

LS Lecture Notes 1

1. Introductory. Pre-Han.

1.1. About Myself

Introduce self. Origins of project: need for book, all the specialists up to now (including myself) failed to write it. (Tell why: through extensive photographing/slide-making projects, arrived at visual coverage of whole extant body of Ch ptg that would have permitted a history; but meanwhile, 1970s-80s, whole art-history field going off in different direction, away from narrative art history. My analogy: (etc.)

Taught course quite a few times: history of Chinese ptg from earliest times through Sung dynasty, late 13th century, with emphasis on landscape. These lectures will be based on that course, but will be briefer: concentrating on visuals—in fact, I'll limit myself largely to the visuals—leaving out most of my background lectures on Chinese religion and philosophy, history, art theory, etc. For those, will suggest readings—on my website, or in books you can get. So I must emphasize from the beginning that these lectures are meant only to supplement, certainly not to supplant or replace, a proper academic lecture courses on early Chinese painting. If you're not enrolled in such a course, but want to reach a comparable understanding of the subject, you'll need to do a lot of background reading, which I'll suggest in the lectures, or in the accompanying materials on my website, as we go along.

Also, I would plead guilty immediately to not having kept up with all the new writing in my field; I will be making mistakes that others have corrected long ago, and applying outdated criteria in my judgments. Against this well-founded charge I can only plead age, and decades of having turned my attention mainly to the later periods of Ch ptg.

I want to make one very strong recommendation—if I could make it a requirement, I would. Since names and dates and other information of that kind about the artists and paintings will be available on my website, in the outlines or study-guides for each lecture, DON'T TRY TO TAKE NOTES AS I TALK. It will keep you from looking at the pictures, which is what you should be doing.

First of all, I want to spend some time talking about my background, my teachers and predecessors, how I got here, why I feel competent to deliver these lectures, in fact feel an obligation to do so while I still can. I ask you to be patient with this, since I'll use it to lay out not only background for these lectures, but also some basic principles underlying them. Will get to paintings before too long. If you don't want to watch and listen to this, you can skip ahead (nobody will see you leave the lecture hall, and return when you want to).

Me and teachers

1.1.1. Max Loehr,

1.1.2. Shûjirô Shimada,

1.1.3. Wang Chi-ch'ien or C. C. Wang. All deceased.

Wang: born & brought up near Suzhou in China; spent time in Shanghai, was one of leading disciples of major collector-connoisseur Wu Hufan (good book on him by Clarissa von Spee). Other was Xu Bangda. C.C.Wang came to U.S. in 1947, lived in New York rest of his life.

I'm certainly not claiming to have combined the best of these three great traditions of scholarship; that would be presumptuous and untrue. But I absorbed enough of them to have some sense of how Chinese paintings were understood and appreciated in each of them.

Leaving out two other art historians: Alexander Soper (describe briefly); also Osvald Siren, another prominent figure in Chinese painting studies whom I spent time with. Not his student. Siren didn't have students. Art historian; in some sense a disciple of Bernard Berenson; wrote on Italian painting before turning to Chinese.

1.1.4. Photo: C.C.Wang and I with Chuang Yen (or Chuang Shang-yen), then Director of the Palace Museum in Taichung in 1959; Li Lin-ts'an (second from left), close friend, later Vice-Director, with whom C.C.Wang and I spent long, happy days looking through boxes of paintings (he called us "Three Painting Worms" by analogy with bookworms); two other curators; and, beside me, wearing glasses: Henry Beville, photographer for National Gallery in Washington D.C., who did photographing for my Skira book *Chinese Painting*. This great series of viewings in 1959 not only decided much of selection for that Skira book, but also much of the selection for great exhibition *Chinese Art Treasures*, which opened at National Gallery in D.C. in 1961.

1.1.5. -Photo: Henry Beville, Aschwin Lippe, John Pope and myself at opening of that exhibition. (Freer Gallery only showed its own objects, no outside exhibitions). Aschwin Lippe (describe), then curator at the Metropolitan Museum in New York, and I were responsible for selection of paintings, much of it based on what C.C. Wang, Li Lin-ts'an and I had seen and selected two years earlier.

1.1.6. - Photo: I also had the good fortune to be a member of the 1973 "Archaeologists" delegation to China, led by Sherman Lee. (Explain why "archaeologists"). Also Larry Sickman, Richard Rudolph (only real archaeologist among us), also Arthur Wright, Chinese historian at Yale, Tom Lawton, later Director of Freer, others. Month-long tour of Chinese museums and collections, along with important sites, on which we saw and photographed large numbers of early and important paintings. Followed up by:

1.1.7. - Photo: 1977 "Old Chinese Painting" delegation, led by me, with such notable Chinese painting specialists as Ellen Laing (my vice-chair), Nelson Wu, Wai-kam Ho, Wen Fong. Ellen, Wen Fong and I are still around, most others have joined their ancestors.

1.1.8. - Me with then-Director of Palace Museum in Beijing, looking at painting (attrib. to Chan Tzu-ch'ien—we'll see later.) We were allowed to make slides from all we saw, to take back to U.S. for ourselves and our colleagues to use in teaching and research. Great opening up of Chinese collections. These two month-long delegations, together with photographing of Palace Museum collection in Taiwan, collections in Japan and U.S. and Europe that had been accessible earlier, gave us a new degree of visual coverage of best Chinese paintings all over the world. We were, in principle, ready to settle back and write our histories. Somebody should have written a detailed, comprehensive history of Chinese painting through the end of the Song dynasty, the late 13th century, the kind of history these lectures will attempt to outline. But nobody did. Max Loehr tried, in his general book (about which I'll speak later) and went badly wrong on problems of dating and attribution of paintings. Siren's books simply don't serve the purpose, as you know if you've tried reading them—he never arrived at the real understanding that should underlie such a history. Michael Sullivan got off to a good start with two books on early Chinese landscape, but then didn't continue into the great period,

10th to 13th century. I myself could have made a good try at it, and instead devoted my publishing efforts more to the later periods, after Song. That's why we are in the predicament we're now in, as I see it; and it's a big reason why I'm doing these lectures, to go some small way toward ameliorating this gap in our collective knowledge. And maybe to encourage some younger scholar to buck the trend and write the book we need.

