

CLP 2A
1963

Smithsonian Institution
FREER GALLERY OF ART
Washington 25, D. C.

SYMPOSIUM
OCTOBER 1962
NEW YORK CITY

February 15, 1963

Dear

Attached is the official summarized transcript of the event that took place in New York last October 4th and 5th, which has been variously termed the Palace Museum Exhibition Post-mortem Symposium, the First International Convocation of Painting-worms (using Li Lin-ts'an's useful neologism, formed by analogy with "bookworm"), and the Conference for the Fragmentation of Chinese Painting Studies.

Not summarized herein are my own opening remarks. I began by quoting a statement made recently that the study of Chinese painting is at present going through a "Great Leap Forward"; I suggested the "A Great Leap in All Directions" would be a more accurate description, and that the principal aim of the conference would not be to solve the problems involved in the paintings to everyone's satisfaction, but only to make sure that we do not lose all contact with one another as we leap. I felt it would be better to present and distinguish the approaches represented by various scholars in the field by allowing these approaches to emerge naturally in discussions of particular paintings, rather than through abstract theorizing and arguments on method. I pointed out that the "Combined List of Opinions" distributed before the meetings had made it painfully apparent that any one of us holds some opinions that will seem to any other one of us quite untenable and preposterous, so that we had best begin with an attitude of mutual tolerance, and avoid statements of the "as any fool can plainly see" type. In particular, those of us practiced in articulating our views in lectures and writing should recognize that other views, based on a personal and unrationalized kind of connoisseurship, may not be so easily stated in words, but may nevertheless be as valid as our intellectual formulations. The art historian is required to communicate ideas, and to distinguish them from feelings, or at least to convince others that they are more than feelings; the connoisseur is not, and so may be at a disadvantage in such discussions as we were about to hold.

In retrospect, the symposium can be said to have accomplished what we hoped it would. Responses of those who attended were on the whole enthusiastic, although some were not convinced that its effect would be entirely beneficial ("I should think the graduate students present would be strongly tempted to turn to government service." "It's a good thing more of the collectors weren't there." "The whole thing (i.e. the transcript) makes discouraging reading; and then just think what a symposium on theory would be like?"). Two more views to sum up: "It was like a Summit Conference; nobody expected that anything would be decided, and it was really a rather desperate effort to keep lines of communication open." And: "We may have advanced the study of Chinese

painting, or we may have set it back, but we sure shook it up."

Thanks are due to the American Council of Learned Societies, for a grant to cover the expenses of the meetings and the printing of this transcript; to Asia House, and particularly to the Director and Assistant Director of Asia House Gallery, Dr. Gordon Washburn and Mr. Richard Cleveland, for their hospitality and assistance; to Messrs. Roderick Whitfield and Chou Ju-hsi, for running the slide projectors and preparing (in rough form) this transcript; to Mr. Frank Caro, Mr. Nathan Hammer, Mr. Howard Hollis, and Mr. Joseph Seo, for the Chinese banquet held at the Shun Lee Restaurant on Thursday evening; to Mr. and Mrs. H.C. Weng, for arranging this banquet and for showing paintings at their home afterwards.

The transcript has been checked and corrected by the main participants, and can be taken as a reasonably accurate summary of the views they expressed. Nevertheless, it is to be regarded as a restricted document, not to be published in any form or quoted from without the permission of the persons whose opinions are being quoted. It is being sent privately to those who attended the meetings and a few others who were unable to come. It is not for sale, and will not be distributed to libraries or otherwise made available to the public generally.

Sincerely yours,

James Cahill
Curator of Chinese Art

A partial list of those who attended (alphabetically):

Annaliese Bulling
James Cahill
Chiang Yee
Victoria Contag
(Mrs. von Winterfeldt)
Usher Coolidge
John Crawford
C.A. Drenowatz
Betty Ecke
(Tseng Yu-ho)
Richard Edwards
Wilma Fairbank
Mr. and Mrs. Myron Falk
Wen Fong
Nathan Hammer
John Haskins
Wai-kam Ho
George Lee

Jean Lee
Sherman Lee
Chu-tsing Li
Aschwin Lippe
Max Loehr
Jane Gaston Mahler
Jean Mailey
Kiyo Munakata
Robert Poor
John Pope
Hsio-yen Shih
Shujiro Shimada
Laurence Sickman
Osvald Siren
Alexander Soper
Mrs. Carl Stern
Michael Sullivan
Peter Swann

William Trousdale
Henry Trubner
Father Harrie
Vanderstappen
Wang Wen-po
Hugh Wass
Nelson Wu
Martie Young

And some thirty graduate students specializing in Chinese or related fields of art from Harvard, Princeton, Michigan, Chicago, New York (Institute of Fine Arts), Columbia and other universities.

SYMPOSIUM ON THE CHINESE ART TREASURES EXHIBITION
Thursday, October 4, 1962

2. EMPEROR MING-HUANG'S JOURNEY TO SHU

Li Lin-ts'an: *Ars Orientalis* IV, 1961: late 11th cent.
proposed as date of copy.

Loehr:

Original eighth century painting, seen Taiwan 1957.

Physical qualities: silk, unlike any silk of Sung date.

Silk has warm, yellowish color, as opposed to greenish gray, or brownish gray of Sung, and unusually brittle, with flaking of the material.

Style: no condemning features of later periods.

This work must be judged in the light of the more archaic taller version (Ku Kung, Vol. 26; 300 Masterpieces, I, 4) att. Li Chao-tao, with a strip of water at the bottom, suppressed in the present work. That tall, "gothic" version, which I believe to be a Sung copy, was regarded as the prototype in Siren's Chinese Painting, although he had noted its inferior quality in his Early Chinese Painting. In its crystalline, rhombic rock formations, by the way, the "gothic" version agrees somewhat with another archaistic Sung work, namely, a farewell picture by Chao Tsung-han of the 1050's. (1057 A.D.) (see Ku Kung, Vol. 5). (The "gothic" version may yet be derived from a lost original earlier than the work under discussion.)

Brush strokes: Li Lin-ts'an has stressed the "mouse-tail" and "nail-head" strokes. I find it difficult to consider them as significant criteria for a Sung dating. The brush strokes essentially serve to bring out every small detail in magnificent clarity.

Details: none appear to be Sung, and the consistency and discipline argue for an early date.

Coloring: not later than the T'ang

Figures: costumes of the horseman and the court ladies are not of the Sung period.

Trees and plants: complete in themselves, unified and not blurred: all arguments against Sung date.

Style: What we have to keep in mind is, that before the date of the picture (as an object) can be established, the date of its style has to be established. The picture, if the subject is correctly identified, would date after 756: a date later than 800 would seem incongruous. Lapse of time between the two versions difficult to assess.

Wen Fong:

Sixteenth century.

Rather than taking the attributed Sung paintings in the Palace Collection as basis for comparison, one should start with reliable T'ang and earlier works.

Agrees with Loehr that the problem is a question of style, since it is impossible to date it from either the technical or the documentary point of view.

Blue green style: as large context for the picture.

Evidences:

1. Tun-huang
2. Shosoin
3. Blue green style reflected in the Japanese Yamato-e Mi Fu: 11th cent. "most of the so-called Li Ssu-hsuns are Japanese paintings."

Traditionalism: the type never goes out, but through eclecticism or archaism is always preserved. A differentiation of styles necessary.

Style: 1. Motives and elements are features of a primary level. It is all right to say this is in T'ang style, but T'ang motif doesn't make it T'ang date. 2. The combination of motifs and elements; structures that are symptomatic of the artistic concept and attitude.

Brush work: (Li Lin-ts'an)

13th cent. first reference to brush terminology in the writings of Wang Lo-yü (16th C?)

And even more in the Yuan (T'ang Hou)

Literary description versus the thing seen

Nail-head: said by Wang Lo-yü to have been "initiated" in the 11th cent.--hence the date of the pictures. Li

Lin-ts'an did not compare with works of the 8th or 11th cent.

Line: here too disciplined and controlled (WF agrees with Loehr on this).

Structural principles: the structure is aesthetically self-conscious and not for the purpose of modelling. (For examples of this see Tun-huang and the Shoso-in) Here obvious mannerism and loss of structural validity, with non-functional lines.

Modelling: here is patternistic, creating dark and light pattern, and not a rounding out of forms.

Coloring: "blue-green" style. It has been stated that the blue-green style, and works in that style, must be considered on a separate basis from paintings in monochrome: but stylistically and in composition, "blue-green" should be comparable with monochrome.

Trees: are overly complex

Wang Wei: man in distance has no eye; tree in distance has no branch; water in distance has no ripples.

Mountain treatment: a contradiction of simplicity and stylization. Archaic in appearance and extremely complex tree arrangement.

Shosoin--Biwa with Tiger-hunt in T'ang style--cf. Wang Wei: "a mountain should have three sides;" here is schematic representation of this. But the literary description will fit both the pictures in the preliminary level of style (motives and elements) and hence is not sufficient.

Conception: the Shosoin biwa landscape is built up layer by layer to create the space.

Ming-huang's journey: The visual integration and the complexity of the space are much more advanced. The interest of the artist is in the patternistic arrangement and the surface decoration. The very intricacy is in itself decorative: in the interplay of solid and

void, of cloud and mountain.
Surface values are paramount.
Patternistic design of contrast.
Cf. the trees for rhythmic complexity and two-dimensionality.
Verticals are contrasted with horizontals, blank space
with busy areas. Silhouette is used in an archaistic
manner.

Hence the two pictures (Ming-huang and Shosoin biwa) are
of different dates, and in examination the description
(of work) and the concept (of style) are important.
For comparison and comparable works see Ch'iu Ying:
whose jagged rock contours are similar to Ming-huang's
journey. Cf. Immortals in Fairyland, 300 Masterpieces,
No. 243. In him again the two dimensionality and the
surface interest.
There is need to distinguish between Vertical and Horizontal
Style: the blue-green style is to be found in the 14th cent.,
cf. Chao Meng-fu's Autumn Colours (69); and between
archaic and archaistic.

Cahills:

On the basis of the silk and the pigment, as well as details
of drawing, a 16th cent. copy. Ming-huang's Journey was
remounted at the Freer Gallery by a Japanese mounter,
T. Sugiura, who felt that the silk is cracked on account
of excessive drying, and not because it is 8th cent. silk.

Wen Fong:

Compare the different condition of the 9th cent. silk from
Tun-huang in the British Museum.

Mrs. Bulling:

Again cf. condition of BM Tun-huang silk.

Michael Sullivan:

Condition of the painting too good to be true, as regards the
silk and the miraculous preservation of this and the color
and the lack of later restoration.
In T'ang the color was applied on a white ground.
Tung Yuan, Hsiao-hsiang-t'u: white shows through on account
of the top color being rubbed off--no instance of that in
the painting under discussion.
T'ang style: the high landscape court style of the T'ang
is unknown to us (apart from the example under discussion.)
But there is nothing incompatible in the style here when
compared to the works from Tun-huang and the Shosoin.
Ming-huang t'u: mountains artificial, but this feature also
in T'ang style at Tun-huang.
Archaic features can be traced back through Six Dynasties
landscape style to Han.
Shosoin Biwa with Tiger Hunt: Unsophisticated phase. This
can more accurately be described as in tan-ch'ing (red
and blue; the ancient term for painting) than in blue
and green (ch'ing-lu).
Landscape is traceable back to Tung K'ou: where the
mountains are painted in layers in contrasting colors.
Ming-huang--is the culmination of an archaic style.
Date: S. Sung at the earliest, but representative of that
archaic style and valid to use as a document for the

study of T'ang painting.
Anon. Immortals' Dwellings in the Palace Museum: this shows some similarity in brush technique and in treatment of rocks, though the trees more careless. Would date to the 14th cent. at the earliest.
Both of these could be by the same hands--or products of the same studio.
Chao Po-chü scroll in Peking: more advanced version of same style.

Wen Fong:

Gives later Ming date for this Chao Po-chü--see Northern school. Configuration of mountains points to late Ming. Asked to compare Chao Po-chü with Stockholm Chu Tuan.

Soper:

Objected: comparison unsuitable and unfair.

Edwards:

This can still be done though on the basis of common period style.

Wen Fong:

Notes the diagonal recessions--Chao Po-chü vs. Chu Tuan
Chu Tuan: line--Chu Tuan is development of Kuo Hsi. Devil face pattern contrast.

Complexity of the surface and the contours.

Line tends to flatten the substance and does not act as a modelling line.

Is similar to the line of "Chao Po-chü"

Provincialism, not as a criterion for "differentiation"

Sullivan:

Still close to the Chao Po-chü work in the Palace.

Soper:

This has been dated to the Sung; (i.e. the Ming-huang Journey);

Soper would prefer to place the picture very late, whether 16th or 18th cent. immaterial; it seems definitely an antiquarian reconstruction of the T'ang style, perhaps as a pastiche from literary descriptions and fragments of various old paintings, rather than a copy from a T'ang original.

Parenthetically would object at the start to Fong's use of the Shosoin tiger hunt as typical of T'ang landscape style. By contrast with the much more accomplished elephant scene it must be an awkward, early Japanese experiment (the two biwas' inlaid patterns prove that both are Tempyo works).

We know from literary sources two all-important ingredients of mature T'ang landscapes. First, they were unprecedently three-dimensional, through the innovations of Wu Tao-tzu. Second, the best of them possessed a richly varied expressive power, capable of strongly affecting the emotions. Neither of these can be properly applied to Ming Huang's Journey. There the mountains are paper-thin; precisely where the subject requires them to be penetrated by human action (the ravine on the right, the causeway on the left) the illusion of usable space is most completely lacking. The picture therefore seems to be the creation of an age which was so far separated in time that all clear memory of the basic T'ang qualities had been lost,

and the style could be visualized only as something ancient, pure, and simple (i.e. non-realistic). Thus when Tung Ch'i-ch'ang wished to describe what he thought were the Wang Wei factors in Chao Meng-fu's style he said: "He has caught the delicacy of T'ang without its finickiness."

Again, the linework of the Journey's landscape suggests an un-historical archaism. The nail-head rat-tail line was first invented, probably in late T'ang, to make possible a more dynamic drawing of human and animal forms by accenting joints and abrupt turns of surface. It is too small in scale, too formal, and too repetitious to have any proper place in an early landscape repertory. Suggestions for the look of the landscape may have been taken by the late artist from the highly schematized designs on early T'ang mirrors. Other obvious early details like the ladies' hats and the mane of the emperor's horse may simply have been reconstructed from descriptions in well-known literary sources (e.g. Kuo Jo-hsu's history).

Landscape att. Chan Tzu-ch'ien--compared for the spatial rendering.

Ming-huang-t'u--figures solid and the mountains thin.

Lady with hat: the hat is of early date (T'ang figurines)

Emperor's horse: mane tied in accordance with T'ang custom derived from Central Asia.

Kuo Jo-hsu: also reports this for Imperial horses.

Conclusion: the Ming-huang-t'u is an archaistic reconstruction.

Lippe:

*i.e. the London exhibition of 1935-6, Loehr's Gothic version.

The early features of costume, armor, etc., discussed by Soper and felt by him to be derived from books, are confirmed by tomb figurines; do not occur on any known later pictures; can only have been taken from an original painting. Destruction of the palace in T'ang and So. Sung led to demand for copies of early painting, and the painting was probably executed at this time. The version in London,* lacking the T'ang style hats and tied mane, is later. This noted as being in a 17th cent. collection, seals of Keng Chao-chung; so suggested 18th cent. date unlikely.

Jane Mahler:

If antiquarian in fabrication, details (dress, etc.) surprisingly accurate.

Sullivan:

Two separate questions here: (a) can it be taken to represent T'ang style, and (b) when was it painted?

Fong:

Commonly acknowledged tradition of this Ming-huang t'u. Not outright fabrication.

Edwards:

Later copies to be used, close comparison available. Antiquarianism: Ch'iu Ying's concern, but not Ch'iu Ying himself.

Li Chu-ting:

Suggests Ch'iu Ying for comparison.

Sickman: Ch'iu Ying not comparable, particularly for costume.
Consistency in details: hence not attributable to 16th cent.
Nail-head line: cf. the lady under the tree in the Shosoin.

Poor: Spatial relationship of background and foreground presents sharp contrast.

Li Chu-tsing: Archaism in 16th cent.
Ch'iu Ying also has copies or forgeries.
No. 69--Chao Meng-fu: Yuan as the key to landscape painting--emphasis on foreground and de-emphasis on background.
Blue-green style: archaism emphasized
Figures: small in comparison with the trees, Yuan assimilation of the T'ang work.
Combination of archaism and naturalism shown.
Ming-huang-t'u: this is not so. Intricacy, over-elegance, can only be Ming.
Relationship: i-p'in to No. Sung as Ming-huang-t'u to T'ang.

Soper: An indication that the picture does show some T'ang traits of design--however derived--this given by comparison with the Heian period Shotoku Taishi Eden screens, the work of an artist whose family specialized in the Chinese manner. Figures and trees have a similar scale and are arranged so as to convey an elementary sense of depth. Both use the device of terminating a meandering forward movement by a sharp turn over a bridge in the foreground, set parallel to the picture plane. In the Eden's view of "China" there are similar mountains, though--significantly--these are more carefully described in the three-dimensional sense.

Mrs. Bulling: T'ang figurines as models for the hat of the lady.

Sickman: No mineral blue in this painting.
Ming has more blue--shih-ch'ing

Wilma Fairbanks: Asks for comparison with the Nelson sarcophagus.

Vanderstappen: A pastiche? Cf. Nelson Gallery sarcophagus; in terms of spatial relationships; sarcophagus unclear where Ming-huang clear. This clarity is point in its favor. Is it a copy? Probably, but may be taken to represent high T'ang style. Clarity of space relatable to Tun-huang paintings. Spatial unities: foreground, middle and background clearly established.

Loehr: If the Ming-huang-t'u were a copy it would have to be a perfect copy.
Agrees with Sullivan on distinction:
1. Date of style
2. Date of execution
Stresses the proper setting for the painting. Comparison with the Nelson sarcophagus convincing.

The presumed original behind the "gothic" version.
Ming-huang t'u from exhibition: a second version, and an innovation, an advancement.

