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Abstract

This dissertation addresses modern Chinese ink painters’ use of seventeenth-century *yimin* art as a philosophical, aesthetic, and political vehicle for synchronizing the fundamental values of Chinese art with the modern world during the first half of the twentieth century. In this case, the polemical term “*yimin*” designates “leftover subjects” or loyalists to a previous fallen dynasty. “Ming *yimin* art” refers to the ink paintings done by a group of seventeenth-century individualist masters—among whom the most famous is Shitao (1642-1707)—whose paintings often appear expressive or abstract from a modern perspective. The rediscovery of this individualist art in a modern context was carried out almost simultaneously in China and Japan, and later spread to Europe and America. Employing a body of still understudied materials from art journals, museum archives, and artists’ writings to paintings, my study challenges the common misconception that early twentieth-century Chinese ink painters were conservative and their paintings outdated. I argue modern ink painters re-appropriated and canonized seventeenth-century individualist painting with a dual purpose not only to legitimize and prioritize the value of traditional ink aesthetics within an international art scene, but also to create an ink painting suitable to a new forward-looking Chinese culture.
The rediscovery and reformulation of Ming yimin painting by twentieth-century intellectuals can best be understood as a process of temporal and spatial “alignment” or “synchronization” as modern ink painters sought to situate themselves both within China’s historical continuum and within an international scene increasingly aware of cross-cultural comparison and market competition. This bipartite act of synchronizing the past and present, the traditional/Chinese and modern/Western, enabled early Qing individualist painting to be reinterpreted as an art of modern value and transformed into something new by both Chinese and Western standards. The simultaneous impulses to historicize and renew are both responses to the exigencies of Chinese modernity. Well-exposed to the notions of Social-Darwinism and constantly reminded of the undeniable success of Western powers, early twentieth-century Chinese painters strategized to find an artistic heritage in China’s past that could be compared, no matter how vaguely, to certain aspects of modern Western art. Concurrent with, and partially inspired by, contemporaneous Japanese interest in seventeenth-century individualist art, many late Qing and Republican ink artists readopted and reevaluated yimin painting in order to transform their medium into an art they considered distinctively modern. Their promotion of yimin art and theory as parallel to contemporary European art was aided by the modern means of printing and publishing. Reflecting the drastically changing ideological concerns of Chinese intellectuals in the first half of the twentieth century, the appropriation of yimin art and the reinvigoration of ink traditions were carried out in a variety of fashions by different generations of historians and painters.
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Introduction

In June 1932, *Yilin yuekan* (Art circle monthly), official journal to the China Painting Research Association (Zhongguo huaxue yanjiuhui 中國畫學研究會), included in its 30th issue the reproduction of a painting after Shitao 石濤 (1642-1707), entitled *A Recent Work Imitating Shitao* (*Jinren ni Shitao 近人擬石濤*) (fig. 1). The editorial note reads: “The brush, ink, and style attain both form and spirit, and the painting could pass off as genuine. Who may have done this except for our Zhang Daqian 張大千 (1899-1983), but would he ever admit to it?” Just one month earlier, Lake Society (Hushe 湖社), a spin-off and rival of the China Painting Research Association, carried in its May issue of *Hushe yuekan* (Lake Society monthly) an anecdote of Shitao counterfeits. According to contemporary gossip, a certain “leftover elder” (*yilao 遺老*) paid a painter 50 yuan to forge a Shitao, which he then sold through a curio shop for 1,000 yuan. When the buyer, who soon had the painting appraised and confirmed as a forgery, returned it to the shop, the dealer sought reimbursement from its original seller.

---

The leftover elder, however, flatly denied that the transaction had occurred. To his dismay, the shop owner had to refund the buyer and shelve the fake Shitao.²

These two entries contain multiple layers of information that raise even more questions. First, they reveal that not only were Shitao’s paintings popular and pricy in the early 1930s, but many were counterfeited—some even by the famous forger Zhang Daqian. Something about Shitao must have struck a chord with leftover elders. Given the overall ambiguous tone of the second story, there was no need for the narrator to specify the seller as a remnant elder. But Shitao’s identity as a remnant subject, or loyalist, of the Ming dynasty (1368-1644) must have been so significant that the narrator felt obliged to identify the painting’s patron as a remnant elder as well, even though the latter was a leftover subject to the very Qing dynasty (1644-1911) that had replaced the Ming. Why did Shitao’s experience as a remnant subject resonate with intellectuals of the Republican era (1912-1945)? How did his life and art become so popular in the first half of the twentieth century? Why did Zhang Daqian, along with many of his contemporaries, worship and promote Shitao and his painting? What did modern artists perceive in Shitao, and how did this overwhelming trend impact the modernization of Chinese ink painting during the critical phase of Westernization?

The answers lie in how modern Chinese ink painters appropriated seventeenth-century individualist art as a philosophical, aesthetic, and political vehicle for synchronizing the fundamental values of Chinese art with the modern world during the first half of the twentieth century. The individualists here refer to a group of seventeenth-

² “Huajie suowen” 畫界詳聞 (News from the painting circle), Hushe yuekan 湖社月刊 (Lake Society monthly) 54 (1932): 16.
century non-orthodox painters, sometimes called yimin, or loyalists, whose lives spanned the transition from the late Ming to the early Qing. The most famous among these are Shitao, Bada Shanren 八大山人 (1625-1705), Kuncan 髮殘 (1612-1674), and Hongren 弘仁 (1610-1663), often grouped together as the “Four Monks.” The Chinese term “yimin,” frequently translated as “leftover subject” or “remnant subject,” broadly defines Chinese people who live through a dynastic replacement. In a narrower sense, however, yimin refers to those who express their loyalty to the previous regime by committing suicide, fighting against the new establishment, or retreating from society as to avoid serving the new government. Yilao, or remnant elder, is a synonym of yimin. Although technically speaking, yimin and yilao existed after each dynastic change, our current focus is on seventeenth-century yimin, remaining loyalists of the Ming dynasty.

The history of the seventeenth century, a century of “global crisis,” appealed to twentieth-century intellectuals because it served as a historic mirror reflecting the changes and calamities of modern times. In China, the crises of the seventeenth century reached their climax on April 25, 1644, when the last Ming emperor Zhu Youjian 朱由檢

---


4 為留遺之民也. 今稱易代不仕新朝者為遺民. Ci yuan 辭源 (The encyclopedic dictionary) (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1915), you 酉, 214.

5 It means the subject of the bygone emperor or dynasty. 一謂先帝舊臣也, 二謂勝朝之舊臣也. Ibid., you 酉, 216.

(1611-1644), posthumously named Chongzhen 崇禎 (reign 1627-1644), hanged himself on Jingshan, the artificial hill behind the Forbidden City. The prelude to the tragedy, however, began much earlier; while corrupt eunuch chiefs gained power at the court, peasant armies suffering famine and heavy taxes headed riots, and the Jurchens, a Tungusic people who were to call themselves Manchus after establishing the Qing, consistently attacked the northern borders. The Manchu takeover was brutal. Ming loyalists resisted doggedly, resulting in bloody suppressions by the Qing government, who did not unify and pacify most of China until the end of the century.\(^7\) The intertwining of artistic innovation and social change during the seventeenth century has long interested historians of Chinese painting, starting with Victoria Contag who singled out Chinese masters of the 1600s.\(^8\) More recent art historians have reexamined the period


from different angles: James Cahill discussed representational interests and formalistic distortions,⁹ Michael Hearn traced the discordant voices of loyalist painters,¹⁰ Peter Sturman revealed art as a means of reclusion and passive resistance,¹¹ and Katherine Burnett investigated the issue of conceptual originality in art criticism.¹²

In this context, yimin or loyalist art designates a variety of seventeenth-century painting styles considered non-conformist or individualist in contrast to the orthodox “Four Wang” school of the early Qing. Equally as important as their political connotations, ink paintings by individualist masters carry styles that often appear expressive or abstract to the modern viewer. The reintroduction of seventeenth-century individualist art into a modern context occurred almost simultaneously in China and Japan, but the emphasis on its political connotation, namely the loyalty of Ming yimin, was by and large a Chinese phenomenon. It is, therefore, important to clarify that the

---


¹⁰ Maxwell K. Hearn and Metropolitan Museum of Art, Department of Communications, The Art of Dissent in 17th-Century China: Masterpieces of Ming Loyalist Art from the Chih Lo Lou Collection (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2011). The catalogue was prepared for an exhibition of the same title, September 7, 2011–January 2, 2012, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. The same collection is also recorded in He Yaoguang 何耀光 and Chinese University of Hong Kong Art Gallery, Chih-lo lou ts'ang Ming i-min shu hua 至樂樓藏明遺民書畫 (Painting and calligraphy by Ming i-min from the Chih-lo Lou collection) (Exhibition, September 1975) (Hong Kong: Art Gallery, Institute of Chinese Studies, Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1975).


interchangeability of “Ming yimin painting” and “seventeenth-century individualist art,” or the preference of the former term over the latter, only applies to the Chinese context. This paper challenges the common misconception that Chinese ink painters during China’s transition from empire to republican nation-state were conservative and their paintings outdated. Instead, I argue modern ink painters re-appropriated and canonized seventeenth-century individualist painting with a dual purpose not only to legitimize and prioritize the value of traditional ink aesthetics within an international art scene, but also to create an ink painting suitable to a new forward-looking Chinese culture.

The rediscovery and reformulation of seventeenth-century individualist painting by twentieth-century intellectuals can best be understood as a process of temporal and spatial “alignment” or “synchronization” as modern ink painters sought to situate themselves both within China’s historical continuum and within an international scene increasingly aware of cross-cultural comparison and market competition. This bipartite act of synchronizing the past and present, the traditional/Chinese and modern/Western, enabled early Qing individualist painting to be reinterpreted as an art of modern value and transformed into something new by both Chinese and Western standards. The simultaneous impulses to historicize and update along with the current are both responses to the exigencies of Chinese modernity. Well-exposed to the notions of Social-Darwinism and constantly reminded of the undeniable success of Western powers, early twentieth-century Chinese painters strategized to find an artistic heritage in China’s past that could be compared, no matter how vaguely, to certain aspects of modern Western art. Concurrent with, and partially inspired by, contemporaneous Japanese interest in seventeenth-century non-conformist art, many late Qing and Republican ink artists
readopted and reevaluated Ming \textit{yimin} painting in order to transform their medium into an art they considered distinctively modern. Their promotion of \textit{yimin} art and theory as parallel to contemporary European art was aided by the modern means of printing and publishing. Reflecting the drastically changing ideological concerns of Chinese intellectuals in the first half of the twentieth century, the appropriation of \textit{yimin} art and the reinvigoration of ink traditions were carried out in a variety of fashions by different generations of historians and painters.

The two major lines of inquiry underlying this study, therefore, are to trace how individualist painting was historicized in China and Japan, and how it was modernized in China. The Chinese modernization of the \textit{yimin} art tradition was achieved both through the revision of stylistic features in contemporary painting practices and through theoretical debates defending the modern qualities already inherent to seventeenth-century loyalist styles. Moreover, modern canon formation of this individualist tradition in both China and Japan had to cater to multiple needs ranging from cultural and commercial promotions of nation building on the one hand to domestic and international political struggles on the other.

In order to arrive at meaningful conclusions, I have devised four chapters, each addressing a critical facet of the issues at hand. Chapter One provides a historiographical examination of Republican constructions of concepts such as the “Four Monks” and “\textit{yimin} painting” in order to canonize the late Ming and early Qing individualists. Next, the early twentieth-century popularizing and commoditizing of loyalist art through collotype publications are traced in the context of print culture. The third chapter investigates the rediscovery of \textit{yimin} art, especially that of Shitao, as reflected in Chinese
painters’ writings and works of art. Last but not least, the Japanese interest in seventeenth-century Chinese individualist painting is scrutinized for its originality and divergent intentions.

**History**

The fall of the Qing dynasty and the founding of the Republic in 1912 induced mixed feelings among educated Chinese. While some diehard loyalists of the Manchu court committed suicide or fled the country, others mourned for the loss of their fatherly monarch and the entire feudal system. Although the Manchus had solidified the Central Kingdom by expanding its territories and sustaining the Confucian institution, many Han Chinese were relieved that the Mandate of Heaven (*tianming* 天命) had at last showed its disfavor of the dubious sovereignty. Others, still, worried about the future of China as a cultural entity or independent nation-state. The pressure of modernization loomed over the nation. More urgently, foreign invasions had arrived at China’s doorstep. It was in this period that modern Chinese artists and historians returned to the seventeenth century, and especially the Ming loyalists, for cultural, ideological and aesthetic motivations.

The seventeenth century, along with other historic epochs of turmoil, was of particular interest to early twentieth-century Chinese who believed in the value of history while faced with changes both similar to and different from those of the past. For many, the first half of the twentieth century would be a dreadful time to be in China. Disaster
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13 For a study of the Qing yimin group, see Lin Zhihong 林志宏, *Minguo nai diguo ye: zhengzhi wenhua zhuansheng xia de Qing yimin* 民國乃敵國也: 政治文化轉型下的清遺民 (The Republic of China is the enemy: the Qing loyalists and the changes in Chinese political culture) (Taipei: Lianjing, 2009).
struck after disaster: treaty ports occupied by Western Powers had been a sign of semi-colonialism since the mid-nineteenth century, the Manchu Qing dynasty collapsed in 1912, the warlords’ seesawing warfare continued throughout the 1920s in spite of the Nationalist government, the Second Sino-Japanese War erupted between 1937 and 1945, and the Domestic War between the Communist and Nationalist parties lasted for another half decade thereafter. But it wasn’t all destruction. There was strong hope for the new and the progressive. While the May Fourth New Culture Movement of 1915 to 1921 assured Chinese citizens that they were in a modern time that had ruptured completely from the past, Western models of democracy and science provided great hope for the nation’s future.\(^\text{14}\)

Historians were burdened with the task of reinterpreting China’s past in order to legitimatize the Republic as a modern, independent state with a distinctive tradition. At the very beginning of the 1900s, Liang Qichao 梁啓超 (1873-1929) criticized traditional approaches to history and, following his Meiji-Japanese model Fukuzawa Yukichi 福澤諭吉 (1834-1901), proposed the idea of “New History Studies” (xin shixue 新史學) and the writing of “specialized histories” (zhuanmen shi 專門史).\(^\text{15}\) Liang and the younger generation of the New Culture Movement believed wholeheartedly in the potential of New History Studies to strengthen nation-building and solve the urgent needs of the
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unsettled society. Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 (1893-1980) utilized folklore to probe and challenge the orthodox history written in accordance with Confucian standards. His exploration of alternative traditions was echoed by art historians of the time who defied the supremacy of the Southern School of Painting first theorized by Dong Qichang 董其昌 (1555-1640) in the 16th century and then codified through the orthodox school of the “Four Wangs” in the early Qing.

In this case, yimin painting, represented by the works of the “Four Monks,” was upheld as the heroic antithesis to the orthodox school of the “Four Wangs,” and thus the challenger to the established tradition of Chinese painting. The “Four Monks” and “yimin/individualist painters” as historical concepts were constructed much later than the canonization of the early Qing orthodox masters. The most notable painters of the Qing orthodox school are the “Four Wangs,” namely Wang Shimin 王時敏 (1592-1680),
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Wang Jian 王鑑 (1598-1677), Wang Hui 王翚 (1632-1717), and Wang Yuanqi 王原祁 (1642-1715), as well as Wu Li 吳歷 (1632-1718) and Yun Shouping 惽壽平 (1633-1690). Ju-hsi Chou observed that the formulation of the individualists as the “opponents” of orthodox artists was well established in the 1930s and 1940s, and the advocacy for seventeenth-century individualists and eighteenth-century Yangzhou Eccentrics has been prevalent since then.20 According to Chou, the oversimplified duality of orthodoxy and individualism has roots in both East Asian and Western studies of Chinese painting, two trajectories that eventually converge. Western scholarship on the subject originated in the 1950s and 1960s, when the allure of Abstract Expressionism urged even historians to revere individualism and innovation above any conventional values.21 English-language studies on the rebels and renegades of Chinese painters and calligraphers such as Chen Hongshou 陳洪綬 (1599-1652), Cui Zizhong 崔子忠 (died 1644), Fu Shan 傅山 (1607-1684), Gong Xian 龔賢 (1618-1689), Hongren, Bada Shanren, and Shitao have since flourished.22


21 Ibid., 36.

Chinese interest in late Ming and early Qing individualists was driven not only by an appreciation of the painters’ artistic vision, but also by cultural and political incentives. Chou identifies the modern interest as linked to a yearning for revolution and a pursuit of fundamental changes to the established tradition. To Republican intellectuals, the “Four Hans” and their orthodox followers, no matter how inspired and gifted, became associated with the deposed monarchy of the Manchu Qing and thus something that needed to be changed or overturned. Chou argues convincingly that the Qing orthodox movement was not as hackneyed as described by twentieth-century historians, but rather gradually progressive. On the other hand, Chou considers the equation of individualist and yimin as problematic, but unfortunately does not go into detail. The first chapter of my dissertation solves this missing piece of the puzzle. Indeed, although the focus of the chapter is the comprehension of yimin art by Republican rather than


23 Chou, “In Defense of Qing Orthodox,” 36.

24 Ibid., 36-40.
contemporary historians, it is inevitably an effort to demystify the canonicity of *yimin* painting and the “Four Monks” through tracing how seventeenth-century individualists were historicized and their label of loyalism highlighted for the first time in the early twentieth century.

The modern discipline of art history in China started around the 1920s on the grounds of traditional biographic records and newly appropriated Japanese texts,\(^25\) both of which occasionally recognized but did not categorize seventeenth-century individualist painters. From the turn of the century to the 1930s, The label of “Four Monks” was consolidated through a procession of histories on Chinese painting written by Ye Dehui 葉德輝 (1864-1927), Huang Binhong 黃賓虹 (1865-1955), Zheng Chang 鄭昶 (1894-1952), and Pan Tianshou 潘天壽 (1897-1971). It was also adopted by Ōmura Seigai 大村西崖 (1868-1927) in the mid-1920s, but did not gain currency in Japan. Two editions of Pan Tianshou’s *Zhongguo huihuashi* 中國繪畫史 (History of Chinese painting) were published a decade apart in 1926 and 1936. While the former copied Japanese scholarship and held no mention of the “Four Monks,” the latter was heavily rewritten and embraced the term. The revision demonstrates Pan’s commitment to original research and exposes the way in which Western archetypes filtered into China through Japan and were reworked for the purpose of Chinese scholarship. The designation of the “Four Monks,” a term that draws attention to each member’s tri-fold identity as loyalist, Buddhist, and painter, became a competitor of equal value to the orthodox school in Pan’s 1936

modification, when Sino-Japanese conflicts of the 1930s and 1940s redirected Chinese intellectual energy to focus on patriotism. Many of Pan’s peers, including Yu Shaosong 余紹宋 (1885-1949), Yu Jianhua 俞劍華 (1895-1979) and Fu Boashi 傅抱石 (1904-1965), further laid emphasis on the nationalism of Ming yimin artists and provided a more lucid explanation of yimin painting.

At this juncture, I want to qualify the term “nationalism” as it emerges regularly throughout the paper. The discourse on yimin history is fundamentally a defense of Han elite culture, and can be deemed nationalistic only with a cautious awareness of its emphasis on cultural values rather than physical territories. In particular, I would like to revisit Joseph Levenson’s dichotomy of “culturalism” and “nationalism” in defining the mentality of modern Chinese intellectuals. According to Levenson, culturalism—stressing the importance of elite Chinese culture and Confucianism but not necessarily the identity of a nation-state in a modern sense—was substituted by nationalism in favor of the Social-Darwinist idea of evolution, especially by Liang Qichao.26 This dichotomy, while useful in tracing the basic elements of intellectual development, oversimplifies the mentality of modern Chinese intellectuals, many of whom were interested in both cultural preservation and nation-building. I consider the pair not mutually exclusive, but even sharing some common ground; each inherited traits from the other, and both relate to intellectual modes of thinking in modern China. As anxiety about China’s future deepened with the increasing transparency of Japan’s expansionist ambition in the 1930s,

26 Levenson, Liang Ch’i-ch’ao and the Mind of Modern China, 109-22.
however, contemporary discourses came to favor a more standard nationalism that
stressed the unification of multiple ethnic groups within set geopolitical boundaries.

**Collotype**

Chapter Two turns away from textual sources and focuses on the visual and
commercial aspects of print culture in its dissemination of traditional ink painting,
particularly individualist painting. The canonization of *yimin* art (along with all the arts
of China’s past) through photography-quality collotype reproduction is worth a separate
discussion because the process offers a unique lens to observe the modern institution of
publishing and the management of traditional art in general. While invested particularly
in examining individualist painting through pictorial materials, the chapter also addresses
the broader issue of solving art historical problems such as visuality, canon formation,
and the popularization of painting, all via the perspective of print culture.

Studying the origin, development, and effect of collotype publications of
traditional art in early twentieth-century China is crucial to understanding the
modernization process of Chinese print and publishing culture, and to rescuing this
history from Eurocentric narratives of linear progress and dominant Western influence.27

By tracing the formation of Chinese print capitalism in the late nineteenth and the early

twentieth century, Christopher Reed offered a panoramic view of the mechanized, commercialized, and ultimately capitalized Chinese print world centered in Shanghai. Rather than treating the process as a belated version or derivative of European print capitalism, Reed argues that Chinese print pioneers in Shanghai, propelled by traditional aesthetics and social values, only imported technologies to realize China’s own modern printing, a development which altered the trajectory of China’s cultural evolution. Similarly faced with the opportunities offered by Western technology and printing legacies of China’s past, fine art publishers in early twentieth-century China had to make choices. Their decisions and productions would greatly impact contemporaneous readers and set the norm for later publications. In describing Shanghai lithographers who served as intermediaries between the past and the future, Reed used the term “Janus-faced” to vivify their effort of reconciling cultural and technological discrepancies. I suggest the expression applies to publishers and editors of collotype periodicals as well, and contrast their intellectual project of preserving and promoting traditional art against the outcome of increased appreciation and commercialization of Chinese art in the modern world.

The study of modern Chinese print culture, as it has become a fresh subfield of history and literature, benefits art historical research. Literary experts probe the cultural and economic traits and effects of literature by uncovering their publication venues and
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circulation. Publishing is not only an industry of technological and commercial development, however, but also a channel of spreading knowledge and forming a new sociopolitical atmosphere. In art history, the focus of scholarship on art-related publications in Republican China is regularly placed on vanguard designs, calendar posters, and commercial art and culture that were envisioned as “modern” or Westernized in the New Culture sense. Little research has been conducted on the huge body of journals that reproduced the “old” traditional art and cultural objects, including curios and antiques of different media, archaeological findings, and works of painting and calligraphy. It was not until recently that art historians began to examine Chinese
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31 For studies on the famous Commercial Press, see Jean-Pierre Drège, La Commercial Press de Shanghai, 1897-1949 (Paris: Collège de France, 1978); Reed, Gutenberg in Shanghai, 203-279.


collotype magazines of the early twentieth century and compare them to technological and editorial models in Japan.  

Among early twentieth-century periodicals pertaining to traditional art, two collotype journals are of particular interest: *Shenzhou guoguang ji* 神州國光集 (National glories of Cathay) and *Zhongguo minghua* 中國名畫 (Famous Chinese paintings), both started in Shanghai in 1908. These far preceded latecomers such as *Hushe yuekan* 湖社月刊 (Lake Society monthly, 1927-1936) and *Yilin xunkan* 藝林旬刊 (Art circle ten-day, 1928-1929) in Beijing. With the goal of preserving Chinese heritage, *Shenzhou* intentionally blurred the boundaries between fine arts (*meishu*), antiquities (*guwu* 古物) and cultural relics (*wenwu* 文物), designating them all as national treasures (*guobao* 國寶). Providing photo-generated images of various national treasures for the first time, *Shenzhou* established two major canons: *jinshi* 金石 (literally “metal and stone;” including bronze, oracle bones, and stele), and *shuhua* 書畫 (calligraphy and painting).

With a narrower focus on painting, *Zhongguo Minghua* became a platform showcasing both imperial and private collections. The publisher Di Baoxian 狄葆賢
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35 *Yilin* was changed to a monthly, renamed *Yilin yuekan* 藝林月刊 (Art circle monthly) in January 1930, and terminated in 1942.


37 A new category, *zaoxiang* 造像, was later added to separate sculpture from *jinshi*. Ibid., 295-96.
(1873-1941?) included private patrimonies from his and other collectors’ households in order to suggest alternative canons of painting functioning outside of those established by the Qing court. The amassing of painting ordered during the Qianlong reign (1735-1796) did not achieve full canonical synthesis, but for the most part favored three types: literati painting in the orthodox mode, Buddhist painting of Tibetan Lamaist sensibilities, and the Sino-European style court painting championed by Giuseppe Castiglione (Lang Shining 郎世寧 in Chinese; 1688-1766). Both Zhongguo minghua and Shenzhou are highly significant as early art periodicals that may have served as models for later canon formations realized through public exhibition and mass publishing in the late 1920s and thereafter.

Individualist painting was undoubtedly a competing alternative to the old canons, and the second chapter concentrates on the reproduction of individualist and other forms of traditional painting in collotype publications of the first half of the twentieth century, particularly in Shenzhou. The significance of publishing and publicizing traditional painting is to be considered in both technological and economical terms. Specifically, I will discuss the roles of traditionalist editors in popularizing, canonizing, and commoditizing ink painting from an internationalized standpoint. Surviving materials reveal a strong trend toward popularizing and canonizing individualist painting in the first
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39 Ibid., 272. For a study of Castiglione’s life and art, see Cécile Beurdeley and Michel Beurdeley, Giuseppe Castiglione, a Jesuit Painter at the Court of the Chinese Emperors (Rutland: Charles E. Tuttle, 1971). Another major category in the Qing imperial collection was academic and court paintings from the Song and Ming dynasties.

five decades of the twentieth century. In the late Qing and early Republican period, seventeenth-century yimin painting was an uncategorized tradition randomly ascribed to either the Ming or the Qing Dynasty, but by the mid-century it had become canonized and its reputation widespread. This shift was concretized in 1948, when Zheng Zhenduo 鄭振鐸 (1898-1958) edited a collotype series entitled *Yuwai suocang Zhongguo guhuaji* 域外所藏中國古畫集 (*Ancient Chinese paintings in overseas collections*), two volumes of which are dedicated to Ming yimin painting as separate from other Ming and Qing painting.

I argue that the craze for individualist painting did not come about incidentally; while ample publications and access to private and national collections were readily available to the public, exposing intellectuals to a greater range of artworks and schools of painting, the particular zeal for yimin painting reflected and facilitated the urgent need of preserving and reviving traditional art. In addition, these publications naturally point to the masterminds directing them, intellectuals such as Deng Shi 鄧實 (1877-1951) and Huang Binhong, co-editors of *Shenzhou*.⁴¹ Although the foremost intent of all art editors was to protect and promote traditional Chinese art, the inadvertent byproduct of their efforts was the commercialization of art treasures from the past, which eventually readied them for the international market where Japanese and Western collectors used the journals as trade catalogs.
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⁴¹ Huang’s editorial and artistic achievements are discussed in: Jason C. Kuo, *Transforming Traditions in Modern Chinese Painting: Huang Binhong’s Late Work* (New York: Peter Lang, 2004); Idem, *Innovation within Tradition: The Painting of Huang Binhong* (Williamstown: Williams College Museum of Art in association with Hanart Gallery Hong Kong, 1989); Claire Roberts, “The Dark Side of the Mountain: Huang Binhong (1865-1955) and Artistic Continuity in Twentieth Century China” (PhD diss., Australian National University, Canberra, 2005).
I interpret the cultural undertones of these collotype publications in order to show how Chinese painting was understood within the framework of culturalism before Chinese nationalism was fully fledged. The founders and editors of these periodicals, all literati versed in Confucian classics, expressed a mixed ideology blending a sense of crisis in Chinese culture, an enticement by Western powers collecting and studying Chinese art, an enthusiasm for commercialization and canonization, and a desire to situate Chinese art in open-ended dialogue within the global context. Nationalism can hardly summarize the ideological elements at work behind a cultural project like this, for nationalism relies heavily on a clear definition of the nation-state, an idea that was only still forming in early twentieth century China. Around 1910, China was a cultural entity with an uncertain and gloomy future, with no fixed borders, no centralized political administration, and also no clear enemies or “others” to help delineate its nation-state. Defining “China” remained a difficult task for the Nationalist government of the new Republic. In the meantime, traditionalists like Huang Binhong were dealing with problems from a more culturalist perspective. Shenzhou, for example, published few politically-charged articles that confronted either the Manchu rule or Western impositions. Its practice of canon formation, which embraced all forms of Chinese art, was moreover quite different from those carried out in 1930s and 1940s, when Chinese nationalism became better formulated and its sentiments heightened under the assault of the Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945). Zheng Zhenduo’s 1948 catalogue is meaningful not only in its clear labeling of Ming loyalist painting, but also in its pointed implication that some of the greatest paintings from China’s past were no longer home but in exile, recently smuggled or purchased into foreign collections.
The culturalist standpoint of late Qing and early Republican publishers framed collotype journals of traditional art as an open platform where the past and future converged. *Shenzhou*, the model for many Republican collotype publications on Chinese art, uncovered and recorded innumerable antiques and paintings in private collections that were later dispersed in domestic and overseas markets. Fine art editors like Huang Binhong utilized imported technologies and materials to commemorate relics of Chinese civilization. Thus “synchronizing” China’s art heritage with the present, they hoped Chinese traditions would gain new life through publicity, commoditization, and canonization. The collotype reproductions offered many possibilities for further studies on art by later artists and critics. One example is the publication of individualist paintings popular among private collectors. Articulated through the platform of periodicals, the idiosyncratic and expressive styles of *yimīn* painters enabled Republican intellectuals to argue that modernist components had already been expressed in traditional ink painting; Chinese art, therefore, was not inferior to its European counterparts, even under modern Western criteria.

**Art**

Although traditional painting as a subject of historical and cultural studies was already proven valuable in the early twentieth-century, the very legitimacy of art was challenged by the question of how artistic creation and aesthetics should fit the new
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Cai Yuanpei 蔡元培 (1868-1940), Minister of Education during the Beiyang warlord period (1912-1928) and President of the Academia Sinica of the Nanjing Government from 1928 on, defended and secured the position of art with his “Theory of Replacing Religion with Aesthetic Education” in the late 1910s. Devoting his entire life to the reform of education, Cai Yuanpei was the promoter and founder of aesthetic education in China. Having received his academic training in Germany, Cai emphasized the universal nature of the appreciation of beauty, a point derived from Kantian philosophy, and stressed that aesthetic education was morally ameliorative as it would eliminate corrupt elements and thereby help Chinese society transform into a better one.

By endowing aesthetics with this ethically transcendent quality, Cai secured a place for the creation and appreciation of art in the Republican era. With all the prestige of Cai’s position in educational affairs, his theory was rapidly spread by his cohort of artists and educators.

---


44 Cai gained his knowledge in philosophy during his study at University of Leipzig, between 1908 and 1911. William J. Duiker, Ts’ai Yuan-p’ei: Educator of Modern China (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1977), 47.

45 Julia F. Andrews and Kuiyi Shen, The Art of Modern China (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 31. Cai Yuanpei’s proposition of aesthetic education (美育 meiyu) was first brought forward in his 1912 speech, “Duiyu jiaoyu fangzhen zhi yijian 對於教育方針之意見 (My views on the aims of education), published repeatedly in various journals the same year; reprinted in Cai Yuanpei meixue wenxuan 蔡元培美学文选 (Selected writings on aesthetics by Cai Yuanpei), ed. Wenyi meixue congshu bianji weiyuanhui 文艺美学丛书编辑委员会 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1983), 1-7.
Now that art was indispensable, the problem facing many Chinese artists became the choice between the traditional and the Western. The New Culture modernizers took the stance of supporting Western artistic models. Until the late 1910s, the new curriculum of art education only contained courses on Western drawing, graphic design, and realist oil painting, all of which had pragmatic applications for the new society. Young artists ventured to Japan, Europe, and North America to study oil painting and came back, each upholding a certain art school ranging from French Academism to Post-Impressionism, from Cubism to Surrealism. It would be much easier for art historians today if that superficial triumph of Western forms were the whole story of Chinese painting in the early twentieth century. But it is not. Not only did many oil painters at some point in their careers return to practicing with ink and paper, but ink painters in their own fashion also constructed alternative modernities for Chinese art.

Late Qing and Republican traditionalist painters, like their lettered peers in literature and history, articulated their response to the exigencies of modernity either passively or actively. Current research on the alternative intellectual trends of the period has undermined the false accusation set forth by the New Culture Group that “conservatives” constrained their interest to the past alone, and has directed a more
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48 The retrospection started with Charlotte Furth, ed., The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976). This trend has become fashionable again in recent years in studies of modern Chinese literature. Some of the acclaimed monographs are: Perry Link, Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies: Popular Fiction in Early Twentieth-Century Chinese Cities (Berkeley: University of California Press,
sympathetic eye toward treatments of Chinese tradition in campaigns such as the National Essence Movement (1890s-1920s). Contrary to the worries of traditionalists and the wishes of radicals, traditional painting did not become extinct, but gained new life. Not only did ink painters preserve their conventional gatherings of creating and enjoying poetry and painting, but they also soon took advantage of modern devices like public education, exhibition venues, and new printing techniques to promote traditional art. Ink painting was added to the curriculum of modern schools in the late 1910s, and domestic
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50 In the late 1910s and 1920s, Chinese painting was attacked in a succession of writings by men in rather different positions, including Kang Youwei 康有為 (1858-1927), Chen Duxiu 陳獨秀 (1879-1942), Lü Cheng 吕澂 (1896-1989), and Xu Beihong 徐悲鸿 (1895-1953). Andrews and Shen, “Japanese Impact on the Republic Art World,” 10. Kang Youwei’s criticism of literati painting is uttered in his preface to the inventory of his painting collection, see Kang Youwei 康有為, Wanmu caotang canghuamu 萬木草堂藏畫目 (List of paintings collected at the Ten-Thousand-Wood Thatched-Hall) (Shanghai: Changxing shuju, 1918).


art exhibitions contained both oil and ink paintings. When it came to exhibiting Chinese art abroad, the selections were composed exclusively of ink painting by ancient and contemporary masters.

Even the notoriously elitist literati painting (wenrenhua 文人畫) was carried on with great enthusiasm by artists of different generations in Beijing, Shanghai, and Guangzhou. Some defended it on a theoretical level. Chen Shizeng 陳師曾 (1876-1923), for instance, issued a counterargument against wholesale Westernization in 1921, in which he points out that not pursuing formal likeness is precisely what made literati
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54 For Chinese painting exhibitions in Europe, see pertinent entries in Shanghai modern, 1919-1945, ed. Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker et al. (Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz, 2004); and Hui Guo, “Writing Chinese Art History in Early Twentieth-Century China” (PhD diss., Leiden University, 2010), 143-74. And for Sino-Japanese exhibitions of ink painting, see Aida Yuen Wong, Parting the Mists: Discovering Japan and the Rise of National-Style Painting in Modern China (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2006), 100-21.

painting progressive. By citing the advent of current painting schools in Europe like Futurism and Expressionism, Chen argues that contemporaneous Western trends were comparatively late in turning away from verisimilitude and had only just begun to cherish subjectivity. To Chen and his associates, literati modes of painting and calligraphy constituted a counterpart to, or even a forerunner of, European modernist notions of abstract, self-expressive art. This theory that the Western “modern” had long existed in Chinese history continued into discourses of constructing national painting (guohua 国畫) in the 1930s and so on.

Tracing how Republican painters appropriated Shitao’s life and art, the third chapter scrutinizes the Sino-centric method of finding or forging the Chinese counterpart of Western modernism from within its own history, and investigates this attitude’s role in modernizing the individualist tradition of ink aesthetics. Scholarly interest in the modern legacy of Shitao and other individualists is consistent, but scattered. Chu-tsing Li was the
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57 For a translation of the important excerpts from Chen’s texts, see Andrews and Shen, “Japanese Impact on the Republic Art World,” 11-12.