1.2. About This Series

1.2.1 and 1.2.2.- "Xu Xi" Bamboo & Tree in Winter, really Anon. 10th-11 century work; plus detail. Have used this ptg often to represent what seems to me the apogee or high point of realism/lifelikeness/truth to nature in Ch. ptg; along w LS of same period, which we'll see, it is dedicated to portraying natural world w. deep understanding as well as remarkable degree of visual faithfulness. Again, this is unfashionable idea: good grad students in my dept. tried hard to convince me that it was meaningless to talk abt degrees of lifelikeness, since all representation is convention. Still doesn't make sense to me.

1.2.3 replaces 1.2.2. beside 1.2.1.

Handscroll supposed to be by great 11th cent. statesman-poet Su Shih or Su Tung-p'o (1036-1101), Bamboo, Tree, and Rock. One: almost photographic realism; other: not realistic at all. Admired as *expressive*: his friend Mi Fu would write that rocks and trees in Su's paintings were "coiled up like the sorrows in his breast," or something like that. Su Shih's is early example of new kind of ptg, done by scholar-amateurs, that would eventually, after end of Sung (beyond our lectures), occupy forefront of Ch ptg and be accepted as mainstream. I'll talk abt that in later lecture. Anyway, this one has lots of seals and inscriptions attached to it; other has nothing. (Tiny ionsc on it, I'll talk abt when we come to it.)

These two raise the Issue of lifelikeness, realism, naturalism, fidelity to nature, etc.—not worrying about words. Famous art historian Ernst Gombrich, in *Art and Illusion* (1960) and other writings, sets forth pattern for development within an artistic tradition in which each significant artist tries to adjust the schemata or representational conventions he inherits to bring them closer to natural appearance as he can observe it—toward greater realism, that is. Like kind of *progress*. I hasten to say that neither Gombrich nor myself attaches positive value judgments to this

distinction—more realistic art isn't necessarily *better* art, for him or for me. (I yield to nobody in my admiration for Japanese ptg, including some of the furthest from realism, such as Rimpa; I respect Indian and Persian, or Islamic, painting without knowing them as well as I know East Asian. I'm excited by Cubist paintings, or Matisse, and so forth.)

1.2.4, 1.2.5. - Pair: LS in Tang style (will see and talk about later); one from 11th cent. (Guo Xi). Gombrich was coming to realize, late in his life, that the only other artistic tradition of painting in world art—other than that of Europe, that is—only other one that follows this pattern, stretching over centuries and engaging a great many artists and movements, to arrive finally at a high degree of realism, is Chinese painting. I mean to follow, generally, the pattern Gombrich lays out, however unfashionable and (for some) objectionable it may be, both because I believe it has great value and embodies a certain degree of truth, and because it isn't being done much today, and I think needs to be.

1.2.5 with 1.2.6. - Another pair: Guo Xi with Xia Gui, sec'n of great handscroll "A Pure and Remote View of Streams and Mountains," from which I took the title of this series. Late 12th-early 13th cent. (etc.)

1.2.7 to left of 1.2.6 (replaces 1.2.5). : next section of Xia Gui. Chinese ptg after 12th cent. almost literally dissolves into space; much of the best of it misty, atmospheric, glimpsed only fitfully through mist. You'll be sorry to see it end—I hope—if you don't, I will have failed.

It's important to add that this developmental pattern within the history of Chinese painting, through the Song dynasty, is not only clearly discernible in the painting themselves, properly understood; it's also reinforced, as I'll try to bring out as we go along, in the writings of Chinese critics and theorists, who recognize that Song-period landscape could capture depths and subtleties of natural scenery that made earlier phases, landscape painting of Tang and before, look childish and artificial. The practice of artists, that is, is recognized and backed up by writings of art critics and theorists of the time—a series of (in effect) art-historical accounts preserved from 9th century on. Chinese ideas of truth-to-nature not same as Western—different aesthetic, idea of naturalness more central, avoiding look of man-made, etc. All this will be in my discussions

as you go along. But recognized that ptrs collectively achieved progress twd it.

So, the art-historical narrative sequence I'll be trying to bring out clearly in considering the paintings, with some references to contemporary writings, is not by any means a pattern imposed on the materials by foreign art-historians, as some ideologically-motivated writers used to charge, claiming that Western art-historians were trying to overlay the Chinese tradition of painting with developmental patterns they had adopted from Wolfflin and other historians of European art. If you end up after watching and listening through this series still believing something like that, you haven't looked and listened carefully enough. (Again, I must emphasize that I'm not attaching value judgments to this historical process; don't mean that Ch. ptg got better & better as centuries passed. Figure ptg finer in T'ang period than later; lots of people think Guo Hsi is greater artist than Hsia Kuei, just as many prefer Botticelli to Raphael. I'm talking instead abt a kind of continuous quasi-logical mvt toward greater truth to nature on Chinese terms—a great capacity of LS ptg to embody deep philosophical or metaphysical concepts.

1.3. (Back to me on camera, holding up books:)

There are a number of quite good books on Chinese art history and Chinese painting history available, although none that corresponds closely with my account, and I'll include references to several of them in my "handouts" on my website and accompanying these disks. There are mainly three books I'll be referring to: **(HOLD UP BOOKS)**

- Max Loehr, The Great Painters of China. New York and London, Phaidon, 1980. My teacher, as I said before. Very much that is very good in it. But goes badly wrong on matters of dating and attributing paintings, accepting as works by famous artists a lot of paintings that seem to me and others to be later school works and imitations. I'll talk about this later, and will call this "Loehr's book" or just "Loehr."

- Robert Thorp and Richard Vinograd, Chinese Art and Culture. 2000. Abbrev.: T&V. Good teaching text, good general account by two excellent scholar-writers.

- A collaborative work in which I was involved, Three Thousand Years of Chinese Painting (Yale U. Press, 1997) Sometimes listed with my colleague Richard Barnhart as author, but that's matter of alphabetizing: I was (etc.) We'll use it for the early periods: through Tang dynasty by Professor Wu Hong, now teaching at the University of Chicago; through the Song dynasty by Professor Richard Barnhart, now retired from teaching at Yale. They were my own recommendations for writing these sections, and I admire very much what they did. So if I differ from this book, or from something I quote from Loehr or from Thorp and Vinograd, it's in spirit of scholarly respect, I'm not in any way putting them down.

- My own old Skira book *Chinese Painting*, published in 1960; begun while I was still writing also my doctoral dissertation. Good book of its kind, but doesn't take us very far; you can read it overnight, use for illustrations.