"Gothic" version: "archaistic" features may well be archaic features, and the recurrence of such features in the painting of later periods is not a proof for the late date of the painting.

Chao Meng-fu: Autumn Colors: seen as representing later version of blue-green style: not a clear-cut thing.

Wang Hsi-meng: poetic version of the blue-green style.

Compare with:

Wang Wei (att.) Winter Landscape in Ku Kung collection, with ts'un, gold outlines, opaqueness of snow, waterfall, indicating 8th cent. origin of style: example of the T'ang blue-green style.

Ming-huang t'u: its consistency represents an advancement Li-tai Ming-hua chi--"revolutionary style in landscape of Wu Tao-tzu." This must have departed from the blue-green of Li Chao-tao and Li Ssu-hsun.

Ming-huang t'u: the coloring also is revolutionary on account of its modern qualities.

It would have been impossible for a Ming artist to reconstruct such a masterpiece.

Soper:

In Western art the artists of the Renaissance reconstructed classic art without being "greater" than the Greek and Roman masters.

Lee:

Venetian marble work accepted in the Renaissance as classical work. However, no documented work of Ch'iu Ying resembles the Ming-huang t'u, and it must be close to a T'ang original if of Ming date.

Shimada:

Ming-huang's Journey cannot possibly be an original. Copy of T'ang original, to be dated no earlier than the middle of the Ming period.

Cahill:

Hatching on the rocks may indicate a proto-ts'un (i.e. early form of "texture strokes")

Sullivan:

Not before Li T'ang, however.

Soper:

Ref. the show of forgeries at the British Museum in 1961. A central exhibit, the pseudo-Etruscan sarcophagus, had traits similar to the Journey: more deliberately contrived signs of antiquity than in the authentic terra-cotta coffins on which it was modelled; an archaistic cuteness of faces and costume combined with a most un-historical shapelessness in the bodies. So in the Landscape a stress on picturesque "ancient" elements, the ladies' hats, the causeway on the cliff face, as hallmarks of the period.

Cahill:

Such built-out roads belong to actual scenery (road to Shu), not to style.

- Edwards: Detail of the actual road.
- Soper: A double anachronism involved. The theme, in spite of tactful circumlocution, actually as shameful as Napoleon's retreat from Moscow. Historically impossible at least until the end of the T'ang dynasty, as a form of lese-majesté. Stylistically, on the other hand, the forms imitated are pre-Ming Huang: "mountains like melting ice", slight proportions of human figures.
- Swann: If this is supposed to be a Ming convention, why are there no other Ming paintings showing it?
- Poor: If T'ang figurines were source, how did the Ming reconstruct?
- Bulling: Tomb at Tan-hsien, with paintings on molded clay, shows similarities in the mountains and also in the trees with the Ming-huang t'u.
- Ho: Perhaps not Ming-huang's Journey, but different subject. (no reason given by Ho)

13. ATTRIBUTED TO KUAN TUNG. TRAVELLERS IN THE MOUNTAINS.

- Cahill: 11th cent.? Didn't like when first seen at Palace Museum; came to respect more when more time spent with it (remounted at Freer by Sugiura, who felt silk was "very old," pre-Ming.)
- Ref. to concept from Kubler, The Shape of Time: "systematic age" vs. actual age. The position of a picture within a series may be more important than its actual age. So lineal traditions must be clarified before period styles can be defined. E.g. the Kuo Hsi sequence through So. Sung into Ming: a picture may be placed convincingly within this which would be hard to fit into any of present (too narrowly drawn) conception of "period style." This painting surely occupies late position in a stylistic lineage, betrays odd mannerisms which appear at such a stage (in whatever period). These do not necessarily argue for late date. Tradition originating in 10th cent. could well have reached this point by mid-11th or so--as Fan K'uan tradition had reached corresponding stage by So. Sung.
- Travellers: rendering of recession not successful; but flatness could be ingredient of stylistic tradition (Kuan T'ung or whatever) as it is e.g. in later blue-and-green landscape. Some elements suggest real date: mountains most comparable to Kuo Hsi, 1072, in surface treatment; neither texture strokes nor even wash; but in between. Uneven, fluctuating line has antecedent in (but more extreme than) Yen Wen-kuei. Trees and temple reminiscent of Fan K'uan. Genre details at bottom "ring true" for period; paralleled in other works (e.g. Nelson Gallery "Li Ch'eng"--which is,

however, much more "of its own time.")
Conclusion: a manneristic work deriving from a 10th cent.
tradition of landscape; perhaps mid or late 11th cent.
in date.

Betty Eeke:

From the viewpoint of a painter: a beautiful painting, but
doubts Sung date.

Brushwork: Sung: volumes important.

Travellers: brushwork manneristic, more relaxed, a
stage not reached in Sung.

Date: original, but later than Kuan Tung. Popular approach
of the Yuan period to be seen in the genre foreground
(detail of village live--not seen in the Sung) and
especially in the two figures lying flat in greeting.

Conclusion: Yuan period, "popular approach of the Yuan."

Sherman Lee:

Agrees with Eeke, but the mannerism may begin earlier
than the Yuan, cf.:

After Wang Wei: Wang Chuan Villa scroll in Chicago,
probably 12th cent.

Cahill:

(Introduced detail of figures from Crawford Kuo Hsi for
comparison.)

Lippe:

(Generally avoids repeating here what he wrote in the
Exhibition catalog, which should also be consulted
for his views.)

The Ssu-yin seal on this painting a half-seal of the Ming
court, used only between 1373 and 1384 (ref. to Chuang
Shen-ch'ing's article). Inventory of early Ming col-
lection, taken over from Yuan. When in Ming palace
collection these paintings were not available to the
public, and the knowledge of the half-seal, but its
meaning lost, and despite research and "deciphering"
(incorrectly) it remained unknown, until:

Ch'en Jen-tao: article on half-seal (1956) (material
from Chang Ta-ch'ien)

Chuang Shen-ch'ing: article 1960 (information from
Chuang senior). Chuang lists 120 paintings and
calligraphy with half-seal; of these, 40 are
known to him only through literary sources;
many others only through reproductions. He
mentions four probable fakes: two in Japan
(Saito and Yamamoto coll.), two in Palace
collection (Mu-ch'i and a Li T'ang, not in
exhibition). Old fakes of this seal are few and
imperfect because of misunderstanding, faulty
reading, copyist thinking it complete, etc.;
often have wrong dimensions. From own observation
we can add two more fakes in Palace collection:
Ma Yuan, "Lute Player" (Exh. No. 55); Chu-jan,
"Asking the Way..." (Exh. No. 15).

Of Chuang's 120 items, at least four do not actually
bear this seal. Most existing paintings listed
by him are in Palace collection; about six in

Japanese collections; six or more in Chang Ta-ch'ien collection; four or more in Ch'en Jen-tao collection. Therefore: Excepting recent imitations, half-seal is very important criterion (among others); cannot be disregarded.
Cf. Yen Wen-kuei for archaising mannerism; cf. also Fan K'uan.

- Loehr: Wrong reading by Ming: "seal of the controlling office."
- Soper: Size of seal hardly a reliable criterion, except in case of Imperial seal for official possession, as private collectors often varied the size of their seals.
- Lee: Ref. Contag and Wang. Seal evidence not final, but may shed light. Liang Ch'ing-piao and others used seals systematically.
- Sullivan: On "foreground" detail: not of top quality, and comparatively realistic, cf.: Chang Tse-tuan: Ch'ing-ming Shang-ho t'u of the No. Sung.
- Siekman: Restoration in the detail: vs. corner of the house and the two figures (lying down).
- Lippe: Some restoration and patching before the application of the ssu-yin half-seal.
- Siekman: Feels painting never finished, and hence the lack of volume. Ts'un on top of peak well worked out, but there are flat areas in the rock on the right, with merely an outline; while the waterfall has only the underpainting. Lack of volume due to this.
- Haskins: Architecture at the top different from that in the foreground; could there have been two artists?
- Eeke: Due to change of brushes?
- Siekman: Conclusion: 11th-12th cent. and uncompleted.
- Sullivan: Detail from Yen Wen-kuei in Abe collection "much more authoritative."
- Edwards: May be unfinished but possibly owing to artist's intent. This spontaneous while the Yen Wen-kuei is more intentionally finished.
Architecture: the differences between top and bottom can be explained as those between temple and shack.
Expressive values emphasized.
Date: late No. Sung.
- Loehr: The discrepancies of the spatial design i.e. the tallness of the mountains and the sudden stop: these are T'ang features and not No. Sung, as pointed out by Basil Gray. Kuan T'ung, in comparison with Fan K'uan, is more archaic, but not archaistic.

Atmosphere: not shreds of cloud, but a lighted-up area at the foot of the hill and cliff--cf. Tun-huang. Hence an early date would be indicated.

Trees: strongly unified, and as Cahill pointed out, reminiscent of Fan K'uan.

Figures: close to No. Sung figures.

Buildings: in archaic rhombic patterns, while the houses in the Ch'ing-ming shang-ho t'u (dated late No. Sung, before 1125) are quite different.

Rocks in waterfall: Kuan T'ung's pebbles are unstructured, and might seem to be after No. Sung.

Mannerism: looseness of technique not necessarily archaic, but note the absence of ts'un that is also a T'ang feature.

Absence of rationalistic touch (as for instance in the Fan K'uan Travellers in Mountains and the Yen Wen-kuei in Palace Museum) (dates c. 1000).

Date: the Kuan T'ung must be earlier.

Attribution: arbitrary, but not important. Should be a work of or before the 10th cent. with 9th cent. designs.

Cf. Wang To: who notes similarity to Hsiang Jung (9th cent.) and Kuo Chung-shu (10th cent.).

15. CHÜ-JAN. ASKING ABOUT THE TAO IN THE AUTUMN MOUNTAINS.

Sullivan:

A disappointment. The monumental style is right, but the performance is slack--cannot be early. Chü-jan just bought by the BM is more likely to be right. Chu-jan in Shanghai (same composition)--trees more stylized, design more simplified than the BM Chü-jan, and would be probably later than it. No painting att. Chü-jan is certain to be right, but the BM one comes nearer, and would be inclined to give it a date contemporary with Mi Fei.

Contag:

Tung Ch'i-eh'ang gives special significance to the So. School masters, and our view of Chü-jan is mostly from Ming painting, and Tung Ch'i-eh'ang (alum lumps, etc.)

Sullivan:

Tung Ch'i-eh'ang may not have had genuine works before him, and so his vision of Chü-jan's style may not have been correct.

Cahill:

Own Chang Ta-eh'ien painting (signed) showing close proximity in details to "early" painting, especially the BM landscape.

Fong:

On Tung Ch'i-eh'ang--the snow scene att. Chü-jan should be examined more closely.

Sullivan:

Was Chang Ta-eh'ien deliberately painting or concealing a Chü-jan?

Eske:

The Chü-jan att. picture bears no relation to Chan Ta-eh'ien. Chang Ta-eh'ien's brush technique is more Wang Meng than Chü-jan.

Chiang Tsan is closer in technique. Palace Chü-jan: later date, in Yuan dynasty. Cf. Palace Wu Chen.

Cahill:

Chü-jan in show should be around Yuan.

Lee:

Compare the exhibition Chü-jan and the Shanghai Chü-jan with the Chü-jan in the Saito collection, which bears a superficial likeness to the Palace picture, though only of album size, about 16" high. Both the Saito and the Palace Chü-jans represent a 14th cent. idea of his style. Shanghai Chü-jan (on silk, not on paper) is close to the British Museum painting, but with clear strong brushwork; earlier.

BM Chü-jan: the brushwork is impressionistic and the nearer one approaches the fuzzier it becomes; later than No. Sung.

Cleveland landscape: reflects the style of Chü-jan and is close to the Palace Chü-jan titled "Wooded Hills." Has seal dating to 1083.

An I-chou: in description of painting mentions large, but undecipherable seal--now deciphered as of the No. Sung bureau. This bureau used the seal for a very short time; painting must be at least as early as the late 11th cent.

Conclusions: Palace and Saito paintings--Yuan date. Palace painting left in Formosa, Wooded Hills, is closest to Chü-jan.

Cleveland: second closest.

Lippe:

On Ssu-yin half-seals of Palace and Saito--they are both wrong and probably 17th cent.

19. HSÜ TAO-NING. FISHING ON A SNOWY RIVER.

Loehr:

Fan K'uan in Crawford collection closest to the Hsü Tao-ning, in technique and design.

Details: crests--light in tone and treatment, and snow-covered.

Trees: "deformed" like match-sticks crossing.

Date: questionable--discrepancy between the eyelical and the reign dates: 1044 or 1034.

Inscription: unreliable, and attribution to Hsü Tao-ning is also questionable.

Lippe:

The title also is wrong. Fishing is not the subject of the painting. The subject is that of a gentleman (with umbrella) calling a fisherman to ferry him across.

Li Chu-tsing:

Both silk and ink are quite fresh in quality, and painting is disappointing.

Brush: artist limited in his use of brush, with little variety in the details, repetitive and monotonous. This repetition reminds one of the "Chü-jan" painting, and is not of Sung quality.

- Soper: Cf. Ashikaga painting in Japan: close in tall, narrow format and composition. This sort of Ashikaga painting derived from a Ming original rather than from a Sung, and so this also would seem to be a Ming painting.
- Eske: Could possibly be attributed to Yen Hui or to other lesser-known Yuan artists of ability. These painters still had some of the Sung painters' great sense of space and of perspective.
- Lippe: Cf., however, wavering lines in Yen Hui. Nothing comparable in this.
- Mrs. Bush: Cf. landscape with old cedar trees att. Kuo Hsi: would seem to be by the same hand. Both later than the Hsü Tao-ning in Kansas City--vertical lines for distant trees and tree shoots are close to the Palace Hsü Tao-ning, and the architecture and fences are also fairly close. Maybe in Hsü Tao-ning tradition.
- Soper: All such comparative material is also doubtful. Cf. Rowley's mathematical analogue: $\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = 1/8$, which may apply to degree of likelihood of such attributions.

32. HUI-TSUNG LANDSCAPE

- Lee: May be in "Hui-tsung" style? There is a variety of styles attributed to him.
Brushwork: finicky and lady-like.
Space: poorly handled.
Date: transition between No. and So. Sung.
Details have quality of miniature painting. Perhaps from the academic circles associated with Hui-tsung.
Conclusion: an unusual painting in its reduction in scale: att. not sure.
- Lippe: Compares:
Chu Te-jun: horizontal scroll
Sheng Mou: horizontal scroll
Hui-tsung Autumn: detail of tree comparable to Yuan tradition.
Date: Ssu-yin seal on painting dates it not later than the Yuan. Related to Boston Tung Yuan.
- Vanderstappen: Chu Te-jun and Sheng Mou comparisons point to similar attitudes. Differences in details.
Hui-tsung: equal emphasis throughout the painting: the artist "stands back" from his subject, puts equal stress on various places.
Yuan qualities: "equal stress;" equal emphasis on light and dark areas. No gradual transition, no true feeling for atmosphere that Sung paintings have. Decorative quality.
Date: Yuan

- Edwards: Individual elements are sophisticated and exquisitely used-- but the painting does have atmospheric space: the misty middle distance creates a unity and a sense of cohesion. Comparison with Sheng Mou does not hold exactly. Date: closer to S. Sung than to Yuan.
- Lippe: Agrees.
- Cahill: Date: 12th-13th cent.
There must have been more in the So. Sung than just the Hangchow academy painting. What was being produced in the North under the Chin? Continuation of schools already established there in late No. Sung: Li T'ang, Kuo Hsi, Mi Family, probably Li Kung-lin.
Atmosphere: agrees with Edwards that this is a So. Sung feature.
Ink: used decoratively, with pronounced tonal variation in restricted areas; cf. "Tung Yuan" in Boston, Wu Yuan-chih Red Cliff.
Conclusions: may be a northern backwash paralleling So. Sung trends in the 12th-13th cent. Yuan painting may have some Chin elements. Chin should be placed between No. Sung and Yuan; Yuan paintings drew on No. Sung traditions, largely by way of Chin. Boston Tung Yuan is 13th cent.?
- Poor: Kao K'o-kung atmospheric quality is quite close and worth examining for Yuan date.
- Lippe: For dating, cf. copy in the Abe collection (perhaps by Wang Hui?)
- Shimada: Would support the Ku-kung Hui-tsung rather than the Abe version.
- Li Chu-tsing: Li Kung-nien in Princeton: beginning of 12th cent., relates to Hui-tsung
Date: between No. and So. Sung, with northern elements still present.
Composition: zig-zag leading back into the mountains--atmospheric quality.
Hui-tsung: based upon such a painting as the Li Kung-nien.
Trees: cf. Shen Chou.
Date: 16th cent. Ming painting.
Details: tendency to over-describe certain objects, while at the same time the brush-work is not so sure and strong.
Conclusion: Ming.

36. LI T'ANG. WHISPERING PINES IN THE MOUNTAINS.

Lippe: Handscroll (No. 37) relates to an album leaf published by Cahill (Skira). Hanging scroll is close to a so-called Fan K'uan in Palace. So there may be two groups of paintings involved, or two hands.

Fong: "Grouping" (ref. morning discussion)
Li T'ang: Spring (Koto-in) quite incompatible with Whispering Pines. Question of "stylistic range"-- could the two be painted by the same man?
Koto-in: early So. Sung style.
Palace Li T'ang: cf. the modelling of Chou Ch'en.

Loehr: Koto-in Li T'ang: the rendition of the two figures is discordant with So. Sung: they are dry, not Sung types, and rather Ming or would-be Sung.
Trees: probably Ming (vivacious, daring, boldly designed).
Rocks: triangles of dark ink in foreground and water especially not true for Sung.
Impossible for both Koto-in and Palace to be Li T'ang.
Palace Li T'ang (No. 36) indeed reminds one in silhouetted trees of Chou Ch'en.
Signature: conspicuously placed on pinnacle seems out of tune with the Sung.
But painting in Fan K'uan tradition, translation of Fan K'uan, not in So. Sung idiom.
Date: nothing against the 1124 date except the flat area of foliage of trees.
Palace Chou Ch'en: not possibly by the same hand.
No. 36--chipping effect in rock ts'un would fit in the No. Sung, but would be far-fetched in a later period.
Koto-in: these paintings flank a Ming Kuan-yin.
Framing: a Ming characteristic in these.
Signature: why erased? According to Shimada Li is clear: the next character is not quite legible.