58 Wong, Parting the Mists, 74-76.
first to identify an interest in *yimìn* art as a distinctive trend within modern ink painting.\(^{59}\)

Aida Wong further confirmed that Shitao served as the icon of modernity in Republican artists’ search for national-style painting.\(^{60}\) Individualists like Shitao and Bada Shanren can be easily found in the indices of recent exhibition catalogues of modern ink painting.\(^{61}\) Modern Chinese painters’ re-adoptions of *yimìn* artistic styles and theory, especially those of Shitao and Bada, is an indispensable, yet sporadic, component in recent monographs on ink masters of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, such as Zhao Zhiqian 趙之謙 (1829-1884), Wu Changshi 吳昌碩 (1844-1927), He Tianjian 賀天健 (1891-1977), Wu Hufan 吳湖帆 (1894-1968), Pan Tianshou, and Fu Baoshi,\(^{62}\) as well as expatriates like Zhang Daqian and C. C. Wang 王己遷 (1907-2003).\(^{63}\)
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Shitao epitomizes the remnant subjects or yimin of the Ming-Qing dynastic transition. Scion of the Ming royal line, Shitao lost his family and status at an early age and was forced to live under the Manchu regime of the Qing. Frequently recalling his aristocratic origin and conveying his nostalgia for the past, Shitao identified himself with the remaining subjects of the Ming dynasty. The anachronism at the core of Shitao’s identity is sometimes used to explain his idiosyncratic behavior and art. His painting styles, often expressive and abstract, represent non-conformism in contrast to the orthodox “Four Wang” school of the early Qing. Shitao’s circumstances echoed the plight of Chinese painters in the early twentieth century who could be perceived as the residual literati guarding their rich and ponderous cultural legacy against aggressive Westernization. Shitao’s individualism, conveyed in his artistic and theoretical accomplishments, buttressed modern painters’ belief in the vigor and potential of Chinese ink painting. Shitao’s character is moreover so multi-faceted and puzzling that scholars today still struggle to understand his artistic personality and philosophical attainment. For instance, Shitao mysteriously changed his religious convictions from Buddhism to

---


64 For a novel discussion of Shitao’s life and art in his last decade in the context of early Chinese modernity, see Hay, *Shitao*.

Daoism as early as 1693.\textsuperscript{66} In spite of his claim to imitate none but nature, the artist’s personal styles were also suspiciously indebted to the local schools of Anhui and Nanjing.\textsuperscript{67} It is not hard to imagine how inspirational such a rich character like Shitao must have been to Republican artists who anxiously desired to transform tradition.

Chapter Three examines the various approaches of modern Chinese artists to studying Shitao through the lenses of connoisseurship, theoretical appropriation, and stylistic influence. I argue that Shitao’s artistic creativity and autonomy provided great inspiration and confidence to early twentieth-century Chinese artists who were anxious to justify the modernity of Chinese ink painting. Specifically, I will investigate the modern implications of Shitao’s art and philosophy as it filtered through the visions of He Tianjian, Zhang Daqian, Pan Tianshou, Liu Haisu 劉海粟 (1896-1994), and Fu Baoshi. Although similarly striving to revive Chinese painting, each painter represents a different pattern in which Shitao’s art and theory was absorbed and transformed in the early twentieth century. He Tianjian’s hermeneutic reading of Shitao’s *Huayulu* (Treatise on painting) imbued the individualist’s abstruse writing with modern vernacular legibility. Fu Baoshi promoted a nationalistic interpretation of Shitao and other loyalist painters, although his research on Shitao’s biography was driven by the desire to compete with Japanese scholarship on the same subject. To Liu Haisu and his peers who experimented with both ink and oil media, Shitao was a bridge that connected the incompatible artistic values of China and the West, allowing them to mix or not to mix

\textsuperscript{66} Hay, *Shitao*, 259.

the two systems in order to create the best of modern painting. To Zhang Daqian, Pan Tianshou, and contemporary artists whose work aimed at innovation within tradition, Shitao represented a power in Chinese tradition that was renewable and, in modern parlance, progressive. But this is not to say that the ink painters’ appreciation and appropriation of Shitao was unrelated to their awareness of Western modernism, whether they acknowledged it or not. Zhang Daqian’s vision problems caused by the cataract, exposure to Abstract Expressionism, and professional need to appeal to Western buyers contributed to his beautiful splashed ink and color painting, a metamorphosis of the ancient Chinese broken/splashed ink (pomo 破墨 or 潑墨) style that first caught Zhang’s attention through Shitao. Moreover, his forgeries of Shitao’s paintings resulted from and contributed to the popularization of the individualist master in the twentieth century. Consciously separating Chinese painting from the Western system, Pan Tianshou employed Shitao’s art and theory to solve the modern concerns of ink painting. The rediscovery of Shitao therefore allowed Chinese ink painters to internalize or localize the issues of modernizing traditional art while competing with their Western counterparts.

Japan

A recurring theme in the previous chapters is a Chinese motion to simultaneously appropriate and contest Japanese “influences” in art history, print culture and artistic practices from the late nineteenth into the early twentieth century. Because of geographic and linguistic affinity, Japan, a nation already one step ahead in the game of modernization and self-strengthening, became a model that China could build on, revise, and contend with. Following suit to recent scholarship, the first few chapters of this paper
tell the Chinese side of the story. But a comparative study of Sino-Japanese exchange is not complete without looking at the Japanese side as well. The fourth chapter ergo concentrates on Japanese discourses on individualist art of seventeenth-century China with particular focus on their treatment of Shitao. In juxtaposing Japanese scholarship with its Chinese counterpart, this paper demonstrates the subtle link between culture and politics in defining the relationship between the two nations that had so strong a historical tie yet were split so deeply by war.

If anything, Japan and China reconnected with great enthusiasm in the mid-nineteenth century. Even in previous centuries, during the long years when either or both governments banned foreign trade, sporadic contact was maintained through smuggling or sanctioned ports like Guangzhou (Canton) in China and Nagasaki in Japan. In the second half of the nineteenth century, Japanese painters working in literati styles (bunjinga 文人画) traveled to Shanghai to study the latest Chinese literati painting (wenrenhua 文人畫). Chinese painters and calligraphers similarly undertook long

---

68 The Chinese bans, called haijin 海禁 (literally “sea ban”), started in the late thirteenth century Yuan dynasty and lasted intermittently through the Ming and Qing, and ended with the Qing government being forced to open five coastal cities in 1842 after the First Opium War (1840-1842) against the British Empire. The Japanese practices were called sakoku 鎖国 (literally “locked country”) and were in place, also intermittently, from 1633 to 1854, when Commodore Perry of the U.S. Navy forced Japan to trade with the West.

sojourns to meet Japanese colleagues and patrons,\textsuperscript{70} as well as to collect rare Chinese
texts no longer extant in China.\textsuperscript{71} Both parties were pleased and impressed by the other’s
deep learning of the Chinese classics. Although the atmosphere of mutual respect
continued well into the twentieth century,\textsuperscript{72} the legitimacy of literati painting was
challenged in both countries. In Japan, the Meiji Restoration fostered a new interest in
Western-style oil and Japanese-style ink painting. \textit{Bunjinga}, however, was left out. In
China, the New Culture campaign also jeopardized the future of \textit{wenrenhua}. Attempts at
reviving literati painting took place in both countries around 1920, under the banner of
New Southern Painting (\textit{shin nanga} 新南画) in Japan,\textsuperscript{73} and in the forms of a continued

\textsuperscript{70} Chen Jie, “Travels to Japan by Chinese Painters and Calligraphers in the 1870s and 1880s,”

\textsuperscript{71} Shana Brown, “Modern Antiquarianism and Sino-Japanese Rivalry: Yang Shoujing in Meiji
Japan,” in Fogel, \textit{Role of Japan in Modern Chinese Art}, 69-83.

\textsuperscript{72} On the individual level, this respect is best expressed in the careers of Wang Yiting 王一亭
(1867-1938), Qian Shoutie 钱瘦鐵 (1897-1967), and Hashimoto Kansetsu 橋本関雪 (1883-
1945), to name a few. Friendship was also shown in the six Sino-Japanese painting exhibitions
held from 1921 to 1931. For Wang Yiting and his Japanese connection, see Walter B. Davis,
“Welcoming the Japanese Art World: Wang Yiting’s Social and Artistic Exchanges with
Japanese Sinophiles and Artists,” in Fogel, \textit{Role of Japan in Modern Chinese Art}, 84-112; and
idem, “Wang Yiting and the Art of Sino-Japanese Exchange” (PhD diss., Ohio State University,
Shoutie and the Literati World of Hashimoto Kansetsu,” in \textit{Turmoil, Representation and Trends},
271-82. For the exhibitions, see Wong, \textit{Parting the Mists}, 101-121.

\textsuperscript{73} Michiyo Morioka, “The Transformation of Japanese Literati Painting in the Twentieth
century,” in Berry and Morioka, \textit{Literati Modern}, 28-39; and Sakai Tetsurō 酒井哲朗, “Taishōki
ni okeru nanga no saihyōka ni tsuite—Shin nanga o megutte” 大正期における南画の再評価に
ついて—新南画をめぐって (On the reevaluation of southern painting in the Taisho period—
focusing on new southern painting), \textit{Miyagiken bijutsukan kinkyū kiyō 宮城県美術館研究紀要}
wenrenhua and a National Painting (guohua 国画) movement in China. The two threads converged in 1922 when Chen Shizeng and Ōmura Seigai joined their voices to defend literati painting. As Julia Andrews and Kuiyi Shen pointed out, each scholar had to defend literati painting from within his own distinctive tradition; while Seigai countered the Japanese academic legacy of Ernest Fenollosa (1853-1908) and Okakura Kakuzō 岡倉天心 (also known as Okakura Tenshin 岡倉天心; 1862-1913), Chen sought to legitimize ink painting by establishing its alliance with modernist oil painting.

In the first half of the twentieth century, relations between the two nations became even more entangled and tense. The surprising result of Japan winning the First Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895) fueled a Japanese sense of national pride and propelled Chinese to pay more attention and respect to its newly modernized neighbor. For the first time, China turned to Japan for scholastic models in researching art and history, and thanks to a bustling art market, Japan was brought completely up-to-date of Chinese

---

74 For the institutionalization of national painting or guohua, see Kuiyi Shen, “Concept to Context: The Theoretical Transformation of Ink Painting into China’s National Art in the 1920s and 1930s,” in Writing Modern Chinese Art: Historiographic Explorations, ed. Josh Yiu (Seattle: Seattle Art Museum, 2009), 44-52; and Wong, Parting the Mists, 35-53.

75 Ōmura Seigai’s “Wenrenhua zhi fuxing” 文人畫之復興 (The renaissance of literati painting), translated by Chen, and Chen’s own article, “Wenrenhua zhi jiazhi” 文人畫之價值 (The value of literati painting), were published together as a book in 1922, in Chen, Zhongguo wenrenhua zhi yanjiu, 1a-9b; 1a-32a (separate paginations).

luxurious artifacts, including tea ware, antiques, and contemporary works of art. Among the influx of old Chinese paintings brought to Japan by Chinese expatriates like Luo Zhenyu 羅振玉 (1866-1940) were literati paintings from the Yuan to the Qing dynasties, including many seventeenth-century individualist works. These were called the “new importations” (shin hakusai 新舶載), a term intended to contrast the pre-Meiji canon of Chinese painting based on age-old temple and aristocratic collections and composed mostly of religious and court paintings that weren’t even considered classical in China.

The update and expansion of canonical Chinese works in Japan launched a renewal of scholarship on Chinese art history by Naitō Konan 内藤湖南 (1866-1934) and a younger generation of scholars. The patterns set by this Japanese scholarship, especially in their structure of progressive history and their reading of Ming and Qing orthodoxy as a setback, were in turn borrowed by Chinese historians of the Republican period.

The implications of the same history, however, were quite different to each of the two parties.

---


78 A Qing loyalist, Luo Zhenyu stayed in Japan between 1911 and 1919 and sold a considerable number of antiques from the Qing imperial collection to fund the last emperor Puyi 溥儀 (1906-1967). For an evaluation of Luo’s role as a Qing loyalist in modern China, see the conference proceedings, Lost Generation: Luo Zhenyu, Qing Loyalists and the Formation of Modern Chinese Culture, ed. Yang Chia-Ling 杨佳玲 and Roderick Whitfield (London: Saffron, 2012).


Chapter Four traces the Japanese interest in individualist art, particularly that of Shitao, and exposes its similarities and differences from on-going Chinese discourse. The first half of the chapter investigates how Japanese scholars situated seventeenth-century individualist painters in Chinese and East Asian art history. My study finds that most Japanese were not attracted to the idea of *imin* (this term uses the same characters and pronunciation in Japanese as *yimin* in Chinese, but with a different transliteration) and so did not develop a specific discourse on *imin* art. Those Japanese artists and historians who did appreciate seventeenth-century individualist painting, however, were also the first to compare its styles to Western modernism and to consider individualist painting as an antidote to the decaying orthodox tradition. The cultural implication of the alternative canon, however, differed significantly between the two generations of Japanese scholars from the late-Meiji-and-Taisho to the Shōwa period, coinciding with Japan’s transition into a militarily-expansionist power in the late 1920s. Members of the elder generation like Naitō Konan and Ōmura Seigai, although differing in their approaches, believed in the potential and bright future of Chinese painting. In contrast, the younger generation, including Kinbara Seigo 金原省吾 (1888-1963) and others who conformed to Pan-Asian discourse, deemed late Chinese art history a continuous downward spiral and individualist painting the last flash of a dying tradition. The second half of this chapter conducts a case study of the Japanese craze for Shitao as reflected in the special issue dedicated to Shitao by the journal *Nanga Kanshō* 南画鑑賞 (*Southern painting connoisseurship*) and the “Six Masters of the Qing” exhibition held in Tokyo in 1935. By examining the many interpretations of Shitao propounded by early twentieth-
century Japanese holding various occupations and interests, I argue that Japanese enthusiasm for Shitao was related to the New Southern Painting movement.
Chapter 1
Historicizing the “Four Monks” and Ming Loyalist Painting

From “Two Stones” to “Four Monks”

Unlike the “Four Wangs,” early Qing individualists shared neither a common artistic vocabulary nor close personal connections. The concept of the “Four Monks,” namely Hongren, Kuncan, Bada Shanren, and Shitao, was not constructed until the nineteenth century, and only achieved widespread acceptance in the early twentieth century. The four painters were all remnant subjects of the Ming who had once been tonsured as monks. None of them, however, had ever met. Hongren and Kuncan may never have even heard of Shitao or Bada,¹ and Shitao and Bada corresponded but never met in person.² Nor did their contemporaries observe the similarities that allowed late Qing and Republican writers to group the four artists together. The late Qing painter Qin Zuyong 秦祖永 (1825-1884) might be the first in the two centuries after their deaths to link Shitao (literally “Stone Wave”) and Kuncan (or Shixi 石谿, literally “Stone Creek”)

¹ Wang Shiqing 汪世清, “Shitao sankao” 石濤散考 (Scattered records of Shitao), in Shitao yanjiu 石濤研究 (Studies of Shitao), vol. 56 of Duoyun 朵雲 (Art clouds), ed. Lu Fusheng 卢辅圣 et al. (Shanghai: Shanghai shuhua chubanshe, 2002), 23.

² Shitao and Bada are considered to be distant cousins because they were both offspring of the Ming royal clan. But they never met face to face and did not get in touch with each other until the very end of the 1900s. For details on the sporadic collaborated paintings between the two and an extant letter from Shitao to Bada, see Hay, Shitao, 126-31.
as the “Two Stones” (*ershi* 二石).³ He reasoned that Shitao and Kuncan handled the brush in the same way and were both unstained by overused conventions. He also noted that Shitao’s wildness contrasted Kuncan’s calmness and that both painters were unmatched by any of their followers.⁴

Hongren was the first to join the “Two Stones” and together form the “Three Monks,” a grouping first suggested by Huang Chongxing 黃崇惺 (1821-1908) and termed by Huang Binhong. In a poem commenting on a Hongren landscape, Huang Chongxing wrote: “Shitao used vitality (*qi* 氣) to make [painting] unrestrained. Kuncan forced the brush to create steepness. Hongren went after the method of the Yuan masters. Are today’s Buddhist monks so capable or not?”⁵ He emphasized the religious identity of the three, and was careful to praise their art by comparing them to other monk painters. Huang Chongxing’s poem was recorded in his *Caoxinlou duhuaji* 草心樓讀畫集 (Collected notes on studying painting at the Grass-Heart Hall), written between 1863 and 1864.⁶ Although Huang Chongxing was more than thirty years senior to Huang Binhong, he was theoretically still Binhong’s distant nephew according to the Chinese family

---

³ Qin Zuyong 秦祖永, *Tongyi lunhua* 桐陰論畫 (Discussing painting under the shade of the phoenix tree) (S.l.: s.n., 1864), 1: 9a.

⁴ Ibid., 8b-9a.

⁵ Huang Chongxing 黃崇惺, “Caoxinlou duhuaji” 草心樓讀畫集 (Collected notes on studying painting at the Grass-Heart Hall), in *Meishu congshu* 美術叢書 (A compendium of fine arts), ed. Huang Binhong 黃賓虹 and Deng Shi 鄧實 (Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 1947), 1: 99.

⁶ Xie Wei 謝巍, *Zhongguo huaxue zhuzuo kaolu* 中国画学著作考录 (Research notes on monographs of Chinese painting studies) (Shanghai: Shanghai shuhua chubanshe, 1998), 660.
hierarchy. Huang Chongxing frequently sent books that he had written and collected to his younger uncle, and Huang Binhong published *Caoxinlou duhuaji* in *Meishu congshu* (A compendium of fine art) in 1911.

Endorsing Huang Chongxing’s model of appending Hongren to Shitao and Kuncan, Huang Binhong named them the “Three High Monks” (*sangaoseng* 三高僧) in his 1925 *Guhua wei* 古畫微 (A glimpse of antique paintings). In 1926, he used the term again in an article that identified all painting schools of the past, published in the magazine *Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜志 (The Eastern miscellany). Huang wrote:

During the chaos of the end of the Ming, those virtuous among the gentlemen would often assume the role of Buddhist monks in anticipation of eschewing persecution. Among them, the most famous ones shall be called the “Three High Monks,” namely Hongren, Kuncan, and Shitao. Monk Hongren initiated the Anhui (Xin’an) School, Kuncan the Nanjing (Jinling), and Shitao the Yangzhou. They all practiced with the method of the Chan [Southern] School, and their styles spread both south and north of the Yangtze, and thus the three schools formed a tripod situation of competition.

---

7 Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, “Shetandu Huangshi xiande lu” 黃潭渡黃氏先德錄 (Records of the virtuous ancestors of the Huang clan from Shetandu), in *Huang Binhong wenji, zazhu bian* 黃賓虹文集 雜著編 (Collected writings of Huang Binhong, miscellany), ed. Zhengjiang sheng bowuguan 浙江省博物館 (Shanghai: Shanghai shuhua chubanshe, 1999), 459.

8 Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, *Guhua wei* 古畫微 (A glimpse of antique paintings) (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1925), 37.

9 明季之亂, 士大夫之高潔者, 恒多托跡缁流, 以期免害, 而其中工畫事者, 尤稱三高僧: 曰漸江, 曰石溪, 曰石濤, 其卓卓者. 釋漸江開新安一派, 釋石溪開金陵一派, 釋石濤開揚州一派; 畫禅宗法, 傳播江南北, 遂如鼎足而三. Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, “Jiangu minghua lunlue 4: Lidai huajia zhi paibie” 江南名畫論略·四·歷代畫家之派別 (Regarding the appreciation of famous old paintings 4, schools of dynastic painters), *Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜志 (The Eastern miscellany) 23, 4 (1926): 95.
Huang went on to disparage the followers of these painters for being as clichéd as those of the Wu School and of Dong Qichang (affiliated with the Yunjian or Songjiang School). Next, he hailed Bada Shanren as the founder of the Jiangxi School. Although Huang did not merge Bada with the category of the “Three Monks” directly, his narrative did acknowledge the role of all four painters in leading a new school of painting.

There was only one more name needed to fulfill the more popular designation of the “Four Monks.” It was Fang Yizhi 方以智 (1611-1671) rather than Bada Shanren, however, who was first added to the group. Ye Dehui adopted the term in Youyi zhiyan 游藝卮言 (Ramblings on art), written in the first decade of the 1900s or earlier:11

The leftover elders (yilao) of our Qing dynasty escaped [bad] reputation by resorting to painting, and the Four Monks (siseng 四僧) were the crowns. The rawness and spice of Kuncan, the magnificence and strangeness of Shitao, the antiquity and detailing of Yaodi (i.e. Monk Wuke 無可, Fang Yizhi from Tongcheng), and the blandness and transcendence of Hongren were by and large the spirit (qi 氣) that connected the two dynasties, and couldn’t be compared with those wearing mundane attires.12

To Ye, the “Four Monks” belonged to the larger yilao group whose works of literature and painting were as outstanding as those from the remote past. Ye continued:

10 Ibid.

11 The preface is dated October of the year of Xinhai 辛亥 (1911), the last year of the Qing dynasty.

12 國初遺老托畫逃名, 尤以四僧為冠。石溪之生辣, 石濤之雄奇, 碑地之古微 (即釋無可, 桐城方密之以智也), 潭江之淡逸, 大抵兩朝間氣之所接續, 不得以衣冠之士相比論。Ye Dehui 葉德輝, Youyi zhiyan 遊藝卮言 (Ramblings on art) (Xiangtan: Yeshi guangutang 湘潭葉氏觀古堂, 1911), 6a. The original woodblock version was prefaced in 1911, and added to the second compilation (dierji 第二集) of his Guangutang suozhushu 観古堂所著書 (Books authored by the Antiquity-Observing Hall) (Xiangtan: Yeshi guangutang 湘潭葉氏觀古堂, 1902-1911). The pagination of each book or volume starts anew on page 1.
“Though not recognized officially, they certainly were versed in classics, and of high morality and literary grace. Then there is no need to pursue [works of art from] the Tang and Song and earlier, since many of them are forgeries [literally a donkey disguised as the mythical creature qilin]!”

By 1917, Ye Dehui had replaced Fang Yizhi with Bada Shanren as one of the “Four Monks” in his work Guanhua baiyong 觀畫百詠 (Eulogies after viewing paintings). Wu Xueshan 吳雪杉 elaborated two reasons explaining Ye’s substitution: first, Bada was a direct member of the Ming royal family while Fang Yizhi was just a normal, albeit famous, loyalist; second, Bada’s achievement in painting was higher and his reception among later artists wider than Fang. It is clear that Ye chose the final four painters for their tripartite identities as painters, Buddhist monks, and remnant subjects. In Guanhua baiyong, he stressed the political connotation of the Four Monks even more highly: “[They] painted occasionally only to convey the sorrow of their heart, so they did not paint for perfection but nevertheless arrived at perfection. Take Kuncan, Hongren, Shitao, and Bada Shanren, for example, they either implied [in painting] their grief as yimin or mourned their banishment as members of the royal family.”

---

13 該書味盎然，亦必古致岳落，可以高山仰止，文采長存。又何必遠征諸唐宋以上，多收此麒麟麟榜哉。Ibid., 3a-3b.

14 It was prefaced in the year of Dingsi 丁巳 (1917).


16 偶然作畫，無非夷其心史之悲，其畫不必求工，而自無不工者。如殘道者石溪，漸江弘仁，大瀉子石濤，八大山人雪個，或以遺民寄其悲憫，或以宗室痛其流離。Ye Dehui 葉德輝,
The Revisions

Neither Huang Binhong nor Ye Dehui created a book on the history of Chinese painting in the modern sense, and younger art historians did not immediately adopt their models of the “Three Monks” or “Four Monks”. In 1926, Pan Tianshou published Zhongguo huihuashi 中國繪畫史 (History of Chinese painting). As Pan admitted in the 1925 preface, and as later art historians have revealed, the book was nearly a direct translation of the 1913 Japanese publication Shina kaigashi 支那繪畫史 (History of Chinese Painting) by Nakamura Fusetsu 中村不折 (1866-1943) and Oga (Kojika) Seiun 小鹿青雲. The structure of Pan’s book adhered to the Japanese model of dividing China’s past into the Early (shangshi 上世), Medieval (zhongshi 中世), and Early Modern (jinshi 近世) periods. Following in the suit of Shina kaigashi, Pan moreover began his narrative on Qing painting by highlighting the dominance of the Southern School. After listing the orthodox masters, he named the founder and followers of each regional school, with Hongren listed as the leader of the Anhui school. Pan then

Guanhua baiyong 觀畫百詠 (Eulogies after viewing paintings) (Nanyang: Yeshi guangutang 南陽葉氏觀古堂, 1917), guanhua si 觀畫四, 3b.

17 Pan stated in the preface that the book was based on Peiwenzhai shuhuapu 佩文齋書畫譜 (Peiwenzhai encyclopedia of calligraphy and painting) and the Nakamura Fusetsu text, and supplemented by references from Meishu congshu. For an English analysis of the case, see Andrews and Shen, “Japanese Impact on the Republican Art World,” 18-22.

18 Ibid., 19-22.
catalogued other famous painters of the transcendent class (shiwei gaoren 世外高人), including Shitao and Bada.\(^{19}\)

Similarly, Zheng Chang did not regroup the loyalist monks in his 1929 Zhongguo huaxue quanshi 中國畫學全史 (A complete history of Chinese painting). In his preface, Zheng acknowledged the advancement of Japanese and Western scholarship on Chinese painting in recent times, and quoted Kinshi Kaigashi 近世絵画史 (Painting history of recent times; Kinkodo 金港堂, 1903) by Fujioka Sakutaro 藤岡作太郎 (1870-1910), the study of literati painting by Ōmura Seigai, and Shina kaigashi by Nakamura Fusetsu.\(^{20}\) Unlike Pan, Zheng did not follow Japanese periodization, but traced the evolution of the function of art in society.\(^{21}\) In the section on early Qing painting, Zheng listed regional schools following the orthodox “Four Wangs,” Wu Li and Yun Shouping. While Hongren was identified as the founder of the Anhui School, Bada, Kuncan, and Shitao were listed along with other individualists who did not belong to any other group (jiaojiao buqun 矯矯不群).\(^{22}\)

The publications by Ye Dehui and Huang Binhong, which introduced the labels of the “Three Monks” and “Four Monks,” made their way onto the bookshelves and into the minds of the younger generation starting in the late 1920s. Zheng changed his placement

---

\(^{19}\) Pan Tianshou 潘天壽, Zhongguo huihuashi 中國繪畫史 (History of Chinese painting) (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1926), 173-75.

\(^{20}\) Zheng Chang 鄭昶, Zhongguo huaxue quanshi 中國畫學全史 (A completely history of Chinese painting) (Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju, 1929), 4.


\(^{22}\) Zheng, Zhongguo huaxue quanshi, 441-42.
of Shitao, Bada, and Hongren to reflect Huang’s “Three Monks” model in Zhongguo meishushi 中國美術史 (History of Chinese art), published in 1935. Zheng’s description of the “Three Monks” was taken directly from Huang’s Guhua wei, though with a slight adaptation that employed more vernacular wording. Although Zhongguo meishushi was published only six years after Zhongguo huaxue quanshi, Zheng found it necessary to make serious changes to his classification of the individualist and regional schools of the early Qing. Shitao and Kuncan, who had no affiliations with regional schools previously in Zhongguo huaxue quanshi, became the heads of the Yangzhou and the Nanjing schools respectively. Interestingly, neither the Yangzhou nor the Nanjing School existed in Zheng’s 1929 narrative of early Qing landscape painting.

By 1936, Pan Tianshou had also altered his account of seventeenth-century individualists in his revised version of Zhongguo huihuashi, published a decade after the first edition that was heavily indebted to its Japanese prototype. The Commercial Press lost the print blocks of many earlier publications as a result of Japanese bombardments during the Shanghai War in 1932 (January 28-March 3), and consequently invited Pan

---

23 昭季之亂，士大夫的高潔者，常多托跡佛氏，以期免害，而其中工畫事者，尤稱三高僧，即漸江，石濤，石溪，漸江開新安一派，石溪開金陵一派，石濤開揚州一派。畫禪宗法，傳播大江南北，成鼎足而三之勢。Zheng Chang 鄭昶, Zhongguo meishushi 中國美術史 (History of Chinese art) (Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju, 1935), 106.

24 Zheng insisted that the “Eight Masters of Nanjing” should not be considered a school of painting because they painted in various styles. The “Eight Eccentrics of Yangzhou” only appeared later in the section of Qing bird-and-flower painting in the 1929 text. Zheng, Zhongguo huaxue quanshi, 441 and 451.

25 The Japanese bombing and the damage it caused to the plates owned by the Commercial Press were recorded on the inner cover of the reprint of the Chinese translation of Ōmura Seigai Seigai’s text. Ōmura Seigai 大村西崖, Zhongguo meishushi 中國美術史 (History of Chinese art), trans. Chen Binhe 陳彬龢 (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1930; 1934).
to submit a reworked edition in 1934. Pan made substantial changes to the new publication. He added an Ancient (gūdài 古代) period including primeval history up to the Qin dynasty (221-207 BCE) before the Early, Medieval, and Early Modern periods. He also modified the content of several chapters. In describing the early Qing monk painters, Pan moreover adopted the term of “Four Monks,” even though he copied nearly word for word an extract of Huang Binhong’s 1926 article in Dongfang zazhi which proposed the concept of the “Three Monks.” Pan followed Huang’s wording: “During the chaos of the end of the Ming, those virtuous among the gentlemen would often assume the role of Buddhist monks in anticipation of eschewing persecution.” Because he opted for the “Four Monks” model, however, Pan had to squeeze Bada in:

Among them, the most famous ones shall be called the “Four Monks,” namely Bada Shanren, Hongren, Kuncan, and Shitao. Bada initiated the Jiangxi School, Hongren the Anhui (Xin’an), Kuncan the Nanjing (Jinling), and Shitao the Huangshan [the Yangzhou School in Huang Binhong’s version]. They all practiced with the method of the Chan [Southern] School, and their styles spread both south and north of the Yangtze.

More surprisingly, instead of copying Huang’s saying that “the three schools formed a tripod situation of competition,” Pan contended that “[the four schools] fought bitterly

26 The year is given by Pan Gongkai, Pan Tianshou’s son, in his preface to the 1983 reprint of his father’s book. Pan Tianshou 潘天壽, Zhongguo huahuashi 中國繪畫史 (History of Chinese painting) (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin meishu chubanshe, 1983), 1.

27 明季之亂, 士大夫之高潔者, 恒多托跡缁流, 以期免害. Pan Tianshou 潘天壽, Zhongguo huahuashi 中國繪畫史 (History of Chinese painting) (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1936), 206.

28 其中工畫事者, 尤稱四高僧, 曰八大山人, 曰弘仁, 曰髡殘, 曰道濟. 八大開江西, 弘仁開新安, 髡殘開金陵, 道濟開黄山, 畫禪宗法, 傳播大江南北. Ibid.
and almost seized the banner of the [orthodox] schools of Yushan (Changshu) and Loudong (Taicang).”

Since finishing the first edition in 1925, Pan Tianshou had expanded his reference list to include many more Chinese sources made accessible by the blossoming modern publishing industry centered in Shanghai. Curiously, Pan elected to use the model of the “Four Monks” over “Three Monks” even while relying heavily on Huang Binhong’s wording. Like Zheng Chang, Pan also significantly modified his 1925 interpretation of the early Qing system. First, Hongren, the leader of the Anhui School, was joined by the other three individualists to form the “Four Monks.” Second, Kuncan, Bada, and Shitao were suddenly identified as the founders of the Nanjing, Jiangxi, and Huangshan schools respectively, even though in the 1926 version the Nanjing and Jiangxi schools were led by Gong Xian and Luo Mu (1622-after 1704). Not to mention the Huangshan School did not even exist in the 1926 edition. Last but not least, rather than regarding the competition as an internal one among regional schools as Huang Binhong, Pan thought the “Four Monks” and their schools of painting contested the orthodoxy of the “Four Kings” and “almost seized the banner.” It is clear that by 1936, Pan treated the “Four Monks” as diametrical rather than marginal to the orthodox tradition.

29 與虞山，婁東鏖戰，幾行奪幟。Ibid.

30 In addition to Peiweizhai shuahuapu and Shina kaigashi, that he mentioned in the preface of the first edition, Pan listed Guhua pinlu 古畫品錄, Xu hua pinlu 繼畫品錄, Tangchao minghua lu 唐朝名畫錄, Lidai minghua ji 歷代名畫記, Yizhou minghua lu 益州名畫錄, Tuhua jianwen zhi 圖畫見聞誌, Hua ji 畫記, Tuhui baojian 畫繪寶鑒, Tuhui baojian xubian 畫繪寶鑒續鑒, Huashi beikaof 繪事備考 Guochaoohua zhenglu 國朝畫徵錄, Guochao huazhi 國朝畫識, Moxiangju huazhi 墨香居畫識, Molin jinhua 墨林今話. But he did not include Meishu congshu 美術叢書 this time. Ibid., bianyan 言言, 1.
Omura Seigai’s Adjustment

The popularity of the term “Four Monks” was confirmed in and propagated by the translation of Omura Seigai’s scholarship on Chinese art history into Chinese. In 1928, the Commercial Press published Seigai’s Zhongguo meishushi 中国美术史 (History of Chinese art), translated by Chen Binhe 陈彬龢 (1897-1945). The “Four Monks” was used to designate Hongren, Bada Shanren, Shitao, and Kuncan.31 In Chen’s preface, written in 1926, he stated that the original text was an offprint of the China section of Seigai’s book on the arts of Asia—primarily of India, China and Japan, and dated the Japanese offprint to 1901 (Meiji 34 or Guangxu 27).32 If this were the case, Seigai would be the first modern scholar to use the term “Four Monks” in East Asia. A close examination of Seigai’s publications, however, finds no such text published in 1901. As a matter of fact, Seigai’s first monograph on Asian art, Tōyō bijutsu shōshi 東洋美术小史 (A short history of East Asian fine art), was published in 1906. The portion on Chinese painting was slightly expanded and came out in 1910 as an offprint entitled Shina kaiga shōshi 支那绘画小史 (A short history of Chinese painting). It is feasible that Chen misread the year 1910 (Meiji 43) as 1901 (Meiji 34) in citing Shina kaiga shōshi.33

---


32 Ibid., zixu 自序, 1.

33 Another possibility is that Chen Binhe read Seigai’s introduction to Tōyō bijutsushi but not carefully enough. Seigai stated in the preface that his first effort to write Tōyō bijutsu shōshi as a textbook was in 1901 (Meiji 34), for the students at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts. Chen probably ignored, whether carelessly or intentionally, Seigai’s remark only a few lines later that
However, the content of Chen Binhe’s translation corresponds to neither of Seigai’s texts from 1906 and 1910, but to Seigai’s 1925 Tōyō bijutsushi 東洋美術史 (A history of East Asian fine art). Chen probably did not realize there had been substantial expansions and revisions between the 1906 and 1925 publications. This same error in assuming the similarity of Seigai’s books has unfortunately found its way into some recent scholarship. One of the major changes made by Seigai to his 1925 text was the adoption of the term “Four Monks.” No monk painters were mentioned in the 1906 Tōyō bijutsu shōshi. In the 1910 offprint, Hongren was named as one of the “Four Masters of Anhui (Xin’an),” Shitao was described simply as a free spirit, Bada was listed only as a bird-and-flower painter, and Kuncan was not mentioned at all. By 1925, however, Seigai had incorporated the concept of the “Four Monks” (Hongren, Bada Shanren, Shitao, and Kuncan) into his Tōyō bijutsushi.


For example, Chen Zhenlian records incorrectly that Seigai’s Tōyō bijutsushi was first published in 1901. The only source he refers to is the 1928 Chinese translation by Chen Binhe. Chen Zhenlian 陳振瀛, Jindai Zhong Ri huihua jiaoliushi bijiao yanjiu 近代中日繪畫交流史比較研究 (Comparative studies on modern Sino-Japanese exchange in painting) (Hefei: Anhui meishu chubanshe, 2000), 270-71.

Ōmura, Shina kaiga shōshi, 24b-29a.

Idem, Tōyō bijutsushi (1925), 436.
Ômura Seigai’s espousal of the “Four Monks” was exceptional in early twentieth century Japan when all other major Japanese historians of Chinese art ignored the term in their writings. Liu Xiaolu observed that while Seigai’s Sinophilia made him little-favored in the Japanese academic world, he was significantly more popular in Republican China and maintained scholarly exchange with his Chinese friends. Seigai visited China five times between 1921 and 1926, staying between one and three months each time. There, he had the opportunity to study paintings in the Forbidden City with the help of friends in Beijing including Chen Shizeng, Jin Cheng 金城 (1878-1926), and Chen Baochen 陳寶琛 (1848-1935). After his third trip from May to June 1924, Seigai returned to Japan and finished the revision and expansion of Tōyō bijutsushi within three short months. It is possible that Seigai learned the notion of “Four Monks” from Chinese friends and recent Chinese publications discovered during his sojourns. In the section on Qing painting in Tōyō bijutsushi, Seigai cited over one hundred Chinese

---

38 Seigai’s affection for China and his lifelong devotion to researching Chinese art is discussed in Yoshida Chizuko 吉田千鶴子, “Ômura Seigai to Chūgoku” 大村西崖と中国 (Ômura Seigai and China), Tōkyō Geijutsu Daigaku Bijutsu Kabubu kiyō 東京芸術大学美術学部紀要 (Bulletin of the Faculty of Fine Arts at the Tokyo University of the Arts) 3 (1994): 1-36.


40 Ibid., 338. According to Seigai’s introduction to the book, he started writing on June 11 and finished on September 10, 1924. Ômura, Tōyō bijutsushi, reigen 例言, 2.
sources, including Ye Dehui’s *Guanhua baiyong*, one of the earliest Chinese accounts to utilize the term “Four Monks.”