- Will have references on the handouts on my website to vol. III of Osvald Siren's Chinese Painting: Leading Masters and Principles. Use for plates, for those who want to see reproductions of ptgs I talk about, or just to identify them exactly. Won't refer to this book for text, probably . . . But black-and-white plates good, often include things w/o reproductions elsewhere. All "Siren" references are to vol. III, plate volume.

Will also refer from time to time to Michael Sullivan's books: The Birth of Landscape Painting in China, 1979; a follow-up on Sui -T'ang ptg I don't have here; and Symbols of Eternity: The Art of Landscape Painting in China, 1979. Important books, but don't make up what I take to be the missing comprehensive history of Ch LS ptg through Sung.

1.3.1. About Chinese Painting: General.

Everybody who wants to follow these lectures and gain some understanding of the development of painting, especially landscape painting, in China should have some general background information on Chinese painting—the materials it uses, the forms it takes, and so on, more than I will be able to convey in my talks. So I recommend strongly that you separately do readings to fill this in. I'll be putting recommended readings on my website to accompany these lectures as we go along. But to begin with:

1.3.2. Recommended readings, for general background:

- my introductory essay in *3000 Years of Ch. Ptg.* "Approaches to Chinese Painting, Part II," pp. 5-12.
- If you have it accessible: Jerome Silbergeld. *Chinese Painting Style: Media, Methods, and Principles of Form*, 1982 book, U. of Washington Press. Very good. Both pieces of writing outline the forms in which Chinese paintings are made, the tools and materials, the conventions it uses, something about how it differs from the European-American painting that we're familiar with.

On this matter, how Chinese painting differs in big ways from Western painting, I believe strongly that we should steer clear of certain Chinese popular formulations that started as poetic truths, took on character of historical or absolute truths, and have been delivered endlessly as Great Truths about the subject: Writing & ptg have single origin. (No, they don't. I'll talk about that at one point in my lectures.) Ch ptg doesn't capture outer forms, it captures the inner essence, or inner spirit, of things it depicts. Augh. I used to (etc.) Or any reflection of the old myth about a spiritual East vs. a materialist West. Forget it. All these are simplistic, in my opinion misleading.

1.3.4- Slides: brushes, from exhib. case; Silbergeld Fig. 2: Brush structures and dynamics. Brushes and ink. Brush tip conical, not flat like ours used for oil ptg. Touched lightly, moved smoothly, produces fine line; more pressure, stroke thickens. Perfect fluidity of movement: can go equally in any direction. Holds a lot of ink or color: cavity in center for this. So: Chinese painting begins, as I began my old *Skira Ch. Ptg* book, as art of line, outlining forms to depict them; but brushstrokes in Chinese painting very early depart in various ways from strict line, as we'll see.

1.4. The Beginnings

Now we go back to begin looking at the earliest examples of painting in China.

Good, long discussion of Chinese Neolithic painted pots in Thorp and Vinograd. I'll show only two, to make a simple point:

1.4.1, 1.4.2. - Painted designs on Neolithic pots at Banpo, 5th millennium B.C. 3000 Fig. 5, p. 18; T&V 1-11, p. 39.

One I used to use to talk about as "beginnings of art in China"—partly facetious, but real belief behind it.

I should add here that some of the Banpo pots have scratched marks on them that may be an early form of writing. After someone gave a paper on this at a conference on calligraphy long ago, I suggested that we should recognize that (etc.)

1.4.3, 1.4.4.- Qin Shihuang Terracotta Army, near Xi'an, ca. 210 B.C. T&V 03, p. 16, 4-18&19, pp. 140-141. 5,000 of them, full size, originally painted in natural colors, looking as though all different, carrying real bronze weapons.

1.4.4 beside 1.4.5. May have employed some hundreds of thousands of workmen maybe ten or twenty years to produce; still baffle ceramic specialists and others on how it was done.

Why do I put these people on screen? (etc.)

1.4.6, 1.4.7. - design on lacquer dish; inlay design on *bianhu* vessel, 5th-4th cent. B.C. ^&V 3-20. [/ 1-7/

Max Loehr published article in 1968, in *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America*, titled "The Fate of the Ornament in Chinese Art."

Profound and true. These ornamental designs much more highly evolved, sophisticated, than any pictorial art of the time.

So, how did pictorial art begin in China? Earliest stirrings of it may have come from outside, from the nomadic cultures to the north and east of China: designs on so-called hunting-style bronzes. Won't stop to make argument for saying that, will just say it: not crucial to our subject.

1.4.8, 1.4.9. - Bronze design. Hunting hu. Vessel and detail of design. Images flat, repeated, probably made with some kind of stamp or stencil.

1.4.10, 1.4.11. - Jannings hu, + drawing of design. 3000 Fig. 10, p. 21; T&V 3-24, p. 112. (Last Laugh)

Same kind of images as "hunting hu," with some additions, but now organized with horizontal lines that stand for a wall, the lower and upper floors of a building, or the ground on which the figures stand.

1.4.12, 1.4.13. Two close-up views of vessels with inlaid designs of this kind. (Discuss).

1.4.14. - Fragments of lacquered wood, late Zhou period, from region of Changsha, in SE China. Like outgrowth of images on hunting hu: (describe)

1.5. Earliest Paintings

1.5.1, 1.5.2. - Man and dragon, from Changsha. About 37 cm. high. From tomb near Changsha, Hunan Province; dates from end of Zhou dynasty, 3rd cent. B.C. Materials: silk; ink, some pigment (lost or hard to see). 3000 Fig. 12, p. 23. T&V 3-29, p. 113, Loehr Fig. 4, p. 11.

1.5.3. Detail, with 1.5.1 (whole, on silk).

Wu Hung, in 3000 Years p. 21, quotes mentions of painting and artists from Han-period writings. Mostly collaborative, artisan work. But also remarkable anecdote found in text ascribed to the Daoist philosopher Zhuangzi, late Zhou period. Ruler of Song state needs to have a painting done, calls his artists; they all come, bowing and scraping and showing off their skills. But one arrives late, takes off his outer clothes and sprawls comfortably outside, in no hurry to present himself. Aha, says the ruler, this is the true artist! and hires him to do the job. Remarkable story for so early a period. Idea of artist as exceptional being will continue to turn up in writings in later periods, as we'll see.

