by Büyantu, the new emperor returned the title and fief Anxi Wang (Fu) to Ananda's son Örüg Temür, who was, however, similarly ill-fated, being forced to commit suicide in 1332. At this point the succession of Anxi Wang was terminated and the palace area came to be known as the old palace (gugong\textsuperscript{6}). It was this name, Anxi Gugong, that Li Haowen\footnote{66} used for the palace area in his fourteenth century Illustrated Record of Chang\textsuperscript{an} (Chang\textsuperscript{an} Zhi Tu;\footnote{68} Fig. 19). The palaces remained as late as 1357, when they were used by the Red Turbans to quarter troops, but were destroyed at the very end of the Yuan dynasty in a peasant uprising.

Sites without Published Plans

Three more sites excavated in the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region during the 1950s yielded Yuan period remains, although no maps of them have been published.\footnote{71} About thirty kilometers southwest of Jining, a double walled city was found. Its outer dimensions were one thousand meters north to south and sixty meters less than that east to west. The inner city (650 by 750 meters at the perimeter) was lodged in the northeastern boundary of the outer city. It had seven gates, one on the south and two at each of the other sides. This Yuan city was nearer to Shangdu than to any other Mongol town or city with a known plan, and the description of the remains at Jining suggests that the plan of this city, where outer and inner walls shared a border, resembled that of Shangdu more than any other imperial Mongolian city. It is known that Liao emperors used the site for hunting and fishing, but inscriptions with the dates da Yuan (great Yuan) and zhizheng\textsuperscript{6} (1341–68) attest to its Yuan history, as does a stone stele from a Confucian temple with the name of a female donor and a date corresponding to 1312. Street and other temple remains, and a dense residential area were also uncovered.

Thirty kilometers northeast of Baolingmiao (Darhan Muminggan Lianheqi), a Yuan period wall measuring fifteen hundred by eight hundred bu\textsuperscript{*} (a bu equals five chi) was uncovered. The wall stands four meters at the northeast corner; and its northern, eastern, and western faces, at least, each had one gate. More than twenty building foundations were excavated, most of them at the south or center of the walled area. Each building was enclosed on four sides, but the enclosures were of variant height and thickness. Raised on a platform four meters high and eight meters square in the south of the city was a building group oriented forty-five degrees off of due north. Although the wall apparently was aligned with the cardinal directions, the orientation of the building recalls that of the palace-city of Qara Qorum. A Confucian temple was uncovered, as were stone stele with Chinese dragons at the top (but inscribed in Mongolian), a pagoda, and glazed and unglazed fragments of architectural decoration.

The third site where Yuan remains were found but whose plan is unpublished is Daning\textsuperscript{56} Lu, formerly Dading, the “central capital” of the Liao dynasty (947–1125). It is now in Pingquan Xian near the border between Hebei, Liaoning, and the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region. Yuan occupancy was confirmed by a bronze object inscribed with the date 1265 and a stele with 'Phags-Pa script, introduced to China from Tibet during the Yuan period.

Northwest of China and the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region, in the present Mongolian People’s Republic, a walled architectural complex approximately square in shape was excavated in the vicinity of Delger Mören. Like the three towns presently in Chinese territory, whose chief residents are unknown, the Delger Mören town’s occupation during the Mongolian period (under Möngke Qaghan) has been confirmed by a stele.\footnote{78} The city was enclosed by a wall approximately one
hundred and fifty meters square, which had an entry on each side. Fortifications were evenly spaced along the wall faces, and there were four corner towers. Remains included a Buddhist monastery, palatial halls, Chinese-style stone sculpture, glazed tiles, and pillar foundations (Fig. 20), such as have been uncovered at Qara Qorum, Shangdu, and the four other towns in or near the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region. It is believed that with the exception of palatial and administrative halls and military fortifications, the standing structures were impermanent.

**Kondui**

The most complex imperial Mongolian architecture in the Mongolian People’s Republic, more elaborate even than the remains of Qara Qorum, has been found at Kondui. Unfortunately, neither the name of an imperial occupant nor a dated inscription has been uncovered. Kondui attracted the attention of Russian explorers early in the nineteenth century and is first mentioned in literature in 1818. In 1835 V. Parshin did some preliminary excavation at the site, the results of which were published in 1844; but Sergei Kiselev, who supervised the Soviet excavation of Kondui, points out that the term “excavation” with reference to Parshin’s work should be taken lightly. The first serious digging at Kondui was undertaken in 1889 by A. K. Kuznetsov, who, however, did not begin to publish his results until 1925.

The main architectural ensemble of Kondui was excavated on a cruciform-shaped mound west of the Sukhooi Canal (Fig. 22). Although the Chinese term *hangtu* is never employed to describe it, Kiselev’s description of the layered earthen platform into which pieces of wood and rubble were pounded corresponds to the definition of *hangtu*. On top of the mound was an architectural base composed of square bricks thirty centimeters on each side. Cylindrical stone columns and their bases were lodged into it (Fig. 21). It is evident (see Fig. 22) that at least four columns from what would otherwise have been a perfect column grid were eliminated from the interior. As has been noted above in the discussion of Yingchang Lu, this was a practice typical of medieval Chinese architecture. Remains of a lacquered wooden balustrade decorated with dragon-faced stone interlocking sculpture, of the kind found at Qara Qorum and Shangdu, were also uncovered (Fig. 23). Since the first discovery of the animal-faced stone sculpture at Kondui in the 1840s, more than one hundred pieces have been revealed. This architectural component, whose Tang and Song Chinese sources have been mentioned above, is indeed one of the most prevalent remains of imperial Mongolian construction. Other Chinese-style animal sculpture found at Kondui included lions, chimeras, and phoenixes (Fig. 24). Glazed ceramic pieces and portions of Buddhist images were also among the ruins of Kondui.

The cruciform rammed-earth mound and its buildings were the focus of a larger architectural complex that spanned both sides of the Sukhooi Canal (Fig. 25). Four building areas were found east of the waterway, two main mounds associated with a south-oriented building longer in its east-west dimension and facing south, and two smaller mounds symmetrically placed to the southeast and southwest, a formation typical of Chinese construction. The more impressive architecture enclosed the cruciform-shaped foundation on the other side of the canal. There, based on Chinese architectural precedents, one assumes the buildings farthest south and north to have been gates on the same axial line as the main palace halls. The three horizontally positioned mounds between the main complex and the north gate, and the four symmetrically arranged mounds southeast and southwest of the palatial complex, may or may not have elevated permanent structures. They might well have been tent sites, for the configuration of two mounds on either side of the main building axis resembles those of the tent mounds at Qara Qorum and Yingchang Lu (See Figs. 3, nos. 6 a–d and 16, nos. 6, 7, 10, and 11).

The architectural and decorative remains of the main palatial compound at Kondui suggest Chinese prototypes, as Kiselev points out. More specifically, comparisons can be made between them and those from a residence excavated inside the walls of Dadu after Kiselev’s material from Mongolia had been published. A residence, Houying Fang, survives as a series of pounded-earth foundations faced with brick floors, all interconnected by courtyards or connective corridors. Lodged into the floors were square pillar bases and circular pillars. At the corners of some of the rectangular elevated areas were stone animal sculptures (Fig. 26). No inscription with a date or an occupant’s name was uncovered during the excavation of Houying Fang; its chief occupant may have been of any nationality, but presumably was someone in the service of the Mongolian emperor of China. Kondui was almost undoubtedly the residence of an imperial Mongolian relative.
Still, even with only limited evidence of foundations and excavated objects from the two sites, the great distance between Kondui and Dadu makes the similarities between the two residential architectural complexes yet more impressive.

Khirkhira River Sites

Several sites with architectural remains were uncovered by Soviet excavations in the vicinity of the Khirkhira River.\(^{84}\) The most important site from the Mongolian period was found two kilometers north of modern Uruylinguy and spanned an area fifteen hundred meters north to south by three thousand meters east to west (Fig. 27). Like Kondui, this site had come to the attention of Russian archaeologists in 1818. Fourteen years later an inscribed stone from the Khirkhira River vicinity made its way to St. Petersburg, where, in 1839, it was labeled the “Chinggisid stone,” for carved on it was the first known specimen of the Mongolian language.\(^{85}\) There was renewed interest in the site in 1925, when the name Yisüngge was found on another engraved stone uncovered during the Kuznetsov archeological expedition. The Mongolian period site near the Khirkhira River, last excavated by Kiselev in 1957, was the residence of Chinggis’ brother Jochi-Khasar and his son, Yisüngge.

Like Kondui, the focus of this Mongolian period site near the Khirkhira River was a palace-style residential compound, but, more in the manner of Chinese construction, its outer enclosure was nearly square (100 meters east to west by 110 meters north to south). As much as two meters of a wall between fifteen and twenty meters thick remained. Near the center of the south wall was a gate twenty meters across. The wall was originally surrounded by a moat, also in the manner of Chinese cities, part of the waterway surviving at the southeast wall corner. Southeast of the city was a pond, in roughly the same position as Qujiang\(^{86}\) Pond of the Sui-Tang imperial capital, Chang’an. Northwest and adjacent to the main walled area were five mounds of up to two meters high and between fifteen and twenty meters on each side, arranged along an east-west line. These may have been houses. Another impressive building foundation stood east of the main walled enclosure. It consisted of at least three interrelated structures and may have joined some buildings to its north as well.\(^{86}\)

The floors of the Khirkhira buildings were faced with rectangular brick, into which pillars and foundations were lodged. Fragments of glazed roof tiles and animal sculpture of the kind described at Kondui, Qara Qorum, and Mongolians towns of the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region were also uncovered at the Khirkhira site. Kiselev has given both this architectural complex and Kondui the general date thirteenth-fourteenth century, allowing for the possibility of rebuilding during that time span.\(^{87}\)

Conclusions

The imperial period towns of the Mongolian People’s Republic were not the first urban complexes built in the region. In the vicinity of the Khirkhira River alone, at least ten cities from the time of Qidan rule in northeast Asia have been uncovered. These include Qaraqan-Balagas, Zuun Kherem, and Chin-Tolgoi.\(^{88}\) In the vicinity of Tuva, a walled town with interior walled enclosure stood at Sagonar (Fig. 28).\(^{89}\) Farther west were the famous cities at Samarkand, Bukhara, and Pendzhikent.\(^{90}\) The proximity of the Mongolian period cities within the Soviet sphere of Asia—Kondui, the Khirkhira city, and Qara Qorum—to the cities just mentioned, combined with the nationalities of their excavators and the research materials available to those archaeologists, might lead one to conclude that the architecture of the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century urban centers was more heavily influenced by that of Uygar or later Soviet Central Asian cities. Indeed, the published plan of Sagonar (Fig. 28) and the Russian word isitadel (citadel) so frequently used to describe these cities point to a desire to see a continuation in urban patterns from the ninth through the fourteenth centuries in what is today Soviet Central Asia.

“Citadel,” however, to one familiar with the urban patterns of China, seems more logically thought of as simply a walled city; and Sagonar, as a palace-city within an outer city whose wall has four corner towers. Kiselev, of course, makes countless references in his writings to the similarities between the architecture of Qara Qorum and Kondui and that of China. Yet stronger statements can be made about the impact of native Chinese pre-Yuan period imperial construction on thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Mongolian urban architecture. Beginning with the construction of Qara Qorum and including not only the cities of the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region and Shaanxi but all the cities of what was originally the ulus of Ögöedei, most of the fundamental
principles of Chinese imperial urban planning—four-sided enclosure, gates, corner towers, defensive projections, clearly articulated and directed space, axial orientation and alignment, wards of restricted population or function, accessibility by water, vast size, and huge population—can be observed in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century imperial Mongolian architecture. Missing are but the ward system, size, and population. As for size and population, small as these princely towns might seem by Chinese urban standards, they were large in comparison to what had preceded them on the Mongolian steppe. Furthermore, the arrangement of the imperial Chinese city and its buildings were part of the imperial Mongolian grand plan. Before its implementation at Dadu, the gong building arrangement had been used at Qara Qorum and was employed again in Princess Sengge’s city at Yingchang Lu. In addition, the foundations of imperial Mongolian structures were raised on pounded-earth platforms, onto which circular stone pillar bases were placed. Columns were implanted into these bases, and at Yingchang Lu and Kondui columns were eliminated from hall interiors in accordance with medieval Chinese standards of architecture. The inverted U-shaped hall plan, surviving in excavated remains of the Tang dynasty palaces, was used at Shangdu. A school for Confucian learning stood at Yingchang Lu, and a temple to the sage was built at the Inner Mongolian site near Bailingmiao. Beneath the ground at Qara Qorum was an underground heating system, and the published remains of brick floors from Kondui in the Mongolian People’s Republic are comparable to those excavated within the Dadu outer wall in China. Architectural decoration, especially glazed ceramic roof tiles and animal-faced stone sculpture, from every imperial Mongolian site point to pre-Yuan China, as do the turtle-based and entwined dragon-headed stele.

An argument against direct borrowing from Chinese sources might be raised momentarily if one examines architectural remains found among such groups as the Uygurs, Qidan, Jurchen, or Qara-qitai, who were assimilated into the Mongolian empire. Each of those groups had borrowed from Chinese models in earlier centuries. Yet Chinese sources once removed cannot be the explanation for the cities built and used by the steppe nomads who were so quickly transformed into Chinese-style rulers. Anyone building a city in Asia who was aware of Chinese architecture and its powerful imperial symbolism turned to the source. The Japanese, Koreans, Bohai, Qidan, Jurchen, Uygurs, and other Turks had done so. When the Mongols, beginning with Chinggis Qan, turned to city building as part of their imperial program, they, too, sought out the architecture of China and, by association, its imperial prestige. In doing so they were following an established precedent. Although religious buildings and decorative objects might represent talented craftsmen of all Asian nationalities, the evidence to date suggests that it was not only Qubilai’s capital at Dadu that owed its appearance to the imperial Chinese building tradition but every imperial city along the Mongolian road to Dadu.
Notes

1 would like to thank Thomas Allsen for reading this manuscript and for helpful suggestions, including the proper transcription of Mongolian names, in the pre-publication stage. In most cases I have used the closest English transcription for foreign names, but in a few instances standard English spellings have been substituted.


3. Three travel accounts in which tents are described are Qiu Changchun, Xi You Ji (Record of a Journey West), 1221-24, partially translated in Arthur Waley, Travels of an Adventist, London, 1931; John of Plano Carpini’s account of his audience with Güyük Qaghan in 1246 (Friar John also had an audience with Batu that year), History of the Mongols, translated by C. R. Beasley in The Texts and Versions of John de Plano Carpini and William de Rubruquis, London, 1903, and in Christopher Dawson, The Mongol Mission, London, 1955; and William of Rubruck, whose account of his meeting with Möngke Qaghan is translated in Dawson and in William W. Rockhill, trans., The Journey of William of Rubruck, London, 1900.


8. Dadu is the most carefully studied of the three cities. Since it is the subject of my Imperial Architecture under Mongol Patronage: Kubilai’s Imperial City of Dadu (Dadu), Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1981, and “The Plan of Kubilai Khan’s Imperial City,” Artibus Asiate, v. 44, no. 2-3, 1983, pp. 137-58, its architecture will not be discussed here. On Dadu, also see Chen Gaohua, Yuan Dadu, Beijing, 1982.


10. According to Sergei Kiselev, Drevnemongol’skii goroda, Moscow, 1965, p. 132. Bichurin discussed Qara Qorum in Istoria pervikh chetyrekh doma khovan Chingsiva, 1829, a work unavailable to me.


16. Cleaves suggests that this monastery might have been one of the twelve “idol temples” mentioned in William of Rubruck’s account of Qara Qorum. See Cleaves, “The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1346,” p. 23, and Rockhill, The Journey of William of Rubruck, p. 145.


19. Kiselev related that missing wall portions made it impossible to determine the exact dimensions of the wall.

20. In Drevnemongol’skii goroda, p. 140, Kiselev suggested that this building complex may have been the “palace” (qarsh) mentioned by Rashid al-Din (see Boyle, The Successors of Gengis Khan, p. 62), which has been identified with the W‘an’an Gong, built in 1225 when Qara Qorum was walled. On W‘an’an Gong, see Cleaves, “The Sino- Mongolian Inscription of 1346,” pp. 25, 27, and n. 31, and Song Lian (Ming), ed., Yuan Shi (History of the Yuan Dynasty), repr. Beijing, 1976, juan 2, p. 34 and juan 58, p. 1382.


22. On the use of the gong plan in China, see Liu Dunzhen, Zhongguo Gudai Jianzhu Shi (History of Traditional Chinese Architecture), 2nd ed., Beijing, 1984, pp. 11-12. Other well-known Chinese imperial and monastic settings in which the gong plan is used include the Confucian Temple complex in Qufu, Chongsh’an Monastery in Taiyuan, and, of course, the Three Great Halls and Three Back Halls of the Beijing Forbidden City.
23. The animal-faced architectural members shown in Figs. 13 and 23 are probably what is described in early Ming dynasty official Xiao Xun’s account of what remained at the Mongolian imperial city Dadu at the end of the fourteenth century. In his Gugong Yi Lu (Record of Remains of the Ancient Palaces), repr. Taipei, 1963, p. 1, Xiao writes, “Each vertical post of the balustrade rests upon the head of a sea turtle, the head protruding beyond the edge of the terrace.” In my “Toward the Definition of a Yuan Dynasty Hall,” Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, v. 47, no. 1, 1988, pp. 57–73, I suggested that the source of these interlocking animal-headed architectural members may be traced to the Northern Song dynasty (960-1126), when a similar structural component is published in the twelfth-century Yinggao Fashi (Building Standards), repr. Taipei, 1979, juan 29, p. 18. Since my article was written, an animal-faced stone architectural member excavated at the remains of the Linde palace-complex from the Tang imperial city at Chang’ an has been published. See Yang Hongxun, “Tang Daming Gong Linde Jian huyuan Yanju Jieduan Baogao” (Research Report on the Reconstruction of Linde Hall of Daming Palace complex of the Tang Dynasty), Kongwane Lunwen Ji, Beijing, 1987, pp. 234–52. The architectural member is illustrated on p. 247.

24. Kiselev, Drevnomongol’skie goroda, p. 164. The glazed ceramic pieces certainly suggest Chinese roof ornaments, but elements of a timber frame necessary to confirm Chinese construction were never found.


26. Kiselev thinks this may have been true even during the time of Chinggis. See Drevnomongol’skie goroda, p. 135.

27. On Guillaume Boucher, see Leonard Olschki, Guillaume Boucher: French Artist at the Court of the Khans, Baltimore, 1946. Those with non-Chinese names engaged in Mongol building projects included men of Muslim, Qidan, and Jurchen descent, at least. The names that survive in Chinese sources are listed in my “The Plan of Kubilai Khan’s Imperial City,” p. 152, n. 33. An illustration of the taking of captives, presumably artisans (since few others survived Mongol invasions of central and western Asian cities), by the Mongols appears in the Sarayi albums (the so-called Diez albums) in the Berlin Museum. For an illustration, see Mazhar Ipsoiqogh, Saray-Alken Die’i’sche Klebstinde aus den Berliner Sammlungen, Wiesbaden, 1964, pl. 6.

28. The non-Chinese Bohai kingdom of seventh-eighth century Northeast Asia also had an underground heating system, but in China the use of underground pipes can be traced much earlier, to the second half of the first millennium B.C., when they were used in the third-century B.C. palaces of the first emperor of China, Qin Shi Huangdi, at Xianyang. See several articles on the first emperors palaces and their construction in Wenwu, 1976, no. 11. On underground heating from the preceding period of the Warring States (481–256 B.C.), see Zhang Yuhuan, Zhongguo Gudai Jianshu Jishu Shi (History and Development of Ancient Chinese Architecture), Beijing, 1986, p. 5.

29. Kiselev, Drevnomongol’skie goroda, p. 151.

30. The wall painting section of Drevnomongol’skie goroda, pp. 167–72, was also authored by Evtiukhova. For comparable examples of Soghdian wall painting, see A. M. Belenitskij, Monumental’noe ikhustvo Peredishchent, Moscow, 1973; Belenitskij, Mittelasiens Kunst der Sogden, trans. Lisa Schirmer, Leipzig, 1980; and Guitty Azarpay, Soghdian Painting, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1981.

31. The section on beads found at Qara Qorum in Drevnomongol’skie goroda, by V. P. Levashova, appears on pp. 297–307.

32. Kiselev’s suggestion that the four mounds at Qara Qorum were for tents has already been mentioned. At Dadu, tents for Mongolian relatives were enclosed in the northern sector of Longfu West Park (Fig. 4, north of no. 19).

33. The use of this interior decoration of the steppe in halls of the Dadu palaces is described in Xiao Xun, Gugong Yi Lu, pp. 1–2, and in Tao Zongyi (1346–1415), Zhugong Lu (Record of Rest from the Plow), 1568, repr. Shanghai, 1959, juan 21, pp. 251 and 253. See also my “Toward the Definition of a Yuan Dynasty Hall,” p. 72.
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Fig. 1. Map showing locations of excavated Mongolian cities and towns.
Fig. 2. Plan of Qara Qorum at the time of Ögödei. (After Kiselev, Dreimengol'skie goroda, p. 140.)

Fig. 3. Plan of Ögödei’s palace-city. (After Kiselev, Dreimengol'skie goroda, p. 128.)
Fig. 4. Plan of the imperial city of Dadu. (After Zhu Qiqian, "Yuan Dadu Gongyuan Tukao," Zhongguo Yingzao Xueshe Huikan, v. 1, no. 2, 1937, after p. 10.)
Fig. 5. Qara Qorum building foundation showing pillar and pillar base remains. (After Kiselev, Drevnemongols'kie goroda, p. 162.)

Fig. 6. Imperial stele base in shape of tortoise excavated at Qara Qorum. (After Kiselev, Drevnemongols'kie goroda, p. 141.)
Fig. 7. Roof tile decorated with Chinese dragon excavated at Qara Qorum. (After Kiselev, Drevnemongol'skie goroda, p. 149.)

Fig. 8. Chinese-style Buddhist deity from wall-painting excavated at Qara Qorum. (After Kiselev, Drevnemongol'skie goroda, pl. 2.)

Fig. 9. Iranian-style seated male from wall-painting excavated at Qara Qorum. (After Kiselev, Drevnemongol'skie goroda, pl. 4.)
Fig. 10. Plan of Shangdu at the time of Qubilai. (After Harada and Komai, Joto, pl. 1.)

Fig. 11. Plan of Shangdu palace-city. (After Harada and Komai, Joto, pl. 2.)
Fig. 12. Chinese-style glazed dragon from roof tile excavated at Shangdu. (After Harada and Komai, Jötö, pl. 47.)

Fig. 13. Interlockable animal-faced architectural member excavated at Shangdu. (After Harada and Komai, Jötö, pl. 42.)
Fig. 14. Stone stele with Chinese imperial dragons at top. (After Harada and Komai, J600, pl. 59.)

Fig. 15. Nestorian tombstone excavated in vicinity of Yili. Courtesy of Gulbenkian Museum, Durham University.
Fig. 16. Plan of Yingchang Lu. (After Kaogu, 1961, no. 10, p. 532, fig. 2.)

Fig. 17. Stele from Confucian school excavated at Yingchang Lu. (After Kaogu, 1961, no. 10, p. 532, fig. 3, left.)
**Fig. 18.** Plan of Anxi Wang Fu. (After *Kaogu*, 1960, no. 5, p. 21, fig. 2.)

**Fig. 19.** *Qin Yuan Cheng Tu* (Illustration of the Yuan City at Qin) showing Anxi Gugong. (After *Chang’an Zhi Tu, juan shang*, pp. 3a–b.)
Fig. 20. Remains of pillar foundation at Delger Mören. Permission of *Central Asiatic Journal*, v. 4, 1959, p. 141.

Fig. 21. Pillar foundations excavated in central part of Kondui palace area. (After Kiselev, *Drevnemongolskie gurud*, p. 350.)
FIG. 22. Plan of cruciform building foundation excavated at Kondui. (After Kiselev, Drevemongol'skie goroda, after p. 327.)
Fig. 23. Interlockable animal-faced architectural members excavated at Kondui. (After Kiselev, Drevnemongolskie goroda, p. 40.)

Fig. 24. Fragment of ceramic tile showing Chinese dragon excavated at Kondui. (After Kiselev, Drevnemongolskie goroda, pl. 31.)
Fig. 25. Plan of fourteenth-century remains at Kondui. (After Kiselev, *Drevnemongolskie goroda*, p. 327.)

Fig. 26. Excavated remains of Houying mansion showing pillar foundations and floor. (After *Kaogu*, 1972, no. 6, pl. 4.)
Fig. 27. Plan of Yuan period remains excavated in the Khirkhira River region. (After Kiselev, Drevnemongol'skie goroda, p. 25.)

Fig. 28. Theoretical reconstruction of twelfth/thirteenth-century walled city at Šagonar. (After Kogu, 1960, no. 2, p. 48, fig. 7.)
THE LADIES’ CLASSIC OF FILIAL PIETY AND SUNG TEXTUAL ILLUSTRATION: PROBLEMS OF RECONSTRUCTION AND ARTISTIC CONTEXT

By JULIA K. MURRAY

The Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety (nü hsiao ching⁶) was one of the best known works of educational literature for women in traditional China.¹ Intended as a counterpart to the men’s Classic of Filial Piety (Hsiao ching⁶), a Han guide to moral conduct in a hierarchical society, the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety prescribed a strict Confucian code of behavior for women. A mid-T’ang woman surnamed Cheng is customarily identified as its author, although the first reference to the work is not found until the late Northern Sung period. Structurally and linguistically, the book closely parallels the new-text version of the Classic of Filial Piety; the material is organized into eighteen chapters whose titles, except for the last three, are nearly identical to those in the Classic of Filial Piety.

Like the Classic of Filial Piety, the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety was a congenial subject for illustration in handscroll form, and more than one version has survived.² Unlike the various illustrated scrolls of the Classic of Filial Piety, however, the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety scrolls are inconsistent with one another in their sequence of chapters and pairing of texts and pictures. Furthermore, all the extant examples seem to belong to just two major recensions of illustration, while the paintings of Classic of Filial Piety display greater variety, perhaps a result of the greater antiquity and popularity of the latter. This article will attempt to reconstruct the original illustrative program of the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety, trace the stylistic affiliations of extant versions, and explore some implications for the position of textual illustration in the Sung period.

Origins of the Illustrations

The earliest references to paintings of the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety occur under the names of two artists, Shih K’o⁴ (act. tenth century) and Li Kung-lin’ (ca. 1049-1106), included in the catalogue of the Northern Sung palace collection of painting, Hsüan-ho hua-p’u⁴ (ca. 1120).³ Both entries pose problems of interpretation. Shih K’o’s reads “Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety portraits (hsiang⁶)–eight”; but the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety does not seem to lend itself readily to portraiture, and the number eight does not correlate well with anything. There may have been eight sets or perhaps portraits of eight of the eleven women mentioned by name in the later chapters. Li’s entry says “Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety tableaux (hsiang⁶ written differently)–two.” The term “tableau” is also used for Li’s illustrations of two Buddhist sūtras as well as his painting of the Classic of Filial Piety.⁴ The numerous other textual illustrations listed under his name are called “pictures” (t’u), as are his nontextual narrative paintings, but the two terms (t’u and hsiang⁶) may not be significantly different and both may simply mean “illustration.” The references of later connoisseurs to Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety scrolls attributed to Li Kung-lin suggest that his pictures were illustrations to whole chapters of the text and probably were in the format of text and painting in alternation.⁵

A Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety scroll attributed to Yen Li-pen⁶ (d. 675) appears in Ch’ing catalogues,⁶ suggesting that the pictorial tradition began in the T’ang period. However, the meager information available concerning Madam Cheng, the presumed author of the book, suggests that she did not live until the eighth century.⁷ Thus, Yen could not have illustrated the work because he died long before it was written. On the other hand, the attribution was endorsed by two astute connoisseurs, Ku Fu⁰ and Wu Sheng, and their recognition of a style they associated with Yen Li-pen is important information, even if the attribution is not literally correct. In all likelihood, they were responding to a conservative T’ang style of painting in “ironwire” brushlines and opaque mineral pigments on silk, a mode that survived the T’ang dynasty by hundreds of years.

Illustrations of Chapters One through Nine (Extant Scrolls)

The best known set of illustrations for the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety is a handscroll in the National Palace Museum, Taipei (Figs. 1–9).⁸ Originally one of a pair, the surviving scroll
treats only nine chapters, or the first half of the book. According to the Ch'ing imperial connoisseurs' notes, the last scene of the second scroll bore the signature of Ma Ho-chih (act. latter half of twelfth century), along with the k'ou-trigram seal of a Southern Sung empress. The surviving scroll opens with a section of calligraphy, followed by a section of painting, and this alternation is maintained throughout. The silk is not continuous but has joins between all the sections. The paintings are in the manner of the Southern Sung court painting bureau, perhaps most resembling the style of Ma Yuàn (act. late twelfth–early thirteenth centuries) and his son Ma Lin (act. ca. 1216–ca. 1254). Each scene depicts aristocratic figures in landscape settings, sometimes with elegant buildings or garden patios. Characteristic of the assertive brushwork are the "axe-cut strokes" on the rocks and trees, and the accented contours articulating the clothing. While mineral pigments are extensively used, especially to highlight manmade objects like furniture and textiles, color is essentially subordinate to line and brush in defining forms.

Another version of the first nine chapters of the Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety is in the Palace Museum of Peking (Figs. 10–18). Unlike the Taipei scroll, it starts with a painting followed by a calligraphy text, setting the pattern for the rest of the scroll. Not only are all the sections separated by joins, but the calligraphy is on a different kind of silk and is several inches shorter than the paintings. A further peculiarity is that the columns of writing are also separate from one another, and each column has a horizontal break halfway down. Since the writing amounts to a series of strips mounted side by side, the textual portions clearly were spliced into the scroll from another source. The paintings differ from those of the Taipei scroll both in style and composition, and they exhibit much greater concern for realistic effects. Lavish attention is given to the details of architecture, furnishings, patterned textiles, utensils, and plants, so that they seem vividly tangible. Forms are drawn in smooth, even contours that are carefully filled in with opaque mineral color or with inkwashes graded to suggest modeling. The handling of space is somewhat odd; the floors of buildings are slanted sharply upward, creating very shallow interiors hardly able to accommodate the roundly modeled figures who inhabit them. The large standing screens that adorn several of the interiors are painted with compositions that suggest a thirteenth-century date.

Three other scrolls are known whose illustrations are of the same iconography and style as the Peking paintings and also treat just the first nine chapters of the Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety. Photographs of two of these scrolls were published in the early twentieth century, but the whereabouts of the scrolls themselves are not currently known. One, whose subject was incorrectly identified as Pan Chao's Admonitions for Women (Nü chieh, a Han treatise), had paintings attributed to Chao Po-chü (act. first half of twelfth century) and calligraphy assigned to Sung Hui-tsung (1082–1135; r. 1100–26). This scroll was photographed in 1913, when it was in the collection of Ch'en K'uei-lin (1855–after 1915). The other scroll, attributed to Ch'en Chü-chung (act. early thirteenth century), belonged to a Mr. Jen of Shao-hsing when it was published in 1931. Its calligraphy sections were not reproduced or described. The third scroll, with paintings attributed to Yen Li-pen and calligraphy to Yü Shih-nan (558–638) was described in great detail by Wu Sheng in 1712, enabling us to study it even though the scroll itself has disappeared. Wu noted that the calligraphy, which was written on paper, looked more like that of Sung Kao-tsung (1107–87; r. 1127–62).

Illustrations of Chapters Ten through Eighteen (Recorded Scrolls)

Although connoisseurs' catalogues suggest that paintings once existed for all eighteen chapters of the Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety, no illustrations for the second half of the book are now known. The Taipei scroll is the surviving member of a pair catalogued as part of the Ch'ien-lung emperor's collection in 1744, and a Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety scroll, part two, attributed to Ma Ho-chih and Sung Kao-tsung, appears on a list of works removed from the palace in 1992. Thus, the second scroll was lost from the palace comparatively recently. Two other scrolls with texts and illustrations for the latter nine chapters were recorded within the last hundred years, but both have dropped from sight. One of these contained a complete set of paintings and texts for chapters ten through eighteen and was published by Lu Hsin-yüan (1834–94). Not recognizing the subject, Lu thought the scroll illustrated Pan Chao's Admonitions for Women. Taking his lead from a colophon by Wen Cheng-ming (1470–1559) appended to the work, Lu
attributed the paintings to Ma Yüan and the calligraphy to Sung Kao-tsun. These paintings may be the ones reproduced by the Shanghai Chung-hua shu-chi\textsuperscript{20} in 1920, without provenance or other information, and whose whereabouts are unknown.\textsuperscript{17}

The other recorded version was a scroll containing only four illustrations, paired with texts from the second half of the book (chapters seventeen, fifteen, thirteen, and eleven, in that order). This partial version was owned by P'ang Yüan-chi\textsuperscript{24} (ca. 1865–1949), who catalogued it under the misleading title Pictures of Eminent Women (Lieh nü t'\textmu\texttextsuperscript{w}sr\textsuperscript{18}). Like the scroll recorded by Lu Hsin-yüan, the paintings were attributed to Ma Yüan and the calligraphy to Sung Kao-tsun, but they could not be the same work because the seals do not agree. P'ang's descriptions of the pictures tell us little more than the number of figures in each scene. The only exception is his description of the illustration for chapter thirteen, which recounts the melodramatic story of the chaste Lady Ch'i\'ang,\textsuperscript{d} the wife of King Chao of Ch'\textsuperscript{u}.\textsuperscript{23} Stranded on a flooded terrace, Lady Ch'i\'ang virtually drowned rather than allow herself to be rescued by an envoy who had forgotten to bring her husband's tally as proof of his mission. The scene P'ang described showed Lady Ch'i\'ang and her attendants on the flooded tower, and the envoy galloping up on horseback.\textsuperscript{19} In the absence of adequate visual material for studying the illustrations of the last nine chapters, we shall confine our attention to the first half of the book.

Comparison of Extant Scrolls

As previously discussed, for the first nine chapters of the Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety we have five versions: two extant scrolls, two more known through old reproductions, and one published with enough descriptive detail to enable us to draw conclusions about it. Even a casual comparison of the five works reveals unexpected disparities among them. No two scrolls agree in their ordering of chapters or in their matching of texts and illustrations, unlike illustrated versions of the Classic of Filial Piety, which are highly consistent with one another.\textsuperscript{20} Of the five versions of the Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety, only the Taipei scroll has the text-chapters in the right order, a task made simple for mounters because ordinal numbers follow the chapter titles written on this version. The other scrolls lack these numbers, and their text-chapters are scrambled, presumably because of careless remounting. Since published editions of the Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety were always available for reference concerning the proper order of chapters, it is puzzling that so many variations could arise.

Not only do the chapters vary in sequence from one scroll to another and from printed editions of the Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety, the texts do not always accompany the same illustration. The magnitude of the disparity is clear when this information is presented in the form of a chart (Table 1). In the chart, numbers one through nine indicate the text-chapters, letters A through I are assigned to the nine compositions found in the five scrolls, and the notes to the chart briefly describe the key elements in each scene. Despite the differences in the pictorial details between the Taipei and Peking illustrations, there are enough similarities in the basic features to permit both sets to be given the same general descriptions. We can thus see at a glance how great are the disparities between the five scrolls, both in the sequence of chapters and in the pairing of texts and illustrations.

In determining which illustration originally accompanied which chapter, we have no external standard of judgment to apply. No titles are written directly on any of the paintings, and, as we have seen, no two scrolls contain exactly the same matchings. Therefore, we have to rely directly on the evidence contained in the texts and paintings themselves in order to restore the appropriate pairings. By carefully analyzing the verbal content of each chapter and subjecting each picture to close observation for significant details, we hope to be able to reconstruct the original illustrative program of the Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety.

Texts of Chapters One through Nine

Like the Classic of Filial Piety, which is presented as a dialogue between Confucius and his disciple Tseng-tzu,\textsuperscript{18} the Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety takes the form of an exchange between the eminent Han instructress Pan Chao (ca. 45–ca. 115 A.D.), in the role of the wise teacher, and a group of young ladies, her pupils. In content, the teachings are a composite of the prescriptions for female behavior from Pan Chao's own book, Admonitions for Women; invocations of cosmic principle from the Classic of Filial Piety; and instructive anecdotes from Liu Hsiang's\textsuperscript{21} Biographies of Eminent Women (Lieh nü chuan\textsuperscript{20}).\textsuperscript{21} Numerous quotations from the Classic of Poetry (Shih ching\textsuperscript{48}), Classic of History (Shu...
Ching*), and Classic of Changes (I ching**) create a refined, literary tone. The first nine chapters are translated below.

Chapter One: “The Starting Point and Basic Principles”

Ts’ao Ta-ku⁸⁹ [Pan Chao] was at leisure and the young ladies were seated in attendance. Ta-ku said, “In antiquity, the two daughters of the Sage Emperor [Yao] had the filial way and came down to Kuei-jiu,⁹⁰ They were humble, yielding, respectful, and frugal; their thoughts were of fulfilling the wisely way. Sagely and wise, they avoided difficulties with others. Have you heard about this?” The young ladies withdrew from their seats and apologized, saying, “We girls are stupid and unenlightened and have not received the rest of your teachings. Could we hear them?” Ta-ku said, “Study by collecting them and question by debating them; hear much and omit the doubtful, and it can be taken as a system for human [conduct]. If you can heed these words and perform these deeds, I will tell you. Filiality broadens heaven and earth, deepens human relationships, moves ghosts and spirits, and affects the birds and beasts. Venerate close relatives with proper rites; act after thinking thrice. Do not make a display of merit and do not boast of your goodness. Be agreeable, yielding, chaste, and obedient; humane, enlightened, filial and merciful. When your virtuous acts are accomplished, you will be without blame. The Classic of History says: ‘As for filiality: being filial, and friendly with your brethren.’¹²⁴ This says it.

Chapter Two: “Empress and Imperial Consorts”

“The poems from ’The Ospreys’ (Kuan sai⁹) through ‘The Unicorn’s Feet’ (Lin chih chih)⁹⁵ embody the virtue of the empress and imperial consort. She is concerned that sages be promoted, and does not defile her sex. Morning and evening her thoughts and meditations are anxious and diligent. Her virtuous influence reaches the common people and she is a model for [all within] the four seas.⁹⁶ This is the filiality of the empress and consorts. The Classic of Poetry says, ‘The drum and bell are beaten in the palace / Their sounds are heard outside.’³⁷

Chapter Three: “Noble Ladies”

“Be lofty and able to restrain yourself, and protect your position without selfishness. Appreciate diligence and toil, and understand public opinion. The offices of the Classic of Poetry and Classic of History can be studied, and the principles of the Classic of Rites and Classic of Music can be practiced. But, if one is famous but not wise, this is called a heap of misfortune; if one is of great status but small virtue, this is called incipient calamity. How could I not warn you of this? Alone in repose and upright in action, do not lose your dignity; then afterwards you will be able to harmonize your sons and grandchildren and preserve the ancestral temple. This is the filiality of noble ladies. The Classic of Changes says, ‘He does away with what is false and preserves his integrity. His character is influential and transforms men.’³⁸

Chapter Four: “Wives of Feudal Lords”

“If it is not the clothing prescribed by rites and doctrines, do not dare to wear it; if it is not the speech prescribed in the Classic of Poetry and Classic of History, do not dare to utter it; if it is not a sincere and virtuous act, do not dare to do it. If you want people not to hear [something], nothing is better than not to say [it]; if you want people not to know, nothing is better than not to do [something]; if you want people not to gossip, nothing is better than not to engage [in something]. When these three [conditions] are fulfilled, then you will be able to preserve the rites and sacrifices. This is the filiality of wives of feudal lords. The Classic of Poetry says, ‘She picks the artemisia, by the ponds, on the Isles / She employs it, in the business of dukes and marquises.’³⁹

Chapter Five: “Common People”

“In carrying out the way of the wife, understand the benefits of righteousness. Put others first and oneself last, thereby serving your parents-in-law. Spin thread, make garments, and supply the sacrificial foods for the altars. This is the filiality of the wife of a commoner. The Classic of Poetry says, ‘A woman who has nothing to do with public affairs / Leaves her silkworms and weaving.’³⁰

Chapter Six: “Serving the Parents-in-law”

“In a woman’s service to her parents-in-law, she is as respectful as she is to her own father and as loving as she is to her own mother. Maintaining this [attitude] is righteous, and acting on it shows propriety. At the cock’s first crow, she washes her hands and rinses her mouth and dresses in order to serve them. In winter she warms [them], in summer she cools [them], in the evening she settles [them] and in the morning she arouses [them]. She is respectful in straightening interior [affairs] and righteous toward the outside. Her propriety and sincerity established, she acts on them ever afterward. The Classic of Poetry says, ‘When a young lady goes forth [to be married] / She leaves her parents and brothers.’⁴¹

Chapter Seven: “The Three Powers”

The young ladies in attendance asked, “Is the husband really so great?” Pan replied, “The husband is heaven; how could one not serve him? The ancients used the word huel⁴² [to follow, pledge allegiance to] to refer to the marriage of a woman; she moves to another ‘heaven’ and serves her husband. The morality of it originated in high antiquity: It is the first principle of heaven, the ultimate standard of earth, and the norm of conduct for the people. The nature of heaven and earth provides a pattern for mankind. Patterning oneself on the brightness of heaven, one accordingly [achieves] the benefits of earth.⁴³

If you guard against idleness and act with propriety, you will be able to establish the family. Moreover, the ancients used universal love, and gentlemen did not neglect filiality and charity. They disseminated norms of rectitude, and gentlemen enthusiastically complied.
The ancients used respectful yielding, and gentlemen did not quarrel. They led them with rites and music, and gentlemen lived harmoniously. They showed them examples of good and evil, and gentlemen knew what was forbidden.35

The Classic of Poetry says, ‘Intelligent is he and wise / Protecting his own person.’34

Chapter Eight: “Government by Filiality”

“In ancient times, virtuous women used filiality to manage their nine degrees of kin. They dared not neglect the wives of the lowly or the young, much less their younger in-laws. Thus, they gained the good will of their six relations and thereby served their parents-in-law. Those who managed the family dared not insult the chickens and dogs, much less the humble members; thus, they gained the good will of their superiors and inferiors and thereby served their husbands. Those who regulated the women’s quarters dared not slight the servants, much less the ladies; thus, they gained the good will of everyone and thereby served their parents. Accordingly, while their parents were living, they loved them, and [after their death], they sacrificed to appease their spirits. By these means they harmonized the nine degrees of kin and did not cause or calamity. This, then, is how a virtuous woman uses filiality to manage those above and below. The Classic of Poetry says, ‘Erring in nothing, forgetful of nothing / Observing and following the old statutes.’45

Chapter Nine: “Elucidating Wisdom”

The young ladies inquired, “In the virtue of the wife, can nothing be added to one’s intelligence?” Ta-ku said, “Mankind imitates heaven and earth, sustaining sin and harboring yong.48 If one has an intelligent and wise nature, there is nothing wrong with exercising it, especially if one is careful. Once, King Chuang of Ch’u44 was holding court in the evening and Lady Fan44 entered and said, ‘Why do you end court so late? Can you not be tired?’ The king said, ‘Today I am speaking with a sage, and I am so happy that I do not notice that it is late.’ Lady Fan said, ‘Might I inquire who this sage is?’ The king said, ‘Yü Ch’iu-tzu.’44 Lady Fan covered her mouth and laughed. The king found this strange and asked her the reason. She replied, ‘Yü Ch’iu-tzu may be a sage, but he is not loyal. I have been your wife for eleven years, and I have introduced nine girls [into the harem]. Two of them are more esteemed than I, and the other seven are ranked equally with me. I know how to undermine or steal your love for the others, but I would not dare to put my private interests in the way of the general good; I want you to have broad experience. Now, Yü Ch’iu-tzu has been minister for ten years; as for the people he has recommended to you, if they were not his sons and grandsons, then they were his clansmen. I have not heard that he promotes the worthy and retires the unworthy—can he be called a sage?’ The king thereupon accused Yü Ch’iu-tzu, and Yü did not know what to do, so he abandoned his house and slept in the dew. An envoy was sent to receive Sun Shu-ao49 and bring him to court, and the king established Sun as minister. Because of one word to the wise, the feudal lords dared not advance their armies; and [King Chuang] ended up becoming hegemon of the country, because of the efficacy of Lady Fan.56 The Classic of Poetry says, ‘He who obtains [good] men prospers / He who loses [good] men is ruined.’57 It also says, ‘If your words are harmonious / The people will become united.’58

Proposed Matchings of Illustrations with Texts

In the notes to Table 1, the nine illustrations to the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety have been given schematic descriptions identified with the letters A through I for convenience in noting which picture accompanied which text in our five scrolls. All but one depict anonymous women in domestic settings, in interactions so generalized that it is sometimes hard to determine which chapter is being illustrated. Here I will argue that the sequence A through I is in fact the correct order for illustrations matched with chapters one through nine, such that a “perfect” scroll would be arranged as follows:

1 A, 2 B, 3 C, 4 D, 5 E, 6 F, 7 G, 8 H, 9 I.

As is appropriate to a text concerned with lofty ideals of behavior, the paintings are decorous and solemn, with few incidental details that might distract the viewer’s attention from their moral content. Of the eight illustrations of anonymous paragons, three (A, C, and D) suggest an instructional context with an older woman addressing one or more younger ones. As the three scenes contain very few clues for linking the pictures to specific chapters, it is not surprising that their assignment differs among the five Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety scrolls. Two other scenes (G and H) that also are assigned to various texts depict scenarios that could conceivably pertain to more than one chapter. On the other hand, three paintings (B, E, and F) present enough contextual detail for there to be no ambiguity as to which chapter is being portrayed, and they are consistently matched with the same text. Likewise, there is no confusion in identifying the correct illustration (I) for the ninth chapter, the only painting in which a specific woman is represented.

One logical approach to the problem of matching illustrations to the proper texts is to start with the easiest and most obvious cases, in order to eliminate their corresponding chapters from the range of possibilities remaining for the more difficult illustrations. In searching for clues and sup-
Table 1. Order and Components of Scrolls Illustrating Chapters 1-9 of the *Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety*

Chapters are listed by numbers 1-9; illustrations are listed by letters A-I*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scroll</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Ma Ho-chih”</td>
<td>NPM Taipei</td>
<td>1C, 2B, 3D, 4H, 5E, 6F, 7G, 8A, 9I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous**</td>
<td>Peking Museum</td>
<td>1A, 2B, 7D, 9I, 6F, 4H, 3C, 8G, 5E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Chao Po-chü”</td>
<td>ex-Ch’en K’uei-lin collection</td>
<td>1A, 4H, 7D, 2B, 6F, 9I, 3C, 8G, 5E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ch’én Chü-chung”***</td>
<td>ex-Jen collection</td>
<td>A, H, B, I, C, D, G, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Yen Li-pen”</td>
<td>described by Wu Sheng</td>
<td>1A, 4H, 7D, 2B, 6F, 9I, 3C, 8G, 5E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Illustrations A-I are as follows:
A. Instructress seated on dais, surrounded by young ladies.
B. Empress seated in high-backed chair indoors, with attendants.
C. Woman with fan, seated indoors, instructing younger ladies.
D. Women outdoors.
E. Women spinning and sewing outdoors, seated on *tatami* mats.
F. Man and woman seated on *tatami* indoors; woman bringing them a dish.
G. Woman bowing or kneeling before man seated outdoors.
H. Empress at entrance to ancestral temple.
I. Woman remonstrating with ruler surrounded by attendants; carriage driving away in the distance.

**In Peking scroll, texts actually follow paintings but are noted in reverse here for convenience in comparison with other versions.

***No information is available about the texts for this scroll, except that they follow the paintings.

...porting proof, we may make useful comparisons with the paintings of the *Classic of Filial Piety*, on the theory that the *Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety*’s dependence on the *Classic of Filial Piety*’s literary structure makes it likely that their illustrations are also related. For these comparisons, reference will be made to the Southern Sung court version of the *Classic of Filial Piety*, now mounted in album form (Figs. 19–22). References to the Peking version of the *Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety* should be understood as applying also to the three similar scrolls of unknown whereabouts.

Illustration B (Figs. 2 and 11) is clearly a representation of an empress, an iconic type recognizable from her crown, ornate chair, and attendants. Her posture and attire are closely related to those of the empress-dowager depicted in the painting for the second chapter of the *Classic of Filial Piety*, “The Emperor” (Fig. 20), in which the emperor demonstrates his filiality in his devotion to his widowed mother. Although details of the setting differ considerably, the similarity in the basic conception is particularly clear when the *Classic of Filial Piety* scene is compared with the Peking version of the *Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety* (Fig. 11), for the empress is attended by three attendants in male garb (women dressed as men) rather than the two, clearly female, maids of the Taipei scroll (Fig. 2). It seems obvious that the picture can only illustrate the second chapter of the *Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety*, “Empress and Imperial Consorts.” The only other painting that could possibly correspond to this chapter is illustration H (Figs. 8 and 17), which also depicts an empress; however, the latter illustration emphasizes the ceremonial sacrifice in the ancestral temple, to which chapter two does not refer.

Illustration E (Figs. 5 and 14) shows women spinning thread and sewing cloth, seated on *tatami* mats outdoors under the trees. The Peking scene (Fig. 14) includes an additional vignette at the left side of the composition, where another woman is placing bronze ritual vessels on a high table. Spinning and making clothing are mentioned only in chapter five, “Common People,” and a reference to preparing sacrifices also occurs there. The relatively simple clothing and humble
surroundings of the women—the Taipei picture (Fig. 5) includes a rustic thatched fence—are appropriate for depicting the wives of commoners, and there is no ambiguity about the intended subject. The idea that making clothes is a women’s duty is enshrined in the ancient anthology of poems, the Shih ching, or Classic of Poetry, and a related composition occurs in that cycle.40

In illustration F (Figs. 6 and 15) a man and woman are seated side by side on a tatami mat in front of a landscape screen. Before them are food and wine vessels, and another dish is being brought to them by a younger woman. In the Taipei scene (Fig. 6), she kneels directly in front of them, preferring the dish with the expression of one anxious to please. The composition of this illustration is very similar to that of the scene illustrating the fifth chapter of the Classic of Filial Piety, “Scholar-Officials” (Fig. 21), in which a gentleman bows deferentially to his aged parents, who likewise sit before a landscape screen with feast dishes in front of them. In this picture it is the scholar’s wife and maids who actually bring the dishes, so by analogy it seems clear that the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety painting depicts the wife in chapter six, “Serving the Parents-in-law.” Chapter seven is the only other one that specifically discusses the wife’s service, but it refers only to her own husband; its illustration surely could not depict him seated beside another woman while his wife serves him. The Peking composition (Fig. 15) is somewhat more ambiguous because the wife stands out in the corridor with her dish, and the parents-in-law are much younger. Nonetheless, the contextual similarity of the feast for a couple in front of a landscape screen relates it clearly to the Taipei scene.

Illustration I (Figs. 9 and 18) contains two separate vignettes: at the right, on a terrace, a lady confronts a king with his retinue of attendants; at the left, in the distance, a carriage is driving away. The narrative details included in this composition make it easy to recognize as the illustration to chapter nine, “Elucidating Wisdom,” in which Lady Fan bravely criticizes the minister blindly favored by her husband, King Choung. Her statement that she had unselfishly introduced suitable women into his palace is reflected in the number of maids attending him. In the Peking version (Fig. 18), these figures appear at first glance to be men, but are actually women in male garb. The carriage hurrying off in the background is that of the envoy sent to bring Sun Shu-ao to court. In the Taipei version (Fig. 9), the empty expanse of mist that separates this vignette from the figures in the foreground is a device that tells us that the two events occur at different times. Moreover, since the handscroll unrolls from right to left, it is natural to read the temporal sequence of the narrative in the same direction. The Peking painting is less emphatic in separating the two moments, but even there the neutral zone of blank ground and the drastic change of scale provide a transition from Lady Fan’s remonstrance to the envoy’s departure.

Illustration A (Figs. 1 and 10) presents a group of women sitting on stools around a large dais, upon which another lady is seated cross-legged. One has left her stool and stands before the dais, looking at the cross-legged lady with an expression of deferential inquiry. The scenario is very similar in concept to the painting for the Classic of Filial Piety’s first chapter, “The Starting Point and Basic Principles” (Fig. 19), in which Confucius’ disciple Tseng-tzu initiates a dialogue with the master. In view of the opening sentences of its identically titled first chapter, the illustrations of the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety should also begin by introducing the instructress and her pupils. Actually, neither picture is entirely faithful to the respective texts: the former depicts a group of disciples seated around Confucius’ dais, but the text indicates that Tseng-tzu attended the master alone; the latter places a lone woman before the dais as if asking a question of Pan Chao, but the text is a dialogue between the instructress and an undifferentiated group of young women. The master-disciple composition is simply a conventional device for suggesting a didactic context. While the Classic of Filial Piety scene takes place out-of-doors, the ladies meet on a terrace landscaped with a prominent garden rock and blossoming trees, suggesting that they are inside a residence or palace, as is appropriate for well-bred women.

The remaining four illustrations (G, D, G, and H) are more difficult to identify both because they are more generalized and because none has a close counterpart in the paintings for the first nine chapters of the Classic of Filial Piety. Accordingly, our inquiry requires even more detailed analysis and subtlety in argumentation. Recalling the logic used above to rule out the possibility that scene F depicted chapter seven, “The Three Powers,” we may assign scene G (Figs. 7 and 16) to that chapter because it is a picture of a woman serving a lone seated man, her husband. The Taipei and Peking scrolls differ considerably in the details of
the scenario, but the primary interaction is the same. In the Taipei version (Fig. 7), the woman merely bows respectfully to the man, who inclines toward her with a rather stern expression; in the Peking painting (Fig. 16), she kneels at his feet to offer him a bowl.

Illustration H (Figs. 8 and 17) shows an empress entering the ancestral temple, in which sacrificial offerings have been set out. All three of the remaining chapters speak of ancestral sacrifice, three ("Noble Ladies"), four ("Wives of Feudal Lords") and eight ("Government by Filiality"). There are two reasons why it is most likely that the eighth chapter is the one illustrated. First, the woman entering the temple wears a robe and crown that clearly belong to an empress, as we can verify by analogy with illustration B (Figs. 2 and 11). Since the third and fourth chapters specifically treat lower ranks of women (i.e., noble ladies and the wives of feudal lords), their depictions would be unlikely to include an empress as protagonist. Second, the eighth chapter recapitulates in generalized terms the ancient principles of filial management of the family, including the performance of appropriate ancestral sacrifices. Since no specific class of woman is singled out in the discussion, the concept could theoretically be illustrated in any social context; and perhaps the choice of an empress underscores the importance of filial management of the extended family at all levels. The depiction of the ancestral temple and its furnishings just before the sacrifice begins is modeled in a general way on the painting for chapter sixteen of the Classic of Filial Piety, "Evocation and Response" (Fig. 22), a more elaborate composition in which court officials perform a stately ceremonial dance before the temple. Both scenes also employ the arresting frontal perspective that appears to be conventional in representations of religious rites or experiences.

By process of elimination, illustrations C and D must depict chapters three and four, but their specific identifications are the most difficult of the entire series to establish. In illustration C (Figs. 3 and 12), a seated lady addresses the younger woman (two women in the Peking version) standing deferentially before her. Behind her is a landscape screen, and her quarters open onto an elegant garden. The silk fan in the lady's hand is a type associated in Sung times with ladies of the court and is perhaps intended to suggest the high social context of chapter three. In the Peking scroll (Fig. 12), the composition includes two books, an inkstone, paperweights, a scroll, and a bronze ritual vessel, which are placed on a table before the seated lady, perhaps alluding to the classics named in the chapter.

Illustration D (Figs. 4 and 13) differs the most between the Taipei and Peking scrolls, the former presenting a seated lady instructing two younger ones on a terrace, the latter depicting a gathering of six ladies of approximately equal age in a garden. The subtle but crucial clue is found in the Peking version (Fig. 13). The lady standing at the extreme left points to a white flowering sprig in her hand, and one of the seated women also gestures in its direction. It seems likely that the motif refers to the line "She picks the artemisia" in the quotation from the Classic of Poetry (Shih ching) at the end of the fourth chapter. By contrast, the Taipei picture (Fig. 4) offers nothing by which we could determine whether it illustrates chapter three or four. Perhaps the rationale behind its ambiguous composition was to maintain the parallel with chapters two and three, which feature a single seated composition, since all three texts concern the filiality of upper-class women. The reasons for the differences between the Taipei and Peking versions will be further discussed below.

Dates of the Extant Scrolls and Their Original Recensions

Despite their differences, the Taipei and Peking illustrations probably are not widely separated in actual date of execution. Of the two, the Taipei scroll is the more readily dated, for it exhibits familiar characteristics identified with the Southern Sung court painting bureau. Despite the appearance of a reputed signature of Ma Ho-chih on the now-lost second scroll of the Taipei set, the mannerisms and brush techniques are firmly within the tradition of Ma Yuán and his son Ma Lin. Among the motifs associated with them are the ubiquitous trees and branches that jut out at expressive angles and frame the spaces occupied by the figures, the prominent tree-roots that protrude from the earth, the firmly drawn buildings on which decorative details are indicated in cursory but adequate fashion, and the tall-proportioned women in voluminous robes. In the brushwork, we find emphatic, often hooked strokes giving somewhat unnatural contours to the clothing, with color lines sometimes added to highlight the folds; "ax-cut" strokes used with restraint on the large rocks; and trees and
rocks that are heavily outlined and hard-edged. The landscape panels that embellish screens in illustrations B, C, and F are mist-filled “one-corner” compositions, of a type that gave Ma Yüan his nickname, “One-Corner Ma.”

More generally, the handling of space in the Taipei scroll reflects the advances and concerns of the Southern Sung. Every illustration includes an architectural structure of some type—a building, paved courtyard, or fence—whose zigzagging contours define stable, substantial spaces for the figures. Many scenes are “framed” on either side by trees and/or rocks; arching branches often close off the composition from above, and rocks or architectural elements sometimes provide a repoussoir from below. Thus, the compositional space is organized to focus on the interactions of the figures, dramatizing them for the viewer. Points of view are varied, and spatial relations are coherent. More distant objects are seen through and behind the forms in the fore or middle ground, but there is no clearly delineated and continuously receding ground plane. In view of these characteristics and in the absence of any indications of a later date, it seems likely that the Taipei illustrations belong to the first half of the thirteenth century, when the influence of the Ma family style was at its height in the court painting bureau.

The Peking scroll seems at first more difficult to place. The style is much more conservative than that of the Taipei scroll and is reminiscent of the late T’ang or Five Dynasties’ periods. In many respects—clothing, hairstyles, furniture—it resembles the well-known Night Revels of Han Hsi-tsai, a work attributed to the tenth-century painter Ku Hung-chung but generally believed to be a Sung copy. Elements in the landscape and furnishings are depicted with a striking concern for realism, particularly noticeable in the richly modeled garden rocks in illustrations A, C, D, and I. The volupitous treatment of aristocratic female forms evokes the legacy of late T’ang-Five Dynasties’ painters like Chou Fang (ca. 730–ca. 800) and Chou Wen-chü (act. mid-tenth century); the large and full-bodied figures are drawn with smooth, unobtrusive brushlines, accented only sparingly with slight thickening or turnings of the brush. Opaque mineral pigments enrich the garments, and ornate designs are often carefully depicted in the fabrics. The handling of space is relatively simple; in most sections we are given a nearly frontal view, and the architectural settings are friezelike and shallow, with sharply slanted floors. Outdoor scenes are simply and economically defined by a tree and rock, leaving blank silk to imply the ground. Our perception of T’ang elements in the Peking scroll is intriguingly anticipated by Ku Fu and Wu Sheng, who attributed a related scroll to Yen Li-pan, even though the text of the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety did not exist in Yen’s lifetime.

On the other hand, the most “modern” elements in the Peking paintings and probable clues to their actual date are the landscape compositions that embellish the large standing screens in illustrations B, C, and F. In B (Fig. 11) the screen depicts monumental mountains across a river, with a view up the river valley into the deep, misty distance at the left; at the right, scholars sit in a thatched-roof pavilion beside a thunderous waterfall. The picture is comparable in sophistication to the anonymous Streams and Mountains without End, attributed by Fong and Lee to the twelfth century. In both works, relative scale and transitions are well integrated, and the brushwork shows a tendency to fusion and abbreviation. In illustration C (Fig. 12), the screen displays a sparse, level-distance composition in which a white egret is flying toward bamboo growing on a riverbank; the far shore lies diagonally across the broad expanse of water, marking a low horizon. The wintry river panorama on the screen in illustration F (Fig. 15) is also organized on a diagonal, with the solid forms extending outward from opposite corners, a composition reminiscent of Wang Hung’s River and Sky in Evening Snow in the Eight Views of Hsião and Hsiang (ca. 1150). The brush technique of the screen, however, belongs to the Li Ch’eng/Kuo Hsi mode.

Collectively, the three screens suggest a date no earlier than the late twelfth century, and probably one in the thirteenth century would be better. Although the overall appearance of the Peking paintings does not bring the name of a specific artist to mind, in court painting of the later Southern Sung period there was a conservative survival of T’ang-Five Dynasties’ styles, particularly in narrative or textual illustration. Sometimes the paintings were reasonably careful copies of older works, as is probably true of Night Revels of Han Hsi-tsai. Many others were new compositions rendered in older styles, such as the anonymous Breaking the Balustrade in Taiwan and the two Palace Ladies album leaves in the Freer Gallery. In the Peking paintings, the combination of late T’ang-Five Dynasties’ features with evidence of twelfth-century advances in landscape painting clearly
places the scroll in this conservative wing of Southern Sung painting. Beating the Clothes (1240) by Mou ¹⁹ (ca. 1178–ca. 1165), though rendered in ink-monochrome, provides another chronological benchmark.²⁰ Like the figures in the Peking scroll, Mou’s ladies are voluptuously proportioned and smoothly drawn in the manner of Chow Fang, whom Mou invokes in his colophon. The shallow architectural interiors in the two scrolls are strikingly similar both in type and treatment, and even the landscape screens are comparable.

As previously noted, there are three other scrolls whose illustrations are virtually identical to those of the Peking scroll. Two of them are attributed to the Southern Sung court painters Chao Po-chü and Ch’ên Chu-chung; the third is associated with Yen Li-pen.²¹ The pervasive differences between these four and the Taipei version, traditionally ascribed to Ma Ho-chih, suggest the co-existence in the Southern Sung period of two separate recensions of illustration, which were originally formulated at slightly different times and in different traditions of figure painting. The late T’ang-Five Dynasties’ characteristics observed in the Peking paintings invite the speculation that the recension to which they belong could have originated with the tenth-century illustrations by Shih K’o, recorded in the Northern Sung imperial catalogue, Hsian-ho hua-p’u.²² Despite his present image as an untrammeled ink-splasher, Shih K’o seems to have painted in more conservative styles and to have made his reputation in figure painting. Soper has presented convincing evidence that Shih K’o’s painting technique actually bore no resemblance to the Ch’an spontaneous mode but was more akin to that of T’ang artists (whose paintings he is known to have seen), displaying firm brushwork, appealing colors, and a high degree of “finish.”²³ Moreover, the titles of his recorded works suggest that he was particularly good at narrative and religious illustration. Although the Northern Sung palace was ransacked by the Chin invaders in 1126–27, numerous pieces in the collection were later reacquired by the Southern Sung court. Even if Shih K’o’s own illustrations to the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety were never recovered, their appearance may have been perpetuated through copies that eventually became available to Southern Sung court painters who produced additional sets in the same style.

If Shih K’o may be behind the Peking recension, might the Taipei version be associated with Li Kung-lin, the other artist whose illustrations of the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety are cited in the Northern Sung imperial catalogue? Again, while there is no firm documentary evidence to prove the connection, some support can be found for the hypothesis. Fragments from Li’s recorded version or another one survived to be seen in 1265 (or 1289?) by the connoisseur Chou Mi¹⁸ (1232–ca. 1308),²⁴ so it is likely that Li’s compositions were known and possibly copied during the Southern Sung period. The subjective quality of the Taipei scroll also suggests a connection with Li Kung-lin, who had studied the styles of Ku K’ai-chih¹⁸ (ca. 344–ca. 406) and other pre-T’ang painters in order to regain the intimacy and immediacy that T’ang figure painting had lost.²⁵ Compared to the figures in the Peking scroll, which display the decorous formality and objectivity typical of T’ang figure painting, the Taipei figures are invested with greater emotional character and seem by their postures and expressions to interact more deeply with each other. They turn or incline toward one another, meet each other’s gaze, make complementary gestures, or bow deeply—all of which heighten the intensity of their relations. The difference between the two recensions is particularly striking in the illustrations to chapter six (compare Figs. 6 and 15): the Taipei version offers a memorable depiction of humility, as the young wife self-effacingly kneels to serve her parents-in-law; while in the emotionally neutral Peking scene, the wife stands in the corridor, blocked from their view by a wall.

As is well known, Li Kung-lin’s illustrations of Confucian texts and literary works did much to reinvigorate the genre of textual illustration in the late Northern Sung, and his influence was perpetuated in the art of the court throughout the Southern Sung period. It is particularly evident in the work of Ma Ho-chih, whose illustrations of classical texts for the Sung court reveal his awareness of Li’s oeuvre and sometimes borrow from it directly.²⁶ Ma and other painters greatly modified the naïve directness and simplicity typical of Li’s figurative scenes to create a style more agreeable to aristocratic taste, so that it is possible to argue, as Barnhart does, that the result is quite alien to the humanistic spirit of Li’s art.²⁷ By the time of Ma Yüan and his followers, Li’s influence may have been tempered almost beyond recognition. Nonetheless, it seems quite possible that the depiction of interpersonal dynamics in the Taipei Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety scroll might distantly reflect the innovations of Li’s recension.
Textual Illustration and Narrative Scrolls in the Southern Sung

In addition to the five *Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety* scrolls discussed above, another Southern Sung version by a court painter, Li Tsun, was seen by the fourteenth-century connoisseur Hsia Wen-yen. Although we cannot confirm the Southern Sung date of the scrolls of unknown whereabouts, it is intriguing that so many seem to belong to the same period. In fact, recent studies suggest that it was relatively common for illustrated texts and narrative paintings to be produced in multiple versions by artists of the Southern Sung court painting bureau—familiar examples include the *Classic of Filial Piety*, Ts’ao Chih’s *Goddess of the Lo River* (*Lo-shen fu*), Liu Shang’s *Eighteen Songs of a Nomad Flute* (*Hu-chia shi-pa p’ai*), Lou Shu’s *Agriculture and Sericulture* (*Keng-chih t’u*), and the *Classic of Poetry* (*Shih ching*). Sometimes the pictures are attributed to relatively famous artists, but it is just as common to find them identified as anonymous Southern Sung court paintings. The frequently close dependence of one version upon another suggests that in some cases a primary version by a master artist was copied by the rank and file of the painting bureau. Because illustrative painting had enjoyed its heyday long before the Southern Sung, namely in the Six Dynasties’ and T’ang periods, the apparent resurgence of interest in this type of art during the Southern Sung calls for an attempt at explanation.