Although it is certainly tempting to think Pan Tianshou’s use of “Four Monks” terminology was a result of his exposure to either the 1925 Seigai text or its 1928 Chinese translation, the conclusion cannot be reached without further evidence, especially given that Pan did not include Ye Dehui or Ōmura Seigai (neither his original Japanese text nor its Chinese translation by Chen Binhe) in the bibliography of his 1936 publication. The only thing that can be confirmed is that Pan borrowed Huang Binhong’s wording to regroup the monk painters, but changed their numbers from three to four, most likely for the sake of juxtaposing them with the “Four Wangs.” The revisions and expansions made to the second edition of *Zhongguo huihuashi*, after all, showcased the original research that Pan had carried out since the first edition. Even if he first saw the “Four Monks” in Ōmura Seigai’s text or its translation, Pan would not want to reveal it because the publication of the new edition was commissioned precisely in response to Japan’s 1932 bombing of Shanghai which had caused the destruction of the print blocks for his original 1926 text.

As Japanese aggression intensified in the 1930s, Pan Tianshou and other Chinese intellectuals felt the urgency to adopt a more Chinese perspective. Patriotism compelled them to avoid mention of the Japanese sources that were so germinal to modernizing the

---

41 Seigai must have purchased many of these Chinese books on collecting and appraising paintings, and painting history and theory both in Japan and during his trips to China. Some were fairly recent publications, such as *Haishang molin* (Biographical notes on Shanghai artists) by Yang Yi, first published in 1919 (listed on page 458). Ye Dehui’s *Guanhua baiyong* is listed on page 460 in Ōmura Seigai’s *Tōyō bijutsushi*. 
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Chinese writing of art history in the decade before. In the game of arguing who had invented the term “Four Monks” first, the Chinese could always state the fact that Ye Dehui employed the term earlier than Ōmura Seigai. Seigai’s work did, after all, cite Ye’s *Guanhua baiyong*. The sense of national crisis further obliged Chinese historians to be more politically sensitive in examining the past. One result was that they began to identify and emphasize the historical periods and groups that underwent similar crises, including seventeenth-century loyalists from the Ming-Qing transition. In 1936, Pan Tianshou specified a list of the following Ming *yimin*: Fu Shan, Ding Yuangong 丁元公, Zou Zhilin 邹之麟, Wen Congjian 文從簡 (1574-1648), Wan Shouqi 萬壽祺, Xiao Yuncong 蕭云从 (1596-1673), Yun Xiang 揚向 (1586-1655), Wu Shantao 吳山濤 (1624-1710), Cheng Sui 程邃 (1605-1691), Jin Junming 金俊明 (1602-1675), Fang Yizhi, Jiang Shijie 姜實節 (1647-1709), Zha Jizuo 查繼佐 (1601-1676), Hongren, Kuncan, Bada Shanren, and Shitao.⁴²

**Ming *Yimin* Painting**

From the perspective of late Qing and Republican historians, the term “*yimin*” 遺民 designated the group of people who witnessed a dynastic replacement and explicitly expressed their loyalty to the previous monarchy. At the turn of the twentieth century, there was a steady stream of records published on leftover subjects from the Ming Dynasty. Another famous group of *yimin* dated to the dynastic change from the Southern

---

Song (1127-1279) to the Mongol Yuan (1271-1368) in the late thirteenth century, but materials on these *yimin* were scarcer as they lived more than three hundred years before Ming loyalists. According to their editors and patrons, the modern compilation of such records on *yimin* was aimed primarily at conserving and promoting China’s unique history in the shadow of aggressive Western influence, and sometimes served to rebut the Manchu Qing rule over Han Chinese people. The modern discourse formulating *yimin* history is thus fundamentally a defense for elite Han culture, and can only be described as nationalistic with the cautious observation of its emphasis on cultural values rather than physical territories. This discourse shifted to a more standard nationalism stressing the unification of multiple ethnic groups within set political boundaries along with the deepening anxiety about China’s future under Japanese invasions of the 1930s.

Sun Jing’an 孫靜庵 published *Ming yimin lu* 明遺民錄 (Records of the Ming loyalists) in 1912. In his introduction, Sun stated that his purpose in compiling these accounts was to preserve the true history of China (*xia*) against another foreseeable round of foreign invasions. The first warning as he saw it was the Russo-Japanese War of 1904 and 1905, a competition between two of China’s neighbors over the occupation of Chinese Manchuria and Korea. Sun compared the incident to the Mongol Yuan takeover of the Song Dynasty in the late thirteenth century. The result of such foreign invasion was the falsification or even obliteration of Chinese history by the new regime.

---

43 See the prefaces by Zhang Binglin 章炳麟 (1868-1936), Qian Jibo 錢基博 (1887-1957), Hou Hongjian 侯鴻鑑 (1872-1961), and Sun himself. Sun Jing’an 孫靜庵, *Ming yimin lu* 明遺民錄 (Records of the Ming loyalists) (Shanghai: Xin Zhonghua tushuguan, 1912), n.p.

But Han Chinese scholars, especially those who lived through the end of the Song and Ming dynasties, struggled to save the chronicles of men of outstanding loyalty and morality. Sun cited two works on the remnant subjects of the Song: *Song yimin lu* 宋遺民錄 (Records of the Song loyalists) by Cheng Minzheng 程敏政 (1446-1499), and its sequel, *Guang Song yimin lu* 廣宋遺民錄 (Extended records of the Song loyalists) by Zhu Mingde 朱明德 (17th century). Sun lamented that Song loyalists were poorly recorded in spite of having suffered greatly at the loss of their country. By collecting materials on Ming loyalists, Sun hoped his compendium could be used by the patriotic gentlemen of current times.

The situation in which Sun Jing’an collected materials on Ming leftover subjects is similar to how Cheng Minzheng and Zhu Mingde compiled the records of remnant subjects of the Song. The palpable purpose of all these works was to commemorate the bravery and virtuosity of the subjects who remained loyal to the fallen Han Chinese monarchies. Zhu Mingde and Sun Jing’an in particular were acutely aware that outside forces again jeopardized the Central Kingdom. Although Sun published *Ming yimin lu* in 1912, he might have begun the project several years earlier, probably perceiving that

---

45 According to Sun, Cheng’s version only recorded a few Song loyalists, and Zhu added over four hundred more. Little is known about Zhu Mingde 朱明德. The name might be a pseudonym invented by the author to commemorate the virtue (de) of the Ming dynasty (zhuming; zhu being the surname of the Ming royal family). Zhu’s book bears a 1679 preface by the famous Ming loyalist, Gu Yanwu 龔炎武 (1613-1682). Gu Yanwu 龔炎武, “*Guang Song yimin lu xu*” 廣宋遺民錄序 (Preface to *Aplified records of the Song loyalists*), in *Gu Tinglin shiwen ji* 顧亭林詩文集 (Collected poems and essays by Gu Tinglin), proofread by Hua Chenzhi 華忱之 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), 33-34. Cheng Minzheng 程敏政, *Song yimin lu* 宋遺民錄 (Records of the Song loyalists), reprinted in vol. 27 of *Songdai zhujuan ziliao congkan* 宋代傳記資料叢刊 (A collection of Song dynasty biographical sources), comp. Beijin tushuguan chubanshe yingyinshi 北京圖書館出版社影印室 (Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 2006).
more catastrophes were on their way. The Song and Ming yimin groups lost the battle of protecting Han Chinese sovereignty against the non-Han, so-called “barbarian” ethnics of the Mongols and Manchus. China’s new battles in the twentieth century, however, were with the unexpectedly-advanced West and the rapidly-rising Japan. The Manchu Qing was on its way out, and the new government wanted to recruit minority groups more inclusively into the Chinese race (Zhonghua minzu 中华民族 or huazu 華族). The patent Han-Chinese identity of yimin culture was therefore subdued into the multi-ethnic nation constructed by the Nationalist government, and only a handful of art historians picked up the concept of yimin in their writing during the comparatively-peaceful late 1920s and early 1930s. When the Second Sino-Japanese War called for a revived patriotism and fighting spirit, the yimin concept was packaged into the broader image of nationalist heroes of China without stressing Han ethnicity.

Yu Jianhua might be the first modern art historian to give a separate and detailed list of Ming loyalist painters. In Zhongguo huihuashi 中國繪畫史 (History of Chinese painting), published in 1937, he set aside a section entitled “Paintings by Ming yimin” (Mingchao yimin zhi huihua 明朝遺民之繪畫) near the end of the thirteenth chapter,

---

46 The Qing government was already invested in the project of reconstructing China as a multi-ethnic state. The modern terms of Zhonghua minzu, or huazu, and “five races of China” (wuzu gonghe 五族共和) were proposed by Liang Qichao and Sun Yat-sen respectively and were widely accepted among Republican intellectuals and by the Nationalist government. Gang Zhao, “Reinventing China: Imperial Qing Ideology and the Rise of Modern Chinese National Identity in the Early Twentieth Century,” Modern China 1 (2006): 3-30; James Leibold, “Competing Narratives of Racial Unity in Republican China: From the Yellow Emperor to Peking Man,” Modern China 2 (2006): 181-20.
“Painting of the Ming Dynasty” (Mingchao zhi huihua 明朝之繪畫)。47 Yu provided short biographies of *yimin* painters including Shitao, Bada Shanren, Kuncan, Gong Xian, Mei Qing 梅清 (1623-1697), Hongren, Zha Shibiao 查士標 (1615-1698), Wu Shantao, Jin Junming, Mao Xiang 冒襄 (1611-1693), Monk Hongzhi 弘智, Fu Shan, Gui Zhuang 歸莊 (1613-1673), Wan Shouqi, Bu Shunnian 卜舜年 (1613-1644), Lü Qian 呂潛 (1621-1706), Zha Jizuo 查繼佐, Xu Fang 徐枋 (1622-1694), Guo Duxian 郭都賢 (1599-1672), Chen Man 陳曼, Chen Yinglin 陳應麟, Cheng Zhengkui 程正揆 (1604-1676), Huang Zongyan 黃宗炎 (1616-1686), Monk Quanxiu 諱修, Monk Yezhou 葉舟, Yang Bu 楊補 (1598-1657), Qian Shizhang 錢士璋, and Su Dun 蘇遜。48 The names of Chen Hongshou, Zou Zhilin, Xiao Yuncong, and Fang Yizhi are also listed in this section but their biographies appear elsewhere in the book.49

Yu Jianhua argued that conventional biographies had largely ignored these painters’ unyielding loyalty by ascribing them to the Qing dynasty. Instead, he separated loyalist painting of the Ming from Qing-dynasty painting because the remnant subjects demonstrated their faithfulness to the bygone dynasty and refused to succumb to the Qing. Yu evaluated both the ideological and artistic merits of *yimin* painting. From an ideological standpoint, the *yimin* painters’ lamentation for the fallen monarch and anger

47 There is one more section entitled “Paintings by Ming women” (Mingchao funü zhi huihua 明朝婦女之繪畫) after that on Ming loyalist painting.


49 Ibid., 118.
toward the invading regime could be vented only through the means of painting. Their brave and unyielding spirit humiliated those who surrendered to the new authority. In terms of artistic accomplishment, their idiosyncratic painting styles represented the innovative power of Chinese painting, a strength that could not be found in the “feeble delicacy” of the Wu School or the clichés of the Zhe School.50

Yu Jianhua’s list of loyalist painters in Zhongguo huihuashi seems considerably more selective than that of Sun Jing’an in Ming yimin lu, probably because Yu included only painters with a certain standard of artistic accomplishment and about whom sufficient resources were available. Only some of the individualist painters in Yu’s book are recorded in Ming yimin lu: Bada Shanren, Kuncan, Jin Junming, Gui Zhuang, Wan Shouqi, Lü Qian, Xu Fang, Guo Duxian, Huang Zongyan, Chen Hongshou, and Fang Yizhi.

Yu Jianhua further insisted on the separation of Ming loyalists from early Qing painters in his Zhongguo hualun leibian 中國畫論類編 (A categorized compilation of painting treatises), a thematic compendium of traditional Chinese writings on painting methods and theories, first written in the 1940s.51 Endorsing the necessity of distinguishing loyalist painters, he labeled both Shitao and Gong Xian as Ming yimin in

50 Ibid.

51 According to Yu’s preface written in January 1956, the book was named Lidai hualun daguan 歷代畫論大觀 (A grand view of dynastic painting treatises or treatises on dynastic painting) before the Communist takeover. After 1949, the title was changed once to Lidai Zhongguo hualun jicheng 歷代中國畫論集成 (A collection of dynastic Chinese painting treatises), and eventually Zhongguo hualun leibian. Yu Jianhua 俞劍華, ed., Zhongguo hualun leibian 中國畫論類編 (A categorized compilation of painting treatises) (Beijing: Renmin meishu chubanshe, 1957), 1: qianyan 前言, 1.
the table of contents. According to Yu Jianhua, this categorization was inspired by the earlier works by of Yu Shaosong and Yu Anlan (1902-1999).^{52}

One of the models that inspired Yu Jianhua’s selection of Ming leftover subjects is probably Yu Shaosong’s *Shuhua shulu jieti* 書畫書錄解題 (Annotated bibliography of books on painting and calligraphy), published in 1932.^{53} In the prologue, Yu Shaosong commented on the need to distinguish the remnant subjects of dynastic transitions:

> The literary masters of the Qing dynasty ascribed the leftover elders (*yilao* 遺老) of the late Ming, including famous loyalists like Gu Yanwu 郭炎武 (1613-1682) and Huang Zongxi 黃宗羲 (1610-1695), to the Qing period. They missed the point that while a loyalist might physically live in the Qing dynasty, his heart still belonged to the old country. Listing them as Qing subjects not only violates their will but also diverges from the fact. It might not have been a choice in the Qing, but now there is no need to avoid such taboo; listing them as Ming people, however, also goes against the times. Hence, whenever encountering remnant subjects of the end of the Ming, such as Wang Shimin and Yun Shouping, I will name them Ming *yimin*, and so it can roughly become a norm that does justice to both their reputation and the reality [of their being *yimin*]; I tentatively initiate this standard and wish all literary men adopt it henceforth.^{54}

Yu Jianhua adopted Yu Shaosong’s suggestion in *Zhongguo huihuashi*. The segregation of Ming loyalists, however, entailed redundancy in the ensuing section on early Qing

---

^{52} Ibid.


^{54} 清代著錄之家，於明季遺老，概譜清人，尤其對顧亭林，黃梨洲諸人亦然。不知其身雖入清朝，其心不忘宗國。列入清代，非惟違其誌願，亦嫌事實有乖。此在清代或不得爾，今則無庸忌諱矣，但若題為明人又與時代不甚相合。今凡遇明末遺民，如王穉萼、惟南田輩，直題曰明遺民。庶幾論世有資，名實兼到，姑發其例於此，竊願海內著述家俯采此例也。Yu Shaosong 余紹宋，*Shuhua shulu jieti* 書畫書錄解題 (Annotated bibliography of books on painting and calligraphy) (Beijing: Guoli Beiping tushuguan, 1932), 24.
painting. Many individualists were mentioned again as the founders of regional schools of landscape painting in the early Qing. For example, Hongren led the Anhui (Xin’an) School, Gong Xian was named among the Eight Masters of Nanjing (Jinling), and Xiao Yuncong was matched with Chen Yan 陳延 to form the “Two Talents of the Painting Academy” (huayuan 二妙). These regional schools of landscape painting were introduced before the following section on the “Six Masters of Early Qing Landscape” (Qingchu zhi shanshui liudajia 清初之山水六大家), meaning the “Four Wangs,” Wu Li, and Yun Shouping.

As the Republic of China consolidated itself and the Japanese threat lurked on in the 1920s and 1930s, the notion of Han Chinese yimin, as well as its representative “Four Monks,” also had to be reconstituted to suit the multi-ethnic campaign to build the new nation-state and resist Japan. Fu Baoshi 傅抱石 (1904-1965) addressed the issue by renaming and expanding the group of yimin painters as “national artists” (minzu yiren 民族藝人) in Mingmo minzu yiren zhuan 明末民族藝人傳 (Bibliographies of national artists of the end of the Ming), published in 1939. He included forty-six such painters from the late Ming and early Qing: Cheng Jiasui 程嘉燧 (1565-1643), Cao Xuequan 曹學佺 (1574-1646), Wen Zhenmeng 文震孟 (1574-1636), Wang Siren 王思任 (1574-1646), Sun Qifeng 孫奇逢 (1584-1675), Wen Zhenheng 文震亨 (1585-1645), Huang Daozou 黃道周 (1585-1646), Cai Shirun 蔡石濤 (1616-1698), Cheng Sui, Fang Zhenru 方震孺 (1585-1645), Ni Yuanlu 倪元璐 (1593-1644), Xiao Yuncong, Yang Wencong 楊文駒 (1594-1646), Shao Mi 邵灜 (ca. 1592-1642), Chen Hongshou, Cui Zizong, Zha

Fu Baoshi’s inclusion of Wang Shimin and Wang Jian, the two senior painters of the “Four Wangs,” as well as Wu Li and Yun Shouping in the category of national artists is not the only example in which Fu expanded or altered the canons; he played with the idea of “Four Monks” as well. In Zhongguo huihua bianqian shigang 中國繪畫變遷史綱 (An outlined history of change in Chinese painting), published in 1931, Fu joined the popular trend of grouping Shitao, Bada Shanren, Kuncan, and Hongren together as the “Four Monks” (sida mingseng 四大名僧). But in 1940, he changed the formation of the group when contributing an entry to Shizihou yuekan 獅子吼月刊 (Lion roar monthly). A short-lived Buddhist journal in circulation from 1940 to 1941, Shizihou called monks and lay practitioners to join in the battle against Japan. Fu Baoshi deemed the “Four Monks” a perfect theme for the cause, and so submitted a biographic piece entitled “Mingmo

55 Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, Mingmo minzu yiren zhuan 明末民族藝人傳 (Bibliographies of national artists of the end of the Ming) (Changsha and Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1939).

56 Fu Baishi 傅抱石, Zhongguo huihua bianqian shigang 中國繪畫變遷史綱 (An outlined history of change in Chinese painting) (Nanjing: Nanjing shudian, 1931), 162.
siqiseng” 明末四奇僧 (The four marvelous monks of the end of the Ming). Probably feeling Kuncan and Hongren were not high-profile enough, however, he substituted the two with Monk Lun’an 輪庵和尚 and Mendicant Puming 普明頭陀. Monk Lun’an was Wen Zhenheng’s son, Wen Guo 文果. Mendicant Puming was Gui Zhuang, close friend of Gu Yanwu. The biographies printed in the article on Shitao, Bada Shanren, Monk Lun’an and Mendicant Puming were copied from Fu’s Mingmo minzu yiren zhuan.

It must have distressed Fu Baoshi greatly when he realized his patriotic research on yimín or national artists would require reference to Japanese sources. Before studying under Kinbara Seigo 金原省吾 (1888-1963), historian of East Asian art, at the Imperial Art School (Teikoku bijutsu gakkō 帝国美術学校; now Musashino Art University, Musashino bijutsu daigaku 武蔵野美術大学) in Tokyo between 1933 and 1935, Fu was quite blatant in debasing Japan. In 1931, he decried: “The secondary (laoer 老二) have the power to pay attention, and to invade! Although there are many of them in our neighborhood, the Japanese are the most ferocious! We are the big brothers of China’s Republic, so we lose face by bowing to ask the neighboring secondary! It is suicidal!”

57 Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, “Mingmo siqiseng” 明末四奇僧 (The four strange monks of the end of the Ming), originally published in Shizihou yuekan 獅子吼月刊 (Lion roar monthly) in 1940; reprinted in Fu Baoshi meishu wenji 傅抱石美术文集 (Collected writings on fine art by Fu Baoshi), ed. Ye Zonggao 叶宗镐 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2003), 145-51.

58 The special case is Monk Lun’an (Wen Guo), whose biography in “Mingmo siqiseng” is an excerpt, a part that introduces him as the son, from the biography of the father, Wen Zhenheng, in Mingmo minzu yiren zhuan.

59 老二是力量註意: 是有力量侵略的呵! 隔壁老二雖多, 日本是最厲害的一個! 我們都是中華民國的老大哥, 低頭去問隔壁的老二是去餓! 是自殺! Fu, Zhongguo huihua bianqian shigang, daoyan 導言, 3.
He also admitted, however, that the general lack of research on art in China was bad enough to make one weep.⁶⁰

After his experience studying abroad, Fu’s attitude toward Japan became less harsh. Still, he felt uncomfortable with the fact that he had to resort to Japanese scholarship for his publications, including *Mingmo minzu yiren zhuan*. Fu explained how the book was conceived:

In August of last year (1937), I moved to Xuancheng from the capital Nanjing. In my hurry, I only took with me *Sō Gen Min Shin shoga meiken shōden* 宋元明清書画名賢詳伝 (Detailed biographies of the famous painters and calligraphers of the Song, Yuan, Ming, and Qing dynasties) by Yamamoto Teijirō 山本悌二郎 and Kinari Toraichi 紀成虎一….

After arriving, I read the volumes on the end of the Ming from time to time, and deeply felt the great national spirit of the famous ages, which is indeed the element that has sustained our nation for several thousand years. So I translated selectively… I am awfully ashamed! Due to various reasons, I have to make this book by translating [the Japanese text].⁶¹

Ashamed of using Japanese sources, Fu focused on the Chinese ethnicity (*minzuxing* 民族性) of the extended *yimin* group.⁶² In his narrative, Ming loyalist painters, especially the “Four Monks,” had become the quintessential Chinese model of national artists.

---

⁶⁰ Ibid., *daoyan* 導言, 4.


⁶² Ibid.
Chapter 2
Fine Art Publishing in Collotype

The canonicity of seventeenth-century loyalist painting, once established by art historians, was soon reflected in Shanghai’s bustling publishing industry. In 1948, Zheng Zhenduo, co-founder of the Literary Research Association (Wenxue yanjiu hui) and member of the Chinese Communist Party, edited a collotype catalogue entitled *Yuwai suocang Zhongguo guhuaji* (Ancient Chinese paintings in overseas collections), two volumes of which are subtitled *Ming yimin hua* (Ming loyalist painting) (fig. 2) as distinct from volumes on the Ming and Qing periods.¹

¹ The series had 20 volumes originally: *Xiyu hua* (Painting of the Western regions; 3 vols.), *Han Jin Liuchao hua* (Han, Jin, and Six Dynasties painting; 1 vol.), *Tang Wudai hua* (Tang and Five Dynasties painting; 1 vol.), *Song hua* (Song painting; 3 vols.), *Yuan hua* (Yuan painting; 3 vols.), *Ming hua* (Ming painting; 3 vols.), *Ming yimin hua* (Ming loyalist painting; 2 vols.), and *Qing hua* (Qing painting; 4 vols.); and 4 volumes in its sequel (xuji 續集). Aside from the fact that the first publication of the series took place in 1948, there is no other information about which volumes came out first and when the project concluded. One explanation for the dearth of such information is that Shanghai’s publishing industry was still recovering from the damages of war. In 1937, Japanese troops entered Shanghai, leaving only the foreign concessions unoccupied until 1941. Many printer-publishers were saved and continued operating because their offices and plants were in the concessions. The Japanese eventually took over those districts in 1941, when the Pacific War (1941-1945) broke out. Then, most businesses were force to retreat inland. 1941 thus marks the beginning of a hiatus of industrial activities in Shanghai. Zheng Zhenduo 鄭振鐸, ed., *Yuwai suocang Zhongguo guhuaji* (Ancient Chinese paintings in overseas collections), 20 vols. (Shanghai: Shanghai chuban gongsi, 1948-?).
The first (shangji 上輯) of the two volumes includes four albums by Shitao, and one album each by Bada Shanren, Kuncan, and Gong Xian. The second volume (xuji 續集) contains 60 works, including primarily hanging scrolls but also handscrolls and fans by Gui Changshi 鄭昌世 (1573-1644), Cheng Yun 程雲, Chen Hongshou, Cui Zizhong, Wan Shouqi, Zhang Feng, Qi Zijia 祁豸佳 (1594-after 1683), Lan Ying 藍瑛 (1585-1664), Lan Meng 藍孟 (1644-1722), Lan Shen 藍深, Liu Du 劉度, Yun Xiang, Shao Mi, Dai Benxiao, Lü Qian, Gu Yin 顧殷 (1612-?), Wen Dian, Xu Fang, Zha Shibiao, Jiang Shijie, Mei Qing, Xiao Yuncong, Fu Shan, Hongren, Cheng Sui, Chang Ying 常瑩, Fang Yizhi, Zhang Xun 張恂, Jin Junming, and Zha Jizuо.²

Zheng Zhenduo’s project exemplifies the possibilities and challenges that confronted Chinese editors of fine art publications in the first half of the twentieth century. While the concept of Ming loyalist painting was widely accepted by the 1940s, its details were still nebulous; who yimin painters were and what works were considered yimin art, these questions were still unsettled, as proven by the varying selections by Pan Tianshou, Yu Jianhua, Fu Baoshi, and Zheng Zhenduo (tab. 1). The lack of textual descriptions in the catalogues makes it difficult to comprehend Zheng’s selection of painters. Although Zheng’s inclusion of only four artists in the first volume suggests his awareness of the notion of “Four Monks,” why did the editor replace Hongren with Gong Xian? Why did Zheng add Lan Ying, his son Lan Meng and grandson Lan Shen, all professional painters from Zhejiang, to the Ming yimin group in the second volume? One

² Ibid., Ming yimin hua 明遠民畫 (Ming loyalist painting), 2 vols.
reason for Zheng’s substitution of Hongren with Gong Xian may be the practicality required in publishing reproductions of paintings. The first volume is composed solely of album leaves, and since Zheng probably could not find an album by Hongren—only a hanging scroll and a fan by Hongren appear in the second volume—so the editor substituted Hongren with the Gong Xian album that is now in the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City (fig. 3). Unlike the art historians studied thus far, Zheng had to take into consideration the layout of the catalogues and whether there was a sufficient number of works by each painter. From an editorial viewpoint, Zheng’s effort was in line with his predecessors in fine art publishing; Zheng, too, endeavored to utilize modern printing to conserve and revive traditional art. It is poignant that Zheng’s collotype catalogues, explicitly tracing the Chinese paintings that had entered foreign collections and implicitly hoping they would one day return, themselves mirrored the process through which traditional Chinese art entered the international market in the first half of the twentieth century, a process that was unintentionally facilitated by earlier editors and publishers of collotype periodicals and catalogues.

**Collotype Printing and Painting Albums**

Incorporating classical paintings into books and journals is different from other printing practices. While most printed materials focus on the written word and thus have great freedom in manipulating visual elements such as font, typesetting, and color, pictorial reproductions are more strictly constrained as they aim for the faithful replication of an original. The linear brushstrokes and diffusive ink washes involved in Chinese painting raised printing requirements, demanding a greater control of tonal
subtlety as well as more absorbent paper. These problems were not significant to the reproduction of simple-lined graphics that could be easily printed lithographically, such as the illustrations in *Dianshizhai huabao* 點石齋畫報 (The Dianshizhai pictorial).\(^3\) The most popular method in mass-producing replications of old paintings in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was collotype (*keluoban* 珂羅版), a photomechanical printing process that could achieve high image quality through its microscopically-fine reticulations.

Although China had a long history of printing pictorial images, the reproduction of fine painting was not realized until the late Ming dynasty. The earliest printed pictorial illustrations are found in Buddhist sutras of the Tang dynasty (618-907), when woodblock carving and printing were invented. With the sophistication of woodblock printing, increasing numbers of illustrations appeared in non-religious books over the centuries. By the late Ming dynasty, fine-outlined pictures could be found in all kinds of printed materials, such as novels, calendars, and painting manuals (*huapu* 畫譜).\(^4\) The production of painting manuals demanded even more advanced woodcut and printing craftsmanship because visual images require high-quality lines and controlled color tones.

---


The technology that met such high criteria appeared in 1619 and was called “water color woodblock printing” (douban 鯖版 or muke shuiyin 木刻水印). Its production was arduous. The craftsman had to scrupulously transcribe the lines and shades from the original painting draft onto multiple blocks. Each block carried one color, and by pressing them in sequence from light to dark, the process replicated the effect of color gradation. Classical painting manuals created with this multi-block color printing method include Shizhuzhai huapu 十竹齋畫譜 (Painting manual of the Ten-Bamboo Studio, 1619) and Jieziyuan huazhuan 芥子園畫傳 (Painting album of the Mustard-Seed Garden, 1679). Yet the shortcomings of douban are apparent; every set of blocks needed a drawing custom-made by a professional painter, and large paintings (hanging scrolls of monumental landscapes, for instance) could not be shrunk or reproduced and were thus usually reduced to simplified lines showing only their basic structures. Such painting manuals were meant to impart painting techniques and compositional skills, not to record or preserve masterpieces.

At the turn of the twentieth century, the introduction of collotype printing into China not only replaced traditional douban in manufacturing painting manuals, but also enabled other forms of fine art publishing, especially that of painting albums (huace 畫冊, not the traditional kind of painted albums but similar to printed catalogues). Why

---

5 It was first carried out by Hu Zhengyan 胡正言 (1581-1672), native of Xiuning, Anhui, in 1619. He collaborated with several Anhui woodblock carvers to produce Shizhuzhai jianpu 十竹齋箋譜 (Letter manual of the Ten-Bamboo Studio) and Shizhuzhai huapu 十竹齋畫譜. Luo, ed., Zhongguo gudai yinshuashi tuce, 83.

6 Ibid., 83 and 91.
publications of traditional paintings achieved widespread popularity still needs further research, but two causes can be readily identified: the urgent need to save China’s heritage in the face of national crisis, and the exposure to Western ideas of publicizing art through exhibitions, museums, and catalogues of private collections. Indeed, the establishment of museums and the institutionalization of art exhibitions in the Republican era were based on Western prototypes.\footnote{Andrews, “Exhibition to Exhibition,” 21-37; and Lisa Claypool, “Zhang Jian and China’s First Museum,” \textit{The Journal of Asian Studies} 3 (2005): 567-604.} Painting albums and catalogues further publicized artworks from exhibitions and museums, and provided the interested public with access even to private art collections. This was one of the major selling points of collotype albums. Even though the fundamental need to preserve antiques was a Chinese one, traditional printing technology was unsuited to accommodate Westernized forms of fine art exhibition and publication.

Collotype printing, first introduced into China circa 1875,\footnote{Reed, \textit{Gutenberg in Shanghai}, 28; Song Yuanfang 宋原放 and Sun Yong 孫鴻, eds., \textit{Shanghai chuban zhi} 上海出版志 (Records of Publishing in Shanghai) (Shanghai: Shanghai shehui kexue yuan chubanshe, 2000), 863. The first commercial collotypes were produced in 1868 in Germany by Josef Albert and in 1869 in England by Ernst Edwards. “Collotype & Pochoir,” University of California at Santa Cruz, University Library, accessed June 5, 2013, \url{http://www.library.ucsc.edu/spaccoll/collotype-pochoir}.} soon proved to be the most popular technology in producing high-quality images. Since collotype plates are based on photography—when a metal or glass plate coated with a light-sensitive gelatin solution is exposed to light through a photographic negative,\footnote{“Collotype,” Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., accessed June 5, 2013, \url{http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/125930/collotype}.} they can reduce or enlarge any image taken with a camera that uses film (this action is limited by the size of a plate).
First brought to Shanghai by European printers at the T’ou-sè-wè (Tushanwan 土山灣) Catholic Church in Xujiahui (fig. 4), collotype was used there to reproduce images of the Holy Mother. By the 1900s, Chinese publishers had mastered collotype printing technology through Japanese instruction. Some of the Shanghai printer-publishers specialized in collotype were Wenming Books (Wenming shudian 文明書店), Cathay Art Union (Shenzhou guoguang she 神州國光社), and Youzheng Books (Youzhen shuju 有正書局). Because the gelatin coats were easily worn, the use of collotype was restricted to the reproduction of paintings, stele inscriptions, and rare woodblocks.

The section on painting albums in Minguo shiqi zongshumu 民國時期總書目 (General bibliography of the Republican period) offers an overview of traditional paintings published between 1911 and 1949. One hundred and seventeen titles are recorded, among which twenty are anthologies or multi-volume series (zongji 總集) and ninety-seven are collections of paintings by individual painters (bieji 別集). Albums of

---

10 Reed, *Gutenberg in Shanghai*, 64.

11 They were either trained by Japanese technicians in Shanghai or sent to study in Japan. Ibid.


13 Reed, *Gutenberg in Shanghai*, 64.

14 According to the preface, the bibliography is not all-inclusive because it is only based on available sources in major libraries in Mainland China. Beijing tushuguan 北京圖書館, ed., *Minguo shiqi zong shumu, 1911-1949, wenhua kexue, yishu 民國時期總書目, 1911-1949, culture and science, art* (Beijing: Shumu wenxian chubanshe, 1994), 182-89.
works by individual artists are further divided into three historical periods: six cover the Tang and Song, twenty-one the Yuan and Ming, and seventy the Qing. The latter section contains works by masters from various painting schools, with the orthodox school dominating the scene. For example, the early Qing orthodox master Wang Hui alone has fourteen albums published under his name. While publishers of these albums range from big names like Commercial Press (Shangwu yinshuguan 商務印書館) and Zhonghua Books (Zhonghua shuju 中華書局) to unknown companies in Shanghai and Beijing, Youzheng Books, Cathay Art Union, and Wenming Books are the three major players with dominant shares in the market of painting albums.\textsuperscript{15}

Two Early Collotype Periodicals of Traditional Art

An examination and comparison of two of the most notable collotype periodicals of traditional art, \textit{Shenzhou guoguang ji} 神州國光集 (National glories of Cathay, henceforth \textit{Shenzhou}) and \textit{Zhongguo minghua} 中國名畫 (Famous Chinese paintings, henceforth \textit{Minghua}), will help us better understand the commercial and cultural values of collotype printing in early twentieth century China. Both multi-volume publications on Chinese art, \textit{Shenzhou} and \textit{Minghua} were published by Cathay Art Union and Youzheng Books respectively. The first issue of \textit{Shenzhou} came out in February 1908, and following issues were published every two months until June 1911. Youzheng Books

\textsuperscript{15} Among the ninety-seven titles of individual albums, thirty-eight are published by Youzheng, thirty-five by Cathay Art Union, and eighteen by Wenming. Ibid.
introduced the Minghua series in late 1908, and thereafter published 40 bimonthly issues and numerous reprints until the 1930s. Minghua followed suit to Shenzhou in many ways, but focused solely on reproducing paintings.

Shenzhou was likely the earliest Chinese publication dedicated to mass-disseminating the image of Chinese art treasures on paper. Its institutional background was not only related to the publishing company Cathay Art Union; Deng Shi, who co-founded the business and served as its editor-in-chief, was also one of the leaders of the Association for the Preservation of the National Essence (Guoxue baocunhui 國學保存會). Huang Binhong, co-editor of the bimonthly journal, was also a member of the association. Established in 1904, the Association for the Preservation of the National Essence gathered a group of literati-intellectuals who were well-aware of China’s changing society and sought to save Chinese traditions from unremitting turmoil. Its

16 In a preface written in February 1909, Zhang Jian 張謇 (1853-1926) noted Di had produced four issues so far. The first issue was probably published in August 1908, then. Zhang’s preface was reprinted in Zhongguo minghua ji 中國名畫集 (Collected famous Chinese paintings), a large two-volume format version published by Youzheng Books in the 1930s and including many of the same paintings and some of the same plates from the periodical format versions. Vinograd, “Patrimonies in Press,” 252-253; 361, n10. Zhang’s preface is reproduced in Zhongguo minghua ji 中國名畫集 (Collected famous Chinese paintings), ed. Di Baoxian 狄葆賢 (Shanghai: Youzheng shuju, 1934), 1: n.p.

17 According to Cheng-hua Wang, the University of Hong Kong library has the original series. Unfortunately, Wang did not identify the months in which the journal began and ended. Wang, “New Printing Technology and Heritage Preservation,” 274-275; 364-365, n6. The copies of Zhongguo minghua that I have consulted at the University of Michigan library and Freer|Sackler library are mostly reprints that record only the date of publication of the current edition. Some reprints do not have dates at all. For instance, among the issues available at the University of Michigan library, the copy of issue 37 only shows it was published in May 1940 as the second edition. The copies of issues 38 and 39 contain no information on their dates of publication.

18 The business was established in 1908 with colotype and letterpress printers. Reed, Gutenberg in Shanghai, 285.
members actively participated in publishing as they debated the hot topic of “national essence.” The association’s official journal, *Guocui xuebao* (Journal of the National Essence, 1905-1911), always featured a large number of high-quality collotype portraits of historical figures as well as reproductions of calligraphy and painting—people and art forms that were regarded as embodying the national essence.¹⁹

The scholarly impulse to record art history was reflected in Deng Shi and Huang Binhong’s editing projects. Besides *Shenzhou*, they also collaborated on compiling a collection of Chinese art treatises entitled *Meishu congshu* (Compendium of fine art),²⁰ which still offers the most comprehensive literature review of Chinese writing on art before the twentieth century. *Shenzhou* was similarly aimed to incorporate as many available sources as possible; it reproduced not only works of painting and calligraphy, but also rubbings of inscriptions on antiques, and pictures of Han and Tang ceramic figurines and Buddhist sculptures. Each issue contained thirty to forty plates, with one-third to half of them dedicated to antique inscriptions and sculptural images, and the rest reproducing calligraphy and ink painting.