How can this non-conformist artist's painting have been different from that of the common artisans? Can't answer, except by looking at paintings of this time, and using them to suggest possibilities. Fortunately, we now have a few actual paintings from late Zhou, notably two: this one and another:

1.5.4.-Woman—shamaness? w. dragon and phoenix. 3000 Fig. 11, p. 22, Siren 1. Slightly smaller: about 31 cm. in height.

(Important to note here, early on, that the images I will use, made from slides mostly, but some from reproductions, will vary widely and wildly in color, lighting, fidelity to original. No help for that; not making any claims for accuracy of color or general look. Slide that transmitted real look of original painting would often be very hard to see as an image on the cinema screen. All serious students of Chinese painting should spend as much time as possible looking at originals, and not take slides or reproductions as visually truthful; they aren't. But they can reveal features of the paintings that are hard to see in the originals.)

Writer of 3000 Years text reproduces both these, then writes: "The two paintings share drawing techniques and a compositional formula: images are outlined in ink . . . The main difference between these works lies in the degree of artistry. The female figure appears as a silhouette; the outlines are rather coarse and uneven, apparently by an unassured hand." I can see how one might make that judgment, from a reproduction; but I would differ from it, judge the painting differently, and I'll take you closer into the painting to show you why. True, it's less firmly-defined and substantial image than that of the man riding the dragon, not drawn in same controlled fine line. But this can also be seen as a deliberate difference in style:

1.5.5. another of shamaness picture, beside detail, 1.5.6. - Slides, showing brushline but also brushstrokes of fluctuating thickness, as hand of artist applies more or less pressure.

- 1.5.7 beside 1.5.5, closer look at phoenix and dragon.

- 1.5.8 beside 1.5.5, detail of dragon. , Lines don't entirely enclose form; it isn't, that is, simply outlined.

- 1.5.9 beside 1.5.5, closer detail of phoenix. (comment.)

I began my old Skira *Chinese Painting* book by quoting from an early Chinese dictionary saying that "To paint is to draw boundaries," that is, draw linear outline to define the form, do some interior drawing. But:

(Show: not simply "outlined in ink" at all. Image is produced as a *structure or configuration of brushstrokes*. Important to note this—already a break with the basic means of simply drawing a line around the thing . .

Reading these brushstrokes, we're conscious of movements of hand holding brush that made them, and varying pressure on brush. Gives a certain *energy* to lines and strokes that make up the form. Long ago, I used the term "empathic kinesthesia" for this quality—that is, feeling empathically a movement someone else made. And a sensitive, controlled movement. That kind of response to the *execution* of paintings, in addition to or instead of the *imagery* of paintings, partly underlies great value Chinese put in *brushwork* in judging paintings. Loehr points out on first page of his book that what was sought in Chinese painting, from the beginning, was not some accuracy of representation, but a certain "aliveness"—centuries later, a Chinese theorist would use the term "qiyun

sheng-dong” or “engender movement through spirit-resonance” as supreme quality to strive for in painting. Do we see it already here, when we look at this simple picture close-up and sympathetically?

So much for our first lesson. We’ve learned some important things about early Chinese painting, including a few you won’t find in the books. And that’s the purpose of these lectures, and there will be lots more of that kind of commentary to come. So . . .

Additional reading:

- For a sympathetic, deep-going discussion of the kind of old-fashioned “narrative” art-history attempted in this series, its strengths and its problems, as represented in my old Skira book, as well as sharp observations on the alternative kind represented by Craig Clunas’s *Pictures and Visuality in Early Modern China* (Princeton, 1997), read Richard Vinograd’s essay “Narrative and Metanarrative in Chinese Painting,” in Jason C. Kuo, ed., *Stories from Other Mountains: Chinese Painting Studies in Postwar America* (Washington D.C., New Academia Publishing, 2009) 167-98.

LS Lecture Notes 1

1. Introductory. Pre-Han.1.1. About Myself

Introduce self. Origins of project: need for book, all the specialists up to now (including myself) failed to write it. Taught course quite a few times: history of Chinese ptg from earliest times through Sung dynasty, late 13th century, with emphasis on landscape. These lectures will be based on that course, but will be a lot briefer: concentrating on visuals—in fact, I'll limit myself largely to the visuals—leaving out most of my background lectures on Chinese religion and philosophy, history, art theory, etc. For those, will suggest readings—on my website. So I must emphasize from the beginning that these lectures are meant only to supplement, certainly not to supplant or replace, proper academic lecture courses on early Chinese painting. If you're not enrolled in such a course, but want to reach a comparable understanding of the subject, you will need to do a lot of background reading, which I'll suggest in the lectures, or in the accompanying materials on my website, as we go along.

I want to make one very strong recommendation—if I could make it a requirement, I would. Since names and dates and other information of that kind about the artists and paintings will be available on my website, DON'T TRY TO TAKE NOTES AS I TALK. It will keep you from looking at the pictures, which is what you should be doing.

First of all, I want to spend some time talking about my background, my teachers and predecessors, how I got here, why I feel competent to deliver these lectures, in fact feel an obligation to do so while I still can. I ask you to be patient with this, since I'll use it to lay out not only background for these lectures, but also some basic principles underlying them. Will get to paintings before too long. If you don't want to watch and listen to this, you can skip ahead (nobody will see you leave the lecture hall, and return when you want to).

Me and teachers

- 1.1.1. Max Loehr, *Re-record, shorten, mention others in picture.* ✓
- 1.1.2. Shûjirô Shimada,
- 1.1.3. Wang Chi-ch'ien or C. C. Wang. All deceased.

Wang: born & brought up near Suzhou in China; spent time in Shanghai, was one of leading disciples of major collector-connoisseur Wu Hufan (good book on him by Clarissa von Spee). Other was Xu Bangda. C.C.Wang came to U.S. in 1947, lived in New York rest of his life.

I'm certainly not claiming to have combined the best of these three great traditions of scholarship; that would be presumptuous and untrue. But I absorbed enough of them to have some sense of how Chinese paintings were understood and appreciated in each of them.

Leaving out two other art historians: Alexander Soper (describe briefly); also Osvald Siren, another prominent figure in Chinese painting studies whom I spent time with. Not his student. Siren didn't have students. Art historian; in some sense a disciple of Bernard Berenson; wrote on Italian painting before turning to Chinese.