Fong: Stylistic sequence of the Fan K'uan tradition.
Sitting by Stream, att. Fan K'uan: 11th cent. Fan K'uan tradition.

The modelling of mountains.

Kuo Hsi: "Two types of mountains":

1. Rocky mountain: granite with sand over.
2. Earthy mountain: earth carrying stones.

Palace Fan K'uan (No. 18) a perfect example of Kuo Hsi's "rocky" type.

Sequence:

1. Fan K'uan, No. 18.
2. Att. Fan K'uan, 11th cent. (Sitting by a Stream).
3. Koto-in Li T'ang: axe-strokes as a means to an end, for descriptive and structural purpose: (axe-stroke: a picturesque term in art criticism rather than an artistic term).

Palace Li T'ang (No. 36): axe-strokes are overdone:
aestheticizing quality.
So. Sung trees: pine and oak: two kinds of which
Li T'ang was the first to play up the differences,
contrast.
Figures: lively (disagrees with Loehr, ref. details).
Spatial relations: Koto-in: clarity, opens back to
space.
Palace No. 36--black picture--suffocation in surface
texture.
No. 36 signature: hidden signatures are often mentioned
in the texts. Here the signature is in archaistic
characters, not common until the Yüan period.

Lippe:

Compares: Hsiao Chao (Palace). (Has ssu-yin half-seal).
Li T'ang hanging scroll of 1124 (Has ssu-yin half-seal).
Fan K'uan (Palace) (in Li T'ang style).
Album leaf, Hsiao Chao (Palace); ex-coll., Keng Chao-chung.
All four have characteristic surface of exaggerated
axe strokes and should be grouped close together.
Album leaf also trees before cut-out cloud pattern.

Nerio:
(Cambridge)

Accepts 1124 painting as probably by Li T'ang; can be taken
to represent him.
Style: no reason to discredit it, although may possibly
be later, close copy.
Landscape att. Fan K'uan (in Li T'ang style, Siren III/248):
Siren considers it in Li T'ang school--not a copy, but
not as good as 1124 Li T'ang.
Hsiao Chao: a Ming work which may be based on a Sung
original. Silhouette of the cliff is like a paper
cut-out, decorative and calling attention to itself.
Such outlines not found in the other two.
Waterfall: neo-Sung work.
Li T'ang (Koto-in): hasn't seen, but provisionally accepts
as Sung.
Date: late 12th cent. after Li T'ang: too broadly
worked to be earlier. Close to the Ma Hsia
tradition.
Li Kung-nien: quite removed from the Koto-in Li T'angs.
Similar lapse of time between 1072 Kuo Hsi and Li
Kung-nien as between Li Kung-nien and Koto-in Li Tangs.

Lippe:

Ku-kung shu-hua (No. 38) first reproduction, att. Hsia Kuei,
close to Li T'ang landscape of 1124, should be added to
group.
Li Kung-nien: not as broadly worked as Koto-in landscapes,
and approach is different. (Not convinced of Koto-in
attribution).

Cahill:

Agrees with Nerio on relative position of all these paintings.
Li Kung-nien earlier in style than Koto-in landscapes.
Concentration of main elements: as So. Sung character
(Koto-in). Large areas of painting undefined,
filled in by viewer.
Dispersion (lack of single focal center): as No. Sung
character. Li Kung-nien transitional, like his
contemporary Li T'ang.

Lee: Koto-in Li T'ang: represents transition between No. and So. Sung.
Ref. Japanese practice of cutting down paintings: could these have been greatly cut down from the screen? If so, sees Koto-in paintings as close to the Ku-kung painting: could be the work of a single artist. Strokes very close.
No. 36: original, change of pigment may have contributed to the change in the picture.

Edwards: Li T'ang a transitional figure who was concerned with the physical world.
No. 36: the strokes crisp and positive though not so spontaneous as the Koto-in ones, though they have the same intent. Not decorative mannerism, as Wen Fong says, but attempt to capture the quality of physical reality.
Space: filled up for the same purpose.
Koto-in Li T'ang: less of this idea.
No. 36: Conclusion: genuine work by Li T'ang.
Ku Chien-lung album (early Ch'ing album in Nelson Gal., Kansas City): a late version of the axe-stroke, more decorative as compared to the Koto-in.

Wu: Lack of solid ground on which to base, as we have in archaeology.
Fan K'uan (Palace, No. 18) uncertain attribution--nothing in its genealogy before Ming to prove it, too different from anything else we have, size make it unlikely to have survived that long. What can be observed here are:
Composition: placed directly frontal, in line of observer's vision.
Roeks: those in foreground look like Ming.
Space: measured block by block; cadence, not direct progression.
Figures: the travellers are very small but visible and readable.
Composition: ambiguous space behind the foreground.
Spatial relationship of buildings in mid-ground ambiguous.
Trees: have been done with slow strokes: repairer's hand can be seen in faster strokes done with a more liquid ink.
Koto-in: foreknowledge of the whole composition, uniform space, and greater speed, a sweeping statement in quick rhythm, full control of composition: oblique instead of frontal view.
Li T'ang, No. 36: frontal--bones of the frontality are still preserved, but coloristic quality is added; it overdoes the "Fan K'uan tradition," and is richer than it. One thing well exhibited at the Palace exhibition is the Ming taste (as criterion of selection in Ku-kung coll.).

Sullivan: Academy painting of So. Sung was completely dominated by Li T'ang.
Hsiao Chao, Li T'ang, Fan K'uan series: Palace Li T'ang, No. 36: So. Sung style.
Koto-in Li T'ang: not in the picture. Late So. Sung at the very earliest, and probably later still.
Cf. BM "Hsia Kuei" as Ming revival of Hsia Kuei.

Composition: n. b. straight line from top left to two-thirds of way down.

Figures: look like Ming.

Fong:

Crux of the problem is narrative vs. the stylistic art historian.

Quite possible to construct a pretty fairy tale that there is a chronological succession of the three: e.g.:

1. The Fan K'uan in Li T'ang style (Fan K'uan a la Li T'ang)
2. The palace Li T'ang (No. 36)
3. Hsiao Chao--pupil of Li T'ang

But this is a fairy tale.

Loehr:

Compare Ma Yuan (Seikado) (attribution by Kano master).

Rocks not purely geometrical, crystallizing; irregular shapes bring out substance and mass that is unique in attributions to Ma Yuan.

Hsiao Chao (300 Masterpieces, 103): does not agree with Nerio's suggestion that this may be Ming. Consists of clear-cut composition of dark foreground, and wide open space and light pinnacles in the background. Spit of land at bottom right and ship anchored above are the same as in Seikado picture.

Few elements, clear-cut silhouette:

If Ma Yuan in Seikado is a genuine work, then the Hsiao Chao also is of the period, 12th cent.

The Hsiao Chao signature dangling from the tree, as in the Koto-in Li T'ang.

Edwards:

Cf. Hsia Kuei: Pure and Remote Views of Mountains: detail: Short concrete foreground, and open, sudden distance.

Lippe:

Chia Shih-ku (No. 38) also fits into this series, with exaggerated axe-stroke. Has ssu-yin half-seal.

Cahill:

Round album leaf (Skira, anonymous): angular outline in rocks, here used for naturalistic end, comes to be typical of, and essential to, the Li T'ang style; developed in mannerist way in the late 12th-early 13th cent.

Should precede the Chia Shih-ku, in which same features appear in more stereotyped rendering: derivative forms. This is valuable approach in determining sequence within given group of works.

If all are assumed to be forgeries, this would call for extensive (and unlikely) cooperation between artists in the Ming, to set up convincing series of this sort, consistent with chronological sequence of artists to whom the pictures are ascribed.

37. LI T'ANG. MOUNTAINS BY THE RIVER (Handscroll).

Edwards:

Connections with the Li T'ang of 1124 and with the album leaf attributed to Li T'ang by Cahill (Skira, anon.). Crowded and full painting of paramount importance: important feature is the appearance of the rocks as crystallised. Literary sources: say Li T'ang in 1103 copied a T'ang painting; here the treatment of the water is archaistic. Line: has spontaneity that a Ming painting could not have. Not the work of a copyist or of someone like Chou Ch'en. Date: should logically be placed as a Sung work of the time of the transition between No. and So. Sung. No. 37--opening of the scroll: handscroll is a continuum of space, with profusion of detail. Painter aware of past, but with implications of things to come. Landscape not impenetrable, see the distant boat seen between peaks--giving new feeling of space, cf. So. Sung. Date: accepts attribution and dating.

Sullivan:

Would agree that it is So. Sung and close to Li T'ang, but not a masterpiece. Anon. fan/album leaf (Cahill, Skira) is coherent, moving, poetic. Handscroll: copy of Li T'ang, possibly by a pupil. Line: in its quality and manner of defining form, is flat and lacks emphasis and variety. Brush-strokes: many are nerveless and meaningless. Conclusion: an uninspired follower of Li T'ang, but surely So. Sung.

Cahill:

Handscroll and hanging scroll could be by the same man working in widely different formats and scales: the treatment of rocks in the hanging scroll is too strong for use in the handscroll. Cf. difference between 1072 and Freer Kuo Hsi paintings.

Lee:

Li T'ang (No. 37) a masterpiece, but badly rubbed. Style: semi-T'ang style gold dots on the rocks now badly eroded. Condition: perhaps the painting has been reworked, hence accounting for the "meaningless" (Sullivan) quality of the line. Albums often well preserved, in good condition, and make poor comparisons with badly preserved handscrolls.

Sullivan:

Reworking could not account for the whole of it. There is a general lack of painterly quality over the whole surface, and no passage shows the strength and spontaneity that one expects in the work of a master.

Shimada:

Ref. his Bijutsu Kenkyu article. Li T'ang (Palace, No. 36): formerly suspected might be early Li T'ang. Form of central peak descends from Fan K'uan, but shrunk, indicative of a later date. Att. Sesshu: two sets of four landscape paintings of the four seasons. These show undeniable similarities with the

Li T'ang, No. 36, e.g. in the dense foreground trees with no space between them and the background peaks. These could be free copies of late 15th cent. or early 16th cent. Ming painting (about the time of Tai Chin).
Li T'ang, No. 36: no space between the trees and the foreground. Flat. Cannot recall any Sung work like this.
Hsiao Chao: attribution uncertain.
Contrast between solid and void in almost equal vertical divisions. Japan has many paintings of this type dating from the 15th cent. by minor or anonymous painters.
Date: rejects Sung date, and suggests early Ming.
Hence the sequence is long, running from Fan K'uan to the Ming dynasty.

Cahill: On physical condition of No. 36: disturbing effect caused by the disappearance of the green color in the trees.

Loehr: What Cahill considers disturbing speaks for the genuineness of the work.

43. ANONYMOUS: SNOWY MOUNTAINS AT DUSK.

Vanderstappen: Date: Ming: c.1600
Disturbing factors for Sung date:
Ink tone: precious and slick handling.
Refinement.
Fine gradations in tone.
Little distinction between large and small.
Strong emphasis on decorative qualities.
Artist sublimates feeling of space into juxtaposed tone gradations. Not interrelated. This attitude inconsistent with that of the 12th cent.
Difficult to differentiate the early Ming from the Sung.
The differences are subtle and an example for comparison is the T'ang Yin reproduced by Cahill (Skira).
T'ang Yin: shows similar decorative quality, though the contrast of planes is stronger.
Koto-in Li T'ang: disagrees with Ming date.

Cahill: Similarities, e.g. in peak-treatment, would indicate Ming date for both. Different from Li T'ang, believed Sung.

Maeda: Agrees (with Cahill).

Lippe: Treatment of the details softer and more sensitive than T'ang Yin.
Ts'ao Chih-po (Palace, No. 75) Yuan, for comparison of the neatly-drawn foreground houses.
Date: perhaps later than Sung, but not as late as T'ang Yin.

Siekman: Elegantly executed and beautifully drawn, in fine and sensitive academic style: if details only were seen could

be thought of as late So. Sung or Yuan album leaf.
Tone: controlled and elegantly graded.
Ch'iu Ying: (Palace, No. 102): both show high bank descending
into water, giving clarity and definition to the painting.
Ch'iu Ying is inferior in details: the high rock at
top right does not recede into the background.
No. 43 date: late 13th-early 14th cent. academic work.

Edwards:

Cf. Anon. Flight of Ducks (Chicago, Art Institute) similar
kind of elements, are they same time?

No answer from Vanderstappen.

43. ANONYMOUS: SNOWY MOUNTAINS AT DUSK--postscript

Lippe:

General remark concerning material evidence (not referring
to No. 43):

Seal evidence: half-seal, if genuine, gives terminus
ante quem of 14th cent. Also several outstanding
collectors' seals cannot be just ignored.

Silk and paper: cf. van Gulik: Five dynasties silk
loosely woven and coarse. Hui Tsung "academy silk"
finely and tightly woven and given polish. Acc. to this,
Chao Kan, No. 12, looks more like academy silk than
Five dynasties silk.

Loehr:

Details in No. 43 suggest Sung date rather than Ming.

Cluster of houses centre left.

Perspective: distinguished by methodically carried out
design in central perspective. Not found in Ming
works.

Ming architecture more sloppy.

Foreground: slope with crevasse and shrubs carefully done, cf.
Li Ti Two Herd-boys (Palace, No. 40) So. Sung, dated 1173.

No. 43: not non-Sung spirit: gentleness and tenderness
different from the calculated and brutal effects typical
of the Ming.

There is a progression from Fan K'uan to Li T'ang to this.

One feature reminiscent of 15th cent. Ming works:

group of trees similar to painting formerly in
Oppenheim collection, England. But, these in this
later painting probably taken over from the Sung.

Houses: Kuo Jo-hsu: "One hundred lines converging
on one point."

Fong:

Returns to Koto-in Li T'ang: figures wonderfully drawn.

Chou Ch'en (Kansas City) shipped surface--axe stroke used
as a brush stroke, for its own merit, not as a means to
an end. This virtuoso brush work very close to the Palace
Li T'ang, No. 36.

Sickman:

Chou Ch'en more mannered and studied than in the Li T'ang.
Has worked out square forms while the Palace Li T'ang

(No. 15) observed carefully and remains closer to nature.
Koto-in Li T'ang: figures remind one of Shen Chou--eclectic.

Lee: Difference of scale to be noted in comparison of the
Palace Li T'ang and the Chou Ch'en. Agrees with Siekman,
the difference is subtle.
Chou Ch'en: mechanical but beautiful.
Compare the trees in the two paintings: differences.
No. 36 originally clearer, more understanding of what
is being done. Likely to be 1124 and the other influenced
by it, c.1500.

Fong: Chou Ch'en and Palace Li T'ang (No. 36) extremely similar in
terms of stylistic concepts.

Lee: Chou Ch'en outline of trees more arbitrary.

Fong: But are not they closer to one another than to the Koto-in
Li T'ang? (which Lee also accepts)

Lee: Believable that such a range is possible in one man's work.
Rocks are the important point. Though Loehr dislikes
those in Koto-in paintings and sees them as possible
Ming feature and manner, Lee likes them.
Koto-in Li T'ang: seen 1947 and feels figures repainted
or added.

Shimada: Koto-in figures not repainted.

Fong: Last year saw the second character of the signature,
legible with unaided eye as T'ang of Li T'ang.

Shimada: Though almost invisible in natural light, infra red brings
it out clearly. No doubt on signature.

Loehr: Not visible, unless Dr. Fong has infra-red eyes.

Fong: Ref. to Bijutsu Kenkyo photographs showing it.

Young: Light in Koto-in itself is insufficient, but the signature
is visible and quite clear on the photograph.

Fong: Koto-in Li T'angs: axe stroke used to show the facets
of the rock.
Palace, No. 36: axe stroke used as decorative pattern,
repetitious and flat, without life. Again difference
in purpose and intent.

Poor: Chou Ch'en: white edges show crowding of darks and lights.
Palace, No. 36: this feature is not seen.
Koto-in: intense lights and darks such as are seen in
15th cent.
Figures: look as if they must be Ming.
Rocks: "a manner is being built up" but the artist is
still approaching his subject freshly.

Cahill: Chou Ch'ea: a.b. degree to which the Ming artist betrays his date:
Distinctive trees, way of treating bunches of pine needles; running outline of rock in foreground water. All belong to school, and more specifically to hand of Chou Ch'ea.
Palace Li T'ang, No. 36: nothing of these features, or of Ming flavor. Could a Ming painter do such a large and detailed work without betraying himself somewhere in it? Individual styles of later masters must be understood more clearly before names (Chou Ch'ea, Chu Tuan etc.) are dropped around so freely.

46. ATTRIBUTED TO WU YÜAN-CHIH: THE RED CLIFF.

Ecke: Knows the painting well but has no definite conclusion. Has feeling of a Sung work, but can't figure out by what artist--fits into no known category.
Palace Li T'ang: hanging and handscroll not be same hand.
Many round fans done in handscroll style with gold dots, not signature.
Likes hanging scroll better, but handscroll seems Sung. No. 36 is different from a technical point of view from the Chou Ch'ea, not so mechanical. (Intuitive rather than scientific conclusion).
Red Cliff: Witness of wash a Sung characteristic. Earlier Palace attribution changed to Chin artist, Wu Yuan-chih, because of earlier records.
Very skilful, feeling of later So. Sung.
Brush: almost like Ma Yuan--small axe cut.

Loehr: Should be compared to the scroll in Boston, att. Yang Shih-hsien; also to a hanging scroll in Stockholm published by Siren in Chinese on the Art of Painting, att. Wang Li. Abruptly structured, pillar-like peaks.
Date: early Ming.
Red Cliff: of very high quality, cf. more timid version of it in Boston.
The latter version is Sung, so this should come by end of Sung.

Siren: Agrees.

Edwards: Puzzling painting. Subject relates to that of the Boston painting.
Date: would place as late Sung by general impression, but doesn't quite fit.
Rejects classic calm expression of the So. Sung though it uses S. Sung compositional forms. Brooding quality. Conflicting elements, e.g. direction and placing of hills cause puzzlement.
Work more expressive than crude, for all its abruptness.