---


Already well-designed in its first issue, the periodical continued to undergo constant improvement. Thread-bound (xianzhuang 線裝), *Shenzhou* adopted the format of traditional books—the text reads from top to bottom and from right to left, and page sequence is reversed so the page is flipped from left to right. Consecutive issues often shared the same cover with the title inscribed by a famous calligrapher. The title on issues 1-6 (1908) is written in clerical script (*lishu* 隸書) without the inscriber’s signature (fig. 5), 7-12 (1909) in seal script (*zhuanshu* 篆書) by Wu Changshi (fig. 6), 13-18 (1910) in seal script by Huang Binhong (fig. 7), and 19-21 (1911) in clerical script by He Weipu 何維樸 (1844-1925) (fig. 8). After the 21st issue (June 1911), the journal was halted, probably due to the increasing social unease that preceded the Xinhai Revolution (October 1911-February 1912). The 22nd issue resumed in February 1912, and the name of the periodical was changed to *Shenzhou daguan* 神州大観 (Grand Views of Cathay). The new title was written by Yang Shoujing 楊守敬 (1839-1915) in standard script (*kaishu* 楷書) (fig. 9). Publication continued until 1922.²¹

Each issue of *Shenzhou guoguang ji* (and *Shenzhou daguan*) followed the same layout: table of contents, announcements (if any), editors’ comments (if any), artists’ biographies, plates, and publishing information and advertisements. Art objects were

---

²¹ The last issue (16; 37 in the whole series) of *Shenzhou daguan* is dated October 20, 1922. In issue 12 (issue 33 in the whole series), published in March 1917, an announcement after the contents says the original plan of publishing the journal on a bimonthly basis will change to quarterly due to the economic hardship of publishing antiques during a national crisis. *Shenzhou daguan* 12 (1917): n.p., inside front cover, after the contents; Claire Roberts, “Dark Side of the Mountain,” 64. In 1928 and 1929, Cathay Art Union published another eight issues under the title *Shenzhou daguan xubian* 神州大観續編 (Sequels to *Grand views of Cathay*), containing only works of calligraphy and painting.
categorized according to their medium. From issue 7 (February 1909) on, the table of contents was divided into the subcategories of metal, stone, ceramics, miscellaneous objects, and calligraphy and painting. The biographies of calligraphers and painters were cited from major historical texts that were readily available in *Meishu congshu.*\(^{22}\) All plates were printed with collotype machines and on copperplate paper, both novelties imported from Japan.\(^{23}\) Metal and glass plates were both used. The publisher claimed that although more expensive and time-consuming, increasingly more glass plates were used to produce better images for the viewer’s enjoyment.\(^{24}\) As of the 19th issue (February 1911), all paintings were printed with glass plates on fine rice paper (*xuanzhi* 宣紙) produced in China, purportedly because foreign paper could not sufficiently display the beauty of ink painting.\(^{25}\) Most plates were in black-and-white, and color plates were used sparsely (one or two per issue at most, and sometimes absented altogether).

A strong competitor of *Shenzhou* but focusing solely on painting, Youzheng Books’ periodical *Zhongguo minghua* gradually took over the market in the 1920s, when

---

\(^{22}\) Take the “Four Monks” for example, Shitao’s biography is copied from *Yangzhou huafang lu* 揚州畫舫錄 and *Guochao huaizheng xulu* 國朝畫徵續錄; Bada shanren’s *Zhaodai mingren chidu xiaozhuan* 昭代名人尺牀小傳 and *Guochao huaizheng lu* 國朝畫徵錄; Hongren’s *Guochao huaizheng lu* 國朝畫徵錄 and *Tongyin lunhua* 桐陰論畫; and Kuncan’s from *Duhua lu* 讀畫錄, *Qingxi yigao* 青溪遺稿, *Guochao huaizheng lu* 國朝畫徵錄, and *Tuhui baojian xuzuan* 圖繪寶鑒續纂. All these sources are collected in *Meishu congshu. Shenzhou guoguang ji* 1, 1 (1908): 7; 1, 3 (1908): 5-6; 2, 8 (1909): 2; and 10, 4 (1909): 2.

\(^{23}\) *Shenzhou guoguang ji* 1, 1 (1908): 4.

\(^{24}\) Ibid.

\(^{25}\) The publisher even decided to add to each issue one or two paintings printed on silk. The practice was largely limited by the high cost as admitted by the publisher. *Shenzhou guoguang ji* 19, 1 (1911): n.p., after the contents.
"Shenzhou daguan" was still in print but the business of Cathay Art Union was in decline.\textsuperscript{26} The owner of Youzheng Books, Di Baoxian (also known as Di Chuqing 狄楚青 or Di Pingzi 狄平子), was a Buddhist practitioner and a cultural entrepreneur active in the publishing industry. One of his most famous endeavors was "Shibao" (The Eastern times, 1904-1939), a strong rival of "Shenbao" (Shanghai news, 1872-1949) in early twentieth-century Shanghai.\textsuperscript{27} "Minghua" clearly benefited from the example of "Shenzhou" when Huang Binhong began to edit "Minghua" in 1912.\textsuperscript{28} The layout of "Minghua" was very similar to that of "Shenzhou." Each issue of "Minghua" featured about 15 plates, many fewer than "Shenzhou," partly because "Minghua" focused solely on painting. The price for both periodicals was the same, however, at 1.5 yuan per issue, making "Minghua" more profitable.

Besides setting the standard for Republican publications reproducing Chinese art, "Shenzhou" also served as a commercial model for its competitors, including "Minghua." Various issues of "Shenzhou" had been reprinted multiple times, partly because each set of collotype plates could only print a few hundred copies before needing to be remade. Still, it was market demand that made possible the reprinting of "Shenzhou" issues, usually up to

\textsuperscript{26} The plight was mainly caused by financial troubles. In 1928, the company was purchased by Chen Mingshu 陳銘楨 (1889-1965), Wang Lixu 王禮錫, and Hu Qiuyuan 胡秋原 (1910-2004), and began to publish books on social sciences and literature. Ju Xinquan 鞠新泉, “Lun Shenzhou guoguang she de zhengzhi yitu yu wenhua celue” 论神州国光社的政治意图与文化策略 (On the political intention and cultural strategy of the Cathay Art Union), *Lishi jiaoxue: Gaoxiao ban* 历史教学: 高校版 (History pedagogy: Higher education edition) 2 (2009): 27-31.

\textsuperscript{27} For recent studies on "Shibao" and "Shenbao," see Joan Judge, *Print and Politics: Shibao and the Culture of Reform in Late Qing China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996); and Mittler, *A Newspaper for China?*

\textsuperscript{28} Song and Sun, *Shanghai chuban zhi*, 1026.
four or five times. Riding the tide, Youzheng Books successfully took over the market shares left by the waning Cathay Art Union, as evinced by the fact that some issues of Minghua were reprinted over ten times. Minghua’s success also owed much to the large amount of original research executed by Shenzhou. Because of Shenzhou, Minghua accessed a pool of paintings from private collections that had been authenticated by Huang Binhong and other Shenzhou editors. The concise biographic information on artists, drawn from many literary sources, owed much to Huang Binhong’s editorship and to Meishu congshu, compiled by Huang and Deng Shi.

The Commodification of Art

Commercialism permeated metropolitan Shanghai in the first half of the twentieth century, and the cultural industries of printing and publishing were no exception. With the aid of Western technologies, publishers like Cathay Art Union and Youzheng Books strived to present Chinese art to the consumer in an appealing way. This section discusses the commercial strategies adopted by Shenzhou and Minghua, and demonstrates how they enlivened the Chinese art market and inadvertently facilitated the international sale and exportation of Chinese art.

Browsing through Shenzhou and Minghua, the reader notices advertisements for dozens of painting reproductions, usually listed on the back cover and sometimes encroaching onto the inside, after the publishing information. Two types of reproductions were mainly advertised. One was called a “supplementary” or “extra” album (bieji 別集),

29 For example, the copy of issue 7 (1909) in the University of Michigan library shows it was the 11th reprint in April 1924.
commonly featuring a painted album or a small collection of works by a single painter. These were supposedly bought by art lovers, connoisseurs, collectors, and artists. Offering only a small sampling of paintings by famous artists in each issue (and in the case of painted albums, usually only a few pages of the originals), a painting journal itself became a clever advertisement—if you liked this painter’s works, there were more by the same artist but you had to buy those separately. The other type of reproduction often advertised were replicas of hanging scrolls or pieces of calligraphy in their original size, meant for domestic decoration. Although art education in oil painting was promoted in Shanghai institutions since the 1910s, appreciation for Western painting remained largely in the academic world.30 Ordinary people’s preference for traditional painting was evident in the sheer number of ink painters, fan shops selling ink paintings, and traditional painting organizations located in Shanghai and elsewhere.31 Any Chinese person who wanted a large hanging scroll on the wall in their main room (zhongtang 中堂) but wasn’t able to afford an original could buy a reproduction for about 5 yuan, and even add a pair of calligraphic hanging scrolls to flank the zhongtang for just 1 yuan apiece.

Publishing reproductions of antiques, Cathay Art Union naturally became the place to go to for those who wanted to have their family treasures and patrimonies appraised. The company also found this to be a good opportunity to explore privately-owned collections and, if possible, to photograph worthy antiques and paintings. In issue


12 of *Shenzhou*, Cathay Art Union announced it would purchase old books, rubbings of inscriptions, and works of calligraphy and painting from patrons willing to part with their old collection in its entirety—but no fakes would be accepted.\(^{32}\) At the same time, the company also sold paintings. In the same issue, fifty works by famous artists were advertised for sale, with prices ranging from 4 yuan to 100.\(^{33}\) Before long, *Shenzhou* staff discovered it was difficult for the business to be fully responsible for both the purchase and sale of art objects. Ever more antiques were appearing on the market and the company could not possibly buy them all. Because curios did not always sell and new items could not be bought without old ones getting sold, the renewal rate of the company’s storage was low, which hindered the magazine’s purpose of photographing as many antiques as possible. Finally, the increasing number of antiques purchased by the organization was simply too huge a financial burden.\(^{34}\)

Cathay Art Union dealt with these problems by becoming an art dealer, a role not too different from that of the modern auction house. Collectors in possession of works they wished to sell were invited to send them to the company. Instead of purchasing them, however, the company would only photograph select antiques, and then appraise and price all items for other buyers, creating a list of works for sale including those that had been photographed as well as those that had not.\(^{35}\) Unlike the modern auction company, however, Cathay Art Union did not charge commission. Its renewed purpose in dealing

\(^{32}\) *Shenzhou guoguang ji* 12, 6 (1909): n.p., before the plates.

\(^{33}\) Ibid.

\(^{34}\) Ibid.

\(^{35}\) *Shenzhou guoguang ji* 19, 1 (1911): 4.
with sellers and buyers was to gain the privilege of photographing and publishing important antiques.\(^{36}\)

A major concern for *Shenzhou* as a magazine publicizing fine arts was authenticity. *Shenzhou* assured its readers of the genuineness of the artworks it reproduced by publishing only those works from trustworthy family collections that were authenticated by its staff of sharp-eyed connoisseurs. Besides faithfully recording the provenances of artworks from reliable collections, the journal assured its readers that no forgeries would be published, and those who found fakes in their purchases would be compensated by the organization.\(^{37}\) *Shenzhou* could make such commitment because it had a strong team of experts who were experienced connoisseurs and art historians,\(^{38}\) including its co-editor Huang Binhong. In appraising paintings from numerous private collections, Huang Binhong and the professional staff of *Shenzhou* developed an extensive network of contacts. The reputation of Huang Binhong became so widespread that he was not only commissioned by the government to authenticate the collections from the imperial palace, but was also invited by foreigners to evaluate their collections of Chinese art.\(^{39}\)

\(^{36}\) Ibid., 1.

\(^{37}\) *Shenzhou guoguang ji* 20, 2 (1911): 4.

\(^{38}\) In the first issue of *Shenzhou*, Deng Shi noted the involvement of Shen Xuelu 沈雪廬, Zheng Shuwen 鄭叔問, Yang Sun’an 楊篷盦, Wang Bogong 王伯弓, and Luo Shuyun 羅叔蓮 (Luo Zhenyu 羅振玉) as collectors and connoisseurs who contributed to the journal. *Shenzhou guoguang ji* 1, 1 (1908): 2.

\(^{39}\) In his letters to Xu Chengyao 許承堯 (1874-1946) in 1936, Huang mentioned several times that he had been authenticating the imperial collection of the Palace Museum as a consultant. Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, letters to Xu Chengyao 許承堯, 1936, reprinted in *Huang Binhong*...
Although the thriving art market in China was something Deng Shi and Huang Binhong desired, they did not expect the foreigners’ sudden zeal for Chinese art and the ensuing loss of antiques from the domestic market. As of the nineteenth century, Western interest in the arts of East Asia was kindled by a series of publications and exhibitions on the subject.\(^{40}\) By the end of the century, although most foreigners’ understanding of East Asian art was still based on Japanese art, some cultural adventurers explored China for a chance of finding new treasures. Their timing was perfect. Due to unstable social conditions, tons of antiques became available to those who wanted to buy and had the capital. Huge amounts of art treasures disappeared from the old summer palace known as the Garden of Perfect Brightness (Yuan Ming Yuan 圆明園) in 1860,\(^{41}\) and from the Forbidden City in 1900, when foreign troops sacked the imperial palaces. After the armies’ retreat, impoverished locals sneaked into the desolate palaces and pilfered any precious object that foreign looters had left behind. They later released the booty onto the

---


\(^{41}\) For the garden in its heyday, see John R. Finlay, “‘40 Views of the Yuanming Yuan’: Image and Ideology in a Qianlong Imperial Album of Poetry and Paintings” (PhD diss., Yale University, 2011).
Chinese art market for solid cash.\(^{42}\) The collapse of the Qing moreover rendered previous imperial family members and court officials jobless and impecunious, forcing them to sell their art collections. The comparatively low pricing of the antique market in China soon attracted both native *nouveaux riches* and foreign collectors, especially given that Western buyers found it more and more difficult to acquire worthy Far Eastern collectibles for a reasonable price in Japan.\(^{43}\)

Under such circumstances, art journals like *Shenzhou* and *Minghua* were used by foreign collectors and their advisors as a guide for locating and buying works of art. They also enabled Western collectors to get into contact with Chinese collectors and connoisseurs like Huang Binhong. Fine art magazines played an important role in helping foreigners get in touch with Chinese suppliers. An example is that of Charles Lang Freer (1854-1919), a Detroit millionaire who founded the Freer Gallery in Washington D.C.\(^{44}\) During a trip to China in 1910, Freer received copies of *Minghua* from his friend Mr. Pecorini,\(^{45}\) and later purchased paintings that were featured in *Shenzhou* and *Minghua*.\(^{46}\)

---


\(^{43}\) Cohen, *East Asian Art and American Culture*, 64.

\(^{44}\) Freer’s life as an art collector and his contribution to the Freer Gallery of Art is discussed in ibid., 38-73; and Thomas Lawton and Linda Merrill, *Freer: A Legacy of Art* (Washington, DC: Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution; New York: Abrams, 1993).

\(^{45}\) Pecorini sent the first seven issues of Minghua to Freer, along with the English translations of the tables of contents. Pecorini, letter to Freer, July 8, 1910. Charles Lang Freer Papers, Freer Gallery of Art and Arthur M. Sackler Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC.

\(^{46}\) For instance, the first plate, a Buddhist painting from the collection of Duanfang 端方 (1861-1911), in issue 2 of *Minghua* was bought by Freer in 1914 and entered the Freer Gallery’s collections (accession number F1914.147a).
The gradual adoption of English captions in collotype journals around 1910 also reveals the publishers’ awareness of the existence of foreign readers. While *Shenzhou* only occasionally posted English advertisements,47 *Minghua* more readily embraced foreign modes of reading to appeal to Western audiences. *Minghua* initially adopted the vertical arrangement of Chinese characters written by Zhang Jian (1853-1926) on the front cover (fig. 10).48 In later reprints, however, the Chinese characters still run from right to left, but are typeset horizontally, and accompanied by an English title and company address that read from left to right (fig. 11). The table of contents in some other reprints is also altered to fit a horizontal layout, with Chinese and English scripts both running from left to right (fig. 12). With Western subscribers in mind, Youzheng Books also made reprints that used a different translation of the title, *Specimens of Old Chinese Pictorial Art*, and provided a table of contents in English only (figs. 13 and 14).

Foreign collectors and dealers often sought Chinese painters and connoisseurs for their expertise on appraising antiques. Huang Binhong was once invited to a club on the Bund where a Western dealer and his friends were examining a Song dynasty album. Huang immediately recognized the album as by Liang Kai (ca. 1140-1210), the Northern Song master of Chan painting, and was thereafter celebrated as a great connoisseur among Western collectors.49 In 1914, Huang Binhong authenticated a

---


48 Zhang’s calligraphy is on the covers of issues 1-21 in the University of Michigan library, with many of them being reprints. One source says Zhang’s inscription is only on the covers of the first ten issues originally. Wang, “New Printing Technoloy and Heritage Preservation,” 286.

painting catalogue of Chinese works published by the Latvian dealer E.A. Strehlneek in Shanghai. Huang’s article was featured as a “Note by a Chinese Connoisseur” in the catalogue entitled Zhonghua minghua (Famous Chinese paintings). Wu Changshi also contributed an entry as a “famous artist.” Huang and Wu’s endorsements gave Strehlneek and his collection greater credibility than it might otherwise have had, and the collection was eventually acquired by Klas Fahraeus in Stockholm, Sweden. It is therefore safe to suggest that collotype albums and their publishers smoothed the path for Chinese art treasures quickly finding new owners overseas during the first half of the twentieth century.

Preservation and Promotion

The outflow of Chinese artworks into international markets propelled traditionalists like Huang Binhong and Deng Shi to reconsider the cultural and political values of art, and their opinions to diverge on the propriety of sending Chinese treasures abroad. Believing in the ultimate significance of the national essence, Deng Shi found it unacceptable to let antiques leave China. Huang Binhong, on the contrary, did not see it

as intolerable. This segment explains why traditionalist publishers like Deng Shi found it imperative to preserve China’s art treasures, and reveals their understanding of the position of Chinese art in the global context.

The sense of crisis was the fundamental drive behind late Qing intellectual movements. Internal strife and incessant defeat at the hand of imperialist powers became evidence of the Manchu-Qing government’s inefficiency and illegitimacy. China, as both a cultural and territorial entity, faced destruction. In the preface to the inaugural issue of *Shenzhou*, Deng Shi voiced his fear of an impending crisis: “People today seek utility, fame, and fortune, and do not understand what art is. Chinese relics are leaving the country everyday. The time will come when the nation will face annihilation, and with that crisis will come the total loss of historical objects.” In a later issue, the editor even incited all scholars to protect antiques from exportation by establishing a new law prohibiting such loss.

Deng’s anxiety, however, was triggered not only by China losing hold of artifacts, but also by the nation’s incompetent methods of conservation and research compared to Western nations and Japan. He noted the popularity of museums of national history and fine art in all cities and even small towns in Europe and America. In spite of its abundant depository of historical objects, China had never established a public institute that collected, preserved, and exhibited art. Conscious of the huge amount of fine antiques in the hands of private collectors, Deng argued that art collections kept privately could

---

51 今者世人方驚於功用利祿，久不知美之為何物，中原法物日流海外，異日必有國亡而物與之俱亡者．*Shenzhou guoguang ji* 1, 1 (1908): 3.

52 *Shenzhou guoguang ji* 19, 1 (1911): 1.
neither contribute to the public understanding of art nor withstand the destruction and loss of warfare. He then delivered a partial solution to Shenzhou and the Association for the Preservation of the National Essence, entreating collectors to avail their art treasures to the public so that the masses could recognize the beauty of China and value its art as national glories.53

The expanding enthusiasm of foreigners studying Chinese art may have been incentive to Deng Shi and Huang Binhong’s efforts (both individual and collaborative) to organize pictorial and written materials and publish Shenzhou and Meishu congshu. In a note in the 19th issue of Shenzhou, Deng offered an account of the recent surge of Western academic interest in Chinese art.54 Since the plundering of imperial treasures during the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, many works of art had been brought back to Europe and displayed in public museums in big cites like Paris, Berlin, and London. Private collections also found their way out of the country. Exposed directly to fine Chinese antiques, Western appreciation of and desire for ancient Chinese paintings increased. The profusion of forgeries in the Chinese art market, however, required that European and American buyers develop basic connoisseurship. Deng noted the publication of a book on appraising Chinese painting by an expert at the London Museum, and commended it as quite insightful.55 The development of European scholarship on Chinese art, which in

53 Shenzhou guoguang ji 1, 1 (1908): 2-3.
54 Shenzhou guoguang ji 19, 1 (1911): 1.
Deng’s mind was quick and startling, must have driven Deng to further encourage Chinese scholarship of the national treasures of China.

Living in early twentieth century Shanghai, China’s most modernized and dynamic city at the time, fine art publishers and editors like Deng Shi, Huang Binhong, and Di Baoxian were exposed to the international craze for collecting Chinese art, and came to recognize the value of their nation’s art heritage partly through this global perspective. In his writings, Deng Shi often voiced the opinion that Chinese antiques should be prevented from going abroad. He further cited Western countries’ efforts at archeological excavations and their practices of collecting and exhibiting all sorts of antiques in public museums so as to justify the preservation of artifacts in China. While Deng Shi was more “conservative” in restricting the outflow of Chinese art, other traditionalists like Huang Binhong and Di Baoxian seemed less openly opposed to it. The case of Minghua’s changing front cover and table of contents, which contained progressively more English translations, indicates the journal’s readiness to attract and serve more foreign readers, many of whom were collectors and dealers.

**Huang Binhong’s Regionalism and Traditionalism**

Huang Binhong’s involvement in fine art publishing and antique trade compelled him to understand Chinese art from a broadened—and arguably international—perspective. Traditionalists like Huang Binhong may have found it sadly ironic that their original intent of preserving and promoting Chinese art had to some extent resulted in the

---

56 *Shenzhou guoguang ji* 1, 1 (1908): 2-3.
leaking of China’s art treasures to international markets. At the same time, however, the Western craze for Chinese art also urged Chinese literati to understand the position of Chinese art within a wider context beyond Chinese culture. This section examines Huang Binhong’s espousal of regional styles, artistic inspiration from seventeenth-century individualist masters, especially Hongren and Cheng Sui of the Anhui School, and traditionalist response to the modern world.

Huang was famous for his dark and powerful monumental landscapes (fig. 15), painted in his 80s and 90s when living in Beijing and later Hangzhou. In creating his landscapes, Huang drew upon a variety of Chinese painting traditions as well as personal memories of visiting mountains and rivers across China. One of his favorite subjects was Mount Huang (黄山). His affection for the mountain derived from more than the astonishing beauty that has possessed numerous artists and tourists for centuries. To Huang Binhong, Mount Huang was a landmark of his home province, Anhui. Although born in Jinhua, Zhejiang, Huang had always identified himself as a native of Shexian, Anhui, where his family came from. Receiving Confucian education in Jinhua in his teens and twenties, Huang traveled several times to Shexian to take his civil examinations and visit relatives of his clan. Later, Huang always recalled the trips as

57 He lived in Beijing between 1936 and 1948, and moved to Hangzhou in September of 1948, after sojourning in Shanghai for about one month. Wang, Huang Binhong nianpu, 393, 494, and 499.

58 Huang also compiled records of painters related to Mount Huang, and the earliest example was Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, “Huangshan huayuan lunlue” 黃山畫苑論略 (On painters of Mount Huang), originally published in Yiguan 藝觀 (Art view) 1 (1926); reprinted in Huang Binhong wenji, shuhua shang 黃賓虹文集 書畫上 (Collected writings of Huang Binhong, painting and calligraphy 1), ed. Zhejiang sheng bowuguan 浙江省博物館 (Shanghai: Shanghai shuhua chubanshe, 1999), 309-41.
“returning” (fan 返) to his hometown. In 1894, Huang and his family moved to Shexian and settled down in Tiandu Village, where his ancestors had lived. Taking teaching jobs in nearby cities like Nanjing and Hangzhou to support his family, Huang didn’t move his family from Tiandu Village to Shanghai until 1909.

Huang Binhong’s belief in the vitality of regional schools of painting buttressed his artistic traditionalism. In his early years, Huang already recognized the rich history of Shexian and took pride in its cultural deposits. Shexian, the center of Xin’an region in Anhui, remains famous for its production of high-quality inks, ink stones, and rice papers. More directly related to Huang’s artistic inclination is the Anhui School of Painting (Xin’an huapai 新安畫派). Founded by painters from Xin’an and adjacent areas in Anhui in the mid-seventeenth century, the Anhui School is characterized by its artists’ loyalty to the Ming, their depictions of Mount Huang, and their sparse and dry brushwork. Huang Binhong was proud of the artistic legacies of his home region and studied works by Anhui masters with great admiration throughout his life. In 1912, he composed “Jianjiang

---

59 Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, “Zixu” 自敘 (Self introduction), originally published in Huang Binhong shuhua zhan tekan 黃賓虹書畫展特刊 (Special catalogue of an exhibition of Huang Binhong’s painting and calligraphy) in 1943; reprinted in Zhejiangsheng bowuguan, Huang Binhong wenji, zazhu bian, 561.

60 Huang moved back to Shexian in 1894 when his father died in the sixth month of the lunar calendar. Before he settled in Shanghai with the help of Deng Shi in the spring of 1909, Huang had been taking temporary teaching and editorial jobs in Shanghai and other nearby cities. Wang, Huang Binhong nianpu, 27-28; 68.

dashi shiji yiwen” (Anecdotes of master Jianjiang), a biographical account of Hongren (zi Jianjiang), the acclaimed founder of the Anhui School and one of the “Three High Monks” in Huang’s earlier writings. Huang Binhong began the biography by commending the rich deposit of books, steles, antiques, calligraphies, and paintings accumulated in Xin’an over the past millennium, a collection so abundant that even the wealth of cultural relics in Wu and Yue (southeastern coastal areas) failed to outshine it. Huang then summarized Hongren’s important role in painting history:

Master Hongren first studied Northern Song painting, then Ni Zan (1301-1374), and he surpassed Ming masters and became the top painter of all ages. Not only was he qualified to be the patriarch of all Anhui painters, but he had also become the best since the Yuan dynasty in the orthodox lineage of the Dong Yuan (ca. 934-962) and Juran (fl. 10th century) School of Jiangnan landscape. It is because he achieved the great synthesis of the styles of Li Cheng (李成 919-967), Fan Kuan (范宽 901-1020), Guo Xi (郭熙 ca. 1020-1090), Jing Hao (荆浩 ca. 855-915), Guan Tong (關仝 ca. 906-960). His nature was noble and pure, and elegant as Ni Zan. It is said that Hongren acquired Tang painting’s finesse but removed its frailty, and Song painting’s boldness but not its uncouthness. He also managed to travel among famous mountains, including Wuyi and Mount Lu, and indulged himself in the waters and mountains of Mount Huang and Baiyue [Qiyun 齊雲]. Hongren studied both ancient masters and nature, so he could pick the strange and

---

62 Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, “Jianjiang dashi shiji yiwen” (Anecdotes of master Jianjiang), first published in 1912; reprinted in Huang Binhong wenji, shuhua xia (Collected writings of Huang Binhong, painting and calligraphy 2), ed. Zhejiang sheng bowuguan (Shanghai: Shanghai shuhua chubanshe, 1999), 186-221. It is based on a shorter biography of Hongren by Huang, “Meihuaguna zhuan” (A biography of Meihuaguna [Hongren]), originally published in Guocui xuebao (Journal of the national essence) in 1909; reprinted in Zhejiangsheng bowuguan, Huang Binhong wenji, shuhua shang, 16-18. The author’s penname, Yuxiang 弈向, is an alias, or biehao 別號, of Huang Binhong. Huang adopted it to honor Yun Xiang 憶向 (1568-1655), a native of Wujin, Jiangsu.

63 Huang, Guhua wei, 37; and “Jiangu minghua lunlue 4,” 95.

unfamiliar scenes and attain serenity and deep meaning in his works. Over
the past several centuries, only Master Hongren has deserved such
distinction.65

Huang Binhong distinguished the Anhui master as a brilliant new star in the lineage of
literati tradition, exceeding most Ming scholar-amateurs and the “Four Wangs,” who are
not even mentioned here. Huang also collected Hongren’s works of painting and
calligraphy. Issue 8 of Shenzhou guoguang ji reproduced Hongren’s Withered Tree,
Bamboos, and Rocks (Kushu zhushi 枯樹竹石) (fig. 16), and listed it as belonging to
Huang’s private collection, known as Thatched Hut of Binhong (Binhong caotang 濱虹
草堂). Huang Binhong only imitated Hongren’s dry brush lines and airy composition
early in his artistic career, however.66 As his personal style matured, Huang moved onto
the heavy and dark structures reminiscent of Northern Song landscape.67

Cheng Sui was another seventeenth-century Anhui master whose painting styles
continued to charm Huang Binhong throughout his life. An undated work by Huang,
Cheng Sui’s Methods (Goudaoren fa 塩道人法) (fig. 17), most likely painted before
1940,68 demonstrates Huang’s familiarity with Cheng Sui’s scratchy lines that evoke the

65 漢師初學北宋, 繼效倪迂, 超軼前明, 素絕千古. 非但於新安畫家, 足以稱作祖宗, 即如江南
山水, 董巨正傳, 元代而後, 已無其亞. 蓋集大成於李成, 範寬, 郭熙, 葉浩, 闕全. 性情高潔, 雅
近雲林, 所謂有唐人之細而去其纖, 有宋人之粗而去其獷. 又得縱遊名山, 覽武夷, 畽虯諸勝,
黃山, 白嶽, 澳笈久淹. 師古人兼師造化, 故能取境奇辟, 命意幽深. 數百年來, 卓然大家, 惟漢
師始克當此. Ibid., 186.


67 For a study of Huang’s mature painting styles, see Kuo, Transforming Traditions in Modern
Chinese Painting.

68 The same inscription on this painting appears on a 1940 handscroll that shows a more
sophisticated application of brush and more integrated composition. The painting is reproduced in
Chenghuai gudao 澄懷古道 (Homage to tradition) (Catalog of an exhibition held at the Hong
dryness of northern mountains (fig. 18). Huang’s inscription reads: “Cheng Sui’s methods include both the dryness as cracked by the autumn wind and the moisture as containing the spring rain” (垢道人为裂秋風潤含春雨). Although extant paintings by Cheng capture only his dry style, Huang’s reinterpretation adds a few splashes of ink wash to solidify and unify the work. In his later landscapes (fig. 15), Huang continues to apply this scorched, wiry brushwork to construct the landforms, innovatively achieving a sense of volume and weight by repeating the dry dabs and lines and finishing the work off with a layer of ink wash. Although Huang’s later work is inspired by a range of styles that reveal his erudition in various painting traditions, his heart belonged to Anhui, and his art was rooted in the visual language of the Anhui School of Painting.

In the 1930s and 1940s, Huang Binhong calibrated his traditionalist view on ink painting. As an eminent art historian and connoisseur (more so than painter) during the Republican period, Huang was aware of Western scholars’ interest in Chinese art history. Seeking to situate regional styles of Chinese painting in an expanded, cosmopolitan scope, Huang contended that there was commonality between Chinese and Western conventions. In a 1943 letter to Fu Lei (1908-1966), Huang lauded foreigners’ achievements in Chinese studies:

> Over the past twenty years, the Europeans have highly praised Eastern culture. For example, the Frenchman [Georges] Margouliès who worked on *xuanxue* [studies of the poetic anthology *Zhaoming wenxuan* 紫明文選]

---


69 Fu Lei studied art and art theory in France from 1928 to 1932. After returning to China, he translated literary works by French masters like Voltaire, Balzac, and Romain Rolland. His association with Huang Binhong is mapped in Roberts, *Friendship in Art.*
(Selections of Refined Literature), [Paul] Pelliot (1878-1945) on archeology, the Italian [Carlo] Zanon (b. 1889), the Swede [Osvald] Sirén (1879-1966), the German lady [Victoria] Contag, Professor [Lucy] Driscoll in Chicago, and others, with the majority of whom I have either met or corresponded, were all able to read classical works. Studying Chinese painting theory, they have realized that Yuan scholar-amateur painting towered over Tang and Song painting, and no inferior to Yuan painting were the paintings by those late Ming aristocrats and officials in reclusion. They must have investigated brush method instead of merely looking at superficial appearance.

The “late Ming aristocrats and officials in reclusion” (明季隱逸簪纒), or yimin, certainly included many of the Anhui masters Huang Binhong admired. Western scholars’ recognition of seventeenth-century individualist painting as another gem in Chinese art history spoke dearly to Huang’s heart because Huang also considered the late-Ming-and-early-Qing period a later renaissance of Chinese painting.

---


71 約二十年, 歐人盛稱東方文化, 如法人馬古烈談選學, 伯希和言考古, 意之沙龍, 瑞典喜龍仁, 德國女士孔德, 芝加哥教授德裏斯柯諸人, 大半會面或通函, 皆能讀古書, 研究國畫理論, 有明於元代士大夫之畫高出唐宋, 而以明季隱逸簪纒之畫不減元人, 務從筆法推尋, 而不徒斤斤於皮相。Originally in Huang’s letter to Fu Lei in 1943, and reprinted in *Zhushu nianpu* (Writings and a chronicle), vol. 10 of *Huang Binhong quanji* (Complete works of Huang Binhong), ed. Huang Binhong quanji bianji weiyuanhui (Jinan: Shandong meishu chubanshe; Hangzhou, Zhejiang renmin meishu chubanshe, 2006), 124. The English translation is adapted from Roberts’, correcting the translation of “xuexuan” 選學 from “the imperial examination system” to “studies of Zhaoming wenxuan”. Roberts, *Friendship in Art*, 72-73.

Assured by foreign Sinologists’ devotion for Chinese art, Huang believed that traditional painting should and would be preserved and studied in an international context, and espoused traditionalism as his response to the changing circumstances of modern ink painting. Huang was also conscious of modern art and culture from the West. Fu Lei was a significant force in familiarizing Huang with modern taste and introducing him to foreign collectors and scholars of Chinese art. Huang’s contact with Fu Lei and Western art historians resolved him to represent Chinese ink painting in the style of abbreviated brushwork (jianbi 簡筆) to modern Western viewers. Huang wrote in 1940: “A letter from Driscoll, a professor of painting studies in Chicago, arrived yesterday, saying she has been paying close attention to the works of Ming loyalists, and highly regards those landscapes done in abbreviated brushwork [by yimin painters]. [Driscoll] is insightful.”

While impressed by Driscoll’s acute comprehension of Chinese painting, Huang also pinpointed which part of traditional painting appealed to Westerners most: abstraction. Comparing Chinese and Western painting, Huang observed:

Western painting has also gone from impression to abstraction, with the principle of accumulating dots to form lines. Its artistic potential has matured and come to agree with the East. Nevertheless, one [Western painting] starts with mechanic photography and leans on rules of physics, and so has accomplished more in material civilization; one [Chinese painting] comes from poetry and literature and focuses on brush and ink, and so has attained more in spiritual civilization.


74 原芝加哥畫學教授德裏斯柯君來函, 極註意中國明代遺民作品, 最重簡筆山水, 可為知言. Originally in his 1940 letter to Huang Jusu 黃居素 (1897-1986); reprinted in Zhushu nianpu, 120.

75 泰西繪事, 亦由印象而談抽象, 尤積點而事線條, 藝力既瑧, 漸與東方契合. 惟一從機器攝影而入, 偏拘理法, 得於物質文明居多; 一從詩文書法而來, 專重筆墨, 得於精神文明尤備. Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, “Lun Zhongguo yishu zhi jianglai” 論中國藝術之將來 (On the future
Aware of Western interest in abbreviation and abstraction, Huang Binhong adjusted his brush lines and compositions to make Chinese ink painting more congenial to foreigners. In the late 1940s, he gifted two such paintings to Geoffrey Hedley (d. 1960) (figs. 19 and 20), a member of the British Council in China introduced to him by Fu Lei.  

Hedley, who worked in Chongqing, Beiping (Beijing), Nanjing, and Shanghai from 1944 to 1950, helped many Chinese artists obtain painting supplies during the war, and acquired photographs of their paintings for Michael Sullivan’s book on modern Chinese art.  

Both paintings, executed in abbreviated brushwork, bear Huang’s untidy, scratchy lines and dots indebted to Cheng Sui. Roberts observed how the straight lines and built forms of the landscape in the second Hedley sketch (fig. 20) are visually similar to the lines and structures in Cézanne’s later watercolors *Mont Sainte-Victoire*. Undoubtedly, Huang’s abbreviated-brush paintings highlight the similarities that Huang perceived between Chinese and Western painting.

**Culturalism and Nationalism**

It is unmistakable that multiple cultural elements were at play in Huang Binhong’s endorsement of regional schools of painting, adaptation of traditional styles for Western audiences, and publication of antiques and traditional painting. It would be

---

of Chinese art), originally published in *Meishu zazhi* 美術雜志 (The fine art magazine) in 1934; reprinted in *Zhushu nianpu*, 39.