1.1.4. Photo: C.C.Wang and I with Chuang Yen (or Chuang Shang-yen), then Director of the Palace Museum in Taichung in 1959; Li Lin-ts'an (second from left), close friend, later Vice-Director, with whom C.C.Wang and I spent long, happy days looking through boxes of paintings (he called us "Three Painting Worms" by analogy with bookworms); two other curators; and, beside me, wearing glasses: Henry Beville, photographer for National Gallery in Washington D.C., who did photographing for my Skira book *Chinese Painting*. This great series of viewings in 1959 not only decided much of selection for that Skira book, but also much of the selection for great exhibition *Chinese Art Treasures*, which opened at National Gallery in D.C. in 1961.

1.1.5. -Photo: Henry Beville, Aschwin Lippe, John Pope and myself at opening of that exhibition. (Freer Gallery only showed its own objects, no outside exhibitions). Aschwin Lippe (describe), then curator at the Metropolitan Museum in New York, and I were responsible for selection of paintings, much of it based on what C.C. Wang, Li Lin-ts'an and I had seen and selected two years earlier.

1.1.6. - Photo: I also had the good fortune to be a member of the 1973 "Archaeologists" delegation to China, led by Sherman Lee. (Explain why "archaeologists"). Also Larry Sickman, Richard Rudolph (only real archaeologist among us), also Arthur Wright, Chinese historian at Yale, Tom Lawton, later Director of Freer, others. Month-long tour of Chinese

museums and collections, along with important sites, on which we saw and photographed large numbers of early and important paintings. Followed up by:

1.1.7. - Photo: 1977 "Old Chinese Painting" delegation, led by me, with such notable Chinese painting specialists as Ellen Laing (my vice-chair), Nelson Wu, Wai-kam Ho, Wen Fong. Ellen, Wen Fong and I are still around, most others have joined their ancestors.

*You highlight
Ellen Laing
Nelson Wu
Wai-kam Ho
Wen Fong
etc.*

1.1.8. - Me with then-Director of Palace Museum in Beijing, looking at painting (attrib. to Chan Tzu-ch'ien—we'll see later.) We were allowed to make slides from all we saw, to take back to U.S. for ourselves and our colleagues to use in teaching and research. Great opening up of Chinese collections. These two month-long delegations, together with photographing of Palace Museum collection in Taiwan, collections in Japan and U.S. and Europe that had been accessible earlier, gave us a new degree of visual coverage of best Chinese paintings all over the world. We were, in principle, ready to settle back and write our histories. Somebody should have written a detailed, comprehensive history of Chinese painting through the end of the Song dynasty, the late 13th century, the kind of history these lectures will attempt to outline. But nobody did. Max Loehr tried, in his general book (about which I'll speak later) and went badly wrong on problems of dating and attribution of paintings. Siren's books simply don't serve the purpose, as you know if you've tried reading them—he never arrived at the real understanding that should underlie such a history. Michael Sullivan got off to a good start with two books on early Chinese landscape, but then didn't continue into the great period, 10th to 13th century. I myself could have made a good try at it, and instead devoted my publishing efforts more to the later periods, after Song. That's why we are in the predicament we're now in, as I see it; and it's a big reason why I'm doing these lectures, to go some small way toward ameliorating this gap in our collective knowledge. And maybe to encourage some younger scholar to buck the trend and write the book we need.

1.2. About This Series

1.2.1 and 1.2.2.- "Xu Xi" Bamboo & Tree in Winter, really Anon. 10th-11th century work; plus detail. Have used this ptg often to represent what seems to me the apogee or high point of realism/lifelikeness/truth to

*Can 1.2.1 be
less yellow?
Cooler tone please*

nature in Ch. ptg; along w LS of same period, which we'll see, it is dedicated to portraying natural world w. deep understanding as well as remarkable degree of visual faithfulness. Again, this is unfashionable idea: good grad students in my dept. tried hard to convince me that it was meaningless to talk abt degrees of lifelikeness, since all representation is convention. Still doesn't make sense to me.

1.2.3 replaces 1.2.2. beside 1.2.1.

Handscroll supposed to be by great 11th cent. statesman-poet Su Shih or Su Tung-p'o (1036-1101), Bamboo, Tree, and Rock. One: almost photographic realism; other: not realistic at all. Admired as *expressive*: his friend Mi Fu would write that rocks and trees in Su's paintings were "coiled up like the sorrows in his breast," or something like that. Su Shih's is early example of new kind of ptg, done by scholar-amateurs, that would eventually, after end of Sung (beyond our lectures), occupy forefront of Ch ptg and be accepted as mainstream. I'll talk abt that in later lecture. Anyway, this one has lots of seals and inscriptions attached to it; other has nothing. (Tiny ionsc on it, I'll talk abt when we come to it.)

These two raise the issue of lifelikeness, realism, naturalism, fidelity to nature, etc.—not worrying about words. Famous art historian Ernst Gombrich, in *Art and Illusion* (1960) and other writings, sets forth pattern for development within an artistic tradition in which each significant artist tries to adjust the schemata or representational conventions he inherits to bring them closer to natural appearance as he can observe it—toward greater realism, that is. Like kind of *progress*. I hasten to say that neither Gombrich nor myself attaches positive value judgments to this distinction—more realistic art isn't necessarily *better* art, for him or for me. (I yield to nobody in my admiration for Japanese ptg, including some of the furthest from realism, such as Rimpa; I respect Indian and Persian, or Islamic, painting without knowing them as well as I know East Asian. I'm excited by Cubist paintings, or Matisse, and so forth.)

1.2.4, 1.2.5. - Pair: LS in Tang style (will see and talk about later); one from 11th cent. (Guo Xi). Gombrich was coming to realize, late in his life, that the only other artistic tradition of painting in world art—other than that of Europe, that is—only other one that follows this pattern, stretching over centuries and engaging a great many artists and movements, to arrive finally at a high degree of realism, is Chinese painting. I mean to follow, generally, the pattern Gombrich lays out,

however unfashionable and (for some) objectionable it may be, both because I believe it has great value and embodies a certain degree of truth, and because it isn't being done much today, and I think needs to be.

1.2.5 with 1.2.6. - Another pair: Guo Xi with Xia Gui, sec'n of great handscroll "A Pure and Remote View of Streams and Mountains," from which I took the title of this series. Late 12th-early 13th cent. (etc.)

1.2.7 to left of 1.2.6 (replaces 1.2.5). : next section of Xia Gui. Chinese ptg after 12th cent. almost literally dissolves into space; much of the best of it misty, atmospheric, glimpsed only fitfully through mist. You'll be sorry to see it end—I hope—if you don't, I will have failed.