Axe-stroke: may be aware of Ma Yuan but doesn't seem to have accepted his technique.
Conclusion: Chia would be a logical hypothesis--late 12th cent., not untouched by So. Sung, but not really interested in it; aware of Li T'ang also.

Cahill:

Agrees with much of above.
Date: could well be placed in Chia on other grounds than literary.
Attribution: Wu Yuan-chih convincing.
Attached calligraphy by known Chia writer; paper and ink of calligraphy and painting agree.
Conclusion: if we put it in late 12th or early 13th cent. and admit it puzzles, then Chia is suggested.
Scroll att. Sun Chih-wei: also shows hatching, break-down of "axe-cut" texturing. This seen as a development of Li T'ang tradition, cf. the Li T'ang handscroll. Also other features, as placing of trees on pads of long grass, composition with hills stretching diagonally into misty distance.
Chia work, "wen-jen-ization" of Li T'ang style. Quite separate from Li T'ang to Ma Yuan development in South. Points in common with other Chia paintings. Fact that this explanation sounds rather involved doesn't mean that "simpler" explanations, e.g. throwing it into Ming (where it won't fit at all) more likely to be right.

Bush:

The Wu Yuan-chih attribution was made before by Li Jih-hua in the late Ming period.

Soper:

Emphasis on the water--not an indication of So. Sung, and a strange subject for a Northern painter--perhaps some region in the South.

Cahill:

This accounted for by the subject.

Sullivan:

Cf. the degree of mannerism in early Koryu painting: could this derive from No. China??

Ecke:

Palace collection: two paintings of water by two different artists. Elaborate exercise.
Li Sung: Ode on Red Cliff in Nelson Gallery, Kansas City (reproduced Cahill, So. Sung cat.) close to this.

Shimada:

Asks Siekman's opinion on the water in the Li Sung and the No. 46 Red Cliff.

Siekman:

Treatment in both very close.

Edwards:

To Cahill: is Crawford Ch'iao Chung-eh'ang related to this?

Cahill:

Not much resemblance except that Ch'iao work in Li Kung-lin tradition, so both belong to the Literati School of the So. Sung.

Some minor similarities in use of ink tone and brushwork.
Approach of both includes elements of traditional styles.

Soper suggested (private conversation) that application of literati criteria not valid for anything earlier than Yuan; Cahill thinks matter of school more decisive than period here.

Soper:

Incorrectly quoted. Standards of quality meant, and not a stylistical matter. At Yuan there is a break with tradition.

47. ANONYMOUS. CLEARING AFTER SNOW IN MIN MOUNTAINS.

Lee:

Painting seen twice.

First impression: close to Kuo Hsi, 11th cent.

Second: still close, not as improvised, still by a close follower.

Kuo Hsi 1072 given top rating by almost all.

Rational and well organized.

Details: show improvisation (trees and rocks--pentimenti, pale wash sketching of things to be finished).

Literary sources of No. Suag: painting as a struggle with brush and ink.

Hence the pentimenti strengthen likelihood of it

being really primary sketching, and original work.

Perhaps indebted to Li Ch'ang.

Clearing after Snow

Handling: coarse, provincial.

Date: late No. Suag, early So. Suag.

Cf. Streams and Mountains Without End: which began with late No. Suag colophon (subsequently removed), and then had two Chin colophons. Such a painting was in Chin collection, and is perhaps a source for the Chin tradition.

Conclusion: transitional work c.1100.

Fong:

Cf. Chu Te-jun.

Kuo Hsi 1072: an impressive painting, but the rock formations are too broken up, the line too advanced, for such a date.

Chu Te-jun: (Palace, No. 82) represents the Kuo Hsi tradition in the 14th cent.

Trees: volume and movement.

Composition and brushwork: similar in both.

Cf. Ts'ao Chih-po: "pine forest" and "snow scroll."

No. 47, Clearing: both line and composition more advanced than the Chu Te-jun.

Li Kung-mien (Princeton): end of No. Suag, transitional period.

Wash: here the So. Suag character appears.

Scale: not naturalistic; the distance is broken into three bands.

Style: not in the Li T'ang, Ma Hsia tradition, but prior. Solid and well constructed, close to Fan K'uan in modelling and tactile quality.

Att. Hui Tsung Four Seasons (Japan): also shows some of this quality.
With the Li Kung-nien as a basis, the Palace Kuo Hsi cannot be accepted.
Kuo Hsi 1072: space: ambiguous, smudged, suddenly obscured trees in mist.
Mist: not even comparable with that in the Daitoku-ji Lohans. To be compared to Li Tsai in mist rendering.
Black and white juxtaposition seems Ming.
Well handled but spatial ambiguity created.
Date: fits late 14th cent. or early 15th cent.
Li Tsai: much shallower, not as rich. Represents an early Ming return to Sung.
Concept of trees and rocks:
Recession: vertical and horizontal placing of elements causes geometric plan, no oblique recession.
Composition: not self contained as in Sung work.
Change of direction comes with the end of Yuan; in the Ming there is more symmetrical balance. Sung movement in space is lost.
Ming: a "framed" picture (not found in Sung).
Horizontal scroll: Sung. Movement part by part;
Ming: sweeping movement in picture plane.
Kuo Hsi 1072: is close to the spectator, unlike Sung which is detached and removed from the spectator.
Dichotomy between extreme realism and geometricising.

Lippe:

Chu Te-jun: Wash treatment.
Clearing, No. 47: some resemblance to Chu Te-jun, but former has total, general as opposed to detailed, pars pro toto approach to nature.
Cf. Li Ch'eng: (Waterfall, No. 17) in which the landscape picks up again beyond the mist--not as complete or as cosmic a vision as the Kuo Hsi.
The Li Ch'eng is Yuan and close to Chu Te-jun, while Clearing is slightly earlier.

Lee:

Problem is: what to base conception of Northern Sung painting on.
Fong uses Fan K'uan, Liao tombs, Central Asia--mostly provincial, as basis of criteria for attribution.
Anything unlike this assigned to 14th-15th cent.
This expands 14th and 15th cent. to include all of No. Sung.
Texts: significant statement that Sung was great period of landscape.
Lee prefers to accept broader view, use seals, silk, brush, etc., as criteria to accord with standards set in texts; reluctant to reject the monumental on account of the provincial works. Not possible to build on so restricted a view of No. Sung.

Soper:

Claims Lee's statements were made on his suggestion.

Loehr:

Clearing, No. 47: dynamic quality is essential.
Note contrast of light and dark.
Kuo Hsi 1072: not so good as all that; somewhat dull, smudged in passages.

Date: 12th cent. would create more problems, better to leave in 11th cent.

Passionate, serious and severe aspect of the two paintings shows originality, not a later cooked-up job.

Clearing: recession not yet solved v. high horizon.

Ching Hao (Japanese collection, Shina-sanzui-qa no kenkyu): somewhat mannered, but the composition is close to Clearing: v. rocks piled on one side, and endless river on other side of the painting.

Li Ch'eng (Boston MFA) reminiscent: enormous space and clear sky.

Nothing forcibly suggests anything as late as So. Sung; certainly not Yuan.

Chu Te-jun: worn and tired by comparison. Would rule out Yuan date for Clearing, No. 47.

"Detailed" form of nature, contrasted to Ming "wholeness" in landscape.

Conclusion: Clearing possibly earlier than Kuo Hsi of 1072.

Vanderstappen:

Agrees with Loehr in many respects.

Clearing: Composition: high horizon, opening up of one side, diagonal.

Agrees with Loehr that is incompatible with 12th cent.

Traditionally, the concept of placing the mountains on one side for uninterrupted view of side is an earlier one.

Complexity of grouping of peaks and trees and repetition of forms, contrast of dark areas against light, also seen in Kuo Hsi: but in Clearing appears to be a patterning based on something earlier.

Composition of Clearing should be pre-Li T'ang, possibly pre-Sung.

"A painting tells the story of the landscape;" builds up: the spatial unity is made up of many elements in succession; and this seems an early quality.

Like Chu Te-jun in repetition of forms.

Outlines: blotchy

Treatment: decorative, not to be expected in an early painting.

Clearing: lay-out: muddled, mixed-up.

Date: of very early tradition, but not of early date.

Group of trees in decorative fashion, also not of such early date.

Siekman:

Contrived elements such as trees in right foreground incongruous in scale.

Six lines running across into picture from sides: high horizon does not read too clearly.

Would add to Lee's remarks: excellence and speed of technique made for enormous output. Painters did lots of painting in life-time and hence many should survive. Tradition of preserving old paintings very strong in China; much survives from same periods in Europe; why not in China?

Fong:

Little left before the early Ming. Thousands of "Shen Chou." Why no example of Shen Chou's family members works who were lesser artists?

Cahill: Disagrees with Vanderstappen and favors So. Sung date for Clearing; the type was popular in the No. Sung, and preserved in Yuan. Possibility that tradition was continued in between should not be ruled out, and Clearing would date in 12th cent.; for which the character of the mist is perfectly good.

Kuo Hsi 1072: Always rational in parts: but not rational and logical in total structure.

Clearing: central section is incoherent and confused, lacks control: not differences due to master and follower, but rather to earlier and later stylized phase of the Kuo Hsi tradition.

Clearing: not yet mannerist, but tends toward it.

Kuo Hsi 1072: no traces of mannerism. (Cf. criteria for placing painting in series, mentioned in connection with Li T'ang.)

Lippe: Wrong caption; should be farewell scene: two gentlemen leaving on horseback, woman and child bidding goodbye.

Soper: Cahill's statement true.

The ambiguities in combinations of forms in Kuo Hsi 1072, and the smudged-over areas alongside other passages of brilliant clarity, must have been deliberate, an attempt to capture the quality of a dream, or vision. A product excessively difficult to imitate later, is a more prosaic period.

Incidentally, discussion so far has made obvious the personal and subjective character of many of our judgments. Fong's pejorative "smudged" is my "visionary"; Loehr's "passionate" might well be interpreted by someone else as a sign of nervous agitation.

52. MA YÜAN. ON A MOUNTAIN PATH IN SPRING.
53. MA YÜAN. THROUGH SNOWY MOUNTAINS.

Eeke: Disappointed.

Brushwork: not as perfect as it should be.

Followers: many artists in China, hence masters often copied and imitated.

Authorship: done by his students, at time not too remote from Ma Yuan.

No true forgery intended.

Mrs. Clapp: Disappointed also.

No. 52: no pretention to being Sung.

Willow branch: connection between it and mountain on surface of picture would not have appealed to Sung; branch itself is done in self-conscious manner.

Conclusion: is Che School work in imitation of Ma Yuan.

No. 53: better chance, but not convinced of attribution.

Line: foreground shore-line is self conscious and obtrusive.

- No. 56: Anon. Banquet by Lantern-light.
Has better chance of Sung date.
Concern with time of day: twilight (cf. No. 53)
Restrained but profound expression of mood.
Date: last half of the 12th cent.
No. 53: slightly earlier of two, but neither it nor No. 52
could possibly be by Ma Yuan.
Ku-kung has signed "Ma Yuan" vertical scroll, similar
composition to No. 56, but Ming date.

Edwards:

- No 52: we have no clear idea of what is Ming in this style.
Ming represents an overworking of the So. Sung formula:
sweet, detailed, exquisite. Here careful juxtaposition of solids
and voids. Exquisite, but more evidence needed to put in Ming.
No. 53: No so exquisite, more spontaneous: still possible
within the Ma Hsia School.
Should be compared with the Koto-in Li T'angz (figures in
both not really standing on anything).
Koto-in Li T'ang: figures may represent So. Sung going
back to T'ang for subject matter.
Cf. Liang K'ai: historical reconstruction. Historical-
conscious period.
Tung Yuan Hsiao Hsiang: pigmented figures float and are
not integrated in the landscape.
Hovering figures are reconstruction of earlier style.

Vanderstappen:

- No. 52: Ming Che School's relationship with the Ma Hsia
School very complicated.
No. 52: A Sung interpretation of such a composition
(e.g. Boston willows) would emphasize space with
clearly defined repoussoir; indefinite space.
No. 52: details of composition: extended willow branch
over very large figure "dressed up to stand there."
Figure: the main focus of the painting; in foreground;
important in garment and stride; needs inscription to
describe activity. This feature is not one found in
original Ma Yuan work.
Line: sharpness of line and rock is disturbing.
Drawing: flat.
Landscape: is used to emphasize the figure, not the use
to which Ma Yuan would paint.
Composition: angular with side open, but elements of
landscape used as framework, not as repoussoir.
Boston fan: would prefer to accept as an original. Spatial
relation is convincing.

Loehr:

- Boston fan: a superior work, terser, more masculine in the
brushwork of the willow.
Nos. 52 and 53: agrees with Eeke that these may be pupil's
work.
No. 52: Cf. Liang K'ai Portrait of Li T'ai-po. Willow
branches insecure and unsatisfactory.
No. 53: superior to No. 52, may be given Sung date, cf.
Li Ti in Yamato Bunkakan; belongs to Ma Yuan School, but
does not merit extended discussion.

Fong:

- Agrees with last statement.

Methodology: need to understand the artist's creativity and the causation of style in order to understand how and why style changes.

Boston Ma Yuan fan: quite credible as Sung.

Has completeness lacking in the other two; harmonious, logical flow.

No. 52: repetition: branch-rendering insecure: the issue is more basic than one of quality; how the artist visualizes the picture.

Build-up of vocabulary--consistent from pre-T'ang onwards: pre-14th cent. more interest in representation than in decoration.

Shoso-in: even here the elements are related to one another, and not just decoratively placed.

No. 52: brushstrokes: axe-strokes are not for representational ends.

Stereotyped, unlike the Koto-in Li T'ang.

Conspicuous white-line edging to rock.

Seikado Sun Chün-tse: Yuan Ma-Hsia tradition--stylization.

Axe-strokes--late ones repeated as axe-strokes, do not serve purpose of representation, unlike Koto-in Li T'angs.

No. 52 date: Ming. Compare decorative surface with Ming painting. Abrupt cut of branch inconceivable in So. Sung.

Boston fan: a closed circuit. Self-contained with repeated but never identical lines.

Classification of Chinese art can be done in terms of careful and cautious process. In terms of visual concepts.

Sullivan:

Fashionable, easily imitated painter with many competent followers. Makes the problem of the Ma-Hsia School almost insoluble. Ma Yuan's artistic quality uneven.

Boston fan: painting of willows feeble, awkward crossing of branches. But this need not indicate a copy; an imitator would be more careful.

No. 52: consistent with the Ducks in Peking.

No. 53: also by Ma Yuan, but uninspired.

Soper:

Fong's dogma that pre-Yuan painters constantly referred to nature, drew solidly constructed rocks, is contradicted by his own key monuments. In the Koto-in "Li T'ang" waterfall, the most important large area of cliff is spatially meaningless; the apparent contrasts of plane actually cannot be rationally explained.

Lippe, Siekman:

Agree.

Cahill:

But unintelligibility does not speak for date. Cf. perfumatory area-filling in Daitoku-ji Lohans.

Fong:

Point well taken. Not question of success, but how the parts and the whole of the picture are conceived.

Koto-in (distant mountains): play of yin-yang.

Branch: stretching upward with tension and growth.

Composition: orderly recession in space.

Ducks: (Peking) rigid, surface play.

Fan K'uan: clear delineation.

"Wang Wei" Waterfall of So. Sung: shows life rhythm.
Formal characteristics: correlated with intellectual
and philosophical concepts. Form symptomatic of
attitude towards nature and mode of seeing.

Ducks:

Branch as in No. 52; not as structurally clear.
No. 52: expression--theatrical, posed figure, shows
Ming tendency.
Conclusion: Ming date certain.

29. LI KUNG-LIN: KUO TZU-I RECEIVING THE HOMAGE OF THE UIGURS.

Lee: First section very good, second a replacement but also good.

Soper: No very positive impression except that the work is not
of very high quality. Li Kung-lin as a figure master
was considered--by critics in a time when such values
were still understood and prized--to be supremely talented,
in a tradition largely drawn from T'ang. The feebleness
of drawing seen here is totally inappropriate, both for
the master and probably also for the whole Sung period.

Siekma: Drapery: repetition of folds is stylized and not descriptive.
Reminiscent of Ma Ho-ehih.
Conclusion: may be an early reproduction or substitute,
but of better quality than Soper would have.
Figures and composition good and dramatic.

Soper: Japanese treating this kind of subject are better.

Lee: Japanese not better, but different. And not comparable to
this. Sung artist is being correct and archaistic--fine
line. Japanese artist more expressive.

Edwards: Not much use to say "better but different."
Wen-ien-hua: detail as reflection of learning.
Composition: attractive and dramatic, a beautiful and
skilful representation.

Soper: Am thinking of the Tokyo section of the Heiji Monogatari
which shows two companies of warriors confronting each
other across a diagonal of intense, breathless anticipation.
Incidentally would those who defend this sort of Chinese
painting against its Japanese equivalent be also willing
to defend Japanese landscapes against Chinese?

Edwards: Would.

Loehr: Attribution problem.
Vimalakirti att. Li Kung-lin (in Japan) "every stroke
derived from Wu Tao-tzu." Cf. Mi fei: Hua-shih on
landscape: "every stroke derived from Wang Wei."

Psychological depths: insight into and glorification of Chinese heroism.

Figures: each individually characterized.

Style: stands apart from everything Sung, but still considers to be Sung.

Not justifiable as Li Kuang-lin.

31. ATT. HUI TSUNG: A LITERARY GATHERING.

Siekman: All agreed that it is an academic painting. Question is when was it done?

Lee: Cf. Ch'iu Ying handscroll of good quality formerly in Chang Ts'ung-yü collection, with same subject. 16th cent. Perhaps the Ch'iu Ying should derive from such painting. Gathering: could not be by Hui Tsung who couldn't paint so well, nor would he have had the time to produce such an elaborate work. Probably good or best Hsüan-ho academy work, end of No. Sung. Figures: sensitively done: superficially relate to Ch'iu Ying because he copied this or work like it. Brushwork: suave, folds of garments have weight. Details: observation of actual objects e.g. in table setting. Ting-yao pottery--objects in Ch'iu Ying are rather symbols than actually real.