78 Roberts, *Friendship in Art*, 118.
inappropriate to lump all these facets of Huang’s career into the common cause of nationalism, since the Chinese nation-state was a concept that had yet to be established in the first two decades of the twentieth-century. On the contrary, even in the heyday of Republican nationalism in the 1930s and 1940s, Huang’s writing and painting continued to exhibit his preoccupation of preserving the Chinese tradition and imparting it to foreigners, a perspective that is here termed culturalism. In facilitating the outflow of Chinese antiques to the international market and painting ink landscapes for Westerns in a condescendingly simplified manner, Huang believed that Chinese art, with interpretation and adaptation, was competent of appealing to non-Chinese audiences.

According to Levenson, what distinguishes culturalism and nationalism is the imagined place of China in the world: culturalists deemed Chinese civilization superior to all others and able to convert barbarian invaders; nationalists considered China an equal, if not disadvantaged, component of the multiethnic and multicultural globe. These two perceptions can certainly coexist in a person’s mind, a publication or work of art, and a period of time, but one may still manifest more powerfully that the other. Back in the first quarter of the twentieth century, Traditionalists like Deng Shi and Huang Binhong were eager to define what constituted “Chinese-ness,” but their perspectives differed on if Chinese art should be saved only in China or shared internationally. As a result, *Shenzhou guoguang ji*, exemplifies both nationalist and culturalist stances. Deng Shi’s editorial notes, for example, emphasize the necessity of keeping antiques in China out of political patriotism. On the other hand, the journal employed few politically-charged statements that confronted Manchu authority or Western impositions. Its practice of canon formation, which embraced all forms of Chinese art, was quite different from those carried out in
1930s and 1940s, when Chinese nationalism became better formulated and its sentiments heightened under the assault of the Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945). This section seeks to differentiate culturalism and nationalism through further analysis of *Shenzhou*.

One of the most original and ambitious projects in publishing Chinese artwork, *Shenzhou guoguang ji* fulfilled the goals stated in its first issue: promote national culture (“glories”), advocate art, and bring antiques long-sequestered in private collections to the attention of the public for their appreciation.79 The founders and editors of these periodicals, all literati versed in Confucian classics, expressed a mixed ideology blending a sense of crisis in Chinese culture, an enticement by Western powers collecting and studying Chinese art, an enthusiasm for commercialization and canonization, and a desire to situate Chinese art in open-ended dialogue within the global context.

A brief comparison of *Shenzhou* and Zheng Zhenduo’s 1948 *Ming yimin hua* demonstrates the gradual shift from culturalism to nationalism. The term *yimin* was not used in *Shenzhou* to categorize Ming loyalists. As a matter of fact, these artists were randomly grouped, sometimes with Ming painters and sometimes in the Qing period. For instance, Gong Xian was listed in the Ming dynasty in the contents of issue 2 (1908), in the Qing in issue 11 (1909), and back in the Ming in issue 13 (1910); Shitao was categorized in the Ming in issue 2 (1908), and the Qing in issue 10 (1909); and Bada Shanren was classified in the Ming in issue 3 (1908), and the Qing in issue 7 (1909). From the culturalist standpoint, this confusion is comprehensible because the artists indeed lived in both the Ming and Qing dynasties. Nonetheless, Republican nationalists

---

79 *Shenzhou guoguang ji* 1, 1 (1908): 1-3.
who needed a clear division rejected such a calm and non-political stance. To patriotic scholars like Fu Baoshi and Zheng Zhenduo, being culturally Chinese was not enough; Ming loyalists had to be hailed as examples of a people who would defy the aggression of non-Chinese groups, be they Manchu, Japanese, or Western.

Imbued with the publishers and editors’ culturalist stance, late Qing and early Republican collotype journals of Chinese art served as an open platform where the past and the future converged. *Shenzhou*, the model for many Republican collotype publications on Chinese art, uncovered and recorded many antiques and paintings in private collections that were later dispersed in domestic and overseas markets. Fine art editors like Deng Shi and Huang Binhong utilized imported technologies and materials to commemorate historical relics of Chinese civilization. Bringing forward their art heritage into contemporary society, they hoped Chinese traditions would gain new life through publicity, commoditization, and canonization. The openness of their project offered many possibilities for further studies on art by later artists and critics. One example is the publication of individualist paintings popular among private collectors. Articulated through the platform of periodicals, the idiosyncratic and expressive styles of *yimin* painters enabled Republican intellectuals to argue that modernist components had already been expressed in traditional ink painting; Chinese art, therefore, was not inferior to its European counterparts, even under modern Western criteria.

Some of the ideas that had buttressed the creation of *Shenzhou* also contributed to fundamental changes in the Chinese understanding of art in the Republican period. In the inaugural issue of *Shenzhou*, Deng Shi stated that the study of fine art (*meishu zhi xue* 美術之學) was different from any other knowledge because art was created by genius and
can be separated from profit.\textsuperscript{80} Citing the idea from a certain recent German philosopher, most likely Schopenhauer, Deng claimed that art, the product of genius, was the best antidote to utilitarian craving and personal suffering in this time of decline.\textsuperscript{81} Another note by Deng reveals his exposure to Kantian aesthetics, especially the universality of beauty. Deng argued that the apolitical nature of art made it suitable to the enjoyment of the rich and the poor, of both weak and strong nations.\textsuperscript{82} Possessing the universal quality of beauty, art was a field in which the Chinese could converse with the world with equal standing, even though in science and many other aspects China was struggling to catch up with the West.

Collotype publications of traditional art were the intellectual quintessence of the Janus-faced fine art publisher-editors’ effort of integrating traditionalism and internationalism when China was evolving into a modern nation-state. A precious record of the coming and going of art treasures, they prepared Chinese art for its subsequent commercialization and canonization. The open-ended dialogue initiated by traditionalists remains meaningful even in the post-modern understanding of the tensions between the local and the global. It addressed Chinese art within a universal scope. In a world where traditionalism was increasingly marginalized and maintaining such commitment more and more difficult, the courage Deng Shi and Huang Binhong displayed in their time to argue that Chinese ink painting should stay unique and not everything Chinese had to be Westernized is impressive, indeed!

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid, 1.

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{82} Ibid.
Chapter 3

Appropriating Shitao’s Artistic Legacies

I am what I am because of my original being. The beards and eyebrows of the ancients cannot grow on my face, nor can their lungs and bowels be placed in my body. I shall reveal and convey my own feelings. Even if I sometimes touch on one master’s style, it is because that master’s style comes to me, rather than I do it purposefully. It is done spontaneously. So, is it not that I study the antique but also transform it?

Such a self-aware, confident statement of an artist’s power of appropriation and creation comes from Shitao, a seventeenth-century painter full of talent and idiosyncrasies. Accordingly, the individualist imbued his painting with artistic autonomy and non-conformism. At first glance, Riverbank of Peach Blossoms (Jiaan taohua 夾岸桃花) (fig. 21) compels us as a pleasant picture that recalls fleeting moments of spring. Shimmering tones of azure, scarlet, and mustard are overlaid onto the surface of the paper in a quick succession of dabs and smudges, perfectly evoking the couplet inscribed to the upper right that reads: “a brocaded wave of peach blossoms about the riverbank and a warm

---

fragrant breeze from orchid leaves on a misty sunlit day” (yankai lanye xiangfeng nuan, jiaan taohua jinlang sheng 煙開蘭葉香風暖, 夾岸桃花錦浪生). ² Shitao painted the album leaf around 1697 when in his late fifties, and borrowed the verses from Yingwu zhou 鷺鷥洲 (Parrot island) by the eighth-century poet Li Bo 李白 (701-762). Shitao went on to inscribe that his purpose was to entertain and interest (yinxing 引興). At the time, he had returned from the capital after a failed attempt at seeking patronage at the Qing court, and back in Yangzhou he had to cater to the taste of the steady stream of merchant buyers who made their fortune from the city’s salt business. ³ The interest Shitao was hoping to entice could only be his own or that of his small circle of likeminded literati friends and, willingly or not, wealthy patrons.

Two hundred years later in the early twentieth century, however, his art and life did generate a greater interest, broadening to a nationwide or even cross-border enthusiasm. The zeal for Shitao’s art took off so wildly that some lamented Shitao was imitated by almost anyone who claimed to be a painter, and was often abused in the hands of the mediocre. ⁴ Other more original painters, however, did not merely imitate Shitao’s styles but transformed the essence of his artistic spirit. As indicated by the modern seal stamp on Riverbank with Peach Blossoms, Shitao’s album leaf was once collected by Zhang Daqian, one of the five renowned modern ink masters to be discussed


in this section who all studied and copied Shitao’s paintings fervently in the early twentieth century. Concurrent with, and no doubt partially inspired by, contemporaneous Japanese interest in Shitao’s art, modern Chinese ink painters like Zhang Daqian re-adopted and re-evaluated Shitao and his painting styles and theories, among other traditional values, in order to transform their medium into an art that they considered uniquely modern. To many of them, Shitao’s abstract and expressive styles resembled and perhaps outshone those of Western modernism.

Shitao’s family descended from Ming imperial lineage and was settled in the southern province of Guangxi. As a child, Shitao witnessed the traumatic replacement of the Ming regime by the Manchu Qing. In 1646, his father was decapitated for attempting to reestablish a pro-Ming court in their hometown of Guilin. The entire family was executed as punishment for the father’s treason, but the young Shitao was saved and secretly escorted to Wuchang, a city along the Yangtze River in Hubei province. There, he was tonsured at a Buddhist monastery so as to avoid political persecutions. In his twenties, Shitao traveled around China and was especially attracted to great mountains and rivers. Although a Buddhist monk, he was also interested in Taoism, which is believed to have become Shitao’s major belief system in his late years in Yangzhou. Frequently asserting his aristocratic origin and expressing his nostalgic thoughts of the

---

5 The Ming Dynasty ended in 1644 when its capital Beijing was first sacked by a peasant revolt and then occupied by the Manchu Qing army. It was not until the early 1680s that the Kangxi Emperor (1654-1722; reign 1661-1722) finally completed the conquest or pacification of the majority of China.

6 Hay, Shitao, 84-97.

7 Ibid., 239-72.
past, Shitao identified himself with the group of leftover subjects, or yimin, of the Ming dynasty.\(^8\)

Not only are Shitao’s painting styles unconventional and personalized, but his writings are also exceptionally abstruse and enlightening. His peculiar ideas and refreshing advice on painting are recorded in both his painting inscriptions and the eighteen-chapter *Huayulu* (Treatise on painting).\(^9\) *Huayulu* rejects the conventional approach of imitating old styles without exerting one’s personality, systematically discusses the nature and function of painting and the painter, and strings together the representational and presentational (expressive) purposes of painting with the theory of “one-stroke” (yihua 一畫). Interpretations of Shitao’s “one-stroke” encompass everything from the substantial line created by an ink brush to the ontological oneness reflective of Shitao’s Taoist belief.\(^10\) By linking his “one-stroke” to the cosmogenesis

\(^8\) Ibid., 131-43.


described in the Taoist canon *Daodejing* 道德經 (*The Classic of the Way and Virtue*),\(^{11}\) Shitao freed himself from the constraints of “method” (*fa* 法).\(^{12}\) It is important to point out that Shitao’s highly-distilled writing in classical Chinese, composed of ambiguous philosophical terms with multiple meanings, offers modern readers ample space to interpret or misinterpret the artist’s “one stroke” to serve their own purposes.

The widespread popularity of Shitao at the beginning of the twentieth century can be explained by several major factors. First, Shitao’s identity as a remnant subject struck a chord with those modern Chinese who considered themselves left behind by the Qing regime and the whole of dynastic history. Second, at a time when China was being invaded by foreign powers, Shitao’s status as Han Chinese royalty satisfied modern intellectuals’ pursuit of a patriotic or nationalistic model. Last but not least, Shitao’s painting styles, often expressive and abstract, represented non-conformism against the established literati canon. Shitao’s circumstances echoed the plight of Chinese painters in the early twentieth century who could be considered the residual literati guarding the country’s rich and ponderous cultural tradition, and fearing the annihilation of that tradition in the face of aggressive Westernization. As a result, Shitao’s cultural identity and artistic individuality played a significant role in shaping ink practices and aesthetics.

---


in modern China. To those who believed in the self-regenerating potential of Chinese culture, Shitao came closer than anything else to representing the modern quality of traditional ink painting. In other words, Shitao’s artistic originality provided great inspiration and confidence to early twentieth-century Chinese artists who were anxious to justify the modernity of Chinese ink painting.

The surge of artistic and scholarly interest in Shitao at the dawn of the twentieth century coincided with social change as well as transformations in art and culture. In this period of rapid modernization or westernization, traditional ink painting was overtaken, mostly in academia rather than art market, by its western counterpart, oil painting. Literati painting or wenrenhua, rooted in Confucian elitism, was deemed worthless compared to the scientific and utilitarian nature of Western-style drawings. The huge flock of artists rushing to rediscover Shitao’s legacies advocated traditional painting, an art they hoped to revive through the study and transformation of Shitao’s attainment. This chapter examines how modern Chinese artists appropriated Shitao both theoretically and stylistically, as well as how other cultural impetuses intersected with the formalist appeal of Shitao’s painting. Specifically, I will investigate the modern implications of Shitao’s art and philosophy through the visions of five twentieth-century masters: He Tianjian, Zhang Daqian, Liu Haisu, Pan Tianshou, and Fu Baoshi.

He Tianjian: Hermeneutics

He Tianjian was a landscapist of neo-Shanghai painting styles. From a rich and educated family in Wuxi, Jiangsu Province, he was exposed to a considerable number of painting collections and became well-versed in the conformist styles of the “Four Wangs” as well as those of non-orthodox painters including Shitao.\(^\text{14}\) He also became interested in painting theory very early in his life. According to one anecdote, a fifteen-year old He Tianjian wrote an article in which he contended that landscape should be comprehended within three different contexts: in real life, in poetry, and in painting.\(^\text{15}\) His aptitude for writing on art later made him one of the most eloquent traditionalists to defend Chinese painting with textual argumentation.

He Tianjian demonstrated his passion for art theory and expressed his opinions on the current art world when he served as editor for various art journals in Shanghai. In 1934, in response to the debate on how to treat the impact of Western oil painting, He wrote “Wo duiyu guohua zhi zhuzhang” 我對於國畫之主張 (My proposition on national painting). In the article, He Tianjian summarized some three common attitudes of the time, all of which more or less endorsed the adoption of Western oil painting into Chinese art. The three types varied in degree: the first was to replace Chinese painting with Western painting completely; the second was to apply Western techniques to enrich the vocabulary of Chinese painting; and the last was to reach a compromise between the

\(^\text{14}\) He Tianjian 賀天健, Xuehua shanshui guocheng zishu 学畫山水過程自述 (Recounting my process of learning landscape painting) (Beijing: Renmin meishu chubanshe, 1962), 11.

\(^\text{15}\) He Tianjian 賀天健, He Tianjian huaji 賀天健画集 (Collected Paintings by He Tianjian) (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin meishu chuabanshe, 1982), xuyan 序言, 2.
two that integrated both forms equally. He Tianjian criticized each attitude and declared that it was not necessary to borrow from Western models. Chinese painting, he maintained, should preserve its own characteristics and seek innovation from within.\(^{16}\)

He Tianjian’s stance of embracing Chinese painting’s ability to renew itself represents one end of the spectrum of competing ideas then in China’s art world. As Andrews has argued, the modernization of Chinese painting in the early twentieth century was largely a process in which Chinese artists struggled either to adopt or reject Western conventions.\(^{17}\) The disadvantage of being in the camp that wholly refused Westernization is that one could easily be capped with the appellation of “conservative.” To prove traditionalism was promising even in modern times, He Tianjian scoured the history of Chinese painting to find something dynamic and transformative, whether in practice or in theory. In addition to his practice of painting that renewed techniques from different periods, He Tianjian turned to art theories in order to articulate stronger arguments.

In the sea of classical literature on painting, theoretical treatises especially appealed to He Tianjian because they could be reformulated to produce new guidelines for painting practices, and thus could prove to be progressive and amenable to modern taste. He Tianjian’s aesthetic ideas, derived from the writings of old masters, were recorded in his autobiography on how he learned to paint ink landscapes.\(^{18}\) Han-Yun

\(^{16}\) He Tianjian 賀天健, “Wo duiyu guohua zhi zhuzhang” 我對於國畫之主張 (My proposition on national painting), Meishu shenghuo 美術生活 (Fine art and life) 3 (1934): editorial column.


\(^{18}\) He, Xuehua shanshui guocheng zishu.
Chang recently observed that the painter’s terminology and ideas about artistic creativity were both inspired by Shitao’s sayings, especially those collected in *Huayulu*.\(^{19}\)

In writing about Chinese painting aesthetics, He Tianjian often appropriated Shitao’s ideas and sometimes used Shitao’s terms directly, usually in modern vernacular Chinese language. Offering advice on how to make Chinese painting eye-catching in the new culture, He Tianjian listed six general points.\(^{20}\) Chang argued that He Tianjian’s use of “six points” instead of “six laws” exposes his opposition to dogmatic pedagogy, similar to Shitao’s disdain for mindlessly following previously-established doctrines.\(^{21}\)

The opening sentence of *Huayulu*, for instance, reads: “There were no methods/laws in remote antiquity.”\(^{22}\) Shitao also quipped: “did I learn from the Northern or Southern lineage, or should they learn from me? Holding my belly laughing, I would reply: I use my own method (*fa*).”\(^{23}\) He Tianjian took it as an indiscriminative and all-inclusive statement, and claimed that modern artists should learn the styles and spirits from the

\(^{19}\) Chang, “He Tianjian and the Defense of *Guohua*,” 151, 157, and 164-65.


\(^{21}\) Chang, “He Tianjian and the Defense of *Guohua*,” 151.


\(^{23}\) 今問南北宗我宗耶? 宗我耶? 一時捧腹曰, 我自用我法. Hay, *Shitao*, 243 (fig. 158) and 250. According to Hay’s note 39 on page 366, the painting may be spurious. However, since the quote has long been recorded in the eighteenth-century edition of *Dadizi tihua shiba*, it must be widely accepted as one of Shitao’s famous sayings in the early twentieth century.
Five Dynasties to the Song Dynasty, blend these with the Northern and the Southern Schools of Painting, and draw inspiration from nature as well.\(^{24}\)

The sixth point by He Tianjian, “one generates ten thousand things and ten thousand things become one,”\(^ {25}\) owes its origin to Shitao’s idea of “one-stroke.”\(^ {26}\) Expounding the power of the one-stroke in \textit{Huayulu}, Shitao theorized “the one-stroke is the origin of all things, the root of all phenomena,” and “my Way employs Oneness to string everything together.”\(^ {27}\) Simply put, in Shitao’s theory, the one-stroke, as both a production of the artist’s brush and a philosophical idea in his heart-mind, is able to connect the outer world with the artist’s inner understanding, and thus create paintings that are both representational (of what the painter wants to capture in real life) and presentational (of what the painter wants to convey spiritually). He Tianjian simplified the idea in his sixth point: “the various and complex elements shall be united by a principle, so to create a sense of powerful solidness.”\(^ {28}\)

\(^{24}\) Xu Jianrong 徐建融, “Ershi shiji de haipai shanshuihua” 二十世纪的海派山水画 (Shanghai School Landscape Painting of the Twentieth Century), in \textit{Ershi shiji shanshuihua yanjiu wenji} 二十世纪山水画研究文集 (Collected papers on twentieth-century landscape painting), ed. Shanghai shuhua chubanshe 上海书画出版社 (Shanghai: Shanghai shuhua chubanshe, 2006), 391.

\(^{25}\) 一以生萬,萬歸於一. He, \textit{Xuehua shanshui guocheng zishu}, 36.


He Tianjian also offered insight into puzzling expressions by Shitao. He Tianjian’s theory of “unlike likeness” (busi zhisi 不似之似) derived from one of Shitao’s poetic inscriptions: “The sky and the earth had been fused together; Then it was distinguished into wind, rain, and four seasons; Light, dark, high, low, far, and near; The unlike likeness would resemble it.”\(^{29}\) The inscription makes it difficult for us to grasp the meaning of the paradoxical “unlike likeness,” which may only have been explicable to Shitao’s Chan-Buddhist-and-Daoist mind. He Tianjian decoded it as follows: “the likeness should be hidden behind unlikeness, so when the likeness is revealed it becomes more powerful.”\(^{30}\) He Tianjian’s reinterpretation of Shitao’s term thus enabled him to address contemporary problems of realism and expressionism. To He Tianjian, the unlikeness of representation did not hinder Chinese ink painting’s potential of catching spiritual likeness, or the essence of nature; rather, once able to perceive beyond form, the viewer would not only see the essence of the physical landscape, but also understand the vision of the landscape held in the artist’s mind.

He Tianjian’s aesthetic ideology and painting practice accorded with one another. As reflected in the way he taught his students, He insisted that a painter should first learn


from all old masters and then progress without being confined by their methods. Among the illustrations he made for teaching, one example of texture strokes is in the style of Shitao (fig. 22). The inscription, “Shitao’s style after Song masters’ methods” (Shitao fang songren fa 石濤仿宋人法), points to the fact that the individualist arrived at his own method only after arduous training in conventional styles. He Tianjian’s 1934 Lower Shanjuan Cave (Shanjuan xiadong 善卷下洞) (fig. 23) exhibits this time-honored approach by integrating the texture strokes of Jing Hao 荊浩 (ca. 855-915) (fig. 24), Guo Xi 郭熙 (ca. 1020-1090) (fig. 25), and Shitao (fig. 22). The different styles are brought together and enhanced by the bold composition that zooms in on what would traditionally be a fragment of a monumental landscape.

Zhang Daqian: More than a Forger

With his signature cascading white beard and long robe sometimes matched with a tall cap and gnarled wooden staff, Zhang fashioned himself as an ancient scholar living in the modern world (figs. 26). His sartorial anachronism conveys a psychological bond

---

31 He Tianjian’s pedagogical notes and illustrations are collected in He Tianjian 賀天健, He Tianjian ketu huagao 賀天健課徒畫稿 (Painted illustrations for the students by He Tianjian), ed. Qiu Taofeng 邱涛峰 and Miao Chongan 苗重安 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin meishu chubanshe, 1988).


33 It is said that Zhang modeled himself after the Northern Song poet Su Shi 蘇軾 (1036-1101). Fu, Challenging the Past, 15.
with Shitao, who was once a Buddhist monk.\textsuperscript{34} Zhang spent three months in a temple near Shanghai in 1919, where the abbot bestowed him with the name of Daqian, which refers to the all-pervasiveness of the Buddhist world.\textsuperscript{35} Zhang exiled himself into the mountains and rivers in Republican China, and left the mainland altogether after the Communist takeover. He then traveled internationally, living in Brazil and Pebble Beach in California, and finally settling in Taiwan, where the Nationalist Party retreated after 1949 and maintained the Republic of China. To both Zhang and Shitao, only the mountains and rivers lingering in their memory and captured in their painting could bring peace to the agony of missing their homeland.

When he moved from his hometown in inland Sichuan to Shanghai around 1920, Zhang was welcomed into the traditional art community for his talents in replicating painting styles of the past. In the tradition of Chinese painting, imitation was the primary means to study and transform the works of old masters. With the orthodox school purportedly heading to a dead end, alternative modes of individualist painting from the early Qing served as Zhang’s artistic models. A group of four mounted fans (figs. 27-30), created between 1931 and 1932,\textsuperscript{36} demonstrate his mastery of the styles by different

\textsuperscript{34} For a study that compares and relates Zhang and Shitao’s lives and arts, see Bao Shaoyou 鮑少游, \textit{Shitao yu Daqian 石濤與大千} (Shitao and [Zhang] Daqian) (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1985).

\textsuperscript{35} Zhang’s given name is Yuan 爱. After his childhood sweetheart died in 1918 and the family tried to arrange for him a marriage with a girl who was mentally unstable, Zhang decided to become a monk and ran off from his hometown, Neijiang, Sichuan province, to a Buddhist temple in Songjiang, a suburb of Shanghai, in the winter of 1919. Ibid., 21; Li Yongqiao 李永翘, \textit{Zhang Daqian nianpu 張大千年譜} (A chronicle of Zhang Daqian) (Chengdu: Sichuansheng shehui kexueyuan chubanshe, 1987), 22.

\textsuperscript{36} Fu, \textit{Challenging the Past}, 104-7.
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individualists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: Hongren, Bada Shanren, Shitao, and the Yangzhou eccentric Jin Nong 金農 (1687-1764). Among them, Zhang was most attracted to the free yet cultivated styles of Shitao. He studied every artwork available in his teachers’ collections and from collotype reproductions. He became so skilled that his copies were difficult to distinguish from the originals. The only trace was his signature or seal stamp—if he decided to leave one. In the fan painting styled after Shitao (fig. 30), Zhang thoroughly mastered the tree motifs, ink dots, and horizontally-pressed standard script of Shitao. But Zhang used his own seal as a proud declaration of his talent.

The line between an honest copy and a forgery is very thin. Monetary gain aside, Zhang was motivated by other reasons, such as exchanging his forgeries for original paintings and gaining fame. One of the earliest known examples of Zhang’s successful forgeries of Shitao is the album leaf Through Ancient Eyes (Ziyun Jin Guan yizhi yan 自云蓟闤一隻眼) (fig. 31), produced in the early 1920s. All signs point to an original Shitao: the unexpected composition showing two stalwart mountains framing a scholar’s abode; the experienced application of soft shades of indigo, burnt sienna and grass green over the lush landscape; and the use of the long, wavy ropes of ink in rendering landforms. It was only revealed as a forgery by Zhang himself in the 1950s and 1960s.

---

37 Li, Zhang Daqian nianpu, 28. Zhang’s memories for his calligraphy and painting teachers, Li Ruiqing 李瑞清 (1867-1920) and Zeng Xi 曾熙 (1861-1930), are recorded in Xie Jiaxiao 謝家孝, Zhang Daqian de shijie 張大千的世界 (The world of Zhang Daqian) (Taipei: Shibao wenhua chuban shiye youxian gongsi, 1983), 44-54.

38 Shen Fu attributes it to between 1920 and 1922. Fu, Challenging the Past, 84-87.
The story goes that around 1920 Zhang went to see Huang Binhong, already a reputable
cognoscente of ink painting in Shanghai at the time, in the hope of borrowing his newly-
acquired Shitao. (But) Huang refused. Unwilling to accept defeat, Zhang made copies of
sections of a handscroll by Shitao and even invented a spurious seal. Zhang then
presented one of the forgeries to his calligraphy teacher Zeng Xi 曾熙 (1861-1930). As
fate would have it, Huang accidentally saw the album leaf at Zeng Xi’s house and
insisted the work was not only genuine but also a prime example of Shitao’s mature style.
Denying Huang’s inquiry on how much the painting would cost, Zhang slyly proposed an
exchange with the Shitao that Huang had refused to show earlier.39 In doing so, Zhang’s
cunning success challenged the authority of the ancient masters as well as that of the
arrogant connoisseurs.

A young professional artist with a big family and support staff, Zhang Daqian
soon realized that making Shitao forgeries was a quick path to enriching his collection of
ancient paintings and attaining fame. Every so often throughout his life, Zhang would
gleefully point out that a piece by Shitao in such and such collection was in fact one of
his counterfeits.40 He eventually painted fewer and fewer Shitao forgeries once his own
paintings were priced high enough, but his love for Shitao compelled him to continue

39 Zhang told the story on two separate occasions with some discrepancies to Zhu Shengzhai 朱省齋 (ca. 1902-1970) in the 1950s and to Xie Jiaxiao 謝家孝 in 1968. Zhu Shengzhai 朱省齋, “Ji Dafengtang zhuren Zhang Daqian” 記大風堂主人張大千 (An account of Zhang Daqian, the
owner of the Great-Wind Hall), originally published in Yiwenzhi 藝文志 (Records of art and
culture) 126 (March 1976): 18-19; reprinted in Zhang Daqian zhuanji ziliao 張大千傳記資料
(Biographical sources of Zhang Daqian), ed. Zhu Chuanyu 朱傳譽 (Taipei: Tianyi chubanshe,
1979-1985), 1: 12a-b; and Xie, Zhang Daqian de shijie, 80-81. Both are cited and translated in Fu,
Challenging the Past, 84 and 86.

40 Fu, Challenging the Past, 25.
collecting the master’s works. In the 1950s, after Zhang fled China and settled in Brazil, he published an illustrated catalog of paintings then in his collection. The second of the four volumes was devoted entirely to Shitao’s painting and calligraphy, which demonstrates the depth of Zhang’s admiration for this artist. The volume records 57 items, including hanging scrolls, handscrolls, and album leaves. Judging from other catalogs of Zhang’s collection and from one of his seals that reads “one of the hundred Shitaos collected reverentially by the lay Buddhist disciple Zhang Daqian” (Daqian jushi gongyang baishi zhiyi 大千居士供養百石之一) (fig. 21), however, Zhang must have owned over one hundred Shitaos.

Thoroughly amazed by and versed in Shitao’s art, Zhang discovered that the master’s viewpoints and techniques had often foreshadowed modern ideas and technologies. An enthusiast of the advancement of camera machinery, Zhang was thrilled by the zoom lens, which provided him with a fresh interpretation of Shitao’s idiosyncratic styles as displayed in Riverbank of Peach Blossoms (fig. 21). He marveled:

Shitao has a unique method of sometimes reversing things and he would paint the foreground in a blurred, amorphous manner; but he would paint the midlevel and background clearly. … This is like a zoom lens on a camera; if [the camera lens] focuses on the distance, [then what is far away] becomes clear and the foreground naturally will become blurred.


42 The third volume contains only Bada Shanren’s works.

43 石濤還有一種獨特的技能，他有時反過來把近景畫得模糊而虛, 把遠景畫得清楚而實. … 這等於攝影機的焦點, 我們以望遠長鏡頭對正遠處, 甚至就是我們眼睛在瞭望遠方的時候, 近處就自然顯得不清楚了. Xie, Zhang Daqian de shijie, 241; translated in Fu, Challenging the Past, 43.
From the early 1930s and onwards, Zhang began to expand his artistic vocabulary to include even older styles. From 1941 to 1943, Zhang undertook a sojourn to Dunhuang in the Gobi Desert of the Northwest.\(^{44}\) Fascinated by the exotic and archaic mural paintings in the Buddhist caves, Zhang studied and, of course, forged earlier classics of Chinese painting.\(^{45}\) He also began to practice *pomo* (潑墨 or 破墨), the splashed-ink or broken-ink technique. A method allegedly having originated in the 8th century Tang Dynasty, the *pomo* style first caught Zhang Daqian’s attention through Shitao. Among his hoard of Shitao originals, Zhang named a group of ten leaves the “broken-ink landscape album” (*pomo shanshui ce* 破墨山水冊) (figs. 32 and 33).\(^{46}\) These works display ink washes and splatters that were undoubtedly calculated but that appear spontaneous and random. In the 1950s and 1960s, when Zhang was globe-trotting, his personal style of splashed-ink-and-color matured. *Strolling Alone in the Autumn Hills* (*Qiushan dubu* 秋山独步) (fig. 34), painted between 1962 and 1963,\(^{47}\) shows a clear tendency toward the semiautomatic practice Zhang was experimenting with. Pools of ink are intuitively

\(^{44}\) For Zhang’s account of the expedition and some of his copies of mural paintings, see Zhang Daqian 張大千, *Mogao ji* 漢高窟記 (A trip to the Mogao Cave) (Taipei: Guoli gugong bowuyuan, 1985); and Guoli gugong bowuyuan bianji weiyuanhui 國立故宮博物院編輯委員會, ed., *Zhang Daqian xiansheng yizuo Dunhuang bihua moben* 張大千先生遺作敦煌壁畫摹本 (Copies of Dunhuang mural paintings by the late Mr. Zhang Daqian) (Taipei: Guoli gugong bowuyuan, 1983).

\(^{45}\) For a partial list of Zhang’s forgeries of early paintings, see Fu, *Challenging the Past*, 308-9.


\(^{47}\) Fu, *Challenging the Past*, 235-37.
thrown onto the surface by the artist’s seasoned hand to form shapes and elements. Such
a dramatic stylistic turn resulted from the combination of Zhang’s failing eyesight,
knowledge of the ancient splashed-ink technique, deliberate adaptation of abstract
expressionism, and economic incentive to appeal to the Western market.\(^4^8\) The
experiment eventually led to Zhang’s signature pomo landscapes (fig. 35) that brought
him international fame in the 1970s and 1980s. Unlike abstract expressionists, who were
trying to overthrow their Western artistic heritage, however, Zhang wanted his splashed-
ink painting to fit within Chinese tradition and to expand the range of traditional painting,
not break from it.\(^4^9\)

Although Zhang does not identify the flinty peak in *Strolling Alone in the Autumn
Hills*, the scene bears all the hallmarks of the Yellow Mountains in Anhui Province, a
favorite subject of Shitao.\(^5^0\) Aside from the physical resemblance of the gnarled pine trees
and misty clouds, Zhang’s depiction of the overhanging rock with moss dots and
schematic pine branches and needles reveal his commitment to Shitao. Although a direct
model has not yet been found, Zhang’s composition and motifs reappeared one year later
in a painting by Liu Haisu (fig. 36), who was also a fervent follower of Shitao. The close

\(^{4^8}\) Ibid., 30.

\(^{4^9}\) Ibid., 71.

\(^{5^0}\) A famous Huangshan album by Shitao was brought from China to Japan in the early twentieth
century and bought by Sumitomo Kanichi 住友寛一 (1896-1956), and is now in the Sumitomo
collection of the Sen-oku Hakuko Kan 泉屋博物館, Kyoto. Shitao 石濤, *Ōzan hasshō gasatsu* 黃
山八勝畫册 (Painting album of eight sceneries of Mount Huang), with texts written by Kohara
resemblance between the two works suggests the painters probably shared a common example of Shitao.  

**Liu Haisu: Cross-cultural Analogy**

Unlike Zhang Daqian who forged and transformed Shitao within the Chinese painting tradition, Liu Haisu comprehended the individualist from a cross-cultural perspective. Even though he never ventured into the forgery business, Liu appropriated Shitao in another astounding way by equating him with European modernism. A native of Changzhou, Jiangsu province, Liu Haisu received a classical education in a wealthy family, but was more attracted to things that were modern and western, and pursued oil painting from an early age. Throughout his life, Liu continued to practice both oil painting in the style of quasi-Post-Impressionism and ink painting in name of Shitao’s free spirit. Liu established his reputation as an artist, art educator and art historian during the Republican era. Among his writings, one section specifically focuses on the introduction of Western art history. The most striking article in this category is probably “Shitao yu houqi yinxiangpai” 石濤與後期印象派 (Shitao and the School of Post-Impressionism), published in 1923, when he was 27 years old. Liu articulated his argument as follows:

The paintings by Shitao and his fundamental aesthetics are very similar to those of the Post-Impressionists. … We must realize that what is now so-called “new art” or “new thought” in Europe has been buried in our

---

51 Fu Shen believed Liu’s mature style of splashed-ink-and-color in the 1970s relied heavily on Zhang’s own work. Fu, *Challenging the Past*, 237. In this case, however, both paintings were painted in the 1960s when China was largely cut off from the West, and so Liu would have little access to Zhang’s new work.
nation’s history for a very long time. [We] certainly need to, on the one hand, research the new movements of European art, and on the other hand, discover the treasure in our own art history.52

Liu summarized the Post-Impressionists’ principles as he understood them, underscoring their emphasis on expression rather than representation and on synthesis instead of analysis, as well as their goal of making art durable, not transitory.53 He then recapitulated Shitao’s aesthetic philosophy, mainly basing his review on Shitao’s *Huayulu*. According to Liu, Shitao was thoroughly against the imitation of the classics and the faithful representation of the real world. Shitao followed his intuition to simplify the object depicted and his brushwork was transcendent and unbound by objectiveness.54 To facilitate the analogy between the Post-Impressionists and Shitao, Liu affixed several of his own ideas (tab. 2): emphasis on self-expression was in opposition to the re-creation of reality, the method of synthesis led to simplification, and the durability of art could only be achieved through timeless brushwork unrestricted by convention and skillfulness.55 In conclusion, Liu deduced:

Only those who can comprehend the nature and essence of things and are also able to express their own heart and sentiments can be considered real

52 然而石濤之畫與其根本思想，與後期印象派如出一轍。… 須知現代歐人之所謂新藝術，新思潮，在吾國湮埋已久矣。一方面因當研究歐藝之新變遷；一方面益當努力發掘吾國藝苑固有之寶藏。Liu Haisu 劉海粟, “Shitao yu houqi yinxiangpai” 石濤與後期印象派 (Shitao and the School of Post-Impressionism), originally published in *Shishi xinbao* 時事新報 (The newspaper of current events), supplement *Xuedeng* 學燈 (Study lamp), August 25, 1923; reprinted in *Liu Haisu yishu wenxuan* 刘海粟艺术文选 (Collected writings on art by Liu Haisu), ed. Zhu Jinlou 朱金楼 and Yuan Zhihuang 袁志煌 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin meishu chubanshe, 1987), 69.