A common element in all these examples of textual illustration is their classicist character, for the literary works they illustrate were written in the distant past or refer to famous early people or recreate the livelihood and values of ancient Chinese society. In addition to being in accord with the Southern Sung philosophical climate of renewed interest in the Confucian classics and in antiquity generally, art on classical themes suited the taste of at least one Southern Sung emperor, Kao-tsung, who patronized conservative types of art in the context of his quest for legitimacy. A trend-setter for his successors in many respects, Kao-tsung probably established a precedent for having such works illustrated in the court painting bureau. Often the texts were transcribed in his calligraphic style, which was also followed by his successors; and undoubtedly the writing was intended to pass for the emperor’s own, even though it was actually done by others. Occasional references in various Southern Sung writings suggest that imperial scrolls were given to high officials, courtiers, and palace ladies as a mark of favor. In view of the elevated moral or literary tone of such works, they were eminently suitable as souvenirs of imperial beneficence, being didactic as well as elegant.

The rise and spread of woodblock printing may have been another factor in the renewed appeal of old-fashioned handscrolls containing texts and paintings. In an age when printing technology was rapidly developing and illustrated books were becoming widely and inexpensively available, it is possible that some people regarded the possession of handwritten and painted “editions” in handscroll form as a mark of aesthetic refinement or conservative good taste. However, the fall of the Southern Sung may have been the turning point in the prestige of the illustrated scroll, which probably suffered from its identification with the court and hence political failure. It is interesting to note that a descendant of the Sung royal family, Chao Meng-fu (1254–1322), was the only great master to work in the illustrative mode in the Yuan period. Eventually, the best artists and elite connoisseurs came to prefer landscape paintings. The demand for illustrated handscrolls in later times persisted primarily among the artistically less sophisticated, and their needs were largely satisfied by nameless professional artists who perpetuated ever more distant Sung models.
Notes


4. Hua-yen-ching (Avatamsaka or Garland Sūtra) and Ch’ing-kung-ching (Vajracchedikā-prājñāparāmitā or Diamond Sūtra); see Hsiao-ho hua-p’u, chüan 7, p. 76/450.


7. Life dates are not recorded for either Madam Cheng or her husband, a minor official named Hso-mo-ch’en Mo (or Miao). However, her “Memorial on submitting the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety” says that she wrote the book for her niece, who was about to marry the Prince of Yung (Yung-wang’); see Tung Kao et al., comp., Ch’ing-t’ing Ch’ian T’ang wen, repr. Taipei, 1961, chüan 945, pp. 56–6b, 12399. This prince is probably Li Lin, who lived in the mid-eighteenth century; see his biography in Ou-yang Hui and Sung Ch’i, Hsin T’ong shu, Peking, 1975, chüan 92, pp. 3611–12.


19. A scene matching this description appears in the 1920 Chung-hua shu-chü publication (see n. 17). The biography of Lady Chi’ang originally appeared in the chapter entitled “Chaste and Obedient” in an expanded later edition of Liu Hsiang’s Biographies of Eminent Women (Li hui nü ch’uan); for a translation, see Albert O’Hara, The Position of Women in Early China, Taipei, 1971, pp. 117–18. A very similar painting appears in a handscroll entitled Four Women Who were Chaste to the Death (Ssu lih fu t’u), reproduced in I-t’ieh to-ying, no. 16, 1982, p. 2, top. The latter cycle illustrates four particularly lurid anecdotes from the later edition of Biographies of Eminent Women. (The other scenes in this scroll depict women not cited in the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety.)

20. For an introduction to various illustrations of the Classic of Filial Piety, see Barnhart, “Li Kung-lin,” pp. 66–70. All but one of the versions he discusses consistently have the illustrations for chapters eleven and fourteen reversed, apparently deliberately. The only exception is an album that, as he notes, probably was “corrected” by a later owner (pp. 107–12). One other inconsistency he points out is that a version attributed to Chao Meng-fu has the illustrations of chapters two and three reversed (p. 86).

21. For further analysis of the text of the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety, see Murray, “Didactic Art for Women.”

22. Ts’ao was the surname of Pan Chao’s husband, Ts’ai Shih-shu. Ta-ku was an honorary name bestowed on her by the Eastern Han emperor Hsüan-ti (r. 88–105).

23. In Shansi; literally, the bend of the Kuei stream. Yao sent his two daughters there to be wives of Shun.


25. These are the first eleven poems in the Classic of Poetry, usually referred to collectively as the Chao nan.

26. This statement is quoted from the Classic of Filial Piety, chapter two.


29. Classic of Poetry, poem no. 13, “Picking Artemisia” (Ts’ai fâu’); translation adapted from Legge, The She King, p. 22. Commentators interpret this poem to refer to the wives of feudal lords assisting their husbands in preparing the sacrifice in the ancestral temple.

30. Classic of Poetry, poem no. 264, “I Look Up” (Ch’un yang’); Legge’s translation (ibid., p. 563). The point of the stanza is that disorder arises when women wrongly leave their proper tasks and meddle in public affairs, which are not their proper concern.


32. This passage is quoted almost verbatim from the Classic of Filial Piety, chapter seven.

33. This passage is also quoted from Classic of Filial Piety, chapter seven.

34. Classic of Poetry, poem no. 266, “Multitude of the People” (Ch’eng min’); Legge’s translation (The She King, p. 543).

35. Classic of Poetry, poem no. 249, “Admirable and Amiable” (Chia lü’); Legge’s translation (ibid., p. 481).

36. The story is taken from the second chapter of Liu Hsiang’s Biographies of Eminent Women (Li hui nü ch’uan, ch’üan 2, pp. 8a–9a); translated by O’Hara in The Position of Women in Early China, pp. 56–58.

37. Despite the attribution, this couplet does not appear in the Classic of Poetry.

38. Classic of Poetry, poem no. 254, “Reverse” (Pan wên’); translation adapted from Legge, The She King, p. 500.


40. For example, see the third painting in a Southern Sung pai-miao handscroll illustrating Classic of Poetry poem no. 154, “Seventh Month” (Ch’i ye’); in the Odes from the State of Pin (Pin fêng’), in the Freer Gallery; reproduced in Thomas Lawton, Chinese Figure Painting, Washington, 1973, p. 51.

41. Furthermore, the woman in illustration H wears a blue robe decorated with pairs of long-tailed pheasants. The garment corresponds to the wen’ robe, described in the official Sung history as being worn by the empress when she visited the imperial ancestral temple (Ch’in-fung’); see Toquet et al., comps., Sung shih, repr. Peking, 1977, ch’üan 151, pp. 3534–35 and p. 3537, n. 10. I am indebted to Richard Edwards for this reference.

42. Artemisia (fan’f) is an aromatic shrub with silver-green leaves and clusters of small white flowers.

43. For comparisons with generally accepted examples of Ma Yuan’s figure paintings, see Composing Poetry on a Spring outing, reproduced in Laurence Sickman et al., Eight Dynasties of Chinese Painting, Cleveland, 1980, pp. 67–68; Scholars Conversing beneath Blossoming Plum, reproduced in James F. Cahill, The Art of Southern Sung China, New York, 1962; and On a Mountain Path in Spring, reproduced in James F. Cahill, Chinese Painting, Geneva, 1960, p. 82. For Ma Lin, see Listening to the Wind in the Pines, reproduced in ibid., p. 64.

45. See n. 6 above.


47. Reproduced in Wen Fong et al., Images of the Mind, Princeton, 1984, p. 222, no. 4 and pp. 274–75.

48. The hanging scroll in the National Palace Museum, Taipei, is conveniently reproduced in Cahill, Chinese Painting, p. 60.

49. Reproduced in Lawton, Chinese Figure Painting, pp. 204–5.

50. The relevance of Mou I’s illustration was pointed out to me by Richard Edwards; see his “Mou I’s Colophon to His Pictorial Interpretation of ‘Beating the Clothes,’” Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America, v. 18, 1964, pp. 7–12.

51. For references, see nn. 12, 13, and 6 respectively.

52. See n. 3 above.


54. Chou Mi records that he saw Li’s scroll in 1265 (the year i-chou’s), along with several other works that had formerly belonged to the Hsian-ho palace, in the collection of Ch’iao Kuei-ch’eng (tsu Ta-chih; hao, Chung-shan’); see Chih-yo-ting tua-ch’i-an, P’ei-chi hsi-pien, Taipei, 1969, ch’üan 6, pp. 133–34. Virtually the same information appears in slightly different form, minus the date of his visit, in Yüen-yen kuo-yen lu (see n. 5 above). Chou Mi comments that Li Kung-lin had also transcribed the texts of the Ladies’ Classic of Filial Piety and that each section was also inscribed by Sung Hui-tsun; however, the emperor’s seals had been removed and those of Chin Chang-tsun” (r. 1188–1208) had been substituted. In the early sixteenth century, Wu K’uan (see n. 5 above) colophonied and recorded a four-section scroll he believed to be the one that Chou Mi had seen and quotes Chou’s entry; however, he gives the date of Chou’s visit as 1289 (ch’i-chou’s). Chang Ch’ou’s entry (see n. 5 above) is based on Wu K’uan’s.


62. See Lawton, Chinese Figure Painting, pp. 54–57; and Sickman et al., Eight Dynasties of Chinese Painting, pp. 78–80. Another Southern Sung Scrollence scroll is reproduced in Wenwu, 1984, no. 10, pls. 2–4 and color plate 2.

63. See Murray, “Ma Ho-chih,” chap. 1.


66. For numerous examples of imperial calligraphy bestowed on various recipients, see the following Southern Sung sources: Ts’ao Hsin, Sung-yin wen-chi, ch’üan 52; Wang Ying-lin, Yü hsi, ch’üan 34; Chou Pt’a, Hsung r’i-ko, ch’üan 7; Yüeh Ko’, Pao-chien-chai f’o-shu ts’an, ch’üan 1–5; and Lou Yiih, Kung k’uei chi, Siu-pu ts’ung-k’uan, Shanghai, n.d., chüan 18, p. 191 and chüan 69, pp. 632–34. By comparison, there is little direct evidence concerning gifts of painting, possibly because these were made to courtiers and palace women who did not write about them. When Ch’in-tsun” (r. 1126–27) was crown prince, he bestowed a handscroll depicting 18 Tang Scholars with his own inscriptions on the palace official Chang Shu-yeh” (d. 1127); see Chao Yen-wei, Yü-lin ma-ch’ao, Chung-kwo wen-hiüeh ts’au-k’ao tsu-liao ts’ung-shu, Shanghai, 1958, chüan 1, p. 2.

67. I have studied this process of development for another popular narrative subject from Sung through Ch’ing times; see “Representations of Hariti, the Mother of Demons, and the Theme of ‘Raising the Alms-Bowl’ in Chinese Painting,” Artibus Asiae, v. 45, no. 4, 1981–82, pp. 253–68.
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Fig. 2. *Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety*, painting section 2, Illustration B (chapter 2): Empress and Imperial Consorts. National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 3. *Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety*, painting section 1. Illustration C (chapter 3?): "Noble Ladies." National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 4. *Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety*, painting section 3. Illustration D (chapter 4): "Wives of Feudal Lords." National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 5. *Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety*, painting section 5. Illustration E (chapter 5): "Common People." National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 7. Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety, painting section 7. Illustration G (chapter 77): "The Three Powers." National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 11. Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety, painting section 2. Illustration B (chapter 2): “Empress and Imperial Consorts.” Palace Museum, Peking.
Fig. 12. *Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety*, painting section 7. Illustration C (chapter 3?): "Noble Ladies." Palace Museum, Peking.
Fig. 13. Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety, painting section 3. Illustration D (chapter 4), Wives of Feudal Lords. Palace Museum, Peking.
Fig. 15. *Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety*, painting section 5. Illustration F (chapter 6): "Serving the Parents-in-law." Palace Museum, Peking.
Fig. 18. Ladies' Classic of Filial Piety, painting section 4, Illustration I (chapter 9): "Elucidating Wisdom." Palace Museum, Peking.

Fig. 20. *Classic of Filial Piety*, leaf 2 (chapter 2): "The Emperor." National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 21. *Classic of Filial Piety*, leaf 5 (chapter 5): "Scholar-Officials." National Palace Museum, Taipei.

Fig. 22. *Classic of Filial Piety*, leaf 13 (chapter 16): "Evocation and Response." National Palace Museum, Taipei.
HSIA WEN-YEN AND HIS T'U-HUI PAO-CHIEN (PRECIOUS MIRROR OF PAINTING)

BY DEBORAH DEL GAIS MULLER

Over the centuries hsia wen-yen's⁠(2) (b. ca. 1315 or after) collection of artists' biographies, the T'u-hui pao-chien,⁠(3) or Precious Mirror of Painting, has become a standard reference work for research on the early history of Chinese painting. In addition to synopsizing information on pre-Yüan artists from many earlier texts, some of which are no longer extant, it provides broad coverage for many Yüan (1279–1368) painters. Hsia's dependence on earlier sources is typical of the whole genre of biographical writing in China; only in his extensive recording of Yüan painters' biographies does it appear that he made an original contribution.¹

Hsia's contemporary and close friend, T'ao Tsung-i (ca. 1316–1401 or after), provides what has been, until recently, the single major source of information about Hsia. In T'ao's conclusion to a lengthy discussion of painting in his notebook, Cho-keng lu⁠(4) (completed in 1366), he discusses his close acquaintance as follows:

My friend, Hsia Wen-yen of Wu-hsing,⁠(5) has the style (ts'u) Shih-liang⁠(6) and the literary name (hao) Lan-chu-sheng.⁠(7) His family has for generations collected famous works for which there are few comparisons. Day and night he delights in examining them; his heart guides his sympathetic understanding (shen-huo) and, moreover, his enjoyment in the art of painting. His comprehension penetrates its [special] flavor (ch'i⁠(8)); this is why his connoisseurship is qualitative and he does not mistake one [item] in ten thousand.

Therefore he selected from all the records of painting, with Account of My Experience in Painting (T'u-hua chien-zen ch'ien),⁠(9) "Painting Continued (Hua chi)⁠(10), and A Sequel to "Painting Continued" (Hsiu hua chi)⁠(11) as his basis, and consulted Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsian-ho Collection (Hsian-ho hua p'u)⁠(12), A Painting History of the Seven Courts of the Southern Sung (Nan-tu chi-ch'iao hua shih)⁠(13), and the painting records for artists of the Ch'î (479–502), Liang (502–57), Wei (586–553), Ch'en (557–89), T'ang (618–906), Sung (960–1279), and so forth; and in his [examination of] the biographies and miscellaneous records [preserved] in numerous men's writings, he investigated the hidden and eliminated the mysterious, tying together [these sources] in a network without neglecting any. From the time of the Yellow Emperor to 1275 he discovered over 1,280 [Chinese] and 30 Chin men who were capable painters; in this dynasty, from 1276 until the present, in a period of over ninety years, he found over 200, [making] a total of over 1,500 people.

His inquiry was really thorough and his effort very diligent. His discussion of the three classifications of painting (san-p'in) expands upon what was not manifested [in the writings] of previous men.²

Though not mentioned by name, the painting history to which T'ao refers is clearly the Precious Mirror of Painting. His comments on Hsia's biography summarize what is also generally known through Hsia's own and Yang Wei-chen's⁠(14) (1296–1370) prefaces to the Precious Mirror of Painting and T'eng Hsiao's⁠(15) (1502 chin-shih)⁠(16) preface to its supplement. All three texts emphasize the author's devotion to collecting and connoisseurship; Hsia's own preface naturally assumes the appropriate tone of self-effacing humility dictated by the circumstances under which he wrote.³ T'ao points in addition to what he considers to be Hsia's major theoretical contribution, his discussion of the three classifications for painting.⁴

Hsia Wen-yen's life was definitely one of relative obscurity. The recent indexing of Yüan biographical materials, however, has made it possible to piece together some new sources that partially illuminate his family background and personal circumstances.⁵ The purpose of this article, then, is to examine those sources and thus construct a slightly fuller sketch of Hsia's life. In addition, the history of the Precious Mirror of Painting's text, its sources, and its underlying set of literati (wen-jen) values will be briefly examined.⁶

Hsia Wen-yen and the Hsia Clan of Sung-chiang

The Hsia clan of Sung-chiang⁠(17) (see Table 1) was well known in the fourteenth century. Yang Wei-chen's casual reference to Hsia Wen-yen as a member of the "righteous clan" (i-men)⁠(18) of Sung-chiang in his preface to the Precious Mirror of Painting succinctly placed the author for their mutual contemporaries.⁹ References to the Hsia family also appear in Yang Yu's⁠(19) (1285–1361) notebook, Shan-chî hsin hua⁠(20) (completed by 1360), and in T'ao's Cho-keng lu.⁠(21) Although some clan members served in minor official posts, the clan itself apparently prospered mainly through its business dealings and secured its social position through philanthropy and public works.
Table 1. Genealogy of the Hsia Clan of Sung-chiang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hsia Pin 夏彬</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Ch'i 夏杞 (b. before 1246, d. soon after 1293?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Ch'un 夏彬 (1246–1320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Shih-tse 夏世澤 (b. a. 1265 or after d. before 1346?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Shih-ying 夏世英</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Shih-chieh 夏世傑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Ch'un 夏彬 (1293–1356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Lü Yu-shu 吕有淑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Wen-chü 夏文樞 (b. a. 1515 or after)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Wen-yen 夏文彥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Wen-te 夏文德</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Ta-yu 夏大有 (d. 1387)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The family established itself in Sung-chiang shortly before the fall of the Southern Sung (1127–1279) and began thriving there in the late thirteenth century. The Sung-chiang branch of the clan was founded by a fourth-generation ancestor of Hsia Wen-yen, Hsia Pin, who, accompanied by his two sons, Ch'i (b. before 1246, d. soon after 1293?) and Ch'un (1246–1320), moved from the ancestral seat in Ch'anghsing in Wu-hsing. After their father's death, Ch'i was responsible for the family's affairs. In 1276 the Mongol armies were advancing on Sung-chiang; the two brothers, having become convinced that armed resistance would be folly because harsh Mongol military policies would dictate mass slaughter in retaliation, managed to persuade the city to surrender peacefully. After the Mongol occupation of the city, the Yüan minister Wang Ch'ing-tuan signed a mortgage pledge made by Ch'i in the Chingt'ing period (1260–64) and used the land as a military encampment. At this time the two brothers were registered as residents of Sung-chiang. Ch'i was granted an imperial audience in 1277, then became district magistrate, first for his home town and later for Yü-yao. While Ch'i served in office, Ch'un managed the family's business affairs, successfully. Having shown themselves to be pragmatic in their dealings with the conquerors, their services and support were apparently sought by the Yüan regime. It is obvious that the marked change in the Hsia family fortunes in the late thirteenth century was a direct result of their collaboration with the Mongols.

The major sources for the family history are the two grave inscriptions written for Hsia Ch'un and his grandson, Hsia Ch'un (1293–1356). Except for a short note on Hsia Ch'un in the Yüan history, no other official biographies exist, indicating that the family produced no major officeholders. A few gazetteer notices, however, have been preserved. The grave inscriptions and the gazetteer entries for Hsia Ch'un all stress the Hsia family's philanthropic activities, demonstrating how they served their community in the private sphere. They are commended for "righteousness" (pi), one of the four Mencian principles. It denotes virtuous conduct that when developed with the other principles of humanity (jen), propriety (li), and wisdom (chih) leads to sagehood. The philanthropic orientation of the biographies indicates that the clan's reputation and status were enhanced by such actions, but it probably also conceals the fact that having produced no major officeholders, the family's prosperity was based primarily on successful business dealings. The emphasis on philanthropy and enhancement of the clan's well-being serves to distract attention from the likely source of the family's wealth while simultaneously asserting its position as important members of the local gentry.

The first grave inscription, composed by Teng Wen-yüan (1259–1328) for Hsia Ch'un at the request of his son, Hsia Shih-tse (b. a. 1265 or after, d. before 1346?) summarizes the process through which the family established its position in Sung-chiang in the early Yüan period. Teng begins his text by referring to Hsia Ch'un's reputation as a "righteous scholar" (i-
shih"m" and enumerates the droughts and famines in which he provided public assistance by offering food, shelter, and medicine and by burying the dead. Public recognition of Hsia Ch'un's acts assumed the form of a recommendation for public office. Ch'un declined on the basis of old age and substituted his eldest son, Hsia Shih-tse. The Yüan court also presented Ch'un with an official commendation.20 Teng's text then explains how the Hsia family came to Sung-chiang and acknowledges various public works that were undertaken by Ch'un, among them the founding of a charitable school (i-hsüeh"m" or i-shu"m").21

Continuation of the family tradition of philanthropy is emphasized in Kung Shih-t'ai's (1298–1362) grave inscription for Hsia Ch'un, Hsia Shih-tse's son and Hsia Ch'un's grandson. Ch'un refused to pursue an official career and separated from his family. On later rejoining the clan, he undertook public works of the type initiated by his grandfather and rebuilt the family mansion and charitable school after the 1346 fire in Sung-chiang.22 In addition, in an attempt to ensure the family's economic well-being, Ch'un founded a charitable estate (i-chuang"m") that was to benefit three clans, those of his father, mother, and wife. Clan members received financial assistance in the form of rice money and cloth and silk, and were given additional funds in the cases of weddings, funerals, and illness.23 The maintenance and administration of the communal property apparently continued into the next generation since Yang Wei-ch'en twice described Hsia Wen-yen as a member of a "righteous clan."24 This family-oriented charitable estate represented an expansion and redirection of what earlier had been exclusively public philanthropy.

This composite narrative of the Hsia family, based mainly on documents intended for a commemorative purpose, emphasizes its public, social role within the Sung-chiang community.25 Materials on Hsia Wen-yen, however, are drawn from the private writings, literary collections, and notebooks of his contemporaries.26 Although the texts provide us with a more personal focus and some tantalizing new insights into Hsia Wen-yen's life, they remain difficult to interpret precisely, because certain key facts are still missing. Nevertheless, the information they offer is too significant to be discarded.

Hsia Wen-yen was the second of Hsia Ch'un's three sons. He held at least two official posts under the Yüan, both of which are listed in his father's grave inscription.27 A text composed by Yang Wei-ch'en as a record for Hsia's Wen-chuh-süan," the "pavilion of Wen [T'ung's] bamboo" in which he housed his painting collection, predates this service and may have been written in the late 1340s. In his explanation of the pavilion's name, Yang mentions that Hsia had not yet received an official appointment. One of Hsia Wen-yen's greatest treasures, Yang says, was a scroll of Yün-tang"m" valley bamboo painted by the Northern Sung (960–1126) bamboo specialist Wen T'ung"m" (1018–79), after which Hsia's pavilion was named. Yang then alludes to a famous text by Wen's friend, the renowned poet Su Shih"m" (1037–1101), in which Wen's resilience is compared to that of bamboo.28 This image of the Yün-tang bamboo's inner strength and integrity becomes a metaphor for Hsia Wen-yen's resilience as well and, by extension, alludes to the disappointment he perceived himself to have experienced in not having been appointed to office.29

Yang's closing remarks recall the Hsia family's reputation as art collectors and place Hsia Wen-yen's collection in the context of the family tradition. He asks about the I ch'ing t'u"m" and Ping yü t'u,"m" two famous paintings of presumably historical subjects that had been owned by Hsia Wen-yen's grandfather, Hsia Shih-tse, and had been burned with his studio, the Chih-chih-t'ang.30 In response, Hsia Wen-yen cites one of the two scrolls mentioned by Yang as equal to his Wen T'ung painting, thereby acknowledging the family legacy of art collecting.30

Yang's text is significant for two reasons. First, it confirms very specifically the extent of Hsia Wen-yen's personal collection, noting that he had a large library and owned works by 110 artists.31 Second, it explicitly connects Hsia Wen-yen with Hsia Shih-tse and asserts that a family tradition of collecting existed. Yang names Hsia Shih-tse only as Hsia Wen-yen's ancestor; however, Hsia Ch'un's grave inscription makes it clear that he was Hsia Wen-yen's paternal grandfather.32

The Hsia family collection was apparently initiated by Hsia Shih-tse, whose reputation as a collector was recorded by Li Jih-hua"m" (1565–1635) in the seventeenth century. Li reports that Hsia Shih-tse's residence was frequented by artistic luminaries such as Yang Wei-ch'en and boasted a pediment stone inscribed by the early fourteenth-century painter and calligrapher Chao Meng-fu"m" (1254–1322). A long landscape scroll of mountains and valleys owned by Li and attributed to Huang Kung-wang"m" (1269–1354) was said to have been executed in Hsia Shih-tse's studio.33 Huang's
better-known * Dwelling in the Fu-ch’uan Mountains* (National Palace Museum, Taipei) was also inscribed for Master Wu-yung at "Mr. Hsia of Sung-chiang’s Chih-chih-t’ang." The 1350 date of this inscription confirms the existence of Hsia’s pavilion; however, the textual sources indicate the likelihood that by then Hsia Shih-tse had died and that his original studio had been destroyed by fire. Without additional information it is impossible to reconcile these conflicting pieces of evidence.55

In his preface to the *Precious Mirror of Painting*, Yang Wei-chen alludes to the breadth of Hsia Wen-yen’s father, Hsia Chün’s, collection of painting and calligraphy. Kung Shih-t’ai’s grave inscription adds that the collection, which was housed in the Ai-hsien-t’ang, also contained bronzes. Yang specifies that the collection became quite extensive under the direction of Hsia Chün and Hsia Wen-yen, implying that they built upon a foundation established by their predecessor, Hsia Shih-tse. Two points remain unclear. The first is how much destruction Hsia Shih-tse’s collection suffered in the fire mentioned by Yang Wei-chen. The second is directly related to the first. Did each hall and its collection remain intact and retain its individual character after the death of its owner, or were the objects moved freely from place to place and considered part of a family collection? This question is especially significant in light of Huang Kung-wang’s apparently posthumous reference to Hsia Shih-tse’s Chih-chih-t’ang.

This brief history of the Hsia family’s collecting activities demonstrates that Hsia Wen-yen’s artistic interests imitated those of his father and grandfather and that all three generations enjoyed the social activities and lifestyle of cultured gentlemen, using their collections as the focus for literary gatherings with other scholars. Nevertheless, in the texts for Hsia Wen-yen little mention is made of his predecessors’ collections, although Hsia’s connoisseurship abilities are always admired. T’ao Tsung-i refers briefly to the family history of collecting in the passage translated above. Only Yang Wei-chen alludes more specifically to its origins with his friend Hsia Shih-tse, in his text for Hsia Wen-yen’s Wen-chu-hsüan; in his preface to the *Precious Mirror of Painting* Yang also recalls, indirectly, how Hsia Chün had enriched that collection.59

A prose composition by the early Ming literatus Cheng Chen (1372 chü-jen) provides some insight into the later phase of Hsia Wen-yen’s life. Cheng’s record for Hsia’s Tung-chien-ts’ao-t’ang, the thatched cottage to which he retired when he was exiled to Feng-yang, an area of An-hui to the west of the early Ming (1368–1644) capital at Nanking, contrasts the impoverished circumstances in which he is found with the wealth and comfort by which he had been surrounded, at least up until the time the *Precious Mirror of Painting* was published in 1365/66. Cheng’s composition is the single major document for this later period and thus supplies important information about Hsia’s life under the early Ming.

Cheng opens his text with a description of the barren landscape around Hsia Wen-yen’s cottage and of the walk from the old site of the town of Feng-yang along the stream from which Hsia’s cottage derives its name (tung-chien, “eastern torrent”) and over a bridge called the Wu-li-ch’iao. After locating Hsia’s residence at this bridge crossing Cheng begins the following narrative:

The name of Mr. Hsia Shih-liang [Wen-yen] of Sung-chiang was placed on a list of the exiled. He obtained [this] thatched cottage in which to live and was content. He tilled the fields and fed his cattle and had just enough to feed and clothe himself. On days of leisure he would take out manuscripts [whose texts] were preserved from ancient bronzes and stone tablets and read. Actually he was one who could forget his surroundings [in his enjoyment] of them.

Shih-liang was a descendant of one of the Four Greybeards of Han, Hsia Huang-kung, his ancestors had moved from Wu to Hua-t’ing where they established their family as ju [Confucian] scholars and became well known in their district for their commitment to righteousness. The court commended the family [for their virtuous actions], Shih-liang was already the fourth generation [of this line]. He incited himself to be industrious and practice austerity. He was capable of sustaining his predecessors’ occupation [as ju] and humbled himself among famous scholar-officials, among whom he was especially known for his literary compositions.60

The central passages may allude to someone who had harmed Hsia Wen-yen in the past and later found himself banished to the same place. The remainder of the text, in contrasting Hsia’s former life of wealth and comfort with his present situation, provides a commentary on Hsia’s ability to remain unaffected by circumstances. In a final flourish Cheng closes with various examples that demonstrate how a place can be ennobled by its resident. No other records of Hsia’s exile and death are known.

*The Precious Mirror of Painting*

The *Precious Mirror of Painting* is the only surviving evidence we have of the literary endeav-
ors in which Hsia Wen-yen engaged in the earlier part of his life when he still lived in the cultured environment of Sung-chiang. Chronologically, it appears at the end of a sequence of major, early histories that covered large spans of time—Chang Yen-yüan’s 5th (ca. 815–after 875) Record of Famous Painters of All the Dynasties (Li-tai ming-hua chih; completed in 847), Kuo Jo-hsū’s 6th (act. second half of the eleventh century) Account of My Experiences in Painting (T’u-hua chien-ven chih; completed ca. 1080), and T’eng Ch’ün’s 6th (act. twelfth century) “Painting” Continued (Hua chi; preface dated 1167).11 From the Ming dynasty on, in contrast, most painting histories limited their scope to a more specific time period or realm of activity.42 Later histories that attempted to be comprehensive in their coverage of artists’ biographies either relied extensively on Sung and Yüan sources like the Precious Mirror of Painting or modified the earlier models.43 The Ch’ing (1644–1912) compilation P’ei-ven-chai shu hua p’išt (completed in 1708), for example, expanded this earlier format of theoretical comments and biographies to include many more theoretical excerpts and inscriptions as well as lists of collections and titles of works.44 Later additions to and expansions of the Precious Mirror of Painting also point to its pivotal position at the end of this early sequence of comprehensive histories.45 Within the context of this series, the Precious Mirror of Painting’s indispensable role as an authoritative source of early biographical materials is clear: despite its brevity, its literati biases, and other shortcomings, no later text has ever replaced it as a comprehensive history and reference work. In fact, its very compactness partially accounts for its usefulness and popularity as a handbook.46

Beginning with the Record of Famous Painters of All the Dynasties, the biographical format of art historical texts, including the comprehensive histories, comes closer to that of the standard histories, with a series of general introductory sections or chapters preceding the biographies, apparently in imitation of the essays that open each official history.47 These later biographies contain far less abstract characterization than do those in earlier works such as Hsieh Ho’s 6th (act. ca. 500–555?): Classification of Painters (Ku hua p’in luś). Instead, they stress factual information such as alternate names, place of origin, official position (if any), teachers, and famous works and occasionally interject a brief anecdote or critical comment about the artist. This content makes for an apparently more straightforward presentation of the bare facts of an artist’s life and leads to biographical stereotyping of the type found in traditional Chinese historical sources.48 A man’s conduct, or in this case, his art, is summarily reviewed and classified for easy reference; much of the subjective nuance sought in the earlier qualitative descriptions is forfeited in favor of what is, seemingly, a less value-laden format. It is this model of biographical writing that characterizes Hsia Wen-yen’s Precious Mirror of Painting.

The date of publication for Hsia Wen-yen’s volume is not actually known. Hsia’s preface of 1365 provides an approximate date of completion for the work; the publication date of 1366 recorded in one surviving edition indicates that the text was certainly available by that date, if it had not already been published the previous year.49 This Yüan edition of five chapters and an appendix of lacunae ( pu-štś) has been almost completely replaced by the seventeenth-century, six-chapter version edited by Mao Chih’s 16th (1598–1659) and published in his collection, Chin-tai pi-šuńś (1630–ca. 1642).50 Another, later expansion of the text attributed to Lan Ying’s (1585–ca. 1664) and Hsieh Pin’s 15th–1650) and entitled T’u-hui pao-chien hsü-tsuńś further updated Mao Chín’s six-chapter edition; however, it is not well regarded and has not been widely accepted.51

Mao Chín’s text is based upon an early sixteenth-century, six-chapter republication sponsored by Miao Tseng’s 16th (act. early sixteenth century). Han Ang’s (act. early early sixteenth century), in a note dated 1519 and appended to the end of the supplement ( hsü-tsiün’ś), claims responsibility for the authorship of the sixth chapter.52 But both the T’eng Hsiao preface to the supplement and the 1519 colophon written by the monk Hu-lin Tsung-lin’s (act. early sixteenth century) acknowledge only Miao Tseng as the editor of the new edition.53 Han Ang’s note states that Miao asked him to finish the incomplete text of a sixth chapter that had been begun by someone named Ch’iś (apparently Miao’s son).54 Since T’eng and Hu-lin Tsung-lin contributed to the volume, they must have known of Han’s efforts. Their failure to acknowledge Han, who is always cited as the compiler of the supplement, is therefore disturbing. Originally, the supplement also contained anachronistic references to artists of the mid-sixteenth century, such as Ch’ien Ku’s 15th–1572), Lu Chih’s 1496–1576), and Wen P’eng’s 1498–1573), whose periods of activity postdated Han Ang’s note. On the assumption that these were later additions,
they were deleted from the Mao Chin and *Ssu-ku ch'üan-shù* editions in the Ch'ing period. The circumstances surrounding the compilation and transmission of the supplementary sixth chapter thus remain obscure.

In addition to these major inconsistencies, there are other textual problems in the Mao Chin edition. The order of the prefaces has apparently been reversed because Hsia Wen-yen's text, which followed Yang Wei-chên's in the original Yüan edition, now precedes it. Moreover, a supplement (hsü-pu) has been added to the list of lacunae included in the original Yüan edition. The recutting of the text on new blocks in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries apparently provided the opportunity for the introduction of these modifications. Despite these minor changes, the Mao Chin edition remains the standard one in modern collections of writings on art.

Chapter One

Hsia Wen-yen drew on a number of older sources in writing the *Precious Mirror of Painting*. With the exception of the definition of the three classifications of painting that appears at the beginning of chapter one and is designated by T'ao Tsung-i as Hsia's contribution, the remainder of the chapter consists mainly of borrowings from earlier works. The opening half of the section on "The Six Laws and Three Classifications" is taken from the discussion of "The Impossibility of Teaching Spirit Consonance" in *Account of My Experiences in Painting* by the Northern Sung author Kuo Jo-hsi. Kuo's definition of the three faults in painting from his section "On the Virtues and Faults in Brushwork," major parts of his discussion of "The Models [to Be Followed] in Working," and virtually all of his section on "The Relative Superiority of Past and Present" are also repeated in the *Precious Mirror of Painting*. In the latter passage Hsia Wen-yen makes a significant alteration to Kuo's text when he adds Tung Yüan (act. mid-tenth century) to Kuo's list of the three great masters of the modern art of landscape, Li Ch'eng (919–67), Kuan T'ung (act. early tenth century), and Fan K'uan (d. ca. 1023 or after). The discussions of the six essentials and six merits of painting are taken from Liu Tao-ch'un's (act. mid-eleventh century) *Critique of Famous Painters of the Present Dynasty* (*Sheng-ch'ao ming-hua p'ing*), while the text on copies and the opening passage on connoisseurship are derived from T'ang Hou's (act. early fourteenth century) *Discussion of Painting* (*Hua lun*). The source for the remaining three excerpts on connoisseurship cannot be identified. A final section on mounting and stripping is at least partially dependent on Mi Fu's (1052–1107) *Painting History* (*Hua shih*).

Chapters Two through Four

It seems likely that the biographies in the three chapters covering the periods before the Yüan (chapters two through four) were put together in a similar fashion. In his own preface Hsia Wen-yen states that his primary source for the biographical sketches was the *Hsüan-ho hua p'u* (preface dated 1120), or *Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsüan-ho Collection*, after which he consulted other texts. Close examination of the *Precious Mirror of Painting* reveals how he extracted and compiled the biographies.

Chapter two is devoted to artists through the Five Dynasties period (907–60). The entries are arranged by dynasty, and Hsia begins with the earliest painters, Ts'ao Pu-hsieng (act. early third century) and Wei Hsieh (act. fourth century), whose biographies are recorded in the second subject category of the catalogue, the section on secular figure painting. Hsia then returns to the opening section on Buddhist and Taoist painting and extracts the biography of Ku K'ai-chih (ca. 345–ca. 406). From there he progresses through the various subject categories of the catalogue, grouping artists together under their respective dynasties. When Hsia comes to the sections on the T'ang and Five Dynasties, his system results in a subject-by-subject transposition of the catalogue's biographies that is only chronological by dynasty. Once Hsia completes his borrowings from the *Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsüan-ho Collection*, it becomes much more difficult to determine the sources he used in compiling the latter part of chapter two. It is likely that many of the remaining biographies depend on the *Record of Famous Painters of All the Dynasties and Account of My Experiences in Painting*, but the brevity of Hsia's entries and his failure to follow the order of these texts as consistently as he had when borrowing from the *Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsüan-ho Collection* make a definitive identification of his sources impossible.

The organization of chapter three on the Northern Sung begins in the same way: the biographies are listed in the order in which they appear under their respective subject categories in the *Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsüan-ho Collection*. Hsia adheres to this system quite closely, although there
are a few exceptions. In the latter part of the chapter, extensive but more selective borrowings from Teng Ch‘un’s “Painting” Continued appear; these follow Teng’s chapter order, which is dependent first on social class and then on subject matter. Hsia omits artists such as Chao Ling-jang (act. late eleventh century) and Li Kung-lin (b. ca. 1040–49, d. 1106), whose biographies had already been covered in the excerpts borrowed from the Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsiian-ho Collection, and deletes Teng’s biographies for painters such as Mi Yu-jen (1086–1165), Chiang Shen (b. ca. 1090, d. 1138), and Chao Po-ch‘u (d. ca. 1162), who were active after the fall of the Northern Sung. These artists are included in chapter four, but their biographies do not agree in content with those in “Painting” Continued and are apparently drawn from another source or sources. Interspersed with the excerpts from “Painting” Continued are some sections of short biographies that may have been drawn from Account of My Experiences in Painting. Once again the biographies are not in proper chronological order within the chapter.

An analysis of the sources for chapter four on the Southern Sung and Ch’in (1115–1234) is not possible. The chapter is certainly based in part on two texts written as supplements to “Painting” Continued, Chuang Su’s (act. late thirteenth century) A Supplement to “Painting” Continued (Hua chi pu-yen, completed in 1298) and another, now lost text by Ch‘en Te-hui entitled A Sequel to “Painting” Continued (Hsii hua chi). But no further conclusions can be drawn because Ch‘en’s text is not available for comparison.

Chapter Five

The Yüan biographies in chapter five are generally assumed to have been compiled by the author himself. Hsia covers the whole period, recording artists who were still active at the time of his writing. His organization of the chapter appears to be based, at least in part, on social categories similar to those used by Teng Ch‘un in his “Painting” Continued. Hsia begins with officeholders, many of whom served the Sung dynasty; then moves to a more general section that includes recluses and other painters; and closes with entries on foreigners, Taoists, Buddhists, women, artists identified only by surname, and foreign countries. The latter part of the chapter also covers many painters still active at mid-century; it is not clear whether this represents an attempt at chronological ordering or whether it was simply the case that at mid-century fewer artists served in office. Although many of the entries are brief, the broad coverage of Yüan painters that Hsia offers makes his text a significant reference work.

In compiling his biographies, Hsia followed a process of neatly condensing and extracting what he considered to be the most essential information. In general, the order of the biographies duplicates, with a few omissions and exceptions, the sequence of entries in the sources from which he borrowed. But as Hsia moves further into his history, the content of the entries themselves begins to differ more from the source biography or biographies and Hsia begins to take greater liberties with his sources, reordering materials, paraphrasing information, and revising the syntax. In the second chapter any significant information interpolated into the biography extracted from the Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsiian-ho Collection can usually be identified as brushwork formulas borrowed from T‘ang Hou. But as Hsia progresses into the Five Dynasties and Northern Sung periods, his borrowings are less readily defined and tracing the specific sources for the biographies, especially those of major artists, becomes a more complex problem. These developments surely indicate that more diverse information was available for the more recent periods; they may also reflect the fact that Hsia interpolated his own opinions or repeated generalizations current at the time of his writing.

The Li Kung-lin biography in chapter three is an excellent example of Hsia’s composite borrowings:

Li Kung-lin, whose style was Po-shih and whose literary name was Lung-mien chiu-shih, was from Shu-ch‘eng and received the chiu-shih degree. He studied model calligraphies and famous paintings extensively and therefore understood the brush ideas of the ancients. In calligraphy he [used] the styles of the [Eastern] Chin (317–420) and [Li] Sung (420–79) dynasties. In painting he studied Ku K’ai-chih and Lu T‘an-wei (ca. 440–500), Chang [Seng-yu] (ca. 470–550), and Wu [Tao-tzu] (ca. 680–758), and the famous artists of previous generations, taking their good [points] as his own and transmitting [them] as a single style. In making paintings he usually did not add color and only used Ch‘eng-hsin-t‘ang paper; solely in copying and tracing old works did he use silk and apply color. His brush method is like drifting clouds and flowing water in its risings and fallings. Those who discuss [painting] say that his horses surpass Han Kan’s (ca. 715–after 781), his Buddhist images emulate Wu Tao-tzu’s, his landscapes are similar to Li Su-hsin’s (651–716), and his figures resemble Han Huang’s (725–87). [While] their poetic...
quality is likened to Wang Wei's \(^{49}\) (699–759). Thus he is the greatest painter of the Sung dynasty and sheds light on [the artists of] the past. In office [he was awarded the prestige title of ] Gentleman for Court Service (ch'iao-feng-lang)\(^{74}\).

Beginning with the first line of the Li Kung-lin biography in the Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsüan-ho Collection, Hsia transposes Li's literary name from a later passage and inserts it in the appropriate place between his style name and place of origin, then mentions his degree, omitting the date included in the original biography. The sentences referring to Li's connoisseurship abilities and artistic models are summarized from the first section of the catalogue's biography.\(^{75}\)

The next passage on Li's use of paper, silk, and colors and the character of his brushwork contains a significant deletion that changes what had been a specific observation into a broad generalization. The text is transcribed almost verbatim from T'ang Hou's, but Hsia has deleted the first phrase about Li's imitating Han Kan in horse painting and has reversed the characters in the phrase "drifting clouds and flowing water."\(^{76}\) Although no earlier source for the description of Li's brushwork is known, the formulation referring to his use of ink and paper for his own creations and silk and color for his copies appears to have originated with a colophon for a Li Kung-lin copy of a Han Kan horse painting written by Liu K'o-chuang\(^{47}\) (1187–1269). In "Painting" Continued Teng Ch'üan states that Li mostly used Ch'eng-hsin-t'ang paper and did not apply colors in his paintings. In his inscription Liu indirectly alludes to Teng's statement by making a counterargument for the authenticity of the specific painting he was inscribing on the grounds that Li would have used silk and colors to imitate exactly the appearance of Han's original.\(^{77}\) T'ang Hou apparently took this specific case and turned it into a general rule about Li Kung-lin's horse paintings in imitation of Han Kan where he distinguished between Li's own creations and copies after the master. Hsia Wen-yen then converted Liu's observation, made as a connoisseur, into an absolute and arbitrarily simplified formula for authenticity.

In his concluding remarks for the Li Kung-lin biography, Hsia Wen-yen returns to a pattern of more exact borrowings from older sources. With the exception of Wang Wei, Li's artistic models are listed in the same words in "Painting" Continued.\(^{78}\) The office mentioned in the final sentence is found in both the Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsüan-ho Collection and "Painting" Continued.\(^{79}\)

This example clearly demonstrates that in the most complicated biographies of major painters such as Li Kung-lin, Hsia paraphrased out of context, deleted and summarized sections of the source biography or biographies, and quoted parts of it verbatim, depending on his inclination in composing the text.\(^{80}\) Besides providing the basis for some general observations on how he used his sources, the pattern that emerges from an examination of Hsia's borrowings is indicative of the nature of his own text. In his additions to and variations of the borrowed biographies, his major concern was to provide condensed formulas that defined an artist's brushwork and the characteristics of his style. Many of these are derived, in turn, from T'ang Hou.\(^{81}\) The biographies for less well known painters were, by contrast, reduced to the point where they contained nothing more than the artist's name, place of origin, office (if any), and specialty. Thus Hsia's text seems inclined to simplification, in terms both of the repetition of formulas for connoisseurship and the terse character of many of its biographies.

The Underlying Literati Values

Given the fact that much of the content of chapters one through three can be identified as material drawn from other sources, it seems logical to assume that little in the Precious Mirror of Painting is highly original. Hsia Wen-yen appears to have been relatively pedantic in his approach; the significance of this text may lie more in what it tells us about fourteenth-century attitudes in general than in what it tells us about Hsia's own approach to connoisseurship, collecting, and appreciation of paintings.

As we have seen, chapter five of the Precious Mirror of Painting is probably the only section of the text Hsia actually wrote himself.\(^{82}\) In format its biographies adhere closely to the pattern of factual presentation of information described earlier as based upon the standard histories. In tone they are usually either mildly positive or neutral.\(^{83}\) Most often Hsia's comments consist only of a restrained statement of admiration for a particular artist. Not surprisingly, it is in the limited number of instances where more ambiguous or explicitly negative remarks occur that the set of literati values to which Hsia adheres becomes apparent.\(^{84}\)

Two issues central to literati art theory are the imitation of ancient models and the nature of skill
in painting, and it is through these subjects that Hsia’s literati values are most readily inferred.

By the fourteenth century the study of ancient models had become a necessary prerequisite to the formulation of an artist’s personal style. One indication of how much significance Hsia attached to such study is his careful enumeration of an artist’s models and teachers. In some instances he also praises a painter for fusing the good points of several models, while at other points he mentions artists who had no models but could still achieve limited success as painters. Only in one case does he emphatically highlight an artist’s complete failure to absorb the lessons to be drawn from imitating those models. We are told that “[Chang Wu’s] (act. ca. 1340–65) brush manner had not matured and lacked a sense of antiquity.”

Apparently Hsia found Chang’s insistence on a modern style of brushwork in his archaizing ink drawings (p’ai-miao) completely unacceptable.

In contrast, we are told that Wang Yüan’s (b. ca. 1280, d. after 1349) praiseworthy emulation of ancient styles was the result of the instruction he received from Chao Meng-fu, “so all that he painted imitated the ancients, without a brushstroke in the academic manner.” Wang’s bird-and-flower paintings were based upon Huang Ch’üan (903–68), an academic master of the late tenth century who was also Chao Meng-fu’s model. Hsia deliberately distinguished Wang’s painting from that of the academicians by associating it with Chao Meng-fu, whose work was seminal for archaic styles among the literati, and by evoking the same artistic model canonized by Chao as the appropriate source for bird-and-flower painting done in the literati style. Hsia’s statement that Wang had avoided the academic manner, is, in one sense, an indirect acknowledgment that both Chao and Wang drew upon an older, albeit from the literati point of view acceptable, academic model.

In literati theory the creation of an original style based upon the ancients was regarded as the culmination of this process of study and imitation. Hsia Wen-yen is most explicit on this point when he discusses Huang Kung-wang, who “was good in landscape painting and followed Tung Yüan. In his late years, he transformed this tradition and achieved a style of his own.”

The question of skill is a more complicated one. Hsia praises Wang Chen-p’eng (act. early fourteenth century) for his great skill in boundary painting but speaks disparagingly of Meng Yü-chien (act. early fourteenth century) and Wu T’ing-hui (act. fourteenth century), whose blue-green style painting was “extremely fine but did not avoid a crafted spirit.” In the latter case it appears to be the emphasis on fine and detailed rendering in what was an otherwise acceptable archaizing style that Hsia is criticizing. Hsia’s evaluation is motivated by the same reaction aroused by Chang Wu’s art, his sense of the inappropriateness of combining the archaism valued by the literati with a more “academic” or “professional” brush technique. Hsia’s negative evaluation here contrasts with other contexts in which the same term, kung ("skilled" or "skillful"), is used relatively more favorably, though never as a term of absolute admiration.

In the literati context the question of skill is intimately tied to the issue of social class and its effect on the styles of individual artists. In my opinion there was in actual practice no cleardown, self-imposed separation between the skilled, artisanlike, “professional” and “academic” painters and the “literati” artists of the Yüan period; nor did these somewhat distinct social groups define themselves through their painting styles. The relationship between social class and artistic style was argued at the theoretical level by literati critics such as Hsia Wen-yen.

At one point Hsia indicates his own perception of this relationship when he distinguishes the style of Sheng Mou (act. ca. 1310–ca. 1360) from that of his teacher, Ch’en Lin (act. ca. 1260–1320). We are told that Ch’en Lin received instruction from Chao Meng-fu and “thus his painting was not common.” Sheng Mou, who came from a family of “professional” painters, “began his artistic training by studying Ch’en Lin’s [work] and transformed his style slightly. [His painting] had a surplus of fineness and delicacy and was especially excessive in its artfulness [ch’iao].” Sheng’s preoccupation with “artfulness,” a term that has overtones of superficiality, prevented him from fully absorbing the lessons of Ch’en Lin’s work. While Ch’en chose to imitate the ancients, Sheng emulated Ch’en and failed to recognize the proper models defined by the literati tradition. Hsia’s description characterizes Sheng Mou as an artist who, despite his study with Ch’en Lin, remained tied to the “professional” tradition that was his artistic background.

The unique stylistic distinction presented in the biography of Ni Tsan (1301–74) provides a striking example of how external circumstances could influence an artist’s style and perhaps also indicate the social context within which a painting was made. We are told that the “sketchy and
simple” style of Ni’s later work was a result of the strained economic situation in which the artist found himself at the end of his life:

He [Ni Tsan] painted woods and trees, level landscapes, and bamboos and rocks, all without a touch of dusty atmosphere of the cities. In his late years [he painted] in a sketchy and simple way to repay obligations. Thus [his works] appear to have come from two different hands.99

Ni was painting to repay his debts and was no longer free to paint only when he was so inclined. The sketchy works of Ni’s late years were thus the product of a situation closely paralleling that of “professional” painters filling commissions, and it may have been the case that when constrained to paint under such conditions, Ni deliberately expressed himself in a separate style to signal those circumstances. In any event, it would be difficult to associate that “sketchy and simple” style with the fine and detailed renderings of the “professional” painters criticized in the Precious Mirror of Painting. As a literati painter Ni could never choose the more meticulous rendering of the “professional” but might instead execute his gifts in a manner more sketchy than that of his earlier works in order to set them apart.

Hsia’s view of the relationship between social class and artistic style is based upon his belief that skill alone is not sufficient to create the most original works of art. Both Hsia, in his definition of the three classifications at the opening of chapter one, and Yang Wei-chen, in his preface to the Precious Mirror of Painting, espouse superior personal qualities as the basis for creation of the greatest art works. Hsia defines an artist of the inspired class (shen-p’in”) as “one whose skill cannot be discovered by others . . . .”100 In the writings of near contemporaries such as T’ang Hou, ordinary connoisseurs and artists are described as valuing “formal likeness” (hsing-ssu”) rather than the more sublime quality of “spirit resonance” (chi’yün”).101 Hsia is in agreement with their values when he reserves his highest praise for literati painters who transcend skill in describing objects and convey their personal artistic vision through their painting.

In a straightforward affirmation of Hsia Wen-yan’s preferences, Yang Wei-chen informs us that Hsia especially valued the works of “literati and talented scholars” (wen-jiang ts’ai-shih”), meaning that he favored literati painting.102 At points this predilection clearly surfaces, guiding his choices in the writing of history. The literati outlook underlying Hsia’s statements, though communicated indirectly, is usually quite obvious.

The Precious Mirror of Painting is a major monument in the tradition of early biographical writings on artists. In its position at the end of the “classic” sequence of early biographical texts, it both summarizes information from the earlier tradition and serves as a filter for the transmission of that information in later periods. Presentation of the conservative literati viewpoint in Hsia’s text occurs at a point when that viewpoint is being more sharply defined in critical writings on art. The appearance of the Precious Mirror of Painting at this critical moment in the development of literati art theory therefore enhances its role, lending significance to what otherwise might be regarded as a relatively mundane biographical anthology.
Notes

Richard M. Barnhart read an earlier version of this paper; I have benefited from the suggestions and criticism of Maggie Bickford, Susan Bush, Richard Edwards, John Hay, Jeffrey M. Muller, and Susan E. Nelson. I am also grateful to Elizabeth Endicott-West for her patient advice on the interpretation of certain historical texts.

1. Chih Wei-no, “Sung Yüan hsi-pien-te hui-hua t’ung-shih,” Mei-shu yen-chii, no. 4, 1979, p. 86. I am grateful to Shih Shou-ch’ien for drawing this reference to my attention. Yü Shao-sung, Shu hua shu-lu chieh’i-i, repr. Taipei, 1968, chüan 1, p. 8b, cites no post-Sung source for the Precious Mirror of Painting, implying that the Yüan chapter is Hsia’s own work.
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8. Yang Yü, Shan-ch’ü hsia hua, Chih-pu-tzu-tsi ti’ung-shu (Pai-pu ts’ung-shu chi-ch’eng [hereafter PPTSCC], no. 29), ed. Pao T’ing-po, Taipei, 1964–70, pp. 36b–37a; Herbert Franke, Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Chinas unter der Mongolenherrschaft: Das “Shan-kü shiu-hua” des Yang Yü (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, v. 32, no. 2), Wiesbaden, 1956, pp. 99–100, and T’ao Tsung-i, Ch’eng-lu, chüan 15, p. 225 both discuss a reflecting picture of a pagoda (?) owned by a Mr. Hsia, but the two descriptions of the object differ. Yang’s cites the owner as the “righteous scholar Mr. Hsia (t’ı-shih Hsia-shih),” while T’ao’s refers to him by the shortened form of an official title, “supervisor of transport” (chien-yüan), held by Hsia Shih-tse; see Kung Shih-t’ai, Wen-chai chi (Ssu-ku ch’üan-shu chen-pen san-chi [hereafter SKSCC san-chi], v. 288–89), Taipei, 1972, chüan 10, p. 18b. Since Hsia Shih-tse was apparently dead or incapacitated by 1546 (see below, n. 18), I would suggest that he had been so strongly identified as the clan head that that identification continued to be applied even after his death. Yang Wei-chien’s epitaph for Yang Yü (Tung-wei-tzu wen-chi, chüan 24, p. 177), also states that Yang’s burial was paid for by the “transport commissioner” (?), which Franke (p. 22) suggests that this is the same Mr. Hsia mentioned in Yang’s text; I would suggest, instead, that this person was probably the head of the Hsia clan at the time of Yang’s death in 1561, perhaps Hsia Wen-chü, Hsia Ch’ün’s eldest son and Hsia Wen-yen’s older brother. For Yang Yü, see YJCCTLST, v. 3, pp. 1527–28.

9. Cheng Chen, Jung-yang wai-shih-chi (Ssu-ku ch’üan-shu chen-pen chi-wu-chi, v. 362–67, Taipei, 1969–70, chüan 9, p. 3a, calls Hsia Wen-yen a member of the fourth generation; this is correct because it is only with Ch’i and Ch’en’s generation that the family was registered in Sung-chiang.

10. Ch’i’s birth date can only be fixed in terms of his younger brother’s; his death apparently occurred soon after he assumed the office of district magistrate of Yü-yao in 1293, see YJCCTLST, v. 2, p. 857.
11. Teng Wen-yüan, Pa-hsi chi (SKSCCP, sen-ch'i, v. 276), chüan hsia, p. 54a; Kung Shih-t'ai, Wan-ch'ai chi, chüan, 10, p. 18a. Hsia Wen-yen identifies himself as from Wu-hsing in his preface to the Precious Mirror of Painting (HSTS, v. 2, p. 644) and is so identified by T'ao Tsung-i in his notebook (Ch'o-keng lu, chüan 18, p. 264). Yang Wei-chen is more explicit in his preface to the Precious Mirror of Painting (HSTS, v. 2, p. 644) where he states that Hsia's ancestors were from Wu-hsing.

12. This is implied in the text of Teng Wen-yüan's grave inscription, Pa-hsi chi, chüan hsia, p. 54a.

13. These events are chronicled in Teng Wen-yüan, Pa-hsi chi, chüan hsia, pp. 54a–54b, and are summarized, in part, in Kung Shih-t'ai, Wan-ch'ai chi, chüan 10, p. 18a. It is not clear from the text whether one brother or both were received in imperial audience. The mortgage and registration are directly connected only in one late gazetteer notice (Sun Hsing-yen and Sung Ju-lin, Sung-chiang fu-chih, 1819, chüan 50, p. 34a), but none of the events of 1276 are enumerated there. For Wang Ch'ing-tuan, see YJCTLSY, v. 1, p. 215.

14. For this division of labor, see Kung Shih-t'ai, Wan-ch'ai chi, chüan 10, p. 18a; Teng Wen-yüan, Pa-hsi chi, chüan hsia, p. 54b, speaks of Ch'un's financial success.

15. For Hsia Ch'un, see Teng Wen-yüan, Pa-hsi chi, chüan hsia, pp. 55a–55b. For Hsia Chûn, see Kung Shih-t'ai, Wan-ch'ai chi, chüan 10, pp. 17b–20b. These sources are indexed in the second volume of YJCTLSY on pp. 858 and 859, respectively, but Hsia Ch'un's death date is recorded incorrectly on p. 859.


19. As the eldest son Hsia Shih-tse's birth date is estimated on the basis of his father's in 1246. That he was already dead or incapacitated by 1346 seems clear on the basis of the fact that his son, Chûn, had assumed direction of the clan's activities by that year; see Kung Shih-t'ai, Wan-ch'ai chi, chüan 10, p. 19a. Teng Wen-yüan's Pa-hsi chi, chüan hsia, p. 55a, and Kung Shih-t'ai, Wan-ch'ai chi, chüan 10, pp. 18a and 18b list the offices held by Hsia Shih-tse; no separate biography exists for him. Hsia Shih-tse is also mentioned in n. 8 above and is discussed below. For Teng Wen-yüan, see YJCTLSY, v. 3, pp. 1911–12.


23. Wan-ch'ai chi, chüan 10, pp. 19a–19b.

24. See above, n. 7. John W. Dardess, "The Cheng Communal Family: Social Organization and Neo-Confucianism in Yüan and Early Ming China," Harvard Journal of Asian Studies, v. 34, 1974, pp. 7 and 7–8, n. 1, defines what he calls the "communal family" (i-men) as a hereditary family commune. In a letter dated 11 November 1986, Professor Dardess explained to me that official recognition of the Chengs' i-men was based upon their communally owned and managed property. I am grateful for his explanation of Shimizu Morimitsu's discussion of the term i in Ch'ungku zuosan seize ko, which was not available to me, because it clarifies the fact that official recognition of the Hsia family as an i-men was apparently derived only from their philanthropic activities.

The Hsia family's i-men differed from the model he cites in that ownership of private property separate from the clan's communal property was apparently permitted. This practice conforms to the definition of the i-men as a clan trust as put forward by Hui-ch'en Wang Liu, The Traditional Chinese Clan Rules (Monographs of the Association for Asian Studies, no. 7), Locust Valley, NY, 1959, pp. 105 and 107–8, and Denis Twitchett, "The Fan Clan's Charitable Estate, 1050–1760," in Confucianism in Action, ed. David S. Nivison and Arthur F. Wright, Stanford, 1959, p. 98. My assumption that there was private ownership of property by individual clan members is based on Sun Tso's (d. 1376) inscription for the Hsi-hsin ch'üan, a spring located in Hsia Wen-yen's country villa. See Ts'ung-lo ch'i, Su-hsing-shih ts'ung-shu (Chiang-yin Chinsih chiao-fan pen), 1889–1916, chüan 6, pp. 1b–2a. Hsia also mentions a residence on the Su River in his preface to the Precious Mirror of Painting (HSTS, v. 2, p. 644). Sun Tso composed the preface for T'ao Tsung-i's notebook (Ch'o-keng lu, p. 1) and also wrote T'ao's biography. See More, "Notes on the Life of T'ao Tsung-i," pp. 289–89; he is otherwise unidentified.

25. The information in Teng Wen-yüan's grave inscription was based on Li Tao-t'an's record of conduct for Hsia Ch'un; see Pa-hsi chi, chüan hsia, p. 54a. For Li Tao-t'an, see YJCTLSY, v. 1, p. 547. Kung Shih-t'ai also mentions such a record for Hsia Chûn; see Wan-ch'ai chi, chüan 10, p. 20b.
In addition to the passage from T'ao Tsung-i's Ch'ao-k'ung lu and the prefaces to the Precious Mirror of Painting and its Ming supplement discussed above and in nn. 2–3, sources include Yang Wei-chien's record for Hsia Wenyen's Wen-ch'i-hsuan, Tung-wei-tzu wen-chi, chüan 15, pp. 110–11; Sun Tso's inscription for Hsia's Hsien-ts'ien chuan mentioned in n. 24; and a prose text and poem by Cheng Chung-yang wu-shih chi, chüan 9, pp. 26–4b and chüan 92, p. 28a, respectively.

Kung Shih-t'ai, Wan-chai chi, chüan 10, p. 20b, lists these as Ch'ung-chih hiaowei ('loyal and supportive [military] comandant,' a merit title listed under its suffix in Charles O. Hucker, A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China, Stanford, 1985, no. 2456) and Shao-hsing lu tsung-chih Yü-jo shou-shih ('Vice-Prefect of Yü-jo in Shao-hsing route'). Hucker (no. 7471 [t'sung-chih]) cites a rank of 6a or 7a for a vice-prefect in the Yüan period and gives 6 or 7 as the usual rank for a commandant (no. 2456 [hiaowel]).

Hucker, JYCCTLSY, v. 2, p. 861, and Bush and Shih, Early Chinese Texts on Painting, p. 307 list only the vice-prefect's office. These titles should have been conferred by the late 1350s, the probable date for Kung's writing of the grave inscription.

Su Shih, Tung-p'o i-pa, i-shou t'ung-pien (hereafter ISTP), comp. Yang Chia-lo, 36 v., Taipei, 1974–76, v. 22, chüan 5, p. 97; translated in Bush and Shih, Early Chinese Texts on Painting, p. 201. The reference to Yün-tang bamboo is based on another Su Shih text, Ch'ing-chin Tung-p'o wen-chi shih-tieh, SPTK, chüan 49, pp. 290–91, which at one point discusses Wen T'ung's fondness for the bamboo from this valley. For Su Shih and Wen T'ung, see Ch'ang Pite et al., eds., Sung-chen chuan-chi ts'ao-luo su-jin (hereafter SJCCTLSJ), v. 5, Taipei, 1975–78, v. 5, pp. 4512–24 and v. 1, pp. 34–36, respectively.

Tung-wei-tzu wen-chi, chüan 15, pp. 110–11. This text is dated to the late 1340s on the basis of Hsia Wenyen's approximate age and its mention of the fire that destroyed Hsia Shih-tse's studio, here assumed to be the same 1346 fire that destroyed the family residence in Sung-chiang (Kung Shih-t'ai, Wan-chai chi, chüan 10, p. 19a); see also below and n. 35. According to Kung Shih-t'ai's grave inscription for Hsia Chün (see above, n. 25), Hsia Wenyen had apparently been appointed to office by the mid-1350s. This date provides a probable terminus after which Yang Wei-chien's text would no longer have been applicable.

Wan-chai chi, chüan 15, p. 111.
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Kung Shih-t'ai, Wan-chai chi, chüan 10, pp. 20b and 18a–18b.

Li Jih-hua, Li-yen-chai san-pi (Ssu-wu ch'üan-shu ch'en-pen ch'i-cha, v. 158), Taipei, 1977, chüan 4, pp. 11a–11b. Richard M. Barnhart has suggested that this scroll may be the one recorded in James Cahill, An Index of Early Chinese Painters and Paintings: T'ang, Sung, and Yuan, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1980, p. 282, as formerly in the Wang Heng-yung collection. If, as both Barnhart and Cahill indicate, the scroll is not by Huang, then the text of the inscription could easily have been borrowed from the Fuch'ian handscroll. For Chao Meng-fu, see YJCCTLSJ, v. 3, pp. 1736–41; for Huang Kung-wang, ibid., pp. 1483–85.


Marilyn and Shen Fu, Studies in Connoisseurship: Chinese Paintings from the Arthur M. Sackler Collection in New York and Princeton, Princeton, 1973, p. 6, suggest that Hsia Shih-tse was active ca. 1320–55, apparently on the basis of the information contained in Li Jih-hua's notebook and repeated in their text; see above and n. 19 for a slightly different estimate of his birth and death dates.

Hsia Chün's grave inscription (Kung Shih-t'ai, Wan-chai chi, chüan 10, p. 19a) mentions his rebuilding of the family residence after the fire of 1346; therefore, it is possible that Hsia Shih-tse's studio was also rebuilt at this time. Another possibility, and one that might alter the chronological sequence suggested here, is that the studio fire referred to by Yang Wei-chien (Tung-wei-tzu wen-chi, chüan 15, p. 111) was not the 1346 Sung-chiang fire and that the studio itself was located in a compound or villa separate from the main family residence in Sung-chiang. See also above and nn. 8 and 29.


Wan-chai chi, chüan 10, p. 20a.

For Hsia Shih-tse's collecting activities, see Li Jih-hua, Li-yen-chai san-pi, chüan 4, p. 11a; for Hsia Chün's, Kung Shih-t'ai, Wan-chai chi, chüan 10, p. 20a; Hsia Wenyen's collecting activities are implicit in what Yang Wei-chien says of him in Tung-wei-tzu wen-chi, chüan 15, p. 111. To the best of this my knowledge, the only surviving colophon that mentions Hsia Wenyen's name occurs on a handscroll of early Chao Meng-fu calligraphy now in the National Palace Museum in Taipei; see KKSHL, v. 1, chüan 1, pp. 82–86. The text of the inscription by Chao Li-yung referring to Hsia Wenyen occurs on p. 85 and in the Palace Museum Archive no. V C2e.5143 but appears to have been copied from another source. I am grateful to Marilyn Wong Gylesteen for assistance on this point.
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more limited works in the same canonical sequence, such as Teng Ch'un's "Painting" Continued. These works represent the standard sequence of comprehensive histories for early Chinese painting and should be distinguished from a text such as the Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsian-ho Collection (Hsian-ho hua p'u) which, though thorough, is the catalogue of a single collection. On this point, see also Alexander Coburn Soper, trans., Kuo Jo-hsi's "Experiences in Painting" (T'hu-hua chien-wen chih) (American Council of Learned Societies Studies in Chinese and Related Civilizations, no. 6), Washington, D.C., 1951, p. xi, and the texts listed as histories in chapter one of Yü Shao-sung, Shu hua shu-chi ch'ii.
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43. See, for example, Chu Mou-yin, Hua-shih hui-yao, completed in 1653 (Ssu-khu chuan-shu chen-ren erek-chieh [hereafter SKCSCP erek-chieh, v. 201–2), repr. Taipei, 1971; Wang Yühsien, Hsu-shih pei-k'ao (preface dated 1691; SKCSCP erek-chieh, v. 203–4); and P'eng Yün-t'san (1780–1840), Li-tai hua-shih hui-ch'ao, 2 v., Taipei, 1956. See also Yü Shao-sung, Shu hua shu-chi ch'ii, ch'iao 1, pp. 11a–13b and ch'iao 8, pp. 6a–6b, respectively.