*marker: moving
back as I speak
of foreground
into distance—*

It's important to add that this developmental pattern within the history of Chinese painting, through the Song dynasty, is not only clearly discernible in the painting themselves, properly understood; it's also reinforced, as I'll try to bring out as we go along, in the writings of Chinese critics and theorists, who recognize that Song-period landscape could capture depths and subtleties of natural scenery that made earlier phases, landscape painting of Tang and before, look childish and artificial. The practice of artists, that is, is recognized and backed up by writings of art critics and theorists of the time—a series of (in effect) art-historical accounts preserved from 9th century on. Chinese ideas of truth-to-nature not same as Western—different aesthetic, idea of naturalness more central, avoiding look of man-made, etc. All this will be in my discussions as you go along. But recognized that ptrs collectively achieved progress twd it.

So, the art-historical narrative sequence I'll be trying to bring out clearly in considering the paintings, with some references to contemporary writings, is not by any means a pattern imposed on the materials by foreign art-historians, as some ideologically-motivated writers used to charge, claiming that Western art-historians were trying to overlay the Chinese tradition of painting with developmental patterns they had adopted from Wolfflin and other historians of European art. If you end up after watching and listening through this series still believing something like that, you haven't looked and listened carefully enough. (Again, I must emphasize that I'm not attaching value judgments to this historical process; don't mean that Ch. ptg got better & better as centuries passed.

Figure ptg finer in T'ang period than later; lots of people think Guo Hsi is greater artist than Hsia Kuei, just as many prefer Botticelli to Raphael. I'm talking instead abt a kind of continuous quasi-logical mvt toward greater truth to nature on Chinese terms—a great capacity of LS ptg to embody deep philosophical or metaphysical concepts.

1.3. (Back to me on camera, holding up books:)

There are a number of quite good books on Chinese art history and Chinese painting history available, although none that corresponds closely with my account, and I'll include references to several of them in my "handouts" on my website and accompanying these disks. There are mainly three books I'll be referring to: **(HOLD UP BOOKS)**

- Max Loehr, The Great Painters of China. New York and London, Phaidon, 1980. My teacher, as I said before. Very much that is very good in it. But goes badly wrong on matters of dating and attributing paintings, accepting as works by famous artists a lot of paintings that seem to me and others to be later school works and imitations. I'll talk about this later, and will call this "Loehr's book" or just "Loehr."

- Robert Thorp and Richard Vinograd, Chinese Art and Culture. 2000. Abbrev.: T&V. Good teaching text, good general account by two excellent scholar-writers.

- A collaborative work in which I was involved, Three Thousand Years of Chinese Painting (Yale U. Press, 1997) Sometimes listed with my colleague Richard Barnhart as author, but that's matter of alphabetizing: I was (etc.) We'll use it for the early periods: through Tang dynasty by Professor Wu Hong, now teaching at the University of Chicago; through the Song dynasty by Professor Richard Barnhart, now retired from teaching at Yale. They were my own recommendations for writing these sections, and I admire very much what they did. So if I differ from this book, or from something I quote from Loehr or from Thorp and Vinograd, it's in spirit of scholarly respect, I'm not in any way putting them down.

- My own old Skira book *Chinese Painting*, published in 1960; begun while I was still writing also my doctoral dissertation. Good book of its kind, but doesn't take us very far; you can read it overnight, use for illustrations.

- Will have references on the handouts on my website to vol. III of Osvald Siren's *Chinese Painting: Leading Masters and Principles*. Use for plates, for those who want to see reproductions of ptgs I talk about, or just to identify them exactly. Won't refer to this book for text, probably . . . But black-and-white plates good, often include things w/o reproductions elsewhere. All "Siren" references are to vol. III, plate volume.

1.3.1. About Chinese Painting: General.

Everybody who wants to follow these lectures and gain some understanding of the development of painting, especially landscape painting, in China should have some general background information on Chinese painting—the materials it uses, the forms it takes, and so on, more than I will be able to convey in my talks. So I recommend strongly that you separately do readings to fill this in. I'll be putting recommended readings on my website to accompany these lectures as we go along. But to begin with:

1.3.2. Recommended readings, for general background:

- my introductory essay in *3000 Years of Ch. Ptg.* "Approaches to Chinese Painting, Part II," pp. 5-12.
- If you have it accessible: Jerome Silbergeld. *Chinese Painting Style: Media, Methods, and Principles of Form*, 1982 book, U. of Washington Press. Very good. Both pieces of writing outline the forms in which Chinese paintings are made, the tools and materials, the conventions it uses, something about how it differs from the European-American painting that we're familiar with.

On this matter, how Chinese painting differs in big ways from Western painting, I believe strongly that we should steer clear of certain Chinese popular formulations that started as poetic truths, took on character of historical or absolute truths, and have been delivered endlessly as Great Truths about the subject: Writing & ptg have single origin. (No, they don't. I'll talk about that at one point in my lectures.) Ch ptg doesn't capture outer forms, it captures the inner essence, or inner spirit, of things it depicts. Augh. I used to (etc.) Or any reflection of the old myth about a spiritual East vs. a materialist West. Forget it. All these are simplistic, in my opinion misleading.

1.3.4- Slides: brushes, from exhib. case; Silbergeld Fig. 2: Brush structures and dynamics. Brushes and ink. Brush tip conical, not flat like ours used for oil ptg. Touched lightly, moved smoothly, produces fine line; more pressure, stroke thickens. Perfect fluidity of movement: can go equally in any direction. Holds a lot of ink or color: cavity in center for this. So: Chinese painting begins, as I began my old Skira Ch. Ptg book, as art of line, outlining forms to depict them; but brushstrokes in Chinese painting very early depart in various ways from strict line, as we'll see.

1.4. The Beginnings

Now we go back to begin looking at the earliest examples of painting in China.

Good, long discussion of Chinese Neolithic painted pots in Thorp and Vinograd. I'll show only two, to make a simple point:

1.4.1, 1.4.2. - Painted designs on Neolithic pots at Banpo, 5th millennium B.C. 3000 Fig. 5, p. 18; T&V 1-11, p. 39.

One I used to use to talk about as "beginnings of art in China"—partly facetious, but real belief behind it.

zoom in to
masker as
I talk of
them...
later: enlarge
pot on right,
lose other.