53 Ibid., 69-71.

54 Ibid., 71-72.

55 Ibid., 71.
artists. ... The Post-impressionists are all real artists! And Shitao, who can be called the foremost patriarch of Post-Impressionism, especially, is a great artist!\textsuperscript{56}

Nowhere in the article are specific paintings cited for visual reference. By avoiding the specifics of particular works, Liu could concentrate on the similarities of the general principles reflected in the paintings and writings of the two parties, no matter how far-fetching they might seem. To those who believe in the universality of art, Liu Haisu’s theory is sympathetic; indeed, many of Shitao’s later works appear Post-Impressionistic, if not modern. An analysis by James Cahill of \textit{A Mountain Pavilion} (\textit{Shanting} \textsc{山亭}) (fig. 37) explains how Shitao’s novel use of form and color still continues to arouse the interest of modern viewers:

[The album leaf] represents a man in a hut built beneath an overhanging cliff. But the movement of line in the drawing of rocks is too grand, too sweeping, to be limited to particular objects, and the use of multiple contours suggests the artist’s refusal to fix such limits. Shitao is not so much depicting rocks as presenting to our senses the forces that mold and destroy rocks. Experiencing empathically the movement of his hand as it wielded the brush, we take part in an awesome act of creation. A combination of calligraphic line and \textit{tien} [\textit{dian}; dot] (Shitao introduces the novel method of applying them in colors, here light blue and brown) pulls the picture forward for the most immediate impact upon the viewer, besides supplying an extraordinary surface excitement. The lines that serve as contours and crevices of the rocks penetrate the forms as a vivifying network, like veins and arteries in a living thing.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{56}能探求物象內面之意義, 將自己之情感韻律表現出來, 才是藝術家. … 後期印象派之畫家確是藝術家! 可稱為後期印象派不祧之祖的石濤, 尤其是大藝術家! Ibid., 73.

\textsuperscript{57} Cahill’s summary of Shitao’s art and aesthetic thoughts is also pertinent to and in accordance with Liu’s interpretation: “Shitao, a descendent from one of the Ming Emperors later renounced the world to become a monk, and followed the percepts of Guo Xi, absorbing sensory impression from nature but also trying to ‘understand the hidden force of heaven and earth.’ His belief in the ‘single brushstroke’ as ‘the origin of existence and root of the myriad phenomena,’ and his development of that theme in the first chapter of his treatise on landscape painting, establishes once more the mysterious affinity between natural and artistic creation which the Song theorist
The visual affinity between Shitao and Post-Impressionistic paintings was not an indispensable part of Liu Haisu’s argument. Judging by Liu’s early paintings in the style of Shitao, Liu may never have seen a Shitao that carried post-impressionistic traits by the time he wrote the article.

*Landscape in the Style of Shitao (Fang Shitao shanshui 仿石涛山水)* (fig. 38), painted in 1938 by Liu, is a faithful copy of a large hanging scroll by Shitao (fig. 39), with a slight adaptation to the composition and a different choice of coloring. Liu Haisu’s imitation is intriguing because Shitao is well-known for handling intimate compositions on album leaves and handscrolls rather than large formats, and neither the original nor Liu’s copy seems sufficiently modernist to prove Shitao as the forerunner of Post-Impressionism. The lack of visual proof renders Liu Haisu’s theory remarkably bold, if equally unsound. Given that Liu never hallucinated like Van Gogh, what is it that he was trying to convey in his flimsy argument?

Simply put, Liu’s conclusion is that Shitao articulated the modernist spirit of European Post-Impressionism two hundred years ago in China. If we follow Liu’s logic,

had recognized. Once the artist has grasped this ‘method that is no-method,’ the principles with which all natural phenomena comply will govern also the formation of his paintings. Out of a diversity of visual stimuli he composes a limited and ordered system of forms stated as the ‘second reality’ of Confucian thought. By pondering his perception, the artist becomes aware of the general in the particular, and a relationship between seemingly disparate parts. Shitao often portrayed the scenery of specific places, relying, no doubt, upon sketches or memories of his travels; but he so universalizes his experience that one mountain becomes all mountains. Shitao is perhaps the most inventive of all later artists.” James Cahill, *Chinese Painting* (Geneva: Skira, 1960), 180-181.

58 For example, Zhang Geng 張庚 (1685-1760) criticized Shitao’s inability to handle large formats in his *Guochao huazheng xulu* 國朝畫徵續錄 (An amplified record of Qing painters). Chou, “In Defense of Qing Orthodox,” 35. However, there are some large hanging scrolls that Shitao presumably painted in his later professional years in Yangzhou.
we see superficial similarities between these two phenomena. According to Liu, the greatness of Western modernity has long existed in China, but remained hidden in its cultural legacies. Liu Haisu’s fundamental argument is that no matter whether one paints in Chinese ink or Western oil, as long as one upholds the untrammeled creative spirit, be that from Shitao or Post-Impressionists, one is on the right track to make modern art. Liu Haisu tried to remove himself from the debates over Westernization by legitimizing both ink and oil as modern media. His supposition is also meaningful on the cultural level. Republican artists like Liu Haisu who adopted both conventions found it difficult to position themselves between Chinese and Western traditions. Liu’s theory, in finding the commonalities shared by the two sides, rationalizes the coexistence of both practices in the work of one artist without requiring compromise.

Liu Haisu’s early works in the traditional manner demonstrate his drastic experimental way of combing ink and oil techniques. In his 1924 Tomb of Yanzi (Yanzi mu 言子墓) (fig. 40), the only indisputably Chinese elements are the inscriptions on the top and the multi-perspective composition. Liu Haisu controlled his Chinese brush as though handling either an oil brush or a pencil. The modeling of the tree trunk, which abruptly occupies the right foreground, could be easily associated with the effect of using charcoal. Liu also tried to imitate the texture of layered paint by applying different densities of ink on the background mountain, although it was not very efficient.
Nevertheless, this painting was still lauded by his contemporaries. In his inscription on
this painting, Wu Changshi congratulated Liu as assisted by the celestial spirit.\(^5^9\)

With such experiment, Liu Haisu attempted to realize a revolution in the two great
traditions of Western oils and Chinese ink painting. A diehard fan of van Gogh, Liu
continued to make oil paintings in the Dutch artist’s style throughout his life (fig. 41).
Van Gogh’s spell on Liu Haisu was so strong that it is difficult to tell if some of Liu’s
eyear ink paintings, such as *Angry Waves* (*Nutao 怒濤*) (fig. 42), are inspired more by van
Gogh or Shitao. In a 1925 article, Liu glorified van Gogh as a “traitor to art” (*yishu pantu*
藝術叛徒), a genius of rebellious spirit.\(^6^0\) Liu himself was famous for being known as the
“traitor to art,” a byname whose origin is unclear but most likely created by Liu
himself.\(^6^1\) By crowning Van Gogh “traitor to art” and thus lending his own appellation to
the great master, Liu Haisu was trying to place himself on equal footing with Van Gogh.
At the same time, Liu continued to admire Shitao’s creativity and was encouraged to
advance modernist qualities in the medium of ink. Part of Liu’s original intention in
connecting Shitao and the Post-Impressionists, including van Gogh, was to promote
himself as an icon of Chinese modern art.

\(^5^9\) Wu’s full inscription goes: 吳中文學傳千古, 海色天光拜墓門。雲水高寒, 天風瑟瑟。海粟此畫, 有神助耶？

\(^6^0\) Liu Haisu 劉海粟, “Yishu pantu” 藝術叛徒 (Traitor to art), originally published in *Yishu* 藝術
(Art) 90 (Feb. 15, 1925); reprinted in Zhu and Yuan, *Liu Haisu yishu wenxuan*, 102-4.

\(^6^1\) Julia F. Andrews, “Art and the Cosmopolitan Culture of 1920s Shanghai: Liu Haisu and the
Nude Model Controversy,” *Chungguksa yongu* 中國史研究 (Studies of Chinese history) 35,
Pan Tianshou: Traditionalism

While Liu Haisu strived to bring together the two worlds of ink and oil painting, Pan Tianshou asserted the necessity of separating Chinese painting from the Western art tradition. A gifted and devoted ink painter, Pan was well-informed of—and to some extent oppressed by—the thriving of Western art in China. He received his secondary education at Zhejiang First Normal School in Hangzhou, where he took classes on Western art history taught by Li Shutong 李叔同 (1880-1942), a returnee from the Tokyo School of Fine Arts in Japan. In 1928, Pan Tianshou became an art professor at the National Art Academy (Guoli yishuyuan 国立藝術院) in Hangzhou, where he taught ink painting for the rest of his life. Among his colleagues were many prominent oil painters including Lin Fengmian 林風眠 (1900-1991), who returned from France with his own take on Impressionism and Cubism. Pan’s mature landscape style is considered a distillation and metamorphosis of the wild and eccentric modes of Shitao and Bada Shanren, another seventeenth-century individualist. Although Pan cited Shitao

---

62 For Li’s life, see Fang Ailong 方爱龙, Yinhong xuancai: Li Shutong zhuan 色绚彩: 李叔同传 (Colors bright and deep: biography of Li Shutong) (Shanghai: Shanghai shuhua chubanshe, 2002).

63 Pan’s life and art are discussed in Pan Gongkai 潘公凯, Pan Tiansho pingzhuan 潘天寿评传 (Annotated biography of Pan Tianshou) (Hong Kong: Comercial Press, 1986); and Yang, “Pan Tianshou and Twentieth Century Traditional Chinese Painting.”

64 For Lin’s painting, see A Pioneer of Modern Chinese Painting: The Art of Lin Fengmian (Shiji xianqu: Lin Fengmian yishuzhan 世纪先驅: 林風眠藝術展), ed. Hong Kong Museum of Art (Hong Kong: Leisure and Cultural Services Department, 2007).

65 Pan’s landscape painting is analyzed in Yang, “Pan Tianshou and Twentieth Century Traditional Chinese Painting,” 229-56. Zeng Sankai 曾三凯, Qijie Yin Zhou xue: Pan Tianshou shanshuihua yanjiu 气结殷周雪: 潘天寿山水画研究 (Spirit of the snows from the Yin and Zhou
frequently in his writing and teaching, he never treated the master’s individualism as a precursor to Western modernism. But as we shall see in the following discussion, Pan often appropriated Shitao to respond to the exigencies of modernity in Chinese painting.

*Blue and Green Landscape* (*Qinglù shanshui* 青绿山水) (fig. 43), painted in the early 1930s,\(^66\) displays Pan’s early attempt of absorbing and negotiating Shitao’s composition and motifs (fig. 44) in order to modernize ink painting. Pan depicts the tree leaves with small irregular dots and simplifies the composition with bold outlines in the manner of Shitao, but uniquely places the poetic inscription in the space between the foreground and background.\(^67\) The poem, as if pointed at and recited by one of the two gentlemen on the riverbank, reads:

> It’s been a custom that we have the factionalism between the literati Wu and the professional Zhe schools of painting, and so painters laugh at each other being too delicate or too vulgar; now that Shitao has gone and so there are few genuine painters, who can still delineate mountains with the texture stroke of “trailing mud in sticky water?”\(^68\)

\(^{66}\) The painting is dated to circa 1932 in Yang et al., *Tracing the Past, Drawing the Future*, 348, cat. no. 93-1. It is not dated but is placed among a group of albums leaves painted in the early 1930s in *Pan Tianshou shuhua ji* 潘天寿书画集 (Collected works of painting and calligraphy by Pan Tianshou), ed. Pan Gongkai 潘公凯 and Pan Tianshou shuhuaji bianji weiyuanhui 潘天寿书画集编辑委员会 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin meishu chubanshe, 1996), 2: 32.

\(^{67}\) For Pan Tianshou’s research on the role of inscriptions in composition, see his, “Zhongguohua tikuan yanjiu” 中国画题款研究 (A study of inscriptions in Chinese painting), first published in 1957; reprinted in Pan Tianshou 潘天寿, *Pan Tianshou meishu wenji* 潘天寿美术文集 (Collected writings on fine art by Pan Tianshou) (Beijing: Renmin meishu chubanshe, 1983), 119-48.

\(^{68}\) 習俗派爭吳浙間, 相識繕細見獨願; 苦瓜佛去畫人少, 誰寫拖泥帶水山?
The “trailing mud in sticky water” texture stroke (*tuoni daishui cun* 拖泥带水皴) is one of Shitao’s signature techniques. It combines dry calligraphic brush lines with diffusive ink washes to create an organic representation of the well-vegetated and wrinkleless hills commonly seen in Southern China.

In *Blue and Green Landscape*, Pan adopts Shitao’s spontaneous wash-like brushwork but adds his own twist by using only green-colored washes to define most of the boulder. Although the blue-and-green style was conventionally used to depict immortal lands or aristocratic estates, Pan singled out the element of green coloring to create a form that is abstract and visually provoking. In terms of composition, the hillock is pushed away from the center to draw the viewer’s attention to the borders of the picture plane. The inscription is placed in the center to assert the flatness of the surface, preventing the viewer from conceiving the blank space as a body of water that connects the foreground to the background. Both Pan and Shitao’s compositions can moreover be traced back to twelfth-century Southern Song court painting, a genre disparaged by traditional literati as professional and uncouth. By intentionally selecting such a composition, Pan challenges the literati canon and, as verbalized in the inscribed poem, criticizes the unchanged dichotomy of professional and literati schools of painting.

This mode becomes one of the standard formulas of Pan Tianshou’s later paintings. In *This Land so Beautiful* (*Jiangshan ruci duojiao* 江山如此多娇) (fig. 45), painted in 1959, Pan completely modernizes Shitao’s model into a style that highlights the spontaneous dots, robust lines, geometric shapes, and color scheme that jointly unify the whole picture. The content of the inscription is now a perfunctory eulogy to the
nation’s rivers and mountains in celebration of the tenth anniversary of the new People’s Republic of China. But Pan would not let politics affect his artistic vision any further. He refused to change the flag to a Communist red, and although he initially inscribed a verse by Chairman Mao in the lower right corner, he soon decided to tear it away and repaint the area for compositional integrity. His pride and uprightness, somewhat encouraged by Shitao’s legendary eccentricity, eventually got him into trouble during the Cultural Revolution. In the late 1960s, he was accused of being counterrevolutionary because he declined to use the color red in his blue-and-green landscapes, and refused to cite Mao’s poetry even in his larger body of work.  

Another aspect of Shitao’s art that appealed to Pan is the use of ink dots in painting. Chinese artists at least since Shitao have been using dots in various ways to achieve the subtle effect of brushwork. A perfect example of Shitao’s subversive aesthetic principles, *Ten Thousand Ugly Inkblots* (*Wandian emo* 萬點惡墨) (fig. 46) challenges accepted standards of beauty as the trees and rocks degenerate into Pollock-esque splatters. Refusing the role of representing landscape elements, the ink dots in turn unify the surface and take on a sort of abstract beauty.

In writing about the use of dots in ink painting, Pan Tianshou first summarized Shitao’s painting inscription on dotting methods (fig. 47):

---


Shitao was good at using dots in his painting. He used them in a casual yet coordinated way to achieve variety and complexity. Among his dots are dots for wind, for snow, for clear days and for rain; there are dots for budding flowers, for fringes, and for joining strings; there are vacuous, broad, dry and plain dots; there are dots with heavy ink or with little ink or with flying whites; there are misty dots, lacquer-black dots, sloppy dots and transparent dots; there are also dots covering up heaven and earth and dots that [seem to] pour right onto your face; there are also pictures of a thousand peaks and myriad ravines without a dot.\footnote{\textsuperscript{71}}

Eager to showcase his own achievements, Pan added on to Shitao’s repertoire of dots:

“[Shitao] is thorough enough. Yet he failed to mention ‘dots upon dots.’ He might have accidentally left this out. There are three kinds of dots upon dots. First, eye-opening dots; second, blurred dots, third, bedraggled dots. People good at using accumulated ink naturally know these.\footnote{\textsuperscript{72}}

While it is hard to speculate what eye-opening dots may look like, we can see Pan Tianshou’s great interest in using ink blots to enliven simplified rock forms, as shown in his 1948 \textit{Watching the Waterfall under a Pine Tree} (\textit{Songxia guanpu}) (fig. 48).


Pan’s inscription acknowledges his inspiration to Shitao: “It may be said that this is slightly like Xiazunzhe (Shitao). Is it believably so?” To Pan Tianshou, however, Shitao’s dotting method was not merely a technique but rather inspiration to deal with the more fundamental issues of painting as an art. On the limitation of painting, Pan declared, “Western perspective is a method that shows the three-dimensional on a flat surface. But since painting is after all an art of two-dimensionality, it is partial to merely seek (the illusion) of three-dimensionality.” Due to the intrinsic discrepancies between ink and oil painting, Pan believed the two systems should be kept apart. But his concern over the flat materiality of painting revealed his awareness of the issues of modern painting in the West. His solution was much inspired by Shitao’s experimentation with dots. Pan broke down the surface into a system of dots, lines, and shapes, freeing these elements from representational functionality in favor of the formal rhythm on the two-dimensional surface.

**Fu Baoshi: Nationalism**

While having benefited from his travel and study in Japan between 1932 and 1935, Fu Baoshi nonetheless possessed a nationalist—at times xenophobic—stance in

---

73  或謂略似疎者. 可信然耶?

74  透視者, 以平面顯立體之術也. 然繪畫終為平面之藝術, 唯立體是求, 亦不過執其一端耳. Pan Tianshou 潘天壽, “Lunhua cangao” 論畫殘稿 (Incomplete writings on painting), excerpted in Pan, Pan Tianshou tanyi lu, 125. Most of the passages in “Lunhua cangao” were written by Pan Tianshou on random pieces of paper between the mid-1930s and the mid-1940s. Pan, Pan Tianshou tanyi lu, 2 (bianzhe zhu 編者注).

75  Fu journeyed to Japan twice during the period: from September 1932 to June 1933, and again from August 1933 to June 1935. On his first trip, Fu mainly visited art schools, museums, and
his comprehensive study on Shitao’s life and art as well as in his promotion of Shitao as the symbol of China’s ethnic or national spirit. His patriotic effort appears rather ironic in that his work was highly indebted to modern Japanese-style painting. His research on Shitao in particular was induced and aided by Japanese scholarly achievements on the same subject. While still a teenager, Fu Baoshi was allegedly already fascinated by Shitao’s anecdotal biographies, paintings, and writings.76 His self-fashioned name, Baoshi 抱石 (literally “Embracing Stones”), reveals Fu’s obsession with Shitao (literally “Stone Waves”).77 From Nanchang, Jiangxi province, Fu Baoshi spent most of his life teaching in Nanjing, though he retreated to Chongqing for several years during the
Second Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945).\textsuperscript{78} Although Fu was less actively involved in the bustling debates on the modernization of Chinese painting taking place in Shanghai, he nonetheless held an admirable list of publications on Chinese art history.\textsuperscript{79} During his time in Japan, Fu was attracted to the integration of naturalistic and poetic effects in Japanese-style painting or \textit{nihonga}.\textsuperscript{80} But he had a mixed feeling towards Japanese artists’ passion for Chinese painting.

\textit{Landscape in the Style of Shitao (Fang Shitao shanshui 仿石濤山水)} (fig. 49) well illuminates Fu’s love-hate relationship with Japanese-style painting. Modeled after Shitao’s \textit{Visiting the Huayang Mountains} (\textit{You Huayangshan} 游華陽山) (fig. 50), this painting encompasses a simultaneous tribute and challenge to the master by showing off his distinctive technique of delineating mountain surfaces.\textsuperscript{81} Fu did not try to make a faithful copy of the original Shitao. Rather, he infused Shitao’s wet landscape with a new lyrical naturalism and his own experience of living in hilly and humid cities like Nanchang and Nanjing. The hybridity of naturalistic and poetic effects in Fu’s works

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{78} For a succinct history of Fu’s life, see Anita Chung, “Of History and Nation: The Art of Fu Baoshi,” in Chung, \textit{Chinese Art in an Age of Revolution}, 1-27.

\textsuperscript{79} Fu’s achievements as an art historian, especially in the 1930s, are analyzed in Kuiyi Shen, “Fu Baoshi and the Construction of Chinese Art History,” in Chung, \textit{Chinese Art in an Age of Revolution}, 29-33.


\textsuperscript{81} The texture stroke is labeled “Baoshi cun” 抱石皴 by some of Fu’s Chinese supporters. Most of strokes are applied on to the paper surface with the tip of the side of the water-drop-shaped brush head, but this technique requires the fur in the brush head to be spread out so the brush head has many tips. As a result, it is almost like painting with several smaller brushes simultaneously in one’s hand. However, Fu probably learnt the technique from Japanese artists such as Kosugi Hōan 小杉放庵 (1881-1964) and others who used it earlier.
\end{footnotesize}
cannot be separated from his exposure to Japanese-style painting by modern *nihonga* artists including Tomioka Tessai 大岡鉄斎 (1837-1924), Yokoyama Taikan 洋山大観 (1868-1958), and Hashimoto Kansetsu 橋本關雪 (1883-1945). But Fu did not just copy from the Japanese originals. Even though *Landscape in the style of Shitao* may be said to carry a Japanese flavor, Fu’s delineation of the landforms with texture strokes like “Baoshi cun” rather than the pervasive ink washes in *nihonga* exhibits his artistic concerns for the continuation of the Chinese interest in the brush line. Espousing Shitao’s “I always use my own method” as a motto literally set in stone (i.e. carved into seals) (figs. 51 and 52), Fu understood that the ideal process of imitation and transformation could only be realized when the painter was able to manipulate different styles freely. Fu Baoshi succeeded in fashioning his own style of modern Chinese ink painting by integrating Shitao’s styles and creativity along with Japanese models, the latter of which Fu was reluctant to admit due to the worsened state of Sino-Japanese relations after his return from Tokyo.

For Fu Baoshi, Shitao was more than simple artistic inspiration; he was a national symbol worthy of intensive biographic and historical research. In April 1934, Fu enrolled in a postgraduate program at the Imperial University of Fine Arts (current-day Musashino

---

82 For a discussion of Fu’s indebtedness to *nihonga* masters, see Zhang Guoying 張國英, *Fu Baishi yanjiu* 傅抱石研究 (Fu Baoshi: his life and his paintings) (Taipei: Taibei shili meishuguan, 1991), 145-89.

83 Among the existing seals owned by Fu, two read “I use my method” (wo yong wofa 我用我法). At least one of them was carved during Fu’s stay in Tokyo in 1934. Ye Zonggao 葉宗濤, ed., *Fu Baoshi suozao yin gao* 傅抱石所造印稿 (Stamps of seals made by Fu Baoshi) (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2004), 2: 28b, 54b, and 91b.
Art University) near Tokyo to study art history, sculpture, painting, and crafts.\textsuperscript{84} In a letter written to his Japanese advisor Kinbara Seigo at the end of 1934, Fu stated his intention to write a comprehensive biography of Shitao: “During this break, I plan to study Shitao and finish writing an annotated biography of him. I do not know why Hashimoto Kansetsu, who has compiled Sekitō,\textsuperscript{85} said that ‘it is impossible to write an annotated biography of Shitao.’ Now I will force myself to try, but am not sure if it will come through.”\textsuperscript{86} Fu’s research on Shitao’s biography, paintings and inscriptions resulted in a series of manuscripts prepared in the late 1930s and in the 1940s: “Nigauri oshō nenhyō” 苦瓜和尚年表 (A Chronology of the Monk Bitter Mellon), “Shitao nianpu gao” 石濤年譜稿 (Draft of Shitao’s chronicle), “Shitao shangren shengzu kao” 石濤上人生卒考 (Textual research on Shitao’s birth and death), “Shitao congkao” 石濤叢考 (A textual study of Shitao), “Shitao zaikao” 石濤再考 (The second textual study of Shitao), “Shitao sankao” 石濤三考 (The third textual study of Shitao), Shitao shangren nianpu 石濤上人生年譜 (A Chronicle of Shitao), and Dadizi tihua shiba jiaobu 大瀧子題畫詩跋校補


\textsuperscript{85} Hashimoto Kansetsu 橋本關雪, Sekitō 石濤 (Shitao) (Tokyo: Chūō Bijutsusha, 1926).

\textsuperscript{86} 現晚擬在此休息中研究石濤，先將其評傳寫成。但不為曷事，橋本關雪氏(編有石濤一書)曾云: “欲寫石濤之評傳為不可能”。晩今勉為之，未知有有望否. Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, letter to Kinbara Seigo 金原省吾, December 29, 1934, reprinted in Ye Zonggao 叶宗镐, Fu Baoshi nianpu 傅抱石年譜 (A chronicle of Fu Baoshi) (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2004), 22.
Through the project, Fu achieved unprecedented goals such as deducing the birth and death dates of Shitao, clarifying Shitao’s family history and travel routes, and collecting Shitao’s poems and inscriptions comprehensively. Based on Shitao’s works and previous studies done in China and Japan, Fu Baoshi adopted the traditional methodology of textual research (考據學), i.e. collecting, categorizing, and integrating all available materials into chronological order.

Fu Baoshi’s ambition to conduct textual research on Shitao, a difficult mission hindered by historical distance and a scarcity of materials, was ultimately stimulated by Japanese research on the same subject. As revealed in his 1934 letter to Seigo, Fu was

87 Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, “Nigauri oshō nenhyō” 苦瓜和尚年表 (A Chronology of the Monk Bitter Melon), Bi no kuni 美之国 (Country of fine art) 3 (1935); “Shitao nianpu gao” 石濤年譜稿 (Draft of Shitao’s chronicle), Wenyi yuekan 文藝月刊 (Literature and art monthly) 1 (1936); “Shitao shangren shengzu kao” 石濤上人生卒考 (Textual research on Shitao’s birth and death), Wenhua xianfeng 文化先鋒 (Cultural pioneers) 12 and 13 (1946); “Shitao congkao” 石濤叢考 (A textual study of Shitao), Wenyi yuekan 5 (1936); “Shitao zaikao” 石濤再考 (The second textual study of Shitao), Wenyi yuekan 6 (1937); “Shitao sankao” 石濤三考 (The third textual study of Shitao), finished in July 1940; all listed in Wan Xinhua 万新华, “Fu Baoshi zhi Shitao yanjiu de kaocha” 傅抱石之王濤研究的考察 (An investigation of Fu Baoshi’s research on Shitao), Meiyuan 美苑 (Garden of fine art) 6 (2007): 38. The manuscript of Shitao shangren nianpu was finished by 1941, and first published as seven installments in Jinghu zhoukan 京華週刊 (Nanjing and Shanghai weekly) in 1947, and later published as a book in Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, Shitao shangren nianpu 石濤上人年譜 (A Chronicle of Shitao) (Shanghai: Jinhu zhoushi, 1948). The manuscript of Dadizi tihua shiba jiaobu was finished in 1937, but did not get published with photo-offset until 2006. Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, Dadizi tihua shiba jiaobu 大涤子題畫詩跋校補 (Corrected and amplified collection of Shitao’s painting inscriptions) (Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe, 2006).

88 Wan, “Fu Baoshi zhi Shitao yanjiu de kaocha:” 37-44. Fu’s goals were certainly ambitious in his time, and his research, although not free of errors such as on Shitao’s birth and death dates, has been an important reference on Shitao’s biography to later scholars including Qi Gong 启功, Xie Zhiliu 謝稚柳, Wu T’ung, Wen Fong, and Wang Shiqing 汪士清. Hay, “Shitao’s Late Work,” 59, n2.
setting himself in opposition with Hashimoto Kansetsu, the famous *nihonga* painter who published *Sekitō 石濤* (Shitao) in 1926, a monograph composed of scattered records of Shitao from Qing-Chinese sources. Although studying with a knowledgeable Japanese art historian and awed by the Japanese scholarly interest in traditional Chinese art, Fu was not overwhelmed but remained critical of Japanese research.89 Fu Baoshi ridiculed the dearth of *thorough* Japanese research on Shitao:

When flipping open Hashimoto’s *Sekitō*, I had great hope and thought there must be some new materials in it. At least, I expected to get some clues about Shitao’s birth and death dates. There is this chapter “biography,” but it simply translates the excerpts from *Yangzhou huayuan lu* 揚州畫苑錄 (A record of Yangzhou painters) and *Huashi xulu* 畫史續錄 [sic] into Japanese without changing a word.90 … When it comes to Matsushima’s [Matsushima Shūe 松島宗衛; 1871-1935] work,91 it reads like a deluge of heavenly flowers, as casual as a biography written for a friend, and full of nonsense. … It is true that Japanese research on Chinese stuff may have its original opinions and special approaches, but there are also works that are rough and slipshod, or even plagiarizing what early scholars have already written.92

89 For Fu’s criticism on the history of early Chinese landscape by Ise Sen’ichirō 伊勢専一郎 (1891-1948), see Shen, “Fu Baoshi and the Construction of Chinese Art History,” 30-31.

90 *Huashi xulu* 畫史續錄 may be a typo of (*Guochao* huazheng xulu 國朝畫徵續錄 (An amplified record of Qing painters)).

91 Fu was likely talking about Matsushima Shūe’s “Nigauri oshō Sekitō” 苦瓜和尚石濤 (Monk Bitter Melon Shitao), collected in Matsushima Shūe 松島宗衛, *Bokurin shingo* 墨林新語 (New words on the ink grove) (Tokyo: Nikka Kurabu, 1926), 113-32.

Attempting to surpass Japanese scholarship that relied narrowly on “painting theories” *(huihualun 繪畫論)* or Qing writing on Shitao, Fu expanded his research scope to include the individualist’s biography, artistic thoughts, and the social ambience of his times. On the other hand, however, Fu admitted regretfully that the interest of Japanese scholars working on the subject contrasted sharply with the indifference in China. Fu Baoshi’s enthusiasm in studying Shitao was fueled by a mixed sense of embarrassment at China’s lag behind Japan, and pride assured by his culturalist belief that he would exceed Japanese scholarship as a Chinese.

Fu Baoshi’s other writings from the Republican period also disclose that he possessed a strong nationalistic tone and upheld Shitao as an embodiment of China’s spirit. Commenting on the circumstances of art in China’s Republic, Fu professed his uneasiness about the stagnated development of Chinese ink painting, his admiration for a small number of recent masters, and his worry about Chinese artists’ worship of modern Japanese art. He cautioned, “I can tell those paying attention to the Japanese painting circle: except for those [Chinese artists] who died two hundred years ago, most are not respected in Japan. … As for their research on Chinese painting, the purposes are very

---

93 Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, “Dadizi tihua shiba jiaobu zixu” 大涤子題畫跋校補自序 (Self-preface to the corrected and amplified collection of Shitao’s painting inscriptions), written on March 6, 1937, reprinted in Ye, *Fu Baoshi meishu wenji*, 132.

94 Ibid.

95 Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, “Minguo yilai huihuazhishi de guancha” 民國以來國畫之史的考察 (Observations on the history of national painting since the Republic), originally published in *Yijing 逸經* (Scattered classics) 34, (July 1937), reprinted in Ye, *Fu Baoshi meishu wenji*, 138-43.
complicated.” By “those who died two hundred years ago,” Fu was referring to the group of individualist masters, including Shitao, whose creativity brought Chinese painting to another climax during the Ming-Qing transition in the seventeenth century. In another article, “Zhongguo huihua zhi jingshen” 中國繪畫之精神 (The spirit of Chinese painting), Fu Baoshi explicitly affirmed that Chinese painting had always shown the national spirit of China. Providing a list of examples of ancient masters who did and did not represent national spirit, Fu cited Zhao Mengfu 趙孟頫 (1254-1322) and several other painters as negative examples. According to Fu, because Zhao had abandoned his identity as an imperial descendant of the Song when he accepted the official rank offered by the Mongol Yuan, he was condemned by later commentators. Even the reputation of Wang Meng 王蒙 (1308-1385) suffered because he was Zhao’s nephew. Aware of the controversy over whether Shitao, the leftover subject of the Ming dynasty, had painted for the Kangxi Emperor of the Manchu Qing, Fu listed Shitao neither as a positive nor a negative example. Elsewhere, Fu conceded, “At first I tried arduously to prove false the record [of Shitao meeting with Kangxi]; but later I found Shitao’s own inscription talking about the event. … It does not, however, harm the sun and the moon.” Fu nevertheless

96 我可以告訴關心日本畫壇的人, 中國畫在日本, 除了死去在二百年以上的作家, 是看不起的. … 至於他們研究中國畫, 那目的又複雜的很. Ibid., 141-42.

97 Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, “Zhongguo huihua zhi jingshen” 中國繪畫之精神 (The spirit of Chinese painting), originally published in Jinghu zhoukan 京滬周刊 (Nanjing and Shanghai weekly) 1, 38 (September 28, 1947), reprinted in Ye, Fu Baoshi meishu wenji, 357-60.

98 Ibid., 358.

99 余初力辯其偽, 後於湘湘老人題記見之. … 然亦無傷日月也. Fu, Shitao shangren nianpu, 32.
remained sympathetic to Shitao’s plight, and included Shitao as a national artist in both “Mingmo siqiseng” (The four strange monks of the end of the Ming) and *Mingmo minzu yiren zhuan* (Bibliographies of national artists of the end of the Ming).
Japanese Scholars’ Placement of Seventeenth-Century Individualists

Although several famous Ming loyalist painters, particularly Shitao and Bada Shanren, enjoyed great popularity in Japan starting in the early twentieth century, the concept of *imin* 遺民 painting and its ideological values did not gain currency in Japan, a country where imperial lineage had remained unbroken since its founding myth. One of the few instances in which the significance of leftover subjects is singled out is the compilation of biographic records of Chinese painters by Yamamoto Teijirō and Kinari Toraichi. The sixteen-volume monograph, published in 1928 and titled *Sō gen min shin shoga meiken shōden* 宋元明清書畫名賢詳伝 (Detailed biographies of the famous painters and calligraphers of the Song, Yuan, Ming, and Qing dynasties), affirms in its preface the necessity of assigning the loyalists to the right dynasties:

> On the occasions of dynastic falling and thriving, there are many notable sages whose affiliations have not been determined. This book strives to investigate the origin and trace of the *imin* of a previous dynasty, who might live in the new regime but whose mind remained with the bygone rulers. Their loyalty never goes away even after thousands of generations. But for those who are famous [and already canonized], such as the Four

---

1 The Japanese term and its Chinese equivalent use the same characters and have the same pronunciation, but appear differently in Romanization, as *imin* in Japanese Kana and *yimin* in Chinese Pinyin.
Masters of the Yuan and the Four Wangs of the Qing, no reattribution is imposed.²

As a result, most seventeenth-century loyalists are placed in the three volumes (6-8) addressing the end of the Ming, with a few others spread out into the volumes on the mid-Ming and early Qing. This way of historicizing imin painters did not gain currency among Japanese art historians in the first half of the twentieth century, but inspired Chinese readers like Fu Baoshi to further work on distinguishing the loyalists. According to Fu, Mingmo minzu yiren zhuan draws the biographies of its forty-six Ming loyalist artists from various volumes of Sō gen min shin shoga meiken shōden: Cheng Jiasui from volume 5, thirteen painters from Cao Xuequan to Shao Mi from volume 6, thirteen artists from Chen Hongshou to Zhang Feng from volume 7, fifteen loyalists from Zha Shibiao to Jiang Shijie from volume 8, Wang Shimin and Wang Jian from volume 9, and Wu Li and Yun Shouping from volume 10.³

Although Japanese scholars were largely disinterested in the discourse of Ming loyalist painting, they remained entranced by seventeenth-century Chinese individualist painting which they classified not as imin painting, but as an artistic trend of the Qing. In the first half of the twentieth century, there were a handful of Japanese texts detailing the

² 各代達興の際, 名賢の所屬未だ世に定まらざる者多し。本書は力めて之が出處の跡を考究し, 身は縹ひ興朝に至って卒すといへども, 志仍は亡國亡君に在りし者は, 之を前朝の遺民とし, 以てその忠節を千載に没せざらしも。但だ元四の大家といひ、清の四王吳恽といへる如き, 久しく人耳に熟せる者は, 今強いて之を改めず。Yamamoto Teijirō 山本悌二郎 and Kinari Toraichi 紀成虎一, Sō gen min shin shoga meiken shōden 本元明清書画名賢詳伝 (Detailed biographies of the famous painters and calligraphers of the Song, Yuan, Ming, and Qing dynasties) (Tokyo: Heigo Shuppansha, 1928) 1: 3.

³ The full list of names is recorded on pages 59-60 of this paper, and follows the original sequence in Mingmo minzu yiren zhuan. Fu, Mingmo minzu yiren zhuan, liyan (例言), 1.
history of Chinese painting. These writings, which functioned primarily as textbooks for art history, represent two generations’ worth of Japanese scholarship in the later Meiji and Taisho period and the Shōwa period, namely before and after Japan became fully invested in fascism around 1930. Of the older generation, Naitō Konan (also known as Naitō Torajirō 内藤虎次郎), Nakamura Fusetsu, and Ōmura Seigai are most famous; of the younger generation, Ichiuji Yoshinaga 一氏義良 (1888-1952) and Kinbara Seigo are best known.