45. See below for a discussion of the later versions of the Precious Mirror of Painting.

46. Ch'in Wei-no, "Sung Yüan hsü-pien-te hui-hua t'ung-shih," p. 86.

47. Bush and Shih, Early Chinese Texts on Painting, p. 45; Yü Shao-sung, Shu hua shu-chi ch'iao, p. 4b.
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68. The biographies of Chao Shu-ang through Chao Shih-an (HSTS, v. 2, pp. 742–43) are borrowed from chapter two of Teng Ch'un's "Painting Continued", those of Su Shih through the monk Te-ch'eng (pp. 743–45), with the exception of the master Pao-chi-ch'ieh, whose biography is in Teng's chapter five, from chapter three; those of Liu Ming-fu through Yung Yen (pp. 745–48), from chapter four; those of Kan Feng-ju through Wei Kuan-ch'ia (pp. 749–52), from chapter five; those of Liu Kuo-yung through Li Tan (pp. 752–57), from chapter six; and those of Li Ts'un-i through Yang Wei (pp. 757–59), from chapter seven.

69. HSTS, v. 1, pp. 289, 292, and 278, respectively; HSTS, v. 2, pp. 765, 767, and 764, respectively.

70. T'ao Tsung-i's notebook, Cho-keng lu, ch'ian 18, p. 264, and T'eng Hsiao's preface to the hsü-pen, HSTS, v. 2, p. 827. It is T'eng who cites the author of A Sequel to "Painting Continued" by name and states that the text contained 151 biographies covering the period from Kao-tsung's reign to the end of Sung. From this we can deduce that Ch'en Te-hsi, about whom nothing is known, was probably a contemporary of Chuang Su. T'ao Tsung-i (Cho-keng lu, ch'ian 18, p. 264) also mentions a text titled A Painting History of the Seven Courts of the Southern Sung (Nan-tu ch'ü-ch'ao hua shih) that probably covered artists active during the seven Southern Sung emperors' reigns. This text and Ch'en Te-hsi's are mentioned under lost works in Yü Shao-sung, Shu hua shu-lu chieh-t'i, ch'ian 10, p. 24a. According to Shimada Shūjirō, "Shōhai bijū
teiyō," Busha, v. 20, no. 2, 1956, p. 99 (214), there are many instances of borrowings from the Album of Plums from the Pine Studio (Sang-ch'ai mei p'ei) of Wu T'ai-su in the Precious Mirror of Painting; I am grateful to Maggie Bickford for this reference and for pointing out that Hsia Wen-yen's Yang Pu-chih biography (HSTS, v. 2, p. 766) may represent an instance of this borrowing.

Chin Wei-no, "Sung Yüan hsü-pien-te hui-hua t'ung-shih," pp. 84 and 86, suggests that chapter four of the Precious Mirror of Painting contains the whole of Ch'en Te-hui's text and is mainly dependent on it. I am inclined to believe, on the basis of study of chapter three, that Hsia's borrowings in these two Sung chapters were probably more varied. See, for example, Weng T'ung-wen's useful comparison of biographies from Chuang Su's A Supplement to "Painting" Continual and Hsia's Precious Mirror of Painting, "T'ou-hui pao-chien ts'uan-kai chu-wen chih-wu chih-hu," in Lin t'ung-k'ao, Taipei, 1977, pp. 59-70. Although Weng's intent is to expose errors in the Precious Mirror of Painting, his juxtaposition of biographies from the two texts may illustrate that in each of the cases cited Hsia borrowed at least a few phrases from Chuang Su. Chin Wei-no (p. 86) takes the opposite position, arguing for the reliability of the Precious Mirror of Painting using some of the same biographies from A Sequel to "Painting" Continual; at least he too credits Hsia with some dependence on Chuang Su, whose work is not mentioned as a source in the early discussions of Precious Mirror of Painting. For Chuang Su's text, see Hua chu pu-i, 2nd ed., Chung-tou me-ch'iu law-chu t'ung-k'ao, Peking, 1983. I am grateful to Shih Shou-ch'ien for the reference to the Weng T'ung-wen article.

Susan Bush has pointed out to me in private conversation that the fact that the biography of at least one Chin painter (Li T'ao [act. late 12th century], HSTS, v. 2, p. 795) was derived from an inscription by the Yüan literatus Chang Chu (1287-1368) demonstrates that Hsia did use a variety of sources for his text. For Chang Chu, see YCCTLSY, v. 2, pp. 1094-95.

17. HSTS, v. 2, pp. 797-814. Entries for mid-century artists begin on p. 804, but Hsia's chronology is still inconsistent. For example, Ho Ch'eng (1223, d. after 1312) is recorded in the latter part of the chapter (p. 809) under the name Ho Tai-lu; see Ch'en Kao-hua, Yüan-tai hua-chia shih-chiao, Shanghai, 1980, p. 257 for this identification. In his entry for Ho Ch'eng's Kuei-ch'eh-lai in Chuang-t'ou hou-hua lu, n.d., ch'iao 1, p. 398, Kao Shih-ch'i incorrectly criticizes Hsia Wen-yen for omitting the biographies of Ho and Chu T'ou-chang (act. 12th century); Chu is recorded in the Precious Mirror of Painting (HSTS, v. 2, p. 789).

18. There are also occasional character changes and some personal interjections in Hsia's text. An example of an "added" biography may be found in HSTS, v. 2, p. 687, where within a sequence of texts borrowed from Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsüan-ho Collection, Chao Kung-yu's (act. ca. 825-50) biography is inserted.

19. See the following biographies: Ku K'ai-chih (HSTS, v. 2, pp. 689-94), Wu Tao-tzu (p. 687), Chang Hsüan (p. 689), Ch'ou Fang (p. 690), Li Suo-hsün (p. 691), Li Ch'ao-tao (pp. 691-92), Wang Wei (p. 692), Ch'ing Hao (p. 693), Ts'ao Pa (pp. 693-94), and Han Kan and Wei Yen (p. 694). In his biography of Ho Ch'eng (act. second half of the 10th century), Hsia quotes T'ang Hou directly (see HSTS, v. 2, p. 718).

20. HSTS, v. 2, p. 718. I am grateful to Yeh Yang for assistance with this translation.

21. HSTS, v. 1, p. 448; see p. 450 for Li Kung-lin's literary name.


25. HSTS, v. 1, p. 450 and HSTS, v. 1, p. 282, respectively.

26. Wai-kam Ho, "Li Ch'eng and the Mainstream of Northern Sung Painting," in Proceedings of the International Symposium on Chinese Painting, Taipei, 1972, p. 205, states that Li Ch'eng's biography in the Precious Mirror of Painting is taken mainly from the Catalogue of Paintings in the Hsüan-ho Collection. In Li Kung-lin's case, about half the text is from that source, the remainder consisting of formulas derived from later biographies and perhaps also from the connoisseurship conventions of Hsia and his contemporaries. See above and n. 73. Susan Bush also recognizes this development, which she identifies as "the more technical approach of Yüan connoisseurship" (Bush and Shih, Early Chinese Texts on Painting, p. 242). Chi Yün et al., eds., Ssu-hu ch'üan-shu t'ang-mu t'ien-yo, v. 3, p. 2346, praise Hsia for his convenient stylistic definitions of various artists.

27. To the best of my knowledge, only Ch'en Lin's (ca. 1260-1320) biography in chapter five (HSTS, v. 2, p. 799) can be traced to another source, in this case, Criticism of Past and Present Painting; see ISTP, v. 11, p. 45.


85. Hsia praises Liu Kuan-tao (act. ca. 1279) for having combined the good points of several ancient models, while pointing out that Chang Heng (act. 14th century) had no model in bamboo painting and established his own style (*HSTS*, v. 2, p. 800). Niu Lao (act. 14th century) also did not emulate the ancients but deserved a rough glance (p. 802).


87. Muller, “Chang Wu: Study of a Fourteenth-Century Figure Painter,” p. 15.


89. *HSTS*, v. 2, p. 804; that Huang Ch’i-tian was Chao Meng-fu’s model can be inferred from the quote in Ch’en Chung-jen’s (act. early 14th century) biography (p. 803).


Chuang Su’s preface to *A Supplement to “Painting” Continued* (p. 1) describes Southern Sung artists as stressing skill without attaining the achievements of their predecessors.

94. *HSTS*, v. 2, p. 798 (Wang Chen-p’eng), p. 800 (Chai Tien), and p. 805 (T’ao Fu-ch’u). The related term ch’iao is used in a less complementary context on pp. 802 (Niu Lao) and 805 (Sheng Mou).

95. Muller, “Chang Wu: Study of a Fourteenth-Century Figure Painter,” pp. 6–20.


98. See also Cahill, *Hills beyond a River*, pp. 50–68, for discussions of Ch’en Lin and Sheng Mou; and n. 94 above for the terms kung and ch’iao.


101. *Hua lun, ISTP*, v. 11, pp. 6 and 9; translated in Bush and Shih, *Early Chinese Texts on Painting*, pp. 260 and 261, respectively. This attitude is also presented in Yang Wei-chen’s preface to the *Precious Mirror of Painting* (*HSTS*, v. 2, p. 643); translated in Bush and Shih, p. 246.


**Glossary**

| a.  | 夏文彦 | n.  | 棘湖記 |
| b.  | 團繪書鑑 | o.  | 宜和畫譜 |
| c.  | 陶宗儀 | p.  | 南渡七朝畫史 |
| d.  | 韓幹錄 | q.  | 三品 |
| e.  | 吳興 | r.  | 楊維楨 |
| f.  | 字 | s.  | 眺霄 |
| g.  | 上氏 | t.  | 進士 |
| h.  | 號 | u.  | 文人 |
| i.  | 蘭渚生 | v.  | 松江 |
| j.  | 神會 | w.  | 義門 |
| k.  | 趣 | x.  | 楊瑀 |
| l.  | 圖畫見聞記 | y.  | 山居新話 |
| m.  | 畫記 | z.  | 夏形 |
THE MYSTERY OF THE CHANG SEAL

By CHI CHIEN WANG AND KATHLEEN YANG

In China the long-standing tradition of using seals for personal identification, with or without written signatures, is well known. While careful connoisseurship, objective scholarship, and familiarity with the brushwork and calligraphic stroke of an individual artist are major elements in deciding the authenticity of a Chinese painting, seals themselves can often play a significant role in this process. Recognized seal impressions used by painters, scholars, and collectors are helpful references for they provide concrete evidence with which to substantiate or reject other clues. One way to compile a collection of reliable seal impressions is through methodical study and comparison of impressions that appear on known, authenticated paintings.

In the course of collecting impressions of seals of painters, calligraphers, and scholars from Chinese paintings in American collections, we have been able to study a single seal legend of special importance—a large and impressively clear impression of the character Chang.1

It was initially called to our attention because of its presence on an important painting by Zhao Mengfu2 (1254–1322), one of the leading masters of the Yuan dynasty. The painting, a handscroll entitled Summer and Autumn Orchids (Lanhui tu) is currently in the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Shorenstein and on loan to the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco (Fig. 1). The calligraphic stroke and brushwork seen in this painting are typical of Zhao’s work, particularly that of his later years, and there are approximately ten paintings of similar style known to be in existence.3 The condition of the painting is excellent. It was signed and dated by the artist on the twenty-third day, second month, and eighth year of the Dade Period (1304).

Although the quality of the painting is superb and the brushwork unquestionably that of Zhao Mengfu, the Chang seal (Fig. 2), though a seemingly minor detail in the painting, poses perplexing questions. This seal is found after the signature and date and is similar in appearance but subtly different in carving and dimensions from another Chang seal (Fig. 3) familiar to many Chinese scholars and connoisseurs. The latter, since it is often accompanied by other impressions of his seals, is usually identified as that of Jia Sidao4 (1213–75), the famous corrupt government official of the late Southern Song dynasty who amassed a formidable collection.5 The presence of Jia’s Chang impression usually commands instant respect because it links the provenance of the work of art with an eminent collection and immediately dates it to the Southern Song Dynasty or earlier. Thus the Chang seal on Spring and Autumn Orchids raises questions for the following reasons: First, this seal does not exactly match other known Chang seals of Jia Sidao; second, if the seal belongs to Jia, it means that the painting predates the Yuan Dynasty and implies that the authenticity of the scroll itself is in jeopardy since Spring and Autumn Orchids is dated 1304 and Jia was killed twenty-nine years earlier in 1275; and third, the Chang seal here is not accompanied by other seals of Jia, which, while not conclusive, strengthens doubts that this painting was ever in his collection.

Since the brushwork and calligraphic stroke seen in Summer and Autumn Orchids may be accepted as authentic, one may reasonably assume that there are two similar but different Chang seals belonging to two different collectors. Having carefully compared the Chang seal on Summer and Autumn Orchids with similar impressions on other paintings, we believe that this Chang seal most likely belonged to Geng Jiazuó (or Geng Huihou), an important collector of the seventeenth century, and that the other belonged, as has previously been accepted for all of them, to Jia Sidao of the thirteenth century.

Our reasoning is as follows. Where the Spring and Autumn Orchids handscroll begins, there are two seal impressions of Geng, placed on the joint, what the Chinese call qifeng yin5 (“riding on the joint seal”). They are Geng Huihou jianding shuhua zhizhang6 (“Geng Huihou’s seal for authenticating calligraphy and painting”) and Dancheng7 (“Loyalty”; Fig. 4). Immediately following, there are three seal impressions of the Qianlong emperor. At the end of the painting, there are, in order, two more seals of the Qianlong emperor, Zhao’s signature and dating of the painting, four seal impressions of Zhao, followed by three of Geng, two of the Qianlong emperor, and two small seals, one of which belongs to a contemporary Japanese collector. The two seal impressions of Geng, Dancheng (“Loyalty”) and Qishu Tang8 (“Hall of Lute and
Books"), and the Chang seal are all placed on the joint (Fig. 5). Before the first colophon begins, there is one more impression of Dancheng on the joint.

Traditionally, when seal impressions are placed in this fashion on a scroll, it is to ensure that the different parts of the painting and its mounting will remain together and thus prevent tampering and fraud. In this scroll, the seals all belong to one person, except for Chang whose ownership is not initially clear. Chang, however, is a type of collector's seal (zhang yin), not the name of a person. Since here it is positioned in a consistent group of seal impressions, all of which can only belong to Geng Jiazu or Geng Huihou, one may, accordingly, assume that the Chang impression is also his.

Supporting evidence that this is the seal of Geng Jiazu rather than that of Jia Sidao may be found on the handscroll Eighteen Songs of a Nomad Flute (Huji shiba pai), now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. After the first scene, there is a series of three seal impressions: Dancheng, Hanshui Geng Huihou shuhua zhizhang ("Seal for the calligraphy and painting of Geng Huihou from Hanshui"), and Chang (Fig. 6). Again, all but the Chang seal are known to be those of Geng, and the Dancheng and Chang seals match the ones on Spring and Summer Orchids (compare Figs. 5 and 6). The ink used for the three seals is of the same kind, and the manner in which they are placed in both paintings is similar. One must therefore conclude that all three belonged to the same person, Geng Jiazu (Geng Huihou).

Here let us point out that the following method was used to ensure that the seal impressions were properly compared. From an original painting, Denis Yang photographed the seal and reproduced it in facsimile. This reproduction was then compared with the seal impression in question. From a reproduction, the dimension of a seal impression in question was established by relative measurement to other known seals in the same painting.

In the course of our studies, we also had occasion to examine carefully the Chang seal of Jia Sidao along with others bearing his names. Jia's Chang seal appears both singly and in proximity to others identifiable as his. For instance, in Huang Tingjian's Pine Wind Hall Poem (Songfeng ge shi), a calligraphy scroll now in the National Palace Museum, Taiwan, there are three established Jia seals (Yuesheng, Qiahe, Sidai) and a Chang impression (Fig. 7). Having compared the way these four seals are carved, their proximity, and the contrast of seals belonging to other collectors in the same area of the scroll, one must agree with the accepted opinion that this Chang seal belongs to Jia Sidao.

Turning to another example, Dong Yuan's handscroll Summer Mountains (Xiashan tu), now in the collection of the Shanghai Museum, two Chang seals are to be found; one at the beginning of the painting, and the other, a half seal impression, at the end. The Chang at the front of the painting has been cut, part of it removed and repieced together. (It was quite common in China that when a painting was remounted, a small piece would be cut off.) The combined left and right sides of this Chang seal and the Chang at the end of the painting (Fig. 8) both match Jia's Chang from Pine Wind Hall Poem. Although in the reproduction of Summer Mountains another seal bearing Jia's name is not discernable, identity appears certain. The absence of a seal bearing Jia's identifiable name should not stop us from drawing this conclusion for the following reasons: First, the Chang seals in Summer Mountain match precisely another known one. Second, part of the painting has been removed and rejoined; other Jia seals may therefore have been removed. And third, as experience with other ancient paintings has shown, seal impressions on silk are especially subject to fading and so are easy to miss. A close examination of the original may still reveal other seals of Jia. It must also be added that this conclusion is supported by no less an authority than Dong Qichang (1555-1636), who in a colophon to the scroll makes the same identification.

Additional impressions of Jia's and Geng's Chang seals may be found on the following handscrolls and paintings.

In the collection of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, the securely authentic handscroll containing Scenery of Yixing (Yixing xiaoqing) by Zhou Chi (fifteenth century) and Autumn Views of Tong-guan (Tong-guan qiues) by Shen Zhou (1427-1509) has, following Zhou's painting and after the colophon written by Shen, two related seal impressions, Huihou zhishang ("Seal of Huihou") and Chang (Fig. 9). The Abe collection in Osaka includes the handscroll The Hundred Gibbons (Juyuan tu*), attributed to the style of Yi Yuanji (mid-sixteenth century), at the end of which are three seal impressions: Zhenm* ("Secret treasure"), Huihou zhenshang ("Huihou's treasured taste"), and a half seal impression of Chang (Fig. 10). In both
scrolls, the Chang impression can be given to Geng because of its relation to his known seals.

Another Chang half seal may be found on a colophon attached to Qian Xuan's "Floating Jade Mountain Retreat (Fouyu shanju tu)". This seal has puzzled many scholars. However, when the seal impression is compared with the facsimile reproductions of Jia's Chang and Geng's Chang, it is clear that it matches that of Geng not of Jia (Fig. 11). Furthermore, not too far away, on the painting itself (below a Qian Xuan seal) is Geng's secure seal impression, reading Geng Huihou jiangding shuhua zhizhang (Fig. 11). No other seal identifiable as belonging to Jia is to be found anywhere on the painting or its colophons.

In the Palace Museum in Peking, on the handscroll Wintry Sparrows (Hanqiao tu) by Cui Bo (act. 1068–1077), there are seals of both Geng and Jia, as well as a half Chang seal (Fig. 12). One concludes from a comparison with the facsimile reproduction, however, that the half Chang seal in this painting matches that of Jia rather than Geng. A logical sequence of events would be that Jia placed his seals there first, and Geng then placed his seal above Jia's Chang seal.

At the time of this writing, a forthcoming exhibition entitled Masterworks of Ming and Qing Paintings from the Forbidden City, sponsored by the International Arts Council, contains two paintings of Ming masters that also bear impressions of the large Chang seal: Preparing Tea (Shiming tu) by Tang Yin (Fig. 13) and Thatched Hut in the Peach Blossom Village by Qiu Ying (Fig. 14). The Ming period of the paintings precludes, of course, any consideration of Jia Sidao as the owner of these seals.

Though there are other known, smaller versions of a Chang seal identified with other collectors or artists, the immediate focus of this article has been the two large seal impressions that because of their close similarity have been the cause of so much debate. For these we hope our arguments have clarified ownership. One belongs to Jia Sidao, the right prime minister (You Chengxiang) of the Southern Song Dynasty and has been seen singly or in conjunction with other seals of Jia. The other belongs to Geng Jiazu, or Geng Huihou, of the Kangxi Period.
Notes

1. The paintings are Bamboo, Rock and Old Tree, reproduced in the book Shih-Chieh ed., Three Hundred Masterpieces of Chinese Paintings in the Palace Museum, Taichung, 1959, p. 4, no. 147; Bamboo, Rocks and Lonely Orchids, reproduced in the catalogue by Richard Barnhart, Along the Border of Heaven, New York, 1985, pp. 118, 119 and p. 128, respectively; and A Garden Rock, Dry Trees and Small Bamboo Shoot, reproduced in two volumes, Chinese Painting Leading Masters and Principles, New York, 1958, v. 6, part 2 (the authenticity of this painting may be in question: it could be a copy of Chiao’s painting rather than the original, in any event it needs further study).


4. See the seals in the following scroll reproductions: Huang Tingjian, Song Huang Shang Fengge shi juan, Nishin, Tokyo, 1960, pp. 19 and 20; Nan Tang dong Yuan Xiashan Tujuan, Shanghai, 1959; Su Shi, Chihfu, Taiwan, 1975, p. 15; Yan Zhengqing, Zisha Guangfen, Shanghai, 1985, p. 139; and Xu Bangda, Zhongguo huabu shi tula, Shanghai, 1981, pp. 37 and 149.

5. See Nan Tang dong Yuan Xiashan Tujuan, as cited above in n. 4.

6. For example, on the The River Bank by Dong Yuan, reproduced in Barnhart, Along the Border of Heaven, pp. 28, 51, 32, as well as Appendix 1, p. 175 and Appendix 2, p. 185, there is a very faint impression of a Jia Sidao Qihe seal, which was discovered only after Denis Yang photographed the seals on this painting with a special film.

7. See K. Tomita et al., Portfolio of Chinese Paintings in the Museum Collection, Yuan to Ch’ing Period, Boston, 1961, pl. 16b.

8. For an illustration of this handscroll, see Osaka shiritsu bijutsukan, 2 v., Tokyo, 1975, v. 1, no. 24; for the seal impressions, see v. 2, no. 24, p. 115.

9. We are indebted to Ma Ching and Zhu Xuchu of the Shanghai Museum for providing us with two negatives of Geng’s seals from Floating Jade Mountain Retreat.


11. We are indebted to Charles Moyer of the International Arts Council for giving us the opportunity to view slides of these seals in order to check the Geng seals.

12. See, for example, the Ch’eng seals of Liu Shao, Zhang Chi, and Fang Gongliang, which may be found in Signatures and Seals on Painting and Calligraphy: The Signature and Seals of Artists, Connoisseurs and Collectors since the Tiin Dynasty, comp. Joint Board of Directors of the National Palace Museum and National Central Museum, Taiwan, Hongkong, 1964, v. 2 nos. 1161, 0971, and 0877, respectively. We are indebted to Richard Edwards for referring us to the Ch’eng seals mentioned above and for sharing his research regarding the Ch’eng seal with us.

13. In closing we would like to consider two issues related to the identification of the Ch’eng seal. The first has to do with the reading of the Ch’eng seal, the second with the meaning of the word Ch’eng and consequently the reason both Jia Sidao and Geng Jiazuo may have used the seal. Regarding the first issue, we should mention that the Ch’eng seal has been sometimes been read as Feng.48 A contemporary of Jia Sidao, Zhou Mi (1232–1308), in his Yuan yan guoyan lu (1947, ed. Huang Binghong et al., Hongkong, p. 32), read this seal as Feng (on the same page, however, a notation by Tang Zhongmou49 says that Zhou was mistaken and that the seal script should be read as Ch’eng). We are indebted to Richard Barnhart for referring us to this publication and for sharing information from his research. Indeed as late as the eighteenth century, in the Qinding Mianian Zhulin Shiqiu booo suixian, the Ch’eng seal was printed as Feng more often than Ch’eng (see, for example, the following scroll in that publication: Huang Tingjian’s Pine Wind Hall Poem, p. 21, p. 9, and Zhan Zhiquian’s Travelling in Spring [Vouchou tu], Cui Bo’s Wintry Sparrows, and Yi Yuanji’s The Hundred Ginkob, in v. 27, pp. 170, 201, and 204, respectively). The more reliable reading, however, remains Ch’eng. Dong Qichang in his colophon to Dong Yuan’s Summer Mountains referred to this seal as Ch’eng, and in the publications of the National Palace Museum in Taiwan, it is Ch’eng rather than Feng that is used today; see, for example, the following publications: Gugong shuhua lu, Taipei, 1956, para 1, pp. 50, 32 and juan 3, p. 157; Signatures and Seals on Painting and Calligraphy, v. 1, p. 140; and Ye Gongzhuo, Xiao Qingmu Le, Hongkong, 1972, p. 40. (We had difficulty arriving at a decisive answer regarding the reading of the Ch’eng seal when studying various publications from the People’s Republic of China. We wrote to Yang Xin of the Palace Museum in Beijing. His reply was that the answer was pending and that research work continues at the museum.) Having checked the records of old seal scripts (Duan Weizhi, Gu zhuowen dazi dian, Taizhong, 1965, pp. 702 and 703;
Kong Zhaoming, dist., Qingdai wengjia zhuan li dazi dian, Taipei, 1979, p. 1190; and Ding Furao, ed., Shuwen jiezi gulin, Taizhong, 1965, pp. 212, 702 and 703; according to these publications, Chang is more likely the correct reading) and having compared the Chang seal in question with those of known seal scripts of Chang and Feng, we agree with the generally accepted reading of Chang. As to the second issue, one of the given meanings of "Chang is zhuohu" (feudal lord). Jia Sidao was given the titles of Wei Gong, a feudal title, and Taishi, which has as one of its meanings a feudal title used in the Zhou Dynasty. In the court, Jia was often referred to as Zhou Gong, a highly respected feudal lord of the Zhou Dynasty (see Feng Qiyuan ed., Songshi jishi benmo, repr. Taiwan, 1955, juan 105, p. 888), and he may have used Chang to show his status. Geng Jiazu may have used the seal for a similar reason. Geng's great grandfather, grandfather, and uncle all had the title of a feudal prince bestowed upon them. Geng's father became a consort to Manchu Princess Duohou before the age of fourteen and his uncle inherited the title of Jingnan Wang when his father was thirty-one. Geng's uncle declared war against the emperor when his father was thirty-four, but for a period of twenty years, the Geng family was very powerful and influential in the court. If his father had his son early in his life, Geng would have been old enough to start a collecting career when the family was still in its prime and thus may have used the "Chang" seal to show the family's eminent position. If this was the case, however, he probably used the seal only for a relatively short period since it would have been difficult for him to flaunt his influence while his uncle was leading an insurrection. This may explain why Geng's "Chang" seal is not seen as often as other seals used by both Geng and his father. For the Geng family history, see A. Hummel, ed., Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period, Washington, 1943, pp. 415-16; Xu Qianxue, Zhanjuan wenji, ed. Chang Bide, repr. Taipei, 1971, pp. 31-34; Cang Lihe et al., eds., Zhonggguo renming da cidian, Shanghai, pp. 837-38; and Meng Sen et al., eds., Qingdai shihao huiban, Hong Kong, 1977, p. 2411. For the meaning of Feng and Chang, see Zhang Qiyuan, ed., Daixue cidian, Taipei, 1973, pp. 392, 393, 1944, and 1945.
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b. 趙孟頫
k. 鎮印
c. 蘭蕙圖
l. 胡笳十八拍
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e. 耿嘉祚
n. 黃庭堅
f. 耿會侯
o. 榮風閣詩
g. 騎縛印
p. 悅生
h. 耿會侯鑑定書畫之章
q. 秋寒
i. 丹誠
r. 似道
s. 董源
t. 夏山圖
u. 董其昌
v. 宜興小景
w. 周繇
x. 銅官秋色
y. 質周
z. 會侯之章
aa. 聚頂圖
ab. 易元吉
ac. 珍尾
ad. 會侯穎賞
ae. 鋪選
af. 浮玉山居圖
ag. 寒崔圖
ah. 崔白
ai. 生茗圖
aj. 唐寅
ak. 仇英
al. 石丞相
am. 封
an. 周密
ao. 雲煙過眼錄
ap. 湯仲謀
aq. 欽定秘殿珠林
ar. 諸侯
as. 魏公
at. 大師
au. 周公

THE MYSTERY OF THE CHANG SEAL
Fig. 4. Geng Huihou jiandeng shuhua zhizhang and Dancheng seals from Summer and Autumn Orchids.

Fig. 5. Dancheng, Qushu Tang, and Chang seals from Summer and Autumn Orchids.

Fig. 6. Dancheng, Hanshui Geng Huihou shuhua zhizhang, and Chang seals from Eighteen Songs of a Nomad Flute by unknown artist. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
Fig. 7. Yueheng, Quhe, Sidan, and Chang seals from "Fine Wind Hall Poem" by Huang Tingjian. National Palace Museum, Taiwan. (After Song Huang Shangu Songfeng ge shijian Ta Wuzong.)

Fig. 8. Chang seals at the beginning and ending of "Summer Mountains" by Dong Yuan. (After Nan Tang diong Yuan Xialian Tujuan.)

Fig. 9. Huihou zhizhang and Chang seals from "Sanery of Yixing" by Zhou Chi and "Autumn Views of Tong-guan" by Shen Zhou. Fourteenth and fifteenth century, respectively. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Fig. 10. Half Chang, Zhenmi, and Hushou zhenshang seals from *The Hundred Gibbons* attributed to Yi Yuanji. Mid-eleventh century. Abe Collection, Osaka, Japan.

Fig. 11. Chang and Geng Hushou jianding shuhua zhishang seals from *Floating Jade Mountain Retreat* by Qian Xuan. Courtesy, Shanghai Museum.
Fig. 12. Chang seal of Jia Sidao from 
Wintry Sparrows by Cui Bo. Eleventh century. The 
Palace Museum, Peking.

Fig. 13. Chang seal from Preparing Tea 
by Tang Yin. Ming Dynasty. Courtesy, 
The Palace Museum, Peking, and 
the International Arts Council.

Fig. 14. Chang seal from Thatched 
Hut in the Peach Blossom Village by Qiu 
Ying. Ming Dynasty. Courtesy, The 
Palace Museum, Peking, and the 
International Arts Council.
THE IMPACT OF SHUGENDŌ ON THE PAINTING OF YOKOI KINKOKU

By PATRICIA FISTER

Emerald eyes and frosty beard illuminate his tattered robes. After mastering ascetic practices, his years have advanced. Holy mountains and sacred peaks—he must have visited them all—Its not strange that smoke and mist arise from his colorful brush.

The above verse by Nakajima Soin(1785) describes the monk-artist Yokoi Kinkoku(1761–1832), one of the most extraordinary personalities of the Edo period (1600–1868). He was such a colorful figure that a serialized account of his life ran in the Japanese newspapers during the 1940s, and two modern novels have been written with Kinkoku as the protagonist. Throughout his life, Kinkoku's restless spirit alternated between a thirst for the tranquil existence of a Buddhist monk and a longing for the adventures of the open road. He eventually found resolve in the Japanese mountain religion called Shugendō, which combined traditional Buddhist practices with arduous journeys into mountainous regions. Shugendō not only provided Kinkoku with new spiritual direction but also acted as a catalyst in his development as a painter and led to a major artistic breakthrough. This article will demonstrate how Kinkoku's Shugendō religious experiences gave him a new vision of nature that he fervently tried to communicate with brush and ink. The bold, idiosyncratic style that Kinkoku developed as a result of his adventures freed him from the rank of second-rate artisan painters and led him to become one of the most dynamic masters of Japanese landscape painting.

Formative Years

Kinkoku documented the first half of his life in autobiographical writings entitled the Kinkoku Shōnin gochidai-ki, or Biography of the Monk Kinkoku (hereafter referred to as Ichidai-ki). He wrote about his early years with a sense of slapstick humor not unlike Jippensha Ikku's (1766–1831) Hizakurige (Shank's Mare), and one cannot be certain that all of the outrageous tales Kinkoku included actually happened. Nevertheless, the Ichidai-ki does give the reader a true sense of Kinkoku's eccentric and unruly character, and an understanding of the circumstances that led to his involvement with Shugendō.

Kinkoku was born in the small rural village of Kasanagi in Ōmi province (present-day Kusatsu city, Shiga prefecture); at the age of nine by Japanese count, he was taken to the Jōdo temple Sōkinji in Osaka where his uncle En'ō was chief priest. Kinkoku's father had been a Buddhist monk, probably of the Jōdo sect, and his son was expected to follow in his footsteps. However, Kinkoku wrote that from an early age he blatantly ignored the rules of standard behavior. Full of youthful vigor, he rebelled against the discipline expected of Buddhist monks, and the Ichidai-ki is replete with rowdy tales of the mischief Kinkoku caused at this temple. His pranks ranged from putting fish into the water-offering receptacles to urinating on the wooden temple drums. Once during the abbot's absence, he removed the central image from the platform in the main hall and raised himself to stand in its former position (Fig. 1).

After being repeatedly punished for his misdeeds, Kinkoku left Sōkinji at the age of seventeen (1775) and went to Edo, where he was admitted as a novice into the Jōdo temple Zojoji in Shibag. For a time Kinkoku approached his Buddhist studies with fresh enthusiasm, and by his account he quickly outdistanced the other pupils. However, he claimed that he once again was bewitched by some kind of demon. Unable to ignore the carnal pleasures of Edo, he began to frequent the "flower and willow world" of Shinagawa and was expelled from Zojoji.

Kinkoku first took refuge at the Jōdo temple Renkōji in Hasunuma in the province of Kazusa (Ibaragi prefecture). Thereupon adopted the life of a mendicant monk and traveled to Shima (Chiba). Kinkoku tried to settle down by marrying a fourteen-year-old girl but quickly became disillusioned and divorced her. He then attempted to reenter Zojoji but was refused admission. Kinkoku's insatiable taste for adventure led him to explore the Tōkaidō (Eastern Coastal Way) and other areas of Japan. Although the Tokugawa government attempted to restrict movement along the main roads through checkpoints that assured that only legally sanctioned travel took place, monks
could always use the pretext of visiting temples or making pilgrimages and hence had an uncommon freedom to travel where they pleased. Kinkoku earnestly set about visiting famous historical sites, temples, and shrines, cavorting with women along the way. He earned traveling money by giving sermons and selling talismanic garments called kyokatahira7 which he made of paper stamped with sutras from a block he had carved.

Kinkoku eventually returned to his hometown and from there went to Kyoto, where, under the guidance of several priests, he once again applied himself to Buddhist studies.5 When he became twenty-one, Kinkoku received the imperial order of Ōensandai8 (“Fragrant Robe of the Inner Truth”) and was invited to become the priest of Gokurakuji9 on Mount Kinkoku in the northern part of Kyoto.7

Though proud of his new title and position, in time Kinkoku became restless with traditional temple life, which was simply too uneventful for his wayward spirit. His curiosity and interests were boundless. He began to study jōruri9 (narrative chanting usually accompanied by shanisen music) and also became affiliated with the temple Myōanji, where he became an active komuso10 (itinerant monk who plays the shakuhachi). In Kinkoku’s day jōruri was considered to be a rather debased form of entertainment, not befitting a Buddhist priest. His activities as a wandering komuso also showed disregard for his position at Gokurakuji. This unorthodox behavior shocked the temple elders, as did his infatuation with gambling and other unseemly activities in the pleasure district of Kyoto. Kinkoku’s actions were undoubtedly related to the general decline of Buddhism during the Edo period, which ceased to hold an appeal for many Japanese intellectuals. The rise in secular spirit, stimulated by the peace and economic prosperity of the era, led to the attitude that one should take advantage of all the worldly pleasures in this life. Kinkoku described his position as a “crane amidst a flock of chickens,” writing that his friends were distraught and continually pleaded with him to “stop this evil life and become once more the pure Dōjin.”18

Eventually Kinkoku wearyied of the “floating world” and devoted his time to playing with children and flying kites from the roof of the main hall at Gokurakuji. A fire swept through Kyoto in 1788 and destroyed his temple, providing Kinkoku with an acceptable excuse to relinquish his duties and travel.9 One of his first sojourns was in the hot springs town of Kinosaki,7 where he became acquainted with many scholars, artists, and poets. Here he was introduced to the literati lifestyle, for which he had an affinity. Whereas scholar-artists frequently stayed with friends and patrons, painting and writing out poetry in return for food and lodging, Kinkoku stayed at Jōdo temples, giving sermons and painting Buddhist deities or pictorial biographies of Hönen12 (1133–1212).10 He traveled west, through present-day Hyōgo and Okayama prefectures, and reputedly as far as Nagasaki.11 Along the way Kinkoku painted scrolls of the Enkō Daishi ekotoba10 (Pictorial Biography of Hönen) for Shinkōji11 in Himeji,13 Dairenji16 in Akō17 (Hyōgo prefecture), Daionji16 in Nagasaki, and an unnamed temple in Kyōnoshima.16 Kinkoku represented himself in the act of painting one of these scrolls in the Ichidai-ki (Fig. 2). Scrolls depicting the life of Hönen were used in teaching and propagating the ideals of the sect. The style and composition of Kinkoku’s paintings of Hönen’s biography suggest that at some point he saw an example at one of the Jōdo temples he visited and made a sketchbook. The most famous pictorial biography of Hönen extant is the set of forty-eight handscrolls from the Kamakura period preserved at the Chion-in19 in Kyoto. This monumental work seems to have set the standard, and all later renditions of Hönen’s biography were based on it. Shortened versions began to appear as early as the Kamakura period, and in time the kakemono,20 or hanging scroll, format became popular because it could be viewed by many people at one time and hence was more useful in teaching.

The whereabouts of the examples Kinkoku noted in his Ichidai-ki is unknown.19 But from a version of the Enkō Daishi ekotoba (painted in 1799) owned by Soeiji20 in Kusatsu,21 we can learn about Kinkoku’s early artistic efforts (Fig. 3). Kinkoku utilized the kakemono format for his depictions, condensing both illustrations and text so that Hönen’s biography could be contained in four scrolls. At the end of the final scroll, before adding the date and his signature, Kinkoku wrote: “From the entire biography of forty-eight scrolls I have copied these four using a simplified format, and present them so that others can attain life in paradise.” This indicates that Kinkoku was aware of the existence of the Chion-in scrolls, but it is unlikely that he would have had access to them. Instead he probably saw, and used as a model, paintings or printed versions of Hönen’s biography that copied the designs of the original.

When comparing Kinkoku’s version with the Chion-in scrolls, one can see that he has selected
and illustrated the most climatic moments in Honen’s career. Each illustration is preceded by a caption consisting of about sixty characters—an abbreviated version of the original. The characters were first written in ink and then covered with gold paint. Kinkoku concluded his fourth scroll with the death of Honen, but the original set goes on to recount the history of the Jodo sect and the establishment of the Chion’in.

Since they are the most important elements in the narrative, Kinkoku focused his attention on the figures, leaving out or simplifying such details as landscape, architecture, textile patterns, and so on. The style of painting he employed was modeled upon the age-old yamato-e tradition that was generally used for enoki. The compositional design with strong diagonals, interior views into buildings, and bands of clouds that divide narrative scenes adheres to traditional conventions. Likewise, the application of color with designs first outlined in ink, filled in with opaque pigments, and then reoutlined follows the methods utilized in early enoki.

The products of Kinkoku’s forays into the genre of Buddhist painting, exemplified by the Soejii Enkō Daishi ekotoba, are at best derivative. His reasons for taking up the brush were primarily economic: by fulfilling some temple’s need for didactic paintings, he could earn traveling money and/or food and lodging. Like most professional painters of Buddhist subjects, he based his compositions on standard compositions, compiling a sketchbook of designs he knew he would be repeating. Kinkoku seemed to be content with imitating and felt no need to develop avenues of individualistic expression. However, he derived very little personal satisfaction from this type of painting for he wrote in the Ichidai-ki that when he was asked by the temple Kumagayaadera to paint four scrolls of the Enkō Daishi ekotoba, he declined, replying that he was tired of painting this subject and could not endure copying it from the model again.

During his long journey, Kinkoku lived for an extended period of time in Akō, where around the year 1790 he married the great-granddaughter of Hara Sōemon, one of the forty-seven rōnin immortalized by the drama Chushingura. Kinkoku continued to earn some of his living expenses through artistic commissions, noting that he painted some sliding door panels (fusuma) in the Akō Castle of Lord Mori. With the money he received, Kinkoku had a boat made that became his home. Eventually, he tired of life in Akō and once again felt the urge to travel. He first went to Kyoto alone, then he and his wife made a pilgrimage to Ise, and in the early 1790s they settled in Nagoya and had their first child, a son named Fukutarō. Kinkoku continued to operate as a free-lance Buddhist priest, providing services and lectures when asked, but until 1804 he does not seem to have been affiliated with any particular temple.

The move to Nagoya marked a significant turning point in Kinkoku’s life. Whereas previously he had failed to enjoy a settled home because of his eccentricities, in Nagoya he found acceptance among artists, poets, and scholars. Since unconventionality was often viewed as a prerequisite for creativity in artistic circles, Kinkoku’s offbeat behavior probably enhanced rather than marred his image. During his early years in Nagoya, he seems to have continued his vocation as a journeyman painter, gradually moving beyond Buddhist subject matter into the realm of secular figures. Among his new circle of friends were the haiku poets Kanamori Keigo (1748–1812) and Inoue Shirō (1742–1812). His fraternization with poets stimulated his own interest in haiku and inspired him to paint haiga and haiga-style paintings. Through them Kinkoku was encouraged to study the painting of Yosa Buson (1716–84), who gradually became his single most important source of inspiration. The existence of several direct copies by Kinkoku suggests that he must have had access to paintings by Buson.

Kinkoku’s haiga have been discussed elsewhere. Here, how his interest in Buson extended to other types of painting, such as Kinkoku’s scroll depicting a woodcutter on horseback (Fig. 4), painted in the spring of 1790, will be explored. This painting is from a set of six that were probably once mounted on the panels of a folding screen. Kinkoku inscribed the date in cyclical characters on only one of the six paintings. These represent the earliest known dated paintings by Kinkoku and will be discussed later.

Kinkoku’s woodcutter was clearly inspired by one of Buson’s many versions of this pastoral subject, represented by a painting in the Itsuō Art Museum (Fig. 5). However, Kinkoku’s rendering of the figure and the horse is rudimentary in comparison. His outlines are rather stiff and tentative, undoubtedly the outcome of his undeveloped skill and the fact that he was copying a model. The landscape setting is also rather simply done, with little comprehension of the range of brushwork required for describing trees, rocks, and grasses.
Not only did Kinkoku lack the skill to tackle landscape at this point but his interest was clearly still concentrated on the figures.

Another painting from the 1790 set depicts a subject that Kinkoku repeated many times in the following decade—a Monkey Trainer (Fig. 6). His signature reads Kinkoku sanbō utsusu, or "painted by the monk from Mount Kinkoku." Although his temple on Mount Kinkoku had been destroyed in 1788, Kinkoku still identified himself with this location. Compared to Kinkoku’s woodcutter after Buson (Fig. 4), his Monkey Trainer displays characteristics associated with the Shijō style of Buson’s pupil, Goshun(1752–1811). Kinkoku was probably guided in this direction through his association with the artist Cho Gesshō(1772–1832) in Nagoya, who was also a haiku poet.

Kinkoku became a pupil of Cho Gesshō sometime in the 1790s, the exact year is unknown: there is a record of a letter written by Kinkoku to Gessho, thanking him for a modelbook and asking for further examples. Prior to his move Kinkoku seems to have been self-taught, learning to paint through copying the work of established artists. Now, from Gesshō, Kinkoku learned to paint figures in the Maruyama and Shijō styles, and landscapes showing the strong influence of Goshun. Gesshō had initially received training under the Nanga painter Ichikawa Kunkéi(1736–1803) and then from Goshun. After moving to Nagoya around the year 1790, Gesshō became a pupil of Yamada Kyūjō(1747–93), who painted in the Nanga and Nagasaki styles. As a result of his training in diverse painting traditions, Gesshō developed a rather eclectic style, but the most influential of his teachers was Goshun. Gesshō seems to have been responsible for transmitting Goshun’s Shijō style to Nagoya, where it was enthusiastically taken up by Kinkoku.

Kinkoku’s Monkey Trainer is unmistakably based on a Shijō school model. The short, stocky type of figure with large head, popularized by Goshun in his later years, is represented here by a woodblock-printed illustration by Gesshō from the Meika gafū(1788). Kinkoku has not only used similar proportions but has also drawn the lines around the face to represent wrinkles, whiskers, and eyebrows. However, as noted in the discussion of the woodcutter on horseback (Fig. 4), Kinkoku’s brushwork is rather flat and lifeless, the result of submitting to the models of another artist instead of following his own inspiration. There are at least three other versions of identical monkey trainers extant, all dated 1797, documenting Kinkoku’s tendency to copy the same subject many times, either as a means of learning, or as a professional painter responding to commissions. He continued to work from a sketchbook throughout his life, adding compositions he either admired or thought would have popular appeal.

**Exploration of Landscape**

The majority of Kinkoku’s paintings thought to date from the fifteen years between 1790 and 1805 are figures. He became accomplished in a wide range of styles, from *haiga* and more formal paintings in the Buson manner to figures in the Maruyama and Shijō traditions. In addition, he continued to do occasional Buddhist paintings and gradually began to investigate the theme of landscape. His earliest known pure landscape paintings were done in the spring of 1797 and are included in a set of six works (three landscapes and three figure paintings) that were probably once mounted on a folding screen. The three landscapes are very elementary, which is understandable since they were among Kinkoku’s first attempts at depicting nature (Fig. 7). Kinkoku simply defined the outer structure of the mountain ridges, boats, buildings, and figures, employing lines of slightly varying thickness and ink tonality. Within the mountain forms, he drew a series of parallel, slanted lines to represent ridges and added smooth, rounded strokes of wash to indicate clefts in the rock surfaces. Horizontal and vertical dots were sparsely applied around some of the ridges for foliage. Kinkoku’s description of the tree forms was also minimal. The foreground trees in one of the landscapes (Fig. 8, left) were brushed with rough, angular outlines; little attempt was made to fill in their interiors with texture strokes. Tree foliage was limited to only two kinds of brushstrokes: small, outlined triangles and horizontal dots. Some sense of depth is hinted at by the simple overlapping of forms, but the overall regularity of brushwork and simplicity of designs work against the development of convincing space or mass.

Since the compositional designs and motifs of all three landscape paintings are unsophisticated and the brushwork is rough and unskillful, Kinkoku may not yet have been under the guidance of a teacher or was at most a beginning student. However, the quantum jump in terms of compositional organization between these works and *Picking Persimmons* (Fig. 9) from the Biwako Bunkakan,
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Painted one year later in 1798, indicates that during this period Kinkoku seriously took up the study of landscape painting, probably under the direction of Chō Gesshō.

The organization of landscape elements in Picking Persimmons is much more complex than in Kinkoku’s 1797 paintings. Furthermore, Kinkoku used a wider range of brush techniques. Four different kinds of tree foliage can be observed, and the lines, dots, and washes describing the mountain forms are more adroitly applied and integrated. Similarities between the 1797 and 1798 paintings include the repetition of lines and the wet horizontal strokes to represent ridges and faceted rocks. This was a brush technique that Kinkoku probably learned from Gesshō, although it ultimately derives from Goshun’s Shijō style. The mountains and rocks in Gesshō’s landscapes display many Shijō brush manners, exemplified by his Red Cliff (Fig. 10). A painting of the same subject by Goshun will serve as a comparison (Fig. 11). Although Goshun composed his landscape within a horizontal format and Gesshō arranged his vertically, the brush methods utilized in building up the landscape forms are clearly similar. Both artists have divided up the rocky surfaces into parallel ridges, filling in the interiors with broad strokes (also applied in parallel fashion) and layers of graded wash.

The figurative types and motifs in Picking Persimmons such as the man receiving a massage, the thatched hut, wall, and grove of bamboo also recall paintings by Goshun (and his mentor Buson). Although Kinkoku must have come into direct contact with paintings by these two masters at some point, he probably became acquainted with their styles through Gesshō.

By 1798 Kinkoku had advanced in terms of grappling with a more complex composition and a variety of brush methods, but his brushwork is still stilted and awkward in Picking Persimmons. For example, the myriad short strokes forming the bamboo leaves appear to have been painstakingly applied. Similar bamboo thickets painted by Buson or Goshun were more freely brushed and hence have a featherly lightness. Likewise, the brushstrokes within the rocks in the lower foreground of Kinkoku’s landscape were added without much understanding for the integrity of the whole. Later in his life, Kinkoku did another version of this painting that will be discussed at the end this article, where the changes in the development of his style will be summarized.

Goshun’s Shijō tradition continued to supply Kinkoku with compositional and brushwork models, as is shown in the latter’s Spring Landscape (Fig. 12) dated to the spring of 1799. It is instructive to compare Kinkoku’s landscape to Goshun’s Farmhouse and Stream in the Seattle Art Museum (Fig. 13) because they depict similar subject matter and share analogous compositions. Both paintings are dominated by tall trees jutting diagonally inward from rocks in the lower right foreground. Beneath the trees are small thatched huts and villagers attending to their daily chores; low rounded hills rise in the distance. Kinkoku’s painting lacks sophistication, but the similarities point to a Shijō school model, particularly the rocks and mountains displaying outlined ridges or crevices filled in with layers of washes and broad strokes rather than multitudes of individual texture strokes.

Such scenes emphasizing the pleasures of rural life seem to have captured and sustained Kinkoku’s interest in the early stages of his painting career. Another example in this vein, undated but extremely close in style to his 1799 Spring Landscape, is Rice Fields owned by the Spencer Museum of Art (Fig. 14). Similarities include the short stocky figures, trees jutting out an angle from the foreground, low-lying hills in the background dotted with trees, and extensive use of wash in the modeling of the rock forms. Kinkoku focused a great deal of attention on the figures who merrily go about performing the activities associated with planting rice; one farmer in the center pauses to watch two egrets take wing. The figures resemble those in Picking Persimmons, likewise following Buson and Goshun prototypes.

A landscape painting with figures dated to the winter of 1800 has recently come to light, offering new evidence regarding Kinkoku’s change to a literati style (Fig. 15). The painting bears a title identifying the scene as a view of Yorō Waterfall, a famous site in Owari (Aichi prefecture). The inscription goes on to say that it was painted after Kinkoku had climbed up to view the waterfall. Below, a group of figures are waiting to receive sencha (a form of Chinese steeped tea) being prepared by a young attendant. It is possible that the painting depicts Kinkoku’s actual excursion for he uses the two characters shinzu (true painting) in his title. It is tempting to imagine him as the figure peering out at us from between the two pine trees.

What is important here is that the figures are not as prominent as they were in the previously discussed paintings and are clearly based on the
scholarly types favored by Nanga artists rather than on the peasants and townfolk so commonly found in Shijo paintings. This indicates that Kinkoku was beginning to explore the literati landscape tradition, again probably through his eclectic teacher Gessho. However, Kinkoku’s brushwork has not advanced much into the literati realm, with the exception of larger groupings of dots being scattered over the rock surfaces. The foundation for his brushwork remains the same: rocks and mountains outlined and divided into ridges by series of short, parallel lines. There is very little texturing within the rock forms modeled with smooth rounded strokes and larger areas of wash. In sum, this painting could be described as halfway between Shijo and Nanga.

**Involvement with Shugendo**

In 1804 an event took place that significantly altered the course of Kinkoku’s life and the development of his painting. In the spring of that year, Kinkoku saw an official announcement distributed by Sanbōin in Kyoto, stating that the abbot of that temple, Kōen Hoshimō (d. 1848), was going to make a pilgrimage to Mount Ōmine to pray for peace, and that all yamabushi, or practitioners, of Shugendo in Japan were invited to join.

Shugendo is a religion unique to Japan that prescribes ascetic practices in mountains in order to attain magical powers. The origins of Shugendo are syncretic, combining elements of the ancient worship of mountains as the sacred dwellings of native gods with the doctrine, ritual, and symbolism of esoteric Buddhism. It is believed that mountains are sacred and inhabited by deities, and that through special procedures humans can avail themselves of their religious powers. Mountains are invested with the symbolism of the esoteric Buddhist mandala, the climb representing the passage from a profane to a sacred world. In the course of the ascent and subsequent sojourn on a mountain, austerities are practiced that are intended to rouse the Buddha nature from its hidden state and to bring about one’s transformation into a Buddha. Rituals performed along the way include fasting, abstaining from drinking water, attending outdoor fire ceremonies, and such dramatic actions as hanging over cliffs, from which position one is supposed to confess all one’s sins.

In the early stages of Shugendo, yamabushi were unmarried mendicants who spent their time in religious practices in the mountains. As Shugendo became more organized, its practitioners gradually lost their status as individual wandering ascetics and became affiliated with local Shugendo temples, which by the Edo period existed all over Japan. Many yamabushi married and either had their temple homes at the foot of sacred peaks or made periodic pilgrimages to mountains. While on the mountains, yamabushi not only sought to acquire supernatural powers in their own person but also learned various religious practices that enabled them to mediate these powers. A yamabushi would usually form a bond between the people of a certain district and a particular sacred peak, the area under his spiritual guidance resembling a parish. When yamabushi descended the mountain, they visited their parishioners to administer blessings or to perform special services of healing and exorcism in return for food. The German physician Englebert Kaempfer (1651–1716) gave a rather amusing account of yamabushi activities he witnessed during a visit to Edo-period Japan:

> Among other things they betook themselves to a sort of trade, which proves very beneficial to them, and to impose upon the vulgar they give out, that they are peculiarly versed in magical arts and sciences, pretending by virtue of certain ceremonies, and mystical obscure words and charms . . . to do many things beyond the power of Nature, to dive into secrets and mysteries, to recover stolen goods, and to discover the thieves, to foretell future events, to explain dreams, to cure desperate distempers, to find out the guilt or innocence of persons accused of crimes and misdemeanors, and the like.

Kinkoku described himself as being struck by a lightning bolt when he first learned of the intended expedition from Sanbōin; in the spring of 1804 he determined to become a yamabushi. This mountain religion had a unique appeal for Kinkoku, with its Buddhist training and adventure-seeking personality. In Shugendo he found a magical excitement lacking in traditional Buddhism, along with an activist approach to attaining enlightenment. The Jōdo sect promised paradise after death, but Shugendo, under the influence of esoteric Buddhism, embraced the concept that one could acquire supernatural powers during the present life. Given Kinkoku’s impatient, restive temperament, it can be easily understood why he was attracted to the mountain religion.

Kinkoku acquired official yamabushi status by petitioning the local government office and moved to a vacant Shugendo temple named Daibōin in Owari, where he devoted himself to learning the customs and ways of the mountain ascetic. In the
sixth month of 1804, he went directly to Sanbōin in Kyoto to gain permission to participate. There Kinkoku pleaded earnestly that he would do anything to be included in the pilgrimage, volunteering to carry a large ceremonial axe weighing more than eighteen kilograms. The axe-bearer customarily walked before the palanquin carrying the leader and consequently had a role of great importance. Kinkoku was temporarily given the title of Daiokke, the highest among Yamabushi ranks, as it would not have been fitting for him to perform his duty with a lesser rank.

Kinkoku devoted a large portion of the last three chapters of his Ichidai-ki to a detailed diary of the journey, describing the places the ascetics visited and the ceremonies they performed. The information in his text, together with the illustrations, makes this an important document relating to Edo-period Shugendo practices. Within Shugendo there were two main sects: Honzan- ha (Tendai) and Tōzan- ha (Shingon). The former was directed from Shōgōin and the latter, from Sanbōin, both in Kyoto. Kinkoku became a member of the Tōzan sect; his ceremonial journey took a southward course, starting from Yoshino and moving on to Kinpu, over Mount Ōmine, to Kumano in Wakayama prefecture (Fig. 16). The pilgrimage Kinkoku accompanied was exceptional because it was led by a priest-prince and consequently had an overwhelming number of participants. Close to five thousand people were included in the initial procession (Fig. 17) that left Kyoto on the second day of the seventh month in 1804, but the numbers thinned out as the group penetrated deeper into the sacred mountains. In addition to performing Shugendo rituals, the pilgrims stopped to pay their respects at numerous shrines and temples where they were invariably shown treasures or honored by ceremonies. Temporary shelters had been built along the way to accommodate the priest-prince, but the Yamabushi often slept out-of-doors. Despite being subjected to extreme physical hardships, throughout the long journey Kinkoku continually marveled at the magnificent scenery unfolding all around him. From his descriptions in the Ichidai-ki, one can sense the awe of the wilderness Kinkoku was experiencing. The journey was also exhilarating spiritually, and Kinkoku wrote of himself in the Ichidai-ki:

Originally his status was humble: by what kind of good karma had he come to this secret place? Following the lead of people not really of the human race, he was also able to listen to the secrets of the Buddhist doctrine. A single tear dropped.

The entire journey took nearly two months to complete. After performing esoteric practices at Ōmine, Kumano, and Katsuragi, the group returned by way of the west coast of the Kii peninsula and from Osaka headed northeast to Kyoto.

Upon arriving in Kyoto, Kinkoku was given a ceremonial purple robe and the title Hōin Daisendatsu ("Great Master of the Seal of the Law") for fulfilling his role as axe-bearer. This pilgrimage seems to have given Kinkoku both a sense of identity and inner spiritual fulfillment. Previously as priest of the small temple Gokurakuji, Kinkoku had not been deeply committed and hence had lacked self-esteem and a sense of purpose. In contrast, he was now overtly proud of his participation in the 1804 pilgrimage and celebrated it thereafter by stamping seals on paintings reading Hōin Kinkoku, Daisendatsu Daibōin, and Onogyōja Kinkoku in ("Seal of the Axe Ascetic Kinkoku"). He even used a seal that was shaped like an axe, the characters reading Aji itto ("Severing all bonds within the universe"). In addition, Kinkoku often signed his paintings Hōin Kinkoku, Shishi Hōin Kinkoku ("Hōin Kinkoku who was awarded the robe"), and Kinkoku Onogyōja ("Axe Ascetic Kinkoku"). Not only are these seals and signatures tangible symbols of Kinkoku's pride, but they are also useful means of dating his paintings because one can be sure such works were done in or after the year 1804.

**Shift to Nanga and the Development of a Personal Style**

One of the artistic consequences of Kinkoku's Shugendo experience was that he was now more attuned to the world of nature and thus felt stimulated to paint scenes of mountains more than figures. This shift in subject matter was undoubtedly bolstered by the demands of a new group of patrons eager for views of the sacred mountains he had climbed. Kinkoku noted in the Ichidai-ki that his reliance on painting as a profession increased sharply after this expedition, and that he had many requests for landscapes depicting the peaks of Ōmine, Katsuragi, and Kumano. His paintings were probably regarded as embodying some of the mystical energy of the mountains he had entered. Kinkoku followed, in his own way, the Japanese tradition of selling scrolls at famous mountains depicting local kami. Such scrolls are still sold to pilgrims today as souvenirs and as a way of eliciting a mountain's
spiritual power by taking home a symbol of the peak.

Not only did Kinkoku turn more to landscape painting after his pilgrimage, but his style underwent a transformation that was inextricably related to his involvement with Shugendō. In particular, the journey seems to have accelerated Kinkoku's growing inclination toward Nanga, and he now readily abandoned the Shijō manner. This shift is exemplified by Landscape with Boat (Fig. 18) from a set of eight painted in the early summer of 1805. Whereas broad applications of wash had dominated Kinkoku's earlier landscapes, now line and texture strokes became his principle means of expression. For example, in comparison with his Spring Landscape (Fig. 12) of 1799, Kinkoku has used more broken lines and dotting to describe the forms in Landscape with Boat. Underneath, light washes and broad strokes of ink and light color can be observed, but their role is secondary. Though still lacking in variety and technical refinement, Kinkoku's brushwork in Landscape and Boat displays a rugged sense of vitality, indicating that he was attempting to communicate the animate qualities of nature. The lines and dots in his earlier painting are rather subdued in comparison. The brushwork in the 1805 scroll also exhibits a new freedom and sprightliness, suggesting that now the dynamic process of painting was an important element in Kinkoku's artistic expression. The composition is one that became a favorite of Kinkoku: a large rock and tree thrust inward from one lower corner, directing the viewer's vision to the men in the small boat. This is one of the earliest scrolls on which Kinkoku wrote out a poem in Chinese characters, perhaps further indicative of his interest in the literati tradition.

In comparison with his previous paintings, which were often imitations, Kinkoku's landscapes from 1805 on display a greater sense of his personal creativity. This is undoubtedly because Kinkoku now had something he felt compelled to express. The question that immediately comes to mind is why did Kinkoku shift to the linear Nanga style? Modeled upon the centuries-old painting tradition developed by scholar-artists in China, the premiere subject of Japanese Nanga was landscape, composed of lines interwoven with layers of small brushstrokes and washes. Chinese scholar-artists had promoted the idea that the aim of painting was personal expression rather than verisimilitude. They chose landscape as the primary vehicle through which to express themselves because it represented their desire for a spiritual communion with nature, and they derived their brush methods from calligraphy, where each stroke was believed to communicate the state of mind of the creator. When the literati painting tradition was introduced to Japan, many artists strove to imitate the lifestyle of Chinese scholars. Over time, however, the literati style of painting was appropriated by artists of divergent backgrounds and modified to conform to Japanese aesthetic tastes. Kinkoku was undoubtedly in sympathy with certain Sinophile ideals, but as a boastful itinerant monk he was a far cry from a literatus. He was undoubtly attracted to the Nanga style because he felt that vigorous lines and dotting had greater expressive potential than Shijo painting techniques such as the use of graded ink washes. For example, in Kinkoku's Landscape with Boat, the rapidly brushed lines in the lower rock and trees successfully convey a sense of movement. In contrast the rocks rendered with layers of graded wash in his Spring Landscape have not only a sense of clarity lacking here but also a peaceful serenity. Kinkoku's view of nature was now quite different, for in his Shugendo mountain-climbing experiences, he had been introduced to a wild, untamed nature, which he described in the following passage from the Ichidai-ki:

On the twenty-sixth day the wind and rain did not cease, becoming even more severe. Standing in the dense fog they could not see an inch in any direction. Tightly packed together and assembled in a line, the pilgrims started. The deep mountains and secluded valleys had not been entered by mountain ascetics for a thousand years, and the leaves were piled up in many layers. Water had collected on top so that it was like walking through a muddy rice field. Rain penetrated the stomach and pierced the marrow of their bones. Amidst these bitter hardships they continued on . . . . The suffering of entering the great peak knew no bounds.

The soft, relaxed Shijo style was inappropriate for expressing this kind of turbulent energy, resulting in Kinkoku's decision after the pilgrimage in 1804 to search for a more suitable style. It is unclear which models Kinkoku first used when exploring the Nanga style. It was noted earlier that Gesshō's landscapes display a mixture of Nanga and Shijō brushwork. Therefore, Kinkoku probably initially learned certain linear brush methods from Gesshō but expanded his repertoire by adopting features from the landscapes of the renowned Nanga master Buson. Fueled by his admiration for Buson as a haiku poet, Kinkoku had previously employed Buson models for his figure
paintings; now he found certain qualities in Buson’s landscape style that harmonized with his own ideas.

Buson’s depictions of men riding on horseback through green sunlit fields or seated in thatched huts surrounded by luscious bamboo groves must have appealed to Kinkoku with his rural background and love of nature. Kinkoku may also have been captivated by Buson’s freely rendered brushwork that expressed the life and movement in rustling leaves and bubbling brooks or the warmth of sunlight streaming down over a verdant forest. Buson was a master at expressing the growth and flux of nature; his landscape paintings are vibrant with the life forces Kinkoku wanted to express. Consequently, Kinkoku avidly began to adapt many of Buson’s designs, methods of structuring compositions, and basic patterns of brushwork. It is important to recognize that Kinkoku did not merely imitate Buson but transformed the master’s style to suit his own mood, applying his brushstrokes in a distinctly looser and unstructured manner.

A prime example of Kinkoku’s transformation of the Buson manner is his *Bridge in a Bamboo Grove* (Fig. 19) painted in the winter of 1806. It was clearly inspired by the kind of works Buson created during the last years of his life, which are referred to as his Sha-in” period (1778–84), such as the Itsuō Museum’s *Thatched House in Spring Woods* (Fig. 20). Buson-derived motifs in Kinkoku’s painting include the figure in the center wearing a straw hat and coat crossing a bridge, the thatched cottages in the upper left, and the surrounding thicket of bamboo and other foliage. However, *Bridge in a Bamboo Grove* is less refined and less patiently executed than is Buson’s painting. From Buson’s paintings Kinkoku adapted a system of ropelike, linear brushstrokes to describe mountain forms; however, Kinkoku used wetter and thicker brushstrokes and applied them more freely. He also simplified the rock and tree forms, using fewer brushstrokes to define them. Whereas Buson was interested in expressing the warmth and intimacy he sensed in nature, Kinkoku sought to capture the wild, unrestrained quality he had experienced. He succeeded in heightening the dramatic effect by arranging his motifs along sharp diagonals. The foreground bank slopes upward toward the left, and the huts are placed along the same diagonal. This movement is echoed by the mountain peak above, which also projects forcefully towards the left. Rain sweeps downward along the same diagonal. Kinkoku used flickering lines of varying thickness to define the rocks and mountain forms, creating an almost electric sense of energy that is quite different from the quiet, restrained mood of his works executed in the Shijō manner. The forms in *Bridge in a Bamboo Grove* are described only minimally, but the agitated brushwork communicates the movement of nature’s forces.

Both Buson and Kinkoku penetrated beyond appearances, finding rhythms in nature, which they transmitted through their brushwork. However, as a result of their varied characters and experiences, Kinkoku’s and Buson’s impressions of nature were very different. Striving to recreate visually the elemental power he sensed in nature, Kinkoku used Buson’s style as a framework from which to develop his own kind of expression. Kinkoku selectively borrowed elements from Buson’s painting style, adapting them to suit his own needs. Consequently, Kinkoku’s dramatic compositions and frenzied brushwork evoke an intense and unsettling mood that is quite different from the more tranquil nature of Buson’s paintings.