Siekman: Points the clean structure of the table in the hanging scroll (Gathering) which is confused in the handscroll (Ch'iu Ying). Ceramics good Sung shapes; cf. Chü-lu Hsien. Ceramic shapes in Ch'iu Ying have one or two which are characteristic of early Ming.

Pope: One man in the painting holds what can only be an early Ming blue and white dish.

Lee: Remembers as brown, not blue, designs (could be underglaze red).

Pope: Ceramic dishes of this size and shape not known from Sung times. Color here not important, a convention; all over pattern as well as size and shape clearly 15th cent. in character.

Siekman: Can it not be a white lacquer dish?

Pope: Have we seen Sung white lacquer of that size--or any size?

Soper: Both this painting and the Chao Yen riders seem to represent eclectic transformations of fairly early designs: the top-heavy, incongruous palace garden details (the railings, ornamental rocks, trees) being commonplace additions

intended to heighten the elegance of the scene. Both could originally have been handscrolls without settings. In the Literary Gathering one can imagine the figures rearranged in sequence along one base line, somewhat in the manner of the Boston Silk Beaters or the Kansas City "Chou Faag." Even the dishes on the table are arranged to stress the horizontal and the picture-plane; in this respect Lee's "Ch'iu Ying" shows a late rearrangement suited to the vertical format. The Gathering's figures are drawn without either the early interest in convincing spatial and anatomical relationships, or Sung calligraphic virtuosity. Conclusion: a Ming pastiche of mediocre quality.

Loehr:

Agrees on eclectic nature, handscroll prototype.
Landscape not integrated with table group is typical and important, and decides where the painting should be placed.

Vanderstappen:

Cf. Chao Yen Eight Gentlemen on a Spring Outing (Palace, No. 11).

Gathering: elements connect, horizon lower, with figures on a ground plane.

Spatial relationship unified.

Foliage: pictorial representation has volume.

Chao Yen: the elements do not interconnect, and are equally emphasized, juxtaposed side by side without focus as in Gathering.

The two paintings express totally different views in similar setting.

Ming bowl is crucially important, but would still see it as belonging in the Academy while the Chao Yen is archaistic: an accumulation of objects of reminiscence.

Gathering: setting related to ground plan.

Chao Yen: no setting: equal emphasis on all elements.

Lippe:

Hui Tsung balustrade design plus center tree a 10th cent. type.

Chao Yen: not integrated.

Gathering: integrated.

Ku Kung has another version of same subject, painter anon., with ssu-yin seal; silk in two pieces, slightly cut down along center seam. (not reproduced).

It has other more distant figures that serve to integrate the foreground group with the landscape.

Date: Probably 10th cent.; catalogue calls it T'ang. May have served as model for Hui Tsung, No. 31.

Soper:

The Riders balustrade can be fitted into an evolutionary sequence of architectural details as rendered by painters. Its dryness, flatness, and lack of reasonable articulation are typical late transformation of qualities that in the Sung were still understood and appreciated, even at so unambitious a level as that of the Daitokuji Lohans.

Vanderstappen:

Comparisons between handscrolls and hanging scrolls are often dangerous: the same type of composition may appear in both. Cf. the treatment of Wen-chi story in both handscroll and hanging scroll form.

OTHER MATTERS

- Cahill: Supplementing and correcting of Siren's Annotated Lists is still going on, with a grant from the Harvard Yenching Institute.
Help needed: contributions urgently solicited.
Publication: in three or four years.
List of opinions on Exhibition paintings: not available for general distribution.
- Vanderstappen: Tribute to Baschofer, whose influence felt in many of discussions at these meetings.
- Soper: Tribute also to continuing influence of another great teacher, George Rowley.
On behalf of others who have not yet acknowledged their indebtedness, an expression of admiring gratitude to Tung Ch'i-ch'ang.
- Li: Proposes summer session museum training for graduate students.
- Vanderstappen: Is there grant to photograph Taishung collection?
- Cahill: This being negotiated, looks very hopeful. (Postscript: now seems almost assured.)
- Lee: Making list of paintings in collection of Liang Ch'iang-piao, requests news of paintings with his seal.
- Lippe: Would like photos of any Ssu-yin half-seals.
- Loehr: Suggests for next conference that it should be on theory rather than application of it in connoisseurship.
- Fong: Cf. Western art, where Ackerman has initiated a conference on such a subject at next College Art Association meeting in Baltimore in January, 1963.
- Siekman: Would like to see conference on Ming and Ch'ing, where one would have more solid basis to start from.

The meeting then adjourned, most of the participants going on to the Institute of Fine Arts, where Dr. Sullivan gave a stimulating lecture (before, as he remarked, an audience more awesomely distinguished than any that has previously confronted a lecturer on Chinese art) on landscape painting of the T'ang dynasty.

The attached list of opinions on the painting in the Chinese Art Treasures Exhibition includes all those that reached me by this date. Several other experts who were invited to submit opinions declined to do so, and still others failed to respond at all.

Quite a few who did respond attached notes expressing qualms, ranging from mild to positively tortured, about committing themselves in this way without having made a thorough study of each painting. But none of us has been able to do that, and it should be understood that this list represents, in many cases, only hastily-formed impressions, opinions held with out very deep conviction, or old beliefs which one has not had time to re-assess.

A few contributors made comments and qualifications that should be recorded here. Betty Ecke (Tseng Yu-ho) added to her ratings subjective comments (from "magnificent, down to "bad"), "sometimes from the general art point of view, other times in regard to the individual artist's own working range, unrelated to rational research." Nelson Wu added two extra categories: G, "An eclectic work with image and elements of old design (kao) but these are in new combination and with late attitudes," and H, "Conventionalized vocabulary and positioning (wei-chih) preserved in the genre tradition." Wen Fong remarks that his category F, with no added comment, signifies "beneath contempt."

There was not enough time to check these pages carefully against the individual lists; contributors who find mistakes or omissions in their ratings are invited to inform me of them, and a sheet of errata and addenda can be sent out later.

The contributors are arranged alphabetically by initials, except that a number of brief ratings are often put on a single line, to save space. The contributors are as follows:

JC: James Cahill	WF: Wen Fong	SL: Sherman Lee
VC: Victoria Contag (Mrs. von Winterfeldt)	BG: Basil Gray	AS: Alexander Soper
BE: Betty Ecke (Tseng Yu-ho)	AL: Aschwin Lippe	LS: Laurence Sickman
RE: Richard Edwards	CTL: Chu-tsing Li	HV: Father Harrie Vanderstappen
JF: Jan Fontein	ML: Max Loehr	NW: Nelson Wu
	GK: GEORGE KUWAYAMA	CCW: C.C. WANG
	MS: MICHAEL SULLIVAN	

The system of grades, once more:

- A. Genuine, fine; reliable signature or safe attribution. In the case of anonymous works: genuine, fine work of the period to which attributed.
- B. Genuine, but not of high quality.
- C. An original work of the period, but not by the artist to whom attributed.
- D. An original work of a later period.
- E. A copy of a later period (i. e. probably based on an earlier painting).
- F. An imitation of a later period (i. e. imitation of a style, or manner).

Finally, it should be noted that in my own ratings, and presumably those of some other contributors, the D, E, and F categories do not necessarily indicate a lack of admiration for the paintings, or a disagreement with the decision to include them in the exhibition.

James Cahill

COMBINED LIST OF OPINIONS ON PAINTINGS IN CHINESE ART TREASURES
EXHIBITION OF 1961 - 2. SEPTEMBER, 1962.

1. "Foreign Envoy with Tribute Bearers." Attributed to Yen Li-pen.

JC: E. Ming copy?

BE: E. Obviously a copy from an original work, well painted; from the slope and grasses, one suspects a painter associated with Ch'iu Ying. Such a painter as Yu Ch'iu could have done it. Fair.

RE: E. WF: F. CTL: E. Ming?

JF: Archaizing picture (Ming?). Dislike it very much, but understand and appreciate reasons for taking it.

BG: F. A late work of small interest.

GK: F. Ming copy of a No. Sung version of T'ang.

SL: E. Yuan. Probably Yuan copy. Good quality but pedestrian and dry. Landscape elements of later persuasion.

AL: E. Between late Sung and early Ming; probably Yuan or early Ming.

ML: F. Rather later than Sung. Below the art level.

AS: F. 18th cent.? LS: F. 14th - 15th cent. NW: G.

MS: F. Ming? Better to have had the Hsiao I Seeking the Lan-t'ing script, which at least appears to be a Sung picture. (San Pai Chung, No. 2)

HV: F. Inferior imitation of later period.

CCW: E. Poor copy, late Ming period.

2. "Emperor Ming-huang's Journey to Shu." Anonymous.

JC: F. Superb close copy of important early (8th cent.?) composition; rendering could be as late as period of Ch'iu Ying.

VC: A. But difficult to say if it is really T'ang.

BE: E. Brushwork inclines to Sung, but faithful copy, valuable example. Excellent.

RE: Close to T'ang. Li Lin-ts'an possibly right.

JF: A masterpiece, not later than 10th cent.

WF: F. (16th cent.?) Cf. Ch'iu Ying.

BG: A. And in my opinion of 8th cent. date. By analogy with Tun-Huang wall-paintings, I would att. to that cent.

GK: E. 10th cent. copy. CTL: F. Ming.

SL: E. Early Sung. Might as well stand for T'ang. Argument of 10th or 11th cent. purely academic.

AL: D/E. 10th cent. AS: F. Sung. LS: E (reluctantly). 10th cent.

ML: A. Magnificent T'ang original. Late 8th cent.?

MS: E/F. Not earlier than So. Sung. Possibly by the same artist as painted the Sung Yen Hsien Kuan KKSHL. 5 p. 104.

HV: E. Possibly Sung copy. CCW: D. Probably No. Sung.

NW: E. Lower limit 11th - 12th. I incline to think that after further study on secondary material, one may date it still later.

3. "Two Horses and Groom." Attributed to Han Kan.

JC: D. No. Sung. VC: A RE: No. Sung. E.
BE: E. Brushwork inclines to Sung. Excellent.
JF: E. Hui-tsung inscription authentic?? Fine picture, but date uncertain.
BG: E. Might be a 10th cent. copy. The att. may really be in the hand of Hui-Tsung.
GK: F. 10th cent? CTL: E. Ming.
SL: C. Closer to T'ang than No. Sung.
AL: D/F. 2nd half 10th cent. AS: F. 18th cent. after Yüan?
ML: E. First rate. Perhaps early No. Sung.
LS: E. 10th - 11th cent. MS: D. No. Sung. NW: E.
HV: C. Possibly early Sung. Hui Tsung's calligraphy seems right.
CCW: D. It looks like a work of the Five Dynasties period, but the att. of Hui Tsung seems to be authentic. If we trust the Emperor's judgment we should not commit it until we know Han Kan better.

4. "Ten Views from a Thatched Lodge." Attributed to Lu Hung.

JC: E/F. Free copy of T'ang designs, done in 14th cent.?
VC: D. RE: F. Sung - Yuan? CTL: E. 16th cent.
BE: E. Needs further study; temporarily, have the impression it is a 16th cent. copy.
JF: E. Sung or even later? WF: F. 16th - 17th cent.
BG: E. Probably a Sung copy after a late T'ang early 10th cent. original.
GK: F. Late No. Sung version of T'ang.
SL: F. Yüan. By a not highly accomplished artist of the 14th cent.
AL: D/E. 11th or early 12th cent., follower of Li Kung-lin.
ML: F. Yüan or Ming? With T'ang reminiscences. Has feeling.
AS: D. MS: E/F. Yüan or early Ming. HV: F. Doubt a Sung date.
LS: E. An interpretation rather than a copy. 11th - 12th cent.
CCW: D. Possible late T'ang period, high quality.
NW: G. Lu Hung.

5-6. "Deer Among Red Maples." "Deer in Autumn Forest." Anonymous.

JC: A. VC: A. JF: Masterpieces. AL: A. CCW: A.
BE: D. Chiang-t'sun-shu-hua-lu has an item called Sung, Group of Deer Entering Forest, a handscroll. It could have been the same, since then cut into two, mounted in hanging scroll form. It seems a safe att. to Liao, but of the 10th or 11th cent. Magnificent.
WF: A. Would date in the 11th cent. GK: A. CTL: A. SL: A. Liao
BG: A. These are the sole surviving examples of decorative T'ang painting, otherwise only known in its reflection in Heian Yamato-e. I do not see a close connection with the Liao murals at Ch'ing-ling, except that these are also off shoots from the T'ang style. Still less do I see any connection with Persian miniatures even remote.
ML: T'ang or earlier? AS: A. Liao 11th cent. LS: A. NW: H.
MS: A. Late 10th or early 11th cent. No. Sung court painting rather than Liao.

8. "Hunters with Greyhounds." "Hunters with Eagles." Attributed to Hu Huai.

JC: A? BE: C. Cf. No. 48, probably Sung. Excellent.
RE: No. Sung. WF: F. Late 16th cent. CTL: Yüan?
JF: C. or D. No possibility of verifying attribution.
BG: D. These sophisticated paintings are realistic in intention, subtly composed and economically executed in fine line. Probably No. Sung.
GK: A? Yüan copy? Boston version more convincing.
SL: A. Superb quality and before Ch'en Chü-chung. From a handscroll?? Not Liao dynasty, too good.
AL: (A) C-D. 10th - 11th cent. ML: B LS: A MS: D. No. Sung.
HV: A? An original work.
CCW: D. No evidence to prove it is Hu Huai, good quality. NW: G.

9. "The Parting of Su Wu and Li Ling." Attributed to Chou Wen-chü.

JC: D. Perhaps later stage in this tradition than no. 48, att. Ch'en Chü-chung.
BE: E. Painter has no understanding of the costumes and lines; faked professionally. Poor.
RE: Good early painting. 10th cent.? JF: C? WF: E. 15th cent. copy?
BG: A. I agree with No. Sung attribution.
GK: E. First half 12th cent.? CTL: Yuan?
SL: C. Very good in some parts; others suggest a provincial hand. Chin?
AL: D. 11th or early 12th cent. MS: D. Liao.
ML: D. Hardly later than No. Sung. Att. unjustified.
LS: C. Possibly 11th to early 12th cent.
HV: E. This painting is a copy. The original may have been of 10th cent.
CCW: D. Good quality. NW: E.

10. "Palace Concert" Anonymous, Five Dynasties.

JC: A. VC: A. RE: A. WF: A. GK: A. CTL: A.
BE: A. Safe att., if not earlier. Magnificent.
JF: Perhaps after all Yüan in Five Dynasties style.
BG: A. I would say not later than the 9th cent; an original picture in pure T'ang style.
SL: E. Early Sung. Good copy of T'ang original. 10th cent.
AL: A. 2nd half 10th cent. LS: A. MS: A.
ML: Rather earlier than Five Dynasties. 9th cent.?
HV: A. I would prefer this painting to the one of the Art Institute.
CCW: A. It could be earlier than Southern T'ang.
NW: E. Upper limit 11th cent. The original design may indeed be older than it is att. (10th) in the Catalogue.

11. "Eight Gentlemen on a Spring Outing." Attributed to Chao Yen.

- JC: A/C. 10th cent, superb; impossible to verify or deny attribution.
BE: E. Perspective and the treatment of the horses revealing Sung cf. no. 44. Excellent.
RE: E. Possibly No. Sung. CTL: F. Ming.
JF: No possibility of verifying attribution. 10th cent. ??
WF: D. 16th cent. Cf. Ch'iu Ying.
BG: D. The sensitive treatment of the large rock and the plain air effect suggest a 12/13th cent. date.
GK: F. Ming copy of late No. Sung - So. Sung version of 10th cent. original.
SL: C. 10th or 11th cent., AL: (A) C-D. 10th - 11th cent.
ML: A. Convincing. MS: D. No. Sung. NW: G.
AS: E. Pastiche of two separate themes. The garden element looks post-Sung.
LS: C. Att. not important. 10th - 11th cent.
HV: D. Excellent painting but later.

12. "Early Snow on the River." Attributed to Chao Kan.

- JC: A. VC: A. RE: A. JF: A. WF: A? GK: A? Early Sung?
BE: A. There is a purity about this painting which speaks in favor of its authenticity. Magnificent.
BG: A. Plausible attribution for this realistic painting on coarse silk. The style is reflected in some Yamato-e scroll painting, especially in the figure drawing and the representation of thatch and basketwork.
CTL: So. Sung or Yuan. ML: A. AS: A. MS: A. CCW: A.
SL: A. Masterpiece. (Text says: "The painting is not signed") Signed with notation "described", perhaps a sketch.
AL: (A) D/F. 11th or early 12th cent.
LS: B. Att. unimportant. NW: G.
HV: A. Except for retouching in trees and some of the figures and the horses an acceptable att. The composition would have been quite different if the top and bottom had not been cut considerably.

13. "Travellers in the Mountains." Attributed to Kuan T'ung.

- JC: D/F. Could be in Kuan T'ung tradition, already afflicted with degree of mannerism and remoteness from source by mid-11th cent. or so.
VC: Fine, but why by Kuan T'ung?
BE: D. School of Kuan T'ung, probably Yuan. Fair.
RE: E. Archaistic rather than truly ancient. Perhaps late No. Sung.
JF: Perhaps later (Sung?) WF: F. Late 16th cent.
BG: A. In spite of an awkwardness in the transition from foreground to middle distance, an impressive and vital painting.
GK: A? Chin version? CTL: F. Ming. AL: C(-D). 10th cent.
SL: D. Early So. Sung. A very strange "abbreviated" painting suggesting a later stage of development than the 10th cent.
ML: Possibly earlier than Five Dynasties. Att. unjustified.

AS: D. Excessively calligraphic. HV: E. NW: G.
LS: C. Seems to be an early work, possibly 10th cent. Am unable to say how much there is of Kuan T'ung or his tradition. Is it possible that parts of the picture are unfinished?
MS: D. No, Sung; by follower of Kuan T'ung or Yen Wen-kuei or both.
CCW: D. It might be Northern Sung. Att. is doubtful.

14. "Taoist Temple in the Mountains." Attributed to Tung Yüan.