Although not a single one of their monographs on Chinese art history distinguishes the genre of Ming inmin painting, all show a great interest in the group of individualist painters who were factually Ming loyalists, but only so-labeled sporadically. In his 1916 “Shinchō no kaiga” 清朝の絵画 (Painting of the Qing dynasty), Naitō Konan tagged Bada Shanren along with Gu Yin, Xu Fang, and Jiang Shijie as the late-Ming “recluses” (itsushi 逸士 and inshi 隱士) who refused to serve the new Qing

---


government by living in seclusion. Konan’s definition of the late-Ming recluse is very close to that of Chinese yimin.

Japanese historians were generally more interested in juxtaposing seventeenth-century individualist painters with the orthodox school in the early Qing. Ōmura Seigai developed a neat categorization of early Qing painters, and his approach was accepted and followed by art historians in both Japan and China. As discussed in Chapter One, from the turn of century to the 1920s, Seigai carried out extended revisions and expansions on his texts on East Asian art history. In his 1910 Shina kaiga shōshi 支那繪画小史 (A short history of Chinese painting), Seigai opened the section on Qing painting with the assertion that the Southern School (Chinese: nanzong 南宗; Japanese: nanshū 南宗) dominated the Qing painting world, and the “Four Wangs” of the early Qing stood for the pinnacle of the orthodox school. He went on to list other notable landscape painters, including many Ming loyalists, in groups based on region, friendship, or convention: the Anhui School (led by Hongren), Four Masters of Haiyang 海陽四大家 (Sun Yi, Zha Shibiao, Wang Zhirui 汪之瑞, and Hongren), Two Masters of the Lower Yangtze 江左二家 (Xiao Yuncong and Sun Yi 孫逸), Two Talents of the Painting

---

6 Ibid., 155.

7 Nanga 南画 (Southern painting) or bunjinga 文人画 (literati painting) was a form of Japanese painting that flourished in the late Edo period. Nanga was mostly in monochrome black ink, sometimes with light color, and patterned after Chinese literati painting. For histories of Japanese literati painting, see Umezawa Seiichi 梅澤精一, Nihon nanga shi 日本南画史 (History of Japanese Southern Painting) (Tokyo: Nanyōdō, 1919); and James Cahill, Scholar Painters of Japan: The Nanga School (New York: Asia Society, 1972).

8 Ōmura, Shina kaiga shōshi, 24a-25b.
Shitao was placed with other individualists who did not belong to any particular school but developed their own landscape styles of the Southern School.

In 1925, Ōmura Seigai published the revised and expanded *Tōyō bijutsushi* 東洋美術史 (A history of East Asian fine arts) that would soon be translated in China. The book is based on several of Seigai’s previous publications: a text produced in April 1905 for the students at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts (Tōkyō Bijutsu Gakkō 東京美術学校), titled *Tōyō bijutsu shōshi* 東洋美術小史 (A short history of East Asian Fine Arts) and published by Shinbi shoin 審美書院 in April of the following year; its offprints *Shina kaiga shōshi* and *Nihon kaiga shōshi* 日本絵画小史 (A short history of Japanese painting), both published by Shinbi Shoin in 1910; and *Shina bijutsushi chōso hen* 支那美術史彫塑篇 (Chinese Art History: Sculpture) by Bussho Kankōkai Zuzōbu 仏書刊行会图像部, published in 1915. The chapter on Qing painting in the 1925 edition builds on that of the 1910 *Shina kaiga shōshi* and reflects Seigai’s updated Chinese references gleaned from his trips to China. To the non-orthodox groups, Seigai added the Three

---

9 Ibid., 25b-26a.
10 Ibid., 26a.
11 Ōmura, *Tōyō bijutsushi* (1925), reigen 例言, 1.
Competing Masters 鼎足名家 (Cheng Zhengkui, Fang Hengxian 方亨鹹, and Gu Dashen 顧大申), and Four Monks 四大名僧 (Hongren, Bada Shanren, Shitao, and Kuncan). 12

Similar to Ōmura Seigai’s narrative of Qing painting, Shina kaigashi 支那繪畫史 (History of Chinese painting) by Nakamura Fusetsu and Oga (Kojika) Seiun, published in 1913, provides a lengthy list of names identifying all the individualists and regional schools in addition to the orthodox masters of the early Qing. 13 In the preface, Fusetsu introduces his co-author Seiun, a graduate of Soto-shu University (Sōtōshu daigaku 塘田宗大学; renamed Komazawa 駒澤 University after 1925). Before becoming a lecturer at the University of Law and Politics (Hōsei daigaku 法政大学), Seiun had traveled in China for five years and became interested in researching Chinese painting. 14 In the authors’ opinion, although Japanese painting as an art was flourishing, books on art history and especially Chinese painting could barely be found in libraries, a shame given that Chinese painting was the ancestor of Japanese painting. 15

Up to the Taisho period (1912-1926), Japanese Sinologists commonly revered continental art and culture. In November 1921, Naitō Konan gave a lecture on Southern Painting (nanga) and its position in the world at the Japan Southern Painting Academy

12 Ibid., 433-36.

13 Nakamura Fusetsu 中村不折 and Oga (Kojika) Seiun 小鹿青雲, Shina kaigashi 支那繪畫史 (History of Chinese painting) (Tokyo: Genkōsha, 1913), 190-93.

14 Ibid., shogen 絪言, 2.

15 Ibid., shogen 絪言, 1.
Overall, the talk was a defense for the significance of *nanga* as a form of Chinese art. Konan expressed doubt about Westerners’ capability of comprehending Chinese painting of all dynasties, citing the fact they were only collecting works from the Song and Yuan dynasties. He estimated that it would take Western researchers several decades after they gained full insight into Song and Yuan painting just to begin to understand Ming and Qing painting. Declaring the Japanese about two or three centuries behind in learning continental styles, Konan went on to condemn the Meiji Restoration for devastating traditional culture by creating a setback in Japanese knowledge on recent developments in Chinese literati painting over the past three decades. He noticed it was only recently that contemporary Japanese painters began to realize their shallow grasp of *nanga* and study the newest Chinese models in the hope of achieving innovation.

Naitō Konan’s outlook on Chinese art was bright. The historian treated the fate of a nation and its civilization dialectically. According to Konan, the full blossoming of a

---


17 Ibid., 216.

18 Ibid., 217. Naitō was perceptive. Victoria Contag was among the first to research Qing painting in China in the 1930s. The earliest fruition of her research was the seal book of Ming and Qing. Wang Jiqian 王季遷 (C.C. Wang) and Kong Da 孔達 (Victoria Contag), comps., *Ming Qing huajia yinjian* 明清畫家印鑑 (Seal stamps of Ming and Qing painters) (Changsha, Commercial Press, 1940); Wang Jiqian 王季遷 (C.C. Wang) and Victoria Contag, comps., *Seals of Chinese Painters and Collectors of the Ming and Ch’ing Periods*, with introduction by James Cahill (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1966).

19 Ibid., 218.
civilization often led the nation to its demise, but the anxiety during the period of transition and its subsequent intellectual and artistic production would set the trend for the next era. To look down on the culture produced during the waning period as corrupt or worthless was simply wrong.\(^{20}\) Although it was possible that China would fail politically and never have a real class of modern citizens (*kokumin* 国民), Konan continued, its cultural deposits over the past several millennia were a great contribution to the world, and its culture could still conquer the whole world one day.\(^{21}\) Konan further stressed Japan’s indebtedness to Chinese culture by declaring that Japanese art was rather provincial in the scope of East Asian art. At best, it had added some local color when Chinese art was first introduced to the islands.\(^{22}\)

The importance of seventeenth-century Chinese painting to modern Japanese scholars lay in its interpretation as the model on which Japanese literati painting (*nanga* or *bunjinga*) was based. Art historians in early twentieth-century Japan traced different aspects of the seminal period during which literati painting was imported from China to Japan. As early as the end of the Ming dynasty, Yiran 逸然 and other Chinese Buddhist monks escaped the turmoil to Japan, and entertained themselves with ink painting while practicing Buddhism.\(^{23}\) In the Yongzheng reign (1722-1735), literati like Yi Fujiu 伊孚九 and Fei Hanyuan 費漢原 traveled to Nagasaki and further enticed Japanese interest in

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 219.

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 222-23.

\(^{22}\) Ibid., 223.

nanga. In addition to the fact that a handful of Chinese painters who were little-known in their own country had made their way into Japan and passed on literati styles within the confines of Nagasaki, painting manuals printed in China were disseminated more widely in Tokugawa Japan (1600-1868). A copy of the woodcut Mountains and Rivers in Peace (Chinese: Taiping shanshui; Japanese: Taihei sansui) by Xiao Yuncong emerged in Japan, was acquired by Gion Nankai (1676/7-1751), and was copied by Ike Taiga (1723-1776) to learn nanga. A better-known import would be Painting Manual of the Mustard Seed Garden (Chinese: Jieziyuan huazhuan; Japanese: Kaishien gaden), based on earlier illustrations by Li Liufang (1575-1629) and contributed to by Wang Gai (Gong Xian’s disciple). The manual was believed to be the most popular copybook among nanga painters in Japan.

Ōmura Seigai and Naitō Konan represented two different ways of writing art history in the early twentieth century. Take some of the most renowned Ming loyalist painters, for example. While Seigai placed great emphasis on an artist’s biography, Konan focused more on situating art within its historical and contemporary contexts. Seigai included only a small number of images in Tōyō bijutsushi that are not directly related to the text. Most of the information is derived from textual records, as

24 Ibid.
25 Naitō, Shina kaigashi, 155; Ōmura, Tōyō bijutsushi, 435.
26 Ichiuji Yoshinaga 一氏義良, Tōyō bijutsushi 東洋美術史 (East Asian Art History) (Tokyo: Sōgō Bijutsu Kenkyūjo, 1936), 235.
exemplified in his conventional introduction of Bada Shanren’s life: Bada and Shitao both freely used the brush to break away from existing rules, resulting in unconventional work that criticized society; Bada was dismayed by the eradication of the Ming royal family, and inscribed his painting using appellations like “laugh and cry” (Chinese: kuzhi xiaozhi 哭之笑之; Japanese: kokuno shōno 哭之笑之); his work harvested much admiration in the late Qing and became the root of the current Shanghai School. In contrast, Konan interpreted the eccentricity of loyalist art in its historical context: Shitao and Shixi created paintings representative of the strange and unconventional (kiitsu 奇逸) styles of the late Ming and early Qing, their self-indulgent individuality epitomizing the mindset of the time to diverge from others and pursue originality. Konan included many reproductions of paintings to facilitate his stylistic analysis. Alongside an illustration of Gong Xian’s Cloudy Mountains in the Style of Mi Fu (Chinese: Mo Mi Nangong yunshan 摹米南宮雲山; Japanese: Bo Bei Nangū unzan 模米南宮雲山) (fig. 3), then in Luo Zhengyu’s collection, Konan argued that Gong’s work was reminiscent of Western Impressionism.

From the late 1920s on, along with the Showa government’s adoption of military expansionist policies, the younger generation of Japanese art historians demonstrated a renewed interest in Chinese painting history, particularly in Ming loyalist or early Qing individualist painters. Their interpretation of Chinese art, however, had significantly

---

27 Ōmura, Tōyō bijutsushi, 436.
28 Naitō, Shina kaigashi, 154.
29 Ibid., 155.
changed to suit Japan’s expansionism and the new national narrative. Proving Naitō Konan’s theory that it would take time and distance for the Japanese to fully understand Qing art, younger scholars finally began to connect the Qing dynasty and its cultural legacy to the Republic of China. Ichiuji Yoshinaga’s *Tōyō bijutsushi* 東洋美術史 (History of East Asian Fine Arts), published in 1936, covers the whole history of Chinese art, concluding with the author’s prediction of the “three tendencies of modern Chinese painting.” Yoshinaga observed a climax and extremism in contemporary practices that foretold a bleak future for Chinese painting:

1. Literati amateurism is separated from professional skill and reaches its height of prosperity. Instead of the academic [orthodox] tradition, painters imitate Shitao, Bada, Hua Yan 華喦 (1682-1756), and the like, and aim at the feeling of expressionism. 2. The so-called *bunjinga* and *nanga* painters in China are mostly of the leisureed and learned class, and are largely high officials and millionaires. It is not yet the age for the proletarian masses. The crazy brushwork of Bada and Hua Yan is merely the extreme end of the enthusiasm for individualistic literati painting. Nevertheless, in their time, there were certainly people who did this for their livelihood. 3. Jiangnan has become the center of the proliferation of painters. In general, however, Chinese painting is not thriving. Recently, Western-style painting is widely practiced, but in no way can it be compared with the advancement of its Japanese counterpart.30

Amid the height of pan-Asianism, Sinologists in Japan were expected to devise a narrative that legitimized the takeover of China, a nation now portrayed as the big

---

30 第一は絵画が文人高士の餘技と専門画家とに分れ、しかも文人の餘技画が全盛を極めたことである。南画のアカデミアンと称すべき人々に対し、石濤、八大山人、新羅山人等の如き、表現派的気分本位画家が出た。第二は支那のいはる文人画家、南画家の殆ど全部が、有閔有識階級であり、またその大数が大官、富豪なることである。支那には今日まで無産大眾の時代はない。朱耷、華喦等の狂筆は、かかる個人主義文人画の極端なるマニアに過ぎない。勿論、その間、これを以て衣食する者も少なくてなかった。第三は、畫家の地方的擴散と、江南中心なることである。しかし、全般の見に、支那の繪畫は振はない。西洋風的繪畫も最近頃に行われるが、これまた日本の進展に比じるべくもない。Ichiuji, *Tōyō bijutsushi*, 238-239.
neighbor incapable of sustaining and reviving its own civilization. To some, including Kinbara Seigo, this meant the recent history of China ought to show a tendency of constant decline. In his 1938 *Shina kaigashi* (Chinese painting history), Seigo presumably followed Naitō Konan’s tripartite model of periodization (early, medieval, and modern), and placed the Yuan, Ming, and Qing dynasties in the modern period. As the war dragged on, however, Seigo broke from the neutral periodization, swiftly repositioning the Mongol Yuan into the second period of establishment (*seiritsu 成立*), and explicitly marking the Ming and Qing dynasties as belonging to the third phase of decline (*suitai 好類*) in his 1940 *Shina bijutsushi* (History of Chinese art) and 1943 *Shina kaigaron* (On Chinese painting). Seigo also expressed his strong belief that China was currently in a state of hopelessness as the degradation of art and culture persevered.

Although he regarded the Qing dynasty as an era signifying China’s demise, Kinbara Seigo spoke highly of the individualists. Contrasting the vibrancy of individualist painters with the dullness of orthodox painters rooted in tradition, Seigo praised individualists such as Gong Xian, Kuncan and Shitao, who amateurishly employed intense ink colors and untrammeled brushwork to instill their works with

---


inspiration.\textsuperscript{34} As to discourage optimism about the future of China’s art scene, he contended that Gong Xian, Shitao, Kuncan, Bada, and Zheng Banqiao (1693-1765), and the entire system as inherited by Zhao Zhiqian (1829-1884), Wu Changshuo, and other modern Chinese painters, were just derivative offspring (\textit{matsuryū}末流) of the literati tradition.\textsuperscript{35} Seigo was also convinced that beneath their reputations for excellence in painting, Shitao and Bada concealed their compassion for reviving the Ming Dynasty.\textsuperscript{36} His interpretation of Shitao benefited from recent scholarship as he cited extensively from Hashimoto Kansetsu’s reading of Shitao’s “one stroke” theory of painting.\textsuperscript{37} Also of great importance to Seigo was the opportunity to study original works of Qing painting in Japan through exhibitions such as the well-received display of Qing painting held at the Kyūkyodō 鳥居堂 in 1935. While reproductions of Shitao’s work often appeared stiff and distorted, the originals showed the thickness and strength of the brushwork.\textsuperscript{38}

\textbf{The Japanese Craze for Shitao in the First Half of the Twentieth Century}

As Naitō Konan had foreseen at the beginning of the twentieth century, his countrymen had acquainted themselves with painting by Qing masters like Shitao by the

\textsuperscript{34} Idem, \textit{Shina kaigashi}, 457.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 53.

\textsuperscript{36} Kinbara, \textit{Shina bijutsushi}, 226.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 226-34.

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 226.
mid-1930s, just a few decades after the arrival of the “new importations” from China into Japan. In 1930, Hashimoto Kansetsu recalled when he had worked on Shitao’s biography in the mid-1920s and found an introduction somewhere saying that Sekitō was a famous mountain in the Anhui province. He boasted that his and other Japanese scholars’ pioneer research on Shitao had led to the interest in studying Shitao in China. Kansetsu received news that a New Huangshan (Anhui) School of Painting was founded by contemporary Chinese painters who revered Shitao and Mei Qing, and literary scholars were also digging deeper for relevant materials on the early Qing individualists. In Japan, the puzzling facets of Shitao’s life and personality had also been pieced together painstakingly: he was born sometime in the 1630s and died before 1710; he was believed to have been tonsured and remained bald as a Buddhist monk even though he claimed the contrary; his identity as a Ming loyalist was suspected under the

39 Hashimoto Kansetsu 橋本関雪, “Sekitō Zahhitsu” 石濤雜筆 (Miscellaneous notes on Shitao), Bi no kuni 美之国 (Country of fine art) 2 (1930): 6.

40 Ibid., 7.

41 Kawai Senro proposed Shitao lived from 1636 to 1705. Fu Baoshi deduced that Shitao was born in 1630 and died 1707, citing a painting inscription by Shitao that states he was seventy years old in 1699. Fu also noted a possible inaccuracy, as Shitao might have meant he was in his seventies. They both relied on the inscription of a Shitao in the collection of Shinozaki Tsukasa 篠崎都香佐. Kawai Senro misread the year, and the painting is itself spurious. For a summary of the confusion caused by this forged Shitao, see Fu and Fu, Studies in Connoisseurship, 220-23. Kawai Senro 河井荃廬, “Sekitō ni tsuite giten nidai” 石濤に就て疑点二題 (Two doubtful points related to Shitao), Nanga Kanshō 南画鑑賞 (Connoisseurship of Southern Painting) 10 (1935): 14. Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, “Nigauri oshō Sekitō nenhyō,” 39. The years of Shitao’s birth and death remain a thorny problem with many contradicting materials. The most up-to-date conclusion is Jonathan Hay’s proposal of 1642-1707. For summaries of the controversy, see Fu and Fu, Studies in Connoisseurship, 223; Hay, “Shitao’s late work,” 59-60, n3.

42 Kawai Senro did not agree with Hashimoto Kansetsu’s view that Shitao wore hair as a monk, which was based on a letter from Shitao to Bada. Senro cited Wang Guowei’s Guantang Yimo 觀堂遺墨 (Writings left by Wang Guowei) published in Shanghai a few years ago, which contains a
speculation that he had ventured to serve the Qing government and sought favor from the Kangxi Emperor;\textsuperscript{43} and sometimes he was deified as an enlightened ascetic with supernatural power.\textsuperscript{44}

The blooming research on Shitao was aided by the fast-growing number of Shitao paintings, both original and counterfeit, that had been purchased by Japanese collectors who were proud to take custody of the Chinese treasure. Hashimoto Kansetsu recalled the few good examples of Shitaos in Japan before the mid-1920s, including \textit{Painting Album of Poems by Li Bo and Du Fu} (Chinese: \textit{Li Du shihua ce} 李杜詩畫冊; Japanese: \textit{Ri To shiga satsu} 李杜詩畫冊), owned by Monk Dokusan 獨山, \textit{Album of Seasonal Poems by Su Shi} (Chinese: \textit{Dongpo shixu ce} 東坡時序冊; Japanese: \textit{Tonpo jijo satsu} 東坡時序冊),

---

\textsuperscript{43} In 1930, Hashimoto Kansetsu recalled a recent conversation with Chen Xiaodie 陳小蝶 about Shitao and relevant new publications in Shanghai. The new materials revealed Shitao’s dark side. It was said that although a member of the Ming royal family, Shitao passed the civil service examination in the Qing, and also once composed a poem acknowledging the honor of his short meeting with Kangxi when the emperor stopped in Yangzhou during his Southern Tour. Kansetsu was reluctant to accept the anecdotes, and argued that if it is understandable that someone like Bada Shanren had to pretend to be a mute so as to escape the attention of the Qing government, it is also possible to sympathize with Shitao if he found it inevitable to make a perfunctory poem to commemorate the occasion of his meeting with the emperor. Hashimoto, “Sekitō Zahhitsu,” 7.

\textsuperscript{44} According to one version, Shitao once encountered a tree spirit when he was a monk at a temple in Mount Huang. The ghost came in the form of a giant. While others were frightened, Shitao used a pair of fire tongs to pick up a piece of burning charcoal from the furnace and threw the tongs and charcoal into the dustpan-shaped mouth of the creature. The giant fled. When the snow stopped the next day, the monks found in the mountains a walnut tree whose branches looked like limbs. One of its branches had a dustpan-shaped concave in which lay the burnt charcoal and fire tongs from the night before. Nakagawa Kazumasa 中川一政, “Sekitō ni tsuite” 石濤に就て (On Shitao), \textit{Nanga Kanshō} 10 (1935): 10.
then in Osaka, and a single album owned by Kansetsu himself. Since then, however, many more Shitaos had been imported to Japan, attracting increasing numbers of connoisseurs. The enthusiasm caused the market price of Shitaos to skyrocket in the 1930s, with innumerable forgeries fluxing into Japan’s art market. They became so expensive that Kansetsu could no longer afford to buy the best Shitaos. *Painting Album of the Yellow Mountains* (Chinese: *Huangshan huace* 黃山畫冊; Japanese: *Ōzan gasatsu* 黃山畫冊), much-desired by Kansetsu, was purchased first by Ishii Rinkyō 石井林響 (1884-1930), then Sumitomo Kanichi 住友寛一 (1893-1956). Kansetsu also yearned to buy the Shitao album in Jin Cheng’s collection, but was unable to acquire it because the price was too high and he did not have enough cash on hand. Kansetsu bitterly recollected hearing that Viscount Okabe Nagakage 岡部長景 (also known as Okabe Shishaku 岡部子爵, 1884-1970) purchased the album for 12,000 yen, half the price that was offered to him. Nonetheless, Kansetsu thought it a good thing that such works were preserved in Japan.

---


46 Many contemporaries were aware of the problem. Nakagawa, “Sekitō ni tsuite,” 20; Nagayo Yoshirō 長野善郎, “Shincho gaka to site no Sekitō” 清朝画家としての石濤 (Shitao as a Qing painter), *Nanga Kanshō* 10 (1935): 24-25.

47 Before Jin Cheng, the album was owned by Duan Fang 端方 (1861-1911) and a certain Minister of Finance, Mr. Zhang 財政総長張某氏, “Suiun gahaku no Sekitō ringa ni tsuite (kuchie kaisetsu)” 翠雲画伯の石濤臨画に就いて (口絵解説) (On Suiun’s paintings in the style of Shitao, commentary on the frontispieces), *Nanga Kanshō* 10 (1935): 28.


The Japanese craze for Shitao culminated in 1935, when the “Exhibition of the Six Masters of the Qing Dynasty” (Shinchō rokudaika ten 清朝六大家展) was held at the Kyūkyodō 鳴居堂 in Ginza from October 18 to 22. All twenty-two paintings on view, among them hanging scrolls, hand scrolls and albums, were from the personal collection of Nagahara Oriharu 永原織治 (1893-?). Of these, ten works were attributed to Shitao. Oriharu was a pediatrician and amateur painter who lived in Dalian, a coastal city in Manchuria then under the subject of Japanese colonization. His painting collection included works mostly by Qing painters such as Shitao, Bada Shanren, Hua Yan, Mei Qing, and Jin Nong, and allegedly contained the best extant works of Bada.

Although many of the Shitaos and Badas in Nagahara Oriharu’s collection are now identified as forgeries by Zhang Daqian, their authenticity was not openly challenged by Japanese connoisseurs and scholars at the time. The most scrutinized pair

---

50 No information has been found concerning the identities of the other five painters. Another might have been Bada Shanren. Oriharu published his collection of Shitao and Bada’s works of painting and calligraphy in 1961. Presumably some of the pieces exhibited in 1935 were included in the publication. Nagahara Oriharu 永原織治, Sekitō Hachidai Sanjin 石濤八大山人 (Shitao, Bada Shanren) (Tokyo: Keibunkan, 1961).

51 Nagahara Oriharu 永原織治, “Sekitō saku sūten o kataru (Shinchō rokudaika ten kaisai o ki to shite)” 石濤作数点を語る (清朝六大家展開催を機として) (Speaking several points about Shitao’s work, with the opportunity at the opening of the “Exhibition of the Six Masters of the Qing Dynasty”), Nanga Kanshō 11 (1935): 41.

52 Nagayo, “Shinshō gaka to site no Sekitō,” 25.


54 For example, Hashimoto Kansetsu might have noticed that the letter from Shitao to Bada in Nagahara Oriharu’s collection was questionable. It is interesting that Kansetsu, a renowned Shitao expert in Japan, did not contribute an essay to the special Shitao issue of Nanga kanshō.
of counterfeits in Oriharu’s collection involves a letter to Bada signed as Shitao (fig. 53), and a hanging scroll (fig. 54) entitled *Thatched Hut of Great Cleansing* (Chinese: *Dadi caotang* 大滌草堂; Japanese: *Daijō sōdō* 大滌草堂), which appears to be inscribed by Bada and dedicated to Shitao. Both pieces were exhibited at the Kyūkyōdō exhibition.55 And yet, not surprising in the least, Zhang Daqian forged both: he fabricated the letter on the basis of an original (fig. 55) in his own collection,56 and changed the ages of Shitao and Bada so as to correspond to the inscription on *Thatched Hut of Great Cleansing* and thereby “authenticate” the bogus painting.57 As Marilyn Fu and Shen Fu have pointed out, perhaps he did not want to endorse Oriharu’s collection, or maybe he simply did not have a chance to travel to Tokyo at the time. Oriharu published the letter in 1935, but Kansetsu had already published the text of another version in 1924 that he had seen in the collection of Tang Jisheng 唐吉生 in October 1923, when Kansetsu visited China. The content of the letter, translated into Japanese in Kansetsu’s article, matches the authentic letter now in the Art Museum of Princeton University. Nagahara Oriharu 永原織治, “Hachidai Sanjin ni ataeta Sekitō shokan ni tsuite” 八大山人に与へた石濤書簡に就て (On Shitao’s letter to Bada Shanren), *Bijutsu shinron 美術新論* (New debates on fine art) 12 (1935): 56-57. Hashimoto, “Hutatabi Gyokudō to Sekitō ni tsuite,” 126.

55 Besides Bada’s hanging scroll dedicated to Shitao, *Thatched Hut of Great Cleansing* 大滌草堂, and Shitao’s letter to Bada 石濤書翰寄八大山人, Oriharu listed the titles of eight works by Shitao: a handscroll titled *Pine Waves of Mount Huang* 黃海松濤圖軸, a landscape album of ten leaves 山水畫冊, an album of eight leaves 真跡冊, a landscape album of ten leaves titled *Stone Offerings* 石供山水冊, a landscape album of eight leaves titled *The Lonely Elderly* 零丁老人山水, a hanging scroll titled *Mount Huang* 黃山圖精品軸, a hanging scroll titled *Dragon of the West Hiding in Clouds* 西龍藏雲軸, and a hanging scroll titled *Mount Jianglang* 江郎山圖軸. The article omits two other Shitao’s from the exhibition, as the journal editor added at the beginning of the article that ten works by Shitao were exhibited. Nagahara, “Sekitō saku sūten o kataru,” 41-43.

56 Before Zhang Daqian, the original letter from Bada Shanren to Shitao was collected by Zhang’s teacher, Li Ruiqing, in Shanghai. Fu and Fu, *Studies in Connoisseurship*, 210.

57 Zhang altered the sequence of paragraphs slightly, and changed Bada’s age from seventy-four/five to over seventy and Shitao’s from a little short of sixty to sixty-four/five. For a detailed and convincing analysis that appraises and compares the two letters, see *ibid.*, 210-24, cat. no. XXIII.
the essential divide between Zhang and Shitao in artistic personality and historical circumstance predetermined that Zhang, even with his superlative technique, could neither grasp Shitao’s introvert personality nor achieve his unadorned, rustic styles. In the authors’ words:

[Zhang Daqian’s] brushwork is sharp, dynamic, and aggressive, moving in angular rhythms which tend to skid across the surface of the paper rather than sinking deep into its fibers. Whether working in meticulous line or splash-ink manners, he prefers light, astringent, blunt, or subdued tonalities. He almost never cultivates the flavor of the primitive or clumsy (cho) [zhuo 擦] but prefers the sleek and striking. As a result his works occasionally suffer from a thinness, an over-brilliance, and an excessive sharpness and brittleness of line. Subtlety and restraint in artistic terms are not Chang’s [Zhang’s] forte: he favors the dramatic and flamboyant. ⁵⁸

It is fair to say that visitors to the Kyūkyodō exhibition were looking at works in the styles of Shitao and Bada as filtered through Zhang Daqian’s brush (figs. 54 and 56). Although Zhang’s mischief further complicates the deciphering of Shitao’s life and connoisseurship of Shitao’s painting, his Shitao forgeries are tinted with his own modern sensibilities and would therefore have been even more appealing to twentieth-century viewers.

Accompanying the exhibition were two special issues (tokushū 特輯) of Nanga Kanshō 南画鑑賞 (Connoisseurship of Southern Painting, official journal of the Nanga Kansōkai 南画鑑賞会) dedicated to Shitao, published in October and November 1935. ⁵⁹ The magazine solicited entries from enthusiasts of various occupations, including Nagayo Yoshirō 長與善郎 (1888-1961) and Mushanokōji Saneatsu 武者小路実篤 (1885-1976),

⁵⁸ Ibid., 315.

⁵⁹ A few more articles on Shitao were published in issues 9 (September) and 12 (December) of Nanga Kanshō in 1935.
writers of the White Birch School of Literature (Shirakabaha 白樺派); Seki Nyorai 関如来, a journalist and art critic who helped Yokoyama Taikan 横山大観 (1868-1958) establish Nihon Bijutsuin and revive the painting circle; art historian Kinbara Seigo; nihonga painter Yano Kyōson 矢野橋村 (1890-1965); seal carver Kawai Senro 河井荃庐 (1871-1945); oil painters Hasegawa Saburō 長谷川三郎 (1906-1957) and Nakagawa Kazumasa 中川一政 (1893-1991); and last but not least, Chinese artists Liu Haisu and Huang Junbi 黄君璧 (1898-1991).

Shitao’s popularity among Japanese scholars and collectors had little to do with his imin identity, although it could only have ennobled his status as a virtuous man; rather, his fame in Japan derived from the energy imbedded in his brushwork, which offered great excitement to modern Japanese viewers. Japanese ink painters of both nihonga and

---


64 Kawai, “Sekitō ni tsuite giten nidai,” 14-16.


nanga considered Shitao the typical alternative to early Qing orthodox painting, though still within the literati tradition. In Yano Kyōson’s view, Shitao did a far better job than Wang Hui at conveying in painting the essence of things (shin o tsutaeru 神を傅へる), an idea based on East Asian Pantheism (Tōyō teki na hanshinron 東洋的な汎神論).\(^{67}\) Kyōson thought the difference between the two painters’ art was principally a reflection of their divergent characters (ningen 人間); while Shitao perfected his inner virtue to untrammeled heights, Wang Hui overlooked self-cultivation in favor of attaining mundane skills.\(^{68}\) Connecting this comparison to the current impasse of traditional painting, Kyōson went on to suggest that painters should refine their character by practicing Zen Buddhism.\(^{69}\)

Acknowledging Shitao’s idiosyncratic genius in the nanga tradition,\(^{70}\) novelist and playwright Nagayo Yoshirō evaluated Shitao against the standards of both literati painting tradition and modern Western aesthetics. To Yoshirō, Shitao’s work appeared modern and neurotic (shinkeishitsu 神経質), yet transcendent with a unique East Asian frame of mind (shinkyō 心境).\(^{71}\) Although not belonging with the top tier of Chinese painters like Wu Daozi 吳道子 (ca. 685-758), Wang Wei 王維 (692-761), Li Gongling 李公麟 (1049-1106), Dong Yuan 董源 (died ca. 962), and Emperor Huizong [of the Song]

---

\(^{67}\) Yano, “Sekitō to Sekitani sono hoka,” 12.

\(^{68}\) Ibid.

\(^{69}\) Ibid., 14.

\(^{70}\) Nagayo, “Shinchō gaka to site no Sekitō,” 20.

\(^{71}\) Ibid., 22.
宋徽宗 (1083-1135), Shitao was representative of Qing artists, and was also probably the last Han Chinese master of painting.\(^{72}\) Yoshirō enumerated the reasons for Shitao’s high esteem in modern times: Shitao lived in a time and place that was considered early modern; Shitao’s painting exceeded literati standards, revealing a skillfulness and freedom similar to masterpieces of Western watercolors; the neurotic quality in Shitao’s art was a familiar aspect of Western modernism (and thus could be compared to any modern French painter); and finally, his individuality showed a level of self-awareness \((jikaku 自覚)\) unprecedented in China.\(^{73}\)

Japanese oil painters further sought to find methodological similarities between Shitao and the European modernists. Nakagawa Kazumasa ranked Shitao second only to Van Gogh and Cézanne, for Shitao painted in a way that was closest to Western painting. Kazumasa explained:

> Since the Impressionists left their studios to paint \textit{en plein air}, Western painters have depended on their own eyes. They say they are not able to depict winded cherubs and things that cannot be seen; Shitao’s painting also relied on what he saw with his eyes rather than any internalized or memorized landscapes. … Cézanne said that he learned from nature first and then old masters; Shitao might also have said the same thing.\(^{74}\)

\(^{72}\) Ibid., 23.

\(^{73}\) Ibid., 21-23.

\(^{74}\) 西洋畵が画室から出て寫生するやうになった印象派以後の仕事は自分の眼をたよりにする。クルバーは翅の天使など見た事がないから自分は描かねと云ったき方だが、石濤の畵も胸中山水でなしに自分の眼をたよりにして居る。ではセザンヌは自然を第一の師、古人の作を第二の師と云ったと云はれるが石濤もさういっただろうと思うべし。Nakagawa, “Sekitō ni tsuite,” 9-10.
To Kazumasa, the shared interest in drawing from nature (shasei 写生) made it easier for oil painters to understand and appreciate Shitao.\(^{75}\)

Abstract oil painter Hasegawa Saburō found Shitao was not only up to the Western standard, but exceeded it. He objected that the Japanese put too much emphasis on the spirituality of Chinese painting while overlooking its scientific nature. He argued that the perception of the three distances in Chinese painting was an advanced way of converting nature into the picture plane, and that the Western method of foreshortening, developed during the Italian Renaissance, achieved just one aspect of the Chinese system.\(^{76}\) In Saburō’s view, Shitao mastered the Chinese way of painting and went beyond to exemplify the idea of freedom (shōyō 逍遙) cherished by Chinese literati. So he came in first place for refined taste (kōga na shumi 高雅な趣味) in China’s cultural history.\(^{77}\) Moreover, Saburō felt Shitao could be a remedy to the Japanese obsession with pastime and “taste” (shumi 趣味), hobbies developed in response to the boredom at the time. The tasteless and dreary life in Japan, described by Saburō as living like “the primitive men of the modern times” (kindai no genshijin 近代の原始人), stemmed from the excessive materialism of European civilization imbibed by Japan. Saburō hoped that Shitao’s free spirit and refined taste might be the way leading the Japanese out of this plight.\(^{78}\)

\(^{75}\) Ibid.

\(^{76}\) Hasegawa, “Sekitō e no akogare,” 12.

\(^{77}\) Ibid., 12-13.