In turning to Buson for inspiration, Kinkoku went against the norm of contemporary Kyoto and Nagoya Nanga artists who were beginning to advocate Sinophile models. Unorthodox in his behavior, Kinkoku likewise retained his individualism in painting during an era when art was becoming somewhat conventionalized. There is no evidence that he sought out or copied Chinese paintings, and the metamorphosis in his style cannot be explained by the changing tastes and fashions in art. Instead, it seems to have been triggered by his Shugendō journey, which provided him with an unforgettable experience and a desire to communicate it. Shugendō did not, however, supply Kinkoku with an artistic style; he chose to adapt Buson’s, which was familiar to him, because it allowed him to express his unique vision of nature.

The compositional design of *Bridge in a Bamboo Grove*, dominated by thrusting mountain forms and strong diagonals, was to become a standard feature of Kinkoku’s repertoire. The free-standing rock, seen here in the lower right foreground, also became an outstanding motif. A variation on this design can be observed in a work in the Falk Collection done three years later, *Sage Overlooking a Rocky Promintory* (Fig. 21). The composition is dominated by diagonals: rocks jut inward from the lower right corner of the picture plane, their movement echoed by the mountain forms above. The interweaving lines describing the rock forms pulse with movement and restless energy, brushed with the speed and violence of a
storm. Kinkoku applied dots to the edges of rock forms with such verve that they appear to explode off the surfaces. What at first glance appears to be a tranquil scene actually contains forms bursting with energy. When painting this work, Kinkoku was perhaps recalling an experience similar to the one described in the following passage from the Ichidai-kī:

. . . . soon the mountains began to rumble. It was like the screaming of tens of thousands of people. The veranda doors and shutters rattled from top to bottom, and Kinkoku wondered if heaven and earth would go to pieces and the world would collapse. The hall cracked and tilted, and all of the fierce yamabushi were frightened out of their wits. Finally the storm quieted and an uncanny hush dominated the heaven and earth.\(^2\)

Kinkoku did at least one painting (Fig. 22) that actually portrays a Shugendō journey. He signed it “Respectfully painted by the Axe Ascetic Hōin Daisendatsu Kinkoku, who received the purple robe upon accompanying the Daigo\(^7\) prince’s entry into the peak.” Such declarations frequently appear on Kinkoku’s works after 1804, undoubtedly to impress the viewer with his yamabushi triumphs. Kinkoku’s poem on this painting reads as follows:

Amidst the lofty peaks, a bird’s path opens.
Desiring to search for demon’s caves, our return is further slowed.
Mountain spirits do not tolerate human intruders—
In the daytime a breeze smelling of fish blows,

Kinkoku has emphasized the lively actions of the ascetics as they struggle to climb the steep mountain precipice. On the cliff in the upper right, one man is performing an important Shugendō ritual, the act of hanging out over a cliff (Fig. 23). Is he confessing his sins?

Kinkoku’s transformation to the Nanga tradition was complete by 1810. By that time he had established a repertoire of compositional designs and motifs that he would repeatedly utilize throughout his career. His landscape paintings usually display rather standardized compositions; only rarely did he depict specific mountains such as Mount Fuji.\(^8\) Rather than in capturing the empirical reality of landscape, he was interested in giving form to the vitality he perceived in nature through the spirited application of brushstrokes, paying only cursory attention to its outward appearances and structures. Thus Kinkoku’s personal creativity was concentrated in the style of brushwork he evolved. The idiosyncracies of Kinkoku’s style and the dramatic change that occurred in his brushwork after 1804 are further documented in the following three paintings.

Kinkoku’s Woodcutter (Fig. 4) was discussed as one of his earliest works (1790) at the beginning of this article. As Kinkoku was prone to do, he repeated this subject at different times in his career. The notion of compiling a sketchbook for source material harkens back to Kinkoku’s days as a painter of Buddhist subjects. He obviously retained this habit (and the same sketchbook) throughout his life. A later version of the woodcutter (Fig. 24), undated but clearly painted after his shift in style, allows us to observe exactly how Kinkoku’s style matured over time. The compositions are nearly identical, and the equestrian figures are obviously both based on a sketch that Kinkoku made of a Buson (or Busonesque) painting. What is strikingly different is the brush manner in which the figures and landscape motifs were painted. This is perhaps most apparent in the tree limb, rock, and grasses, which were brushed with Kinkoku’s explosive vitality in the later scroll. The same motifs in the 1790 painting are mild and generic in comparison, and lack Kinkoku’s stamp of individuality. The brushwork defining the figure and the horse has also slightly changed. In the later work the lines are often broken rather than continuous, displaying slight fluctuations in width that embody a sense of movement.

Peasants at Work (Fig. 25) represents another later rendition by Kinkoku of a theme he had painted in his early career. Many of the figural motifs are identical to those in Rice Fields (Fig. 14), yet in the later scroll their placement has been altered. For example, the two children walking hand in hand in the lower section of Rice Fields have been moved to the upper center of Peasants at Work; this is also true of the two white herons in flight. Other groupings of figures have been similarly rearranged. Furthermore, Kinkoku has increased the number of figures in his later composition and has added three huts. The most striking difference, however, lies in the landscape forms that embrace the two agrarian sceneries. In the later painting, Kinkoku has dramatically expanded the size of his rocks and mountains. In Rice Fields he had represented gently rounded banks and hills; in the later scroll they have been replaced by thrusting cliffs and precipitous mountains. Likewise, almost every tree and rock in the later work are diagonally oriented, evoking
a more unsettled mood than in *Rice Fields* where motifs are often centered. The major difference between the two works is the style and application of brushwork, where Kinkoku’s creative spirit is most evident. In the later painting line dominates wash: freely brushed ropy strokes intertwine and pulsate in rhythm to eruptions of dots, expressing the unbridled passion and zeal Kinkoku poured into their execution. The increase in scale of the landscape forms, coupled with the dynamic brushwork applied within, serves to emphasize nature over man.

A third telling comparison illustrating the great strides that Kinkoku made as an artist is a later version of *Picking Persimmons* (Fig. 9), which is in the John and Kimiko Powers Collection (Fig. 26). The vignette in both paintings, a boy climbing a persimmon tree and an old man receiving a massage, are identical, once again pointing to Kinkoku’s reliance on a sketchbook. The placement of the foreground rocks is also the same, but the background mountains in the Powers’ work have been significantly reformed. Instead of breaking up the major mountains into a number of smaller rocks and cliffs, Kinkoku has depicted two large peaks, one thrusting at a dramatic diagonal. The simplification of forms and the use of diagonal alignments were noted earlier as features of Kinkoku’s newly developed style. The most striking disparity between these two paintings, however, is the brushwork. Instead of outlining the ridges and applying broad strokes of washi and dots within, Kinkoku formed the mountains and rocks in the Powers’ painting out of linear strokes that suffuse and interweave. Over these he applied light washes of color and ink and brushed clusters of dots around the edges of the rock forms with such force that they seem to burst with energy. The individual strokes making up the tree and bamboo foliage were also applied with greater freedom and spontaneity than they were in *Picking Persimmons*. These areas are not only more lush in the later scroll, but are imbued with a shimmering quality akin to leaves rippling in the wind. It was movement and life force, above all, that Kinkoku wished to recreate; his successful achievement of these qualities, through compositional arrangement and dynamic brushwork, forms the basis of his creative genius.

One could criticize Kinkoku for repeating his compositions rather than coming up with fresh inspiration every time he picked up the brush. However, this would be overlooking the source of his creativity, which lay not in inventing new compositional structures but in expressing the forces of nature through brisk and trenchant brushwork. In each of the three scrolls discussed above, only the figures and related motifs were copied from Kinkoku’s sketchbooks; the landscape forms and the brushwork describing them are original, further proving that Kinkoku’s personal interest now was focused on nature.

After the great pilgrimage to Mount Ōmine in 1804, Kinkoku continued to visit Shugendō related mountains. His home remained for many years in the area of Nagoya. It is clear that Kinkoku continued to carry out some religious duties as a monk or yamabushi; he also earned part of his livelihood by selling or trading his paintings. In 1824, however, Kinkoku retired to his birthplace in Shiga prefecture, where he spent the remaining eight years of his life. Since he was sixty-four years old at this time, Kinkoku may have felt a nostalgic longing to seek the comfort and security of his old home. Furthermore, by that time, many of his close friends in the Nagoya area, such as Keigo and Shirō, had died. During that year of 1824, Kinkoku wrote a letter to his relative Yokoi Yasaōemon that summarizes the most important events in his life and provides us with information elucidating his career as a painter. In the first part of the letter, Kinkoku requests more rice, saying that in return he was sending along one of his paintings. He then asks his relative to show the second section of the letter to other people in the hopes that he might acquire more patrons. This second part reads as follows:

Life is like a floating gourd and my legs take me where they please. Without a care I have passed more than sixty years, traveling to the east, west, south, and north, and there is no place where I have not extended my staff. In the west I have been to the coast of Kyūshū, and in the east the Kantō provinces, and as far as Ōmine and Katsuragi. Hiei, Atago, Haguro in Dewa, Yudonosan, Gassan, Fuji at Suruga, Izu Hakone, Hakusan in Kaga, Tateyama in Etchū, Myōgizan, Takachiho in Hyūga, Daisen in Hōki, Amakoma, Kumano Sanzan, and Kasagiya [Nara] are no exceptions. I have pursued my discipline in sacred mountains and famous peaks throughout the sixty or more provinces, and from the summer of this year 1824, I have secluded myself in a mountain temple of Shiga in my homeland of Ōmi and have decided to live out the rest of my years here. My life is not worth mentioning amidst the three thousand worlds. I have mastered diverse Buddhist teachings, and although I understand that life and death are essentially like a dream, discipline is difficult because provisions...
are insufficient for my five-shaku\textsuperscript{48} skeleton. Therefore, at this time I gather alms from those with ties to the Buddhist world and solicit rice given to the Buddhas. When people present small donations of money or goods, I give them landscape or figure paintings as desired. All contain power. The merits of those people who give alms of half a sen\textsuperscript{50} or one piece of paper will increase ten thousand fold and their descendents will be rewarded. By this donation to me, I declare that dangers will be chased far away and the sounds of happiness will rebound.

The last line, stating that his paintings would chase away disasters and bring happiness, lends support to the theory that because of his Shugendō experiences, Kinkoku considered himself to possess special powers. He promoted the idea that his paintings were an outward expression of his mystique, serving as amulet or talisman pictures to repel evil spirits and to bring good fortune.\textsuperscript{45}

In his final years, Kinkoku probably lived at or was associated with a small temple, perhaps performing some priestly or yamabushi activities.\textsuperscript{46} He continued to earn at least part of his income by selling or trading his paintings, relying upon members of his family and local temples as patrons. The large number of extant works done during this period indicates that he was at least somewhat successful as an artist. His popularity in the Omi region is further supported by the great number of forgeries that have appeared in collections there. Even today Kinkoku’s name is well known to residents in his old hometown and the surrounding rural villages, who politely refer to him as Kinkoku-san. Though often roughly brushed on poor quality paper, Kinkoku’s works are still treasured by people whose family collections have been passed down from one generation to the next. The aura of his landscape paintings has not faded for modern-day viewers. Perhaps what is most appealing is their sense of dynamic energy: Kinkoku wielded the brush with a tempestuous freedom that was an unadulterated reflection of both his own eccentricity and the powerful forces of nature he discovered through Shugendō.
Notes


2. These stories appeared in the Miyako and Kokumin newspapers. The novels are Aru hitori sō no shōgai by Sakamoto Masaru (Osaka, 1972) and Kinkoku Shōnin gyōjiki by Kamisaka Jirō (Tokyo, 1976).

3. There are many versions of the Ichidai-ki extant in Japan, but none seem to be by Kinkoku's own hand. However, it is generally believed that the copies by pupils and later followers were based on an original by Kinkoku himself. Most versions are in the form of seven emaki, with abbreviated, sketchlike illustrations accompanied by long passages of text. Kinkoku seems to have been directly inspired by other travel diaries of the Edo period, such as Shibata Ōkō's Satyū ryōdan, published in 1790, and Hirayama Ningen Shōsō's Man'yō monzo of 1789. Fujimori Seikichi translated the Kinkoku Shōnin gochidai-ki into modern Japanese and published it under the title Kinkoku Shōnin gyōjiki (Tokyo, 1965). It was annotated by the folklore specialist Suzuki Tozō, who provided information about the people and places Kinkoku mentioned in his text. I have obtained most of the biographical information in this article from Fujimori's book. For a more extensive study of Kinkoku's life and artistic career, see My Yoka Kinkoku: The Life and Painting of a Mountain Artist, Ph.D. diss., Kansas University, 1983.


5. Ibid., p. 9.

6. He first became a pupil of Jakumon Shōnin at Kogetsuan in Fushimi, and also traveled to Kyoto to study with Ryū Shōnin at the temple Komatsudani (now Shōrinji). Also in Kyoto, Kinkoku attended the lectures of the Jōdo priest Ryūzan Hōin (1793–1856) and of Daitōbo (1721–91), a highly respected monk of the Hosō sect.

7. Kinkoku took the name by which he is most well known from this location. The temple was once located south of Teranouchi and Senbon streets in Kamigyō-ku but no longer exists today.

8. Fujimori, Kinkoku Shōnin gyōjiki, p. 36.

9. Kinkoku gave the year 1784, but other records indicate that the fire occurred in 1788.

10. Honen is considered to be the founder of the Jōdo (Pure Land) sect in Japan.

11. There is some question whether Kinkoku actually visited Nagasaki since the section of the Ichidai-ki on Nagasaki seems to borrow heavily from Shibata Ōkō's Satyū ryōdan. Not only did Kinkoku adapt Ōkō's written descriptions, but he also included illustrations that closely resemble those by Ōkō.

12. In May 1982, I visited Daimonji and inquired whether these paintings were still in the temple's collection. The current abbot was not familiar with the present holdings but planned to employ a scholar to study and catalogue the contents of the storehouse. He promised to inform me if Kinkoku's paintings are uncovered.

13. Excellent reproductions of the Chion'in scrolls can be found in Honin Shōninuden (Zoku Nihon emaki taisei, v. 1–5) Tokyo, 1981.

14. Fujimori, Kinkoku Shōnin gyōjiki, p. 82.

15. Ibid., p. 84.

16. Keigo and Shirō were two of the "five great haiku poets of Owari." See Kitō Motorō and Itō Ryūzō, Owari hijin hō, Nagoya, 1950, p. 91. Keigo was a low-ranking samurai serving as magistrate in Kozuchi (Mino city). Shirō was a doctor of gynecology. He studied haiku with Hisamatsu Gyōdai (1732–92), who was a poet and friend of Buson. Shirō added inscriptions to a number of Kinkoku's paintings.

17. A combination of the word hā, which refers to haiku, and go, meaning picture, hāga is usually defined as a work in which painting and haiku poetry are fully integrated. In addition to painting actual haiga, Kinkoku utilized abbreviated, sketchlike brushwork in other works that do not include haiku poems, hence the term "haiga-style paintings."

18. The Ōmi kuritsu-gun shi, Gifu, 1926, p. 598, records that Kinkoku went to Kyoto at the age of thirteen and studied painting with Buson. This information has been reiterated in most Japanese biographies of Kinkoku. However, Kinkoku did not include this fact in his autobiographical writings, and judging from extant dated works, he did not seriously begin painting in the style of Buson until after the latter's death. Buson's later years are well documented by both his own letters and those of his pupils, but none refer to Kinkoku. Therefore, one must assume that Kinkoku did not study directly with the master but later painted works inspired by the style of Buson.


20. This signature and the existence of several paintings from the 1790–1800 decade signed Heian Kinkoku, indicate that Kinkoku attached a certain amount of prestige to the fact that he had lived in Kyoto. See his Monkey Trainer dated 1797 (Private collection, Japan), Yoro Waterfall dated 1800 (Yanagi Takashi Collection), and a winter landscape (Mizutani Ishinouke Collection).

21. Goshun was considered to be the most outstanding pupil of Buson, and at an early age he mastered both Buson's literary and hāga styles. After Buson's death, Goshun seems to have gravitated toward Mariyama Okyo (1733–95) for inspiration and around 1786 or 1787 began to change his style. When Okyo died, Goshun established his own studio on Shimō street in Kyoto and his new style came to be called by that name. Goshun attracted numerous followers and was at the height of his popularity in Kyoto in the 1790s and early 1800s.

23. Gesshō purportedly adopted the character *gesū* from one of Goshun's sobriquets, Gekkei, for his own art name; see *ibid.*, p. 113.

24. These paintings are in the collections of the Shiga Kerenitsu Biwako Bunkakan, Dr. Nakagami Ryōta, and a Japanese private collection. For illustrations, see my dissertation, "Yokoi Kinkoku. The Life and Painting of a Mountain Ascetic," *ibid.*, 38, 41, and 42.

25. An unusual feature of *Picking Persimmons* is the seal impression reading "Kinkok," spelled out in romanized letters rather than written with Chinese characters. The practice of carving romanized seals was rare in the Edo period. Kinkoku may have been shown how to write his name this way when he visited Nagasaki. This seal impression seems to be unique; I have not seen it appear on any other work, which suggests that it was a passing novelty for Kinkoku.

26. The manner of dividing mountains and rocks into parallel, faceted ridges was also a feature of *Tanke Gensen* paintings. The biography of Gesshō in Sato Aiko, *Nihon meigaka ten*, Tokyo, 1967, p. 83, records that he was a pupil of Gessen. Since Gessen was a priest at Jakushōji in Ise near Nagoya, he may have known and instructed Gesshō in the late eighteenth century. In general Gesshō's style has more affinities with Goshun, still the connection with Gessen needs to be explored further.

27. Sanbōin is a subtemple of Daigoji, head temple of the Daigo branch of the Shingon sect in Kyoto, and also serves as the headquarters of the Tōzan sect of Shugendō.

28. After serving as the abbot of Sanbōin, Koen became the abbot of Toji in 1831.

29. The word *yamabushi* means "to lie down in the mountains," referring to the solitary wandering and practice of early mountain ascetics. Later, as Shugendō became more organized, the word came to mean a practitioner or priest of this sect. It was originally written with the characters 岩仏, but now 岩仏 are commonly used.


33. Because their practices were performed in the deep mountains, *yamabushi* needed axes to open unexplored trails. The carrying of the axe gradually became formalized, and a ceremonial axe was used when a priest-prince made the pilgrimage to Ōmine.

34. The order of ranks in the Tōzan sect of Shugendō, beginning with the highest, is Daishōke, Daishaku, Daiōsendatsu, Shōsendatsu, Sendatsu, Shinsendatsu, and Shingaku.


36. Fujimori, *Kinkoku Shōnin gyōki*, p. 122. An unusual feature of the Ichidai-ki is the use of honorifics. Although speaking about himself, Kinkoku wrote in the third person using a form of keigo (polite language), which is ordinarily used as a form of respect when speaking about others.

37. Daiōsendatsu literally means "great master" or "great leader" and was usually awarded after nine periods of pilgrimages to Mount Ōmine. Höin was originally a high rank in the Buddhist priesthood but became a popular title for *yamabushi*.

38. This phrase was adopted from the doctrines of Shingon Buddhism. The first character represents the first letter of the sanscrit alphabet which signifies the fundamental origin of all beings. In order to attain enlightenment, one has to cut oneself off from worldly passions and desires. Here this is compared figuratively to the stroke of a sword.


40. There were a number of well-known Nanga artists active in Nagoya in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, including Yamada Kyūjō, Niwa Kagen (1742–86), Nakabayashi Chikuto (1776–1853), and Yamamoto Baitusui (1783–1856). There is no evidence that Kinkoku was closely associated with any of these artists; he was drawn to the Nanga tradition for the reasons discussed in this article.


42. Ibid., p. 125.

43. He resided for periods of time at the Shugendō temples Taichōin in Seto and later Taizanji in Mikawa.

44. This letter is now in the collection of Yokoi Keinouke.

45. Other *yamabushi* were known to have written out special calligraphy, which was then pasted on doors to protect the occupants and to drive away evil spirits. See Kaempfer, *The History of Japan*, v. 2, p. 49.

46. After his return to Shiga, Kinkoku seems to have established a hermitage called Jōrakuan at a place called "Tairi" near Sakamoto on Mount Hiei. These names figure predominantly in the painting inscriptions of his last years, which also occasionally include the place names Shigasanji or Sankadō. Neither of these nor
the Jorakukan have been identified as to their specific locations.

Glossary

| a. 中島棕間 | ag. 大音寺 |
| b. 橫井金谷 | ab. 赤之島 |
| c. 修騏道 | ai. 知恩院 |
| d. 金谷上人御一代記 | aj. 僧物 |
| e. 十返舍一九 | ak. 宗栄寺 |
| f. 談説毛 | al. 草津 |
| g. 華縁 | am. 大和絵 |
| h. 近江 | an. 絵巻 |
| i. 淨土 | ao. 熊谷寺 |
| j. 宗金寺 | ap. 原憲右衛門 |
| k. 円応 | aq. 浪人 |
| l. 増土寺 | ar. 忠臣蔵 |
| m. 芝 | as. 橋 |
| n. 品川 | at. 森 |
| o. 蓮光寺 | au. 福大郎 |
| p. 蓮沼 | av. 金森桂吾 |
| q. 上総 | aw. 井上士朗 |
| r. 下総 | ax. 俳画 |
| s. 東海道 | ay. 与謝術名村 |
| t. 織姫子 | az. 四条 |
| u. 香衣参内 | ba. 同春 |
| v. 極楽寺 | bb. 張月桜 |
| w. 淨瑠璃 | bc. 丸山 |
| x. 虚無僧 | bd. 市川君圭 |
| y. 道人 | be. 山田宮常 |
| z. 城山寄 | bf. 南画 |
| aa. 法然 | bg. 長崎 |
| ab. 円光大師絵詞 | bh. 名家書谱 |
| ac. 真光寺 | bi. 養老 |
| ad. 姫路 | bj. 尾張 |
| ae. 大蓮寺 | bk. 跡茶 |
| af. 赤穂 | bl. 真図 |
| bm. 三宝院 | cn. 加賀 |
| bn. 高演法親王 | co. 立山 |
| bo. 大峯 | cy. 越中 |
| bp. 山伏 | cz. 妙義山 |
| bq. 大宝院 | da. 高千穂 |
| br. 大越家 | db. 日向 |
| bs. 本山派 | dc. 大山 |
| bt. 当山派 | dd. 伯耆 |
| bu. 聖護院 | de. 天駒 |
| bv. 吉野 | df. 熊野三山 |
| bw. 金峯 | dg. 茶山 |
| bx. 熊野 | dh. 尺 |
| by. 葛城 | di. 錢 |
| bz. 紀伊 | dj. 棕渓軒集 |
| ca. 法印大先達 | dk. 司馬江漢 |
| cb. 法印金谷 | dl. 西遊旅譚 |
| cc. 大先達大法印 | dm. 平沢元豊 |
| cd. 余行者金谷印 | dn. 漫遊文草 |
| ce. 阿字一刃 | do. 寂門上人 |
| cf. 賜紫法印金谷 | dp. 光月庵 |
| cg. 金谷余行者 | dq. 伏見 |
| ch. 神 | dr. 竜上人 |
| ci. 謝賀 | ds. 小松谷 |
| cj. 醍醐 | dt. 正林寺 |
| ck. 富士 | du. 竜山法印 |
| cl. 横井常信左衛門 | dv. 大同房 |
| cm. 関東 | dw. 法相 |
| cn. 比叡 | dx. 上有知 |
| co. 愛宕 | dy. 久村曉台 |
| cp. 羽黒 | dz. 平安金谷 |
| cq. 出羽 | ea. 丸山応挙 |
| cr. 湯殿山 | eb. 月極 |
| cs. 月山 | ec. 丹家月捔 |
| ct. 駿河 | ed. 寂照寺 |
| cu. 伊豆箱根 | ef. 醍醐寺 |
| cv. 白山 | }
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>元</th>
<th>東寺</th>
<th>1y. 泰澄院</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b.</td>
<td>大宿</td>
<td>1r. 瀬戸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1i.</td>
<td>正光寺</td>
<td>1s. 太山寺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1j.</td>
<td>玄光寺</td>
<td>1t. 三河</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1k.</td>
<td>新光寺</td>
<td>1u. 橋井啓之助</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1l.</td>
<td>新客</td>
<td>1v. 淨楽庵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1m.</td>
<td>歌語</td>
<td>1w. 台嶺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1n.</td>
<td>丹羽益言</td>
<td>1x. 阪本</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1o.</td>
<td>中林竹洞</td>
<td>1y. 滋賀山寺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p.</td>
<td>山本梅逸</td>
<td>1z. 餐霞洞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE IMPACT OF SHUGENDŌ ON THE PAINTING OF YOKOI KINKOKU

Fig. 1. Detail from the Ichidai-ki. Ink and color on paper. Shiga Kenritsu Biwako Bunkakan.

Fig. 2. Detail from the Ichidai-ki. Ink and color on paper. Shiga Kenritsu Biwako Bunkakan.
Fig. 3. Enko Datski ehotok. By Yokoi Kinkoku. 1799. One scroll from a set of four, ink and color on paper, each 166 by 91 cm. Soeiji, Kusatsu.

Fig. 4. Woodcutter. By Yokoi Kinkoku. 1790. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 90.9 by 30.6 cm. Private collection.
Fig. 5. Riding in a Grove of Blossoming Peach Trees. By Yosa Buson. Ca. 1778–83. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 107 by 45.5 cm. Itsuo Art Museum.

Fig. 6. Monkey Trainer. By Yokoi Kinkoku. 1790. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 90.9 by 30.6 cm. Private collection.
Fig. 7. Woodblock illustration from the Meika goju. By Cho Gessho, 1814. Shobra Collection.
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Landscapes.

By Yokoi Kinkoku. 1797. Hanging scrolls, ink and color on paper. Private collection, Japan.

Fig. 8. Landscapes. By Yokoi Kinkoku. 1797. Hanging scrolls, ink and color on paper. Private collection, Japan.
Fig. 9. *Picking Persimmons*. By Yokoi Kinkoku. 1798. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 133 by 58.1 cm. Shiga Kenritsu Biwako Bunkakan.

Fig. 10. *Red Cliff*. By Cho Gessho. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 99.3 by 36.1 cm. Private collection.
Fig. 11. Red Cliff. By Goshun. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 48.9 by 87 cm. Spencer Museum of Art, 78.69. Gift of Floyd and Barbara Amsden.
Fig. 12. Spring Landscape. By Yokoi Kinkoku. 1799. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk. Yabumoto Sōgorō Collection.

Fig. 13. Farmhouse and Stream. By Goshun. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 102.5 by 41.3 cm. The Seattle Art Museum, 70.33. Gift of Mrs. Verner A. Cole in memory of David J. Lewis.
Fig. 14. *Rice Fields*. By Yokoi Kinkoku. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 127.9 by 56.1 cm. Spencer Museum of Art, 72.219. Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd T. Amsden.

Fig. 15. *Yorō Waterfall*. By Yokoi Kinkoku. 1800. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper. Yanagi Takashi Collection.
Fig. 16. The Kii Peninsula, showing the route of the Yoshino-Kumano Pilgrimage.

Fig. 17. Detail from the Ichidai-ki. Ink and color on paper. Shiga Kenritsu Biwako Bunkakan.
Fig. 18. *Landscape with Boat*. By Yokoi Kinkoku. 1805. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 43.8 by 27.2 cm. Dr. Jay Federman Collection.
Fig. 19. Bridge in a Bamboo Grove. By Yokoi Kinkoku. 1806. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper. Private collection, Japan.

Fig. 20. Thatched House in Spring Woods. By Yosa Buson. Ca. 1778–83. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 104.5 by 41.3 cm. Itsuo Art Museum.
Fig. 21. Sage Overlooking a Rocky Promontory. By Yokoi Kinkoku. 1809. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 175 by 93.4 cm. Mr. and Mrs. Myron S. Falk, Jr. Collection.
Fig. 22. *A Bird’s Path*. By Yokoi Kinkoku. *Ca*.
1825–30. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper,
130.4 by 52 cm. Yabumoto Sōgorō Collection.
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Fig. 24. Woodcut. By Yokoi Kinkoku. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper. Dr. Nakagami Ryota Collection.

Fig. 25. Detail of Figure 22.
Fig. 25. *Peasants at Work*. By Yokoi Kinkoku. Ca. 1825–30. Hanging scroll, ink and colors on paper. Private collection, Japan.
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Fig. 26. Autumn Landscape. By Yokoi Kinkoku. Ca. 1825-30. Hanging scroll, ink and colors on silk, 124.6 by 54.4 cm. John and Kimiko Powers Collection.
THE CHOWRIE-BEARING GODDESS ON THE AŚVAMEDHA TYPE OF SAMUDRAGUPTA'S COIN

By PRATAPADITYA PAL

The identification of the goddesses on the reverse of gold coins issued by the Gupta emperors of India between 320 and ca. 450 A.D. has been a matter of dispute among numismatists and iconographers for almost a century. While some of the figures are easily identified, the most enigmatic is the remarkably graceful figure on the reverse of the famous Aśvamedha type of gold coin issued by the imperial mint to commemorate the successful horse-sacrifice performed by the second of the emperors, Samudragupta (r. ca. 335–76). On the reverse of the obverse of the coin is the idealized representation of the sacrificial horse replacing the usual royal portrait (Fig. 1). This in itself is not an original idea but was borrowed by the Gupta mint-master from Satavahana coins. On the reverse, however, we are introduced to an elegant female standing before what is ostensibly a pillar and holding a chowrie with her right hand (Fig. 2). Because she holds a chowrie (chāmara), most scholars have presumed that her position is subservient and hence have been reluctant to identify her as a goddess.

Both Allan and Altekar identified this figure as the chief queen of Samudragupta. The queen did play an important role in the horse-sacrifice, but so did the king. If either was to be represented, it would have been more logical to portray the king on the obverse, in keeping with the prevailing convention, and the horse on the reverse to commemorate the occasion. The arguments proffered by Altekar to identify the female figure as the queen have been ably refuted by several scholars and need not be repeated here. Suffice it to say that in all Gupta coins, the figure on the reverse always represents a divinity and it would have been unusual to place a mortal portrait there instead. As a matter of fact, the horse itself would have been a more appropriate figure than the queen, since the horse is presumed to go to heaven by virtue of its role as the sacrificial victim.

The most plausible suggestion for the identification of this figure is that she represents the concept of Rājyalakshmi, the goddess of sovereignty, or Jayalakshmi, the goddess of victory. The first alternative was offered by Calembus Sivaramamurti, while the second, though not quite as explicitly, was made by Parmeshwari Lal Gupta and Sarojini Srivastava when they wrote: “She may be the personification of Vijāyā, who represents īkṭi (power) of all the Vedic gods. She is symbolized here by the Śakti (spear) placed before her.”

In a recent publication I had more or less accepted both these identifications when I wrote that the figure may represent Vijāyā, goddess of victory, corresponding to the Greek Nike; and that very likely she is none other than Śri-Lakshmī, who probably was the tutelary deity of the dynasty.

Even though the chowrie-bearing lady is not given a nimbus, that she is a goddess rather than the queen must be accepted for three reasons. Apart from the fact that all the other coin-types portray a divine figure on the reverse, the female here clearly stands on a lotus, which is the symbol of divinity rather than royalty. For instance, while the royal figures on the obverse are nimbate, none stands on a lotus. Only on some of the first Chandragupta’s coins (Fig. 3) may the queen stand on a lotus. The implication here is certainly her identification as kulalakṣmī (goddess of the family fortune of the Guptas) for by contracting this marriage with the Lichchhavi princess did Chandragupta I legitimize the dynasty’s claim over the throne. The only feature that may militate against her divine status is the fact that she holds a chowrie, and this will be explained presently. What is rather curious is that most scholars seem to have ignored the object held by her dangling left hand. Although this element has been noted by numismatists in their descriptions of the coin-type, few have discussed its significance. For instance, Gupta describes the feature as a pāśa (noose) or patta (piece of cloth) but does not cite it in his identification of the goddess as the personification of victory.

If indeed this is a noose, then it seems difficult not to identify her as a form of Śri-Lakshmī/Ardoksho, the most popular device on Gupta coins (Fig. 4). It should be pointed out here, however, that the object is not a noose but a simplified version of the beribboned diadem, garland, or wreath frequently held by deities on Kushan and earlier coins (Fig. 5). As has been discussed elsewhere, this is a clear adaptation of a Western device symbolizing the bestowal
of sovereignty or victory upon the monarch by a deity. Partly because the motif looks like a string in the hands of the Gupta goddess, and partly because of their enthusiasm to interpret the motif in an Indian context, most scholars have identified this as a noose. Having done so, however, they have been unable to explain it as an attribute of Śrī-Lakṣmī. How the misinterpretation occurred is best exemplified by the following comments about the goddess on a lotus on the second Chandragupta’s coin:

In the time of Chandragupta II, the Ardoksho motif was gradually transformed into the full-fledged form of Lakṣmī, the Goddess of wealth. Now the Goddess is seen seated on lotus and holding lotus in her left hand. But surprisingly enough, she retains the pāla (noose) in her right hand, which is not known as any attribute of this Goddess in the realm of iconography (italics ours).\(^5\)

In the context of Samudragupta’s coins, the same figure is identified as Ardoksho and the object in her right hand is described as a noose. However, no surprise is expressed even though the noose is not an appropriate attribute of Ardoksho, who is the Iranian counterpart of Śrī-Lakṣmī. As a matter of fact, both Ardoksho and Śiva hold a similar object with their proffered right hand, which makes sense only if the object is interpreted as a beribboned wreath rather than a noose. In other words, as is done in classical and Iranian iconography, the deities are clearly offering both victory and royal glory to the king represented on the obverse.\(^6\) This is also the true import of the attribute in the hand of the goddess in the Gupta coins, even though it looks more like a noose than a garland. If it is interpreted as a noose, is the goddess then offering it to the king to hang himself with?

That it is a wreath of victory is also clear from the ubiquitous emphasis placed by the Gupta monarchs on their prowess and conquests in the legends on the coins. Virtually every legend announces either the king’s valour in battle, his invincibility, his destruction of enemies, or his attaining heaven having conquered the earth. For instance, the legend on the obverse of the coin under discussion reads: “The king of kings, who had performed the horse-sacrifice, wins heaven after conquering (or protecting) the earth.” As a matter of fact, rarely does a legend on a Gupta coin emphasize any quality of the sovereigns other than their martial achievements. Clearly they regarded victory in war as their prime regal duty (dhārṇa), which in turn would gain them a place in heaven. Significantly, only in his lyricist type of coin, whereby Samudragupta intended to project himself as a man of refined tastes, is the claim of the great conqueror eschewed for only the regal titles preceding his name.

Thus, there seems no cogent reason not to identify the chowrie-bearing goddess as Lakṣmī (rather than Ardoksho), though as the presiding deity of sovereignty rather than wealth. At the same time, since the legend on the obverse describes Samudragupta as either the conqueror or protector of the earth, the figure may also represent Prithivi, the Earth goddess. After all, by definition the king is the protector as well as the husband of the earth (mahipati or kshitipati). In that case there would be nothing unusual in her subservient role as the chowrie-bearer of the mighty sovereign. The staff or spear in front of her may well symbolize the ruler himself, who does hold a pennoned or filleted standard with his left hand on the standard type of coin (Fig. 6).

In this regard it should be noted that there is some ambiguity about this motif on Gupta coins. Apart from the king holding a staff or standard (a continuation of the Kushan royal image), the object is frequently placed beside or behind the goddess. In the case of the lyricist type, the standard is identical to that before the chowrie-bearing goddess (Fig. 7), except that both the top and the bottom are rounded off as knobs. In the Aśvamedha type the bottom is a knob, but the top seems to be oval, like the point or blade of a spear. Otherwise, the staff or standard looks like a sistrum held by classical deities. In any case, Gupta and Srivastava are probably correct in identifying this festooned standard, or spear in the case of the Aśvamedha coin, as the rājadaya or standard of sovereignty.\(^7\) It should be mentioned in this connection that it was customary among the Mughals and the Rajput orders to present a spear tip to victorious generals as a token of their appreciation. Moreover, venerating weapons, including the sword and the spear, is part of royal rituals on the last day of the autumnal worship of the goddess Durga.

The iconographic element of the goddess that has thrown all scholars off is the chowrie. While some have regarded this as an attribute of the queen, others have chosen to ignore it. Along with the parasol, the chowrie was the most visible symbol of royal authority in ancient India. Both attributes were transferred to the gods as well as the spiritual kings such as the Buddha and the Jinas who are often fanned by divine figures with
the chowrie while shaded by a parasol. Thus, the chowrie is not an inappropiate attribute of a divine being. Significantly, in the Hindu art of Java, both Siva and the goddess frequently hold the chowrie as an attribute (Fig. 9),

which must have been adopted from some unknown Indian iconographic tradition.

In the case of the Gupta coin, one would expect the goddess of royal fortune or Rājyalakshmi to attend upon her sovereign lord with a chowrie. After all, by declaring himself as the protector of the earth, Samudragupta was clearly implying that he was like the mighty Boar avatar. That the Gupta emperors did liken themselves to Vishnu is well known and need not be repeated here. But more specifically, in the literature of the period the monarch is constantly described as the possessor of rājyalakshmi or royal fortune. To cite only one instance from the fifth-century poet Kālidāsa’s RāgHAVAKHōSA, Lakshmi as Padmā is said to attend upon Raghu, who was initiated into universal sovereignty, by holding a lotus umbrella over him.⁹

Even more pertinent is the appearance of Lakshmi before Pushpabhūti, the founder of the royal family of Sthāneśvar, as described by another celebrated Sanskrit poet, BānaBhāṭṭa, who lived in the first half of the seventh century and was the court poet of HarshavarDhan (606–47). While on a nocturnal visit to the shrine of the Goddess Chandikā, Pushpabhūti was challenged by a nāga called Āṭṭahāṣa. As Pushpabhūti was about to decapitate Āṭṭahāṣa, he noticed the serpent was a brahman and so spared his life. Immediately “in the center of the sword resting in his hand, like a lightning flash in the womb of a black cloud, he beheld a woman whose radiance seemed to swallow up the night.”

“Who are thou, lady?” cried the king unappalled, “and wherefore has thou come within my sight?” “Hero,” she said, almost overpowering him with an unabashededness at variance with her sex, “know me to be that deer whose pleasure haunt is Nārāyaṇa’s breast, the banner-pennon of Prīthu, Bharata, Bhagiratha and the other kings of old, [127] the gay doll upon the victory columns of heroes’ arms, the flamingo wontoning with yearning to sport upon the waves of battle’s bloodshed stream, the peacock of the thicket of kings’ white umbrellas, even Śrī, the lioness whose caprice is to roam in the forest of sharp scimitar edges, the lotus bed of the pools of sword-edge water. I am ravished by this my valorous spirit . . . .”¹⁰

She then offered the king a boon and prophesized that a great line of kings would be born unto Pushpabhūti. Before disappearing her parting words were: “Wherein shall arise an emperor named Hārṣa, governor like Hariścandra of all the continents, world-conquering like a second Māndhātri, whose chowrie this hand, spontaneously abandoning the lotus, shall grasp” (italics ours).¹¹

Thus clearly the goddess of sovereignty here announces that for mighty heroes she is proud to be the chowrie-bearer. The chowrie-bearer on the Asvamedha type of coin, therefore, must represent the Rājyalakshmi of Samudragupta, who had deserved this honor upon the performance of the horse-sacrifice, the ultimate test and symbol of valor among ancient Indian kings. The spear-like staff or standard before her signifies the kings’ “banner-pennon,” its sharp edge representing Rājyalakshmi herself (atitīṣṭastraḥdārāvannahraṇavābhrāmaśvinīhin).

As a matter of fact, shorn of Bāna’s ornate style, the self-portrait of Lakshmi is virtually a description of various forms of Rājyalakshmi on Gupta coins. The characterization of the goddess as “the peacock of the thicket of kings’ white umbrellas” explains the presence of a peacock on the reverse of some coin-types of Kumaragupta I (r. ca. 414–55). In some coins a goddess, and in others the monarch himself, is seen feeding a peacock (Fig. 8).¹² While the bird is generally associated with the god Kārttikeya, in these coins very likely it symbolizes the goddess of sovereignty. That Kārttikeya’s peacock should so symbolize Rājyalakshmi is not inappropriate, for as the god of war, he does bestow victory upon the ruler.

In view of the chowrie-bearing goddess being identified as Rājyalakshmi of the Gupta dynasty, should we still regard the magnificent Didarganj female as a yākṣī? Could she in fact have been installed as the Rājyalakshmi of the Magadhan royal family? But which family is the million-dollar question. An attempt to solve this enigma must be postponed for another occasion.
Notes


11. Ibid., p. 97.

Fig. 1. Asvamedha gold coin of Samudragupta (r. ca. 335-76), obverse showing sacrificial horse. Diameter 1.9 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Purchased with funds provided by Dr. and Mrs. A. J. Montanari.
Fig. 2. Reverse of Figure 1 showing chowrie-bearing goddess.
Fig. 3. Kumāradevi and Chandragupta I (ca. 320) gold coin, obverse. Diameter 1.9 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Gift of Anna Bing Arnold and Justin Dart.

Fig. 4. Goddess Lakshmi, reverse of Chandragupta II's (ca. 376-414) gold coin. Diameter 1.9 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Gift of Anna Bing Arnold and Justin Dart.

Fig. 5. Nike offering beribboned diadem on the reverse of a silver coin of Maues (ca. 75-57 B.C.). Diameter 2.9 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Gift of Anna Bing Arnold and Justin Dart.
Fig. 6. Samudragupta with pennoned standard. Gold coin. Diameter 1.9 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Gift of Anna Bing Arnold and Justin Dart.

Fig. 7. Goddess on reverse of Samudragupta’s lyrist type of gold coin. Diameter 2.2 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Gift of Anna Bing Arnold and Justin Dart.

Fig. 8. Reverse of Kumāragupta I’s (r. ca. 414–55) gold coin showing goddess and peacock. Diameter 1.9 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Gift of Anna Bing Arnold and Justin Dart.
Fig. 9. A deified queen. Eastern Java, fourteenth century. Volcanic stone, 76.8 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Gift of Mr. Jerry Heymann.

The Oriental carpet collection in the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin is one of the richest outside the Middle East. The collection began to be assembled in 1868 when Julius Lessing bought a kilim from the Balkans for the German Trade Museum (Deutsche Gewerkbemuseum). The museum became the Applied Arts Museum (Kunstgewerbemuseum) in 1879, and its carpet collection continued to grow steadily. On the eve of World War II, the carpet collection, divided between the newly founded Islamic Department of the Pergamon Museum and the Kunstgewerbemuseum, ranked as one of the most important in the world. The collection suffered serious losses during the war. Twenty of the most valuable of the carpets were destroyed when the Royal Mint, where they had been moved for safekeeping, was bombed. A second group of 17 carpets, which were moved out of Berlin, has never reappeared. Although it has been impossible to replace the lost carpets, the Berlin collection has nonetheless expanded considerably in the four decades since the Second World War.

The collection, now housed all together in the Museum of Islamic Art, which opened in 1971, currently stands at 208 pieces, all of which are illustrated in Friedrich Spuhler's new catalogue.

Spuhler's book, which was published simultaneously in Berlin, continues a long tradition of outstanding scholarship emanating from Berlin in the field of carpet studies. The work of Wilhem van Bode, Friedrich Sarre, Ernst Kühnel, Kurt Erdmann, and, of course Spuhler himself is familiar to anyone who has studied carpets. Van Bode's Vorderasiatische Knüpfteppiche, revised by Kühnel for a second edition in 1914 (with subsequent editions published through 1955), and Erdmann's Der orientalische Knüpfteppiche, Versuch einer Darstellung seiner Geschichte, published originally in 1955 (translated by Charles Ellis in 1960 as Oriental Carpets, an Account of Their History), are still standard reference works today. Berlin carpet scholarship has been characterized by an interest in relating carpet designs to representations in painting as a means of dating, by the early use of traveller's accounts as a source of information about carpet production, as well as by the examination of the structural principles of carpet designs.

Oriental Carpets in the Museum of Islamic Art, Berlin is an important reference work for carpet studies generally, apart from its value as a complete catalogue of the Berlin collection. After an introduction that details the history of the collection and the scholarship that has evolved around it and a short essay on the beginnings of the knobbed carpet tradition, the book (and the collection) is divided into sections, according to geographic region. There are nine sections (Turkey, Egypt, Persia, the Caucasus, and so on), each of which begins with a summary of the state of the field, with extensive bibliography, before going on to the catalogue entries themselves. Following these nine sections is an appendix in which small fragments, and later pieces, some in poor condition, are discussed. Each entry includes a brief acquisition history, the structure and condition of the piece, and a listing of its appearances in exhibitions and literature, as well as a detailed descriptive analysis. Spuhler refers often to similar pieces in other collections, always including a published source of illustration; the Berlin carpets are therefore securely located in a larger corpus, and their relative significance is clear. The illustrations, eighty-two of which are in color, are at the back of the book, which leads to a certain amount of flipping pages back and forth.

In the course of the introductory sections, Spuhler often sets out new assessments of pieces that have long puzzled carpet scholars. In his discussion of a group of atypical early Turkish village rugs, he suggests that “irregularities in drawing or intentionally simplified variants are too readily misinterpreted as late versions” (p. 26), pointing out that such an interpretation leaves no room in a classification system for the atypical pieces whose creators were not emulating ideal types. While this is not a revolutionary idea in art-historical scholarship generally, it is a welcome suggestion in the more conservative world of carpet studies. On the other hand, Spuhler does not attempt to solve every mystery. In a number of cases he presents a puzzling piece, discusses the theories that have been put forth concerning its date or provenance, and points out the problems with those theories, offering only a tentative theory in replacement. Such is the case with several of the carpets in the group entitled “Turkey-Egypt,” a confusing group with design and structural characteristics of both Turkish and Egyptian manufacture that have led to great deal of uncertainty as to their place of production.

The Berlin collection is particularly rich in Turkish and Persian knotted carpets, and the introductory essays to those sections are especially useful. In each case, Spuhler has provided a detailed analysis of the carpet tradition and the various types that comprise it. For the sake of completeness his analysis includes categories not represented in the Berlin collection, for instance, Safavid pictorial medallion carpets. In the course of his discussion of these carpets, he refers to a number of rare and fascinating examples of Safavid rugs. Particularly interesting are his speculations concerning little published silk Safavid kilims, a small number of which exist in various collections, and which Spuhler suggests were used as the canopies seen in outdoor scenes in Persian miniatures.

Although the first piece purchased for the Berlin collections was a flatweave, the focus of the collection has definitely been on knotted carpets. This is no doubt a reflection of scholarly interest during the period in which most of the collection was assembled. As a consequence, the collecting of flatweaves in Berlin (and in many other major museums, according to Spuhler) has been haphazard and the collection is spotty. Most of the flatweaves are grouped together in the section, “Kilims and Related Flatweaves.” The introductory essay in this section is a useful account of the growth of interest, on the part of both collectors and scholars, in flatweaves. The significant exhibitions and publications that have accompanied this new interest are mentioned, and Spuhler points out the difficulties involved in dating and classifying this group of textiles. Spuhler’s own interests lie much more with the older, knotted carpets presented earlier. This becomes very clear in the appendix, where he gives extremely brief descriptions of fragments, flatweaves, and later carpets, pieces he clearly regards as being of low quality and little interest.

There is no map, an unfortunate oversight, and the book is expensive at seventy dollars. But it is extensively illustrated
with good quality plates, many of which are in color, and with the wealth of information it contains, the book will be a useful reference for both the specialist and non-specialist alike.

Woven from the Soul, Spun from the Heart. Textile Arts of Safavid and Qajar Iran, 16th–19th Centuries. Edited by Carol Bier. 356 pp., glossary, bibliography, many illustrations. New York: The Textile Museum, 1987. $59.50 softbound; $60.00 hardbound.

Woven from the Soul, Spun from the Heart, the catalogue from the spectacular exhibit of Safavid and Qajar textiles organized by Carol Bier at The Textile Museum, is the first major publication in decades on the subject of Iranian textiles and so would be worthy of attention for that reason alone. However, this book, which includes a series of essays by various specialists as well as a catalogue of pieces in the exhibition, will be of great value long after the exhibition, which opened in Washington in the autumn of 1987 and then travelled to Santa Barbara and Detroit, closing finally in August 1988, is over.

Carol Bier, curator of Eastern Hemisphere collections at The Textile Museum, spent four years working on the exhibition and accompanying book. With funding from a variety of sources, including the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Foundation for Iranian Studies, she brought together a group of consultants to discuss recent work in all the areas of Iranian studies relevant to textiles and to develop the multidisciplinary approach to the study of textiles that characterizes this project. Essays by eight of the consultants and Bier, scholars from a range of disciplines, make up the first part of the book. The catalogue itself was also the product of collaboration among a number of textile specialists.

As a result of the range of disciplines represented by the authors, this book will be of great interest to anthropologists, political and economic historians, and art historians interested in the Islamic world, as well as to textile specialists. With only one exception, the essays are extensively documented, providing an up-to-date bibliography on virtually all aspects of Safavid and Qajar Iran. This extremely thorough documentation, which extends into the catalogue and bibliography, is one of the most outstanding aspects of the book, ensuring its scholarly value quite apart from its specific contents.

The book begins with an introductory essay by Bier, a useful summary of the state of the field of Safavid and Qajar textile studies as well as a discussion of the difficulties involved in the study of these textiles and the areas in which further research is necessary. The next three essays, though not directly concerned with the carpets and textiles of the exhibition, provide a cultural, political, and economic context for the use and production of textiles in Persian society. In “Image and Metaphor: Textiles in Persian Poetry,” Jerome W. Clinton, professor of Persian language and literature at Princeton University, discusses the use of metaphor by Persian poets to describe themselves and their work. The poets often likened their writing to various crafts, particularly weaving, as in this passage from a gashad of the eleventh-century poet Faruki: “I left Sistan with merchants of fine robes. The robe I bore was spun within my heart and woven in my soul” (p. 8). Clinton’s short essay gives a sense of the esteemed place of textiles in Persian society of the classical age. Turning to the political and economic significance of textiles, Linda Steinmann uses contemporary European and Persian accounts to discuss the cultivation and production of silk in Iran during the reign of Shah Abbas I and the political and economic consequences of Abbas’s attempts to create a government monopoly in silk production and trade. Willem Floor, of the World Bank, is the author of the fourth essay, “Economy and Society: Fibers, Fabrics, Factories.” His work, based on a large number of contemporary travel accounts and on commercial and diplomatic reports, is a tantalizingly brief account of the variety of textiles produced and their economic significance throughout the Safavid, Afshar, Zand, and Qajar periods. His account of the Persian response to European textile imports in the Qajar period is particularly interesting, as is the list of different types of silk, cotton, and wool textiles produced in Iran during the Qajar period. Since understanding the descriptive terminology of historic textiles used by contemporary authors is always a problem in textile studies, Floor’s list of Qajar textiles would have been more useful to other specialists if he had explained both the sources and his interpretation of them more completely.

Textiles as costume is the subject of “Vesture and Dress: Fashion, Function and Impact” by Jennifer M. Scarce, curator of Eastern cultures at the Royal Scottish Museum in Edinburgh. This essay is of particular importance since the entire subject of Persian costume has, to date, been considered in only a handful of articles. Scarce has attempted to provide a survey of four hundred years of costume history in a scant twenty-three pages; her work is of great interest, but frustrating due to her lack of documentation. She writes that her reconstruction of Safavid costume, for instance, is based on “manuscript illustrations and a limited number of surviving textiles” (p. 34); at this point information about the specific manuscripts used and the collections in which these few textiles are housed would have been welcome. The only illustrations provided to show Safavid costume are two tiny black-and-white photographs from the early Safavid Khasnezh of Nizami in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. The illustrations depicting seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and nineteenth-century dress are larger and easier to see, though still few in number. Since there are several costume pieces included in the exhibition catalogue, at least part of the documentation problem could have been solved by referring specifically to these pieces in the essay. Related to a lack of specific documentation is a lack of clarity concerning the population elements whose costume is under consideration. A brief survey such as this cannot possibly describe everyone’s dress; one assumes that it is the urban Persian, not tribespeople, village dwellers, or religious minorities, whose costume is analyzed in this essay, but it would have been reassuring to know definitely. Despite these problems, Scarce’s essay provides a useful and much-needed overview of Persian costume.

The specific consideration of the textiles included in the exhibition catalogue begins with Milton Sonday’s essay, “Pattern and Weaves: Safavid Lamps and Velvet.” Sonday, curator of textiles at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum in New York, undertook a technical analysis of the structure of two groups of textiles. The details of his analysis will be of interest to textile specialists, and his work is of general interest because it proposes the tentative formulation of Safavid textile design principles, perhaps leading to a better understanding of general design tendencies.

A later group of silk textiles is treated in “Visual and Written Sources: Dating Eighteenth Century Silks,” by Layla S. Diba, former director of the Negarestan Museum in Tehran. Bringing together material from a variety of sources, particularly contemporary illustrated European travel
accounts and Persian histories, Diba’s essay is an exciting re-evaluation of a period in Persian art history, the eighteenth century, that is just beginning to get the attention it deserves. Her careful, critical use of difficult sources and extensive documentation make a convincing argument for the parallels she draws between a group of figural design silk textiles and contemporary visual sources, leading to a new dating of this group of textiles. Diba, following an examination of a wider range of contemporary Persian sources, further suggests a reconsideration of the traditional view, held by many economic historians, of the sharp decline in the Persian economy in the eighteenth century.

The next two essays direct the reader’s attention to the carpets that form a significant component of both Persian textile history and this exhibition. “Court and Commerce: Carpets of Safavid Iran” by Carol Bier, examines the systems of pattern repeat in a group of “star medallion” carpets, in an effort to distinguish the relative degrees of commercialized production that existed among the carpets. Bier posits a relatively straightforward relationship between design sophistication as indicated by the unit of pattern repeat and its manipulation and levels of commercial carpet production, hoping to use this relationship as means of understanding carpet design processes and patronage and production systems. Leonard M. Helfgott, an historian from Western Washington University, in his essay, “Production and Trade: The Persian Carpet Industry,” provides a very useful overview of the history of the production of knotted carpets in Iran. After a brief discussion of the origins of the knotted carpet, he divides its history in Iran into five stages, based on the economic position and social organization of carpet production. His particular focus is on the response of the carpet producers to the fluctuating relationship between the Persian and European economies.

The final essay, by Mary Martin, an anthropologist at the Middle East Center, University of Pennsylvania, gives a different view of Persian textiles. In “City and Country: Rural Textile Production in Northeastern Iran,” Martin discusses a range of textile goods: rugs, clothing, household furnishings, and various other objects that were woven, sewn, embroidered, and knitted. She is particularly interested in exploring the social and cultural dimensions of the production of these goods as well as the ways in which textile production reflects the impact of social and economic change on a settled rural population. Her work provides a rare study of rural textile production (as opposed to nomadic tribal production) and is thus especially valuable.

The catalogue, which makes up the second half of the book, is divided into seven sections, which are roughly related in subject matter to the essays and reflect the organization of the exhibition as it was installed. The organizing principles behind the division of the 102 objects of the exhibition into those sections are not clear, and an explanation would have been helpful. Each section begins with a brief essay, written in most cases by Carol Bier, and a short bibliography. Most of the catalogue entries were written by Mary Anderson McWilliams, a doctoral candidate at the Institute of Fine Arts and an intern at The Textile Museum, with the balance done by Carol Bier and John Wertime. McWilliams (with Bier and Wertime) has done an outstanding job of providing detailed technical information for each piece, listing other known fragments of the same textile, and citing previous bibliography. All the objects are illustrated, with 28 of the 102 shown in color. The rigorous standards of documentation evident throughout the catalogue and essays, as well as the interdisciplinary approach to the study of Persian textiles demonstrated by both the exhibition and this publication, ensure that Woven from the Soul, Span from the Heart will be an oft-consulted addition to many bookshelves.

Nancy Micklewright


As the only survey of Islamic art and architecture presently available, The Art and Architecture of Islam: 650–1250 will undoubtedly have a wide circulation among scholars of Islam as well as among those interested in the history of art in general. The organization of the book is conventional and follows a chronological order. The development of art is discussed within the framework of major political events, and within a given period monuments and objects are examined according to regional divisions. Oleg Grabar has focused on the architecture, while Ettinghausen has focused on the “decorative arts.” Because of the diversified nature of the historical and political developments in the different periods and regions and the fact that artistic products consequently varied in quality and quantity, the monuments are not treated equally. The art of Iran, for example, is analyzed in greater detail than is the art of Egypt and North Africa. The discussion of the art is largely descriptive; theoretical and esthetic examinations of both architecture and objects have been kept to a minimum.

The Art and Architecture of Islam is an incomparable source of information on the first four hundred years of Islamic art and architecture and remarkably thought-provoking at times. The volume, though, is not an eminently readable one. There are stylistic differences between the authors both in the treatment of the subject and in the use of language that should have been subjected to more rigorous editing, and the volume could have used a lighter tone, though not necessarily a less erudite one, and better reproductions. This should nonetheless be an indispensable reference book for both scholar and student, and one hopes that further volumes on the art and architecture of later Islamic periods will soon follow.

Ülku Bates


The unstinting generosity of the collector is everywhere evident in this lavishly produced volume that catalogues 104 Shang bronzes, all vessels except for one hanging bell, in the Sackler Collections. These bronzes are presently divided among the Sackler Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution
(57 objects), the Sackler Collections, New York (40 objects),
the Art Museum, Princeton University (5 objects), and the Metropolitan Museum of Art (2 objects). Seventeen different
vessel-types are represented in this collection, with four types (gai, jue, gui, and zun) comprising almost one-half of the total
number. While the majority of these bronzes cannot be said
to be of outstandingly high quality or unique art-historical
interest, they are here studied and analyzed with the utmost
care and devoted attention.

Each entry consists of a large color photograph of the
object, viewed rather conventionally against a white or pale
grey background, rubbings of its decor and inscription (if
any), and a meticulously detailed description, including a
translation of the inscription and an explanation of the
observable aspects of its casting technique. There then
follows a frequently very extensive discussion concerning the
relationship of the vessel to pertinent excavated objects or to
bronzes in other collections or publications. These related
bronzes are themselves abundantly illustrated, adding well
over three hundred more photographs to the volume, and
are also discussed in considerable detail, thus vastly expanding
the text. Objects that happen to share the same inscription
found on the Sackler bronze have been assiduously tracked
down, described, documented, and frequently reproduced,
along with rubbings of their inscriptions and decor, with the
result that the discussion may explore material bearing only a
rather distant or tangential relationship to the bronze being
catalogued. It is, for instance, not altogether clear what
scholarly purpose is served by assembling all known objects
having the same clan-sign as a Sackler bronze, since only in a
few cases can it be suggested that the similarly inscribed
objects may actually be related to the Sackler example by
virtue of having been commissioned by the same person or
unearthed from the same burial. In any event, no matter
how diligently other occurrences of a clan-sign inscription are
documented, the total number can never constitute anything
but an unknown percentage of all the objects that may
once have been so inscribed. Nevertheless, this wealth of
comparative photographs is by no means unwelcome, since
the objects adduced frequently exceed in interest and quality
the Sackler bronze itself—which, depending upon one’s point
of view, is either diminished and overshadowed by being
juxtaposed to masterpieces of its type or elevated in stature
by the distinguished relatives it thus can claim.

The typological arrangement of the catalogue does not
follow the traditional Chinese sequence but allows for a
rather more natural, partially chronological ordering of the
various types. A significant innovation, however, involves
the application of the name *yu* to the familiar handleless *gui*
(of which there are six in the collection and many more among
the comparative photographs), although this is not
current Chinese practice nor is it supported by persuasive
epigraphic evidence. Since the small number of self-named
*yu* vessels constitute a well-recognized type (a wide-mouthed
bowl with upwardly bent handles), the two exceptions—a pair
of Western Zhou handleless bowls in the Sackler Collections
and the Metropolitan Museum—are insufficient to justify the
application of this name to *all* handleless bowls (p. 500),
especially since this pair of vessels was cast in the state of
Yan where the name was also used for the usual type with
bent handles. It is clear that during the Western Zhou,
and presumably during the Shang period as well, the term
*gui* so predominated that even the bent-handled *yu* could
occasionally be self-named *gui*, as the author notes; and
a recently unearthed Western Zhou *yu* calls itself a *ygui*
in its inscription (*Zhongyuan wenwu*, 1982, no. 4, p. 64).
Consequently, the probability that handleless *gui* were called
*yu* during the Shang and Western Zhou seems particularly
remote; and one hopes that this unwarranted complication in
comenclature will not be adopted elsewhere on the authority
of this catalogue.

The vessels in the collection are broadly dated by century,
beginning with the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries B.C.
for the earliest pre-Anyang objects, and then thirteenth through
eleven centuries for the almost three-century span (ca. 1300–
a. 1050 B.C.) allotted to the Anyang period. Throughout
the catalogue, reference is repeatedly made to the "Fu Hao"
(more accurately "Fu Zi") burial, the unlooted grave excavated
at Anyang in 1976 and here viewed as that of a consort of
the Shang king Wu Ding and dated accordingly to the end of
the thirteenth century B.C. However, the dating methodology
and the concept of stylistic development on which it is based
are complex, and readers must search the individual entries in
order to ascertain why an object has been assigned a particular
date—which even then may occasionally remain mystifying.

Since the range of types and styles within the collection's
bronzes is insufficient to provide the basis for a complete his-
tory of Shang bronze art, a lengthy introduction is provided
(illustrated by an archival array of more than two hundred addi-
tional photographs) in which the author describes in painstaking
detail his view of that history. Though by no means free
of problems—particularly those complications engendered by
the early date of the Fu Zi burial—the discussion here proceeds
on strictly art-historical terms, happily unencumbered by the
frequently absurd symbolic or anthropological interpretations
of Shang bronze motifs that have recently become so popular
in certain circles. The treatment accorded the development of
the *taotie* animal mask is excellent, and it is only unfortunate
that some of the author's most valuable remarks are embedded
in a long footnote (n. 47, pp. 49-50) where they are in danger
of being overlooked by those most in need of their message.

The introduction also includes a section on the origins
of Chinese metalworking in which the author again promotes
the theory that bronze-casting in China was preceded by a
period in which metal vessels were fashioned using smithing
techniques—a theory based not on the actual survival of such
vessels but on what are deemed to be imitations of them in
pottery and in the earliest cast bronze *jue*, *ho*, and *bei*.
Inasmuch as this controversial theory has been extensively discussed and
4-50), it is disappointing that the author nowhere mentions
this article nor attempts to address any of Dr. Barnard's
objections, thus unfairly presenting the non-specialist reader
with only one side of this issue. In such an extensively
researched and thoroughly documented volume, this omission
can only have been deliberate. However, that portion of
the introduction that deals with later Shang foundry methods,
such as mold preparation, mold assembly and cores, joining
techniques, and so on, with a postscript on the beginnings
of lost-wax casting in China during the sixth century B.C.,
is concise, thoughtful, and well researched. Two appendices
supply data on the alloy composition and lead isotope ratios
of the bronzes, although no particular use is made of this information
in the catalogue.

This massive volume, which so richly celebrates a period in
Chinese art of which Dr. Sackler was so understandably fond,
without doubt constitutes a suitable memorial to his lifetime
of dedicated collecting.

Virginia C. Kane
It is difficult to find a good book dealing with any of the various Japanese decorative arts. Painting, calligraphy, and poetry in their exalted position as the three traditional arts of East Asia have amassed a large corpus of secondary source material. Large-scale traditional sculpture, usually of religious significance in Asian art, has also been fairly well documented and subjected to scholarly scrutiny, and many examples have been published and illustrated. The study of any graphic or plastic art form should begin with the primary sources, the objects themselves, when they are extant. But when approaching the so-called decorative arts of any culture, the objects being studied may be the only reliable source material available. A new publication dealing with any of the decorative arts—ceramics, lacquer ware, metalwork, or in this case, netsuke—is therefore welcome. The current general state of research into netsuke sorely requires improvement. This book by Victor Harris of the British Museum’s Department of Oriental Antiquities illustrates more than 600 netsuke and related items in the British Museum from the large private collection formed by the late Anne Hull Grundy, one of the more eccentric personalities in the world of netsuke collecting. Most of the pieces have not been published previously, and the quality of much of the collection is high enough that access to the photographs in and of itself will be a contribution to the development of netsuke studies.

A netsuke is a small toggle, usually carved from wood or ivory. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, netsuke were made in prodigious quantities and served the practical function of securing small personal possessions from the waist sashes (obi) of the traditional garments worn by men. The standard toggelike netsuke was perforated, usually with two holes and a carved channel between them, so that it could be attached to the ends of the doubled silk cord that passed between the garment and the close-fitting sash. The objects being carried hung freely from the cords at the lower edge of the sash; the netsuke rested at the top edge of the sash and prevented the cords and suspended objects from slipping downwards. Objects thus secured included kichaku (coin purses), tobacco pouches, inro (lacquer ware containers with snugly fitted tiered compartments used for carrying powdered medicines), and gourds used as canteens for water or sake. Inro and the attached netsuke themselves were among the few forms of personal adornment used by Japanese men. According to popular literature of the mid-eighteenth century, the suspended inro were sometimes worn empty, as ornamental accessories. Practical considerations undoubtedly continued to create the primary demand for netsuke, the fashionably acceptable means of suspending the inro and other types of functional containers needed to hold the small items a man might want to carry about.

Pictorial evidence also exists showing how netsuke were used; in woodblock prints and folding screens or other paintings of the Edo period (1603–1868), men may be seen wearing inro and pouches resting on their right hips, the netsuke positioned above at the upper edge of the obi. Netsuke seem to have been worn universally by Japanese men in the Edo period and on into the Meiji period (1868–1912), at least until Western-style clothing became the predominant fashion. Sometimes netsuke of male figures are themselves carved with netsuke and suspended containers attached to their waist sashes, regardless of the social class depicted in the carved figure.

Netsuke are worn today as part of kabuki costuming or perhaps by the occasional sumo wrestler in his traditional street clothes. Netsuke are, however, avidly collected, mostly outside Japan; and a few living carvers continue to produce intricately fashioned works that still retain the now usually unnecessary cord apertures.

In addition to the popular literature mentioned above, there is another Edo-period book that relates to netsuke. The Sōken kishō published in 1781 at Osaka deals largely with the artistic appreciation of sword fittings, but its seventh section lists the names of fifty-four netsuke carvers. This documentary source is significant primarily because it demonstrates that eighteenth-century netsuke carvers did not feel compelled to sign their work: only about one-third of the names listed have been discovered as signatures on extant netsuke. This section of the Sōken kishō also illustrates, with woodblock-printed line drawings, some of the types of netsuke being produced before the 1780s. Pages from the Sōken kishō and from several other books in the British Museum’s collection of Japanese printed books are used in Harris’s book as supplemental illustrations.