JC: D. Early Ming, school of Kao K'o-kung? VC: Fine, but later.
BE: D. Probably Yuan; such a painter as Ts'ao Chih-po could have done it. Good.
RE: F. Possibly late Yüan, early Ming, i.e. 14th.
JF: E. Do not know when painted (anyway later than Five Dynasties.)
WF: F. Early 17th cent. Cf. Li Shih-ta.
BG: D. Perhaps a Yüan painting, only remotely connected with Tung Yüan.
GK: D. Yuan. CTL: F. Ming. SL: F. Early Ming. Much later, even Ming.
AL: D-F. Yüan; Kao K'o-Kung? ML: Open.
AS: D. Architecture retains Sung character and careful rendering.
LS: D. 14th cent. MS: F. Yuan or early Ming.
HV: F. Cheschool painting. NW: G.
CCW: D. Probably by Kao K'o-Kung, Yüan dynasty. Fine quality.

15. "Asking About the Tao in the Autumn Mountains." Attributed to Chü-jan.

JC: F. Chü-jan School in 13th - 14th cent.? VC: A.
BE: ? Needs further study; grand and monumental in all respects, but the brushwork just too close to Wu Chen, or the other way around. Cf. no. 76.
RE: A beautiful picture in the "tradition". Cf. Chiang Tsan. Possibly as late as Yüan.
JF: Would seem indeed to be too advanced in style. Could it be Yüan?
WF: F. 17th cent. BG: E. Probably a Yüan copy.
GK: A? 14th cent. or later??? CTL: F. Ming.
SL: F. Yüan. No. A good Yüan paraphrase. AL: D-F. 17th cent.
ML: E. Presumably reliable, early copy. AS: F.
LS: No comment, except that it is a picture of high quality.
MS: E/F. Yüan or early Ming. HV: E. ? CCW: A.
NW: G. Like several others, this is more than just a copy (E), but also a magnification and consequently a "relaxation" of an old design. It may have preserved certain valuable clues for us.

16. "Pheasant and Sparrows Among Rocks and Shrubs." Attributed to Huang Chü-ts'ai.

JC: C/D. Early Sung or so? RE: A. JF: E? Sung?
BE: D. Southern Sung probably, the pair of smaller birds added much later by dealers. The keen biological sense to me seems developed only during the Sung period.
WF: F. 16th - 17th cent.

BG: E. A dull archaizing picture of uncertain date.
GK: A? Northern Sung. CTL: F. Ming. AS: ?
SL: C. Much damaged but excellent. AL: A(-C), 10th or early 11th cent.
ML: A or C. Open att; not impossible. CCW: A. NW: H.
LS: No comment, but a mediocre affair in any case.
MS: A? Title by Hui-tsung not authentic. HV: Too much repaired.

17. "Fishing on a Wintry River." Attributed to Li Ch'eng.

JC: D. Yüan; cf. Chu Te-jun in trees etc. -- it would be, however, his finest work if by him.
VC: Shows well what we know as Li Ch'eng style.
BE: D. Yüan probably, cf. nos. 47, 82, 83. Fair. RE: F.
JF: Agree Yüan, but fine picture! WF: F. Late 16th cent. Cf. Chu Tuan.
BG: E. Possibly So. Sung. GK: F. Yüan. CTL: D. Ming.
SL: C. Superb. Borderline as to date, 10th cent. ? or early 14th?
AL: D. Yüan. AS: F. Yüan? CCW: D. Possibly Yüan period.
ML: D. Unlikely att; probably No. Sung. NW: G.
LS: D. 13th - 14th cent., high quality. MS: F. Yüan.
HV: E. Close in composition to Li Ch'eng.

18. "Travellers Among Mountains and Streams." By Fan K'uan.

JC: A. VC: A. A real masterpiece. BE: A. Magnificent. RE: A.
JF: Masterpiece, signature authentic. WF: A. GK: A. CTL: A.
SL: A. Masterpiece. Some damages in foliage sections on mountain tops.
Outlines still related to T'ang Mountain conventions.
AL: A. AS: A. LS: A. MS: A.
ML: A. Convincing work of supreme quality.
HV: A. A very consistent and excellent painting.
CCW: A. Best example of Fan K'uan.
NW: A? Don't have the heart to call it C.

19. "Fishing on a Snowy River." Attributed to Hsü Tao-ning.

JC: D. 12th cent. VC: Nice, but difficult to say by whom.
BE: C. A certain suaveness indicates a painter like Yen Hui; other Yüan painters could have done it. Fair.
RE: C. Possibly as late as 12th cent. (Could it be Chin?)
JF: Sung? GK: D. Chin - Yüan. CTL: F. Ming.
SL: F. Yüan. Probably even later than No. Sung, 12th or early 13th, or even Yuan; see dots for twigs.
AL: C(-D). Late 11th - early 12th cent. ML: C. Perhaps mid-11th cent.
AS: E. So. Sung or early Ming. LS: D. Possibly 14th cent.
MS: D. Late No. Sung.

HV: E. May be a Sung copy but not earlier than 12th cent.
CCW: B. Even the date is wrong. It could have been written by mistake.
NW: G.

20. "Early Spring." By Kuo Hsi.

JC: A VC: A BE: A. Needs further study. Excellent. RE: A.
JF: A masterpiece. WF: F. Early 15th cent. ?? Cf. Chu Tuan.
BG: A. GK: A. CTL: F. Yuan. AL: A. ML: A. Convincing.
SL: A. Masterpiece. Improvisation on rational framework. Radically different brush approach from Fan K'uan. Opens up wider possibilities of acceptable variations in given periods. What are significance of the "ghosts" of gnarled trees at top, left and right? Are these really distant trees in mist? or are they pentimenti, first sketches in pale ink and later disregarded??
AS: A. LS: A. MS: A. CCW: A.
HV: A? The broad rhythmic patterns are not wholly convincing for the period.
NW: C? The figures are disturbing. Anyone has a theory?

21. "Market Village by the River." Anonymous, eleventh century, Sung dynasty.

JC: A VC: A AL: A AS: ? LS: A. HV: F. CCW: A.
BE: D. Human life dramatically depicted in an elaborate landscape is a favorite of Yuan artists; so is the fluffy brushwork. Excellent.
RE: A. As suggested most meaningful in connection with Yen Wen-kuei.
JF: B. WF: F. 16th cent. BG: A. GK: A? CTL: D. Ming.
SL: A. Much better than any reproduction indicates. Pei Sung carry over of Decorative Fine Style.
ML: Reminiscent of Yen Wen-kuei. Naive work, hard to place.
MS: A. Late No. Sung.
NW: D. By some 50 to 100 years. Late eleventh to early twelfth.

22. "Mandarin Ducks in Autumn." Attributed to Hui-ch'ung.

JC: D. So. Sung. VC: A. BE: C. Good. RE: D. So. Sung.
JF: 12th cent. WF: A? BG: F. CTL: F. Ming.
GK: D. So. Sung. Early Ming?? SL: A. No. Sung as 21.
AL: D. 12th cent. ML: Open. AS: ? MS: D. 12th cent.
LS: D. Early 12th, high quality. HV: D. Possibly early So. Sung.
CCW: D. Possibly by So. Sung artist. NW: H.

23. "Magpies and Hare." By Ts'ui Po.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Magnificent. RE: A.
JF: Genuine picture but disappointing (I tend to accept Mi Fu's judgment on this painter.

WF: F. 15th cent. ? GK: A. CTL: A. AL: A. ML: A. Convincing.
BG: C. Closely observed, but full of air. SL: C. Superb, some damages.
AS: B. LS: A. MS: A? HV: A. CCW: A. NW: D.

24. "Monkeys in a Loquat Tree." Anonymous, eleventh century.

JC: A. BE: A. Excellent. JF: Probably 11th cent. GK: A.
RE: A. Possibly earlier. The 10th has been suggested. CTL: A.
BG: A. Less realistic than I Yuan-chi, more descriptive and painterly.
SL: A. Superb, if damaged. No. Sung. AL: A. LS: B. MS: A?
ML: A. 11th cent. likely. HV: A. Much repaired but seems an original.
AS: B. So. Sung or early Ming from emphasis on features and two dimensional
pattern.
CCW: A. NW: H. WF: F. 16th-17th cent.

25. "Monkey and Cats." By I Yuan-chi.

JC: A. But puzzlingly self-conscious for early date. GK: A. CTL: A.
BE: ? Needs further study. Good. RE: A. JF: D? WF: F. 16th-17th cent.
BG: D. Looks like So. Sung: near to Li Ti. Not necessarily copied after I Yuan-chi.
SL: A. Masterpiece. AL: A. AS: A? LS: No comment. MS: A?
ML: A. Convincing as to period and attribution. HV: A.
CCW: B. May be genuine. NW: D. About 12th cent.

26. "Noble Scholar Under a Willow." Anonymous, eleventh century, Sung dynasty.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: E. A Ming copy. Fair. RE: A. JF: A.
WF: D. 14th-15th cent. ? Cf. Lu Hsin-chung's Lohans at the Shokokuji.
BG: D. Near to Li T'ang. A brilliant picture. GK: D. So. Sung.
CTL: D. Ming. SL: B. Pedestrian work, but Sung. AL: A.
ML: B. AS: D. Southern Sung or early Ming from emphasis on features and
two dimensional pattern.
LS: A. MS: A. HV: F. A Ming copy. CCW: A. NW: G.

27. "Bamboo." Attributed to Wen T'ung.

JC: A? VC: A. A little hard. RE: No valid opinion.
BE: ? Needs further study; at the moment I do not believe it is by K'o Chiu-ssu.
Excellent.
JF: A very fine, even if not Wen T'ung.

WF: E. A tracing copy. 17th-18th cent.?
BG: A. Probably No. Sung. GK: A? CTL: D. Yüan.
SL: C. Excellent but not quite up to expectations. Faded ink?
AL: (A) D-F. Yüan. AS: A?
ML: C. Excellent work, but attribution quite open.
LS: No conviction about this, but lean toward F.
MS: D. Yüan; style of K'ò Chiu-ssu or Li K'an.
CCW: D. Good quality, probably by Yüan artist. NW: D. Yüan.

28. "Pines and Mountains in Spring." Attributed to Mi Fu.

JC: D. Yüan or so. RE: E. Most logically middle Ming.
BE: F. Late Ming or early Ch'ing. Good.
JF: Ming work in style of Mi Fu? WF: F. Date? 17th cent. ?
BG: F. Not earlier than Ming. GK: E. Ming? CTL: F. Ming.
SL: F. Yüan or later. Puzzler. Yüan? See no. 87.
AL: F. Ming. ML: E. Rather earlier than Yüan.
AS: F. Heavy-handed. LS: F. CCW: F. Late Ming.
MS: B (retouched) or F; if F, then Yüan. NW: F.

29. "Kuo Tzu-I Receiving the Homage of the Uigurs." Attributed to Li Kung-lin.

JC: D. Superb; but not by Li, later date. VC: A.
BE: C. The descriptiveness does not suggest Li Kung-lin. The subject matter
could not very well be Yüan; possibly an artist of the 13th cent. Excellent.
RE: I would still hold open the possibility of No. Sung. JF: D.
WF: F. 16th cent. E? GK: F. So. Sung--Yüan. CTL: C?
BG: D. Perhaps early Ming court style.
SL: A (in part). Close to Li Lung-mien. Left side copy?
AL: C. 12th cent. ML: A? AS: C. LS: A. MS: C.
HV: A close copy.
CCW: A. NW: E.

30. "The Isles of the Immortals." Attributed to Wang Shen.

JC: D. Period of Ch'ien Hsüan? Close to his version of the style.
VC: A. RE: Later. Yüan? JF: Yüan picture?
BE: E. Possibly done in the 16th or 17th cent. Fair.
WF: F. 2nd half 16th cent. Cf. Lu Chih. BG: F.
GK: E. Ming copy?? of an early 12th cent. of T'ang. CTL: D. 16th cent.
SL: D. Late Sung or early Yuan. Precedes Ch'ien Hsuan. Fine control.
Possibly by a contemporary of Ch'ien Hsuan, but a more careful academician.
AL: (D)F. Ch'ien Hsüan or follower.
ML: Atypical. Signature unreliable. 13th cent.? AS: ? LS: F.
MS: F. Ming. Possibly traced from an earlier composition.

HV: F. A late Ming painting? CCW: Not 100% sure. NW: G.

31. "A Literary Gathering." Attributed to Emperor Hui-tsung.

JC: E. 10th cent. composition; close copy, perhaps done as late as period of Ch'iu Ying.

VC: C. BE: C. Excellent. RE: C. JF: D.

WF: F or D. 16th cent. Cf. School of Ch'iu Ying.

BG: E. Probably early Ming. GK: C. Ming copy? or Sung.

CTL: D. 16th cent. SL: C. Masterpiece of Hsuan Ho Academy.

AL: A/C (E). Hui-tsung academy painter, copy after 10th cent. picture.

ML: Rather earlier than Hui-tsung. AS: C. LS: C.

MS: C. Academy picture. HV: A. NW: G.

CCW: A. The signature and colophon are authentic; the painter may be a member of his court academy. Need further study.

32. "Autumn Over Hills and River." Attributed to Emperor Hui-tsung.

JC: D. Southern Sung (or Chin), eclectic; no relation to Hui-tsung?

VC: C. AS: C. LS: F. 14th cent.? MS: D. Late Sung?

BE: E. The artist did not truly understand the landscape; a copy of Ming or earlier. Fair.

RE: D. 13th cent. GK: C. 12th cent. CTL: D. 16th cent.

JF: Fine work, Sung picture? Att. indeed wrong, it would seem.

WF: F. 16th-17th cent.

BG: F. A mannered and archaising Ming picture with little to do with Hui-tsung.

SL: B. Believable as Hui Tsung. Some amateurish relationships combined with finicky, ladylike brushwork. Related to Yuan style of no. 90e.

AL: D. 12th-13th cent. ML: Open. Naive work, hard to place.

HV: D. Possibly Yuan? CCW: D. Possibly by Wang Hui. NW: G.

33. "Birds in a Thicket of Bamboo and Prunus." Anonymous, ca. 1100-1125, Sung dynasty.

JC: A. Very possibly Li An-chung; finest surviving work of Hui-tsung Academy.

VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A. JF: Could be No. Sung.

WF: F. 16th cent. BG: A. GK: A? Southern Sung--Yuan?

CTL: D. 16th cent. SL: A. Superb academy picture. AL: A.

ML: A. AS: D. Early Ming? Prototype for Sesshu.

LS: A. MS: A. HV: A? CCW: A. NW: H.

34. "Shrike." By Li An-chung.

JC: C? So inferior to similar bird in 33. as to suggest hand of follower, or copyist.

BE: A. Excellent. RE: A. JF: A. WF: F. 16th cent.

BG: F. Perhaps Ming. GK: A? CTL: A. SL: A. Masterpiece.

AL: A. ML: B. AS: B. LS: A. MS: A. CCW: A. NW: A?
HV: C. Possibly a painting from the So. Sung Academy.

35. "Mountains in Clouds and Mist." By Mi Yu-jen.

JC: A? Fine; one of works to be taken most seriously for Mi style.
VC: A. JF: Att. doubtful, Ming? WF: F. 16th-17th cent.
BE: E. By artist of 16th or 17th cent. Poor.
BG: B. A ghost view. GK: A? CTL: F. 16th cent.
SL: F. Yuan. Good. Fuzzling combination of the scholarly and the archaic.
14th cent.
AL: D-F. 17th cent. AS: ? LS: B. HV: ? CCW: A. NW: F.
ML: E. Connection with Mi Yu-jen justifiable; authenticity in doubt.
MS: E. Possibly based on Hsiao-Hsiang scroll reproduced in Hua-yuan T'o-ying II.

36. "Whispering Pines in the Mountains." By Li T'ang.

JC: A? Sometimes waver; inclined to accept. At worst, a very accurate copy,
like no. 40 (but much better)
VC: A. BE: A. Needs further study on certain aspects. Excellent.
RE: A. JF: A. WF: F. Early 16th cent. Cf. Chou Ch'en.
BG: E. An early copy. GK: A. CTL: D. Ming.
SL: A. Superb. Green of pine foliage now sunken and so differentiation of
foreground and background "lost."
AL: A(C). LS: A. MS: A. Impossible to be certain, but very probably right.
ML: A. Convincing as to date and attribution. CCW: A. NW: A?
AS: F. Heavy-handed, stress on superficial aspects of Li's style.
HV: A. Signature is doubtful, so is the date. However, the att. may be right.

37. "Mountains by the River." By Li T'ang.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Safe attribution. Magnificent. RE: A.
JF: A? Not nearly as good as no. 36. WF: F. 16th cent.
BG: E. An early copy. GK: A. CTL: D. Ming.
SL: A. Masterpiece. Gold dots. AL: A. ML: A. Convincing att.
AS: E. Feeble in execution. LS: A.
MS: E. So. Sung academy follower of Li T'ang. HV: A. CCW: A. NW: A?

38. "Temple by the Cliff Pass." By Chia Shih-ku.

JC: A. BE: A. Magnificent. RE: A. JF: A. WF: F. 15th cent.
BG: B. GK: A. CTL: D. Ming. SL: A. AL: A. ML: A. Convincing.
AS: E. Excessively dry and repetitious in foliage and ts'un. LS: A.
MS: Late 12th cent. NW: F.
CCW: B. No way to prove the signature correct.

39. "Cat." By Li Ti.

JC: A. BE: ? Needs further study. Fair. RE: A. BG: A. NW: A?
JF: Probably A, but not so exciting. WF: F. 16th cent. HV: A? CCW: B.
GK: D? Early Ch'ing Academy? CTL: A? SL: A. AL: A. MS: B.
ML: A? Same painter as no. 40? Perhaps earlier? AS: B? LS: B?

40. "Herdboys and Buffaloes in the Rainstorm." By Li Ti.