I should add here that some of the Banpo pots have scratched marks on them that may be an early form of writing. After someone gave a paper on this at a conference on calligraphy long ago, I suggested that we should recognize that (etc.)

1.4.3, 1.4.4.- Qin Shihuang Terracotta Army, near Xi'an, ca. 210 B.C. T&V 03, p. 16, 4-18&19, pp. 140-141. 5,000 of them, full size, originally painted in natural colors, looking as though all different, carrying real bronze weapons.

1.4.4 beside 1.4.5. May have employed some hundreds of thousands of workmen maybe ten or twenty years to produce; still baffle ceramic specialists and others on how it was done.

Why do I put these people on screen? (etc.)

1.4.6, 1.4.7. - design on lacquer dish; inlay design on *bianhu* vessel, 5th-4th cent. B.C. ^&V 3-20. [/ 1-7/

Max Loehr published article in 1968, in *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America*, titled "The Fate of the Ornament in Chinese Art." Profound and true. These ornamental designs much more highly evolved, sophisticated, than any pictorial art of the time.

So, how did pictorial art begin in China? Earliest stirrings of it may have come from outside, from the nomadic cultures to the north and east of China: designs on so-called hunting-style bronzes. Won't stop to make argument for saying that, will just say it: not crucial to our subject.

1.4.8, 1.4.9. - Bronze design. Hunting hu. Vessel and detail of design. Images flat, repeated, probably made with some kind of stamp or stencil.

1.4.10, 1.4.11. - Jannings hu, + drawing of design. 3000 Fig. 10, p. 21; T&V 3-24, p. 112. (Last Laugh)

Same kind of images as "hunting hu," with some additions, but now organized with horizontal lines that stand for a wall, the lower and upper floors of a building, or the ground on which the figures stand.

1.4.12, 1.4.13. Two close-up views of vessels with inlaid designs of this kind. (Discuss).

1.4.14. - Fragments of lacquered wood, late Zhou period, from region of Changsha, in SE China. Like outgrowth of images on hunting hu: (describe)

1.5. Earliest Paintings

1.5.1, 1.5.2. - Man and dragon, from Changsha. About 37 cm. high. From tomb near Changsha, Hunan Province; dates from end of Zhou dynasty, 3rd cent. B.C. Materials: silk; ink, some pigment (lost or hard to see). 3000 Fig. 12, p. 23. T&V 3-29, p. 113, Loehr Fig. 4, p. 11.

1.5.3. Detail, with 1.5.1 (whole, on silk).

Wu Hung, in 3000 Years p. 21, quotes mentions of painting and artists from Han-period writings. Mostly collaborative, artisan work. But also remarkable anecdote found in text ascribed to the Daoist philosopher Zhuangzi, late Zhou period. Ruler of Song state needs to have a painting done, calls his artists; they all come, bowing and scraping and showing off their skills. But one arrives late, takes off his outer clothes and sprawls comfortably outside, in no hurry to present himself. Aha, says the ruler, this is the true artist! and hires him to do the job. Remarkable story for so early a period. Idea of artist as exceptional being will continue to turn up in writings in later periods, as we'll see.

How can this non-conformist artist's painting have been different from that of the common artisans? Can't answer, except by looking at paintings of this time, and using them to suggest possibilities. Fortunately, we now have a few actual paintings from late Zhou, notably two: this one and another:

1.5.4.-Woman—shamaness? w. dragon and phoenix. 3000 Fig. 11, p. 22, Siren 1. Slightly smaller: about 31 cm. in height.

(Important to note here, early on, that the images I will use, made from slides mostly, but some from reproductions, will vary widely and wildly in color, lighting, fidelity to original. No help for that; not making any claims for accuracy of color or general look. Slide that transmitted real look of original painting would often be very hard to see as an image on the cinema screen. All serious students of Chinese painting should spend as much time as possible looking at originals, and not take slides or reproductions as visually truthful; they aren't. But they can reveal features of the paintings that are hard to see in the originals.)

Writer of 3000 Years text reproduces both these, then writes: "The two paintings share drawing techniques and a compositional formula: images are outlined in ink . . . The main difference between these works lies in the degree of artistry. The female figure appears as a silhouette; the outlines are rather coarse and uneven, apparently by an unassured hand." I can see how one might make that judgment, from a reproduction; but I would differ from it, judge the painting differently, and I'll take you closer into the painting to show you why. True, it's less firmly-defined and substantial image than that of the man riding the dragon, not drawn in same controlled fine line. But this can also be seen as a deliberate difference in style:

1.5.5. another of shamaness picture, beside detail, 1.5.6. - Slides, showing brushline but also brushstrokes of fluctuating thickness, as hand of artist applies more or less pressure.

- 1.5.7 beside 1.5.5, closer look at phoenix and dragon.

- 1.5.8 beside 1.5.5, detail of dragon. , Lines don't entirely enclose form; it isn't, that is, simply outlined.

- 1.5.9 beside 1.5.5, closer detail of phoenix. (comment.)

I began my old Skira *Chinese Painting* book by quoting from an early Chinese dictionary saying that "To paint is to draw boundaries," that is, draw linear outline to define the form, do some interior drawing. But:

(Show: not simply "outlined in ink" at all. Image is produced as a *structure or configuration of brushstrokes*. Important to note this—already a break with the basic means of simply drawing a line around the thing . .

Reading these brushstrokes, we're conscious of movements of hand holding brush that made them, and varying pressure on brush. Gives a certain *energy* to lines and strokes that make up the form. Long ago, I used the term "empathic kinesthesia" for this quality—that is, feeling empathically a movement someone else made. And a sensitive, controlled movement. That kind of response to the *execution* of paintings, in addition to or instead of the *imagery* of paintings, partly underlies great value Chinese put in *brushwork* in judging paintings. Loehr points out on first page of his book that what was sought in Chinese painting, from the beginning, was not some accuracy of representation, but a certain "aliveness"—centuries later, a Chinese theorist would use the term "qiyun sheng-dong" or "engender movement through spirit-resonance" as supreme quality to strive for in painting. Do we see it already here, when we look at this simple picture close-up and sympathetically?

So much for our first lesson. We've learned some important things about early Chinese painting, including a few you won't find in the books. And that's the purpose of these lectures, and there will be lots more of that kind of commentary to come. So . . .

Missing last words

Let #detail
occupy whole
screen
(cursor) showing
details I'm
talking about.

Back to
image of
whole
✓

1 c + c

AddImages.1

0.50 ff. Add images of Max Loehr: three of them.