\(^{78}\) Ibid., 13.
Cultural and Political Motivations in the “Alignment”

Japanese enthusiasm for Shitao was part of a larger movement to revitalize literati painting in Japan since the turn of the twentieth century. The Meiji era witnessed the flourishing of literati styles that featured dramatic landscape compositions with ostentatious brushwork in the 1860s and 1870s, and the proliferation of imitative literati painting in the 1880s and 1890s.\(^79\) The explosion of lesser literati work was met with an onslaught of criticism against *bunjinga*, as made clear in Ernest Fenollosa’s well-known denouncement of literati painting in the early 1880s.\(^80\) The reexamination and revival of literati painting in the emerging art establishment of modern Japan began at the end of the nineteenth century, and was signaled by the founding of the Japan Southern Painting Association (Nihon nanga kyōkai 日本南画協会) in Kyoto in 1897 and the Japan Southern Painting Institute (Nihon nangakai 日本南画会) in Tokyo in 1898.\(^81\)

---


\(^80\) For Meiji criticisms on *bunjinga*, see Christina M. E. Guth, “Meiji Response to *Bunjinga*,” in *Challenging Past and Present: The Metamorphosis of Nineteenth-Century Japanese Art*, ed. Ellen P. Conant (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2006), 177-96. Fenollosa first professed his objection to both *bunjinga* and Western painting and his endorsement of a middle course for *nihonga* between Chinese and European painting conventions in an English lecture given at the Dragon Pond Society (Ryūchikai 龍池会) in 1882 and the Japanese translation was published in October of the same year. Ernest Fenollosa, “Bijutsu shinsetsu 美術真説 (A true theory of fine art), originally published in Tōkyō nichinichi shinbun 東京日日新聞 (Tokyo daily news), October 9, 1882; reprinted in *Meiji bunka zenshū 明治文化全集* (Collected writings of Meiji culture), ed. Yoshino Sakuzō 吉野作造 (Tokyo: Nihon Hyōronsha, 1928), 12: 159-74. Fenollosa’s English manuscript has been lost, and the Japanese translation was the work of a team of interpreters, most likely including his intimate students Okakura Kakuzō 岡倉覚三 (1862-1913) and Ariga Nagao 有賀長雄 (1860-1925). Doris Croissant, “In Quest of the Real: Portrayal and Photography in Japanese Painting Theory,” in Conant, *Challenging Past and Present*, 164.

institutionalization of nanga also consolidated the meaning of the term to signify painting by professionally-trained literati-style artists. While the schism between old school (kyūha 旧派) and new school (shinpa 新派) escalated in the Japanese art world in the 1910s, a renewed interest in literati painting arose among the younger generation in both Japanese-style (nihonga) and Western-style (yōga) painting circles, and the term “New Southern Painting” (shin nanga) surfaced around 1917. Concurrent with the promotion of “shin nanga,” Ōmura Seigai and fellow academics revived the term “bunjinga” in order to reinforce the ideal of literati painting as the playful self-expression of amateur-scholars.

Both modern concepts, shin nanga and bunjinga were amalgams of Japanese traditions, “new importations” from China, and modern Western ideas of artistic autonomy. A broadly-defined trend rather than a stylistic designation, the New Southern Painting movement engaged artists across different painting circles: nanga and nihonga painters from Tokyo and Kyoto, including Komuro Suiun 小室翠雲 (1874-1945), Yano Kyōson, and Hashimoto Kansetsu; yōga-nihonga artists, including Nakamura Fusetsu and members of the Coral Group (Sangokai 珊瑚会); and independent ink and oil

---

82 Ibid., 31
83 Ibid. One of the earliest appearances of the term “shin nanga” was in the title of the editorial in the July issue of Chūō Bijutsu in 1917. “Shin nanga no kiun ugoku” 新南画の機運動く (The Emergence of New Southern Painting), Chūō Bijutsu 中央美術 (Central fine art) 7 (1917): 2-3.
84 For example, Ōmura Seigai 大村西崖, Bunjinga no fukkō 文人画の復興 (The revival of literati painting) (Tokyo: Kōgeisha, 1921); Umezawa Waken 梅澤和軒, “Hyōgen shugi no ryūkō to bunjinga no fokkō” 表現主義の流行と文人画の復興 (The popularity of Expressionism and the revival of literati painting), Waseda bungaku 早稲田文学 (Waseda literature) 186 (1921): 23-31.
painters who participated in neither art organizations nor official exhibitions.\textsuperscript{85} Such a diverse group of artists, especially those oil painters familiar with European Modernism, facilitated the introduction of Western notions like subjectivity and individualism, and prompted Japanese artists to reconsider the literati principle of self-expression.\textsuperscript{86}

In establishing similarities between literati painting and modern Western art, early twentieth-century Japanese artists and historians were recalibrating the aesthetics of Japanese ink and oil painting to compete with international modernism. Yokoyama Taikan and other Japanese-style painters revisited the expressive work by Japanese literati masters such as Ike Taiga and Yosa Buson (1716-1784) (fig. 57).\textsuperscript{87} Western-style oil painters argued boldly that a parallel conviction in the merits of subjectivity existed between Post-Impressionism and literati painting. As early as 1911, for instance, \textit{yōga} artist Fujishima Takeji (1867-1943) pointed out the psychological similarity between European modernists, including Gauguin, Van Gogh, and Cézanne, and Japanese masters such as Taiga and Buson.\textsuperscript{88} Among art historians, Taki Seiichi (1873-1945) and Umezawa Waken (1871-1931) were the first to theoretically link the principles of literati painting to those of modern European art.


\textsuperscript{86} Sakai, “Taishōki ni okeru nanga no saihyōka ni tsuite,” 3.

\textsuperscript{87} Morioka, “Transformation of Japanese Literati Painting in the Twentieth century,” 30; 39, n12.

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., 30. Fujishima Takeji, “Kontei to shinpo” 根底と進歩 (Root and Progress), \textit{Bijutsu shinpō} 美術新報 (Fine art newspaper) 11 (1911): 341-342.
Expressionism (hyōgen shugi 表現主義). By equating philosophical ideas in Eastern and Western aesthetics, such as “spirit resonance” (Chinese: qiyun 氣韻; Japanese: kiin 気韻) by Guo Ruoxu 郭若虛 (11th century) and “inner sound” (innerer Klang) by Wassily Kandinsky (1866-1944), both Seiichi and Waken were confident the popularity of Expressionism would lead to the revival (fukkō 復興) of literati painting.

Realigning the arts of their nation to suit the modern values of the twentieth century, Japanese painters and historians returned to literati painting as part of a wider exploration of past Japanese styles through which they could achieve innovative forms of expression. Although Japanese literati painting had long departed from its continental prototype, Japanese painters still sometimes sought inspiration in Chinese literati painting, particularly in the vigorous brushwork exemplified by Shitao and other seventeenth-century individualists. Take Komuro Suiun, for example. Famous for his decorative bird-

---


90 The earliest use of “qinyun” can be traced back to Guhua pinlu 古畫品錄 (The record of the classification of ancient paintings) by Xie He 謝赫 (5th century). But by citing it from Guo Ruoxu’s Tuhua jianwenzhi 畫畫見聞志 (Experiences in painting), Taki Seiichi was likely trying to fit into the timeframe of literati painting, which did not come about until Guo’s lifetime in the eleventh century. Taki, “Bunjinga to hyōgen shugi,” 160. For a summary of Seiichi’s argument in his essay, see Wong, Parting the Mists, 72.

and-flower works in both *nihonga* and *nanga*, the ink painter had a firm grasp of Shitao’s landscape styles, as shown in Suiun’s close copies of the Chinese master’s works (figs. 58 and 59). With the rise of Pan-Asian discourse, the Japanese felt it was their responsibility as the premier nation of Asia to preserve and advance continental traditions. In addition to attributing the root of *nanga* to late Ming and early Qing Chinese literati painting, Japanese painters were eager to establish a connection between *nanga* masters and Chinese individualists, most notably Shitao and Bada Shanren. Hashimoto Kansetsu used the term “rough” (*yasei* 野性) to describe both the *nanga* painter Uragami Gyokudō and Shitao. Ishii Hakutei 石井柏亭 (1882-1958) was more direct in pointing out that Tomioka Tessai was indebted to both Shitao and Bada’s styles. Shitao’s allure as a kaleidoscope through which different observers see different things, a quality to some extent magnified by Zhang Daqian’s finely-executed forgeries, enabled modern Japanese painters versed in ink and oil to interpret him as they pleased. This is exemplified in the special issues of *Nanga Kanshō*.

---


The appearance of Liu Haisu’s article on Shitao and Post-Impressionism in _Nanga Kanshō_, translated into Japanese by Kurotani Masato 黑谷正人,\(^\text{95}\) perfectly symbolizes the “alignment” or “synchronization” that I use to describe the transtemporal and cross-border rediscovery of Shitao in both China and Japan. There are two hypothetical approaches through which Liu arrived at his theory. On the one hand, Liu’s claim that Shitao is the patriarch of Post-Impressionism is akin to Chen Shizeng’s theory of literati painting as a counterpart to, or even a forerunner of, European modernist art. Chen Shizeng’s defense of literati painting (_wenrenhua_) was fueled by his meeting with Ōmura Seigai, the pioneer who foretold the revival of literati painting (_bunjinga_) in Japan, in late 1921 and early 1922.\(^\text{96}\) On the other hand, Liu Haisu may not have derived the idea from Chinese sources, but more directly from the Japanese art world when he visited Japan in the autumn of 1919.\(^\text{97}\) During the trip, Liu encountered many Japanese artists, including Fujishima Takeji, who had already proposed the psychological affinity between Post-Impressionists and _nanga_ masters.\(^\text{98}\) Contemporary reexamination of the Japanese artistic traditions of _nanga_ and _nihonga_ under Westernized criteria must have inspired Liu to reconsider how Chinese painting traditions, especially the transformative styles

---


\(^{	ext{98}}\) Some other artists met by Liu are Mitsutani Kunishirō 満谷国四郎 (1874-1936), Ishii Hakutei, and probably also Hashimoto Kansetsu. Michael Sullivan, _Art and Artists of Twentieth-Century China_ (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 73;
represented by Shitao, could be justified and thrive in modern times. In either case, Japan was the first to historicize Shitao and other early Qing individualists within a broader trend of reviving Japanese and East Asian literati painting; thanks to the early twentieth-century Sino-Japanese exchange of art and culture, China was driven forward onto the revitalization of its own literati tradition, historicizing and appropriating seventeenth-century individualist painting according to changing cultural and political impetuses.

The interests of Japanese and Chinese scholars rediscovering Shitao converged in the special issues of Nanga Kanshō when two Chinese artists, Liu Haisu and Huang Junbi, joined Japanese contributors to compose a collective eulogy of Shitao. Their attempts were soon disrupted, however, by the ferocious war between the two nations. The fissure that led to warfare stemmed from the intrinsic disparity between the two parties’ stances on the future of East Asian culture. Consider Shitao. While Japanese writers sympathetic to Pan-Asianism wanted to celebrate the Chinese master as part of the shared heritage of the Greater East Asia, notable figures in China refused to concede. The hostilities soon stirred Chinese artists to emphasize the loyalist facet of Shitao and other individualists, and to delineate them as patriotic heroes so as to boost Chinese nationalism. This Sino-

---

99 After returning to China, Liu wrote a long report on his experience with the modern Japanese institutions of art exhibitions and art education. Liu Haisu 劉海粟, Riben xin meishu de xin yinxiang 日本新美術的新印象 (New impressions of the new arts in Japan) (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1921).

100 A famous piece of Pan-Asianist writing on art is Okakura Kakuzō 岡倉覚三 (also known as 岡倉天心 Okakura Tenshin), The Ideals of the East (London: J. Murray, 1903). His ideology is discussed in Brij Tankha, Okakura Tenshin and Pan-Asianism: Shadows of the Past (Folkestone: Global Oriental, 2009). Of course, not all Japanese in the first half of the twentieth century believed in Pan-Asianism or militarism. As discussed earlier in this chapter, bunjinga and nanga advocates later counterbalanced the Fenollosa-Okakura model of promoting nihonga only.
centrism is evident in Huang Junbi’s article for *Nanga Kanshō*, entitled “Sekitō to Chūgoku gendaiga” 石濤と中国現代画 (Shitao and modern Chinese painting). After providing Shitao’s biographic information and repeating sayings already well-known to the Japanese, Huang concluded: “All in all, Shitao’s painting is totally about the self—subjective, not depending on other people—creative. [His spirit] is always progressive and ahead of its time, and matches the Zeitgeist of modern *Chinese* painting. It is not without reason that his painting is welcomed by common people nowadays.”101 While the two parties agreed on canonizing Shitao as “modern,” the Chinese wanted to retain Shitao as a Chinese icon rather than endorse his artistic legacy as a part of Japan’s “Greater East Asia.”

101 The original Chinese text and its Japanese translation are printed side by side in the journal.

Chinese: 總之, 石濤的畫完全是自我的—主觀的, 不依傍他人的—創作的, 永遠是時代的前進者, 與中國現代繪畫的思潮, 互相吻合, 他的畫在今日, 為一般人所歡迎, 不是無因的。

Conclusion

Discussing cross-border communication between China and Japan in the first half of the twentieth century is like gazing at the moon’s reflection in the water; while the facts appear close, they are always out of reach, their forms ever-shifting depending on where the observer stands. It is no doubt that China received great incentive, both gentle and violent, from the West and neighboring Japan. In some cases, when both parties shared a common interest, the Chinese adopted Japanese approaches to addressing a particular issue. It is, however, important to realize the fundamental difference in motivation underlying Japan and China’s respective modern transformations in the first half of the twentieth century, when nationalism was newly acquired and at its height.

Rather than tracing a pattern of “influence” between the two neighboring countries in terms of Sino-Japanese art history and historiography, my dissertation treats the Chinese and Japanese canonizations of early Qing individualist painting as two distinctive trajectories that converged at times because of shared cultural interests but ultimately resulted in disparate theoretical conclusions due to political conflict. The Japanese craze for seventeenth-century Chinese individualist art, particularly that of Shitao, started at the turn of the century along with the rekindled interest in nanga-bunjinga as an antidote to the monopoly of Japanese-style painting in the late nineteenth century. The cultural enthusiasm continued to grow in the second quarter of the twentieth
century despite the worsening diplomatic relations between the two nations. Japan’s venture into Pan-Asianism and military expansion, however, led Kinbara Seigo and other younger art historians sympathetic to the new ideology to adopt a pessimistic outlook toward the future of Chinese art. In contrast, Naitō Konan of the older generation foresaw a bright future for the same tradition. More research will have to be done on modern Japanese ink painters’ stylistic appropriation of Shitao in order to better understand the full impact of this trend.

One objective in this dissertation is to recognize the nuance between culturalism and nationalism in the Levensonian model, and apply the formula to interpreting the growing popularity of seventeenth-century individualist art in both China and Japan in the first half of the twentieth century. In the early twentieth century, artistic movements in both China and Japan were inspired by the Ming-Qing individualists for various, and largely shared, cultural reasons. The non-conformist styles provided both parties with the inspiration to defend and revitalize certain forms of ink painting in response to Western modernity. Yet each nation approached inherited cultural traditions from a different perspective. Take Shitao, for example. The Chinese perceived in him a dynamism that could invigorate ink painting as a form of Chinese (national) culture. The Japanese, on the other hand, used Shitao’s creativity to justify *nanga-nihonga* as a viable Japanese tradition equal to *nihonga* and oil painting in its importance. By the 1930s, the intensification of nationalism in both countries further complicated the situation, and in some cases, political sentiment overpowered cultural sympathy. Chinese and Japanese intellectuals of the second quarter of the twentieth century comprehended Shitao similarly on a cultural level, but very differently on the political front. From a culturalist
standpoint, both sides would still easily agree that Shitao stood for the vital energy of East Asian tradition in opposition to the West. Political nationalism, however, propelled this common understanding of Shitao into different directions. For example, to Kinbara Seigo, the art of Shitao and other early Qing individualists signaled the last flash of Chinese civilization before the emergence of the “Greater East Asia” with Japan at the helm. Fu Baoshi, on the other hand, repackaged the image of Shitao and other Ming loyalists to boost patriotism.

By tracing the Chinese rediscovery of Ming loyalist art in the late Qing and republican period, my study explicates how seventeenth-century individualist painting was canonized and synonymized with “yimin art” in modern China. Up to the 1920s, Chinese scholars assimilated the Japanese model of constructing art history as a modern discipline, and concurrently canonized the individualists by moving from the label of “Two Stones” to “Four Monks.” By the 1930s, Pan Tianshou established the conjectural rivalry between the orthodox masters and the “Four Monks” as archetype individualists. The yimin terminology, especially in art historical writing, was restricted in the first three decades of the twentieth century for two major reasons: before 1911, the ethnically charged term was threatening to the eyes of Manchu Qing government; in the 1910s and 1920s, yimin was downplayed again as the Nationalist Party attempted to unite ethnic groups in China. But the installation of Puyi 濟儀 (1906-1967), the last Qing emperor, as the puppet ruler of Manchukuo in 1932 and emperor in 1934, not to mention the subsequent Japanese incursions into China, made the “yimin” rhetoric once again suitable for anti-Manchu and anti-Japanese discourse. In the 1930s and 1940s, as a result of chauvinistic fervor, Fu Baoshi and Zheng Zhengduo further transformed contemporary
understanding of individualist art with the “yimin” tag, which magnified its loyalist, patriotic, and even ethnic meaning. This politically driven refocus then endowed a new, nationalistic significance beyond modernization to working in the styles of Shitao and other individualists.

Last but not least, by accentuating the varied manifestations of culturalism and nationalism in Huang Binhong, He Tianjian, Zhang Daqian, Liu Haisu, Pan Tianshou, and Fu Baoshi’s art and theory, my discussion of these Republican ink masters’ stylistic and rhetorical appropriation of early Qing individualists and particularly Shitao demonstrates the rich complexity of cultural and political impetuses to the advancement of Chinese ink painting in the first half of the twentieth century. In other words, China’s modern revival of individualist art does not fit neatly into a linear history of culturalism-turned-nationalism. Only Fu Baoshi among artists studied here exemplified a heightened sense of nationalism in his writings of the 1930s and 1940s, which was somewhat negated by his Japanese-inspired painting styles. Culturalism, on the other hand, continuously evolved to reconcile the tensions between China and the outside, be it the West, the Modern, or Japan. In the early twentieth century, Huang Binhong and He Tianjian considered Chinese ink painting far above and beyond its Western counterpart. Liu Haisu, an enthusiast for modern European painting, was among the first to recalibrate this Sino-centrism by equating Chinese and Western art. In the second quarter of the twentieth century, this metamorphosed cultural understanding of Chinese painting’s position against Western art compelled Huang Binhong, Zhang Daqian and Pan Tianshou to situate and transform the vigor of ink tradition, especially that of seventeenth-century individualist art, in the context of a seemingly fast Westernizing globe. Simultaneously
inspired by and competing with their Japanese peers, Republican Chinese artists and historians, from traditionalists to New Culture advocates and Republican nationalists, struggled to modernize traditional Chinese painting. Their reinterpretations, misinterpretations, and appropriations of Shitao and other Ming yimin painters uniquely served to realign Chinese art in the modern world.
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Table 1. A comparison of Ming loyalist painters recorded in the four publications by Pan Tianshou, Yu Jianhua, Fu Baoshi, and Zheng Zhengduo respectively during the 1930s and 1940s.


Z: Zheng Zhenduo 鄭振鐸, ed., *Ming yimin hua* 明遺民畫 (Ming loyalist painting), 2 vols., in *Yuwai suocang Zhongguo guhuaji* 域外所藏中國古畫集 (Ancient Chinese paintings in overseas collections) (Shanghai: Shanghai chuban gongsi, 1948-?).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bada Shanren 八大山人 (1626-1705)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu Shunnian 卜舜年 (1613-1644)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cai Shirun 蔡石潤 (1616-1698)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cao Xuequan 曹學佺 (1574-1646)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Ying 常嫖</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen Hongshou 陳洪綬 (1599-1652)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen Man 陳曼</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen Yinglin 陳應麟</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng Jiasui 程嘉燧 (1565-1643)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng Sui 程邃 (1605-1691)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng Yun 程雲</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng Zhengkui 程正揆 (1604-1676)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cui Zizong 崔子忠 (died 1644)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dai Benxiao 戴本孝 (1621-1691)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ding Yuangong 丁元公</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Wenguang 范文光</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang Yizhi 方以智 (1611-1671)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang Zhenru 方震孺 (1585-1645)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu Shan 傅山 (1607-1684)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gong Xian 龔賢 (1618-1689)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gu Yanwu 顧炎武 (1613-1682)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gu Yin 顧殷 (1612-?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gui Changshi 歸昌世 (1573-1644)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gui Zhuang 歸莊 (1613-1673)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guo Duxian</td>
<td>(1599-1672)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongren</td>
<td>(1610-1664)</td>
<td>P Y F Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hou Fangyu</td>
<td>(1618-1654)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Daozhou</td>
<td>(1585-1646)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Zongxi</td>
<td>(1610-1695)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Zongyan</td>
<td>(1616-1686)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiang Shijie</td>
<td>(1647-1709)</td>
<td>P F Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jin Junming</td>
<td>(1602-1675)</td>
<td>P Y F Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuncan</td>
<td>(1612-after 1674)</td>
<td>P Y F Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lan Meng</td>
<td>(1644-1722)</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lan Shen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lan Ying</td>
<td>(1585-1664)</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Yin</td>
<td>(1610-1685)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Du</td>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lü Liuliang</td>
<td>(1629-1683)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lü Qian</td>
<td>(1621-1706)</td>
<td>Y F Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo Mu</td>
<td>(1622-ca. 1704)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mao Xiang</td>
<td>(1611-1693)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mei Qing</td>
<td>(1623-1697)</td>
<td>Y Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni Yuanlu</td>
<td>(1593-1644)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qi Zijia</td>
<td>(1594-after 1683)</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qian Shizhang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quanxiu</td>
<td>詮修 (Monk)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shao Mi</td>
<td>(ca. 1592-1642)</td>
<td>F Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Kefa</td>
<td>(1601-1645)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shitao</td>
<td>(1642-1707)</td>
<td>P Y F Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su Dun</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Qifeng</td>
<td>(1584-1675)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan Shouqi</td>
<td>(1603-1652)</td>
<td>P Y Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Jian</td>
<td>(1598-1677)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Shimin</td>
<td>(1592-1680)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Siren</td>
<td>(1574-1646)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen Congjian</td>
<td>文從簡 (1574-1648)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen Dian</td>
<td>文點 (1633-1704)</td>
<td>F Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen Zhenheng</td>
<td>文震亨 (1585-1645)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen Zhenmeng</td>
<td>文震孟 (1574-1636)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wu Li 吳歷 (1632-1718)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Shantao 吳山濤 (1624-1710)</td>
<td>P Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiao Yuncong 蕭雲從 (1596-1673)</td>
<td>P Y F Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xu Fang 徐枋 (1622-1694)</td>
<td>Y F Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xu You 許友 (ca. 1620-1663)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Bu 楊補 (1598-1657)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Wencong 楊文聰 (1594-1646)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yezhou 葉舟 (Monk)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yun Shouping 悌壽平 (1633-1690)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yun Xiang 悌向 (1586-1655)</td>
<td>P Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zha Jizuo 查繼佐 (1601-1676)</td>
<td>P Y F Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zha Shibiao 查士標 (1615-1698)</td>
<td>Y F Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang Feng 張風 (died 1662)</td>
<td>F Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang Mu 張穆</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang Xun 張恂</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zou Zhilin 邹之麟</td>
<td>P Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Liu Haisu’s analogy of Shitao’s artistic principles and those of Post-Impressionism, in Liu Haisu 刘海粟, “Shitao yu houqi yinxiangpai” 石涛與後期印象派 (Shitao and the School of Post-Impressionism), originally published in *Shishi xinbao* 時事新報 (The newspaper of current events), supplement *Xuedeng* 學燈 (Study lamp), August 25, 1923; reprinted in *Liu Haisu yishu wenxuan* 刘海粟艺术文选 (Collected writings on art by Liu Haisu), ed. Zhu Jinlou 朱金楼 and Yuan Zhihuang 袁志煌 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin meishu chubanshe, 1987), 69-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Impressionism</th>
<th>Liu’s Additions</th>
<th>Shitao’s <em>Huayulu</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>expression; not representation</td>
<td>self-expression = opposite of representation</td>
<td>against imitation of the classics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表現; 非再現</td>
<td>個性人格之表現 = 非再現</td>
<td>and representation of nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synthesis; not analysis</td>
<td>synthesis = simplification</td>
<td>intuitive simplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>綜合; 非分析</td>
<td>綜合 = 單純化</td>
<td>由觀念而趨單純化</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durable art; not transitory</td>
<td>durability = timeless brushwork unrestricted by</td>
<td>transcendence; not bound by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>永久; 非一時</td>
<td>convention and skillfulness</td>
<td>objectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>永久 = 畫筆之超然脫然; 無一定系統之傳承; 無一定 Techniques of brushwork unrestricted</td>
<td>超然脫然; 說不到客觀束縛</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by convention and skillfulness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Figures
Figure 1. Reproduction of the painting entitled *A Recent Work Imitating Shitao* (*Jinren ni Shitao* 近入擬石濤) in issue 30 of *Yilin yuekan* 藝林月刊 (Art circle monthly), June 1932.
Figure 2. Pages from *Ming yimin hua* 明遺民畫 (Ming loyalist painting), two volumes, in *Yuwei suocang Zhongguo guhuaji* 域外所藏中國古畫集 (Ancient Chinese paintings in overseas collections), ed. Zheng Zhenduo 鄭振鐸 (Shanghai: Shanghai chuban gongsi, 1948-?).
Figure 3. Gong Xian 龔賢, “Cloudy Mountains in the Style of Mi Fu” (Mo Mi Nangong yunshan 摹米南宮雲山), Landscapes (Shanshui 山水), 1671. Leaf from album of ten leaves, ink and light color on paper, 24.1 x 44.7 cm. Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City.
Figure 4. A collotype printer imported in 1875, exhibited in the T’ou-sè-wè (Tushanwan 土山湾) Museum, Shanghai.
Figure 5. Cover, issue 1 of *Shenzhou guoguang ji* (National glories of Cathay), February 1908.
Figure 6. Cover, issue 7 of *Shenzhou guoguang ji*, February 1909.
Figure 7. Cover, issue 13 of *Shenzhou guoguang ji*, February 1910.
Figure 8.  Cover, issue 19 of *Shenzhen guoguang ji*, February 1911.
Figure 9. Cover, issue 1 of *Shenzhou daguan* 神州大観 (Grand Views of Cathay), February 1912.
Figure 10. Cover, issue 1 of Zhongguo minghua 中國名畫 (Famous Chinese paintings), 1908.
Figure 11. Cover, issue 22 of Zhongguo minghua, 1920.
Figure 12. Table of contents, issue 29 of *Zhongguo minghua*, 1936.
Figure 13. Cover, issue 8 of *Zhongguo minghua*, undated reprint (first half of the twentieth century).
Figure 14. Table of contents, issue 8 of Zhongguo minghua, undated reprint (first half of the twentieth century).
Figure 15. Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, *Mount Huang (Huangshan 黃山)*, 1953. Hanging scroll, ink and light color on paper, dimensions unknown. Zhejiang Provincial Museum, Hangzhou.
Figure 17. Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, *Cheng Sui’s Methods (Goudaoren fa 垄道人法)*, undated (early twentieth century). Album leaf, media not specified, dimensions unknown. Collection of Qian Xuewen 錢學文, Hong Kong.
Figure 18. Cheng Sui 程邃, *Flying Streams among Peaks (Qunfeng feiquan 群峰飛泉)*, undated (late seventeenth century). Hanging scroll, ink on paper, 87.8 x 47.1 cm. Shanghai Museum.
Figure 19. Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, *Landscape (Shanshui 山水)*, ca. 1949-1951. Album leaf, ink and color on paper, 35.5 x 47.6 cm. Collection of Michael Sullivan, Oxford.
Figure 20. Huang Binhong 黃賓虹, *Landscape (Shanshui 山水)*, ca. 1949-1951. Album leaf, ink and color on paper, 35.5 x 47.6 cm. Collection of Michael Sullivan, Oxford.
Figure 21. Shitao 石濤, “Riverbank of Peach Blossoms” (Jiaan taohua 夾岸桃花), Wilderness Colors (Yese 野色), ca. 1697. Leaf from album of twelve leaves, ink and color on paper, 27.6 x 21.5 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
Figure 22. He Tianjian 贺天健, Shitao’s Texture Strokes in the Styles of Song Masters (Shitao fang Song ren cunfa 石濤仿宋人皴法), ca. 1957-1961. Mounted as album leaf, ink on paper, dimensions unknown. Collection of Qiu Taofeng 邱涛峰.
Figure 23. He Tianjian 賀天健, *Lower Shanjuan Cave (Shanjuan xiadong 善卷下洞)*, 1934. Hanging scroll, ink on paper, 68 x 34 cm. The National Art Museum of China, Beijing.
Figure 24. He Tianjian 贺天健, Jing Hao’s Ghost-Face and Vertical Raveled-Rope Texture Strokes (Jing Hao guilian zhi jiesuo cunfa 荊浩鬼臉直解索皴法), ca. 1957-1961. Mounted as album leaf, ink on paper, dimensions unknown. Collection of Qiu Taofeng 邱涛峰.
Figure 25. He Tianjian 賀天健, *Guo Xi’s Curled-Cloud Strokes and Ghost-Face Rock (Guo Xi juanyuncun guilianshi 郭熙卷雲皴鬼臉石)*, ca. 1957-1961. Mounted as album leaf, ink on paper, dimensions unknown. Collection of Qiu Taofeng 邱涛峰.
Figure 26. Zhang Daqian 張大千, *Self-Portrait in the Yellow Mountains (Huangshan zihuaxiang 黃山自畫像)*, 1961. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 192.2 x 101.6 cm. Collection of Chang Sing-yi, Brazil.
Figure 27.  Zhang Daqian 張大千, *Landscape in the Style of Hongren (Fang Hongren shanshui 仿弘仁山水)*, 1931-1932. Folding fan mounted as album leaf, ink and color on paper, 22.8 x 63.5 cm. Collection of Tien-tsai Hwang, Taipei.
Figure 28. Zhang Daqian 張大千, Landscape in the Style of Bada Shanren (Fang Zhu Da shanshui 仿朱耷山水), 1931-1932. Folding fan mounted as album leaf, ink and color on paper, 22.8 x 63.5 cm. Collection of Tien-tsai Hwang, Taipei.
Figure 29. Zhang Daqian 張大千, *Bamboos in the Style of Jin Nong (Fang Jin Nong huazhu 仿金農畫竹)*, 1931-1932. Folding fan mounted as album leaf, ink and color on paper, 22.8 x 63.5 cm. Collection of Tien-tsai Hwang, Taipei.
Figure 30. Zhang Daqian 張大千, *Landscape in the Style of Shitao (Fang Shitao shanshui 仿石濤山水)*, 1931-1932. Folding fan mounted as album leaf, ink and color on paper, 22.8 x 63.5 cm. Collection of Tien-tsai Hwang, Taipei.
Figure 31. Zhang Daqian 張大千 [signed as Shitao 石濤], Through Ancient Eyes (Ziyun Jin Guan yizhi yan 自云荊關一隻眼), ca. 1920-1922. Hanging scroll, ink and light color on paper, 33.3 x 33.3 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
Figure 32. Shitao 石濤, “Composing a Verse under a Tall Pine” (Changsong miju 長松見句), *Broken-Ink Landscapes (Pomo shanshui 破墨山水)*, undated (late seventeenth century). Leaf from album of ten leaves, ink or ink and color on paper, dimensions unknown.
Figure 33. Shitao 石濤, “Walled Town by a River” (Jiangcheng 江城), Broken-Ink Landscapes (Pomo shanshui 破墨山水), undated (late seventeenth century). Leaf from album of ten leaves, ink or ink and color on paper, dimensions unknown.
Figure 34. Zhang Daqian 張大千, *Strolling Alone in the Autumn Hills (Qiushan dubu 秋山独步)*, 1962-1963. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 191 x 101.5 cm. Collection of Richard Hui, Hong Kong.
Figure 35. Zhang Daqian 張大千, *Peach Blossom Spring (Taoyuan xianjing 桃源仙境)*, 1983. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 209.1 x 92.4 cm. Collection of Cemac, Ltd., Edmonton, Alberta.
Figure 37. Shitao 石濤, “A Mountain Pavilion” (Shanting 山亭), *Landscapes for the Old Taoist Yu (Wei Yu Daoren zuo shanshui 為禹老道人作山水)*, undated (late seventeenth century). Leaf from album of twelve leaves, ink and light color on paper, 24.1 x 27.9 cm. Collection of the C. C. Wang Family, New York.
Figure 38. Liu Haisu 劉海粟, *Landscape in the Style of Shitao (Fang Shitao shanshui 仿石濤山水)*, 1938. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 240.1 x 99.2 cm. Liu Haisu Art Museum, Shanghai.
Figure 39. Shitao 石濤, *Colors of Rivers and Mountains (Jiangtian shanse 江天山色)*, 1687. Hanging scroll, ink and light color on paper, 220 x 99 cm. Sichuan Provincial Museum, Chengdu.
Figure 40. Liu Haisu 劉海粟, *Tomb of Yanzi (Yanzi mu 言子墓)*, 1924. Hanging scroll, ink on paper, 149.6 x 79.7 cm. Liu Haisu Art Museum, Shanghai.
Figure 41. Liu Haisu 劉海粟, Waves (Botao 波濤), 1932. Oil on canvas, 72.5 x 92 cm. Kyoto National Museum.
Figure 42. Liu Haisu 劉海粟, *Angry Waves (Nutao 怒濤)*, 1927. Hanging scroll, ink on paper, 150.8 x 62.3 cm. Kyoto National Museum.
Figure 43. Pan Tianshou 潘天寿, *Blue and Green Landscape* (*Qinglü shanshui* 青绿山水), ca. 1932. Album leaf, ink and color on paper, 33.7 x 39.1 cm. Pan Tianshou Memorial Museum, Hangzhou.
Figure 44. Shitao 石濤, “Boating in the Outskirts of Yangzhou” (Zhuyuwan li da xifeng 茹萸灣裡打西風), *Landscapes painted at the Green-Watching Hall (Wanglütang zhong zuo shanshui 望緣堂中作山水)*, 1702. Leaf from album of eight leaves, ink and color on paper, 18.6 x 29.5 cm. Östasiatiska Museet, Stockholm.
Figure 45. Pan Tianshou 潘天壽, *This Land So Beautiful* (*Jiangshan ruci duojiao* 江山如此多嬌), 1959. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 72 x 30 cm. Pan Tianshou Memorial Museum, Hangzhou.
Figure 46. Shitao 石濤, *Ten Thousand Ugly Inkblots (Wandian emo 萬點惡墨)*, 1685. Two sections of a handscroll, ink on paper, 25.6 x 227 cm. Suzhou Museum.
Figure 47. Shitao 石濤, “The Path beyond the Bridge” (Xiaqiao qujing 小橋曲徑), Wonderful Conceptions of the Bitter Mellon, Landscapes for Liu Xiaoshan (Kugua miaodi, wei Liu Xiaoshan zuo shanshui 苦瓜妙譜 為劉小山作山水), 1703. Leaf from album of 12 leaves, ink and color on paper, 57.8 x 35.6 cm. The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City.
Figure 48. Pan Tianshou 潘天壽, *Watching the Waterfall under a Pine Tree* (*Songxia guanpu* 松下觀瀑), 1948. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 138.8 x 52.2 cm. China Academy of Art, Hangzhou.
Figure 49. Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, *Landscape in the Style of Shitao (Fang Shitao shanshui 仿石濤山水)*, 1943. Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 150.5 x 53.7 cm. Nanjing Museum.
Figure 50. Shitao 石濤, *Visiting the Huayang Mountains (You Huayangshan 游華陽山)*, undated (late seventeenth century). Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 239.6 x 102.3 cm. Shanghai Museum.
Figure 51. Stamp of stone seal “I use my method” (wo yong wofa 我用我法) made by Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, undated (second quarter of the twentieth century).
Figure 52. Stamp of stone seal “I use my method” (wo yong wofa 我用我法) made by Fu Baoshi 傅抱石, undated (second quarter of the twentieth century).
Figure 53. Zhang Daqian 張大千 [signed as Shitao 石濤], *Letter to Bada Shanren (Yu Bada Shanren shu 與八大山人書)*, undated (early twentieth century). First section of six Leaves mounted continuously as an album leaf, ink on paper, 25.5x81 cm. Collection of Nagahara Oriharu 永原織治.
Figure 54. Zhang Daqian 張大千 [signed as Shitao 石濤], *Thatched Hut of Great Cleansing* (Chinese: *Dadi caotang 大滌草堂*), undated (early twentieth century). Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 184 x 72 cm. Collection of Nagahara Oriharu 永原織治.
Figure 55.  Shitao 石濤, two leaves from the album Letter to Bada Shanren (Yu Bada Shanren shu 與八大山人書), undated (ca. 1698-1699). Album of six leaves, ink on paper, 18.7 x 13 cm. Princeton University Art Museum.
Figure 56. Zhang Daqian 張大千 [signed as Shitao 石濤], *The Yellow Mountains (Huangshan 黃山)*, undated (early twentieth century). Hanging scroll, ink and color on paper, 117 x 37.5 cm. Collection of Nagahara Oriharu 永原織治.
Figure 57.  Yokoyama Taikan 横山大観, *Mountain Path (Yamaji 山路)*, 1911. Hanging scroll, color on silk, 159.6 x 70.9 cm. The National Museum of Modern Art, Kyoto.
Figure 58. Reproduction of Komuro Suiun 小室翠雲, Copy of Shitao’s Landscape (Rin Sekitō sansui 臨石濤山水), undated (early twentieth century). Album leaf, ink and color on paper, dimensions unknown. Location unknown. In Nanga Kanshō 南画鑑賞 (Southern painting connoisseurship) 10 (1935).
Figure 59. Shitao 石濤, “Spring Landscape” (Chunjing shanshui 春景山水), Wonderful Conceptions of the Bitter Mellon, Landscapes for Liu Xiaoshan (Kugua miaodi, wei Liu Xiaoshan zuo shanshui 苦瓜妙諦 為劉小山作山水), 1703. Album of twelve leaves, ink and color on paper, 57.8 x 35.6 cm. The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City.