JC: E? Looks like very close (palace?) copy of early Ming or so.
VC: A. BE: A. Good. RE: A. Possibly E, but if so a very careful copy.
JF: Ming Academy painter? Do not believe Li Ti.
WF: F or E. 17th-18th cent. BG: A. GK: F. Ming. CTL: F. Ming.
SL: B. (1) Early Ming? (2) On very fine silk. Possible, I suppose.
AL: B(-E). Ming? AL: A? LS: A. High quality.
ML: A. Convincing as to signature and date.
MS: A. But not a great work. Possibly two sections of a screen mounted together
as a hanging scroll.
HV: E. A very skillful painting but not of the period. Ming? CCW: A. NW: H.

41. "Children at Play." By Su Han-ch'en.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Safe att. Excellent. RE: A. AL: A. NW: H.
JF: Could be by him, fine picture. BG: A. GK: A? CTL: C. SL: C.
ML: A. AS: A. LS: A. MS: A. HV: A. CCW: A. It is possible.

42. "The Han Palace." Att. Chao Po-chü.

JC: D. Period and school of Ma Yuan; wonderful. VC: A.
BE: C. Kinship with Ma Lin. Excellent. RE: C. 13th or late 12th.
JF: Att. would seem rather doubtful, but nice picture. CTL: D. Ming.
WF: F. 17th cent. Cf. Sun I. BG: A. GK: A? So. Sung.
SL: C. I cannot follow Cahill on this as late So Sung. The impasto and careful
brushwork throughout seem like 12th cent. (Cahill: I have never called
it late So. Sung, but period of Ma Yuan.)
AL: C-D. 13th cent. ML: C. AS: B. LS: A. High quality.
MS: D. Anon 12th-early 13th cent.
HV: C. I think the att. to the period is right. The painting seems a cut from a
much larger painting. The composition is hardly consistent with the round format.
CCW: A. Att. cannot be proved, but of very high quality. NW: G.

43. "Snowy Mountains at Dusk." Anonymous.

JC: D? Conceivably OK; but I lean to middle Ming date.
VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A. Not exciting. 13th cent.?

JF: Agree dating 12th cent. BG: B. GK: A. CTL: D. 16th cent.
WF: F. 16th cent. Cf. school of T'ang Yin and Chou Ch'en.
SL: D. Early Yuan. Much darker, late Sung or early Yuan. MS: A.
AL: (A-D). 14th cent.? Foreground cp. Ts'ao Chih-po no. 75.
ML: A. First half of 12th cent., I would say. AS: A. LS: A. High quality.
HV: F. I doubt the Sung date. This painting may be a work of the later 15th cent.
It reminds me of some work by T'ang Yin. Although I must admit that a
close comparison with T'ang's work makes an attribution to T'ang Yin
too hazardous.
CCW: A. NW: G.

44. "Breaking the Balustrade." Anonymous.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A or 13th cent. CTL: D. Ming.
JF: What about inscription? WF: D. 14th-15th cent. BG: A. GK: A? Ming?
SL: E. Yuan? AL: A. AS: A. LS: A. MS: A.
ML: A? Or earlier? Adaptation of an archaic theme?
HV: E. A close copy. Possibly Che School.
CCW: A. It should be classified into No. Sung group. NW: H.

45. "Buddhist Images." By Chang Sheng-wen.

JC: A. But crucial date, 1180, open to question (Shimada).
BE: A. Needs further study. Good. JF: A. Very fine. WF: A.
RE: A. Apparently worked on by different hands. ML: A. AS: A. LS: A.
BG: A. Highly important. GK: A. CCW: A. CTL: ? AL: A.
SL: A. Masterpiece of religious painting. Note relationship of some small
secondary scenes at corners etc. to Weng's Liang K'ai.
MS: A. HV: ? NW: A. So what?

46. "The Red Cliff." Attributed to Wu Yuan-chih.

JC: A. Att. entirely convincing. VC: A. RE: A. NW: A?
BE: C. Extremely skillful technique does not suggest an amateur painter; it is
more likely an artist of the Academic School. Magnificent.
JF: Att. seems very plausible. Very fine picture. WF: F. 16th cent.
BG: A. Poor condition. GK: A. CTL: C? AL: A. AS: A?
SL: C. See also MFA "Tung Yuan". Good but poor correlation of landscape elements.
ML: Sung prototype in the MFA, Boston. Present work early Ming?
LS: No comment. Unimpressive. MS: A. HV: E? Doubtful. CCW: A.

47. "Clearing After Snow in the Min Mountains." Anonymous.

JC: A (as 12th cent.). Execution fine; composition muddled in spots.

VC: A. RE: A. Possibly Chin. JF: A. Fine picture.
BE: E. Unlike no. 20, one finds formularization entering; brushwork close to Chu Te-jun, cf. no. 82. Fair.
WF: D. 15th cent. BG: B. GK: F. Chin - Yüan. CTL: D. Yüan.
SL: A. (1) Superb and very close to Kuo Hsi, 11th cent. (2) Not quite so improvised as Kuo - still a very close follower. Somewhat related to Ch'i shan wu-chin.
AL: A. Chin. ML: Rather 11th cent. Dating 12th cent. seems most arbitrary.
AS: A. LS: 14th cent. ? MS: D. Anon 12th-13th cent.
HV: E. This seems to be a Yüan painting.
CCW: D. Probably by Yüan artist. NW: G.

48. "Wen-chi's Return to China." By Ch'en Chü-chung.

JC: A? Attribution plausible but uncertain.
BE: C. Needs further study to confirm the reliability of the attribution to Ch'en Chü-chung. This is certainly closest of all. Magnificent.
JF: Attribution reasonable. WF: A? BG: A. GK: A. CTL: A?
SL: A. Superb. AL: A-C. 12th cent. AS: A.
ML: Attribution open. Perhaps earlier. Strongly archaistic work.
LS: No opinion really, but possibly B. MS: A. HV: A.
CCW: The attribution may not be accurate. NW: H.

49. "Lohan." By Liu Sung-nien.

JC: A. RE: A. JF: A. GK: D. Ming. AL: A(-E?) ML: A.
BE: E. Yüan or Ming. Poor.
WF: F or D with simply a false signature. 15th cent. ?
BG: Not exhibited at Boston.
SL: B. Excellent and believable as signed and dated.
AS: F. Excessive stress on texture, details, combined with mannered poses (deer, apes).
LS: No opinion really, but possibly B. MS: A. CCW: A. NW: H.

50. "Knick-knack Peddler." By Li Sung.

JC: A. VC: A. RE: A. JF: A. AS: A. NW: A.
BE: E. Genuine folk expression; however, the manner looks more Yüan than Sung. Fair.
WF: D with added signature? 14th cent. BG: C. GK: A. CTL: F. Ming.
SL: A. Masterpiece. AL: A. ML: A. First rate work.
LS: A, but with reservations, possibly F. MS: A. HV: A. CCW: A.

51. "The Hangchow Bore in Moonlight." By Li Sung.

JC: A? RE: A. JF: A. WF: F. 16th-17th cent.
BE: C. Would like to compare the original paintings with Ma Lin and a number
of dragon-fly-like figures att. Sung artists. Good.
BG: A. Better than the Boston MFA version. GK: A. CTL: F. Ming.
SL: A. Superb. AL: A. MS: A. HV: A?
ML: A? Same painter as No. 50? Difficult to imagine. AS: A. LS: A.
CCW: C. It is different from Li Sung's other work. NW: A?

52. "On a Mountain Path in Spring." By Ma Yüan.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: ? Good. JF: A. WF: F. GK: F. Ming.
BG: C. A fine picture and near to Ma Yüan, but not autograph.
CTL: F. Ming. SL: B. AL: A. NW: F.
ML: A? Credible, that is, with some effort.
AS: Early Ming exaggerations. LS: A. MS: A. HV: E. CCW: A.

53. "Through Snowy Mountains at Dawn." By Ma Yüan.

JC: A. VC: A. JF: A. WF: F.
BE: ? These two leaves seem from one hand; the brushwork is weak, yet
carries some authenticity. May be done by Ma K'uei, or Ma Yüan's
follower in the later Sung period. Good.
BG: A. GK: C. CTL: F. Ming. SL: A. 53 better than 54.
AL: A. AS: A? LS: A. MS: B.
ML: A? Credible, that is, with some effort.
HV: A? A section of a larger painting. CCW: A. NW: F.

54. "Apricot Blossoms." By Ma Yüan.

JC: B. Companion leaf, not in exhibition, more attractive.
VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A. JF: A? WF: F. 16th cent.
BG: E. GK: A??? CTL: F. Ming. ML: A. Convincing. AS: ?
SL: B. Only fair. Outlines much damaged. AL: A. LS: A. MS: C.
HV: ? CCW: A. NW: H.

55. "Playing the Lute in Moonlight." Attributed to Ma Yüan.

JC: F. Early Ming or so. VC: C. BE: E. Bad. RE: F. 14th cent. ?
JF: A?? WF: F. BG: E. Probably early Ming. GK: E. Ming.
CTL: F. Ming. AL: F. Ming. ML: A?
SL: C. Very thin and not believable as Ma.

AS: E. Early Ming exaggerations. LS: F. MS: B. HV: F. NW: F.
CCW: C. May be done by follower of Ma Yuan in Sung period. Brushwork is poor.

56. "Banquet by Lantern-Light." Anonymous.

JC: A. 'Superb. Could well be by Ma Yuan. VC: A. BE: A. Excellent.
RE: C. Why not call it Ma Yuan? JF: A. Fine picture. WF: A.
BG: A. Cut at lower edge. GK: A. CTL: C?
SL: B. Good but a little pedestrian. AL: A. AS: A. LS: A. MS: B.
ML: A. Magnificent work, far superior to Nos. 52, 53, 55.
HV: A? CCW: A. NW: A?

57. "Pure and Remote View of Stream and Hills." By Hsia Kuei.

JC: A. Masterwork. VC: A. Wonderful. GK: A. CTL: A.
BE: A. Needs further study. Excellent. RE: A. WF: A. BG: A.
JF: Attribution could be correct. Anyway a masterpiece.
SL: A. Masterpiece. AL: A. LS: A. MS: A.
ML: B? Perhaps a later imitation. Does not wear well. AS: A.
HV: A? Undoubtedly of the period. CCW: A. NW: A?

58. "Conversation Under the Pine-Cliff." Attributed to Hsia Kuei.

JC: C. Almost effaced, illegible signature at left does not read Hsia Kuei.
VC: C. BE: E. Poor. RE: In the style. Possibly a little later.
JF: A? Much less quality than 57. WF: F. Early 16th cent.?
BG: C. Short works. GK: A? Ming? CTL: F. Ming.
SL: A. Superb and believable. AL: C. ML: A? AS: E. Exaggerations.
LS: F. MS: C. CCW: A. NW: F.
HV: E. I doubt this painting. May be a copy.

59. "Fragrant Spring: Clearing After Rain." By Ma Lin.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Magnificent. RE: A. JF: A.
WF: F. Early 16th cent.? BG: C. Short work. GK: B. Ming?
CTL: F. Ming. AL: A. ML: A. Admirable work. AS: A.
SL: (1) Excellent and believable. (2) Superb and believable.
LS: A. High quality. MS: A. HV: A? CCW: A. NW: C?

60. "Listening to the Wind in the Pines." By Ma Lin.

JC: A. Only work on this scale surviving from early stage of Ma School?
VC: A. RE: A. JF: A?

BE: ? This, together with Portraits of Ancient Emperors in the Palace collection which are ascribed to Ma Lin, show a totally different aspect from his other works. Needs further study. Fair.
WF: F. 16th cent. or later. Cf. school of T'ang Yin.
BG: Probably correctly attributed. A highly skilled painting by a professional.
GK: D. Ming. Related to T'ang Yin. CTL: F. Ming.
SL: B. Good but coarse and dry. AL: (A-)F. Ming? ML: F. Ming imitation.
AS: E. Exaggerations. NW: H. 14th cent.?
LS: Possibly A, but something of a problem.
MS: F. School of Liu Kuan-tao and Jen Jen-fa. Late Yuan--early Ming.
HV: E. I doubt the early date. I think it is a painting belonging to the Che School.
CCW: A. This painting is quite arguable. Need more study.

61. "Waiting for Guests by Lamplight." By Ma Lin.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A. JF: A. CCW: A.
WF: F. 16th cent.? GK: B. CTL: F. Ming. HV: A? NW: E.
SL: A. Superb and believable. AL: A. ML: A? LS: A. MS: A.

62. "Clothes for the Warriors." By Mou I.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Magnificent. RE: A. JF: A. BG: A.
WF: F. 17th cent. Archaism cf. Ch'en Hung-shou, Ts'ui Tzu-chung. E?
GK: E. Yuan - Ming. Discrepancies in the dating of colophons.
CTL: F. Ming. AL: A. ML: A. LS: B. MS: A. CCW: A.
SL: A. Masterpiece. Last section somewhat damaged. Tree trunks and flowers done in semi-gouach technique, drapery lines in medium wide pale wet.
AS: E. Excessively feeble drawing of figures, beyond the permissible limits of archaism. NW: E.

63. "A Sage." By Liang K'ai.

JC: C? Hard to place. VC: F. BE: A. Excellent. NW: A?
RE: A. On our knowledge of existing Liang K'ai's, of course it can be questioned.
JF: Not by Liang K'ai, but by whom and when? A later picture?
WF: F. 17th-18th cent. BG: C. GK: D. Ch'an School. CTL: F. Ming.
SL: F Ming? (1) Much damaged but believable. (2) Borderline if that.
AL: C-D. Yuan? ML: C or F. AS: F. LS: B. MS: C. CCW: A.

64. "A Gentleman with his Portrait." Anonymous.

JC: E. Ming copy? Composition probably goes back to 10th cent.
VC: A. BE: E. Ming. Fair.
JF: Indeed Ming would seem more likely.

WF: F or D. 16th cent. BG: F. Ming. GK: A? Ming. CTL: Early Ming.
SL: A. Excellent So Sung. AL: F. 14th cent. ML: A. AS: ? NW: H.
LS: No comment, but lean toward 14th cent. MS: F. Early Ming. CCW: A.

65. "Thousand-Armed Kuan-Yin." Anonymous.

JC: D. Yüan or early Ming? BE: A. Needs further study. Fair. AS: A.
JF: Sung period but not so good as next. WF: D. 15th cent.? BG: B.
GK: A. CTL: ? SL: A. Superb Buddhist painting. AL: A. ML: A.
LS: A. MS: A. CCW: Beyond my knowledge. NW: A?

66. "The Tathagatha Preaching the Law." Anonymous.

JC: A. BE: D. Yüan. Fair. JF: A. WF: D. 15th cent. BG: B.
GK: A. CTL: ? AL: A-D. Yüan? ML: A. AS: A. LS: A.
SL: B. Excellent but not as convincing as photos. MS: A.
CCW: D. Probably Ming period. NW: A.

67. "Three Winter Friends." By Chao Meng-chien.

JC: B. VC: A. RE: A. JF: Possibly by the master.
BE: D. Early Ch'ing, Ch'ien Wei-ch'eng or similar artist. Poor.
WF: F. 16th cent. BG: B. GK: A. CTL: F. Ming.
SL: B. Better than photos. Good. AL: A. ML: A. Convincing, significant work.
AS: E. Over dry. LS: A. MS: A.
CCW: Nice painting but not sure of its authenticity. NW: A?

68. "Squirrel on a Peach Branch." By Ch'ien Hsüan.

JC: A/B. VC: A. BE: E. Poor. RE: A. JF: B. WF: A?
BG: A? GK: A. CTL: A. AL: A(-C). ML: C or F.
SL: A. Excellent and believable. Related to Cincinnatti scroll.
AS: E. Feeble drawing. LS: B. MS: C? HV: A. CCW: A. NW: A?

69. "Autumn Colors on the Ch'iao and Hua Mountains." By Chao Meng-fu.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Magnificent. RE: A. JF: A. WF: A. MS: A
BG: A. GK: A. CTL: A. SL: A. Superb. AL: A. AS: A? LS: A.
ML: A? Chao Meng-fu's inscription might be hard to recognize as his!
HV: I am not convinced. Even if one relocates Chao from a somewhat professional
tradition into that of the more original movements of the 14th cent., the

archaistically poetic attitude of the painting does not seem to belong. I must admit that the alternatives of taking it to be fake or of dismissing it as an inconsequential doodle need much more careful study and examination than I have had the chance of giving it. At this point I am not willing to completely dismiss the more professional tradition attached to Chao Meng-fu. And in that tradition the painting becomes a problem.

CCW: A. NW: A.

70. "Verdant Peaks Above the Clouds." By Kao K'o-kung.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. JF: A? WF: F. 17th cent.
BG: B. GK: A. CTL: F. Ming.
SL: E? Deliberately coarse and almost haphazard. Combined impression significant.
AL: A. ML: A. No doubts. AS: A? LS: Uncertain, possibly B.
MS: A/B. HV: A? CCW: A. NW: A.

71. "Cloudy Mountains." Anonymous.

JC: B. JF: Yüan picture. WF: F. 16th-17th cent. BG: B. GK: B.
BE: D. Possibly late 14th cent., cf. no. 87. Excellent.
RE: The one painting which I think adds nothing to the exhibition.
CTL: F. 17th cent. AL: A. ML: B. AS: F.
SL: E? Poor but possible as to date. HV: ? NW: F.
LS: Possibly F, but not a work of quality.
MS: F. Yüan or Ming but not of high quality.
CCW: D. Not good quality, very stiff.

72. "Duck on a Riverbank." By Ch'en Lin.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Magnificent. RE: A. WE: F.
JF: B. Dislike it very much. BG: F. GK: A. CTL: F. 16th cent.
SL: C. Related to Wang Yüan. Excellent. AL: A. ML: B. AS: A?
LS: F. Ch'ing? MS: A. CCW: A. NW: A?
HV: A bad painting. Chao's calligraphy seems wrong.

73. "Dragon-Boat Regatta." By Wang Chen-p'eng.

JC: B?

BE: E. I have seen four versions of the same subject attributed to him, each done by a different hand. It is possible that during Wang's lifetime, different versions were done by his students. The other version in the Palace collection, though with less colophons, is a better painting. Good.

RE: Not familiar with the intricacies of the various copies of this.
JF: Could be good. WF: 16th-17th cent. E. BG: E. GK: B.
CTL: E. 16th cent.
SL: E. Late Ming. Very dry and inferior to Caro version. Silk is like that
on Ma Ho-chih copies. Official Yuan copy??
AL: E. ML: A? AS: F. LS: F. NW: E.
MS: A. But the version of 1310 is better. CCW: E. May be late Ming copy.