Six netsuke designs from the Sōken kishō are shown on page fourteen (fig. 5), and five comparable pieces in the Hull Grundy Collection (all dated to the nineteenth rather than the eighteenth century, however) are referred to on page thirteen. The three views of a netsuke depicting Ryūjin, the Dragon King (fig. 9, where it is oddly identified as the dragon immortal), is one of the most interesting of the Sōken kishō illustrations, though not an entirely appropriate one since the text does not refer to it and the Hull Grundy Collection does not have a netsuke of the subject.

Other more suitable supplemental figures include an inro (fig. 2) with two of its small tiered compartments opened—the lid and upper two compartments slid upwards on the doubled cord that both joins the sections of the inro and suspends it from the netsuke; readers who have not handled inro will find this illustration very illuminating. Two other netsuke (fig. 3) demonstrate variant styles of cord apertures. Harris explains that the knot tied at the end of the doubled cord could be pulled inside the larger of the two holes seen in the example on the right. This was for both aesthetic and practical reasons: it was less noticeable and less likely to be a hindrance—the ideal functional netsuke required a fairly compact form with few protuberances. This type of aperture, with holes of unequal size, usually predates the type with holes of more equal size, shown in the example on the left in figure 3.

One of the book’s most interesting and more original points is made in the last section of the eleven-page introduction, a section entitled “The artists.” Harris casts doubt on previous attempts, made mostly by non-Japanese collectors, to identify schools of netsuke carving in the absence of any existing documentation other than the Sōken kishō:

There is little evidence to support such studies, apart from the netsuke themselves. But netsuke were easily copied, and free use was made of the signatures on them by unknown carvers. Almost no pre-twentieth-century netsuke can therefore be reliably attributed to the work of a single maker. For this reason it has been decided not to make any definitive identification of the netsuke in this collection. Signatures which appear on the pieces are, of course, recorded. (p. 18)
His disclaimer has validity, but unknown artists often had reasons other than purely financial ones for adding the signatures of more famous artists to their works. The carving styles are discernible; and eventually, more and more previously unpublished netsuke appear in books such as this, someone will be able to tackle the problem of schools with more authority. Future researchers may, however, come to similar conclusions about the need for such divisions.

Still, the present book could have been more definitive in dealing with the signatures themselves. An earlier British Museum catalogue, by Richard Barker and Lawrence Smith, Netsuke: The Miniature Sculpture of Japan (London, 1976), reproduces enlarged signatures beside each illustration of the signed pieces. In this publication at least the graphs used to write the names are apparent, regardless of who actually signed a particular netsuke. Without the benefit of reproduced signatures in the present Hull Grundy Collection book, the index of artists' names (pp. 127–128) lacks precision and leaves numerous questions unanswered. Should any of the six pieces listed as Masatsugu be grouped as the material, signed or inscribed in various permutations Kaigyokusai (Massatsu) (1813–1892)? Certainly the monkey signed Masatsugu (no. 253) and the one photographed beside it signed Kaigyokusai (no. 252) appear to be by the same hand. Did Anne Hull Grundy consider any of the pieces signed Masatsugu to be by one of the four other artists (albeit they were probably first identified by collector-researchers) who signed their work with the same two graphs used by Kaigyokusai Masatsugu? Are any of them signed with the other recorded combination of graphs found on some netsuke that can also be read Masatsugu? Similarly, the catalogue numbers for nine pieces are listed under “Tókoku Fuzui (Bairyū [sic]).” Tókoku, Fuzui, and Bairyū are the three recorded art names used by Suzuki Tetsugorō (1846–1931). The entry for this carver in the index includes a nineteenth-century netsuke of an ox and flute-playing ox herder signed Tókoku and Ryūki (no. 157) that appears to be the work of a different carver altogether. The dubious nature of many netsuke signatures should not become a rationale for completely ignoring the limited, and of course questionable, biographical data that exists for some of the artists. The generally accepted dates for Kaigyokusai, Tókoku, and other carvers represented in the collection have been omitted from the Harris book.

Other sections of Harris's introduction seem to require more discussion. More extensive background information on netsuke may be found in the British Museum catalogue mentioned above, which was produced for an exhibition of 404 netsuke at the time of the 1976 London netsuke exhibition, and in a British Museum publication co-authored by Harris and Smith, Japanese Decorative Arts (London, 1982); perhaps a third complete discussion of the subject in a British Museum publication was considered unnecessary.

The catalogue begins on page twenty-one and illustrates the collection in small black-and-white photographs that reproduce the objects in approximately actual size. Each piece is described by name and technical data—material, signatures (if any), date, dimensions, and registration number. Many, but not all, of the entries have additional information concerning the subjects depicted. The color plates of selected netsuke are grouped in two separate sections: the photographs are of good quality and have been greatly enlarged to show the detailed workmanship. The quality of the black-and-white illustrations, however, varies considerably. Miniature craftsmanship is extremely difficult to photograph well, but a number of illustrations (nos. 60, 111, 123, 197, 198, and 216) border on the inadequate. Part of the problem results from photographing most of the collection in groups of two to seven pieces, which makes it more difficult to light each individual netsuke properly. The decision to use group shots was influenced no doubt by the logistical and financial considerations inherent in producing such a book, but the groupings themselves are not always satisfactory. The scale of the figures comprising some of the groups is disparate, and in too many cases netsuke of the same or similar subject are not in sequence and are interspersed with dissimilar pieces. The first forty illustrations are in numerical order (though the netsuke identified as numbers 3 and 4 are transposed), but numerical order is abandoned in twenty of the following group shots.

Number 350 is printed upside down, as can be ascertained from the four-graph Chinese inscription on the gilt copper disk inset in the stag antler butterfly—the butterfly, incidentally, is misidentified as a bat.

The organization of the catalogue is somewhat inconsistent as well. The division of sections one through ten is based on subject, but sections eleven and twelve are grouped by shell rather than subject. The three subdivisions of the first section, “The human form,” are particularly problematical. “Figures from religion and mythology” includes Buddhist demons (nonhumans, even in form) and the gobin Mikoshi Nyūdō (no. 15), whose ever-extending neck helps it frighten people by peering over things, especially folding screens; “Human beings” includes skeletons; and “Masks” comprises netsuke, particularly the oin-genrō made of horn representing a ceramic roof-gable tile bearing a demon's face (no. 96), that might have been more logically placed in section three, “Everyday objects.” The masks of the kappō water sprite (no. 89) and demons (nos. 90 and 96) also seem out of place in the section on human form. Because the kappō mask entry defines the legendary animal, the kappō on a clam shell (probably, though not identified as such, with its foot trapped by the clam—a warning against inextricable embroilment in sexual liaisons) is bereft of any explanation whatsoever when it appears later in the second section, “Supernatural creatures” (no. 108).

A zoologist would probably argue with Harris's grouping of fauna. The fourth section, “Animals,” comprises various mammals, reptiles (turtles and tortoises), amphibians (toads and frogs), and molluscs (slugs and snails). This section is followed by the fifth, “Birds,” and the sixth, “Fish and shellfish,” which includes a mollusc (three netsuke of octopuses). The seventh section is titled “Insects and spiders.” Scientific accuracy also is disregarded when the abalone shells (nos. 276, 283, and 414) are described as halves of abalone—the abalone is a one-shelled mollusc.

Numerous small editorial points should have been checked more carefully. Romanized Chinese words are mostly rendered in pinyin, but there is at least one lapse into Wade-Giles: Pu Tai for Budai, the Chinese reading for Hotei, one of the seven popular gods of fortune (no. 7). Some parts of names are rendered neither in pinyin nor Wade-Giles. For example, Huagon Shigung instead of the correct jgin Huang Shigong or the Wade-Giles Huang Shih-kuang (no. 205); Su She instead of the jgin Su Shih or the Wade-Giles Su Shih (no. 38, in which the Japanese pronunciation of the name is also incorrectly given as Sosha rather than Soshoku); and Wang Tse Kiao instead of the jgin Wang Ziqiao or the Wade-Giles Wang Tzuchiao (no. 34, where the Japanese reading Oshikyo should be Oshikyo).

In other Japanese words the macrons, or diacritical marks denoting lengthened vowels, are also inconsistent; there is an unnecessary one on the O of Otafuku (no. 11) and none on
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the o of Jo (no. 501) or the O of Emma-O (no. 555). So few netsuke books have even attempted to include the macrons that the effort, though somewhat imperfect, must be appreciated.

A more serious error concerns the use of Japanese words in plural. Quite appropriately netsuke, shajii (p. 37), kikko (p. 39), and mokugou (p. 116) are used as both singular and plural forms. That editorial decision having been made, the informed reader may be distressed to see mons (family heraldic badges, p. 54) instead of mon and two types of mythical creatures called tengus and kappa on page thirty-nine, especially when there is only one kappa on that page.

Unfortunately, actual spelling errors in Japanese words are also far too numerous. The Taoist immortal Gama is spelled Gamma (pp. 17, 22, 100). Minamoto Yorimasa (1104–30) is called Miyamoto (p. 27), the province of Mutsu becomes Muttsu (p. 104), and the name of painter Kusumi Morikage (ca. 1620–ca. 1690) is given as Marikage (p. 107). Female Shinto deities are called migami instead of megami (pp. 21, 23–24), and in fact the male deity Okuninushi no mikoto mentioned on page twenty-three should not be identified even as megami. Amaterasu, the sun goddess herself, is a similar victim of gender confusion and is referred to as "he" (no. 11).

Other errors of fact include the assertion (no. 75) that merely to lift one's sumo opponent off his feet defeats him and the implication (p. 67) that casts doubt on the importation of the elephant and dromedaries that were exhibited in Edo-period Japan; their arrival in Nagasaki is well documented (see C. French et al., Through Closed Doors, Kobe, Japan, and Rochester, Michigan, 1977, pp. 47–49). The Buddhist wooden gongs (mokugou) with confronting dragon-head handles are usually placed on cushions, not suspended by the handles (p. 116).

The long-legged Ashinaga and long-armed Tenaga (no. 40) represent the legendary beings who must work together as symbiotic pairs to gather seafood from the ocean floor. Although they reportedly lived on islands off the coast of China, Harris may have misidentified their nationality as Chinese; the rather un-Chinese curly hair and beards are always part of their iconography. Numbers 342 and 343, which group a toad, slug (not small), and snake, may also be inadequately identified; the legend of Jiraiya certainly refers to snakes and snakes, but toads are more essential to the story. With the three animals (although the toad is usually replaced by a frog) are seen together in a netsuke, they probably represent San sukumi (the "Three Cringing Ones"), who form a three-cornered deadlock: were any aggressive action taken, the snake would be poisoned by the slug's secretions, the slug would be eaten by the frog (which is immune to the slug's poison), and the frog would be eaten by the snake.

There is also questionable terminology used in identifying several of the materials carved into netsuke. "Stag's horn," as it is called in this book, is more properly "stag antler." The carved ivory tusks seen in numbers 595 through 598 could be more precisely identified as wild boars' tusks. The minogame (not minogami), or turtle, on a log (no. 137) is identified as being carved of carbonized wood; the material appears to be unosugi, or jet, a fossilized driftwood, which like coal was subjected to great pressure while being formed. Jet should be well known to a British writer since it was widely used by the Victorians for their macabre mourning jewelry.

The preceding, perhaps overly critical, points are not meant to denigrate the considerable effort that went into the production of this publication. One enjoys a writer who has a collection of this calibre around which to build his book; the Hull Grundy netsuke as a group surpass most of the public collections found in other museums. And one may also imagine the onerous task of presenting 610 tiny objects, many of which allude to arcane topics, in a format and style that will satisfy both the general reader and the serious collector or specialist.

The breadth of the collection includes some Chinese carvings, both toggles imported for immediate use and figures, some of which were adapted for use, as netsuke. There is an ivory mandarin duck signed Mutsuhiro (no. 363) but actually carved by the collector's husband, Professor John Hull Grundy. Four other pieces are mysteriously identified as "Made in England," without further explanation (nos. 390, 391, 405, and 406).

Anne Hull Grundy herself wrote ten articles on netsuke in the late 1950s and early 1960s, profusely illustrating them with pieces drawn primarily from her own collection. In general, her connoisseurship tended to be stronger than her grasp of the facts. Her writing is somewhat informal in style and her usual venue was the collectors' magazine. Two of her articles, however, appeared in Oriental Art, and one, "Netsuke Carving of the Iwami School," appeared in Orientwelt (v. 4, pp. 329–356). The collector's published articles are listed in a separate section of the book's one-page bibliography. Mrs. Hull Grundy died in 1984. Those wishing to know more about this unusual woman may consult the forward to Harris's book, in which Lawrence Smith, keeper of Japanese antiquities at the British Museum, discusses her briefly, specifically her dealings with that museum. More anecdotes may be found in the tributes and memoirs written by four of her fellow netsuke collectors for the Journal of the International Netsuke Collectors Society (v. 12, no. 3, December 1984, pp. 10–15). The ultimate memorial to Anne Hull Grundy is this book and other forthcoming books that have promised to publish additional aspects of the collections she donated to the British Museum and other public institutions.

HUGH WYLIE


Vaisnavism in Indian Arts and Culture contains thirty-seven papers read at a seminar on the "Impact of Vaisnavism on the Indian Arts," held in the Department of Art History and Aesthetics, Faculty of Fine Arts, M. S. University of Baroda from 28 November to 2 December 1983. The central theme of the seminar was the role that religion, specifically Vaisnavism, plays in shaping artistic and cultural expressions in the subcontinent. In the papers, this broad theme is complemented by the wide range of approaches it inspires. Some of the papers survey previous work; some present the results of new research; some display the approach of the traditional Indologist, connecting texts with images; and others reflect techniques of the social sciences, reporting on observations in the field or in the performing arts. As such, the writings consider topics ranging from the time of the Vedas to the present. And ultimately the volume succeeds in providing a richly diverse set of papers clearly defining where Indian scholarship stands today on the important theme of Vaisnavism's role in the arts and culture.

The volume begins with Kapila Vaisnavay's keynote address, which comments perceptively on the need for an

Vaisnavism in Indian Arts and Culture includes contributions by many of the most well known scholars in the field: limitations of space, however, permit summarizing the contents of no more than ten.

Suvira Jaiswal, writing on “The Demon and the Deity: Conflict Syndrome in the Hayagriva Legend,” hypothesizes on conflicts between the Buddhists and the Vaisnavas as a way of explaining Puranic references to a demonic Hayagriva and his fight with Hayagriva-Vishnu. In “The Prakaras of Vishnu Temples,” A. V. Jeyachandrun concludes that the “purpose of the multiplicity of the Avananda and the increased numbers of circumambulation around the sanctum and prakara” is to help the devotee experience the reality of god. M. C. Joshi implies, in “Vaisnava Vyuha and Its Derivatives,” that the original vyuha concept underwent modifications in Vaisnavism, and inspired the Saktas and influenced laiva depictions of emanating forms. Balaram Srivastava, in tracing the progressive accretions culminating in the notion “Vishnu—The Chaturvinsmatimurtiyah,” comments upon the difference between the Vaijnatha and Caturmukhamurti forms and the assimilation of Vira into Vyuha worship. In “Glimpses of Iconographical Data in the Smritis with Special Reference to Vishnu,” N. P. Joshi provides the first study on the bearing of Smriti literature on Vaisnava iconography. Umakant P. Shah describes the “Badari-Naryanaya Image,” still worshipped and therefore difficult to assess; his description is based on a 1940 photograph and several visits to the temple. A. P. Jamkhedkar reports on recent finds at Mandhal, Nagra, Nandapuri, and Ramtek in Maharashtra in “Vaisnavism in the Yakataka Times.” Intuitive, intelligent, and most stimulating is Ratan Parmoorn’s “Some Thoughts on the Sculptures of Vishvarupa Vishnu”; there is enough in this essay to provoke several painstaking analyses. To the question “Are There Regional Variations in the Plastic Representations of Krsna—Lila?”, Krishna Deva arrives at a succinct answer: while there is general thematic unity in the vast tracts of north India, there are nevertheless regional themes and modes with respect to iconographic details and choice of narratives. An example of the impact of Vaisnavism on the performing arts is “Chandrasekar’s Bhumiya (Ordeal of Sitä): An Analysis and Interpretation of the Performance of Dance-Drama”; as written by Gauri Parmoorn and K. Shivaji Panikkar, the production is a fascinating blend of innovations within the Bharata Natyam style.

As is often the case in large compilations of conference papers, the quality of the contributions is uneven. That does not overshadow the usefulness of this volume, which should be consulted by those working in areas related to Vaisnava arts.

DORIS METH SRINIVASAN

Corrections
In Gary Schwindler’s article in volume 17, “Speculations on the Theme of Siva as Tripurántaka as it Appears during the Reign of Räjaräja in the Tanjore Area ca. A.D. 1000,” on page 164, left column, line 12, Figure 8 was referred to as a stone image of Tripurántaka from the ardhamandapa of Tanjore Temple. What has in fact been illustrated as Figure 8 is a bronze version of the deity from the Räjaräjapaläswami Temple in Tanjore now in the Tanjore Art Gallery, to which reference is made in the text on page 167. The stone image of Tripurántaka from the ardhamandapa of Tanjore Temple is not illustrated and what has been illustrated as Figure 9 is a bronze Tripurántaka believed to have come from Mayaravaram and now also in the Tanjore Art Gallery, to which no reference is made in the text.

In Joan Stanley-Baker’s review of Suzuki Kei’s Chügoku kaigashiki (History of Chinese Painting), there are several errors on page 190. For the sentence “Hints into . . . Kundaiken sayü chôki among others” (left column, lines 4–9), read “Hints regarding Muqi’s clerical life in Japanese records are cited from Tamamura Takeji’s editions of Literature of the Five [Zen] Mountains (Gozan bungaku shinshiki) and Onyoken nichiroku, also Kundaiken sayü chôki among others.” For the clause “It is surprising . . . are cited” (left column, lines 13–15), read “It is surprising to find that while Tamamura’s editions are cited, . . .” And finally, for the phrase “Takeji’s studies” (left column, line 24), read “Sato’s studies.”
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MAURYA FIGURAL SCULPTURE RECONSIDERED

BY FREDERICK ASHER AND WALTER SPINK

The didarganj chowrie-bearer is perhaps the most controversial of all Indian sculptures, with solidly respectable scholars disputing its date by as much as a half millennium.¹ A number of recent important studies have reaffirmed its traditional Maurya date;² others have dated it as much as four hundred years later.³ If it is removed from the Maurya period, and if with it go the two Patna male chowrie-bearers now in the Indian Museum,⁴ the Lohanipur torso now in the Patna Museum, and the few other works carved from polished buff-colored sandstone that generally are seen as contemporary, then this critically important early period is left with no monumental stone images whatsoever, other than the “Asokan” pillars.

What brings the Didarganj figure under scrutiny once more is the discovery of a double-sided vrkshdevatā of polished buff-colored sandstone (Figs. 1–3) that bears clear similarity to the well-known chowrie-bearer. The impressive piece, measuring 1.16 by .38 meters, was discovered at Rajendranagar, a site adjacent to Lohanipur, within the metropolitan area of Patna. The figure on one side of the relief (Fig. 1) leans to her right against a tree that twines upward over the right thigh and around the lowered right arm; the figure’s raised left hand grasps the tree, which branches out and blossoms above her head. The figure on the other side (Fig. 2), in which the disposition of the limbs is reversed, mirrors the same pose with an unexpected but surely intentional accuracy. The figure on each side is shown as if nude but for a long scarf that runs across the shoulders, down along the side of the body, and across the hips. The jewelry of each figure is nearly identical: an untypically plain girdle (mekhalā) lacking any definition of the expected beads; a simple two-strand necklace, again with no defined beads; a bracelet at the wrist; and an equally plain circlet just below the elbow on each arm. Quite possibly these two armlets should be read as the thicker outer borders of a continuous, and conventional, series of close-set bangles (see Fig. 3), which, like the surprisingly simplified girdle and necklace, are left undefined in order to make polishing the areas easier. Only the massive earrings of each figure are different, though both they and the distinctive circular hair-buns just above the forehead have striking counterparts in numerous Kushāṇa sculptures, just as they do in the Didarganj chowrie-bearer.

This Rajendranagar sculpture is not the only such double-sided vrkshdevatā from Patna. Another (Figs. 4–5) remains near the find-spot of that piece, at Nayatola village, which is adjacent to the excavated site of Kumrahar.⁵ Although the Nayatola piece is remarkably similar to the Rajendranagar image—the form of the face, the stance, and the way in which the tree trunk crosses the body, for example, are much the same, and both are made of a buff sandstone rather than the mottled red Sikri stone of Mathurā—this sculpture shows much greater detail throughout and has no trace of polish.

Because of the greater detailing, the jewelry of the Nayatola figures appears considerably more opulent than that of the Rajendranagar figures. We might at least suggest, however, that such details as the “missing” beads and bangles on the Rajendranagar images were originally defined with the brush rather than the chisel, for it is reasonable to assume that the sculpture was painted. How else does one explain the unwonted simplicity of these standard costume elements or of the more unusual plain (non-pleated) areas on the scarves of the Rajendranagar figures, which are best understood as still-undecorated counterparts of the apparently related but fully decorated motif that appears just beyond the proper right cheek of the Nayatola figure (Fig. 4)?

Even the broadly defined series of small spherical forms adjacent to the broken hair-bun of the more damaged Rajendranagar figure (Fig. 2) seems to reflect the head ornament of the Nayatola figure and of a number of others dating to the Kushāṇa period,⁶ and it is worth noting that the Didarganj figure has a head ornament that is at least somewhat related to this type, too.

Despite the fact that the Nayatola sculpture (like the Rajendranagar one) is carved from buff sandstone rather than the mottled red “Sikri” sandstone that is more commonly used for Kushāṇa sculptures, the dating to the Kushāṇa period need not be questioned either on the basis of style or that of function, for it resembles many of the double-sided images from Mathurā that likely served as brackets for a torana. The critical question, then, must be: Are the similarities between
this sculpture and the newly found one from Rajendranagar sufficient to allow us to assign the latter, too, to the Kushāna period? If that is the case, as seems apparent, then there are clear implications for the date of the Didarganj figure, which is remarkably similar to it in many ways, and for the use of polished buff-colored sandstone well beyond the Maurya period.

The chowrie-bearer (Figs. 6–9) found at Didarganj, on the eastern outskirts of Patna, is carved fully in the round. Though not a relief like the Rajendranagar sculpture, it, too, is fashioned from brilliantly polished buff-colored sandstone and shares with the Rajendranagar figure similar exaggerated proportions. Even such details as the tubular earrings worn by the female on one side of the Rajendranagar relief (Fig. 3) also adorn the Didarganj figure, and the curious coiffure (with a bun just above the forehead) common to so many well-known Kushāna examples is found on both. There are, however, differences between them as well—most notably the heavy clothing covering the lower portion of the Didarganj image in contrast to the apparent (though certainly not actual) nudity of the females on the Rajendranagar relief, the treatment of the latter being rather like that of the bracket female on the east gateway of Sanchi’s Great Stūpa or of later figures, such as the Bhūteśar pillar figures of Kushāna times. Furthermore, on the Didarganj image, as on the females of the double-sided relief from Nayotola, far greater attention has been paid to detail: the beads on the necklace, the many bangles on the arm, the strands of hair on the chowrie, the folds on the cloth of the shawl, and the billowing cloth suspended from the beaded girdle are well defined. Lastly, the treatment of the faces is different, that of the Didarganj figure being longer and somewhat heavier in appearance than that of the Rajendranagar figure, which is more rounded and almost smiling in expression.

Despite differences among the three sculptures, we see overriding similarities. That is, we have suggested that the Rajendranagar relief figure has much in common with the double-sided relief from Nayotola datable to the Kushāna period. Furthermore, we have suggested that these two bear considerable similarity to the famous Didarganj chowrie-bearer, which many would assign to the Maurya period on the basis of its polish and the relative naturalism of some details, both features of capitals atop pillars that can be dated to the mid-third century B.C. because they bear Aśoka’s edicts. Since the discovery of the Didarganj figure, many have argued for a post-Maurya date, some relating it to Andhra figures from Sanchi and some to works dating as late as the Kushāna period. But which work might serve as an anchor for determining the date of the others? We believe that it is the Rajendranagar figure, datable to the first or second century, and that the links to the Didarganj figure indicate that it, too, should be assigned to about that time. Thus those who have proposed a Kushāna-period date for it are not far from the mark.

Figures as apparently nude as the females of the Rajendranagar relief generally do not appear until at least the late first century B.C. The lower torso of earlier female figures, such as those at Bhārhat and Bodhgayā, are covered with cloth, diaphanous in the case of the Bhārhat figures but still revealing lines of folds where it crosses the legs, and consistently thick in the case of the Bodhgayā figures. On the Rajendranagar figures, however, the garment (for surely one was intended, even if the intention was not to show it) reveals the entire body, as is the case perhaps first on a female figure carved in relief against a pillar from Mathurā now in the Mathurā Museum and subsequently on the bracket vrksadevatā of the Sanchi Stūpa’s east gateway. By the Kushāna period, virtually every female figure from Mathurā conforms to this revealing convention and appears essentially nude.

While we have already noted another double-sided relief—that is, a relief with front views of virtually identical figures on each side—from Patna, it is at Mathurā that such images are found in greater numbers. Such reliefs may have been stimulated by bracket figures, which could be viewed from both sides. Two pre-Kushāna examples from the Kaṅkāla Tilā conform to the mode of the Sanchi bracket figures, showing not the double-sided form as we are using the term here but both front and rear views of a female. In the Kushāna period, however, the double-sided form is exploited for bracket figures, for example, one from the Dīg Darvāza at Mathurā (Fig. 10), a second from the Kaṅkāla Tilā, and another of unknown provenance in Mathurā now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (Fig. 11). Other Kushāna works that were intended to be seen from both sides also conform to the pattern, illustrating almost identical figures on each side, for example, a pillar capital from the Chamunṣa Tilā at Mathurā, whose principal image on each side is a pot-bellied figure seated above a palm flanked by lions. The function of a double-
sided dwarf from the Vinayak Tilā is not as clear, nor is that of a somewhat later sculpture, probably dating early in the Gupta period, an Uma-Mahēšvara image depicted on each side of a large relief. A railing pillar such as the one upon which the Rajendranagar reliefs is carved would be viewed from both sides. At Mathurā, however, railing pillars are generally treated differently, that is, not with what we here are calling the double-sided form. The famous Bhūteśar pillars, for example, all show a female on one side (Fig. 12) and a series of panels illustrating a single episode from the Buddha’s life or a jataka on the opposite side. And on earlier railings such as those at Bodhgaya and Bhārhat, the double-sided form is not applied. Beside the fact that the Rajendranagar sculpture is double-sided and the females of each side appear to be nude, other indications suggest a date no earlier than the first century, and probably one as late as the Kushāna period. Among these features are the great tubular earrings worn by the figure on one side, which are identical to those that adorn several of the Bhūteśar females (Fig. 13) and a railing figure from Mathurā now in Bharat Kalā Bhavan. Also, the great loop of cloth along each figure’s right hip and thigh is seen for the first time on some of the figures of the Great Stūpa at Sanchi and then commonly on Kushāna-period female figures, including several of the Bhūteśar females and the famous bowl-bearing woman from Faizabad. And the coiffure is a feature that cannot be associated with figures any earlier than Kushāna times. In particular, the frontal bun decorated with an ornament that is found on the better preserved side of the Rajendranagar relief is again seen on many Kushāna images, the Bhūteśar figures as well as the bracket figure in the Victoria and Albert Museum among them, but not on earlier works. Lastly, the stance of the figure shows none of the rigid frontality commonly displayed by the pillar reliefs of Bhārhat and Bodhgaya. Rather, the vṛksadevātā of each side stands so that the right shoulder and hip appear to move forward toward the viewer, the opposite sides of her body receding into the pillar, though with somewhat greater sublety of movement than the Bhūteśar females show. All these features, then, suggest a date in the Kushāna period, probably early in the time of that dynasty.

If the Rajendranagar double-sided vṛksadevātā relief, like the similar sculpture from nearby Nayatola, may be assigned to the Kushāna period, then we must ask about the date of the Didarganj chowrie-bearer. We have already noted that this free-standing sculpture has many features in common with the two double-sided reliefs, so many that it is hard to believe that any significant amount of time separates them, certainly not four hundred years, as would be the case were this a Maurya work. Might the similarities result from their common Pāṭaliputra origin—in fact, the three were found within ten kilometers of one another—rather than chronological proximity? Probably not, for the comparisons above should indicate that they share more in common with sculptures of Kushāna date from Mathurā than with those of any earlier time.

One feature of the Didarganj and Rajendranagar sculptures, however, must be explained as a Pāṭaliputra technique rather than a chronologically limited one. That is the brilliantly polished buff-colored sandstone, a feature long thought to indicate with certainty a sculpture’s Maurya date. Its association with the Maurya period is based largely on the pillars bearing Asoka’s inscriptions and thus surely no later in date than the time of his reign. Of these pillars, all those with lion capitals except the one at Vaśāli are similarly polished, although those crowned with other animals are not. But one must not assume that because the technique was applied to works of one date, it was exclusive to that time.

If the Didarganj chowrie-bearer is not accepted as a Maurya work, then what about the few other figural sculptures often ascribed to that time? The colossal male figure from Parkham, thought by some to be a Maurya work, is much less naturalistic and more relief-like in conception and is in many ways related to such works of undoubted Śūṅga date as the Bhārhat railing reliefs. That leaves the two Patna male chowrie-bearers (Fig. 18) now in the Indian Museum and the Lohanipur torso (Fig. 15) now in the Patna Museum among the only remaining figural sculptures that are candidates for a Maurya date. Yet they, too, we believe, must be contenders for later ascriptions. The two Patna male figures, commonly identified as yakshas, are frequently seen as prototypes of the bodhisattva figures developed at Mathurā during Kushāna times. Their erect stance, full fleshy belly and naturalistically rendered drapery links them closely with Kushāna works. True, the abdomen of the Patna figures is fuller, without the subtle variations of Kushāna figures from Mathurā, possibly an indicator of their status as yakshas; and the form of the garment is different, rather like a luṅgi in the case of the Patna figures.
as opposed to the monastic garment worn by the Kushāna Mathurā bodhisattvas. Moreover, the treatment of the cloth, in addition to its fashion, may be distinguished: it is thick and marked with diagonal pairs of parallel striations in the case of the Patna figures but thin in the case of the Kushāna Mathurā bodhisattvas, almost diaphanous, and unmarked with lines where it passes over the legs or across the torso. These distinctions all have been taken as chronological indicators, yet if the Didarganj female figure is reassigned to Kushāna times, then the two Patna male figures also must be dated to that time. Not only do they wear a garment similar in form and treatment to that of the Didarganj image, but even the treatment of the sash that runs diagonally across the Didarganj figure’s back is essentially identical to that worn across the torso of the Patna images. Thus much more than the polished sandstone links them. Instead of being seen as prototypes of the Kushāna bodhisattvas, they should be recognized as contemporary products.

The Lohanipur torso (Fig. 15), however, is more difficult to analyze; because it is nude, comparisons of cloth form and accoutrements are not possible. Moreover, the front of the torso lacks the subtle fleshy forms of the Patna figures, although its rear side is modelled in a manner similar to those. Likely, however, its date is not significantly different from that of the Patna figures. The three, we would suggest, date to Kushāna times. The two Patna figures are closely related to bodhisattva images from Mathurā, and also to Kushāna terracottas, as we show below. The Lohanipur torso is related to a significant number of nude tīrthāṅkara figures of Kushāṇa date from Chausa (Figs. 16 and 17).22

If our proposed date for these sculptures is accepted, this leaves us with the total absence of figural imagery at the time when the animal capitals were carved. But this is hardly surprising, since in any case only a mere handful of stone figures in human form, perhaps only four of them, have ever vied for a date contemporary with the magnificent and rather widely distributed stone pillars. The conclusion that emerges after taking them away—namely, that anthropomorphic representations were not made in stone in Maurya times—seems to us more compelling than the old one, which saw this small and quite disparate group of figures as unique.

Traditionally, two notions have suggested assigning these sculptures to Maurya times, one more analytical, the other more romantic. The analytical reason, a comparison with the pillar capitals of Asoka’s time, already has been noted. Like these Maurya capitals, the figural sculptures are carved from brilliantly polished buff-colored sandstone. That, however, as the Rajendranagar relief shows, is not restricted to the Maurya period. It was used consistently in Pāṭaliputra though Kushāṇa times. Beside the works discussed, others as well were carved from polished buff sandstone, for example, a mithuna from Patna City (Fig. 14) dated by the Patna Museum to Śūṅga times though likely carved in the Kushāṇa period.23 Parts of this image are brightly polished, and in details of the coiffure, earrings, and lower arm encased in bangles, the female of the couple shares much in common with the Didarganj image. Without polish, the buff stone continued to be used at Pāṭaliputra through the Gupta period,24 after which the dark grey stone widely used as the medium of sculpture in Magadha replaced it.

The more romantic reason for assigning these works to the Maurya period is the assumption of Maurya royal patronage. How could a dynasty as powerful and cultured as this fail to provide figural imagery, the argument seems to run. These figures are, after all, from the Maurya capital, Pāṭaliputra. The assumption of royal patronage, moreover, helps explain a difference that many see between relatively naturalistic works (the royal ones) and more abstract figures (considered popular ones) such as the colossal Parkham male figure or the Bhārhat sculptures of Śūṅga times.25 The assumption of this argument is that royalty, especially royalty in touch with Hellenistic Greece, must favor naturalism, while the people—the native hoi polloi, one can imagine the unspoken argument going—must favor abstractions, even monstrous perversions of nature. This is an argument based on no evidence at all and more than a touch of Orientalism.

Once we have taken the Didarganj chowrie-bearer, the Patna chowrie-bearers, and the Lohanipur torso out of the Maurya period, the gap that they leave turns out to be no gap at all. The development of style in the representation of the human figure in stone sculpture is far more consistent and understandable if we are able to start with the different carvings at Sanchi Stūpa number 2 and Bhārhat, and move gradually toward a greater realization of perceptual goals, than if we must start with works of “astonishing maturity”26 only to find that the next stage in the evolution is one of diffident youthfulness. But this is exactly what happens if we move from the Patna figures to-
ward the Sanchi Stūpa number 2 and the Bhārhat railings, rather than see them as impressive representatives of a style that was developing in the late first and second centuries A.D.

Furthermore, once we admit that polish per se by no means guarantees a Maurya date and then move these figures from the Maurya to the Kushāna period, we resolve a further problem: we no longer have to explain why this very small group of highly accomplished representations of the human form has no comparable contemporaries, antecedents, or immediate descendents. It is hard to believe that four such monumental sculptures whose subtle and confident modelling so strongly suggests that they belong to an already well-established tradition ever existed in such surprising isolation. Admittedly, related pieces may have been lost, although the loss of great numbers would be easier to believe if they had been made of metal, which could have been melted down for other uses. Life-size stone sculptures would hardly have disappeared so thoroughly if, as the products of a developed tradition, they had once existed in abundance. However, the fact that never has any counterpart turned up in Mauryan contexts perhaps suggests nothing more mysterious than that we have been looking in the wrong place. What we are arguing here is that when we adjust our focus and look within Kushāna contexts, we do indeed find their missing counterparts—stylistic, iconographic, and now even technical.

Moving the Lohanipur torso up into this same later period brings an even greater sense of clarification. For how can we believe that this large hieratic nude figure could have been intended as anything other than a tīrthankāra? And if it is a divine image, how could we explain its singular isolation perhaps as much as three hundred fertile years before sculptures in any way comparable to it (either in style or function) finally make their appearance? Of course if the torso is that of a jina (as it apparently is) and if it were of Mauryan date (as apparently it is not), it would suggest an early origin for the Buddha image, too, since early sectarian traditions in India are so linked in their evolution. But the present evidence does not argue this; the nude torso, like the other figures, fits comfortably into a later context. It would have been assigned to a later date long ago were its dating not confused by its presumed “Maurya” polish, for its sensitively fleshy modelling bears some comparison with that of the bronze tīrthankāras from the same general region (Figs. 16 and 17).

Once we remove these figures from the Maurya context, the monumental Maurya pillars with their crowning sculptures quite literally stand alone, depending in their uniqueness upon their imperial patronage, and looking even more than before toward Western Asia for their prototypes, both stylistic and technical. Indeed, even the vaunted naturalism of some of the animal capitals is better explained as reflecting Hellenistic influence than as the herald of an Indian sense of the “natural,” which then goes mysteriously underground until about the time of the Sanchi gates; for such “naturalism” is not found either at Bhārhat or on the railings of Sanchi Stūpa number 2, despite all of the conceptual charm of those sculptures. Nor is it evident in the terracotta animals of the Maurya period.

It is well worth studying the abundant terracotta record, because if the large stone sculptures under consideration were indeed of Maurya date, we should expect to find comparable images in clay, just as we do when comparing monumental figures with terracottas in other periods. Terracotta figurines of females datable to Maurya times do, of course, abound, but the standard type is highly stylized, folkish, and generally overladen with heavily applied and/or stamped ornaments. Such naïvely forceful figures have little in common with the painstakingly studied and modelled Didarganj female or her male counterparts. Nor do the more subtly modelled terracottas from Bulandibagh, in which some scholars see Hellenistic influences reflected, show a convincing connection with the large stone figures under discussion. Their costuming in particular is totally different; however, instead of expressing concern that “at present such discrepancies cannot be explained,” as those who would compare such figures with the Didarganj chowrie-bearer are forced to admit, we would argue that the dilemma disappears as soon as we put two or three hundred years between these disparate works.

Significantly, when we do find closely comparable terracottas, they are far from the Maurya period in date, belonging instead to precisely the period to which we have assigned the polished stone figures on the basis of their many connections with Kushāna stone sculptures. A consideration of two terracottas illustrated in the catalogue of the exhibition From Indian Earth will underline these connections. Both, in contrast to all terracotta figurines of Maurya date, are monumental in scale, reflecting a general interest in large freestanding sculptures in Kushāna times. The first of these ter-
racottas, a seated image of Häritī (Fig. 20) from Kauśāmbī, assigned to the “first century A.D. or later,” instead of denying connections with the Didarganj figure, asserts them, albeit without the refinements seen in the latter. The general stance and expression communicate a similar assertiveness and assurance, but the more precise connections are in the type and disposition of some of the ornaments, notably the very similarly designed armlets and anklets. The heavy necklace falls in the same way between the swollen breasts, while the coiffure in each case is characterized by a large “bun” in front, with the hair combed to either side and finally gathered in a central knot (placed much higher in the terracotta), before descending to shoulder level—a hairstyle that appears to be specifically, and frequently, associated with female imagery of the Kushāṇa period. Admittedly, the Didarganj chowrie-bearer’s ornate girdle is absent in the terracotta Häritī, and, too, the latter’s garment is treated much more simply, but here again we can find striking counterparts in numerous Kushāṇa sculptures from the Mathurā region as well as in roughly contemporary ivories found at Begram. A significant number of connections can also be found in certain Gandhāra images of the same general period (Fig. 21).

The rather deep incisions made to suggest pleats or folds in both this and the second terracotta discussed below may be the more humble potter’s way of expediently mimicking the distinctive “double-line” pleats seen in both the Didarganj chowrie-bearer and the Patna chowrie-bearers. Such carefully wrought “double-line” pleats, though understandably absent from the more expediently produced terracottas, are commonly found in stone carvings from Jaggayapaṭṭa and from the earlier contexts at Amarāvati, as well as in many of the Begram ivories—all works that can hardly date before the first century A.D. and more probably should be assigned to the second century.31 As Philippe Stern peremptively argued years ago, this is but one further feature that links the Patna stone figures to works of a relatively late date rather than to anything from Maurya, or even Śuṅga, times.32 They might even be seen as conventionalizations or “misunderstandings” of the somewhat more “realistic” plaits formed in various Gandhāra sculptures, such as the Häritī mentioned above (Fig. 21).

The second terracotta, a headless, standing male (Fig. 19) also from Kauśāmbī and probably from the same workshop as the seated Häritī just discussed, has much of the same authoritative fullness as the Patna chowrie-bearers (Fig. 18) and shows the same confidence in the arrangement of the garment, which falls easily and naturally over the fleshy body.33

Although differences in both medium and function disallow too direct a comparison between such terracottas and the stone pieces under discussion, the connections one can make between them take on a particular significance now that the discovery of the highly polished Kushāṇa vṛksadevatā from Rajendranagar has once again opened up the question of the dating of these important figures. If we are going to understand the development of early Indian sculpture correctly, the proper dating of the Didarganj chowrie-bearer, the Patna chowrie-bearers, and the Lohanipur torso is obviously an issue that has to be resolved and warrants the consideration of all these related works.

Our conclusions, we acknowledge, will require the adjustment of a number of long-held assumptions on the part of those who have accepted the construction of a history of Maurya art that includes these figures. It seems to us that the new evidence demands that we omit all large anthropomorphic representations in stone from the dwindling Maurya repertory. Further, by reassigning those figures to the Kushāṇa period, Mathurā’s position during that age as the premier, indeed almost exclusive, center for figural sculpture in all north India is brought into question. That works were produced elsewhere, even in Pāṭaliputra, during the Kushāṇa period long has been recognized.34 Now, however, we propose that the number of works produced there was greater during Kushāṇa times than was previously recognized. Indeed, among these works were some of the best known in the history of Indian art.
Notes

1. Though commonly identified as a yakshi, there is little conclusive evidence that this should be so but for the popularity of yakshi figures in early Indian art, for example at Bhärhut, where the sculptures bear identifying labels. There, however, the chore is not an identifying attribute of a yakshi.


3. James C. Harle, _The Art and Architecture of the Indian Subcontinent_, Harmondsworth, England, 1986, recently suggested a first century date, the time to which he assigns the Great Stūpa at Sanchi, but without arguing the case. The case for that date is meticulously argued by Herbert Plasschke, “Zur Datierung der ‘Cauri-Trägerin’ von Didarganj,” _Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg_, v. 12, nos. 3—4, pp. 319—30, whose references provide an essentially comprehensive bibliography for the sculpture. A few earlier writers have dated the figure even later.

4. While these figures are commonly identified as yaksas, we are hesitant to identify them so specifically for the same reasons we are reluctant to identify the Didarganj figure as a yakshi.

5. See Frederick M. Asher, _The Art of Eastern India, 300—800_, Minneapolis, 1980, pl. 1 for an overall view of the figure without the “clothing” in which it is currently draped.


7. See Huntington, _The Art of Ancient India_, pl. 6.6, and pls. 8.35 and 8.36.


9. The Mathurā figure (Mathurā Museum, accession no. J2) is illustrated in J. Ph. Vogel, _La sculpture de Mathurā_, Paris, 1930, pl. XVIII.

10. _Ibid._, pl. XI(c), now in the Lucknow Museum (accession no. J545). A second one, with the female standing on a stooping male, is illustrated by Vincent Smith, _The Jain Stūpā and Other Antiquities of Mathurā_, (Archaeological Survey of India, New Imperial Series, v. 20), pl. XXXV.


12. For front and back views of this figure, see Vogel, _La sculpture de Mathurā_, pl. XII.


15. Mathurā Museum, accession no. 30.2084. The precise find-spot of this sculpture is not recorded.

16. For front and back views of these pillars, see Vogel, _La sculpture de Mathurā_, pls. XIX and XX.

17. Accession no. 695.


19. Vogel, _La sculpture de Mathurā_, pl. L.

20. This is usually identified as Chunar sandstone, although it has not been properly examined to determine with certainty its Chunar origins. Nor is that term, commonly used by art historians, the proper one. The sandstone of Chunar and of the hills extending eastward into Rohitas District, Bihar, is properly called Kaimur sandstone.

21. Traces of polish, however, are apparent on the abacus of the Sankissa elephant capital.

22. These figures are discussed in Asher, _The Art of Eastern India_, pp. 17ff. and pls. 6—7.

23. Patna Museum, accession no. 8178. For another view of this figure, see P. L. Gupta, ed., _Patna Museum Catalogue of Antiquities_, Patna, 1965, pl. VI.

24. See, for example, a Parivānātha image from Mahārib Ghat, Patna, and a Vishnu figure from Patna City, illustrated in Asher, _The Art of Eastern India_, pls. 4 and 26.

25. See, for example, Rowland, _The Art and Architecture of India_, pp. 72—74, where he distinguishes between the royally sponsored works with connections to those of Western Asia and those such as the Parkham figure that he considers “archaic and Indian.”


30. Poster, _From Indian Earth_, p. 123.


33. A large seated Kubera in the Cleveland Museum of Art may come from the same workshop. See Czuma, Kushan Sculptures, catalogue no. 54, pp. 126–27. The dating of this whole group is disputed, being variously placed between the first and fourth centuries A.D.; we would suggest the second, or even first, century as most likely.

34. See, for example, the bodhisattva from Kumrahar, Patna, now in the Patna Museum (accession no. 3981). The figure is illustrated in Asher, The Art of Eastern India, pl. 2.
Fig. 1. Double-sided vrkshadevata from Rajendranagar, Patna District. 1.16 m. high. Patna Museum. Photograph by Frederick Asher.
Fig. 2. Opposite side of the vrkshadavatā from Rajendranagar. Photograph by Frederick Asher.
Fig. 3. Detail of the vrkshadevata from Rajendranagar. Photograph by Frederick Asher.
Fig. 4. Double-sided vrkshadavatā from Nayatola, Patna District. 1.04 m. high. Photograph by Frederick Asher.
Fig. 5. Detail of the vrkshadevata from Nayatola. Photograph by Frederick Asher.
Fig. 6. Chowrie-bearer from Didarganj. 1.625 m. high. Patna Museum. Courtesy of the American Institute of Indian Studies.
Fig. 7. Chowrie-bearer from Didarganj. Courtesy of the American Institute of Indian Studies.
Fig. 8. Chowrie-bearer from Didarganj. Courtesy of the American Institute of Indian Studies.

Fig. 9. Detail of the Didarganj chowrie-bearer.
Fig. 10. Double-sided vrkshatarupa from Dig Darvaza. 

Fig. 11. Double-sided vrkshatarupa from Mathura. 50 cm.
High. Victoria and Albert Museum, accession no. 69.89.
Fig. 12. Female figure on a railing pillar from Bhūtesar. 
1.3 m. high. Mathurā Museum.

Fig. 13. Detail of a female figure on a railing pillar from Bhūtesar.
Fig. 14. Mithuna from Patna City. 50.8 cm. high. Patna Museum, accession no. 8178.
Fig. 15. Nude Male torso from Lohanipur, Patna District. Sandstone, 75 cm. high. Patna Museum, accession no. arch 8038. Courtesy of the American Institute of Indian Studies.
Fig. 16. Rshabhanātha from Chausa. Second century A.D. or later. Bronze, 21.9 cm. high. Patna Museum, accession no. 6539. Courtesy of the American Institute of Indian Studies.

Fig. 17. Tīrthaṅkara in kayotsarga pose. Chausa hoard. Second century A.D. or later. Bronze, 49.5 cm. high. Patna Museum, accession no. 6530. Courtesy of the American Institute of Indian Studies.
Fig. 18. Male chowrie-bearer from Patna District. Stone, 1.65 by .700 m. Indian Museum, Calcutta, accession no. A24795/pl. Courtesy of the American Institute of Indian Studies.
Fig. 19. Male torso from Kausāmbī. Second century A.D.(?). Terracotta, about 50 cm. high. G. K. Kanoria Collection. Photograph courtesy of John Huntington.
Fig. 20. Hārīti from Ghositarama Monastery, Kauśāmbi. Second century A.D.(?) Terracotta, 82 cm. high. Allahabad University Museum. Photograph courtesy of John Huntington.
Fig. 21. Hārīti from Gandhāra region. Ca. second century A.D.(?). Stone, 59.7 cm. high. Collection unknown. (After Indian, Himalayan and Southeast Asian Art, Sotheby's [New York] sales catalogue for 22 March, 1989, fig. 14.)
THE LAKŠMAṆA TEMPLE, KHAJURAHO, AND ITS MEANINGS

By HIRAM W. WOODWARD, JR.

Dedicated in A.D. 953, the Lakṣmaṇa is not the largest of the Khajuraho temples, but it is arguably the greatest (Figs. 1 and 2).\(^1\) It is a temple vitalized by the presence of sculpted figures in postures that are as elegant as the conceptual planning of the temple is sophisticated. Both seem as fresh as an undiscovered place in a forest, for there is little sense of the hardening into formula that tends to characterize the later temples. Much of the imagery at the Lakṣmaṇa, furthermore, appears unique, and it seems unlikely that the identification and analysis of the immediate forerunners of the temple will make it appear otherwise. The study of a “text” as rich as the Lakṣmaṇa, like Shakespeare’s plays or Beethoven’s symphonies, should be an inexhaustible enterprise. Simple, general statements such as that the erotic scenes are “stone posters to caution the masses and arouse popular hatred for the contemporary socio-religious morbid conditions” or have “no meaning other than that of an aesthetic impression,”\(^2\) regardless of the degree to which they may be true, are so much less complex than the temple itself that they are of limited value.

At the present time, the mysteries of the Lakṣmaṇa have started to dissipate thanks to the application of certain written materials to the temple, largely in a series of articles by Devangana Desai.\(^3\) This paper will attempt to shed light on the messages embodied by the temple by focusing on an issue not yet specifically addressed: the matter of structural similarities between the imagery of the exterior and that of the interior. I shall propose that the exterior of the temple stands for the world in which we live, the interior for an inner world, and that the elements in both realms have essentially the same order. The arousal of desire, as depicted in a key erotic scene found on the northern and southern joining walls (Fig. 3), it will be suggested, has a fixed place both in the social world and, in sublimated form, within the mentally disciplined human body.\(^4\)

The present study is directed toward what is simultaneously a narrow and a broad end—an overall framework of understanding. The iconographic analysis of the temple’s imagery is only partial, very far from exhaustive, and the relationship of this imagery to what can be found in older icons and temples is not yet clear. This article, instead, is an interpretation of significant themes at the Lakṣmaṇa in the light of certain texts. The first of these is the dedicatory inscription of 1011 (A.D. 953–54). This inscription includes a brief summary of the processes of creation, using Sāmkhya terminology, and it provides the history of the chief image, that of Viṣṇu, a form of Viṣṇu. The lord of Bhoṭa obtained the image from Kailāśa and gave it in friendship to the king of Kīra (in or near Kashmir), from which it was taken by Herambapāla (of Kanauj). It was finally obtained from his son Devapāla by the Candella king Yaśovarman, builder of the Lakṣmaṇa.\(^5\) In 1960 V. S. Pathak connected the cult of the Lakṣmaṇa Viṣṇu with the Kaśmirāgama or Tantrāntara, one of two branches of the Pāncarātra school, the Vaishnavite sect that spread from such centers as Kashmir to southern India during the second half of the first millennium A.D.\(^6\)

More recently other aspects of the Lakṣmaṇa have been interpreted on the basis of Pāncarātra texts.\(^7\) The most relevant translated text is the Lakṣmī Tantra.\(^8\) Though it is said that the Pāncarātrins “decline to be called Tantrics because they do not want to be considered worshippers of the Mother Goddess,”\(^9\) the Lakṣmī Tantra is a Mother Goddess text advocating such Tantric elements as Kuṇḍalini-yoga and sexual union with a partner. Although it is not easy to distinguish the earlier Pāncarātra texts, composed in Kashmir, from the later, composed in southern India, a mention of tepid water led Sanjukta Gupta, translator of the Lakṣmī Tantra, to suggest the possibility of a Kashmiri origin.\(^10\) One iconographic detail that demonstrates the relevance of the Lakṣmī Tantra to the Lakṣmaṇa is the presence of bull-headed and horse-headed deities on the uppermost register of the outer walls of the sanctum (Fig. 9). These apparently correspond to a group of eight directional deities in the text, four bull-headed gods symbolizing the four yugas, and four horse-headed gods symbolizing the Vedas.\(^11\) Otherwise, however, it is the general content of the text that is relevant, not its specific ritual configurations. There is no evidence that the Lakṣmī Tantra was known in Khajuraho; it is merely the available text.
that appears closest in content to the unidentified or lost texts that were known.

Standing beside the inscription and the Lakṣmi Tantra as a key text is the allegorical drama the Prabodhacandrodaya, thought to have been performed at the Candella court in the second half of the eleventh century. Although certain terms and motifs in the play can be connected with Pāñcarātra traditions, by the time it was written the religious atmosphere at Khaṇḍura had changed. The emphasis on advaita and bhakti doctrines aligns the drama with the traditions of Śaṅkara (eighth–ninth centuries) and Rāmaṇuja (eleventh century). The doctrine proclaimed by the drama has been described as Vaiṣṇava Vedānta, “illusionistic and extremely monistic, but at the same time devotional,” falling “more or less in the line of the Vedānta represented by the Paramārthaśāra ascribed to Ādiśeṣa and by the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.” The analysis by the French translator emphasizes the roots in the Vedānta of Śaṅkara, while concluding that the drama, “like certain passages of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, glorifies an original doctrine that combines bhakti toward Viṣṇu with non-dualism.” At the same time, there is a great deal in the play that fits the Lakṣmaṇa very well, so much so that a lost prototype can be supposed. Evidence for this can be found in the inscription “Śrī Sadhunandi Khapanaka” placed beneath figures of a woman and a Jaina monk (or Kṣapaṇaka) at the Lakṣmaṇa (to the left of the figures on the lower register in Fig. 3). “Who can this Sadhunandi Kṣapanaka be,” Devangana Desai has written, “but a character in some play known to the artist of the Lakṣmaṇa temple?” (The Kṣapanaka theme also makes an appearance at a temple that may be considered a stylistic source for the Lakṣmaṇa—the Ghateśvara at Baroli.) There are many ways the relevance of the Prabodhacandrodaya can be demonstrated: through the character of its poetic language; through many of its themes, most importantly the role assigned to sexual desire; through certain specific scenes, especially those involving a Jaina monk, which are echoed on the joining walls at the Lakṣmaṇa; and through the overall structure of the play, which can be viewed as a kind of passage through a temple-like space.

For the purposes of an investigation into iconographic structure, the exterior wall joining sanctuary to great hall will be focused upon (Fig. 3). Lying to the east of the sanctuary at the temple are three units, a great hall, a hall, and a half-hall, from each of which, to the north and south, niches project (Fig. 2). The first niche encountered in a circumambulation around the temple is the southern niche of the half-hall, which contains an image of Ganesa, lord of beginnings. The fifth of the nine niche sculptures, the deity in the niche projecting from the western end of the sanctum, is Śiva, who echoes a Śiva over the eastern entrance and evokes the diurnal course. The north and south walls that join the three hall units to the sanctuary are the joining walls. These are receding rather than projecting walls. They have no niches for images. Here is a place to pass by, not to contemplate, place that is, in a way, the neck of the temple. As Devangana Desai has pointed out, it is also the point “where two equal squares overlap on the ground plan,” those defining the great hall and the sanctuary.

On the south, as on the north, where nearly identical scenes appear, the receding wall is divided into three registers (Fig. 3). On the lowermost appears a royal or aristocratic couple in sexual union. They are flanked by a second couple; the male is a Jaina ascetic (Kṣapaṇaka), who carries a peacock feather to prevent injury to animals. In the middle register a royal couple embraces. The god Agni appears in the topmost register, flanked by four ascetics, who carry faggots for the sacrificial fire. Agni is in a realm of his own, but the lower two registers continue to the left and right. On the lowermost register are figures of the god Śiva; on the middle register are figures of Viṣṇu. These two registers can be recognized, in addition, around the southwest and northwest corners (Fig. 4). Couples or mithuna appear on Śiva’s register but not on Viṣṇu’s, where they are replaced by vyalā, and there are naginī on one part of Śiva’s register but not on Viṣṇu’s. Apparently, therefore, different qualities are to be associated with the two gods.

Although Devangana Desai has proposed that the Viṅguṭha Viṣṇu of the interior (Fig. 8) is not the original image and that the statue described in the inscription would have been made of bronze and have stood in the center of the sanctuary, the stone image and its frame are, together with the figures of the sanctuary jamb, taken here as part of the original fabric of the temple. Creation can be imagined as proceeding from the central Viṅguṭha. The boar and lion manifestations appear first as animal heads projecting from the head of the main image, to the south and the north. (Whether these faces, together with a fourth on the back, were thought to stand for the very first Pāñcarātra emanations of Vāsudeva.
and the three vyūha—Samkarsana, Pradyumna, Aniruddha—remains unclear.21 On the sanctuary jambs (Figs. 5–6) the boar and lion appear again (but on opposite sides). They appear a third time as principal images of the ambulatory niches (Figs. 9–10), with yet another shift of orientation. Varāha remains on the south, but Narasimha moves to the west (Fig. 10), his position on the north taken by the horse-headed Hayāśīra or Hayagrīva (Fig. 11). Perhaps Hayāśīra should be considered an embodiment of the fourth, back face of the Vaikuṇṭha Viṣṇu.22 The Pāñcaraṭra text the Hayāśīra Saṃhitā states that Hayāśīra should be placed on the northern side of a vimāna, just as he is at the Lakṣaṇaṇa, and quite probably an iconographic tradition like that preserved in this text dictated the placement of images. The same text relates the relevant myth.23 During Viṣṇu’s long cosmic sleep, the god Brahmā sat chanting the Vedas upon the lotus that had arisen from Viṣṇu’s navel. Two drops of sweat fell from Brahmā’s body onto Viṣṇu and were transformed into demons. When these demons stole the Vedas from Brahmā, Viṣṇu awoke. Viṣṇu then took the form of Hayāśīra, went to the nether world, and recovered the Vedas. At last he returned them to Brahmā.

Another level seems to be operative in the two images of the lotus-bearing meditating figures placed over the head of the main image, one on the frame, the other on the surround. To these have been given the label Sūrya-Nārāyaṇa.24 Comparable figures of the seated Viṣṇu appear over the main niches of the ambulatory (Fig. 10), where they are accompanied by four ascetics. Among other figures on the image surround are eight seated forms of Viṣṇu, which have been identified as subemanations (vyūhantaram) in the Pāñcaraṭra system.25 These and a number of other aspects of the interior sculptural program are not of direct concern in this article. Of possible structural significance is the presence of the fish and the tortoise incarnations on the jambs, where they occupy places beneath the boar and lion, respectively (Figs. 5 and 7). The fish and the tortoise appear twice again, in more elevated positions: first flanking the Sūrya-Nārāyaṇa over the head of the Vaikuṇṭha image; second on the seats of the meditating Viṣṇus of the ambulatory, on the northern and southern sides. Finally the goddess Lakṣmī appears in two key spots. On the pedestal below Viṣṇu’s feet (Fig. 8), as Krishna Deva has written, she is depicted “as emerging after the churning of the ocean seated on the tortoise under a canopy of serpent-hoods, flanked by two worshipping Nāgas.”26 Lakṣmī can be seen again in a central position on the outer lintel (Figs. 5 and 6).

On the basis of what has been pointed out so far, certain structural connections should be apparent. L. K. Tripathi noted some years ago that there may be a programmatic connection between the four ascetics flanking Agni on the joining wall (Fig. 3) and the four ascetics beside the meditating Viṣṇus of the ambulatory (Fig. 10).27 Let this level, therefore, be called the topmost level, and let the Sūrya-Nārāyaṇas of the interior of the sanctuary be placed there as well. The middle register of the exterior—the Viṣṇu register—would, in turn, correspond to the realm of the lion and boar incarnations inside. There is support for this link in the presence of vyālas on both the exterior Viṣṇu register (Fig. 4) and the main register within the ambulatory. That leaves the question of whether there is a plane inside the temple that corresponds to the Śiva register of the exterior. Judging by the placement of figures on the jambs, there is reason to believe so: here should be placed the fish and tortoise incarnations, at least as they appear on the jambs themselves. The suggested connections between the levels may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Lowermost</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Topmost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joining wall</td>
<td>Two couples, including Kṣapana</td>
<td>Royal couple Agni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW and NW corners of the temple</td>
<td>Śiva</td>
<td>Viṣṇu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image frame</td>
<td>Boar, lion</td>
<td>Sūrya-Nārāyaṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary jamb</td>
<td>Fish, tortoise</td>
<td>Boar, lion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory</td>
<td>Boar, lion Hayaśīra</td>
<td>Meditating Viṣṇu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials for an Interpretation**

Much of what follows consists of a repetition of familiar homologies within Indian culture. There are certain kinds of metaphor, certain myths, and certain concepts—chief among them that of
the three guṇa or Qualities—that can be broadly applied, on microcosmic and macrocosmic levels. It is in such materials that some of the key unifying themes can be found. What one does with one’s mind and body replicates processes within the natural world.

One sort of image that seems especially fruitful can be found in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, in a statement quoted by Rāmanuja: “Just as the blazing fire, fanned by the wind, burns up dry wood, so Viṣṇu fixed in the manas of the yogin (burns up) all sin.” Inside the Lakṣmaṇa sanctuary, the composite Sūrya-Nārāyaṇa is Viṣṇu as fire-of-the-sun burning up all sin within the mind of the yogin. The images of the sun god Sūrya at the extremes of the east-west axis of the temple extend the macrocosmic aspect. Fire in the form of the god Agni, on the other hand, appears on the joining walls on the north and the south (Fig. 3). The bundles of faggots held by the ascetics beside him are in one sense the fuel for the brahmanical sacrificial fire. In the light of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa statement, they are equally the dry wood that is each yogin’s remaining heap of sin, now at last to be ignited. A single image—god in the mind as purifying fire—appears to bring distinct but related meanings to figures at the center of the temple and on the east, west, north, and south sides.

There is other imagery, equally rich. A metaphor with ancient origins and wide applicability is that of firesticks—with which the Vedic sacrificial fires were started. The upper firestick twists in a stationary receptacle. In the Lakṣmaṇa Tantra, rubbing the sticks is a figure for meditation and produces the fire of consciousness. The practitioner envisages Śakti, the female power identified with Lakṣmī, in the lower firestick and “the presence of Hari completely consisting of fiery energy in the upper piece of wood.” The offspring of Śakti is fire. The visual and structural aspects of the metaphor appear in Tantrism as the turning of a key: in Kuṇḍalini-yoga, a key-like motion opens a door, the fire of desire (kāma) is ignited, and Kuṇḍalini-śakti is aroused, to begin her ascent through the body. Another variant upon the image is the churning of the sea of milk, as depicted, for instance, on the right-hand jamb of the sanctuary entrance (Figs. 5 and 6). Kūrma the tortoise takes the role of the pivot, that is, the lower firestick.

Before exploring how the temple embodies the firestick image, another group of concepts should be outlined, that of the Qualities. According to the Lakṣmaṇa Tantra, there is pure creation—the realm of the four viṣhās, unfoldings or manifestations—and impure creation, the latter characterized by the three Qualities (guṇa) of sattva (purity), rajas (activity or passion), and tāmas (darkness, inertia). In the process of creation itself, says the text, rajas predominates; during sustenance, sattva; and in destruction, tāmas. As in other texts, Brahmā the creator is the rajas god; Viṣṇu the sustainer, the sattva god; and Śiva the destroyer, the tāmas god. At the same time, Lakṣmī herself is primarily identified not with purity but with the quality of rajas, while goddesses like Mahākāli have a tāmas nature, and Sarasvatī, among others, is characterized by sattva. This connection is an important one, for it allows us to speculate that it may be possible for Viṣṇu himself to be associated with rajas rather than sattva.

In the other key text, the Prabodhacandrodāya, the Qualities play an equally significant role. Faith (sraddhā) appears in three guises, each personifying one of the three Qualities. Buddhism and Jainism, according to the play, are tasmic beliefs. Faith-Daughter-of-Tamas cannot help the characters Bhikkhu (the Buddhist monk) and Kṣapaṇaka (the Jaina ascetic), and her appearance is brief. Faith-Daughter-of-Rajas, on the other hand, taking the role of a Śaiva Kapālini, by her embrace and conversion of Bhikkhu and Kṣapaṇaka, makes possible a step upward on an ascending ladder. At the end of the third act, in about the very middle of the play, Kṣapaṇaka’s spiritual progress is confirmed when he asks for Faith-Daughter-of-Sattva. He composes a verse stating that she dwells with Viṣṇubhakti in the heart of great souls. In the course of the play, the characters Bhikkhu and Kṣapaṇaka are led from tāmas to rajas to sattva.

Two other realms in which the Qualities can be found are also relevant to the Lakṣmaṇa. One is their connection with the castes: sattva with the Brahmins, rajas with the Kṣatriyas (though also with the Vaiśyas), tāmas with the Śūdras. The other is the invocation of the Qualities in Tantric concentration: the aim is to make use of rajas to activate and ultimately make preponderant the quality of sattva. The Qualities can be envisaged vertically, one above the other, but sometimes they are also connected with a significant configuration in the crosswise plane. Inside the body, in Kuṇḍalini-yoga, are three ducts; through the central one (Suṣumnā), Kuṇḍalini—identified with Lakṣmī in
the *Lakṣmī Tantra*—ascends. The right-hand duct, Piṅgalā, is associated with the sun, Agni, and the river Yamunā; the left-hand duct, Idā, with the moon, Soma, and the river Gangā. If the ducts are identified with the Qualities, the central duct, Susumnā, becomes the supreme Quality of *sattva*, and the lateral ducts become the other two Qualities.

Can the processes of Kuṇḍalini-yoga also be expressed mythically? There is no reason why this should not be the case, yet passages that do so are not easy to find. The *Lakṣmī Tantra* places Kālakurma, the tortoise of time, above the goddess Adhārāśakti, who in the body occupies the region between the navel and the genitals; but there is no overt connection made between this tortoise and the tortoise incarnation. More suggestive is a passage from the commentary on the Tantric *Saundarya-lahari*, as translated by John Woodroffe. The goddess "raises and gives liberation to those immersed in worldly action; so powerful She—just as the Boar raised with His tusk the world which was immersed in the Great Waters." In the light of this comparison, actions of diving and recovering, as carried out by Varāha or, in a different way, by Hayaśīra, are figures for the yogic control that brings about the goddess’s ascent up the middle duct. The goddess rises as well in the churning myth, in which the tortoise serves as pivot. At the end of the fourth act of the *Prabodhacandrodaya*, King Discrimination addresses Vaikuṇṭha Viṣṇu with these words:

Your chest is marked by the designs drawn on the big breasts of Lakṣmī, which was transferred [to your chest] when she embraced with her arms, Lakṣmī who came up from the milky ocean which was churned with the help of [the] churning mountain by your strong arms. Oh Vaikuṇṭha!