4.09 ff. Shimada. Add in: Osvald Siren 2, highlighting figure at far right (Shimada)

6.30 ff. C. C. Wang. His two.

Add audio 1: Here is CCW at an exhib., wearing his Chinese scholar's jacket at a formal event; and (next) here he is with my wife Hsingyuan, at the same event, an exhibition opening.

10.40 ff. Alexander Soper: work in two images.

11:22. Osvald Siren. Remove "I don't have photographs of him here," add in two images.

Add audio 2: Here is Siren in his garden in China, and (change) here he is at a private viewing in Japan, with Shimada and others. This shows how we often used to view scroll paintings in Japan, on the floor.

18:30 ff. Somewhere after this, insert Q03, interior of storage space.

Add audio 3: Here is the storage area of the Palace Museum collection at that time, inside one of the storage bldgs outside Taichung, with the ptgs and other objects still in the crates in which they had been packed & shipped from Beijing years before. Another curator seated in FG, can't recall his name.

(When I'm talking abt Aschwin Lippe, zero in on him?)

24:40 ff. Sickman: work in two slides while I talk about him.

Add audio 4: Here is Laurence Sickman as a young art scholar outside a dealer's shop in Loyang, and (change image) here he is in his later years, as I knew him, as Director of the Nelson Gallery.

26.35 ff. Insert views of 1973 delegation tour, Q02 and Portal Wall.

Add audio 5: Here is the delegation visiting the Palace Museum in Beijing—Sherman Lee wearing a hat at left, Arthur Wright, Virginia Kane turned away—(change image) And here are Sickman, Sherman Lee, Tom Lawton and others entering for the first time the Hui-hua kuan or "Hall of

Ptgs" at the Palace Museum, where we would see major masterworks of painting. A very exciting moment.

27.18 ff. Highlight me (brown jacket, below) not person above. Also, highlight (to my left) Anne Clapp, Ellen Laing, as I talk abt them. (All wrongly highlighted now.)

33.00 after "formal viewing" add Q41.

Add audio 6: Another view, with Ellen in foreground. I must correct what I just said: we weren't being shown this great early scroll in the original but being presented formally with a facsimile of it by the Palace Museum's Director.

33.59 ff. Work in somewhere: Taichung 1963 Van_

Add audio 7: This is a photo of Ray Schwartz, second from left, Freer Gallery photographer who carried out the great photographic project in Taichung in 1963. Myself at far right, and others (out of many who came to watch) Father Harrie Vanderstappen (far left), Chu-tsing Li (2nd from right.)

35.00 ff. Insert again Loehr, Siren images when I mention them? Up to you.

49.40 ff. Hsia Kuei scroll. Add these extras as you think best: 4 details plus transition image (509873) between two sections. Make it visually more interesting, replace blurry close-ups at end w. good details.

58.00 ff. Neolithic pots. Insert 2 other images of Pan-p'o pots:

Add audio 8. Here (Q10) is another Pan-p'o bowl in which a clear image of a fish appears in place of the rectangle; and (Q12) here is pair of bowls showing interchange of recognizable fish & abstract design. Could go either way, image to design or design to image: morphology. (Hold off showing small vase until after these)

1.03 ff. Terracotta warriors: work in four additional images, as you think best, as I talk. Or fewer—up to you.

1.08.02 ff. Insert three images of bronze rhinoceroses, as I speak:

Add audio 9. And here is a bronze vessel, also from the late Chou or Ch'in period, in the shape of a rhinoceros, very realistic. I put it on as another

example of how sculpture can develop realistic styles far earlier than painting can.

1.13.22 ff. “Up above”—cursor moves too far up—should go to *upper storey* of 2-storey building.

1.14.32 ff. Sets of bells, sounding stones: work in real (or reconstructed) sets: Marquis Yi Bells, then Q15.

Add audio 10: (after “Lothar von Falkenhausen” paragraph): And here are an actual set of bells, archaeologically recovered in a great tomb find from the late Chou; and here (change) a set of sounding stones, suspended on a reconstructed stand.

1.14.53 ff. Drum: insert real drum-stand (“Fantastic Bird”) and drum, side by side

Add audio 11: And here we see a real drum-stand, from a late Chou tomb, and a reconstructed drum.

Near end of lecture: enlarge detail of phoenix to fill whole screen?

I thank-yous

Lecture 1 end: thank-yous to ...

Before this ^{first} lecture closes, I want to deliver some heartfelt thanks, which will serve for the whole series. Most of all, to my collaborator Rand Chatterjee of Chatterbox Films, who is listed in the titles as producer, but who has been producer, director, technical advisor—doing virtually everything for these recorded lectures apart from me talking. He took my original conception, a simple filming of old slide-lectures, and through his ^{remarkable} ~~extraordinary~~ technical knowledge and experience turned them into a new form, making them immeasurably better than anything I conceived of.

The President of the Tang Research Foundation, who modestly does ^{not} want to be named, urged me at a lunch here in Vancouver ^{two} ~~several~~ years ago to undertake this series, and promised to provide the basic original funding for it through his personal foundation, as he has done. He deserves a lot of the credit for its very existence..

Jan Ecklund, long ago my student, who has headed the Visual Resources Section (commonly called the slide room) of my old History of Art Department at U.C. Berkeley, responded with knowledge and enthusiasm to my need for hundreds of digital images made from our slide collection; and Samantha Zhu, who is curator of Asian art materials there, has spent a great deal of her time and expertise on this project, much of it in unpaid after-hours work, done simply because she believed in the

value of what we are doing. She, too, deserves a lot of the credit for whatever success the series will have.

I want to thank my many teachers and colleagues, and the many museums, universities, and other institutions that have supported me over the decades of my career. {In particular, I owe a big debt of gratitude to our sponsoring organization, the Institute of East Asian Studies at the University of California in Berkeley, especially to the two people in charge of (respectively) program coordination, Caverlee Cary, and publications, Katherine or Kate Chouta, along with the present Director of the Institute, my old friend and colleague Yeh Wen-hsin. They took on this large, time-consuming project as one to which they were personally committed, and have worked tirelessly to bring it to the present point in which we can present it, free of charge, to the world at large, as part of their educational goal of promoting and disseminating scholarship on East Asia. It is only with the constant and untiring support of these people that I can present to you the fruits of this, my major late-life project. Thank you, all of you.

For this project