74. "Dwelling in the Fu-ch'un Mountains." By Huang Kung-wang.

JC: A. VC: A. Wonderful. RE: A. JF: A. Masterpiece. WF: A.
BE: A. Shen Chou does not have the same swiftness and elegance. Magnificent.
BG: A. GK: A. CTL: A? SL: A. Masterpiece. AL: A.
ML: A. Far superior to the so-called Hsia Kuei, No. 57. AS: A.
LS: A. MS: A. HV: A? CCW: A. NW: A. Some sections.

75. "Clearing After Snow on the Mountain Peaks." By Ts'ao Chih-po.

JC: A. VC: A. But Sirén VI, 77 is better. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A.
JF: A. WF: A. BG: B. GK: A. CTL: A.
SL: B? Not best quality. Questionable. AL: A. ML: B. LS: B.
MS: A. HV: A. CCW: A. NW: A.

76. "The Old Fisherman." By Wu Chen.

JC: A. RE: A. JF: Very disappointing. BG: A. GK: A.
VC: A. But Sirén VI, 85 and this exhibition 90d are better.
BE: A. One of the best of Wu Chen! Magnificent.
CTL: F. 17th cent. SL: A. AL: A. ML: A. Convincing and enjoyable.
LS: B. MS: A. HV: A? Quality is not very high.
CCW: A. Not Wu Chen's representative work. NW: B?

77. "Bamboo Album." By Wu Chen.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: E. Bad. RE: A. CTL: F. Ming.
JF: No opinion because not seen enough. WF: F. BG: F. GK: B.
SL: A. Fine, best of Wu Chen bamboo. AL: A. ML: B. LS: A.
MS: A. CCW: A. NW: A?

78. "Bamboo Grove in Snow." Attributed to Kuo Pi.

JC: C? Very fine, Yuan; not Kuo Pi? BE: D. Early Ming. Excellent.
RE: A. JF: Agree opinion catalogue fine work. WF: F. 17th-18th cent.?
BG: C. A very good picture. GK: Agree with commentary.

CTL: D. 16th cent. SL: C. Superb and unique, not Kuo Pi.
AL: D. Late Yuan - early Ming. ML: D. LS: B or F.
MS: C. Follower of Li K'an? NW: A?
CCW: F. Beautiful composition, but not good quality. Late Ming period.

79. "Bamboo and Chrysanthemum." By K'o Chiu-ssu.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A.
JF: E? Dislike it very much. WF: E. A tracing copy?
BG: B. Probably late Ming. GK: A. CTL: E. 16th cent. NW: F.
SL: E? Questionable. AL: A. ML: A/B. LS: A. MS: A. CCW: A.

80. "Boating in Autumn." By Sheng Mou.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Fair. RE: A. JF: A. A fine picture.
WF: F or E? 17th-18th cent. BG: A. GK: A. Agree with commentary.
CTL: F. 16th cent. AL: A. ML: B. LS: A. MS: A. HV: A.
SL: F. Late Ming. Not Sheng Mou but 16th cent. or so. Coloristic.
CCW: B. NW: F.

81. "Noble Scholar in an Autumn Grove." By Sheng Mou.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Good. RE: A. JF: A. WF: F. 17th cent.
BG: B. GK: A. CTL: A. LS: A. I prefer this to No. 80. MS: A.
SL: B. Inferior quality but genuine? AL: A. ML: B. HV: A.
CCW: A. NW: F.

82. "Music Under the Trees." By Chu Te-jun.

JC: A/B. Some coarseness in execution; conceivably a copy.
VC: A. BE: A. Good. RE: A. JF: A. WF: A. BG: B.
BK: A. CTL: A. AL: A. ML: A. LS: A. MS: A. HV: A.
SL: A. Good. Very wet and blurred ink edges. CCW: A. NW: A.

83. "Fishermen Returning on a Frosty Bank." By T'ang Ti.

JC: A/B. Some coarseness in execution. VC: A. BE: A. Good.
RE: A. JF: A. WF: F. 17th cent. or E? GK: A. CTL: F. 16th cent. ?
SL: A. Excellent. AL: A. ML: A. LS: A. MS: A.
HV: May be of the period. Quality not very high--B. CCW: A. NW: G.

84. "Mountains Seen From A River Bank." By Ni Tsan.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: B. Good. RE: A. MS: A.
JF: May be genuine, but quality slightly disappointing; are these his best works in the Palace collection?
BG: E. GK: A? CTL: F. 16th cent. AL: A. ML: B. LS: B.
WF: F. Late 16th cent. SL: B. Soft and arbitrary. Doubtful.
HV: E. The inscriptions seem all to be by the same hand. CCW: A. NW: F.

85. "Mountain Scenery with River Lodge." By Ni Tsan.

JC: A? VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A. WF: F. Late 17th cent.
JF: May be genuine, but quality slightly disappointing; are these his best works in the Palace collection?
BG: E. GK: A. CTL: F. 16th cent. HV: A? CCW: A. NW: F.
SL: A. Believable. Better than 84. AL: A. ML: B. LS: B. MS: A.

86. "Portrait of Ni Tsan." Anonymous.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: E. Late Ming. Fair. RE: A.
JF: Authentic or very close copy of original. WF: E. 17th cent. BG: B.
GK: A. CTL: F. 17th cent. SL: ? AL: A/B. ML: Open.
LS: B or F. MS: B. CCW: A. NW: H.

87. "Autumn Mountains." By Chu Shu-chung.

JC: B. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A. JF: A.
WF: F. 16th cent. Cf. Mi style works by the school of Ch'en Shun.
BG: A. GK: B. CTL: D. 17th cent. LS: B or F. MS: A/B.
SL: A. Interesting and out of ordinary work. AL: A. ML: B.
CCW: B. NW: B?

88. "Thatched Lodge in Autumn Hills." By Wang Meng.

JC: A. BE: E. Ming. Fair. RE: A. CCW: A. NW: F.
VC: A. as good as Sirén VI, 110a; Sirén VI, 109b is better.
JF: A. Is this best Wang Meng in Palace collection? I find it somewhat disappointing.
WF: F. Late 16th cent. Cf. Kuan Ssu. BG: A. GK: A. CTL: F. 16th cent.
SL: D. Ming. Only fair. AL: A. ML: A. LS: B. MS: A. HV: A?

89. "Immortal Mountains and Luminous Woods." By Fang Ts'ung-i.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A. JF: A. WF: F. 17th cent.
BG: A. GK: A. CTL: D. 17th cent. AL: A. ML: A/B. LS: B or F.
SL: D. 17th cent. Very doubtful throughout. MS: A. HV: A. CCW: A. NW: F.

90a. "Rocks, Bamboo and Dry Shrubs." By Chao Meng-fu.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. RE: A. WF: F. LS: A or possibly B.
JF: No opinion on all, but some leaves look good. MS: A. CCW: A.
BG: Only last four exhibited in Boston--B. GK: A.
CTL: F. 16th and 17th cent. SL: B. Only fair. AL: A. ML: A/B.

90b. "Bamboo Grove in Mist and Rain." By Kuan Tao-sheng.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. RE: A. CTL: F. 16th and 17th cent.
JF: No opinion on all, but some look good. WF: F. GK: A.
SL: B? Poor. AL: A. ML: A/B. LS: B. MS: A.
CCW: A. Possibly helped by her husband.

90c. "Lodge on the River Bank." By Ni Tsan.

JC: A/B (slight). VC: A. BE: A. RE: A. CTL: F. 16th cent.
JF: No opinion on all, but some look good. WF: F. GK: A.
SL: B. Extremely good calligraphy. Style of painting thin and delicate, related
to follower, (hanging scroll in Caro). AL: A. ML: A/B. LS: A.
MS: A. CCW: A.

90d. "A Mountain Among Mountains." By Wu Chen.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: E. RE: A. GK: A. CTL: 16th and 17th cent.
JF: No opinion on all, but some leaves look good. WF: F. SL: A. Good.
AL: A. ML: A/B. LS: B. MS: A. CCW: A.

90e. "Spring Hills After Rain." By Ma Wan.

JC: A/B. Dry. VC: A. RE: A. GK: A. CTL: F. 16th and 17th cent.
BE: No photo available in hand; hesitate pass opinion. SL: A. Excellent.
JF: No opinion on all, but some leaves look good. WF: F. BG: B.
AL: A. ML: A/B. LS: No comment. MS: A. CCW: A.

90f. "Lu Yü Brewing Tea." By Chao Yüan.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. RE: A. GK: A. CTL: F. 16th and 17th cent.
JF: No opinion on all, but some leaves look good. WF: A? BG: B.
SL: A. Excellent. AL: A. ML: A/B. LS: A. MS: A. CCW: A.

90g. "On a Cliff by the River." By Lin Chüan-a.

JC: B. Minor. VC: A. BE: A? Needs further study.
RE: A. WF: F. BG: B. GK: A. CTL: F. 16th and 17th cent.
JF: No opinion on all, but some leaves look good. SL: A. Good.
AL: A. ML: A/B. LS: No comment. MS: A. CCW: B. NW: A?

90h. "Scholar Approaching His Lodge." By Chuang Lin.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A? Needs further study. RE: A. GK: A.
JF: No opinion on all, but some leaves look good. WF: F. BG: B.
CTL: F. 16th and 17th cent. SL: A. Good. Wet wenjen painting. AL: A.
ML: A/B. LS: No comment. MS: A. CCW: B. NW: A?

91. "Literary Gathering in a Mountain Lodge." By Wang Fu.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A. JF: A. CCW: A.
WF: F. 16th-17th cent. BG: A. Bad condition. GK: A. CTL: D. 17th cent.
SL: A. First class. AL: A. ML: B. LS: A. MS: A. NW: F.
HV: A. Rather much damaged but it seems right.

92. "Returning Late From a Spring Outing." By Tai Chin.

JC: A. But another Tai Chin might have been preferable, after all. VC: B.
BE: E. Bad. RE: A. JF: A fine work for this master. WF: F.
BG: B. GK: A? CTL: A? SL: A. AL: A. ML: B.
LS: B or more likely F. MS: A. NW: B.
HV: I think that the painting may safely be att. Tai Chin. The freshness of
the treatment in the background mountains seems to have the touch of Tai's brush(A

93. "Wild Geese and Peonies in Moonlight." By Lü Chi.

JC: B. VC: B. BE: A. Good. RE: A. JF: A. WF: F. 16-17th cent.
BG: B. GK: A. CTL: A. SL: A. ML: B. AL: A. LS: B.
MS: A. HV: A. CCW: B. NW: F.

94. "Lofty Mt. Lu." By Shen Chou.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Magnificent. RE: A. JF: A.
WF: F. 17th cent. BG: A. GK: A. CTL: D. Late 16th cent.?
SL: F? Confused. Doubtful. Note late ind. style at upper right. ML: A.
AL: A. LS: A. MS: A. CCW: A. NW: A.
HV: Possibly good. I would prefer 95.

95. "Walking with a Staff." By Shen Chou.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Fair. RE: A. JF: A. AL: A.
WF: F. 17th cent. Cf. Ch'a Shih-piao. BG: A. GK: A. LS: A.
CTL: A. SL: B. Fair. Not Shen Chou's forte. ML: A/B. MS: A.
HV: Possibly good. I would prefer 95 to 94. CCW: A. NW: F.

96. "Studies of Flowers and Animals." By Shen Chou.

A/B. Some good, some coarse. RE: A. WF: A. BG: B.
BE: A. Magnificent. JF: A. But lesser quality (do not like cat!).
GK: A. SL: A. Excellent. CTL: A. ML: B. AL: A. LS: B.
MS: A. HV: A. CCW: B. NW: B.

97. "Spring in Kiangnan." By Wen Cheng-ming.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Good. RE: A. JF: A. WF: A. BG: B.
GK: A. SL: Superb fine style. CTL: A. ML: A. AL: A. LS: B.
MS: A. HV: A. CCW: B. NW: A?

98. "Old Trees by a Cold Waterfall." By Wen Cheng-ming.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Magnificent. RE: A. JF: A. WF: A.
BG: A. GK: A. SL: A. Superb rough style. CTL: A. ML: B.
AL: A. LS: A. Excellent. MS: A. HV: A. CCW: A. NW: G.

99. "Figures in T'ang Style." By T'ang Yin.

JC: E? Hard to swallow as T'ang Yin; but may be. VC: A. High quality.
BE: B. Fair. RE: B? JF: A. WF: B? BG: E. GK: B.
SL: A. CTL: B. AL: A. ML: B. LS: B. MS: A.
HV: A. Not too good in quality. CCW: A. NW: G.

100. "Whispering Pines on a Mountain Path." By T'ang Yin.

JC: A. VC: A. High quality. BE: A. Magnificent. RE: A.
JF: A. Very fine. WF: A. BG: B. An academic work sold for cash.
GK: A. SL: A. Superb; but second to winter scroll on Taiwan. NW: A?
CTL: A. AL: A. ML: A. LS: A. MS: A. HV: A. CCW: A.

101. "Secluded Fishermen on an Autumn River." By T'ang Yin.

JC: A. VC: A. High quality. RE: A. WF: C? BG: A.
BE: E. Chiang-ts'un-shu-hua-mu called it fake and a bad painting, but the
brushwork and the interpretation seem fairly good to me. Possibly by
Chou Ch'en, or his followers, not too far from the time of T'ang Yin. Fair.
JF: A. Very fine (people who want to be clever say it is by Chou Ch'en).
GK: A. SL: A. Superb. See C.C. Wang's "Ma Lin". CTL: A. NW: A?
AL: A. ML: A. LS: A. Excellent. MS: A. HV: A. CCW: A.

102. "Waiting for the Ferry in Autumn." By Ch'iu Ying.

JC: A. VC: A. Wonderful. BE: A. Good. RE: A. JF: A.
WF: A. BG: A. GK: A. SL: B. Good. CTL: A. AL: A.
ML: A. LS: A. Excellent. MS: A. HV: A. CCW: A.
NW: A? Uneven quality.

103. "Conversation Under Firmiana Trees." By Ch'iu Ying.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: ? Peculiar for Ch'iu Ying; closer to Chang Ling. Poor.
RE: A. JF: Possibly A. Very interesting work. WF: A. BG: B.
GK: B. CTL: A. AL: A. ML: B. LS: A. MS: A. CCW: A.
SL: A. Good, but best is large banana plant scroll on Taiwan. Condition of
this not at top. NW: A?

104. "In the Shade of Summer Trees." By Tung Ch'i-ch'ang.

JC: A. VC: B. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A. WF: B.
JF: Never liked the master and still do not after seeing this picture, but suppose
is good.
GK: A. SL: A. Masterpiece. CTL: A. AL: A. ML: B. LS: B.
MS: A. CCW: A. NW: B.

105. "Sixteen Scenes From a Hermit's Life." By Ch'en Hung-shou.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. RE: B. WF: F or E.
JF: F. Low quality, far inferior to Honolulu scroll (and Freer album, for that
matter). Do not believe this to be genuine.
BG: B. GK: B. SL: A. Superb quality. Lousy reproductions. CTL: A.
AL: A. ML: A. LS: A. MS: A. CCW: A. NW: E.

106. "Verdant Peaks." By Wang Shih-min.

JC: B. VC: C. BE: B. Good. RE: A. WF: B. BG: A. GK: A.
SL: B. CTL: A. AL: A. LS: F. MS: B. NW: E.
CCW: D. By Wang Hui, painted for Wang Shih-min.

107. "Landscape After Hunag Kung-wang." By Wang Chien.

JC: B. VC: C. BE: A. Good. RE: A. WF: B. GK: A. SL: B.
CTL: A. AL: A/B. CCW: F. NW: E.

108. "Countless Peaks and Vales." By Wang Hui.

JC: A. VC: A. BE: B. Poor. RE: A. WF: B. BG: A. GK: A.
SL: A. CTL: A. AL: A. CCW: B. NW: B.

109. "Landscape." By Yün Shou-p'ing.

JC: A. VC: C. BE: B. Fair. RE: A. WF: F. BG: B. GK: A.
SL: B. CTL: A. AL: A. CCW: F. NW: B.

110. "Flowers and Landscapes." By Yün Shou-p'ing and Wang Hui.

JC: A/B. Some of Wang's fine; most of Yün's hard to take. VC: A. BE: B. Poor
RE: A. WF: F. BG: A. Wang Hui. B. Yun Shou-p'ing. GK: A. SL: A.
CTL: A. AL: A. CCW: A. NW: F.

111. "Landscapes After Sung and Yün Masters." By Wu Li.

JC: A. Wonderful album. VC: A. BE: A. Excellent. RE: A. WF: B?
BG: A. GK: A. SL: B. CTL: A. AL: A. CCW: A. NW: F.

112. "Autumn Mountains After Huang Kung-wang." By Wang Yüan-ch'i.

JC: A/B. More interesting work by Wang in Palace Museum? VC: A. BE: A. Good.
RE: A. WF: B. BG: A. GK: A. SL: B. CTL: A. AL: A.
CCW: B. NW: B.

Alexander Soper declined to grade paintings after No. 75; Father Harrie Vanderstappen after 102; Jan Fontein after 105, with the note that he was not much impressed by the works of the Wangs in the exhibition. He adds: "Summing up: the finest exhibition I ever saw; sorry Europe cannot get it, for it could be a real 'eye-opener'." Chu-tsing Li would like to have seen the following in the exhibition (numbers refer to 300 Masterpieces): 31, 42, 52, 67, 71, 133, 163, 186 (some because they are interesting pictures). C. C. Wang found the selection quite satisfactory, but would have replaced works of unimportant painters with more. So, Sung album leaves, and works of the following: Hsiao Chao, Chiang Ts'an, Yen Wen-kuei, Liu Kuan-tao, Tu Ch'ung, Hsü Pen, Liu Chueh, Shang Hsi, Luo Hsu, Lin Liang, Chou Ch'en, Yao Shou, Wen Po-jen, Wen Chia, Lu Chih, Ch'en Shun, Wu Pin, etc.