In yoga what permits the goddess to come up from an ocean is looked upon as a twisting of a key in a lock. This is an action with a sexual aspect, and both central texts suggest ways sexual interests can be appropriately directed. "If a yogin should meet a beautiful and fine-hipped woman," says the *Lakṣmī Tantra*, "he should visualize me [i.e., Lakṣmī] in her while mentally reciting (the mantra of) 'Īrīkā.'" "He should contemplate her beauty with a mind free from lust," the text continues, but the mention of "a beautiful and fine-hipped woman" has already served its purpose. The case of the *Prabodhacandrodaya* is more complex. It is true that Bhikkhu and Kṣapaṇaka are being made fun of when they so willingly submit to the seduction by the Kāpālinī who is Faith-Daughter-of-Rajas. Bhikkhu declares:

How often have I ardently embraced widows with swelling breasts, pressing their big breasts with my arms with great passion! But by the Buddhas I swear a hundred times that nowhere have I attained such pleasure as derived from the embrace of the big swelling bosom of this Kāpālinī.

At the same time, the seduction of the Buddhist and the Jaina marks for them the beginning of a journey toward devotion to Viṣṇu, and so in the total scheme of things it is entirely salutary. Furthermore, the language of the play allows relationships with other female characters to be understood in a sexual manner. Mahāmohā (Great Delusion) calls the female character Viṣṇuabhakti a yoginī, and the sought-for union with Upaniṣad, also a woman, is referred to as *saigam*. Kṣapaṇaka and Bhikkhu are so gross that lascivious behavior is appropriate and necessary, but at more refined levels it is also the case that our relationship with the understanding that leads to god can be viewed in sexual terms.

**Towards an Interpretation**

Devangana Desai has shown how easy it is to view the figures on the joining wall (Fig. 3) as the very characters in the *Prabodhacandrodaya*. On the lower register appear King Mahāmohā, his wife Mithyāḍrṣī (error), and Kṣapaṇaka. A play on words provides a connection between Kṣapaṇaka and Śiva, the presiding deity of the lower register: the term "Digambara" (sky-clad) can refer to either. On the middle register, she proposes, are King Viveka (discrimination) and his wife Upaniṣad. These identifications push the evidence, and it may be preferable merely to say that the sculptured figures allude to characters in a lost drama that was the prototype for the *Prabodhacandrodaya* of the following century.

To say this much, however, is not to say very much about the function of these figures in a total scheme of things. It is important both to make sense of the vertical sequence and to see how such concepts as dependence and effect help differentiate the exterior from the interior. The movement from east to west, along or parallel to the temple’s axis, can be compared to the structure of the *Prabodhacandrodaya*, for it is roughly in the middle of the play that Kṣapaṇaka’s seduction and upward embarkation occur. The middle of the temple is that joining wall “where the energies of two
equal yantra-like structures converge,” in Devangana Desai’s words—an appropriate location for erotic scenes. If the concept of the three Qualities is used to explain the vertical hierarchy, then the lowermost register must embody tāmas, the middle one rājas, and the topmost one (i.e., Agni’s) satītvā. Brahmanical activity occurs on the topmost register; kṣatriya activity, in the middle. The Qualities are visualized vertically in the Bhagavad Gītā: “Those who abide in the quality of Sattva wend their way upwards; while those of a Rajasic disposition stay in the middle. And those of a Tasmic temperament, enveloped as they are in the effects of Tamoguna, sink down.” 47 Śiva, the presiding deity of the lower register, is traditionally the tamasic god. The reasons why Viṣṇu, the deity of the middle register, should be linked to rājas rather than sattvā will need to be explored. And why should Agni appear on the topmost register? The firesticks image is suggestive: the rājas-filled middle register is the upper firestick; when it turns upon the lower register (the lower firestick), the spark that is Agni is born.

Also pointing to ways of thinking about these figures are two terms in the Prabodhacandrodaya: one is the dependent or pranatantra character of Faith, 48 the other is the seed (bija), the seed of worship from which is born the realization of Truth (tāttvāvabadha). 49 In each of the three registers there is a dependent relationship of some sort, yet within this relationship a seed of ultimate independence and release is also present. On the lowermost register a seed is implanted in the gross Kṣaṇaṇaka as he attends—and depends upon for stimulation—the sexually united couple. In the middle register, the seed can be understood as that of procreation itself, engendered by the mutually dependent Kṣatriya couple. Finally, in the topmost register, Agni stands for the ritual activity of the Brahman caste: dependence on Vedic ritual can indeed implant a seed leading to true independence. 50 There is something on this wall to satisfy the needs of three quite different types of person.

In the interior the same forces are present, but they are manifested in different ways. The exterior is a social realm; the interior is not. If dependence is a key theme in the exterior joining wall, independence characterizes the interior. When perceived as a representation of the stages of creation, the temple is a picture that puts all but the final stages in the interior. The processes of creation begin with God and the central image, and move on to the secondary vṛiṇḥantara and incarnations of the image frame and doorway, which must also outline the principles that are constituents of the self. Creation according to the Sāṃkhya system is briefly recapitulated in the dedicatory inscription of the temple, and the same system is one of the several drawn upon for the varying Lakṣṇī Tantra accounts of creation. 51 The sanctuary door may stand at a point in the evolutionary process corresponding to the ten Sāṃkhya doors (dvāra) that are the five senses and five human capacities. 52 The world furthest removed from God, ultimate principles, and mental capacities is the external world, the world of elemental or gross creation. 53 This, the world of things, animals, mankind, and supramundane beings, is what stands on the outside walls of the temple.

The Sāṃkhya system and the Prabodhacandrodaya have differing views of the reality of this external world, but for both it is a world in which God may be found. The Prabodhacandrodaya offers striking similes:

Just as the moon seen in water, just as a city in the sky, just as dreams and magic, so also the Universe is an effect [kāraṇa], subject to origin, destruction, etc. It arises when Viṣṇu, who is self awakening, is unknown, like silver in a shell and a serpent in a garland, but disappears when the knowledge of the truth (tāttvāvabadha) has arisen. 54

If the exterior of the temple is “silver in a shell” or “a serpent in a garland,” then within these shells and garlands Viṣṇu lies hidden, as those with knowledge of the truth are able to perceive.

In the solitary realm of the interior, a related structural order stands for yogic processes. The interpretation proposed here grows out of suggestions made by Devangana Desai. 55 In introducing the second edition of Erotic Sculpture of India, Desai wrote that

the Tāntrikas use ambiguous sandhyā bhāṣā while composing their texts in order to conceal their esoteric doctrines. This code language with double meanings . . . consists of a system of elaborately worked-out ciphers, in which erotic terminology plays an important part. Often the literal meaning is erotic . . . , but the intended meaning refers to the Yogic stage of meditation. The erotic figures on the jioncure walls of Khajuraho temples have also been used in a similar manner as an ambiguous language of sandhyā bhāṣā. 56

What is proposed here, however, is not really that the figures of the joining walls are ciphers, in the sense of an arbitrary secret code. As representations of “effects” they reflect what for most of us is the reality of the world in which
we live. It also happens that this world has characteristics and is directed by forces that can be found in a comparable order within the human body. Somewhat similarly, the mythological figures of the interior should not be understood merely as yogic processes expressed in another code. Once again, it is simply that the gods relate to one another much as do the interior forces controlled in yoga.

There are many images in the interior, and a chart such as the following helps bring this order into focus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duct</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Animal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piṅgalā duct</td>
<td>Śiva</td>
<td>Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central duct</td>
<td>Vaikuntha Viṣṇu</td>
<td>Tortoise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iḍā duct</td>
<td>Brahmā</td>
<td>Bird</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sanctuary

Why should the fish and the tortoise appear twice, once in a lower position on the jambs and again in a superior position inside the sanctuary, above the head of the Vaikuntha Viṣṇu? The higher position is attested on contemporary stone stelae, and it may be that here is merely a convention upon which an interpretation should not be forced. Nevertheless, it is true that the materials presented earlier give reason to picture both incarnations in the watery depths or, in the body, in the lowermost part of the trunk. The tortoise is the fulcrum near the base of the spine, upon which the upper firestick unites a spark. But it is as if the tortoise itself becomes an energy that rises up the central duct. The fish can be seen in just this way—as an embodiment of the truth of the Vedas rescued by Hayāśīra from the waters. It is for this reason that four figures, standing for the four Vedas, appear behind the fish (Fig. 7). On the other hand, even in their elevated position within the sanctuary, the fish and tortoise appear beside the central axis, not upon it. Perhaps, therefore, they merely stand for the breaths of the lateral ducts, marking the top and bottom of each channel. The two incarnations reappear on the pedestals of the meditating Viṣṇus above Varāha and Hayāśīra on the southern and northern faces of the ambulatory. They here seem to be complementary forces to be channeled by the yogin (although it is possible that something still more esoteric is being referred to, fish being one of the five forbidden substances in Tantric practice).

The flanking images of the frame and the portal are placed according to the point of view of the image rather than of someone facing and contemplating the image. That makes it difficult to understand why the positions of the boar and the lion are reversed; they do not match the orientation of the side faces of the Vaikuntha Viṣṇu. It may be that the outer boars and lions are oriented according to the visitor’s body. A reversal of this sort is mentioned in the Lākṣmī Tantra. At one point, when the yogin is facing a principal image, the text says:

Next, he should visualize his self as leaving his body through the right-hand course [the piṅgalā duct] and entering the image’s heart through its left-hand entrance [i.e., the iḍā duct]. Just as he feels his own excellent self within his own heart, so should he feel that same self of his within the heart of the [image].

The thought waves leaving parts of our body, says the text, go in straight lines to the image we
face; they do not cross each other. Though it need not explain the boar and lion reversal at the Laksmana, the passage at least acknowledges the phenomenon of orientational shifts, and it indeed justifies attention to the ducts in interpreting image frames. The passage also suggests a way of internalizing the lion: Nrsimha, according to the Prabodhacandrodaya, tears “open the doors of the breasts of his strong opponents.” Perhaps we can call on Nrsimha to make the connection between our heart and god’s. Seen in yogic terms, Varaha works vertically, opening a trap door and bringing up the goddess from the depths. His complement Nrsimha works horizontally, opening the door between the yogin and the image of the sanctuary.

In such an interpretation, the figures of the middle level—Nrsimha and Varaha—are important to the yogic endeavor. But their martial qualities can be seen as equally important. The Laksmana temple, concludes one of Devangana Desai’s articles, “combines Yoga and Daityari aspects of Visnu.”

Visnu is Daityari, enemy of demons. The dedicatory inscription itself speaks of the temple of Daityari, rivaling the peaks of the mountains of snow. On one symbolic level, Desai has pointed out, Vaikuñtha Visnu vanquishes the three joint demons; on another level, King Yaśovarman is the conqueror of rival dynasties; and on a third level, as suggested by the Prabodhacandrodaya, orthodox religion conquers the heretical sects. In one sense the Daityari aspect dominates the middle register at the Laksmana, which is also the level of royal activity, while the yogic aspect is more important on the upper register, where the yogasaṇa images appear. At the same time, as already suggested, Varaha and Nrsimha—and Hayaśṛṣa as well—need to be viewed in both yoga and Daityari terms.

Is it possible to see both yoga and Daityari aspects in the twelve scenes from the life of Kṛṣṇa on the upper walls of the ambulatory? The scenes do not appear in chronological order. John Stratton Hawley has pointed out that the choice of episodes at the Laksmana runs counter to the contemporary attention to the domestic and pastoral aspects of Kṛṣṇa’s career. Instead, there is “an array of Kṛṣṇa’s heroic and miraculous encounters.”

The textual source, contrary to what had previously been thought, does not seem to have been the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, a text quite probably not known in tenth-century Khajuraho. A Kashmiri text, the Kramadīpika, suggests one possible approach to the choice and sequence of scenes. In this text the purposes of a mantra are redirected by different dhyāna of Kṛṣṇa. The Kaliya episode is connected with poisoning; the Putana one, with allaying adversity. The other six dhyāna mentioned do not appear at the Laksmana, but they too are put in the service of mundane ends: long life, protection against fever, rainfall, and the vanquishing of enemies. As the Kṛṣṇa episodes are depicted on the upper register—that of the Viṣṇu-yogasaṇas—some connection with aspects of the yogic endeavor would be expected. Perhaps the connection between scene and goal is as arbitrary as it seems in the Kramadīpika; perhaps the connection is merely farfetched (the hunchback Kubja’s gift of ointment, for instance, can be looked at an in esoteric fashion: perhaps when Kṛṣṇa subsequently straightens her up, he is allowing an energy in his own body to rise). Whatever the case, the Kṛṣṇa scenes are surely as multivalent as the sculptures elsewhere; they do not merely help the king poison his enemies (following the Kramadīpika), they somehow crown the yogin’s internal processes as well.

The division between Daityari and yoga aspects on the mundane level is the division between princely and priestly behavior. Moving back and forth from exterior to interior, it is the middle level where princely Kṣatriya activity belongs and the upper level that is the realm of Brahman priest. In this social realm, multivalent interpretations also have a place, for we should imagine a class of priests serving the king both by carrying out Brahmanical ceremonies and by practicing yoga in order to safeguard the kingdom from its enemies. In its way, yoga is an internalized form of the external ritual symbolized by the Agni in the corresponding structural position on the joining wall.

Daityari, yoga, king, priest: a third pair is rajas, sattva, the upper two of the three Qualities. In the Purāṇas, the associations of the gods with the Qualities of the impure world run as follows: Śiva is the tāmas god, Brahmā the rajas, and Viṣṇu the sattva. This does not accord with the correlations proposed for the exterior of the Laksmana, where the lower register with its images of Śiva would indeed be the tāmas realm, but Viṣṇu’s, just above it, would be associated with rajas, not sattva. The standard correspondences seem to work better inside, when the left- and right-hand figures are taken to stand for the ducts: Śiva’s side would be the tāmas side, Brahmā’s the rajas, and the central axis would be taken as sattva. Nevertheless, it was pointed out above that in the
Lakṣmī Tantra Lakṣmī's primary connection is with rajas rather than sattva, and Viṣṇu should be seen in just that way on the exterior of the Lakṣmāṇa. What is important is that on the middle register, Viṣṇu's register, the forms of Viṣṇu are not ultimate (ultimate forms lie beyond the Qualities) but merely appropriate to the rajas—that is, passionate and active—qualities possessed by King Yaṣōwarman and all kings. These qualities help him conquer his enemies and, when properly channeled, will bring about complete deliverance.
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Fig. 6. Laksmana temple, Khajuraho. Sanctuary entrance. Photograph courtesy of John C. Huntington.
Fig. 8. Laksmana temple, Khajuraho. Sanctuary. Vaikuntha Viṣṇu. Photograph courtesy of John C. Huntington.
Fig. 9. Lakshmi temple, Khajuraho. Schematic diagram: ambulatory, figures on the outer walls of the sanctuary.
Fig. 10. Laksmana temple, Khajuraho. Ambulatory, western face of the sanctuary. Narasimha and Viṣṇu in yogasana.
Fig. 11. Laksmana temple, Khajuraho. Ambulatory, northern face of the sanctuary. Hayasirsa. Photograph courtesy of the Archaeological Survey of India.
THE ROLE OF GRAND PROTECTOR SHI IN THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE ZHOU CONQUEST

By EDWARD L. SHAUGHNESSY

Although most of the inscribed Western Zhou bronze vessels discovered in recent years have come out of the earth of Shaanxi province, the homeland and capital area of the Zhou people, this has not been the only area in which bronzes have come to light.\(^1\) One of the most important of these discoveries, or, perhaps, better in this case, rediscoveries, was made in Washington, D. C. The Taibao gui (Sh 2.3:58; Fig. 1), originally discovered in Liangshan, Shandong, during the first part of the Daoguang emperor’s reign (r. 1821–50) in the Qing dynasty, had long since disappeared.\(^2\) Then, in 1969, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer donated to the Freer Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution what she described as a “Chou dynasty juei” that had long been stored at her summer house in Mount Kisco, New York.\(^3\) When the Freer curators received the vessel, they were astonished to find themselves the possessors of what many regarded at that time as the earliest vessel of the Western Zhou dynasty.\(^4\) Even though the discovery in 1976 of the Li gui (Sh 50.Ho14:321), a vessel which refers to King Wu’s jiazi day conquest of Shang and commemorates an event that took place just eight days later, has now certainly preempted this distinction,\(^5\) the Taibao gui remains an extremely important source for the history of the early Western Zhou. Indeed, it could be argued from both historical and historiographical perspectives that the Taibao gui is still the most important of these two vessels. Whereas the maker of the Li gui is apparently unmentioned elsewhere in the historical record,\(^6\) the Taibao gui was cast for one of the founding fathers of the dynasty, Grand Protector (taibao) Shi, the Duke of Shao, a figure already well known from the traditional literature of the period.\(^7\) Moreover, the Grand Protector plays prominent roles in the inscriptions of at least five other important bronze vessels cast during the reigns of King Cheng (r. 1042/1035–1006) and King Kang (r. 1005/1003–978),\(^8\) the second and third reigns of the dynasty. In this way, it is a source that illustrates well one of the most important methodologie of bronze studies: the association of two or more bronzes by virtue of a shared personal name.\(^9\) For both of these reasons, it seems useful to reexamine the recently rediscovered Taibao gui, its inscription and historical background, together with other vessels either cast by or mentioning its maker, the Grand Protector.

In many ways, the Taibao gui resembles the Li gui. Like the Li gui, the vessel is decorated with a very pronounced and forceful animal-mask design. Its two large handles are crowned with horned animal heads and have large rectangular pendants descending from the lower curve. Although the Taibao gui does not rest on a rectangular base as the Li gui does, the foot of the vessel is still relatively high, making the vessel appear elevated. The inscription (Fig. 2), too, greatly resembles the inscription of the Li gui. It is comprised of thirty-four graphs in four columns. The graphs appear elongated and are of varying sizes. Finally, like the Li gui, the Taibao gui inscription also relates a Zhou attack on Shang. In this case, however, the attack is not that led by King Wu against Di Xin (r. 1086–1045), the attack that resulted in the original conquest, but rather a second attack occurring some years later, after the death of King Wu, and directed against a rebellion led, at least nominally, by Di Xin’s son Lufu, better known by his posthumous reign title Wu Geng. Although the inscription has been previously translated, it certainly warrants detailed reconsideration.\(^10\)

Taibao gui

王伐条子LineEdit反王
The king attacked Lufu Sheng\(^11\) and suppressed\(^12\) his rebellion. The king

\(\text{征征令} \text{大保大保克} \)
sent down [a/the] campaign command to the Grand Protector. The Grand Protector was capable

\(\text{不亡掌王住大保易(錫)体} \) of being respectful and not having any mistake.\(^13\) The king immortalized\(^14\) the Grand Protector, granting a benefit

余主用丝斧对令
[of] Song-land;\(^15\) [he] uses this vessel to respond to the command.

According to the relatively abundant historical sources pertaining to the establishment of the Western Zhou dynasty, after having defeated the Shang at the battle of Muye, King Wu quickly moved to organize his family into a royal administration. His next eldest brother, Guanshu
Xian, was deputed to the former Shang capital where he was to oversee the vanquished Shang people and their nominal ruler, Lufu or Wu Geng. Guanshu was joined in this important task of maintaining order in the conquered territories by two younger brothers, Caishu Du and Huoshu Chu, the fifth and eighth of the ten direct-line sons of King Wen.16 King Wu’s second eldest brother, Zhougong Dan, the famous Duke of Zhou, was appointed to remain in the Zhou capital and serve as “Grand Captain” (taishi), tantamount to a royal chancellor. In this, he was to share authority with his elder half-brother, Duke Shi of Shao, who was named “Grand Protector.”17 Although this administration was already in place when King Wu died just two years after the conquest, his eldest son and heir-apparent, to be known as King Cheng, had not yet reached maturity.18 Given the still precarious circumstances of the young dynasty, the Duke of Zhou, apparently acting on his own initiative, assumed full royal authority.19 Many of the sources for this period are colored by the legend that was to develop around the Duke of Zhou and portray all of his actions in the most favorable of lights.20 Still, there is little doubt that the Duke’s eldest brother Guanshu Xian regarded this move as a usurpation and, in concert not only with his brothers stationed in the east but also with Wu Geng and former allies of the Shang, revolted against the Western court. The court responded quickly and decisively to this. Under the combined leadership of the Duke of Zhou, Grand Protector Shi, and, at least nominally, King Cheng, the revolt was thoroughly suppressed within three years. In addition to executing Guanshu Xian and Wu Geng, and exiling the other rebel siblings, the court took further steps to lessen the chances of another such revolt. One of these was to carry the campaign beyond just the territory of the Shang to attack and subjugate the independent states situated further east in present-day Shandong. These states were then colonized by other royal relatives, who were rewarded for their allegiance and military exploits with grants of land. One of the first such grants seems to be that commemorated by the Taibao gui, which also confirms the Grand Protector’s role in suppressing this rebellion.

While Grand Protector Shi was only a half-brother of King Wu and the Duke of Zhou, the merit he achieved in the campaigns of conquest and suppression, coupled with an incredible longevity,21 made him one of the most important of the dynasty’s founding fathers. Indeed, were the history of this period to be written solely on the basis of bronze inscriptional evidence, the Grand Protector would probably be considered more important than even the Duke of Zhou.22 Some outline of his career, both at the height of his military activity and later in his old age, is preserved in a number of other early Western Zhou inscribed bronze vessels that can be associated with the Taibao gui by virtue of their mention of the Grand Protector. Two of these are closely contemporary with the Taibao gui, dating probably to the third or fourth years of King Cheng’s reign, and provide further information regarding the Grand Protector’s role in the suppression of the Wu Geng rebellion, while three others, all of which display characteristics dating them to the reign of King Kang, portray him in his later years as something of an eminence grise, the power behind the king.23 In addition to supplying information regarding the career of this important figure, this set of vessels serves an important methodological role by illustrating the evolution of bronze styles over the first two generations of the dynasty.

In many ways the most interesting member of this group is a pair of vessels generally known as the Bao you (Sh 4.16:173) and Bao zun, though they should instead probably be called the Chuo you (Fig. 3) and Chuo zun.24 Discovered in 1948 in Luoyang, the you is now in the Shanghai Museum and the zun is in the Henan Provincial Museum in Zhengzhou. The inscription (Fig. 4), which is nearly identical on both the vessels and covers of both vessels, presents a number of linguistic features that require more than the usual explication.

Chou you

乙卯王令保及
Yimao [day 52], the king commanded the Protector25 to apprehend26
毅東(或)五侯作
the Yin eastern states’ five lords.27 Chuo28
兄(或)六品鉦曠孔
was given six types29 and had martial accomplishments praised30 by.31
保易(或)賓用作(作)文
the Protector and was awarded an audience; [he] herewith makes [for his] cultured
父癸宗寶師徐雅
Father Gui’s temple [this] treasured, sacrificial vessel; meeting
四方造王大祁鉦
with the four regions convoking at the king’s great sacrificial offering
周武才二月既望
in Zhou; in the second month, after the full moon.32
Were it not for the reference to the (Grand) Protector, the mention of the king’s sacrificial offering “in Zhou,” and the dating notation “after the full moon,” it would be easy to confuse this inscription with precedents cast during the final years of the Shang dynasty. Chen Mengjia has pointed out eight features in it that are usually associated with Shang rather than Zhou inscriptions. These divide evenly between orthographic and syntactic points. Chen notes four graphs whose shapes are similar to Shang examples and/or different from Zhou examples: guo in line 2, (xiong) kuang in line 3, han (ji) in line 3, and wang in line 7. He further notes four syntactic similarities between this and Shang inscriptions:

1. the addition of the word zong (temple) to the ancestor appellation;
2. the use of gong (to meet) to introduce the “great event” year notation;
3. the use of he in the sense of “convocation”;
4. the splitting of the date notation, with the gengzi day placed at the head of the inscription and the (year and) month placed at its end.

To these, it could be added that the dedication of the vessel to “Father Gui” is indicative of a Shang (or at least eastern) caster, not only by virtue of the use of a tiangan name but also due to the use of the word fu for “father” instead of kao (deceased-father), which is standard in Zhou inscriptions.

While the reference to the king’s sacrifice in Zhou is conclusive evidence that the vessel was cast during the Zhou period, all of these Shang features of the inscription suggest that the maker of the vessel must have been of eastern origin. This point, overlooked in most studies of this inscription, is confirmed by the proper interpretation of the benefice record, Chuo kuang liu pin, mie han yu Bao, xi bin. The grammar of this sentence is rather complex, but the post-verbal yu (to express) certainly indicates a passive sentence. Since the words mie han (“to praise martial accomplishments”) before this yu are generally taken to be a verb-object compound, there is no subject in this clause. Therefore, the complete sentence must include the previous clause as well and have a compound structure, with chuo being the subject of two different verb-object compounds, kuang liu pin (“to give six types”) and mie han. Thus understood, chuo must be the recipient of these awards and can only be a proper noun. In support of this, there are a number of other inscribed bronze vessels attesting to the existence of a Shang clan named Chuo in the vicinity of Luoyang. Thus, the correct interpretation of this inscription on the Chuo you demonstrates that not all of the former Shang people joined in Wu Geng’s revolt; some, at least, served under Grand Protector Shi in his suppression of it and were appropriately awarded by him for their aid.

The third of the vessels deriving from the eastern campaign to suppress the Shang rebellion was also cast by a subordinate of the Grand Protector in order to commemorate an award made by him. The Lü ding (Sh 2.5:72; Fig. 5) is an extremely representative example of a King Cheng-period ding. Maintaining the taotie design of Shang vessels, the Lü ding also has long, tubular legs and a tri-partite lobing of the belly, both traits particularly associated with this period. The inscription (Fig. 6), though somewhat effaced, displays the same type of calligraphy, with elongated, narrow graphs, found in the Li gui and Taibao gui.

Lü ding

佐公大保来

It was the year that the duke Grand Protector came from

伐反夷年才

attacking the rebellious Yi; in

十又一月庚申公

the eleventh month, gengshen [day 57], the duke

才盤自公易(錫)

was at the Zhou garrison; the duke awarded

旅貝十朋旅用

Lü cowries, ten strands; Lü herewith

乍(作)父尊彝

makes [for his] father [this] sacrificial vessel.

After the momentous events of this rebellion and its suppression, King Cheng apparently grew into his office and succeeded in consolidating Zhou rule throughout both the Zhou western territories and the eastern lands formerly ruled by Shang. But, with the exception of documents pertaining to the establishment of the eastern capital at Luoyang, which have recently been supplemented by the important inscription on the He zun (Sh 48.1:171), and occasional notices of royal appointments to lords of newly established states, the historical record is largely blank for the remainder of King Cheng’s reign. In traditional historiography, this period and extending into the first part of King Kang’s reign was characterized succinctly, and apparently accurately, by Sima Qian (ca. 145–86 B.C.): “The world was at peace and for more than forty years punishments were
not used." Indeed, the fuller record contained in the Bamboo Annals (Zhusu jinian) also shows that through the remainder of King Cheng’s thirty-seven year rule (including the seven years when the Duke of Zhou acted as regent), royal authority went unchallenged.

With the death of King Cheng in 1006, however, the royal court was faced with the need to institute a routine succession. The founding fathers still on the scene, paramount among whom was Grand Protector Shi, surely recalled the devastating consequences of the irregular transfer of power following King Wu’s death. It is therefore not surprising to find in the Book of Documents (Shangshu) a detailed account of the ceremonies legitimating King Kang’s succession. And since it shows in a singularly impressive fashion the preeminence to which Grand Protector Shi had risen, the “Gu ming” (translated by James Legge as “The Testamentary Charge”) chapter deserves to be quoted at length.46

It was the fourth month, on the growing brightness: the king was not well. On jià [day 1], the king then washed his hands and face. The attendants dressed him in cap and clothes and leaned him on a jade armrest. They then assembled Grand Protector Shi of Shao, the Elder of Rui, the Elder of Tong, the Duke of Bi, the Lord of Wei, the Duke of Mao, the captains, tiger [ministers = ] braves, the hundred governors and the controllers of affairs. The king said:

Wuhu The illness greatly advances; it is critical. The pains come daily and [now] constantly remain. I fear that I will not be able to make an oath to discuss the succession. Here I will command you [with] detailed instructions. The former rulers King Wen and King Wu manifested their doubled brightness and established their beauty. Arraying the teachings they toiled, but toiling they did not transgress, thereby being able to pierce Yin and gather the great mandate. I, the stupid one who has come after them, have respectfully met the awe of heaven and successively maintained the great instructions of Wen and Wu, never daring blindly to change them. Now heaven sends down [this] illness. It is perilous that I will not arise, will not recover. Would that you understand these words of mine, therewith respectfully protecting the eldest son Zhao and vastly helping him over difficulties. If pliant with the distant ones, you will be able to cause them to draw near and you will bring peace to and encourage the many states, small and great. Think how a man disorders himself in the trappings of power and you will not take Zhao to covet tribute in what is not critical.

These [officials] having received the command, then returned and brought out the stitched garments in the courtyard. On the next day jiáhou [day 2], the king died.

The Grand Protector commanded Zhong Huan and Nan-gong Mao to serve and assist Lü Ji, Lord of Qi, with two shields and dagger-axes and one-hundred tiger braves to meet son Zhao outside of the southern gate and in procession to enter the solemn chamber, grieviously to dwell at the ancestral altar. On díngmào [day 4], he commanded the recording of the transition measures. On the seventh day, guišou [day 10], the elder assistant commanded the officers to prepare the materials . . .

The king [wearing] hempen cap and embroidered robes ascended by way of the guests’ stairs. The officials and lords of states [wearing] hempen caps and anti-colored robes entered and assumed position. The Grand Protector, Grand Scribe and Grand Master of Rites all [wore] hempen caps and red robes. The Grand Protector elevating the large ritualtablet and the [High = ] Grand Master of Rites presenting the chalice47 ascended by way of the main stairs. The Grand Scribe holding the document ascended by way of the guests’ stairs. Standing before the king he intoned the command, saying:

The august deceased-king leaning on a jade armrest announced his final command, commanding you to succeed to the instructions, to look over and be lord of the state of Zhou, to follow and comply with the great laws, and to bring peace to the world, thereby in answer extolling the bright instructions of [kings] Wen and Wu.

The king twice bowed. Arising, he answered, saying:

Insignificant am I, the small child, last [of our line]; would that I be able to govern the four quarters so as respectfully to dread the awe of heaven.

Then he received the chalice. The king thrice strained [the wine], thrice sacrificed and thrice drank. The Grand Master of Rites said, “It is enjoyed.” The Grand Protector received the chalice, descended and washed his hands. Taking a different chalice, he held a demi-ladle so as to pour the sacrifice and drink.48 Giving the chalice to an altar man, he bowed. The king bowed in answer. The Grand Protector descended and with the many lords exited the temple gate and waited.

The king exited, being within the Response Gate. The Grand Protector led the many lords of the western lands to enter the left of the Response Gate. The Duke of Bi led the many lords of the eastern lands to enter the right of the Response Gate. They all [wore] brocades and knee-covers, yellow and red.49 The guests raised and presented their tablets together with their presents saying, “[We] the [one or two] several ministers and defenders dare to hold the offerings of our fields.” All twice bowed and touched their heads to the ground. The king, being the proper successor, bowed in answer to each in turn.50 The Grand Protector and the Elder of Rui together advanced and saluted each other. Both twice bowed and touched their heads to the ground and said:

We dare respectfully to announce to the son of heaven: august heaven changed the great state Yin’s mandate. It was Wen and Wu of Zhou who received guiding approval and were able to be solicitous of the western regions. It was the newly deceased king [i.e., King Cheng] who completed the moderation of awards and punishments and consolidated their efforts, thereby expansively bequeath-ing beneficence to the heirs. Now the king must respect
it! Spread the august six armies and do not corrupt our high ancestor’s unique mandate.

The king said to the effect:

Lords, husbandmen, males and defenders of the many states; I, the one man, Zhao, announce in return: Formerly, the rulers Wen and Wu grandly brought peace and prosperity, did not bring hardship or misfortune and caused there to come to be an equal trust, thereby manifesting their brightness in the world. Then, they also had bear-like officers and ministers without two hearts to protect and govern the royal house, thereby first being commanded by Shang Di. August heaven therewith instructed its way and gave them the four quarters. Then they commanded them to establish the lords as trees and curtains among us, the heirs. Now, my [one or two] several elder uncles, would that you assist in looking back to make concordant your ministers of the former dukes who served the former kings. Although your persons be on the outside, your hearts should never not be at the royal chamber. Therewith present solicitude of their approval and do not bequeath shame on me, the striping.

When the multitude of dukes had all heard the command, they saluted each other and hurriedly exited. The king removed his cap and restored his mourning clothes.

The ceremonial role that the “Gu ming” attributes to Grand Protector Shi, from leading the many lords into the final audience with King Cheng, to making the matching libation to the ancestors during King Kang’s coronation, to announcing the command to the new king, clearly shows him to have been the most honored official at this time, already some thirty years removed from the events commemorated by the Taibao gui. Moreover, not only did the Grand Protector live to ensure this smooth transition from the reign of King Cheng to that of King Kang, but, if the Bamboo Annals is correct, he lived almost to the end of this next reign. Although this requires a life-span of nearly one hundred years for him, it is at least partially substantiated by three more inscribed bronze vessels, all of which mention him and all of which almost certainly date to the reign of King Kang. Indeed, one of the three, the Zhou Da fangding (Sh 8:42:440; Figs. 7 and 8), serves as a “standard” for this reign by virtue of its posthumous reference to King Cheng.  

Zhou Da fangding

公乘鮑武王
The duke came from casting the King Wu
成王異鬻四
and King Cheng siding. It was the fourth
月既生霸已
month, after the growing brightness, ji-

Chou [day 26], the duke awarded Recorder
大白馬大揭
Da a white horse; Da extolled
皇天尹大保
august Heaven’s assistant the Grand Protector’s
宗用乍(作)且(祖)丁
grace, herewith making [for his] Grandfather Ding
寶蓮彝鼎
[this] treasured, sacrificial vessel. Family-sign.

The Grand Protector is extolled in this inscription as “heaven’s assistant” (tian yin). In the other two vessels dating from this period, he does not receive quite such an honorific accolade, but his actual treatment is perhaps even more honored. In both cases, highly placed officials dispatch subordinates to serve him, and he responds by awarding them gifts. The first of the two vessels, the Jin ding (Sh 51:1:449; Figs. 9 and 10), a vessel that is almost an exact duplicate of the King Kang “standard” Da Yu ding (12.61:647), commemorates one such mission initiated by the Lord of Yan, a son or grandson of the Grand Protector.  

Jin ding

匡侯令董鉈
The Lord of Yan commanded jin to feast
大保右宗周庚申
the Grand Protector in Zongzhou. On geoshu [day 57].
大保貳兪用乍(作)
the Grand Protector granted jin cowries; [he] herewith makes
大巴子癸薄彝鼎
for his eldest son Gui [this] treasured, sacrificial vessel. Family-sign.

The second of the vessels, an oddly-shaped vessel called the Shu tuoqi (Sh 2.6:77; Figs. 11 and 12), is important as the record of a similar mission initiated by one Wang Jiang. The identity of this Wang Jiang is central to one of the most important periodization problems in the study of early Western Zhou inscribed bronzes. While it is a question too complex to be resolved here, it seems safe to say that she was the queen of a Zhou king, probably King Kang.

Shu tuoqi

佐王令于周
It was when the king made ritual-entreaty at Zongzhou;
王姜史(使)叔於卜
Wang Jiang caused Shu to be deputed to the Grand
保貳叔鬽娶
Protector, [who] granted Shu sweet wine, white
metal and a zhù? ox. Shu responds to the Grand Protector's beneficence, herewith making [this] treasured, sacrificial vessel.

It is worth reiterating here that these last three vessels are important not only historically for the evidence they provide concerning the later career of Grand Protector Shi, but also historiographically for the development in bronze styles they manifest over the course of the Grand Protector's life, which, as we have seen, spanned the first two full generations of the young dynasty. Just as the Grand Protector helped to ensure a regular political succession, so too might this stylistic development be best characterized as a movement towards regularity. It is perceptible in both the calligraphy of the inscriptions and the shape and decor of the vessels. For instance, the disproportionately elongated graphs of the first years of the dynasty show evidence already by the reign of King Kang of evolving into a more nearly square, block-like shape. Consistent with this attention to the proportions of individual graphs, there is also a definite tendency towards proportional spacing of the inscription as a whole; in addition to well-defined vertical columns, horizontal rows also begin to emerge in the later inscriptions. With respect to vessel shape and decor, a comparison of the Lü ding, one of the earlier vessels of this set, and the Jin ding, perhaps its latest member, also clearly displays this tendency towards regularity (Figs. 5 and 9). It can be seen in at least three areas: first, the pronounced taotie design covering the entire body of the Lü ding gives way to a single band of decor under the lip of the later vessel; second, the extremely long, slender legs of the Lü ding are replaced with shorter, sturdier legs; and third, the tri-partite lobing of the Lü ding belly is also smoothed into one continuous curve. It is by allowing comparisons such as these to be made that the association of several vessels into a single set has become one of the most important methodologies in the study of Western Zhou bronzes, and the Taibao gui and its associated vessels rightfully have pride of place as perhaps the single most important set from the beginning of the dynasty.
GRAND PROTECTOR SHI AND THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE ZHOU CONQUEST

Notes

1. In addition to the vessels to be discussed here, important pieces found in locations other than the Zhou Shaanxi homeland include the "Yiyou Zi gui" (Sh 10:52:529; for this notation style, see note 2), discovered in Danu, Jiangsu, the "Kanghou gui" (Sh 4:14:141), discovered in either Jixian or Junxian, Henan, the "Ling gui" (Sh 6:24:255) and "Ling yi" (Sh 6:25:276), discovered near Luoyang, and various pieces cast by the Lord of Xing discovered throughout Hebei and Liaoning provinces (for which, see below, n. 44). It bears noting that almost all of these vessels date to the first reigns of the dynasty. Discoveries of late Western Zhou bronzes, with only a few insignificant exceptions, have been restricted to the area of modern Shaanxi. This distribution might suggest a diminished capacity on the part of the later Zhou kings to project their authority.

2. The vessel and its inscription were first published in Xu Zonggan’s (1796-1866) "Fushou jingshi" (preface dated 1843), and the inscription at least had been mentioned in most of the more important studies of Western Zhou bronzes. For sources published through 1963, see Shira-kawa Shizuka, Kimbun tsushoku, Hakatsuru h jitoku kauski, Fascicle 2, 1902, no. 3, p. 58ff (subsequent references to this work, which, in addition to providing Shirakawa’s own views also serves as a convenient compendium of previous research, will be in the form “Sh 2:3:58” and will follow in the text the first mention of each inscription.)

3. For an account of this donation and a study of the vessel and related vessels (including references to other sources not cited by Shirakawa), see Thomas Lawton, “A Group of Early Western Zhou Period Bronze Vessels,” Ars Orientalis, v. 10, 1975, pp. 111–21 and 190–92. For the most recent study of the vessel, see Chen Shou, “Taibao gui de fuchu he Taibao zhu qi,” Kung fu wen wu, 1980, no. 4, pp. 23–30.

4. The "Dafeng gui" now more often referred to as the "Tian Wang gui" (Sh 1:1:1), was and still is acknowledged by most scholars to date to the preceding reign of King Wu (r. 1049/45–1043), but it is also considered by many to predate King Wu’s conquest of Shang and thus to be "pre-dynastic"; see, for instance, Sun Zuoyun, “Shuo Tian Wang gui wei Wuwang mi Shang yijian tongqi,” Wenwu cankao ziliao, 1958, no. 1, pp. 57–64. The "Li gui" (Sh 50:Ho14:321), mentioned below, had at that time not yet been discovered.


6. The "Li gui" is dedicated to a "Duke of Dan" (Dan gong). Tang Lan, "Xi-Zhou shidai zui zao de yijian tongqi Li gui mingwen jieshi," Wenwu, 1977, no. 8, p. 8, has suggested that this danqin is equivalent to danqin on the basis of which he identifies this Duke of Dan with the figure Elker Da of Dan (Danbo Da) mentioned in several early texts as one of King Wu’s leading lieutenants. (The textual locus for Earl Da is the “Ke Yin” chapter of the Yi Zhouhu (Sibu beiyao ed., juan 4, p. 3b)). For an extended discussion of his historical significance, albeit in a different context, see Kaizuka Shigeki, “Shinsushitsu Dan-haku Tatsu ki kó,” Tóhô gekuhó, Kyoto, v. 8, 1937; repr. in Kaizuka Shigeki chosoku shi, Tokyo, 1977, v. 3, pp. 171–214. Tang brings the identification full-circle by proposing that Da, which means “penetrating,” and Li, the name of the caster of the "Li gui" and a word that means “sharp,” are related to one another as name (ming) and cognomen (s), so that Li may in fact be the historical figure Earl Da of Dan.

7. Duke Shi of Shao is best known as the namesake of two chapters of the Book of Documents, the "Shao gao," which records a report made by him to King Cheng (r. 1042/1035–1006), and the "Jun Shi," which records an address to him by the Duke of Zhou, and as the titular founder of the state of Yan, for which see the "Yan Shaogong shijia" chapter of the Shiji (Zhonghua shuju ed., juan 34, pp. 1549–50). As we will see below, he also figures importantly in the "Gu ming" chapter of the Book of Documents, a text that records the events surrounding the death of King Cheng and the inauguration of King Kang (r. 1005/1003–578).


9. In addition to the set of vessels organized around common reference to the Grand Protector, the Taibao gui belongs to another set as well, the vessels with which it was jointly discovered. As mentioned above, the vessel was originally discovered in the early nineteenth century in Liangshan, Shandong, one of a group of seven vessels that soon came to be known as the "Seven Vessels of Liangshan." All seven of the vessels appear to have been related to Grand Protector Shi in one way or another. The discovery included, in addition to the Taibao gui, two fangding also cast by him, both of which are inscribed simply, "Grand Protector cast" (Taibao shou). Three of the other vessels appear to be dedicated to him or to his descendants, who, like him, were referred to as lords of Shao, who were enfeoffed with the state of Yan, centered around presentday Peking. Of these, the longest inscription is on the Bo Xuan ding (Sh 8:40:425), a vessel probably datable to two generations after the Taibao gui: "It was the ninth month, after the growing brightness, xinyou [day 58], at Yan; the lord awarded Xian cowries and metal, and he] extolled the lord’s beneficence, herewith making [for] father Xin, Elker of Shao [this] treasure vessel. [May] Xian for ten-thousand years [have]
sons and grandsons to treasure [it] and gloriously [use:] sacrifice to the Grand Protector.” The final member of the “Seven Vessels of Liangshan” is certainly the earliest vessel of the group and probably also the most famous. It is the Xiaochen Yu zun, better known in the West as the “Brundage Rhino,” since it is part of the Avery Brundage Collection of the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco; see René Yvon d’Argencé, Chinese Treasures from the Avery Brundage Collection, San Francisco, 1968, p. 139. This is not a Western Zhou vessel at all, dating instead to the late Shang. There is at least some suggestion that the name of the Shang subject who cast this vessel is ancestral to the name of the territory granted to the Grand Protector and commemorated by him with the Taibo gui; see below, n. 15. Whatever the merits of this suggestion might be, it is entirely plausible that the “Brundage Rhino” was originally taken by the Grand Protector as a spoil of war, and in this manner found its way into the group of vessels buried by his descendants. For excellent studies of the “Seven Vessels of Liangshan,” see Lawton, “A Group of Early Western Chou Period Bronze Vessels,” and Chen Shou, “Taibo gui de fuchu.”


11. Most commentators agree that “Luzi” refers to Lufu, who, after the Zhou conquest, was installed by the Zhou as nominal leader of the Shang people, and who is generally referred to by the posthumous reign title Wu Geng. There is less agreement regarding the following graph, generally transcribed as sheng. Shirakawa, Sh 2:3:60, interprets it as the name of Luzi, citing an inscription reading, “The Son of Heaven Sheng makes (for) Father Ding (this vessel)” (for the vessel, see Wu Dacheng, Kehai jigu, [1896], June 21, p. 9), and contending that only a figure of Lufu’s stature would dare to appropriate the title of “Son of Heaven.”

12. The word zha occurs commonly in Western Zhou bronze inscriptions as an exclamatory particle, and its usage here is interpreted in that way by many; for example, Yang Shuda, Juejiu jinwen shuo, Beijing, 1959, p. 87. But the syntax suggests that it should be verbal and the meaning for the word given in the Shao wen, “to pluck and hold down” (cha bei ye), or, with Duan Yucai (1735–1815), “to pluck that below” (Shao wen jier Duan-zhu [Shu bieyao ed.], June 3B, p. 13a) is appropriate here.

13. For an excellent summation of the evidence available to interpret this difficult phrase, see Lawton, “A Group of Early Western Chou Bronze Vessels,” p. 119, n. 45.

14. The reading of this graph is problematic, with such suggestions as dao (dao, “to lead”; Wu Shifen, Jundu lu jinwen [preface dated 1895], v. 2, June 3, p. 82; yao (“to await”); Liu Xinyuan, Qigu lu jinwen shu, [preface dated 1902], June 3, p. 32); fai (“to entrust”; Guo Moruo, Liang-Zhou jinwen ci tatu zishu, 1935; rev. 2nd ed. Beijing, 1958, p. 27); and “to receive” (Lawton, “A Group of Early Western Chou Period Bronze Vessels,” p. 119, n. 46). However, none of these suggestions seems graphically defensible. Shirakawa, Sh 2:3:63–64, following Takada Tadachika (Takasuke), Kokuhon, Tokyo, 1925, June 4, p. 28b, points out that the graph has parallels with examples of yong (eternal), which, however, is normally a modifier. Since the context of this sentence is relatively clear, requiring that this word be a verb of praise, Shirakawa’s suggestion of a further parallel with the Warring States usage “eternally blessed” (et yong hu fu) seems appropriate, perhaps giving the verbal sense “to immortalize.”

15. Not only the location but even the correct transcription of this place name is open to question. It is generally rendered as yong and interpreted as the original form of xu, the name of a state allegedly located in southern Shandong province. In this regard, there is an interesting suggestion by Chen Shou, “Taibo gui de fuchu,” p. 25, that the name of this state is derived from the domain of Xiaochen Yu, the caster of the Xiaochen Yu zun or “Brundage Rhino” (for which, see above n. 9), which was discovered at Liangshan, Shandong, together with the Taibo gui. However, as Guo Moruo, Liang-Zhou jinwen ci tatu zishu, 27b, observes, the lower component of the graph here is “wood,” and is clearly distinct from the archaic form of xu; see, too, Loehr, “Bronzentexte,” pp. 33–34. Based on this observation, Shirakawa, Sh 2:3:65, suggests the reading song, which was the name of the state later associated with the Shang people.

16. The ten sons of King Wen, as given in the “Guan Cai shijia” chapter of the Shiji (June 35, p. 1570) are Kao, who died before the conquest; Fa, who became King Wu; Xian; Dan; the Duke of Zhou; Du; Zhenduo, Lord of Cao; Wu; Lord of Cheng; Chu; Feng, Lord of Kang; and Danji Zai. Although the Shiji and sources following it do not include Huoshu Chu among the brothers reputed to oversee the Shang domain, his commission to do so is clearly recorded in the “Zuo Luo” chapter of the Yi Zhoushu; see June 5, p. 7a.

17. The heritage of Grand Protector Shi has received remarkably little attention from historians, whether ancient or modern. Sima Qian (ca. 140–86 B.C.) remarked simply that “Duke Shi of Shao was of the same surname as Zhou” (Shiji, June 34, p. 1519). Ban Gu (A.D. 32–92) noted equally simply that “the Duke of Shao was the son of King Wen” (Baihu tong shuzheng [Zhongguo xizue mingzhu jicheng ed.], p. 383 [June 7, p. 14a]). Huangfu Mi (215–82) clarified this somewhat, stating that “the Duke of Shao was a secondary son (shizhao) of King Wen” (Duan shiji jicun, ed. Xu Zongyuan, Beijing, 1964, p. 86). That Shi was an elder (half)-brother of the Duke of Zhou is clearly stated in the Lunkeng of Wang Chong (ca. 27–97); see June 1, p. 12a. This last statement comes in a discussion of particularly long-lived historical figures; for some indication of Grand Protector Shi’s dates of birth and death, see below, n. 21. For an excellent discussion of his career, see too Pang Huaijing, “Ba Taibo yue—jianlun Shagong Shi de youguan wenti,” Kangyu wenwu, 1986, no. 1, pp. 70–73.
18. The earliest standard sources state that “King Cheng was in swaddling clothes” (tai baoqiang zhi zhang) at the time of King Wu’s death (Huainanzi, juan 21, p. 6b, and Shi ji, juan 33, p. 1518), however this would seem to be merely a euphemism to emphasize his youth. There are two conflicting traditions regarding his exact age at succession. In Jia Yi’s (201–169 B.C.) Xin shu, King Cheng’s age at accession is given as six sui (Xin shu [Sibu congkan ed.], juan 9, p. 12a). This is possibly corroborated by Zheng Xuan (A.D. 127–200), who stated in one place that King Cheng was born in the year after King Wen (r. 1099–1050) died (Mooshi chengvi, v. 8, juan 1, p. 2b). On the other hand, Zheng Xuan elsewhere gives his age at succession, after having fulfilled three years of mourning, as thirteen (Shangshu shu [Zheng-shi yishu ed.], juan 7, p. 5a). This figure is also given in Xu Shen (d. A.D. 146), Wujing yiji (Han-Wei yishu chao ed.), juan 2, pp. 3b-4a, which quotes an “Ancient Book of Documents” (Gu Shangshu). This debate is of some significance, bearing as it does on the recognized age of maturity in ancient China, the earlier of the two traditions suggesting a “capping” age for King Cheng of fifteen sui, and the latter twenty sui.

19. One of the more novel recent reinterpretations of Western Zhou history concerns whether the Duke of Zhou exercised this royal authority in the name of King Cheng, acting as his regent, or whether he actually arrogated unto himself the title of king. In a series of essays, Matsumoto Masaki has argued that references to the “king” (wugong) in several early chapters of the Book of Documents actually refer to the Duke of Zhou and not to King Cheng, as traditionally understood; see, for instance, “Shi k'o sokui k'o,” Shigaku zasshi, v. 77, no. 6, 1968, pp. 1–57. What is more, he has also suggested that the “king” mentioned in certain very early Western Zhou inscribed bronzes, such as the Taibao gui, also refers to the Duke of Zhou. While this is not the place to discuss this question in detail, since there is evidence on the one hand that King Cheng did personally participate in the suppression of the Wu Geng rebellion (see, for instance, the Bamboo Annals [Zhushu jinian] for the second through fifth years of his reign, a portion of this work that I regard as particularly reliable; see Edward L. Shaughnessy, “On the Authenticity of the Bamboo Annals,” Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, v. 46, no. 1, June 1986, pp. 166–75; esp. p. 170, n. 48), and evidence on the other hand that the Duke of Zhou was regularly referred to as “Zhonggong” in other inscribed bronze vessels cast in the course of this campaign (see below, n. 22), I believe that it is safe to conclude that at least in the inscription on the Taibao gui the term “king” must refer to King Cheng.


21. The Bamboo Annals says that King Wu was fifty-four sui when he died, in 1043 B.C. (for a convenient text, see James Legge, The Shoo King or the Book of Historical Documents, v. 3 of The Chinese Classics, 1883, repr., Hong Kong, 1960, Prolegomena 144), suggesting that he was born about 1095. The Duke of Zhou, who, among the royal siblings, was third in line after King Wu, probably would have been born no later than 1085. Since Grand Protector Shi is described as an elder (half-brother of the Duke of Zhou (Loucheng, juan 1, p. 12a; see above, n. 17), he must have been born slightly earlier. Another entry in the Bamboo Annals records the death of the Grand Protector in the twenty-fourth year of King Kang (982 B.C.; Legge, The Shoo King, Prolegomena 149), which, if accurate, suggests that he must have lived to be slightly more than one-hundred years old.

22. The Duke of Zhou’s role in the suppression of the Wu Geng rebellion, the only activity with which he is connected in bronze inscriptions, is mentioned in only three contemporary inscriptions, the Xinocheh Dan shi (Sh 3.9:89), the Qiu gui (Sh 3.10:103) and the Run jianfeng (Sh 3.10:115). For some discussion of the differing nature of the traditional historical sources and inscriptional sources regarding the Duke of Zhou, see Noel Barnard “Chou China: A Review of the Third Volume of Cheng Te-k’ui’s Archaeology in China,” Monumentis Seriatum, v. 24, 1965, pp. 337–54.

23. In addition to these several inscribed vessels, the Grand Protector is also mentioned on other types of artifacts from the early Western Zhou. Perhaps the best known of these is the Taibao yu ge, or, perhaps more properly, Lihou yu ge, a jade ge-dagger-axe also in the collection of the Freer Gallery. This artifact, apparently discovered in the late nineteenth century and said to have come from the tomb of Grand Protector Shi (K. Changji, Jia wen fenyu huan, [Yuyuan congke ed., 1930], juan 12, p. 12a; for further discussion of the artifact’s provenance together with interesting comments on its possible historical context, see Pang Huijing, “Ba Taibao yu ge,” pp. 70–73) bears an inscription of twenty-seven graphs, reading: “Sixth month, hingyi [day 3]: the king at Feng commanded the Grand Protector to inspect the southern states, to follow the Han [River] and to go out to convene the south. [He] commanded the Lord of Li to assist, using one-hundred infantrymen of X.” There is also a bronze dagger-axe, or perhaps a ji (pspear-axe), also in the Freer Collection that is inscribed on one side with the two graphs tai bao; see Rutherford J. Gettens, Roy S. Clarke, Jr. and W. T. Chase, “Two Early Chinese Bronze Weapons with Meteoritic Iron Blades,” Freer Gallery of Art Occasional Papers, v. 4, no. 1, 1971, pp. 66–67, where, however, the inscription is mistakenly read as ‘tan wang zhi zi.” For further discussion of this blade, including the suggestion that the words Taibao probably refer to a later successor to Grand Protector Shi, see Feng Zheng, “Guanyu Xi-Zhou chuqi Taibao Shidai yiyian qingtong hingyi,” Wenwu, 1977, no. 6, pp. 50–54.

24. By convention, inscribed vessels are named after the person for whom the vessel was cast. In this case, although the Protector (Roo) figures prominently in the inscription, it is clear that the vessel was not cast for him, but rather for a subordinate of his named Chuo. This point has been demonstrated conclusively by Shirakawa. In addition to his study and those cited by him, more recent studies of this inscription include Pingxin, “Bao you ming xinshi,” Zhenghua wenshi lunwang, 1979, no. 1, pp. 49–79; Sun Zhihe, “Bao you mingwen huishi,”

25. There have been two suggestions regarding the identity of the figure referred to here simply as “Bao.” Both Jiang Dayi and (Li) Pingxin argue that he is a figure who appears in other bronze inscriptions as “Ming Bao” and is described in one, the Ling yi, as “the Duke of Zhou’s son”; see Jiang Dayi, “Bao you ming kaoshi,” Zhonghua wenshi luncong, v. 5, 1964, p. 98, and Pingxin, “Bao you ming xin shi,” p. 49. Most other scholars, however, identify Bao with Grand Protector Shi see, for example, Huang Shengzhang, “Bao you ming de shidai yi shishi,” Kaogu xuebao, 1957, no. 3, pp. 57–59. Although Grand Protector Shi is usually referred to in both bronze inscriptions and literary documents as “Grand Protector” (taihun) when he is not instead called “Lord of Shao,” there are a number of cases where he is called simply “Protector” (bao). This, coupled with the evidence both inscriptive and literary concerning his suppression of the Wu Geng rebellion and especially of his attacks on the allied eastern states, clearly alluded to in this sentence, leaves no doubt that this “Bao” is indeed Grand Protector Shi.

26. Although Chen Mengjia, “Xi-Zhou tongqi duandai 1,” Kaogu xuebao, 1955, no. 9, p. 157, has interpreted this jido as a conjunction, such that “the king commanded Bao and the five lords of the Yin eastern states,” Huang Shouzhang, “Bao you ming de shidai yi shishi,” pp. 51–56, has demonstrated that the use of ji as a conjunction did not begin until much later. Ji is the pictograph of a hand grasping a man from behind, the original meaning being “to reach to,” “to apprehend”; for a discussion showing the word clearly to have this meaning in Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, see Li Xiaoding, Jingu wenti jishi, Taïpeï, 1965, Juan 3, pp. 915–18.

27. Most commentators punctuate as given here. Shirakawa Shizuka, however, punctuates after “states,” interpreting wu as a placename, giving a figure named “Archer-lord Chuo of Wu” as the subject of the following sentence; see Sh 4.16:181ff. See, too, Sun Zhichu, “Bao you mingwen huishi,” p. 194, and, for a slightly different interpretation, Pingxin, “Bao you ming xin shi,” pp. 62–63. Although this interpretation is one way to resolve the grammatical requirements of the next sentence, not only is there no grammatical need to regard “Chuo” as anything other than a single name, but there is no evidence of any kind for a state named Wu.

28. Many commentators have regarded chuo here as an “empty word” with no meaning. However, such an interpretation leaves the sentence devoid of a subject. Therefore, Chuo can only be interpreted as a proper name, and as such is not only the subject of this sentence but also the name of the person for whom the vessel was cast. For further discussion of this interpretation, see below; see, too, Xia Hanyi, “Jianlun Bao you de zuohe wenti.”

29. Guo Moruo, “Bao you ming shiwen,” Kaogu xuebao, 1958, no. 1, pp. 1–2, interprets xiang as a phonetic loan for huang (“waste,” “to lay waste”), the object of which, “six types” (liu pin), he takes to be Yin and the five lords.

A far more plausible interpretation is to read xiang as the original form of huang (“to give,” “to confer”), as in the inscription on the Zhe jong (Sh 50.Ho15:373):… ling zhoue Zhe huang Wanggu yu Juhou (“commanded Recorder Zhe to be given Wang Grounds by the Lord of Ju”). As Guo himself demonstrates, the word jiu was commonly used in early Western Zhou inscriptions to enumerate such different types of awards as jade, men, and lands. Although the referent is not specified here, it is clear that it enumerates the award given to Chuo. For the grammar of the phrase, see, below, n. 31.

30. The graph han is usually transcribed as li, but Guo Moruo, “Bao you ming shiwen,” p. 1, has pointed out that although the graph did later come to be written as li, on the basis of this inscription and Shang oracle-bone inscrip- tional precedents, the original graph must have been written with the phonetic gan. The exact meaning of the compound me han, which is extremely common in early Western Zhou bronze inscriptions, remains unclear despite considerable etymological speculation; see Zhou Fugao, Jingshi gugua, Tongling Kong, 1957, printed in, p. 9495. The general meaning “to praise military achievements” is, however, fairly clear from the contexts in which the term usually appears.

31. In archaic Chinese, just as in standard classical Chinese, post-verbal yao can serve to indicate a passive sentence, the agent of the action being the object of yu. For a brief study of this grammatical feature, see Yang Wuming, “Xi-Zhou jinwen beidong jushi jianlun,” Guwenzi yanjiu, v. 7, 1982, pp. 309–17.

32. The various dating notations found in this inscription combine both Shang and Zhou conventions. The “great event” year-notation “meeting with the four regions convoking at the king’s great sacrificial offering in Zhou” plausibly refers to an entry in the Bamboo Annals for the fourth year of King Cheng, the year immediately following the final suppression of the rebellion of Wu Geng and the eastern states, which reads, “in the spring, first month, for the first time audience was held in the temple”; see, for instance, Legge, The Shoo King, Prolegomena 145. This inference seems to be confirmed by the month, lunar-phase, and day-notation, “jiunao [day 52] ... second month, after the full moon,” which roughly fits the calendar of 1039 B.C., the fourth year of King Cheng’s official reign (inclusive of the Duke of Zhou’s regency), jiunao being the twenty-fourth day of that month.


34. Already by the Northern Song dynasty, Lü Dalin (1046–92) had observed in his Kaogu tu that Shang inscriptions could be differentiated from Zhou inscriptions by their use of tiaogun in the names of ancestors; see Kaogu tu (1752 Yizheng tang ed.), Juan 1, p. 4b and Juan 4, p. 26a. While it has subsequently become clear that this observation is not relevant for periodization, such dedications appearing in many vessels obviously cast during the Western Zhou period as, for instance, on the now well known Shi Qiang pen (Sh 50.Ho15:395) and other vessels of the Wei-familly cache (for the discovery of this cache, see Shaanxi Zhouyuan kaogudui,
“Shaanxi Fufeng Zhuangbo yihao Xi-Zhou qing tongqi kucang faje jianbao,” Wenwu, 1978, no. 3, pp. 1–16; for an English translation, see Chinese Archaeological Abstracts, 2: Prehistoric to Western Zhou, ed. Albert E. Dien, Jeffrey K. Riegel, and Nancy T. Price, Los Angeles, 1985, pp. 512–29), still it does seem to manifest a deep-rooted ethnocentric difference between these two peoples. A slight modification of this traditional interpretation would suggest that Shi Qiang and his tiangan-designated ancestors were originally descended from a Shang or related eastern people, which the inscription on the Shi Qiang pen, in fact, confirms. By the same token, the dedication of the Chuo you to Father Gui would seem to suggest that Chuo, too, was of Shang or eastern ancestry.

35. It would, perhaps, be possible to suggest, as has been done in another context, that the Shang king Di Xin visited the Zhou capital and conducted sacrifices there (see, for example, Fan Yuzhou, “Shihun mie Shang yiqian de Shang-Zhou guanzhi,” Shixue yuwen, 1981, no. 1, p. 15), but against this interpretation, see Edward L. Shaughnessy, “Zhouyuan Oracle-Bone Inscriptions: Entering the Research Stage?” Early China, v. 11–12, 1985–87, pp. 159–62. Such a suggestion has, properly, never been made in the case of this inscription.

36. See, above, n. 31.

37. For a convenient listing of these vessels, see Sh 4.16: 184–87. Particularly important in this regard is a Chuo ding, the provenance of which is discussed in Rong Geng, Shu zhai yiqian tu lu, Peking, 1936, p. 14. Although Shirakawa properly notes the relationship between the family-name seen in these vessels and that in the Chuo you, due to his curious interpretation of wu in line 2 of the Chuo you inscription as a placename (see above, n. 27), he misses the obvious geographically relationship between them. For a more thorough study of this question, see Xia Hanyi, “Jianlun Bao de zhouze wenti.”

38. The vessel is very similar in appearance to the Xianhou ding (Sh 7.29:335), the inscription of which mentions King Cheng as reigning king, for which reason it serves as a “standard” for that reign.

39. Because of its uncomplicated grammar and vocabulary, this inscription has received relatively little attention. In addition to the discussion by Shirakawa, there is also an annotated translation by Loehr, “Bronzentexte,” pp. 51–58, and brief remarks by Guo Moruo, Liang-Zhou jiwen ci daxu tuolu kaoshi, p. 27a, and Chen Mengjia, “Xi-Zhou tongqi duandai 1,” p. 170.

40. For the archaic usage of “lai Verb” meaning “to come from Verb-ing,” see Loehr, “Bronzentexte,” p. 53; see, too, Chen Mengjia, Yinxu beiu songshu, Beijing, 1956, p. 304.

41. As is customary in very early Western Zhou bronze inscriptions, a complete date notation of the sort found in later inscriptions is not recorded here. However, it is perhaps possible to combine the information that is provided with some inferences about the historical background of this vessel and the ritual practices of the early Zhou to arrive at a possible date for this vessel. In the discussion of the date of the Chuo you above (n. 32), it was pointed out that the Bamboo Annals records the final suppression of the eastern rebellion in the third year of the reign of King Cheng, and also a convocation of the feudal lords in the next year. If it is assumed that the Grand Protector “came from attacking the rebelling Yi” in the year of this convocation, and that he would have chosen an auspicious day to make the award to Li, then it may not be coincidental that gongshen was the fei day (the day on which the new moon is first visible, perhaps regarded as the first day of the month at the beginning of the Western Zhou) of the eleventh month of 1059 B.C., the fourth year of King Cheng’s reign.

42. There is no agreement as to the location of this “Zhou garrison.” Fang Junyi, Zhuai zhai yi qi kuanxi kaoshi, Shanghai, 1935, juan 4, p. 2, suggests that it is to be identified with Zhouzhi county of Shaanxi province, located midway between the Zhou ancestral home at Qishan and its capital at present-day Xi’an, and a name that was already well attested for this area by the Han dynasty. On the other hand, Shirakawa Shizuka, Sh 25.75, without offering any historical-geographical evidence, argues that it must have been located in the just subdued eastern region. The interpretation of lai fa as “to come from attacking” in the great event year-notation would seem to support the Shaanxi location.

43. The He zun was originally excavated in 1965, but its 129-graph inscription, almost certainly the longest inscription of King Cheng’s reign, was not discovered until a layer of covering patina was cleaned away in 1976. The inscription records an address made by the king upon the completion of the eastern capital at Luoyang, and is in many ways extremely reminiscent of the “Da gao” and “Duo shi” chapters of the Book of Documents. Studies of this inscription, in addition to those abstracted by Shirakawa, include Ma Chengyuan, “He zun mingwen he Zhoucha shishii,” in Wang Guawei xueshu yanjiu lunji, ed. Wu Ze, Shanghai, 1983, pp. 45–61; Michael F. Carson, “Some Grammatical and Graphical Problems in the Ho Tsun Inscription,” Early China, v. 4, 1978–79, pp. 41–44; The Great Bronze Age of China, pp. 203–4; and Li Xueqin, “He zun xinshi,” Zhongyuan wenwu, 1981, no. 1, pp. 35–39, 45.

44. One of the first such enfeoffments is commemorated in the inscription of the well-known Kanghou gao. This vessel, reportedly discovered in 1931 either in Jixian or Junxian, Henan, and presently in the British Museum in London, became one of the first Western Zhou bronze vessels to attract attention in the West when it was displayed at the Burlington Exposition in London in 1956; see, for instance, Percival Yeets, “An Early Chou Bronze,” Burlington Magazine, 1937, pp. 147–77; and Herrlee Glessner Cleavel, The Birth of China, New York, 1957, p. 234. The importance of the vessel has continued to be recognized, primarily because of the inscription’s mention of the Lord of Kang, the ninth of King Wen’s ten sons and a figure who also appears in several chapters of the Book of Documents. Studies of this inscription that have appeared since the publication of Shirakawa’s omote renda (Sh 4.14.14) include Zhang Guangyuan, “Xi-zhou kanghou gao kaoshi—jianlun Wei Liu didian ji Zhouchu

A more detailed record of eneoffensive is available in the inscription on the Mai zun (Sh 11.60:628), apparently cast in the first years of King Cheng’s reign. The inscription records the establishment of the state of Xing, located at the site of present-day Xingtai in southern Hebei province, and the appointment of the lord of a state in the vicinity of Luoyang to administer it. For a study of this inscription, including a complete translation, see Edward L. Shaughnessy, “Historical Geography and the Extent of the Earliest Chinese Kingdoms,” Asia Major, 3rd series, v. 2, no. 2, 1989, pp. 19–20.

45. Shi ji, juan 4, p. 134.

46. For previous translations of the “Gu ming,” see Legge, The Shoo King, pp. 544–61, and Bernhard Karlgren, The Book of Documents, Stockholm, 1950, pp. 70–74. While both of these heavily annotated translations (for Karlgren’s annotations, see his Glosses on the Book of Documents, Stockholm, 1970) are representative of the best scholarship of their days, it has seemed desirable here to offer a fresh translation. However, since the purpose of this quotation is primarily to illustrate the role Grand Protector Shi played in the first smooth transition of Zhou rule, except for explanations of textual emendations, I forego the detailed philological apparatus that might be expected of a finished translation.

47. I here delete mao3 as a probable commentator’s gloss on tong1, which, as Yu Fan (170–239) suggested, must originally have been written similarly to mao1. The meaning “chalice” for tong follows the gloss of Zheng Xuan (127–200). Karlgren’s argument that this graph derives from a misreading of a putative original form of jia1 is also plausible, but the reading of zun1 (ladle) for mao1 seems less well supported. For a thorough discussion of this problem, including the readings of previous commentators, see Karlgren, Glosses on the Book of Documents, pp. 166–67, Gl. 1998.

48. I here emend the text to read yi1 cao2 ji2 ji1, adding the ji1 ji2 from the following text. I suspect that that text, which repeats almost identically this text, is the result of an inadvertent copyist’s error. I suspect, too, that the word shai2 after ji1 ji2 was originally a commentator’s note explaining jie2 and has been inadvertently assimilated into the text.

49. For bu2 sheng1 here I read fu2, as suggested by Karlgren, Glosses on the Book of Documents, pp. 170–71, Gl. 2009.

50. For de here I read te2 yi1, as originally suggested by Yu Yue (1821–1906) and followed by Karlgren (Glosses on the Book of Documents, pp. 171–72, Gl. 2011).

51. The Zuoer Du fangding was part of the major cache discovered in 1929 just outside of Luoyang that also included the famous and controversial Ling yi1, Ling zun1, and Ling gui1. It is now also part of the Freer Gallery collection. For the most recent discussion of this important discovery, see Noel Barnard, “The Nieh Ling Yu,” The Journal of the Institute of Chinese Studies of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, v. 9, no. 2, 1978, pp. 585–627. For other translations of the inscription on the Zuoer Du fangding, see Loehr, “Bronzenteexte,” pp. 81–91, and John A. Pope, R. J. Gettens, J. Cahill, and N. Barnard, The Freer Chinese Bronzes, Volume One, Washington, 1967, pp. 194–95. A study of this discovery and its historiographical significance, to be entitled “The ‘Ling yi’ and the Kang Gong” will appear as an appendix in my forthcoming “Sources of Western Zhou History.”

52. There is no question that the graph written here is ci1 (“thorn”), which both Guo Moruo and Chen Mengjia have shown to be a plausible phonetic loan for shi1, the name of the Grand Protector; see Guo Moruo, Liang-Zhou jiuwenci daxi tulu kaoshi, p. 33b, and Chen Mengjia, “Xi-Zhou tongqi duandai III,” Kaogu xuebao, 1956, no. 1, p. 88. Nevertheless, as Yang Shuda, fajueji jiuwen shuo, pp. 164–65, has argued, the syntax here would suggest instead the word lai1 (“to come”), the shape of which is extremely similar. Moreover, as Yang has also pointed out, if the “duke” is to be referred to by both title and name here, consistency would suggest that the reference to him in the fourth line, “the duke awarded Recorder . . . ,” would also include his name. Since it does not, it seems reasonable to assume a slight miswriting of lai1 here. An identical case seems to occur at the beginning of the inscription on the Kanghou gui: wang3 ci1 lai1 fo shang3 yi1 (“the king came from attacking the Shang city”).

53. It is not clear what the term yiding means. Guo Moruo, Liang-Zhou jiuwenci daxi tulu kaoshi, p. 33b, based on an alternative form contained in the Shuo wen (juan 1A, p. 5a), suggests that yi3 is the original form of yi1. Chen Mengjia, “Xi-Zhou tongqi duandai III,” pp. 87–88, on the other hand, suggests on the basis of the Guangyuan (juan 5, p. 41a) definition of yi1 that it is a type of large ding1. Chen further suggests that the two Taihao fangding found among the “Seven Vessels of Liangshan” each represented the first of a pair of vessels, the second vessels of which would have read “King Wu vessel” and “King Cheng vessel,” respectively, and that it was the casting of these vessels that is referred to here. In support of this, there is a Cheng Wang fangding in the Nelson Gallery of Art in Kansas City that is roughly similar in appearance to the one Taihao fangding that is still extant.

54. The Jin ding was discovered in 1975 in Luihe, just to the southwest of Beijing and the site of the ancient capital of Yan, established by the family of Grand Protector Shi. For publications of this vessel, see Zhongguo gu qingtouxi xuan, Beijing, 1975, p. 25; and Yan Wan, “Beijing Liaoning chutong qingyu zuouchu de yan,” Kaogu, 1975, no. 5, pp. 274–79 and 270. For another inscribed bronze vessel related to the state of Yan, see, above, n. 9.

55. According to Chen Mengjia, “Xi-Zhou tongqi duandai III,” p. 65, in 1951 this vessel was in the possession of the Zhejiang Provincial Committee for the Management of Cultural Relics, stored together with a number of forgeries. Based upon his personal inspection, Chen determined that the vessel was in fact authentic. Aside from Chen and Shirakawa’s brief comments, however, the inscription has received no other attention.

57. Chen Mengjia, “Xi-Zhou tongqi duandai III,” p. 65, offers the transcription zhu(?) for this graph without further comment. Shirakawa, Sh 2.6:82, notes that while the graph is unrecognizable, the context suggests that it should represent the color of the ox.
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Fig. 1. Taibao gui. Reign of King Cheng (1040 B.C.). Bronze. Freer Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. (After Lawton, "A Group of Early Western Chou Period Bronze Vessels," *Ars Orientalis*, v. 10, 1975, pl. 1, fig. 1.)
Fig. 2. The Taihao gui inscription. (After Shang Zhou qingtongqi mingwen xuan, v. 1, Beijing, 1986, p. 23, pl. 36.)
Fig. 3. Chou you. Reign of King Cheng (1039 B.C.). Bronze. Shanghai Museum. (After Chen Mengjia, "Xi-Zhou tongqi duandai 1," Kaogu xuehui, 1955, no. 9, pl. 1.)
Fig. 4. The Chuoyou inscription. (After Shang Zhou qingtongqi mingwen xuan, v. 1, p. 22, pl. 33.)
Fig. 5. *Lü ding*. Reign of King Cheng (1039 B.C.?). Bronze. The History Museum, Beijing. (After Chen Mengjia, "Xi-Zhou tongqi duandai I," pl. 10.)
Fig. 6. The Lü ding inscription. (After *Shang Zhou qingtongqi mingwen xuan*, v. 1, p. 42, pl. 74.)
Fig. 8. The Zuoce Da fangding inscription. (After Shang Zhou qingtongqi mingwen xuan, v. 1, p. 77, pl. 165.)
Fig. 9. *jiu ding*. Reign of King Kang (ca. 1000 B.C.). Bronze. Beijing Metropolitan Cultural Relics Bureau. (After Zhongguo gu qingtongqi xuan, Beijing, 1975, pl. 25.)
Fig. 10. The *Jin ding* inscription. (After *Shang Zhou qingtongqi mingwen xuan*, v. 1, p. 26, pl. 47.)
Fig. 12. The Shu tuoqi inscription. (After Chen Mengjia, "Xi-Zhou tongqi duandai III," p. 67.)
SHEN NANPIN'S JAPANESE ROOTS

By HIDEKI KONDÔ

Japanese art historians have long been interested in the impact of Chinese painting styles on artists of the Edo period. One major line of approach to such problems has been the study of the Nagasaki painters, that group of Japanese artists who were living in the only city open to foreign trade during the Edo period. The artists in Nagasaki were among the first to come into contact with the few Chinese artists who visited Japan and were also familiar with the relatively large number of Chinese paintings that were exported to Japan on the trading ships. There have been a number of exhibitions in recent years devoted to the Chinese artists and Chinese paintings that were brought to Japan as well as numerous studies of the works of Japanese artists influenced by such works.¹

I would like to reconsider a number of problems related to the work of one of the most important of the Chinese artists to visit Japan, Shen Nanpin (Shen Quan, eighteenth century), who arrived in Nagasaki from China in 1731.² Although he was only to stay in Japan for two years, his work left a lasting impact on Japanese painting.³ While most scholars agree that Shen Nanpin’s work had an important impact on Japanese painting of the Edo period, there is much controversy over the nature of that impact. A number of scholars have argued that the main appeal of Nanpin’s work was to be found in its use of realism—a realism that they believed clearly traced its roots to Western elements introduced into Chinese painting in the late Ming period. It is my conviction that such evaluations of the work of Shen Nanpin are in error, and in this essay I will show that the true sources of that realism, which had such an impact on Japanese painters of the Edo period, can be found within the native Chinese tradition. While the sources of Shen Nanpin’s orthodox realism can be found in Buddhist painting and in flower and bird painting of the Song dynasty, it also had been influenced by the bird and flower painting styles of the Ming academy, particularly efforts to recreate the expressive methods of Lü Ji (1477–?). Shen Nanpin had reworked those traditional elements to create his own style, which proved to have a tremendous appeal among contemporary Japanese painters.⁴ I will compare the paintings of Shen Nanpin and Lü Ji, and also look at paintings that come out of the Buddhist painting styles typical of Zhejiang as a way of considering the traditional elements in Shen Nanpin’s works and his technical levels of accomplishment.

One of the major difficulties in studying the Chinese painters who worked in Japan during the Edo period is the fact that few of them were well known in their own country. As a result later Japanese scholars have often assumed that the works of such artists were inferior to those of even minor painters working in a contemporary period in China. However, among such Chinese artists who visited Japan during the Edo period, Shen Nanpin is a clear exception to such general assumptions. When Shen Nanpin returned to China after his short two-year stay in Japan, his work was highly praised by leading literati of his own day. I will be referring to comments by some contemporary critics that I introduced in an earlier essay,⁵ as a way of illustrating this point.

Chinese Orthodox Realism: The Visual Elements

Kohara Hironobu was one of the first scholars to note the stylistic similarities between the works of Shen Nanpin and Lü Ji. In a discussion of Shen’s painting of Rabbits and Plums in the Snow (Fig. 1) now in the Hashimoto collection, he wrote, “In composition Shen studied the works of Lü Ji, and we can thus see that in his painting Shen Quan [Shen Nanpin] has selected Lü Ji as his starting point.”⁶

The painting Birds and Flowers of Four Seasons in the Tokyo National Museum, which is generally recognized as one of Lü Ji’s master works, reveals the distinguished technical skills and artistic sense of the artist, but the traditional estimations of Lü Ji’s works in the history of Chinese painting have been unusually low. In spite of the fact that there are a number of well-known works by other artists bearing the notation “after the style of Lü Ji,”(fang Lü Ji), critical works on Chinese painting have given little attention to the works of Lü Ji. Is it because of certain special characteristics embodied in his style that general critics have neglected his work? In searching for an explanation, we should consider some of the following factors. First is the fact that he was a
professional painter and so attacked. Second, he was a native of Yin county (present day Ningbo), and as a result was regarded by later critics as a member of the Zhejiang school of painting and seems to have been included in Dong Qichang's general attack on the Zhe school of painting. Although Lin Liang (early sixteenth century), who served in the Renzhi Dian at the same time, was also a professional painter, he was a skilled poet, and his work was highly regarded by many of the literati of his day. Lü Ji did not share Lin Liang's skills as a poet, nor was he so accomplished in the techniques of realistic drawing as to startle contemporaries.

It was, however, Lü Ji whose style Shen Nanpin chose to study. In doing so we can imagine that he made his choice out of a desire similar to that of Lü Ji, that is, to paint reality rather than ideal types and to stress painting rather than the other literati skills. With regard to the first of these, we have already noted that Shen Nanpin worked within and further developed the Chinese realistic tradition that can be traced back to the bird and flower painting of the Song dynasty. It is therefore only natural that we can note certain similarities to the work of one of the Ming masters of bird and flower painting, Lü Ji. With regard to the second factor, Shen Nanpin's lack of interest in the literary elements, it is important to note that there are no known literary records from the hand of Shen Nanpin. Not only are there no records of poems composed by the artist, but none of his own paintings bear inscriptions by him, nor are there any known paintings by other artists with Shen's inscriptions. So, we will be looking at a section of a painting that is generally recognized as one of the most representative works of Lü Ji, Winter from the group of Birds and Flowers of the Four Seasons (Fig. 2).

First, composition: The composition is constructed of a number of very complicated elements, combined with a great deal of resourcefulness. Although attention has been given to the decorative effect, the meeting of the lines (particularly curved lines) give a feeling of great depth. In painting the subjects that need to be in the foreground, care is given also to the sheltered details in the background, for example, the dry grass in front of the pheasant or the branch of the plum tree projecting in front of the perch for the four sparrows.

Second, line: Our attention is drawn to the length of the lines, which are graceful and at the same time strong.

Third, color: The colors are used with exquisite taste, and to great decorative effect. Particularly effective are the use of red, green and white. These three colors are like cosmetics, bringing to life the surface of the painting. We can see the red accents in the petals of the camellia, the cheeks of the pheasant, the red of the berries on the tree. Green appears in the leaves of the camellia and the bamboo, and the feathers of the pheasant. White is in the plum blossoms and in the snow piled up on the tree branches and in the rocks.

Fourth, subject: Birds and flowers of the various seasons are grouped together to give the essence of each season. Throughout the series all the birds that serve as major subjects appear in pairs, with various small birds in the space at the top of the painting. In the case of the Winter, unlike the other three segments, the movement of the smaller birds is much subdued.

Let us now turn to a comparison of Shen Nanpin's painting with that of Lü Ji. We will be taking for comparison the painting Rabbits and Plums in the Snow (Fig. 1), which is representative of Shen Nanpin's early paintings. Kohara Hironobu has argued for the importance of this painting. I also believe this painting should be given a key role in any discussion of Shen Nanpin's work and accordingly would like to consider it in some depth in the discussion that follows.

First, composition: Although the composition is also very resourceful, it is not as lively as that of Lü Ji. There are a number of unfilled areas in the painting, which seem to be transformed into a feeling of spaciousness.

Second, line: There is an effective use of restrained lines. On this point we can see a clear difference in the personality of the two artists. Shen's lines, however, share the same strength that characterized the work of Lü Ji.

Third, color: As we find in the painting of Lü Ji, the main colors used are red, green and white, used in concert and reverberating with each other.

Fourth, subject: Birds have been replaced with rabbits, but in all other respects elements in the painting are alike.

The greatest similarity between the two paintings, however, is in their common attempt to create a small universe within the limited space of the painting surface. What we see in the paintings is not just a small section of the natural world. To use an exaggeration, in that world the birds and flowers have more than simply a symbolic significance.
I have put so much stress up to this point on the similarities between Shen Nanpin’s work and the works of Lü Ji because so much commentary has strongly stressed the Western influence on Shen Nanpin’s painting style. I personally question whether we can in fact see such Western influences in the work of Shen Nanpin. On the contrary, it seems to me that we can see his work as standing in the middle of traditional Chinese painting styles. Tsuruta Takeyoshi has asserted, “We can think of Nanpin as a painter who was originally a follower of Yun Shouping’s Changzhou school of bird and flower painting who later added to that the realistic techniques of Western-style painting as seen in his careful painting of flowers and grass.”

There are like references, such as the following: “The sharp representation of birds and flowers which came as the result of the introduction of Western painting methods must have seemed very fresh to the eyes of contemporary Japanese and was responsible for his great popularity; after he returned to China he sent many paintings to Japan.”

With regard to the introduction of Western stylistic elements, among Shen Nanpin’s contemporaries there were others who were also known for their use of realism. One of the standard critical texts has the following to say about Yu Xing (act. during the Qianlong reign), for instance:

After studying with Jiang Tingxi, during the Qianlong period he was in the Imperial Academy with Tangdai and Zhou Kun. He was skilled in painting flowers, birds, insects and fish. He used Western techniques for use of the brush and painted gorgeous pictures using bright colors. He was most skilled in painting butterflies and was also accomplished in painting orchids, bamboo and narcissus: one of his paintings has an imperial inscription and is included in Shi qu baoji [Qianlong’s Catalogue].

Since he studied with Jiang Tingxi (1669–1732), we can assume that he had some familiarity with Western painting techniques. However, the extant paintings of Yu Xing themselves, among them, Flowers, Birds and Animals after Liu Yongqian (Fig. 3), do not reveal any elements that can be clearly identified as coming from the use of Western techniques. This is very clear if we compare Yu Xing’s paintings with those of the Italian artist Lang Shining (1688–1766), who was also working in the Imperial Academy during the Qianlong period. Shen Nanpin’s paintings clearly fall into the same category as those of Yu Xing. Thus, Naruse Fujio, as early as 1981, denied the presence of Western elements in Shen Nanpin’s style, stating: “His [Nanpin’s] paintings are often said to show the influence of Western art that reached China in the Ming-early Qing period; But in my view, this is incorrect. Since we know that Nanpin’s work had an influence on Akita Ranga and on Shiba Kokan, this view is still often expressed; however, all of his expressive methods can be explained by reference to the Chinese tradition.”

I am in complete agreement with that view.

As I have already argued elsewhere, when Shen was young he followed the style of Ni Zan (1301–74), and later constructed a “new style.” But does this “new style” really refer to Western painting techniques? Of course not! While it was certainly quite possible that Shen Nanpin was familiar with Western methods of painting, that does not necessarily mean that he chose to incorporate them in his own work. Needless to say, Shen Nanpin undoubtedly had the opportunity to come into contact with Western techniques of painting. From a poem included in the tenth volume of the Changyinge shishu we know that in 1780 (Qianlong 45) Shen produced a joint work with Lu Can. Lu Can had painted a portrait of the emperor that was presumably painted using Western painting techniques. Although there are literary records describing such joint works, to my knowledge none of the paintings survive. All the works by Shen himself clearly show a strong foundation in realistic depiction with the individual elements arranged for a decorative effect, characteristics also observed in the work of Lü Ji.

We also have Kanda Kiichirō’s belief that from Cui Hui (Xiangzhou; eighteenth century), “he learned the untraditional secrets related to painting human figures, and that this presumably refers to the study of Western painting methods of Jiao Bingzhen.” Kanda goes on to comment, “With this I believe we have clarified to some measure the roots of Shen Nanpin’s realistic style of painting.” I do not believe that we can so clearly identify Western influences on Shen Nanpin’s painting style.

Yamakawa Takeshi has written the following:

The classicism we can identify in Shen Nanpin is related to the classicism that runs at the base of the Ming-Qing period calling for a return to the classics of the Northern Song. This classicism found new elements born out of the tradition, and in this sense Nanpin was a classicist in the orthodoxy meaning of that term. Moreover, in Asian society where the classical tradition has such strong roots, it was quite common for new tides of thought to appear in the form of a call for the
return to tradition. In that sense, Shen Nanpin was not just a conservative of the old school but was rather a reformer who was looking to discover an early modern realistic expression (including influences of Western painting methods) within the classical forms of the Northern Song tradition.\textsuperscript{14}

To grasp those elements of Shen Nanpin’s work, it is essential to turn again to an examination of Lü Ji’s paintings. Through our comparison of the various elements in the works of the two artists, we can achieve a sense of the pictorial world that Lü Ji was trying to create and discover similarities with the pictorial world of Shen Nanpin. Naturally, one can point to certain elements in Shen’s paintings that seem to reflect characteristics of Northern Song bird and flower painting, and I would agree with those observations. In order to understand Shen Nanpin’s paintings, we need to keep both factors in mind.

One further factor that we must consider is the composition and content of the Southern Song style of Buddhist painting and the degree to which Shen Nanpin had mastered those techniques. In Shen’s native region of Zhejiang, I presume that there were still those who followed the Southern Song style of Buddhist painting. Shen’s teacher was said to be one Hu Bi (early eighteenth century),\textsuperscript{15} and Hu seems to have been influenced by the work of the late seventeenth century artist Lan Tao (Figs. 4–6). So if we assume that that was so, then we may also be able to find the influences of Lan Tao in Shen Nanpin’s work.\textsuperscript{16} I am convinced from the visual evidence that elements of such Buddhist style painting had a strong impact on Shen’s painting style and the pictorial world he was trying to create. We can see the continuation of this Zhejiang Buddhist painting style, particularly its use of a wealth of colors, in Nanpin’s paintings (Figs. 7 and 8). The visual evidence from Shen’s works suggests that he studied the combination of subject and decorative motifs from this style of painting, and this would seem to be the source of one of the main distinctions between Nanpin and other bird and flower painters.

Within Zhejiang Buddhist painting, particularly within the paintings of the Lohans, we can see an unusual way of treating the subjects. While certainly much technical attention is given to the decorative aspects of the work, at the same time this does not interfere with the clarity of the presentation of the main subjects, the Lohan. That is to say, different methods are used to represent the background and the central subjects.

In painting the background, artists working in this tradition made use of such traditional methods of realism as \textit{cun} (texturizing strokes) and shading, while in painting the main subjects they made use of strong lines to outline the figures, which were filled in with color applied very evenly, giving the bodies a kind of silhouette effect. We can see many elements in Shen Nanpin’s works that use the same techniques. For example, let us compare Jin Dashou’s (late twelfth century) painting of the Sixteen Lohan (Figs. 9 and 10) with Shen’s \textit{Rabbits and Plums in the Snow} (Fig. 1). We can see that Shen Nanpin’s work follows the same composition, replacing the main subject of Lohan with animals but using the same background. Shen’s painting, like that of the Lohan, gives the feeling of calmness, and there is striking similarity in the techniques and use of colors.

\textbf{Shen Nanpin: Biographical Dimensions}

Our images and critical evaluations of an artist’s work are partly the result of our own immediate response to the work of that artist but also partly a product of what we may know from a variety of contemporary accounts and later critical reviews. Later reviews of the work of Shen Nanpin have been greatly colored by much confusion on both counts. In the following sections I would first like to consider several of the literary sources that have been used by scholars to provide evidence about the life of Shen Nanpin and that have served as one of the bases of critical evaluation of his works. Let us turn to questions of the image we have of Shen Nanpin as a person. Among the comments of earlier scholars, we have the following assertions made by Kanda Kiichirō: “When Shen Nanpin visited Shang Pan with other guests including Wang Mingsheng and Li Guo, the four sat on rocks around a tree-shaded spring, passing the day in splendid conversation in an effort to forget the heat. Perhaps Shen Nanpin, more than the impression one might get from his paintings, seemed to be a gentleman of elegant taste.” But it would seem that Kanda Kiichirō may have misunderstood Shen Nanpin’s paintings. It is the last part of his comment here that draws our attention, “Perhaps Shen Nanpin, more than the impression one might get from his paintings, seemed to be a gentleman of elegant taste.”

The fact that Shen Nanpin’s name was often mentioned among the highest ranking literati would seem to suggest that such men recognized a spirit of challenge in Nanpin’s classical and
orthodox paintings and were drawn to it. This we should not forget. Had Kanda seen the painting *Rabbits and Plums in the Snow* (Fig. 1) or the painting *A Crane and Banana Tree in the Snow* in the Rong Bao Zhai collection (Fig. 15), certainly he would not have felt this way. We must assume that Kanda had seen only the more vulgar paintings that have been attributed to Nanpin.

In recent years one of the scholars who has written about Shen Nanpin's personal life, Kohara Hironobu, has said the following:

Shen Deqian who had received the favor of the Qianlong emperor and held a position as Vice-Minister of the Board of Rites, successfully received his jinshi degree at the age of 66. This was in 1739, seven years after Shen Quan returned to China from Japan. However it would seem that even before this member of his lineage received his jinshi degree, Nanpin had already established some connections with the Beijing art world. And it was that news that seems to have urged Nanpin to begin in some haste to paint pictures with themes of good fortune. While this is only speculation based on a small number of works, before the beginning of the Qianlong reign he was not really aggressively involved in painting such pictures of good fortune, but shortly after the reign title was changed he was already presenting such paintings to members of his own lineage. It is my own theory that this change was based on news from the Imperial Palace itself.

Kohara's comment seems to suggest that Nanpin was immediately responding to changes in the political world. My theory in response to Kohara's suggestion is that up to this point there is no evidence that Nanpin was so vulgar. Even if we put aside for the moment a painting such as *Phoenix and the Morning Sun* (Fig. 11), most of Shen Nanpin's paintings take as their subjects birds and flowers, and in China such bird and flower paintings had natural connotations of good fortune. As I have already suggested, Shen Nanpin as an artist deliberately chose to lock himself up in the world of birds and flowers, and to find pleasure in that world. Thus, even if such paintings had connotations of good fortune, it is not necessarily for that reason that he chose to paint such subjects. We must note that to date no one has discovered any landscape or figure paintings by Nanpin, nor have any records of his calligraphy been found. Shen Nanpin seems to have been, from beginning to end, a painter of only birds and flowers.

**Critical Reevaluations**

As I have suggested earlier, our images of an artist's works will directly affect the way we may choose to interpret other evidence about his life. Although the evidence cited above suggests that Shen Nanpin was a highly respected artist in his own country who associated freely with a number of the leading literati of his day, many of the later relatively harsh Japanese critical judgments of both his life and work have been colored by their feeling that many of the works in Japanese collections that have traditionally been attributed to Nanpin are of relatively low artistic value. It is therefore important to reconsider those works in Japanese collections in an effort to reconstruct our own image of the artist's work based on what we can be certain are relatively authentic works by his hand. Only then will we be able to define the true Nanpin style and trace its stylistic elements.

Among Nanpin's extant works there are very few that can be dated to the period he was in Japan. Of those I have seen, we can only be certain of a single fan painting in the collection of the Kobe City Museum, which bears a date that corresponds to the period during which Shen was in Japan (Fig. 12). Of the large number of paintings that are dated to the period after he returned to China, there are all kinds of paintings done with a wide variety of compositions and with varying levels of technical skills. The common explanation for this has been that many of the works were the product either of a studio or of a large number of students whom Shen organized to produce paintings that were then shipped to Japan on trading ships. However, if this is in fact the case, we would like to be able to find evidence that would verify such an hypothesis. I personally believe that most of the paintings attributed to Shen Nanpin that are now in Japan were probably painted by Japanese artists. Simply from a study of the techniques, colors, and subject content of such paintings this would seem to be the case; moreover, we know that in the Edo period there was great respect for the works of Nanpin in Japan. We know for certain that those who regarded themselves as the followers of Nanpin, including Kumashiro Yuhi, Kakutei, Sō Shiseki, Takebe Ryōtai, Mikuma Katen and Kakizaki Hakyo, were passionately involved in the study of Nanpin's works, and that around the central figures in this group were a number of lesser painters who are little known today. It would seem that there are many "Nanpin paintings" completed by such artists. It is to this group of paintings, painted by Japanese who considered themselves the followers of the
Chinese artist, that we will now turn. We need to try to categorize such paintings and try to decide which were the works of which artists or groups of artists.

As to the question of how Shen Nanpin’s paintings were viewed in the Edo period, we can find many examples in the collection of reproductions handed down in the Watanabe family and now in the collection of the Kobe City Museum. Let us first look at the reproduction of the painting A Pair of Cranes (Fig. 13) by the Nagasaki painter Watanabe Kakushu (1778–1830).21 This painting is clearly a direct copy of a work by Nanpin, for we find in the center of the painting an inscription that reads “guizhou, Autumn, painted (xie) by Nanpin, Shen Quan.” The cyclical year corresponds to 1733, the year Shen returned to China. From a second inscription we know that Watanabe Kakushu produced the copy in 1822. One of the things that is disturbing about this copy, however, is that it does not reproduce the seal.

Another reproduction in the same collection is a painting listed as Pair of Deer under the Trees (Fig. 14). The painting is color on paper and 191.6 by 96.7 centimeters in size. It is dated to 1759 (Qianlong 24), the same year in which such extant paintings as Wealth and Long Pair of Deer and Paintings of Auspicious Immortals were painted. These fall in the category of the latter part of Nanpin’s artistic career. However, it is questionable whether this painting is really a copy of a work by Nanpin, since the style of the painting is clearly very different from that of the painting A Crane and Banana Tree in the Snow, which is dated 1749 (Fig. 15). On the other hand, there are real similarities in technique and composition with a painting in the Kobe City Museum collection entitled Lion Cubs at Play (Fig. 16). It would be possible to argue that these two paintings—Lion Cubs at Play, dated to 1756, and the Pair of Deer under the Trees—represent what might have been Nanpin’s style in his later years, that is, the 1750s.

If we follow that line of argument, it would then be possible to see one style of works that includes the following: the 1753 paintings One Hundred Years Old Pair of Deer, One Hundred Years Felicitous Greetings, and Peacocks with Pine and Waterfall, and the 1752 painting Phoens under the Pines.22 However, if we regard these paintings as a group, we are then left with the puzzle of the 1749 painting A Crane and Banana Tree in the Snow, which seems to represent a different mental and visual world. At the very least we can recognize two clearly separate and distinct groups of paintings attributed to this period, those conforming to the style of Lion Cubs at Play and those conforming to that of A Crane and Banana Tree in the Snow and the Rabbits and Plums in the Snow.

We can go one step further in noting that Watanabe Kakushu did not believe that all the “original” Shen Nanpin paintings were truly by that artist. For example, there is a painting in the collection of the Kobe City Museum by Kakushu entitled Presentations to the Court (Fig. 18). The inscription on the painting reads: “Presentations to the Court. The original is a counterfeit (ganpitsu) of a painting by Shen Nanpin. Bunsei kibi third month, eleventh day, copy by Watanabe Kakushu.” This is an 1823 copy and clearly marked as such. But on this painting there are several seals, one reading Nanpin Shen Quan xie, one with the letters in white reading Shen Quan and with the letters in red reading Nanpin shi, and finally a copy of a seal with white letters reading Shigeng. How do we explain this last seal? According to the Xinshizhen duzhi (Supplementary Gazetteer for Xinshizhen) Shen Tianxiang (eighteenth century), a student of Shen Nanpin, used a Shigeng seal. Cranes and Pines by the Sea in the Kobe Museum collection (Fig. 19) is a copy of this. We can see this from an inscription added by Kakushu to a copy of this painting done in 1828. His inscription reads: “Shen Tianxiang, zi Chaoting, shares the same surname with Shen Quan and was his nephew . . . .”

However, in the Nihon genzai Chūgoku meiga mokuroku (A Catalogue of Chinese Paintings Extant in Japan) under the entry for a Shen Xiang, we find the following data on a painting entitled Receiving from Heaven the Thousand Felicities: the inscription, “Qianlong, bing xu, painted (hua) by Zhexi Hegan, Tianxiang,” and three seals, reading Wuxing Shen Xiang, Hegan, and Shigeng. And on a second painting, Peacock with an Old Oak, we find the inscription “painted by Hegan, Tianxiang” and two seals, Wuxing Shen Xiang and Hegan. From this we know that this artist used the zi of Chaoting and that he also had a further courtesy name of Hegan and used the seal of Shigeng.

What we particularly want to follow here is the seal Shigeng. If we look through the paintings attributed to Shen Nanpin, we find this seal on a number of paintings. The earliest paintings bearing the seal are from 1738 and include Crane with Flowers, Deer, Two White Heads in a Tree, and Rock and Tree; the latest paintings are from 1758 and include the Peonies and Rocks with Small Birds.
From this we can see that this seal is included on many of the paintings that are dated to the period after Nanpin’s return to China.

Let us now turn to a comparison of paintings that have the seal with those that do not, taking as our examples two paintings dated to the same year (1749), A Crane and Banana Tree in the Snow (Fig. 15), which does not bear that seal, and Crane in the Morning (Fig. 17), which does. Clearly they show very different styles. What then does the presence of the Shigeng seal indicate? According to the 1801 Kun yin hosei, the Shigeng seal is listed for Shen Quan (Fig. 20). There are a number of possible explanations that we can imagine, for example, that the seal Shigeng is used on works produced by artists who were very close to Shen Nanpin—artists such as Wanatabe Kakusho (Fig. 22). In addition we know of several Japanese artists who also used a Shigeng seal. That seal is found on Sō Shiseki’s (1715–86) A Pair of Jewels Fighting for Brilliance (Fig. 21) and on Kurokawa Kigyoku’s (1732–56) Kittens under the Flowers, which is in the collection of the Tokyo University of Arts.

Let me add a further interesting fact about the seals used by Shen Nanpin. On the copy of the painting of a Pair of Deer under the Trees, we find a seal that reads zhou shi tianshi lan shi zhen. The Kun yin hosei includes a seal for He Yuanting (eighteenth century) that suggests that it is this artist who is referred to here. With regard to the relationship between He Yuanting and Shen Nanpin, Tsuruta argued some years ago, “He Yuanting was an artist who was both close in time and in physical location to Shen Nanpin.”

We can imagine also that these two seals give us hints of a further close relationship.

**Conclusion**

What is the attraction of a study of Shen Nanpin? Shen Nanpin was clearly a classicist who was able to manipulate the elements of the classical vision in his own individual way and to create out of those elements a world vision of his own. The technique he used to create that form of expression was very solidly founded. Among those who studied the classic traditions, we can see at least two types of individuals. At the one extreme was someone like Chen Hongshou (1599–1652) who followed an eccentric pattern; at the other extreme, someone like Shen Nanpin who chose an extremely conservative stance. Shen Nanpin combined elements of Zhejiang Buddhist style painting with the style of Lü Ji, and having once established that pattern of referents, he did not change his point of view. The differences that existed between the Lü Ji model and Shen Nanpin’s works give them a great tension, which greatly contributes to their high artistic value. Easily painted images were not a part of Shen Nanpin’s world vision. To put it in another way, among the paintings attributed to Shen Nanpin, those in which we can not catch a glimpse—if at a distance—of Zhejiang Buddhist art or of Lü Ji are not true to the original vision of Shen Nanpin. For Shen the works of these two traditions represented the boundaries that he had imposed on his own world vision, and it was within those boundaries that he found pleasure. He did not move outside those boundaries, nor did he turn his attention to new elements. That was an essential part of the artistic world of Shen Nanpin.

During the eighteenth century when Shen Nanpin came to Japan, the country was in the period of self-imposed isolation, and perhaps the very unusualness of foreign paintings helped to contribute to the respect he earned. As we have already noted, references to Shen appear frequently in Japanese essays on painting. Among the artists who were particularly interested in realism—such masters as Tani Bunchō (1763–1844), Tanomura Chikuden (1777–1835), and Watanabe Kazan (1793–1841)—his presence could not be ignored. Among students of art history today there are not a few who still have the mistaken impression that Shen Nanpin came to Nagasaki on a trading ship, and that he just happened to be a good painter. One reason this mistaken impression persists may be that the authentic paintings of Shen Nanpin have been hidden behind a flood of imitations. But perhaps even more important has been the spirit, current in Japan since Meiji times, that stresses a theme of “openness in foreign relations, but closed in spirit.” I do not believe that the literati of the Edo period shared those same feelings. Those who came in contact with Western or Chinese culture made direct attempts to understand it and to create a new vision of Japan’s ideal future as influenced by those cultures. The strong interest shown by artists throughout the Edo period in the works of Shen Nanpin was only one manifestation of a general admiration for the continental culture and the artistic works it had produced.
Notes


2. Records of his arrival can be found in two Japanese works, Tosen shinkō kaiyōron and Nagasaki jitsuroku taisi.

3. Kumashiro Yuhi studied his style and technique and created the Nagasaki style painting group, training many disciples. Among those followers were Yū Hibun, Kakutai, Mamuro Roko, So Shiseki, So Shizen, Shokazu Kan, Kakizaki Hakyo, Tō Kyūju, Ōtomo Geko, Mikuma Ken, and Takebe Ryotai. Watanabe Kazan was also an enthusiastic student of Nanpin style painting. For recent publications on Nanpin style painting in Japan, see n. 1.

4. In critical works on painting written during the Edo period, opinion on the work of Shen Nanpin was divided between those who strongly admired his work and those who were critical. Edo period comments on Shen Nanpin’s work can be found in the following works: Takebe Ryotai, Kanga shirron, 1779; Nakayama Koyo, Gatan keirō, 1775; Sakurai Sekkan, Gashoku, 1777; Hirasa Kyokuzan, Kokuga ron, 1788; Nakabayashi Chikudo, 1801; Gado Kongōkihe, and by the same author Chikudo genron, 1802, and Bunga yūrō, 1819; Kanai Ushū’s Musē shū; Tanomura Chikuden, San’enchū jōsetsu, 1815; Shirai Kayō, Gajo shōryūkai, 1832; Anzai Unen, Kinsei meiga shogusen, 1850–52; and Asano Baido, Shokaku kagameishirōku, 1857.


7. Kohara Hironobu has argued, “Rabbits and Paws in the Snow is important, not just because it is the only early painting of Shen Nanpin’s which we can be certain is authentic. This painting was purchased by its former owner, Kuwana Tetsuji, in China. Among the paintings that are attributed to Nanpin are many copies produced in Japan; at the very least, we can be guaranteed that this painting is Chinese in origin.” See Kohara, “Hato o kōete,” p. 6.


9. Hashimoto Collection—Chūgoku kaiga—Raihaku gajin, p. 34.

10. Guowu huaxiang dulu, Dushu yijian, ed. Zhang Geng, 1735. Works of Yu Xing were included in an exhibition of painting during the Qinglong reign period and illustrations can be found in Chou Ju-hsi and Claudia Brown, The Elegant Brush: Chinese Painting under the Qianlong Emperor, 1735–95, Phoenix, 1987.


12. See my essay, “Mingarōku shūhen (2)—Nanpin bekken.”


16. I plan to look at these connections in a future essay.


19. We find in Nakayama Kōyō’s Gatan keirō published in 1775, the following comment: “In recent times there is great interest in the style of Shen Nanpin. Although his technical skills were quite high, the spirit of his paintings was quite coarse. Since this was a style easy to copy, there were many people who favored it.” We find a further reference in the Gashoku by Sakurai Sekkan, published in 1777: “In the city and countryside there are many who paint in the style of Nanpin.” Thus we can imagine that because of the popularity of Shen Nanpin’s works in the Edo period, many copies were produced.


21. Watanabe Kukushe’s given name was Hidemi, his zi, Gensei, and his hao, Kakushe. In 1802 he succeeded his father, Shusen, in becoming a painter in the Chinese style. He was also the author of the book of biographies of Nagasaki painters, Nagasaki gajinden, published in 1850.

22. With the exception of One Hundred Years Felicitous Greetings, which is now in the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm, the paintings are in private collections and are reproduced in Nagasakiha no kachīga, pls. 59, 4, and 18, respectively.

23. All these painting are illustrated in Nagasakiha no kachīga. The paintings and their plate numbers are as follows: Crane with Flowers (pair of hanging scrolls), pls. 12 and 13; Deer, pl. 58; Two White Heads in a Tree, pl. 31; Rock and Tree, pl. 40; and Peonies and Rocks with Small Birds, pl. 26.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangdai</td>
<td>谷文晃</td>
<td>唐岱</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tani Bunchō</td>
<td>田能村竹田</td>
<td>田舎venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanomura Chikoden</td>
<td>蓮九如</td>
<td>日本勝操</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tō Kyōjo</td>
<td>唐船橋港回げ録</td>
<td>日本勝操</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tōsen shinkō kaitoroku</td>
<td>船橋港回銘録</td>
<td>日本勝操</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Mingsheng</td>
<td>王鴻盛</td>
<td>王鴻盛</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe Kakushu</td>
<td>渡辺鶴洲</td>
<td>渡辺鶴洲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe Kazan</td>
<td>渡辺華山</td>
<td>渡辺華山</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe Shūsen</td>
<td>渡辺秀詔</td>
<td>渡辺秀詔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuxing Shen Xiang</td>
<td>吳興沈騏</td>
<td>吳興沈騏</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhejiang</td>
<td>新市鎮繞志</td>
<td>新市鎮繞志</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe Kazan</td>
<td>熊斐文</td>
<td>熊斐文</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe Shūsen</td>
<td>余省</td>
<td>余省</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuxing Shen Xiang</td>
<td>惇寿平</td>
<td>惇寿平</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe Shūsen</td>
<td>張庚</td>
<td>張庚</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhejiang</td>
<td>浙江</td>
<td>浙江</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Mingsheng</td>
<td>浙西 먼저</td>
<td>浙西 먼저</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe Shūsen</td>
<td>周鲲</td>
<td>周鲲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe Shūsen</td>
<td>梁玉樓是真</td>
<td>梁玉樓是真</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. *Rabbits and Plums in the Snow*. By Shen Nanpin. 1716. Hanging scroll, light color on silk, 165 by 80 cm. Courtesy of the Hashimoto Collection.

Fig. 2. Winter, from the group *Birds and Flowers of the Four Seasons*. By Lü Ji. 15th–16th century. Hanging scroll, light color on silk, 176.0 by 100.8 cm. The Tokyo National Museum. (After Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan zukan mokuroku, Chügoku kaigahen, Tokyo, 1979, pl. 54.)

Fig. 3. *Flowers, Birds and Animals after Liu Yongnian*. By Yu Xing. 1741. Handscroll, light color on silk, 165 by 80 cm. N. P. Wong Family Collection. (After Chou Ju-hsi and Claudia Brown, *The Elegant Brush*, pl. 10.)
Fig. 4. Peonies with Rock. By Lan Tao. 1679. Hanging scroll, light color on silk, 170.3 by 75.7 cm. Courtesy of the Hashimoto Collection.

Fig. 5. Peonies with Rock. By Lan Tao. Detail of Fig. 4.

Fig. 6. Peonies with Rock. By Lan Tao. Detail of Fig. 4.
Fig. 7. Rabbits and Plums in the Snow. By Shen Nanpin. Detail of Fig. 1.

Fig. 8. Rabbits and Plums in the Snow. By Shen Nanpin. Detail of Fig. 1.
Fig. 10. One of the Sixteen Lohan. By Jin Dashou. 12th century. Hanging scroll, light color on silk, 118.8 by 51.7 cm. The Tokyo National Museum. (After Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan zuban mokuroku, Chūgoku kaigahen, pl. 15.)

Fig. 9. One of the Sixteen Lohan. By Jin Dashou. 12th century. Hanging scroll, light color on silk, 118.8 by 51.7 cm. The Tokyo National Museum. (After Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan zuban mokuroku, Chūgoku kaigahen, pl. 15.)
Fig. 11. Phoenix in the Morning Sun. By Shen Nanpin. 1749.
Hanging scroll, light color on silk 126.0 by 51.9 cm.
Private collection. (After Nagasaki no kachōga, pl. 11.)
Fig. 12. *Bird and Flowers*. By Shen Nanpin. 1732. Fan, light color on paper. Courtesy of the Kobe City Museum.
Fig. 13. A Pair of Cranes. By Watanabe Kakushu. Copy of an original by Shen Nanpin, dated to 1731. Hanging scroll, color on paper, 107.8 by 59.7 cm. Courtesy of the Kobe City Museum.

Fig. 14. Pair of Deer under the Trees. By Watanabe Kakushu. Copy of an original by Shen Nanpin, dated to 1759. Hanging scroll, color on paper, 191.6 by 96.7 cm. Courtesy of the Kobe City Museum.
Fig. 15. A Crane and Banana Tree in the Snow. By Shen Nanpin. 1749. Hanging scroll, light color on silk, 171.5 by 51.0 cm. Rong Bao Zhai Collection. (After Eikoai Hitsuzo Bijutsu Ten, 1986, pl. 45.)

Fig. 16. Lion Cubs at Play. By Shen Nanpin. 1756. Hanging scroll, light color on silk, 196.2 by 96.7 cm. Courtesy of the Kobe City Museum.
Fig. 17. Crane in the Morning. By Shen Nanpin. 1749. Hanging scroll, light color on silk, 198.7 by 96.5 cm. Private collection. (After Nagasaki no kachôga, pl. 1.)
Fig. 18. *Presentations to the Court*. By Watanabe Kakushu. Copy of an original by Shen Nanpin, dated to 1832. Hanging scroll, light color on paper, 91.5 by 45.8 cm. Courtesy of the Kobe City Museum.

Fig. 19. *Cranes and Pines by the Sea*. By Watanabe Kakushu. Copy of an original by Shen Tianxiang, dated to 1828. Courtesy of the Kobe City Museum.
Fig. 20. Shigeng seal as listed in the **Kun yin hosei**.

Fig. 21. Shigeng seal as it appears on *A Pair of Jewels Fighting for Brilliance* by Sō Shiseki. (After Sō Shiseki gashū, p. 48.)
Fig. 22. Shigeng seal as it appears on *Presentations to the Court* by Watanabe Kakushū. Detail of Fig. 18.
ON THE GOLD JUG INSCRIBED TO ABU MANSUR AL-AMIR BAKHTIYAR IBN MU‘IZZ AL-DAWLA IN THE FREER GALLERY OF ART

BY GLENN D. LOWRY

On March 1, 1943, the Freer Gallery of Art purchased a gold jug from Hagop Kevorkian, a dealer of Islamic art, in New York City. The jug had been on deposit at the gallery since 1935 along with several other items under consideration from Kevorkian.

Raised from a single sheet of gold alloy containing little silver or copper, the vessel (Figs. 1–3) is composed of a bulbous lower body, a tapered neck, and a flaring rim. It is 6 5/16 inches tall, with a maximum diameter of 3 11/16 inches, and a weight of 503 grams. A curved handle, adorned with a small lion’s head, was made from separate pieces of gold and soldered onto the vessel. Arabic inscriptions at the rim and foot of the object and chased designs of birds, animals, and winged beasts set within interlocking medallions divide the surface of the jug into six tightly organized registers. The uppermost of these is composed of an elegant inscription written in an ornamental Kufic script that reads, “Blessing, joy, and good fortune to Abu Mansur al-Amir Bakhtiyar ibn Mu‘izz al-Dawla. May God prolong his days.”

Abu Mansur was a prince of the Buyid dynasty (932–1062) who ruled parts of Iraq and Iran from 967 until his death in 978.

Below the inscription is a band composed of three pairs of facing birds, each holding what appears to be a branch in its mouth. An ornamental band of trefoil-shaped designs and a narrow band of scalloping form the next two registers. Below is the largest zone, consisting of most of the jug’s lower body, composed of three pairs of facing figures: a sphinx on either side of the vessel’s handle, two peacocks with ribbons in their mouths, and two horned animals eating large plants.

The second inscription, written in a less elaborate Kufic script, forms the lowest of the jug’s registers and consists of the following good wishes, “Blessing, felicity, happiness, good health, everlasting good things, success, ease, and complete glory.”

An arabesque pattern of floral forms decorates the foot and base of the vessel (Fig. 4).

Both inscriptions as well as the vessel’s decorative program are rendered with precisely drawn lines and attention to detail. The birds and animals, for instance, are clearly articulated, their musculature and facial features carefully executed. The same is true for the patterns created by the trefoil-shaped designs and for the scalloping around the neck of the jug.

Several aspects of the Freer vessel are remarkable, including its elegant shape, the quality of its craftsmanship, the fineness of its material, and its association with the Buyid prince Abu Mansur. Indeed, few other works of art from this period are of equal aesthetic and historic significance. However, because the jug has no immediate parallels, both its provenance and authenticity have been questioned. Within this context two points need to be remembered. The first is the cumulative effect of comments issued sotto voce. Usually never published or substantiated, but invariably of a negative nature, these observations or suggestions tend to have a residual impact by questioning an object’s authenticity. The second point is that once a work of art has been thus challenged, it is difficult to fully dispel such aspersions.

The earliest recorded comments relating to the jug are contained in a letter written by the eminent French art historian Gaston Migeon to Rudolph Berliner in September 1913. Migeon had the chance to study the vessel while it was in the possession of Hagop Kevorkian, the dealer who subsequently sold it to the Freer in 1943. Perplexed by the jug, Migeon could not convince himself that it was authentic, yet he could not assert that it was unquestionably a forgery.

According to Migeon the vessel first appeared in Paris in July 1912. At that time he considered the piece to be poorly made and similar to forgeries produced at Odessa. Unfortunately, Migeon never explains his reasons for questioning the craftsmanship of the jug, although possibly before cleaning the encrustation masked the precision and control of its lines.

The jug was subsequently returned to Iran, but reappeared in Paris during the summer of 1913. In the meantime Migeon had shown photographs of the inscriptions to the distinguished scholar Max van Berchem, who found them to be credible orthographically, grammatically, and in terms of
protocol. Later, however, when van Berchem actually saw the piece, Migeon indicates that he had second thoughts, though he does not elaborate further. Migeon himself remained unconvinced; he accepted on the one hand the validity of the inscriptions, but on the other was unable to resolve his questions about the vessel's similarity to objects he believed to be forgeries.

Subsequent scholars have continued to echo Migeon's reservations about the jug, often qualifying any comments about the piece with a disclaimer that "several scholars, however, have expressed their doubts about this jug. Their misgivings have been amplified by two recent events. The first concerns the vessel's physical appearance, the second Buyid works of art in general. In 1955 the jug was treated in an acid bath to remove encrustation and cleaned with silver polish. As a result the piece appears to be in pristine condition, aside from a few minor nicks and dents and microscopic traces of encrustation. Hence, several scholars have remarked that it looks, "too good to be true." And, indeed, the surface of the jug, with its intricate patterns, minute ring-punched background, and finely crafted details, sparkles with a remarkable intensity that makes the piece look initially, at least, as if it were "new." This, however, is typical of many gold objects when treated with acid and then polished.

Of far more consequence is the controversy that surrounds Buyid art in general. Over the last thirty years an extensive debate has developed over the authenticity of many objects allegedly made for members of this dynasty. Initially focused on textiles, the controversy has grown to include jewelry, metalwork, and other works of art from this period. The issue erupted in a heated series of exchanges between Dorothy Shepherd and others after the publication of the Rugglesberg report on the Buyid Silks in the Abegg Foundation and has yet to be fully resolved. Consequently, virtually all works of art from the Buyid period have been affected by what can only be called a "climate of doubt." In the case of the Freer gold jug, this lead to its relegation to an appendix for problematic pieces in the gallery's 1985 catalog of Islamic metalware, and exclusion from the most recent survey of medieval Islamic art and architecture. Yet there has been no scientific or historical study of tenth-century metalware that has directed challenged the authenticity of the jug.

This is not to discount the validity of such questions, for any object whose archaeological context has been lost inevitably poses a number of problems that have no easy answers. There are, of course, various techniques—from scientific tests to visual analyses—that can be used to help answer these questions. But these procedures, no matter how precise, rarely provide definitive answers as most works of art—at least from a scientific point of view—consist of clusters of information that rarely, if ever, can be reduced to single incontrovertible judgments about age. Judgments about the authenticity of a work of art, not to mention when or why it was made, depend to a large extent on a series of informed, but subjective, opinions.

What then are the reasons to question the authenticity of the Freer jug? Leaving aside the issues raised by the controversy over Buyid art in general, the case against the jug can be put in the following terms: its condition and appearance are striking, and it is a unique object without any obvious precedents. While it is impossible to deny the spectacular nature of any object that is made of a pound of gold, this is ultimately meaningless information in terms of establishing authenticity. Even if one accepts that because it is virtually impossible to analyze the age of gold, it is a material favored by forgers, objects made of this metal are not necessarily more suspect than others. Indeed, this kind of reasoning is irresponsible as it overlooks the more salient issue that a great deal of information about an object's age can be revealed by studying its method of manufacture and pattern of wear.

Made from a single sheet of raised metal and decorated with chased designs and finely tooled punch marks, the jug is consistent with other medieval Islamic objects. Similar tooling, for instance, can be seen on a late ninth- or tenth-century eastern Iranian silver bowl as well as the Freer pen box of 1210/11. Furthermore, when examined at a microscopic level, the surface of the vessel shows an extensive amount of randomly patterned wear (Fig. 5), a feature specifically associated with objects of great age. While it might be argued that a forger could use the same techniques of manufacture as a medieval craftsman, it is highly unlikely, if not impossible, that such a person could reproduce the complex wear patterns that distinguish this piece.

The argument over the jug's uniqueness is equally invalid. Although no exact parallels exist, the vessel relates closely to a number of other objects. Its shape, for example, is closely paralleled in contemporary ceramics such as several of the jugs found at Nishapur. James Allan has shown,
as well, that the jug’s inscription, decoration, and overall design are consistent with contemporary architectural decoration and eighth-century Soghdian metalwork and wall paintings, including a goblet in the Nagyszentmiklos treasure, frescoes from Panjikent and other sites in Central Asia, and a sword found at Nishapur (Fig. 6).18 Moreover, since the vessel first appeared on the market in Paris, a number of similar metal objects made of either silver or silver and gilt have been identified. These include several jugs and the lid to a box.19 A number of these pieces, like the Freer jug, can be associated with the Buyid dynasty either through inscriptions or stylistic characteristics.20

Two of the jugs, both of which are now in the State Hermitage in Leningrad (Figs. 7 and 8),21 and the lid were found at archeological sites (the jugs in the province of Perm, the lid at Lorvozh along the Ob river) and therefore belong to a group of objects whose authenticity is without question. One of the jugs in particular (Fig. 7) and the lid are closely related to the Freer piece and can be dated on formal grounds to the tenth or eleventh century.22 These objects are chased and tooled, with finely worked backgrounds of ring-punching and designs in relatively high relief, in exactly the same way as the Freer jug. The jug and lid share, as well, the use of the same slightly rounded Kufic script and the same basic decorative vocabulary of pairs of birds and/or animals set within elaborate floral and geometric designs punctuated by trefoil-shaped tendrils. And while it can be argued that the Freer jug is more technically accomplished than these other pieces—its ring-punching, for instance, is more precise, its iconography and details more elaborate—this is presumably a result of it having been made specifically for a prince of the Buyid dynasty.

Finally, there is the issue of the degree to which it would have been possible for a forger at the turn of this century to “create” a Buyid jug. The inscriptive program, for instance, not only is orthographically and grammatically consistent with other tenth-century inscriptions, but also does not refer to Abu Mansur al-Amir Bakhtiyar as ‘Izz al-Dawla as he was more commonly known. This peculiarity, which requires a specialist’s knowledge of Buyid history to understand, would have almost certainly been overlooked or avoided by someone trying to make an object for the relatively uninformed market of the early twentieth century. Moreover, it was not until the 1930s (almost twenty years after the appearance of the jug), following the discovery of the textiles at Rayy, that commercial interests turned to Buyid art. Prior to that, knowledge about Buyid patronage was virtually nonexistent and Buyid works of art were not singled out by scholars or dealers for particular attention. No identifiably Buyid pieces appeared in the 1910 Munich exhibition, and even as late as the great Persian exhibition in 1931 at Burlington House, the Buyids are hardly mentioned. Moreover, as Allan has pointed out, it is inconceivable that, “in the early years of this century, before Panjikent had been excavated, the Nishapur sword discovered, or the Soghdian origin of certain parts of the decoration of the Nagyszentmiklos treasure realized, that a faker should have been able to produce an object which would fit so perfectly with what we know now.”23

Given the overwhelming weight of this evidence, there seems no reason to doubt the jug’s authenticity. Technically, historically, and aesthetically the jug belongs to a group of tenth-century Iranian objects whose provenance and date are beyond question. As one of the most finely crafted pieces from this period to survive, and with its inscription to the Buyid prince Abu Mansur al-Amir Bakhtiyar, its importance to the study of Islamic art in Iran is obviously great. The challenge now is to examine the jug’s iconography, epigraphy, and technique in order to learn more about its function and specific place of manufacture. This, in turn, should lead to a better understanding of how the vessel fits within the social, cultural, and historical setting of late tenth-century Buyid Iraq and Iran.
Notes

1. I am grateful to W. T. Chase and Paul Jett for sharing with me their knowledge about the scientific investigation of works of art and for their technical analyses of the jug. I would also like to thank Boris Marshak, Ann Wardwell, Oleg Grabar, and James Allan for their advice and guidance in preparing this article, and Thomas Lawton for his encouragement to proceed with this study.

2. Including a page from a copy of the 1224 Materia Medica of Dioscorides (accession no. 43:2).

3. The composition of the gold was determined by using energy dispersive X-ray fluorescence. The analyses were performed by Lisa Glimsman of the National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC. Quantified results of the analyses are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Au</th>
<th>Ag</th>
<th>Cu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area on inside of rim</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second area on inside of rim</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solder on handle</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5. For a brief biography of the prince, see the Encyclopedia of Islam, new edition, v. 1, pp. 954–55. See also volume 2 of ibn Miskawaih The Experiences of Nations, trans. D. S. Margoliouth, London, 1921, pp. 158–405. According to ibn Miskawaih (p. 190), Abu Mansur received the title `izz al-Dawla in 950–60. This title does not appear in the jug’s inscription, possibly indicating that the vessel was made before then. However, honorific titles were not always systematically applied, and the absence of the prince’s title on the jug is not a definitive factor in and of itself for dating the vessel.

6. The horns of the animals are only partially developed and appear almost as tufts of hair rising from the back of the animals’ heads.

7. Baraka wa-yumm wa-surur wa-salama wa-ni`ma bâqiya wa-tawfîq wa-yusr wa-`izz tamm.


10. One possibility is that van Berchem was troubled by the prominence of one of the jug’s inscriptions along its rim and the location of the other one along its base where it is almost impossible to see. Oleg Grabar, in conversation, has mentioned a similar reservation about the vessel’s epigraphic program. However, the more prominent inscription gives the prince’s name, while the second one contains only banal good wishes. Their placement on the jug, consequently, is most likely simply a reflection of their relative importance.


12. See R. J. Gettens report in the files of the Technical Laboratory of the Freer Gallery of Art.


20. In addition to the two jugs from the State Hermitage Museum in Leningrad discussed elsewhere in the article, at least two more vessels of this type can be identified. One, now lost, was photographed by Antoine Sevruguin in Iran sometime before 1928. A photograph of this piece is now in the archives of the Freer Gallery of Art (5.2) and indicates that the vessel was damaged at the time it was photographed. A second, more interesting, jug is now in the Cleveland Museum of Art (accession no. 66.22). Like the Freer jug it is made of gold and inscribed with the titles of a Buyid prince, in this case, Samsam al-Dawla (983–998). It too has been called into question by several scholars (see, for instance, Dorothy Shepherd, Metalwork in Medieval Islamic Art, Albany, 1985, p. 211 and n. 199). While this jug shares several decorative features with the Freer vessel, its designs are more coarsely rendered and the background has been scratched to create the appearance of ring punching, but lacks the precision of this technique when examined under the microscope.


Fig. 1. Full view, gold jug inscribed to Abu Mansur al-Amir Bakhtiyar. Courtesy of the Freer Gallery of Art, accession no. 43.1.
Fig. 2. Full view, gold jug inscribed to Abu Mansur al-Amir Bakhtiyar. Courtesy of the Freer Gallery of Art, accession no. 43.1.
Fig. 3. Full view, gold jug inscribed to Abu Mansur al-Amir Bakhtiyar. Courtesy of the Freer Gallery of Art, accession no. 43.1.
Fig. 4. Foot and base of gold jug inscribed to Abu Mansur al-Amir Bakhtiyar. Courtesy of the Freer Gallery of Art, accession no. 43.1.
Fig. 5. Detail of wear patterns, gold jug inscribed to Abu Mansur al-Amir Bakhtiyar. Courtesy of the Freer Gallery of Art, accession no. 43.1.
Fig. 6. Sword found at Nishapur. 9th–10th century. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1940, accession no. 170.168a–d.
Fig. 7. Silver and gilt jug. Iran. 10th century. State Hermitage Museum.
Fig. 8. Silver and gilt jug. Iran. 10th century. State Hermitage Museum.
BOOK REVIEWS


Located on an island in the Arabian Sea about three miles from Bombay in western India, the cave-temple at Elephanta is one of the most splendid, and enigmatic, Hindu monuments of ancient India. Since the mid-sixteenth century when Portuguese travelers first wrote of the temple, this unique monument has been subject of numerous books and articles that have attempted to understand the singular ground plan and the meanings of the nine over-life-size narrative relief panels.

Controversies over the complex have abounded in the literature. One of the most discussed problems, though not necessarily the most important one, has concerned the patron, assumed to have been one of the Kalacuri kings who were devotees of Pāṣūpata in the late sixth century though in fact has never been identified. Of greater significance have been the controversies surrounding the problematic plan (a main temple flanked by two shrines) and entered from the north; Fig. 1) and the iconographically abstruse sculptures. The fact that temples in India are most often entered from the east and the Elephanta temple may be entered only from the north (neither the eastern nor western shrine may be entered from outside the cave) raises an interesting question. Is it possible that the conceptual entrance (east) is different from the physical entrance (north) at Elephanta? Equally perplexing questions are posed by the nine narrative reliefs. Is the image in the northeast panel Śiva as the Great Ascetic or Lakulīśa, the yogic incarnation of Śiva? If it is Lakulīśa, this may indicate the monument was affiliated with the Pāṣūpata sect. But if the image is Śiva as the Great Ascetic, does this actually eliminate that possibility? Do the relief panels represent an iconographic program, and if so, what is the collective message? Are they to be viewed in the usually assumed clockwise circumambulation or in an unconventional counter-clockwise one? And lastly, what is the identification of the central image on the south wall, and is this or the linga in the shrine within the temple on the west the main image?

Using standard sources and two recently rediscovered sectarian texts, Charles Dillard Collins has formulated innovative ideas that tentatively answer some of these questions. Three types of religious literary sources, most informative regarding the god Śiva, have been consulted: Vedic literature, limited in meaning for Elephanta, the Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata epics, and the appropriate purāṇas. (What may yet turn out to be the most significant purāṇa for Pāṣūpata thought, the Vāyu [ca. 350], is not available in translation and was not extensively used.) After establishing the relative dating for these sources, Collins reviews them in chronological order to determine the relevance to each of the narratives. This allows a realistic appraisal of what religious concepts and iconography existed prior to, contemporary with, or slightly later than the construction of the temple. Rarely is the correspondence between word and image exact, but the approach allows a contextual interpretation of the narratives. Another source creatively used by Collins to interpret religious meaning is the secular literature of the great dramatist Kālidāsa, who perhaps resided at the Gupta court in the late fourth or early fifth century. Although again there is little correlation between text and image, Kālidāsa’s writings are helpful for recognizing a “harmony of opposites” in the narratives. Interpretation of the narrative reliefs is augmented by the application of philosophical undercurrents gleaned from ritual texts of the Pāṣūpata sect to which the cave-temple was probably dedicated. Both the Pāṣūpata-sūtra (first-second century A.D., and unfortunately a very corrupt text) and the Gaukārikā (ca. tenth century) and their commentaries are more dogmatic than narrative, but the religious goal of achieving release from suffering through union with the god Śiva and the ritual means of achieving this release are described in detail.

Analysis of the above sources allows Collins to offer new and significant insights into the Elephanta temple. He persuasively substantiates the existence of a planned iconographic program, and the tentative messages of that program, by presenting the parallels and juxtapositions of meaning inherent in both sequentially and comparably placed narratives. An unequivocal interpretation frequently is impossible because there is so little correspondence between text and narrative, and the beliefs often are so badly damaged that iconography is indeterminate. But Collins is able to establish that while individual panels may each have a particular message for the Pāṣūpata adept, the narratives in sequence do seem consistently to alternate depictions of active and passive aspects of the god Śiva, and, moreover, that Lakulīśa (or Śiva as Mahāyogi), Śiva Dancing, Śiva as Half-male and Half-female, and the central three-headed bust of Mahādeva on the south wall are of special importance to the Pāṣūpata sect.

The applicability of Pāṣūpata tenets to the narratives strengthens the attribution of the temple to the Pāṣūpata sect. Furthermore, the Pāṣūpata texts inform and support Collins’ conclusion that circumambulation was performed counterclockwise rather than clockwise. (It should be noted that while proceeding counterclockwise in a cave-temple, the images are still kept on the devotee’s right, supposedly the proper side to present the gods.) Not only is it stated in the Gaukārikā that going to the right is the same as going to
the left, but the internal messages of the narratives are more comprehensive when viewed in this direction, beginning at the north side of the east entrance. The north entrance then is the physical entrance, while the east is the ritual entrance to the interior. This reiterates the view that the linga in the shrine in the west side of the cave, opposite the east entrance, is the main focus of worship; focus is also given to the linga by the architectural emphasis on the east-west axis: the central area between the east entrance and the linga shrine on the west is demarcated by pillars united by transcepts.

The texts also describe the rituals to be performed by Pāṣāputa devotees wishing to achieve release from suffering and union with Śiva. Collins explains how and where these rituals could have taken place within the temple interior. Again, his observations are not conclusive, but the requirements of the Pāṣāputa sect provide a plausible use of the central east-west space. The only aspect of Collins’ explanation that seems highly dubious is his assertion that a screen was used to enclose the central east-west area and another to keep the Mahādeva from view. This suggestion is based on a hypothetical statement made in 1813 and the existence of few texts in Hindu temple contexts, a statement Collins does not substantiate in terms of Elephantana. One would hope for physical confirmation: Are there hooks or holes in the ceiling or on the pillars of Elephantana that would indicate some mechanism for hanging such curtains existed?

Another contribution is Collins’ investigation of the stylistic sources of the sculpture, long considered to have been influenced by the art of northern India of the Gupta period. Previous studies, most extensively that by Walter Spink, have compared the art to sources close to Elephantana at Ajanta, Jogeśwari, Mandapēśwar, and Ellora. Collins extends the analysis to more remote sites. Comparing figural form and some motifs, he surveys the art contemporary with or slightly earlier than Elephantana, south at Aihole and Badami, and north and west particularly at Udayagiri, Śāmalā (possibly another Pāṣāputa site) and Mandasor (including Soṇḍhi, Kīchhāpara, and Afzalpur), Kusumā, and Bāramula in Kāśmir. Although this methodology establishes a broader pattern of influence from Gandhāra through Uttar Pradesh to Rājasthān and Gujārat and then to Elephantana, linking Elephantana more specifically than ever before to north India, it in fact tells us little that is specific about the Elephantana temple. Gandhāra in particular is too removed geographically, and the art there too early chronologically, to be useful in explicating anything about Elephantana other than in very general terms within what appears to be a trend from the northwest. There are still few precedents for Elephantana in terms of the quality of the carving and the composition of the narratives, and none for the grand architectural conception.

Some of the controversies remain unanswered. There is no further evidence that a Kalacuri king was the patron, and this detracts slightly from the argument that the monument had a Pāṃśupata affiliation. A foundation inscription that perhaps could have clarified this problem may have been removed by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century, but its existence is questionable. (Is there a place on the monument that indicates a segment of rock was intentionally carved away?) Internal evidence for an attribution of the temple to the Pāṃśupata sect has rested in part on the identification of the image on the east side of the north porch. Too damaged to be positively identified, it is called either Śiva as an Asotic (Maha-yogi) or Lakulīśa, Śiva’s ithyphallic yogic (twenty-eighth) incarnation who was the supposed founder of the Pāṃśupata sect. Neither this image nor the one in the north shrine is obviously ithyphallic, however. Nor, because of damage, can it be determined whether either held a club (lakula), a symbol of Lakulīśa discernible on contemporary or on slightly later images in other areas of India. Identification of these images remains elusive. The only literary references to a Lakulīśa image are found in two of the later parānas Collins consulted; it may be that at the time the temple was constructed there was no established iconography for this image in this area.

There are five Lakulīśa images at nearby sites, however, that could help clarify the problem, but Collins neither describes nor illustrates them, instead referring the reader to Spink’s study of cave-temples in western India in Ajanta to Ellora, even though they are not illustrated there. The iconography of the four Lakulīśa images at Jogiśwari and the one at Mandapēśwar, the two Hindu cave-temples closest in time and geography to Elephantana, should have been included here. The reader should not be left wondering if any of these images is close in form or iconography to the Elephantana images.

Even if the Kalacuri kings affiliated with the Pāṃśupata sect were not the patrons and these two controversial images at the site are not Lakulīśa, Collins has uncovered enough information from the texts to substantiate his conclusion that the monument was a Pāṃśupata dedication. In fact, it is from the Pāṃśupata texts that Collins culs additional meanings of the three-headed bust of Śiva on the south wall, which has been long debated among scholars but is only ambiguously described in parānas. Its meaning is still tentative, but the Pāṃśupata texts do emphasize the threefold aspect of Śiva (Enabler, Controller, and Destroyer), albeit in a sense different from that in the paraṇas.

Two other topics are covered in this book. The political and religious background of the rulers of the area around Elephantana until the decline of the Kalacuri dynasty is discussed in chapter 1. Collins accepts, for lack of more specific evidence, that the Kalacuris were the patrons and that Elephantana was excavated between 575-600 A.D. This historical survey reinforces his conclusion that the cultural ties of the area of Elephantana must have been to north India. The second chapter analyzes previous observations and studies of the monument from the mid-sixteenth century to the present. Appendix A discusses the mysterious dedication panel mentioned in sixteenth-century Portuguese sources, and appendix B, the meaning of a “bottle-shaped” motif flanked by celestials found in two of the relief panels.

There is clearly a dearth of primary visual and literary materials that actually pertain to Elephantana. The site is geographically isolated from major areas of artistic production, and few of the chronologically appropriate literary sources are territo-

Mary F. Linda

The architectural and sculptural remains at the Buddhist caves of Ajanta would by themselves assure the importance of the site, but it is Ajanta’s remarkably preserved paintings that have made it famous the world over. Nowhere else in India—indeed, nowhere in Asia—is there at a single site so much ancient work of high quality in such a fine state of preservation. In addition to this, the majority of Ajanta’s frescoes were created at the very apogee of India’s “Golden Age” in the fifth century A.D. and thus provide us with an “illustrated history” of the country at a most important moment in its cultural and political development.

Given the uniqueness of the paintings preserved at the site, it is hardly surprising that even by the middle of the nineteenth century (the site having been “discovered” by an English soldier in 1819) artists began making copies of the frescoes, and scholars began the task of identifying the various illustrations of Buddhist tales and texts. The most authoritative of these scholars was the renowned iconographer Albert Foucher, who spent a number of weeks at the site in 1919; his findings were incorporated into the massive four volume series produced by G. Yazdani between 1930 and 1955.

More recently, however, it became clear that the task of identifying the various scenes was far from complete, for in one publication after another during the course of the last two decades, Dieter Schlingloff has offered us new identifications and new insights pertaining to the paintings. Since his articles were often difficult to obtain, and were often written in German as well, the publication of the present volume is most welcome. It brings together most of these articles, somewhat revised and rearranged, and offers them all in translation.

Although quantitatively the greater harvest may have been accomplished by Foucher, who came upon the field afresh, Schlingloff’s gleanings are really the more remarkable, for he is dealing with problems of far greater difficulty. He often builds his hypotheses on the merest fragments of remaining evidence, yet manages to provide us with authoritative new or corrected identifications in instance after instance. One cannot possibly use Yazdani alone as a source for identifications any more, but must consult Schlingloff as a corrective.

Sometimes the frescoes with which the author works have suffered from the effects of nature or the depredations of man to such a degree that hardly more than a hand or part of a face or the shaft of an umbrella remains. Occasionally, by going back to copies and drawings made by Gill or Griffiths, or to early photographs, Schlingloff finds details that by now have disappeared. But generally his conclusions emerge from his impressive familiarity with relevant texts from all over the Asian mainland. Similarly, his knowledge of a vast range of images provides him with comparative materials to which he makes constant reference, even when, due to the constraints of the publication, he does not provide illustrations.

For a student of Buddhology wishing to pursue his own investigations, Schlingloff’s profuse references to various texts that he has consulted while working on particular events or stories at Ajanta will be of great value; they provide a model that others might do well to emulate. His observation that the Vinaya of the Mulasarsvatvidesins was the textual source for most of Ajanta’s representations of the Buddha’s lives (both present and previous) is most welcome too, for it contributes to the long-standing argument about the site’s sectarian connections. He places the paintings “within the tradition of Hinayana Buddhism. Pictorial representations of decidedly Mahayanic themes are not...found at Ajanta” (p. 175).

References to the texts that the author has consulted are expanded in this extensive bibliography; it lists Indian texts and their Tibetan, Khotanese, and Uighur translations, Chinese translations of Indian texts as well as reports of Chinese and Indian pilgrims, and Greek and Roman texts. In all of these bibliographic entries, the abundant chapter and footnote references to the present volume are listed, so that one is able to refer back to the author’s discussions, seeing where and how a particular text was utilized.

After the first eighteen chapters, dealing with representations of the Life of the Buddha (chapters 1–4) and of his previous births (chapters 5–15), the author briefly discusses a few special Buddhist forms and motifs. The representations of the Litany of Avalokitesvara, he argues, need not be limited to the followers of the Mahayana since it is found in regions of classical Indian Buddhism like Ceylon. This reasonably explains its presence at Ajanta. However, the conclusion that it “may well have served as a guiding image and an object of meditation for those monks who were prepared to follow the path of the bodhisattva and work for the redemption of all livings” (p. 178) must be approached with caution. A number of these images (e.g., on the rear face of the capital of Cave 20’s right porch pilaster and in one of the frieze panels over the pillars inside Cave 26) were in minor “decorative” contexts where they certainly would not have been used in this way. On the other hand, the fact that about half of these litany scenes were individual votive donations, mostly by monks, made during the anxious final years of activity at the site might well suggest the kind of use that the author describes.

Schlingloff’s reconstruction of the original form of the now much-damaged Wheel of Existence in Cave 17’s porch is one of the few points in his book where the evidence appears to contradict his conclusions. Reasoning that it would be more understandable in terms of iconography if the wheel had six compartments instead of eight, and realizing that its lower border (now lost) would have to occupy the same space as the upper part of the cell doorway just below, he suggests that a large wedge was left out of the painting in this area. The fact that this would have resulted in a strangely “broken” wheel alone would argue against such a conclusion. But more certain evidence can be seen in the fact that this, and only this, cell doorway has notches for an insert near the top, suggesting that the doorway’s upper portion was filled in with stone or clay or wood and then plastered over before the wheel was painted. What seems to settle the matter conclusively is that one can still see the inscribed outline of the wheel’s rim scratched on the now bare wall surface in this empty quadrant of the circle. It seems clear that the painting of the wheel (like other paintings in the porch) had not been planned-for when the porch was excavated just a few years earlier; therefore, when the porch’s decoration was begun, the problematic cell doorway was “lowered,” so that the painting of the Wheel of Existence could be as large as possible.

The problem could probably have been settled by comparing this wheel with an apparently similar one that earlier visitors had described as having been painted in Cave 86 at Kanheri. But when Schlingloff visited Kanheri in 1969 he “found nothing more than a blank wall that, instead of presenting us with an image of Transmigration, conveyed a striking symbol of Impermanence” (p. 172).
Chapters 19–22 move away from iconography to explore, with the author’s characteristic erudition, some of the many forms and features and activities found in the paintings. These studies cover early modes of cotton manufacture, a discussion of India’s balances (such as the type on which King Sibi weighed his own flesh, in the story of his compassionate sacrifice), cattle and cattle marks, and a lengthy disquisition on ships and seafaring in India and beyond. The author then discusses the relationship between Indian poetry and painting, in terms of their mutual dependence, but also explaining how they sometimes must take divergent courses to achieve their desired ends. In the final chapter, only incidentally about Ajanta’s paintings, the author provides an extensive analysis of various compositional schemes used for narration in India and the West, pointing out how, in India’s “continuing” narrative mode, the setting has the “dominant influence on the composition and...determines the arrangement of the scenes” (p. 265). One can learn much by following Schlingloff’s and discussion point by point, for we seldom look at works of art with such care. Admittedly, the process is not helped here by the all-too-small (yet very complex) line drawings to which one must constantly refer while reading the text. In the illustrations to this and other chapters as well, the identification of the scenes is never given, making it very difficult to leaf through the pictures to find scenes of interest; and the problem is compounded by the omission of any list of illustrations. One can only hope that some of these important studies will eventually be published with illustrations that do them greater justice and give the reader the kind of pleasure that the intellectual content itself so richly provides.

WALTER SPINK


Edited and translated by Natasha Eilenberg, with the assistance of Melvin Elliott, the new edition carefully preserves the original work, enriching it by the addition of a chronological chart, map, drawings (copied after yet another of Professor Boisselier’s books—*La statuaire khmère et son évolution, École Française d’Extrême-Orient*, Saigon, 1955), as well as a glossary of terms and a short select bibliography. These additions, as well as the inexpensive paperback format, make it easily accessible and comprehensible for students less familiar with the subject of Khmer art. The book in its current version, in fact, becomes a concise, useful survey of Cambodian art. This was clearly the goal of the publisher, the Southeast Asia Program of Cornell University, presently one of the most active centers in Southeast Asian studies in the United States.

The work, originally conceived as a catalogue of twenty-four select sculptures from the National Museum in Phnom Penh, while still retaining its purpose of introducing the reader to some of the greatest masterpieces of Cambodian art, allows the reader to study them in the context of the stylistic development of Khmer art. The book begins with an introduction by the author, followed by historical and religious outlines, and finally concentrates on the statuary, providing detailed entries for each sculpture. It is one of the most informative, concise publications dealing with the subject.

The choice of sculptures selected for the original work, which remains unchanged here, begins with the earliest Phnom Da Vihouh and several other pre-Angkorean sculptures, including in this number the famous Prasat Andet Haribara. It continues with masterpieces of Kulen, Bakong, Koh Ker, Baphuon, Angkor Wat, and Bayon. In other words, it covers the entire spectrum of Khmer art from its beginnings in the sixth century through its great florescence until the end of the thirteenth century. The last entry, in fact, a kneeling figure made of wood from Angkor, produced in the fifteenth century under the influence of the Ayuthya school, proves that some of the sculptures that postdate the thirteenth century still merit our attention.

Since the Phnom Penh sculptures are no longer accessible to students of Cambodian art (although contrary to rumor they survive intact, as I recently had the opportunity to verify), the current edition of Professor Boisselier’s book takes on a new meaning, popularizing these masterpieces once again and reminding the world of their great beauty and importance.

Stan J. Czuma


Some months before the last flicker of Song imperial pretensions drowned with the child-emperor Zhao Bing at Yashan in 1279, a Tibetan monk named Yanglizhuan jia provided a much more potent and symbolic termination of the dynasty when he looted the imperial Song tombs at Kuaiji and scattered the corpses of the Southern Song emperors and their consorts in the surrounding woods. The lama’s brutal desecration of the imperial mausolea effectively symbolizes the unusual nature of dynastic change that took place with the Mongol conquest of the Southern Song. Not only had a foreign, “barbarian” force managed for the first time to establish complete dominion over the Chinese empire, but it had done so with shocking suddenness—displacement occurring not after the customary contortions of dynastic decline, but amidst economic prosperity, cultural splendor, and relative political stability. With a new age appearing before the old one had run its course, issues of continuity and change were to be determined less by the question of survival of material culture than by personal choice, the consequences of which were made all the sharper by such actions as those of Yanglizhuan jia. Add to this the ironic fact that the Mongol triumph restored China to full size and opened communication between north and south for the first time in one hundred fifty years and one begins to appreciate the potential complexity that accompanies the study of Yuan dynasty painting. Probably never in the history of Chinese painting were so many choices concerning style and content available to artists so strongly affected, directly or indirectly, by historical circumstances. The diversity of Yuan painting, the complexity of the issues that underlie it, and the sheer number
of works and documentation extant—despite the brevity of the dynasty—all combine to make this one of the most rewarding and challenging subjects of art historical inquiry.

Publication of the third tome of Suzuki Kei’s ongoing historical study of Chinese painting, Chūgoku kaigishi, Part I1b, the Yuan dynasty, is thus a welcome event for specialists in the field. As with his previous works in the series (Part I [1981] through Northern Song, Part I1a [1984] on Southern Song, Liao and Jin), Professor Suzuki presents the experiences of a lifetime devoted to the study of Chinese painting condensed into a format that equally balances historical documentation with art historical analysis. The former is of unquestioned value, as the author not only provides convenient transcriptions (usually in the notes) of colophons, poems, tomb inscriptions, and other essential primary documents but also adds to the fruits of his own prodigious sinological skills the combined efforts of other historians to present state-of-the-art research into the lives of the artists. The real interest in this study of Yuan painting, however, lies in Professor Suzuki’s analyses of the paintings themselves. As one of the most respected senior scholars of Chinese art in the world, Professor Suzuki’s opinions, his insights, and his methodology must all be carefully considered by those interested in advancing the field.

The volume is divided into the following twelve headings:

(1) “Introduction—On Collecting and the Organizational Framework of Yuan Painters,” (2) “Landscape Painting and the Fugu Movement in Early Yuan,” (3) “Large-scale Landscape Painting in the Yuan,” (4) “The Development of the Li Cheng/Guo Xi School of Landscape Painting,” (5) “The Dong Yuan/Juran School—Followers of the Mi Family Tradition,” (6) “The Four Masters of Late Yuan,” (7) “Late Yuan—Early Ming Painters Centered in Suzhou,” (8) “The Southern Song Academy School,” (9) “Others,” (10) “On Professionalism and Amateurism,” (11) “Flower and Animal Painting,” and (12) “Figure Painting.” Of these, the chapters on large-scale landscape painting, the Dong/Ju school, the Southern Song Academy style (essentially on Sun Junze), and the issues concerning professionalism and amateurism are all very brief, shorter than a number of the individual subsections of the other chapters. The book’s structure, in fact, is somewhat unusual, organized according to a number of overlapping principles. Subject matter, for example, seems to be the dominant concern, the book basically dividing into landscape (chapters 2–5), flowers and animals, which includes the themes of bamboo and old trees (chapter 11), and figure painting, which includes Buddhist subjects (chapter 12). The landscape chapters are further divided in accordance with style (Li/Guo, Dong/Ju, Southern Song Academic) or other criteria (fugu, “Four Masters,” late Yuan literati) and more or less follow a chronological progression, at least through chapter 7. Some of the shorter chapters help maintain the flow of the book in its first half—the chapter on large-scale landscape painting serves as an introduction to the important chapter on the Li/Guo style, which in turn is balanced by a short discussion of the Dong/Ju school and the Mi family style—but by the eighth chapter the conflicts one might expect from a book organized according to so many criteria emerge, resulting in a kaleidoscopic impression of artists, genres, and styles in the second half. Chapter 9, simply called “Others,” exemplifies this, with sections devoted to such disparate subjects as Sheng Mou, Liu Guandaot, jiekua landscapes (Wang Zhenpeng, Li Rongjin, Xia Yong), Leng Qian and his “Baiyue tu,” and the salon of the late Yuan patron Gu Ying among others. There are notable absences among major artists (Zhao Yong, Chen Lin, Ren Renfa, Ke Jiuni, Wang Mian, and Wang Yuan, to name a few), major genres (horse painting), and monuments. On the other hand, a number of artists and genres of painting infrequently if ever touched upon in Chinese and Western studies are included, such as lotus and flower/fowl paintings, and such obscure Chan painters as Chen Mengyuan and Songtian. The overall impression is that of a large tableau of Yuan painting constructed from finely detailed examinations of those artists, works, and themes that have attracted the attention of the author over a great many years.

As Professor Suzuki’s approach to art history focuses primarily on issues of style, the organization of his book cannot but reflect some of the perplexing diversity of the period’s art. To a large degree it also reflects his overall view of Yuan painting, which, he says in his preface, cannot be summarized simply. Such characteristics as the fugu movement of early Yuan, the influence of calligraphy on painting, and the growing importance of self-expression are only limited aspects that cannot describe the entire picture (p. 1). Yuan is called a “transitional period” (a key term), not only from the perspective of the lives of the important artists, who because of the short span of the dynasty mostly appear to be either coming from Song or heading towards Ming, but also because of the character of the art, which is described as “syncrgetic,” “eclectic,” (p. 2). As this view of Yuan painting, in my opinion, is very much determined by Professor Suzuki’s basic methodology, and thus of importance to the reader, I would like to focus on it in this review. As a way of introducing the central issues I will first offer a few comments and observations with regard to the first chapters on landscape painting, which basically establish the pattern of Professor Suzuki’s approach to Yuan painting. The book is much too rich and dense to allow a detailed critique of all the material covered.

In the chapter on the fugu movement in landscape painting of the early Yuan, the common denominator linking the three subjects Qian Xuan, Zhao Mengfu, and Gao Kegong is their shared pursuit of guyi, “the mood or concept of antiquity.” Here Professor Suzuki uses to great advantage his experience and familiarity with earlier lineages and styles in determining the sources utilized by these three painters. As more is learned about the important traditions preceding the Yuan dynasty, and a consensus is reached concerning which extant paintings best represent these traditions, such analyses will undoubtedly undergo certain refinements. The tradition of the late Northern Song literati painter Wang Shen is an important example. In the first volume of Chūgoku kaigishi, Professor Suzuki reveals a guarded approach to Wang Shen’s extant attributions, essentially accepting only the Shanghai Museum’s ink and colors on silk version of Seriel Peaks on the Misty River (Tianjiang diechang tu) as a relatively close reflection of the earlier artist’s style of landscape painting. The lack of a strongly defined image of Wang Shen’s art, in my opinion, results in the undervaluing of one of the major influences on both Qian Xuan and Zhao Mengfu. In Qian’s case, Wang Shen’s influence must be considered paramount—not only stylistically, but thematically as well. Professor Suzuki’s description of one of the Beijing National Palace Museum Dwelling in the Mountains (Shanju tu) as suggestive of the immortal isles Penglai and Yingzhou falls just short of establishing the essential link with Wang Shen, whose archaic landscapes promote association with such other-worldly realms. As for Zhao Mengfu, Wang Shen’s influence could be more explicitly recognized on Zhao’s Seriel Peaks on the Layered Rivers (Chongjiang diechang tu) now in the National Palace Museum, Taipei. This painting is considered an “awkward copy” by the author (p. 45), but
one whose original model is presumed to have attempted to combine the diametrically opposed landscape traditions of Dong Yuan/Juran and Li Cheng/Guo Xi. A second *Serried Peaks on the Misty River* attributed to Wang Shen in the Shanghai Museum may well be relevant to Zhao’s landscape of very similar title. (This one, of ink only, has been published and discussed by Xu Bangda in his *Gu shuhua weihao ban*.) The painting is only a portion of the original and not necessarily directly from Wang Shen’s hand, as Professor Xu suggests, but its general stylistic relationship to Zhao’s painting and its confirmed documentary link to the time of Zhao Mengfu and his circle combine to suggest that Wang Shen is the prime figure underlying Zhao’s expression of *guyi* in *Serried Peaks on the Layered Rivers.* To Professor Suzuki’s credit, he mentions a possible connection to Wang Shen in his discussion of this painting, which in turn becomes a potential explanation for what are perceived as failures in the painting’s expression of landscape (the author recognizes an exaggeration of irrational qualities in late Northern Song painting), but this insight is left unexplored at the very close of his arguments (p. 46). Interestingly, in Professor Suzuki’s 1966 article on the Li/Guo school in the Yuan, a stylistic connection is made between Zhao Mengfu’s *Serried Peaks on the Layered Rivers* and the Freer Gallery *Autumn Clearing Over Streams and Mountains* (Xishan qiqiu tu), which is traditionally attributed to Guo Xi but has more recently been ascribed to Wang Shen’s oeuvre by Xie Zhihui and Richard Barnhart. Though Professor Suzuki does not agree with this attribution, one might argue that his own original insights essentially support this Wang Shen–Zhao Mengfu connection.

Recognizing Wang Shen’s influence in the reemergence of a literati style of landscape painting in early Yuan is important for a number of reasons. With specific regard to Zhao’s *Serried Peaks on the Layered Rivers*, it leaves open to question Professor Suzuki’s thesis that a number of Zhao’s landscape paintings are attempts at merging the Dong/Ju and Li/Guo traditions (including River Village, Fisherman’s Joy, *Jingang yule tu*, Cleveland Museum of Art) and *Water Village* (Shuchuan tu, National Palace Museum, Beijing). Establishing an eclectic approach in Zhao Mengfu’s landscapes serves the author well with regard to the trends he sees in Yuan painting in general, but it is questionable how close this brings us to the original intentions of the artist. By exploring the very different manners in which Wang Shen may have influenced both Zhao and Qian Xuan, such intentions might be clarified. Qian emerges as one who pursues his own vision of landscape upon the general framework established by the earlier Wang Shen, incorporating what other elements may be necessary towards the realization of that vision, including those common to the paintings of the Southern Song Academy (as Professor Suzuki demonstrates so well [p. 25]). For Zhao, on the other hand, Wang Shen seems to represent but one of a number of individual forays into the great tradition: style by itself becomes the subject of the artist’s attention.

Understanding the nature of Gao Kegong’s *guyi* appears to be a more difficult matter. In particular, all too little is known of how the Mi family style landscape developed in the north of China following the fall of the Northern Song—one of the likely sources available to Mi followers in the early Yuan. Perhaps, as Professor Suzuki and others have described him, Gao Kegong was simply an eclectic artist who blended the styles of Mi Fu, Mi Youren, Dong Yuan, Juran, Li Cheng, and others to forge an appropriate style capable of capturing the subtleties of the southern landscape to which he had become so attracted (p. 58). Or were the styles themselves of more interest to the artist than the landscape they were being used to describe? Professor Suzuki’s suggestion that Gao Kegong may not have formulated clear distinctions between Dong Yuan, Juran, and the Mi family style (p. 60) and that the artist may not have been conscious about his overlapping of the various styles (p. 55) is frankly contradicted by the earliest descriptions of Gao Kegong’s development as a painter, in which he is said to have added elements from Dong Yuan and Juran to a style of painting based upon the two Masters. Again, Xu Bangda’s *Gu shuhua weihao ban* reproduces an important document: Gao Kegong’s *Evening Haze in Autumn Mountains* (*Qushan mu tu*, now in the National Palace Museum, Beijing), fragmentary and damaged, but authentic. A comparison with the only other entirely reliable landscape by Gao, *Elegant Peaks Girdled by Clouds* (*Yunheng xialing tu*, National Palace Museum, Taipeh), reveals a clear transition from a Mi Youren-dominated style (*Evening Haze*) to one that incorporates the hoary texture strokes of Dong Yuan (*Elegant Peaks*), thus substantiating Deng Wenyuan’s reference to Dong Yuan in his inscription on the latter painting, as well as bringing new meaning to Li Kan’s criticism of Gao’s earlier paintings being overly refined and lacking brush-strength. *Evening Haze in Autumn Mountains* is of immeasurable value as the controlling document by which Gao’s expression of *guyi* in the late *Elegant Peaks Girdled by Clouds* can begin to be analyzed. It also helps to remind us that eclecticism is not synonymous with confusion or ignorance.

If Professor Suzuki’s analyses of Zhao Mengfu’s and Gao Kegong’s landscapes reveal a general mistrust of the eclectic landscape, his analysis of Zhao Mengfu’s *Autumn Colors on the Qing and Hua Mountains* (*Qing Hua quie tu*, National Palace Museum, Taipeh) reveals a related mistrust of the irrational landscape. As the study of Chinese painting develops, this scroll appears to be emerging as a kind of litmus test by which general attitudes towards Yuan dynasty art can be ascertained, especially in its relationship to the slightly later *Water Village*. For those who appreciate the painting, its spatial incoherence, contradictions of scale, and archaic expression herald some of the more challenging aspects of later painting. For others, at best it represents an “experiment” (Max Loehr’s term), especially in comparison with the more tranquil and rational *Water Village*. One feels Professor Suzuki struggling to accept this work, cognizant of the various arguments made on behalf of its illogicalities but essentially disturbed by what he sees (pp. 39–42, and especially n. 28). In the end he half accepts the painting, but only with the qualification that much of the painting has probably been retouched. Professor Suzuki’s explanation for the curious geographical misplacement of the two mountains Huafuzhu and Qiao (Zhao’s inscription explicitly states that in the picture Mt. Qiao is in the east when in reality it should be to the west of Mt. Hua) is reflective of his preference for overtly logical solutions. Zhao Mengfu’s inscription, he suspects, was rewritten or touched up by a Wen Zhengming follower ignorant of Shandong geography (n. 28). Knowing that the recipient of the painting was Zhou Mi, a man who sought to identify himself with the subject of this painting (his ancestral homeland), Professor Suzuki considers it hard to believe that this “error” would have gone uncorrected if truly a simple “slip of Zhao’s brush,” as Qianlong has suggested. While it is true that the “slip of the brush” theory carries little weight, other, more positive explanations are apparent to those willing to see this painting as a colorful celebration of the illogical. Logic, after all, probably meant little to a Song loyalist like Zhou Mi in 1296. With Mt. Huafuzhu set
at the right of the composition, Zhou Mi opens the scroll and encounters first the mountain whose name he shares as a sobriquet. By announcing that Mt. Huafuzhu sits in the west, the view becomes southward—the only direction a loyalist could face (cf. Zheng Sixiao). The landscape is an image of the man, a man who, like Qian Xuan, must have sought refuge in an antiquity free of harsh realities and logic. Possibly the incongruities between Autumn Colors and Water Village have more to do with the social environments of their recipients, Zhou Mi and Qian Zhongding, than with anything else.

A preference for harmonious, classical forms appears frequently in Professor Suzuki's history of Yuan painting. It is particularly evident in the important chapter on the Li/Guo school of landscape painters, which focuses first on the major artists Cao Zhibo, Tang Di, and Zhu Derun before considering, under the section-heading "Others," Yao Tingmei, Luo Zhichuan, Li Sheng, a painting signed "Lai'an jushi" (Chicago Art Institute), and the Autumn and Winter twin hanging scrolls of the Tokyo National Museum. Highly detailed descriptions are used to emphasize distinctions between such closely related paintings as Cao Zhibo's Clearing Snow Among the Peaks (Chuang sueq tu, National Palace Museum, Taihe) and Scattered Pines, Hidden Mountains (Shusong youxu tu, National Palace Museum, Beijing), and Tang Di's Returning Fishermen on the Frosty Bank (Shuangyu guiyu tu, National Palace Museum, Taihe) and Returning Fishermen (Guiyu tu, Metropolitan Museum). With both of these particular pairings, one painting emerges as garish, loud, overly contravertive, and mannered (Clearing Snow and Returning Fishermen on the Frosty Bank) while the other is relatively subtle and pleasing. Scattered Pines, Hidden Mountains in particular reflects the tastes of the author: avoiding the all-too-common attempt to combine the antithetical Dong/Ju and Li/Guo traditions, Cao Zhibo has created a landscape of unity, harmony, peacefulness... a painting that reveals his "deep understanding of the Li/Guo tradition" (pp. 77-78). In contrast, the more mannered landscapes, with their exaggerated forms, loose brushwork, bold tonal contrasts, and lack of concern for naturalism, are usually seen as adumbrations of the Zhe school (including, surprisingly, Cao Zhibo's Clearing Snow). Basically such developments are seen as misunderstandings of the Li/Guo tradition, resulting, perhaps, from a reliance on models that were already some distance removed from the original Northern Song landscapes (p. 68). While Professor Suzuki does reveal an awareness that expressive aims underlie the abstractions of artists such as Tang Di (p. 85), more often than not quality is associated with the Northern Song vision. Indicative of this orientation is his suggestion that the painting by the unknown Lai'an jushi, which is called a fine work, may be closely modelled after an earlier landscape (p. 104).

In his 1976 study of the so-called Northern lineage of Chinese landscape painters, Ri Tu, Ba En, Ku Kui (Suiboku bijutsu taikei, v. 2, Tokyo), Professor Suzuki acknowledges that the study of style alone, without consideration of the artists, their milieu, and the schools to which they belong, cannot be expected to yield particularly fruitful results. Such an inclusive, synthesized approach was beyond the intentions of the author at that time, but, nevertheless, the result was an invigoratingly fresh examination of those artists and paintings that had fallen into undeserved disrepute since the time of Dong Qichang. There is little doubt that Professor Suzuki intended his history of Yuan painting to go beyond the self-imposed limitations of Ri Tu, Ba En, Ke Kui. The wealth of biographical information included in this volume alone proves this. However, it is debatable to what degree this book presents a truly synthesized history of Yuan painting. Attempts at integrating the biographies of the painters with the discussion of their paintings are limited, the two more often being juxtaposed against one another, and the analyses of the paintings, consequently, again become oriented towards that larger scheme—the history of style.

There are two tendencies when paintings are viewed in this manner. First, vertical relationships with stylistically related works of the past become emphasized, overshadowing potentially more significant relationships with contemporary paintings, artists, and others linked by criteria not necessarily concerned with style. With regard to Zhao Mengfu's Autumn Colors on the Qiao and Hua Mountains, for example, which relationship should be considered primary—Zhao Mengfu and Dong Yuan or Zhao Mengfu and Zhou Mi? As it is presented in the specific context of this painting, I think the former cannot be understood without first fully exploring the latter. The landscapes of Cao Zhibo are another example. In two places Professor Suzuki presents documentation that suggests a close relationship between Cao and Huang Gongwang (Huang's 1350 inscription on Cao's Clearing Snow Among the Peaks [p. 75, n. 75] and Huang's friendship with Cao's son Cao Yong [n. 90], who owned Huang's Rain Over Mountains and Streams). Which relationship is the more enlightening—Cao Zhibo and the Li/Guo tradition or Cao Zhibo and Huang Gongwang? Cao and Huang were exact contemporaries who knew each other's paintings well (note the content of Huang's inscription), and their landscapes, in my opinion, have much in common. The details of such a relationship remain to be clarified, but nevertheless, ultimately this may prove a more rewarding avenue of inquiry than that which places Cao Zhibo somewhere between Li Cheng and the Zhe school.

This touches upon the second tendency: with this strong orientation towards style, it becomes difficult not to see these paintings as participants in sweeping processes that might be described as either declinational or teleological—falling away from some height of achievement or aiming towards something yet to come. This is well demonstrated both in the evaluation of the Li/Guo school artists and in the oft-repeated observation that much of what is seen in Yuan painting is a taste of things to come (i.e. Zhe school). In the former case standards of judgement are imposed that fail to enhance our understanding of the paintings discussed. An effort is made to put the works of such artists as Tang Di in a positive light, but the author's great admiration of the Song achievement prevents the unprejudiced evaluation that is vital to the study of any period's art. As for the similarities to Ming dynasty Zhe school painting, one can argue with reason that the Yuan artists are relevant to the later painters, but there is no such relevance in the other direction; the Yuan painters had neither knowledge of nor concern for what would follow in the future.

This gets to the very heart of the label transitional. Every period of human endeavor becomes transitional when considered with reference to what came before and what comes after. It is entirely a question of one's perspective. If one chooses to see Yuan painting as a unitary phenomenon, naturally the focus changes: contemporary affairs become vastly more significant than those of the past or future. Professor Suzuki's description of Wang Meng's Dwelling in Retreat in the Blue Mountain (Qing Buan shanju tu, Shanghai Museum of Art) as a painting that expresses the heights and narrow of nature's spiritual aspect in a manner reminiscent of Guo Xi's Early Spring (p. 138) is a clear example of how the author's methodological orientation results in an evaluation that essentially transcends the immediate concerns...
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of the painting's context. It is not that Wang Meng's Blue Bian Mountains does not reveal a thorough understanding of Northern Song landscape painting, as the author suggests, but that the use of Early Spring as a point of reference for understanding this landscape leads one far away from what many consider to be the primary motivating force in this painting—the chaos of war-stricken Jiangnan as the Yuan dynasty gasped its last painful breaths. Blue Bian Mountains may be as compelling as Early Spring, but nothing could be further from the Song painting's celebration of a landscape ruled by sagely governance than the disturbing imagery of Wang Meng's landscape of almost three hundred years later.

This is not to dismiss the undeniable benefits that emerge from Professor Suzuki's focus on style. The numerous anonymous landscapes, many of which are misattributed to Five Dynasties and Song masters, for example, will become more readily understandable to those who follow Professor Suzuki's descriptions of Yuan mannerisms. And certainly even the most familiar of monuments are bound to look different after exposure to the sharp insights of Professor Suzuki's eye—there is no better form of education than the extremely detailed approach that he brings to the analysis of paintings. With those artists of whom little is known, stylistic analysis is often the only guide to our understanding, and when coupled with a genuine appreciation for the paintings in question, such as those of Sun Jianze and Luo Zhichuan, the results are quite satisfying. There are also moments when the author's analyses extend horizontally beyond the narrow confines of style to speculate upon the motivations underlying a certain painting or genre of painting. The willingness to consider what the intricately detailed architecture and landscape paintings of Wang Zhenpeng, Li Rongjin, and Xia Yong meant to the Yuan court, for example, makes this section one of the most rewarding in the book.

Sometimes Professor Suzuki's detailed research into the biography of an artist or his milieu by itself creates an effective environment within which we can better understand his art. For example, we are indebted to Professor Suzuki for ferreting out an impressive amount of material about the little-known artist Zhu Shuzhong (n. 51, pp. 106–8), whose sole work, a landscape in the Mi style, is now provided with a historical and personal context. With Zhao Mengfu the author elaborates upon his acquaintances with the Chao community, particularly Zhao's close ties to Zhongfeng Mingben (pp. 29–30, n. 20–22), thus revealing a private side to the artist that consequently enriches our appreciation of Zhao's paintings. In general, however, there is a hesitancy to explore at any level of depth the imprecise but vital qualities of expression and personality in these paintings. With regard to Ni Zan, Professor Suzuki remarks that while there presumably is meaning in these landscapes pared down to the most basic of elements, to us, the vulgar, such meanings are unclear; we can only appreciate the strength of his brush, the subtlety of his ink . . . it is impossible to proceed further (p. 133). Difficult, certainly, but if the Yuan artists were concerned with self-expression, as Professor Suzuki acknowledges, then is the art historian not obligated to try and go further in determining the specific nature of such expression in the paintings? It is a telling fact that the inscriptions written on these paintings by the artists and their friends are usually incorporated into the discussion of the paintings only when comments are included that pertain to style or patronage. Ni Zan's poems on his paintings may not always appear directly relevant to his landscapes, but the very fact that he wrote them there compels us to consider what the two, text and image, express together.

If the goal of this volume is to present the very fabric of Yuan painting, with all of its complexities of design and color, then in the end the book's structure proves self-defeating. The horizontal relationships so vital to establishing bits and pieces of the pattern are rarely given the chance to appear; artists and paintings, instead, are relegated to categories that are fundamentally a-historical. The very informative section on Gu Ying's patronage, for example, is left neglected in the chapter entitled "Others," yet how naturally it would have fit with the chapter on the Suzhou literati landscape painters of the late Yuan. Why was it not? Presumably because Gu Ying's circle also included Ni Zan and Wang Meng, two of the Four Masters, and Xuechuhua and Bo Ziting, who, as artists of plants and old trees, also had to be included in a separate chapter. Consequently, Gu Ying's circle is left scattered under different chapter headings. Even the very painting of his studio—Zhao Yuan's beautifully lyrical The Grass Hut at Hesi (Hesi aozhuang tu, Shanghai Museum)—is barely made relevant, discussed not as one of the essential documents that helps to define the image of Gu Ying's patronage, but limited to a brief description in the section under Zhao Yuan.

Where are the consequences of the structure of this volume more apparent than with the fate of the yimin painters of the early Yuan, who, like Gu Ying's circle, are dispatched to different categories of subject matter and style. Luo Zhichuan to the Li/Guo school, Zheng Sixiao to plants and flowers, Gong Kai to animals, among others. And nowhere are the weaknesses of this approach more strongly felt than with Qian Xuan, who appears as a split personality, neatly divided up between the sections on the fugu landscape and plants and flowers. Stylistically, Qian Xuan's paintings of fruits and flowers may appear quite different from his archaistic landscapes, but consideration of the contents of the poems he wrote on such paintings as White Lotus (Liniuhua tu, Shandong Provincial Museum), Autumn Melon (Qiu gua tu, National Palace Museum, Taipei), and Peach Blossoms (Metropolitan Museum of Art) should make it clear that the underlying attitudes of loyalty to the fallen Song, alienation from the Mongol regime, and desire for an ideal world never to be attained are fully expressed in both genres of Qian's paintings. They should not be separated.

There is evidence that in at least some of Qian Xuan's paintings, political sympathies and artistic aims are shared with the group of fourteen yimin loyalists, including Zhou Mi and Qiu Yuan, who composed the "Yuefu buti," a collection of thirty-seven ci poems written in response to the desecration of the Song imperial tombs by Yanglizhen jia. Another yimin artist outraged by the deeds of Yanglizhen jia was the proud monk Wen Riguan, a man who cursed the Tibetan lama as a "grave-robbing devil," was given to unusual outbursts of emotion, and painted branches of drunken grapes as "white eyes staring at the blue sky." Presumably Qian Xuan and Wen Riguan possessed very different personalities; stylistically, their paintings have nothing in common. And yet the fateful events of the late thirteenth century created bonds between these two men and their art that should never be neglected. Perhaps this more than anything illustrates the complexity of Yuan painting. Differences of style, subject matter, and influence should not overshadow the fact that collectively these paintings narrate the history of the period's art. If we listen carefully, compelling harmonies may yet appear amidst the apparent cacophony.

It is testimony to the extraordinary effort that went into this book, the years of painstaking research, that much of the material that will ultimately allow us to broaden our understanding of the warp and woof of Yuan dynasty
painting exists in this volume. In fact, as Professor Suzuki's history of Chinese painting slowly emerges, volume by volume, the immensity of his achievement becomes more and more apparent. This is a serious academic work, unlikely to be paralleled in depth and scope by anything for years, perhaps generations, to come. Nevertheless, the challenges posed by Yuan dynasty painting will be with us for a long, long time.

As a final note it should be pointed out that there is a number of errors, oversights, and controversial choices in the book; only the more important ones are listed here. Gao Kegong's Clearing Rains in Spring Mountains (Chanshan qingyu tu, pl. 22), whose whereabouts are described as unknown, is, in the collection of the National Palace Museum, Taipei, and the Li Kan inscription upon it is dated 1299, not 1295. The first two plates of the book, which should reproduce two different paintings by Qian Xuan, both entitled Dwelling in the Mountains (Shanju tu), repeat the same scroll from different sources. To clarify: plate 1, whose whereabouts are described as unknown, is the painting entitled Dwelling in the Mountains (Shanju tu) in the National Palace Museum, Beijing; plate 2 should be the painting published by Xu Bangda as The Hidden Dwelling (Youju tu), which is also in the National Palace Museum, Beijing. While the two paintings are easily confused, only the former possesses a poem by Qian Xuan, and only the latter has a title inscribed at the scroll's beginning. This last error, which is particularly unfortunate for plunging the reader into confusion right at the very start, is indicative of a laxity in the editing of this volume that results in the occasional failure to coordinate text and plates. A number of paintings discussed in relative detail are not reproduced, such as the twin Autumn and Winter hanging scrolls attributed to Yan Ciping (mistakenly printed Yan Cimian) in the Tokyo National Museum, which are considered important enough to merit their own subsection in the chapter on the Li/Guo style (p. 105). At other times paintings are reproduced in truncated form, or worse, as details only—notably Tang Di's Drinking Party in the Shade of Trees (Linjin yujin tu, Shanghai Museum, pl. 34), and Ma Wan's Hidden Dwelling Amidst Lofty Peaks (Qiaoxiu yujin tu, National Palace Museum, Taipei, pl. 95). In contrast, a few paintings reproduced are barely mentioned at all in the text—Zhao Mengfu's Poetic Ideas Inspired by Autumn (Qixing shiyi tu, pl. 13) and Huang Gongwang's Clearing Snow on the Nine Peaks (Jiufeng xuexi tu National Palace Museum, Beijing, pl. 62) and The Nine Pearl Peaks (Jiuchufeng cai tu, National Palace Museum, Taipei, pl. 63). Fortunately, most of the quirks to the illustrations disappear by the second half of the book.

Tang Di's Fishing in the Snowy Cove, (Xuogang buyu tu, Shanghai Museum, pl. 48) is a copy of a painting whose present whereabouts are unknown. Interestingly, the resemblances Professor Suzuki sees between this painting and Dai Jin's work (p. 89) are supported by a recent article by Howard Rogers, who proposes the theory that this scroll, which possesses the Mu family seal, is a Dai Jin copy. In his discussion of the anonymous Kaishu tu in the Freer Gallery (pl. 176, p. 241), mention should be made of the prototype attributed to Wang Qihan in the Nanjing University collection.

A number of paintings chosen to represent Zhu Derun and Wang Meng will be considered controversial. The same can be said of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts' Nine Sages (Jiaoge tu), which has been used to represent Zhang Wo. Given the problems associated with Lu Guang's attributed Towers and Pavilions in the Mountains of Immortals (Xianshan tongguan tu, National Palace Museum, Taipei), a more standard work such as Spring Morn at the Alchemist's Terrace (Dantai chunxiao tu, Elliot Collection) would have served better as the sole painting representing the artist's oeuvre.

Notes
1. Xu Bangda, Gu shuhua wei e kaobian, Nanjing, 1984, shang, pp. 213–16, pl. 42.3.
5. Gu shuhua wei e kaobian, xia, p. 41, p. 43 n. 1, pl. 14.5.
11. See Thomas Lawton, Chinese Figure Painting, Washington, 1973, pp. 78–80.

PETER C. STURMAN


In this book the author sets out to redefine the patronage and the dating of the Buddhist caves of Yungang. Closely connected with these two questions are matters of style at Yungang and its autonomous character described on page 11 as "Yungang . . . as though in a vacuum." One half of the book is text, and the other half consists of footnotes in which an impressive array of sources and references are listed and quoted to bolster the arguments for the striking
new conclusions the author proposes in the text. I limit my comments to the text.

Any study on Yungang is forever indebted to the monumental work by S. Mizuno and T. Nagahiro (Unko Sekkatsu, 16 double volumes, Kyoto, 1952-56). In subsequent studies a number of major and some minor changes in date and patronage have been made by Alexander C. Soper. Su Bai's publication (Beijing Da-xue Xuebao, 1956, no. 1, pp. 71-84) of historical notes and repairs recorded in 1147 by Can Yao as preserved in a copy from a Jin stone tablet added substantial information on later Yungang history and, more importantly, on Northern Wei patronage of the Yungang caves. Based on these sources and a large number of various other pieces of information, Professor Caswell proposes to assign most of the caves except the imperially sponsored Tanyao caves to aristocratic patrons and to the patronage of Buddhist societies and individuals or groups of individuals with an interest in Buddhism and ambitions to record their piety. Not only does he separate these caves from the earlier imperial caves by their patronage but he suggests that these privately sponsored caves are also separated in time from the Tanyao caves. Although it has always been recognized that there was a variety of patronage for the construction of the Yungang caves, an assumption supported by the few preserved inscriptions, such as those of 483 and 489, and by the many intrusions of carvings of smaller compositions in the principle layout of the walls of the caves, it has been assumed that the main impulse for their construction lay in the continued support and patronage of the imperial house. Little or no imperial presence in the later Yungang caves, as is argued by Professor Caswell, would drastically alter those assumptions.

The proposed patronage changes in Yungang find their best support in Caswell's demonstration that the members of the imperial family were investing heavily in Buddhist projects other than the Yungang caves and that the records do not show they were much interested in Yungang after the sixties of the fifth century. Although one cannot claim much positive evidence in this argument, it is supported by the report in the Jin tablet that at least one cave (pair of caves) was constructed by Wang Yu. No matter the precise identity of this cave, it is clear that it was not a niche or a minor project but an undertaking of major proportions. That fact alone alters substantially the hitherto held traditions of exclusive imperial patronage in the later large caves at Yungang. Professor Caswell argues that the obvious differences between the Tanyao and the other caves at Yungang favor the assumption of differences in patronage. In size and in concentration on central image and shallow enclosure, the Tanyao caves seem exclusively intent on the singular idea of an isolated image and attendants, and are therefore well matched to the symbol of individual imperial presence. The variety of imagery and layouts in later caves suggests a different interest. This may suggest family concerns and devotional purposes and iconographical schemes to match particular doctrines. But these differences between the Tanyao and later caves seem of limited use when arguing for non-imperial patronage. The imperial family could well have acted as a family rather than a representative unit for "Ruler," and their interests would not then have differed that much from those of other aristocratic Tuoba families who might have sponsored caves at Yungang. On the other hand, Professor Caswell's argument does gain strength from the parallel presence in the eighties of the fifth century of lay sponsorship in the Guyang cave at Longmen and similarly from the presence of large caves sponsored by monks and lay people in the Gansu area in the early sixth century. No matter where the particular sponsorship is to be found, it is clear that the author's arguments highlight the importance of seeing the various levels of Buddhist concerns that led to distinctly different expressions in sculptural layouts and references.

Instead of following traditional concepts of dating that place the large Yungang caves in a roughly continuous sequence from the sixties to about 495 and the western caves from later years until about 525, Professor Caswell suggests three main building periods. He places the activity for the Tanyao caves in the sixties, following the commonly accepted pattern. Suggesting a termination of imperial interest after the Tanyao caves, he assumes a period of fifteen years of little sculptural activity and then a second major period of construction from about 485 to 495. The third period of activity he envisions coincides with the commonly accepted decades of activity for the western caves after the transfer of the capital from Datong to Luoyang. This scheme of dating the Yungang caves matches the differences in patronage between the earlier and later period of activity and results in a well-ordered pattern for the whole construction of this large Buddhist site.

There are a number of differences between this proposed dating by Professor Caswell and that of earlier attempts. Though there has never been uniformity of opinion on the precise dating and sequence of the construction of the Yungang caves, the construction of Caves VII and VIII is, at least, generally assumed to have taken place in the decade between the late sixties and the late seventies. Su Bai assumes a date in the mid to late seventies, which is late compared with that of others who have ventured opinions on the matter. Professor Caswell dates Caves VII and VIII to the eighties, and that is crucial for his new history of Yungang. Whereas Su Bai has tentatively identified the pair of Caves IX and X as the caves constructed between 484 and 489 by Wang Yu, Caswell argues for VII and VIII, thereby placing VII and VIII at the critical juncture of the last decade of Yungang activity before the transfer of the capital to Luoyang. An attribution of VII and VIII to Wang Yu based on the information in the Jin tablet is as ambiguous as Su Bai's arguments for IX and X. We know only that there was a large incomplete inscription in front of the Huguo caves and a short complete one in front of the Chengtu caves, and that one of the Huguo caves had an equestrian representation of a Tuoba prince and that both caves were easily opened in the eleventh century. (I am not sure how one interprets the Chinese reference. Could it mean that the Huguo caves were opened without effort since they are without a front wall? Unlike IX and X?) Su Bai argues that there is no space large enough in front of the Caves IX and X to accommodate the large incomplete stela but that there is such a space in front of VII and VIII. He argues, moreover, that there is room enough for a small inscription in front of Caves IX and X and that these caves have the kind of elaborate ornamental splendor described in the Jin tablet of the Wang Yu caves made between 484 and 489. There is no figure in either VII or VIII or in IX and X that can be identified as an equestrian Tuoba prince.

In any case the placement of VII and VIII in the eighties of the fifth century as argued by Caswell does seem very difficult. There is no other comparable set of caves in Yungang. The regularity of the Buddha niches in four rows of niches in the main rooms on all the walls except the north wall in these caves is unique. Though most of these Buddha figures defy identification, many are condensed representations of stories of the life of Buddha. More important though, at least to this reviewer, is the difficulty of reconciling the sculptural style of
VII and VIII with that of later Yungang caves. There is no room to argue this in detail, but a few points can be made. I fully agree with Professor Caswell when he sees a style as different from a mode. Various modes can be represented in the same style. The figures of Caves VII and VIII remain bulky, and they retain remnants of gestures that are part of the lively representations of earlier traditions still seen in some of the earliest figures in Bingling si and even in caves in Central Asia. I consider this style different from that of the figures in the window reveal of Cave XVI, which is dated to 489. The figures of this relief are in the same mode as that of Caves VII and VIII, but they are restrained in their gestures, which are reduced to carefully balanced symmetries around a clear upright center, and thus adjust to the severity of the Chinese emphasis on frontal, symmetrical, and linear-style forms. Even a quick comparison of the niches of the 489 relief or those of Cave VI and other later carvings with those of Caves VII and VIII reveals that the emphasis in all the later niches is on flatness, evenness of distribution of levels of carving, and careful ordering of sequences of levels of depth of recessions. The later niches reveal “the heritage of the two-dimensional sketch” mentioned by Caswell on page 93. This is not so in Caves VII and VIII. Here the figures and the niches tend to allow slow turnings around the corners rather than the clear separating of one layer of carvings from another. This difference seems to be a matter not only of mode but also of style, and one seems to be earlier than the other. In general there are a number of modes to be seen in Yungang, and I suppose that the Udayana mode referred to by Professor Caswell, helpful though that is, would have been clearer had subcategories more along the suggestions made by Marilyn Rhee been considered (“Some Aspects of the Relations of 5th Century Chinese Buddha Images with Sculpture from North India, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Central Asia,” East and West, n.s. v. 26, nos. 3–4, 1976, pp. 439–61).

There are other difficulties with placing all the later Yungang carvings in little more than a decade. It seems too much for so little time. Even granted that a small army of carvers and workers existed that could be employed by various donors, it seems difficult to comprehend that all this work could have been done in a matter of a dozen years or so. Such diversity of activity and different interests would even be more difficult to compress into such a short period of time than had all the work been the result of a more unified central authority.

A change in the identification of the Tanyao caves, marking XIXA as one of them instead of Cave XVI (which the author would tentatively identify as a cave made for Tanyao), may have some plausibility. After all, the large central image on the north wall and the ordered niches and carvings (all of later Yungang-style features) on the other walls of Cave XVI create a room rather than an enclosed niche. The cave is thus essentially different from the traditional Tanyao caves.

Once one accepts that later Yungang patronage is, at least in good part, other than imperial, one opens possibilities for explanations hitherto not considered. There is, however, little real documented evidence for most of the assumptions that have been made about Yungang, and the major change in the Tanyao sequence proposed by Professor Caswell must remain no more than a possibility.

Professor Caswell’s book is a tribute to the Yungang caves and to his own long and careful attention and study of this site. He has treated this monumental Buddhist complex of shrines separately from other contemporary or earlier endeavours. He has thereby emphasized the truly unique splendour of Yungang. Visiting Chinese Buddhist complexes such as Dunhuang, Bingling si, Majiabang, and even Longmen, one is aware that Yungang does have a character of its own. This character seems to be determined by the richness and variety of the images and sizes of caves and niches all in the same gentle sandstone color. Compared to that, Longmen seems fragmented and the only site comparable in unity of stone and design is Gongxian. But the latter site lacks the size, the variety, and the inspired wealth of invention so prevalent at Yungang. Professor Caswell’s insolation of the Yungang caves has its good reason. It is, however, true that the caves at Yungang are the result of a number of religious and artistic traditions, and more discussion of this background would have added a welcome dimension to the project. It is now difficult to get free access to the caves, and it is nearly impossible to get good photographs to illustrate the insides of the caves. The unwillingness of the authorities in China to facilitate legitimate study and photography prevents illustration of the true grandeur of the site, and it is unfortunate that the character of Yungang could not have been better served than by the neat but bookish illustrative material taken from earlier Japanese publications.

HARRIE A. VANDERSTAPPEN


There has been a curious lack of interest in the use of color in Chinese paintings compared to that in paintings from most of the other parts of the world. This point, scarcely a novel insight, is commented on by Silbergeld and McNair in the introduction to their translation and is attributed largely to the influence of the Chinese literati, whose intellectual roots lay in Confucian philosophy, and who maintained both a studied detachment from worldly things and a disdain for overt technical skill. The colors, disdained or not, continued to be there on the paintings, nevertheless. Well into the Tang period, the extensive use of color was normal; and even after monochrome ink painting had reached the heights it did in the Song, the use of colored pigments continued, though the extent fluctuated, depending on period, school or artist, and subject matter. A number of historical works that have come down to us have valuable information on the materials concerned, and several are quoted extensively by Yu Feian.

The interest has been no greater when we look at technical studies (that is, those based on scientific techniques) of Chinese paintings and associated materials. A recent bibliography of Chinese pigment identifications had only fifteen entries, not all devoted entirely to Chinese material and not all dealing with pigments from paintings per se. This bibliography may fairly be said to represent a miscellany, certainly not a coherent body of work, and only with the publication of studies by the Dunhuang Research Institute on paintings in the Mogao caves may such a body be said to be taking shape. The contrast with Japanese research is striking. Long-continued basic work on identifications, discussion of the physical properties of
pigments in relation to their use, and incorporation of such results into a historical context have led to a history of East Asian pigment dominated by research on Japanese material. The publication of the present authoritative translation of Zhong-guo hua yuanwu de yanjiu (the title translates literally as Studies on Chinese Painting Colors) is thus a welcome event. Originally published in 1955 by the noted painter Yu Feian (1889–1959), the book sets out the "received view" on painting materials as it is understood by a skilled and experienced painter. It will be necessary to remember this should any attempt be made to use the book as a starting point from which to unify a rather spotty field, since a good deal of what Yu Feian has written cannot be accepted uncritically. He was clearly no scientist and is sometimes wrong, or on doubtful ground, on matters of technical detail. The translators have dealt with many of the problems thus arising by simply correcting the more obvious or trivial errors and by discussing other points in a series of carefully researched footnotes. Technical questions, though sometimes difficult, are often readily identified and specific in nature. However, Yu Feian adds some historical depth by quoting authors going back to the Yuan period, and indeed adds usefulness to the book by supplying these commentaries on materials, but in doing so he raises a less tangible problem. With the possible exception of the Chinese ink texts, one can drawn upon little critical assessment of the accuracy or balance of these accounts in relation to what the various schools of painting were actually using or doing.

Two examples may illustrate this scepticism. One is the case of realgar (divalent arsenic sulfide), identified by several authors, including Yu Feian, with the orange-yellow pigment xionghuang. This identity is probably correct: realgar had a significant place in Chinese alchemy and has long been available, but the extent to which it has actually been employed on paintings is more problematical. Realgar has never been a commonly used pigment in any part of the world; to the best of my knowledge it has never been identified on a Japanese work, and Xu Weiyi and his colleagues at Dunhuang found only one occurrence in their long list of inorganic colorants in the Mogao cave paintings. The second example is the blue barium copper silicate and a chemically related but incompletely characterized purple compound found as pigments on wall paintings and painted objects from the Han period. This pair of colorants remains a historical orphan, with apparently no reference to them in the handbooks and other accounts, despite their manifest physical existence.

Problems connected with the relation between conventional historical evidence and what was really happening in the use of materials are not confined to Chinese paintings, nor are they new. It remains valuable to have the received view of an artist both made more widely available by translation and carefully annotated to relate this view to our present concerns. Chapter 1 presents the individual pigments in turn, both inorganic and organic, and adds some notes on animal glue (the usual binding medium) and alum. Here the translators’ footnotes are most in evidence. It may sometimes be forgotten that modern pigment terminology in the West is based on specifying the material as precisely as possible (usually via the languages of chemistry and, in appropriate cases, mineralogy) but that traditional names and descriptions are derived from attributes such as color, source, obvious physical nature, and manner of use. Relations between the two points of view are sometimes ambiguous, but the translators have gone a long way, perhaps as far as anyone can for the moment, in clarifying them. It is a pity that several typographical errors have slipped through into print, including a potentially misleading series of transpositions among the footnotes to pages 5 and 6.

Chapter 2 is a historical account of the use of color in painting in China, with some reference to schools and occasional individual artists. It is hardly a criticism to say that this is little more than an outline; more than that could not have been expected when Yu Feian was writing, or even perhaps today. It is interesting that the author includes a section on imported pigments, including some modern ones, and a further section on the modern manufacture of colorants in China.

When it comes to Chinese ink, the subject of chapter 3, we are in much better historical shape, so to speak. Essentially only an intimate mixture of carbon with animal glue, this deceptively simple material has come under detailed scholarly discussion in a number of studies that deal mainly with its historical development and with the more noted inkmakers. Yu Feian’s account of the history is brief, and, ever the practical user, he sets out what he considers important in choosing ink, following this with notes on inkstones and their proper care and use, the best kind of water to use, and the “color of ink” (referring to this case to the optical density of the dispersion). A short supplement deals with colored inks: pigments molded with glue into stick form.

Chapter 4 is entitled “Folk Artisans’ Use of Color.” The term “folk artisan” appears to mean almost any kind of painter who did not aspire to high art as defined by the literati. It is to take in the painters of religious cave murals and of sculpture, and those of various brightly colored pictures (including portraits) and of lanterns. The considerable detail given on the pigments used in these branches of painting is derived mostly from modern practice. Yu Feian’s description of the techniques for gold application are especially interesting and are supplemented by additional notes from the translators.

Chapter 5, on the methods of early masters, is the longest in the book but still seems short compared to the area it covers. The principles used in applying color and the main techniques used by early masters when painting in color are summarized first, and a number of specific examples are given. The rest of the chapter discusses the selection of pigments, their preparation, and the techniques of using them, and is based on (and quotes extensively from) historical sources such as the Bamboo Manual (Zhu pu) by Li Kan (ca. 1318), the Mustard Seed Garden Manual of Painting (Ye zu yuan huo zhu dan) by Wang Gai (1679–1701), Xiaoshan’s Painting Manual (Xiaoshan huo pu) by Zou Yigu (1756), and Painting Trivia by Ze Lang (1797). We may be pleased to have all this assembled, at least as a point from which to start, but it may be premature, for the kind of reason I have outlined above, to accept it all too uncritically. Certainly, conclusions regarding materials and techniques still need, in some areas, confirmation by research on the actual paintings. At the end of the chapter is a table summarizing what Yu Feian has found in the texts on mixing pigments to produce various colors. This may be valid, but an extensive use of such mixtures would be in contrast to what generally has been found with Japanese works.

In the final chapter, on traditional methods in modern painting, the author is firmly on home ground. The basis here is clearly Yu Feian’s own experience along with that of his contemporary artists, and he goes into rather fine detail on methods of preparing the pigments and of actually deploying them in the course of painting.

The translators have supported the text with bibliographic appendices that will certainly increase the book’s usefulness.
Another feature is a double-page chart of traditional Chinese colors, which has been provided by the Central Academy of Fine Arts, Beijing. However, several line drawings in the original (Chinese) publication have been dropped. The index seems to be very adequate, and here, as well as in the bibliographies and various parts of the translated text, the Chinese characters have been inserted.

Notes


2. An extended list of identifications (not included in Winter, above) may be found in Xu Weiyi, Zhou Guoxia and Li Yunhe, “X-ray Analyses of the Inorganic Dunhuang Pigments,” Dunhuang Yenjiu (Dunhuang Research), General Series no. 3, 1985, pp. 187–97. Several other papers in Dunhuang Yenjiu also give information about pigments.


4. See n. 2 above.


JOHN WINTER


Declared by Robert McCormick Adams as “perhaps the most important acquisition in the history of the Smithsonian Institution,” the purchase of the Vever collection by the Sackler Museum is comparable in magnitude for the history of Islamic art to the opening of the Islamic Galleries at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1975 and The Arts of Islam exhibition at London’s Hayward Gallery in 1976. Just as these two events increased public appreciation of Islamic art and advanced scholarship in the field, this collection promises to do the same. In fact, it has already done that, for A Jeweler’s Eye sets a new standard for exhibition catalogues in Islamic painting.

This view is based not just on the exquisite design and excellent scholarship of the catalogue—both factors with a long history at the Freer Gallery—but also, and primarily, on the content of the essays and the presentation of the material. Instead of confusing itself to the usual description and formal analysis of the paintings, the catalogue reaches into the very foundations of collecting and connoisseurship in Persian and Indian painting as a means of understanding the formation of the field and uncovering the fallacies and misconceptions inherent in the process. In the first essay, “Henri Vever, Art Nouveau, and Islamic Art,” Lowry examines the history of the Vever family jewellery business, the history of Henri Vever’s collection, and how the practice, acquisition, and connoisseurship of art were fused within the integrating ideas of the Art Nouveau. Throughout the text, Vever was a small circle of important collectors and connoisseurs—such as Migeon, Martin, Koechlin, and Riefstahl—who were active in France between the two world wars. In addition to Persian and Indian paintings, Vever and his associates also collected Chinese paintings and bronzes: Japanese prints, screens, and lacquer ware; as well as European painting and decorative arts.

Two dominant ideas, one aesthetic and the other intellectual, stood at the basis of this eclecticism. Aesthetically, Vever and his circle believed that “. . . the essence and function of art centered around the creation of complicated sensory impressions for a refined elite” (p. 14). Intellectually, these collectors subscribed to the Art Nouveau ideal of seeking exquisite design in art and craft alike and in European as well as exotic traditions. They also “. . . saw practice, study, and collection of art as a single continuum that enriched and enlivened life” (p. 14).

While Islamic art certainly benefited from being incorporated within the discourse of the Art Nouveau and from being displayed in public exhibitions (always for the purpose of trade), the exclusive interest in its design qualities to the neglect of its cultural and literary associations was a great detriment. In terms of Persian and Indian painting, this led to the total disregard for the Arabic or Persian text and the mutilation and dismemberment of the manuscripts. The matter was quite succinctly put forth by a contemporary connoisseur: “for almost all collectors the text is unimportant, only the miniatures count” (p. 43).

In the second essay, “Persian and Indian Painting,” Lowry presents a total reevaluation of the legacy of these early connoisseurs, a clear and brilliant deconstruction of the apparently seamless web of formalism and connoisseurship that has shaped scholarship in Islamic painting for many decades. He questions the attempts of the connoisseurs to define chronological and geographical categories of painting and to discover individual “creative geniuses” who, as in the West, would have propelled the art to newer horizons. He argues that “since relatively few works are signed or dated, much of the classification depends on attributions made by collectors, dealers, and scholars, derived from formal rather than historical or cultural considerations” (p. 45). He is not beating a dead horse, for even recent essays on Persian painting, such as those by S. C. Welch in Treasures of Islam (Geneva, 1985), are totally formalist in method with hardly a mention of the literary work.

Instead, Lowry reaffirms the position of Islamic painting as part of the Islamic book and as a reflection of the great Persian literary tradition. He sees the relationship between the
illustrations, the book, and the text as manifest on three levels: decorative, illustrative, and pictorial. The decorative qualities of these paintings should not be considered independently but in relation to calligraphy, marginal illumination, and binding: that is, as part of the totality of the manuscript. As for their illustrative aspect, Lowry suggests that most of these paintings do not illustrate specific historical events but rather deeply rooted historical themes in which the individuality of the actors is subsumed within their idealized images and norms of behavior. This in turn would explain the idealized and conventionalized nature of these illustrations, which on the whole do not represent individual masterpieces but rather "interpretation[s] of a set series of forms" that derive their novelty "through the manipulation of an established canon of imagery." On the pictorial level, the paintings can take on a life of their own, not by departing from the text but by further refining and amplifying its essentially conventional and archetypal character. In this manner the paintings "are removed from identifiable, historical time and . . . set instead into an unreal poetic time where they serve as stage setting[s] for the examination of the abstract and idealized" (p. 47). (This approach was first suggested by Thomas Lentz in his doctoral dissertation, "Painting in Herat under Baysunghur," Harvard, 1985.)

Of course Persian painting, in addition to interacting with the text, had its own "internal dialogue" with its past forms and conventions first articulated in the 1330s Ilkhanid Shahnama. Henceforth, conservatism reigned in Persian painting, sustained in part by "the processes of literal reproduction and selective adaptation" that were followed in most teaching ateliers (p. 55). Artistic conservatism, the "generic use of images," and the "typological treatment of experience" all produce an art whose originality was "a function of interpretation and not invention" but whose full comprehensiveness was only possible to those aware of "contemporary social and cultural values" (p. 57).

The catalogue entries attempt to abide by the criticisms of the essays and to live up to their complex discourse. Grouping according to chronology and "schools" is shunned in favor of a text-oriented classification: manuscripts precede albums and individual paintings and drawings. Most entries are purely factual, abandoning the formal and stylistic aspects of the images and including only a brief account of what the image illustrates in the text. On the whole, this fundamentalist approach is refreshing, but it can be problematic. For example, one would like to know why number 18 of the late fifteenth century Shahnama is so much more refined than all the other miniatures in the manuscript and why ms. s86.0061 has small horizontal illustrations whose limited palette and simple compositions recall the Shahnamehs of the previous century. In other words, having undermined the case for connoisseurship and formal analysis, how does one then reintroduce stylistic matters into the broader literary discourse? What is needed, I believe, is not to use the interaction between painting and poetry in order to go beyond the complex formal qualities of the pictures (p. 57) but rather to engage these visual clues as a means of further enriching the discourse. (Models for this kind of "thick description" exist in M. Foucault's essay "Las Meninas" in The Order of Things and are becoming increasingly common in art historical studies.)

Furthermore, the case for the connection between image and text is rather weak for individual or album paintings, and the author's insistence on a literary background for these paintings is a little awkward at times. It is hard to imagine to what text a bizarre painting like number 67 refers, perhaps the reason that it was only given a two-line entry. It is possible that these images may still evoke a literary ideal, but their physical independence from the text would seem to suggest a greater distance from the literary tradition.

A Jeweler's Eye argues an excellent case for questioning the premises and conclusions of much of the previous scholarship in Persian and Indian painting while at the same time presenting an alternate approach. The fact that its remarkable ideas do not apply to all the paintings in this collection should not detract from its numerous merits. It merely suggests that more work along similar lines is urgently needed.

Yasser Tabbaa

Corrections
In volume 18 of Ars Orientalis, Nancy Micklewright's affiliation was given as the University of British Columbia. Professor Micklewright is associated with the University of Victoria, British Columbia. In Nancy Steinhardt's article, "Imperial Architecture along the Mongolian Road to Dadu," there is an error in Figure 1. For Hohhot, read Hohhot.