

U.P., 1983; ders., *T'ang Transformation Texts: A Study of the Buddhist Contribution to the Rise of Vernacular Fiction and Drama in China*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P., 1989), hat Mair eine Studie zu den Kulturgrenzen überschreitenden Einflüssen vorgelegt, soweit sie sich auf den unter Hinzuziehung von Bildern durchgeführten öffentlichen Vortrag beziehen. Zuvor schon hatte er eine Bibliographie zum indischen Einfluß auf die volkstümliche Literatur in China vorgelegt (Victor H. Mair, "A Partial Bibliography for the Study of Indian Influence on Chinese Popular Literature," in *Sino-Platonic Papers* 3 (1987): 1–214). In dem vorliegenden Buch nun beschäftigt sich Mair mit der Geschichte des Vortrags von Erzählungen unter Verwendung von Bildern, einer Form, deren Ausgangspunkt er in Indien sieht und die sich von dort nach Ost- und Südostasien ebenso wie nach Europa ausbreitete. Entsprechend behandelt er, nach einer Einleitung (S. 1–16), im ersten Kapitel „Picture-Storytelling in Ancient India“ (S. 17–37) und schreitet dann nach einer durch dokumentarische Bilder angereicherten Darstellung über Zentralasien, Indonesien und vergleichbare Phänomene im neueren Indien weiter zum Thema „Picture Recitation around the World“ (S. 111–131). Zahlreiche Bildtafeln, ausführliche Anmerkungen, Bibliographie und Register runden das Werk ab. Freilich bleiben manche Fragen offen, wie jene, ob und in welcher Weise wir von heutigen Phänomenen wie dem Kleinodienrollen(pao-chüan 寶卷)-Vortrag in Kansu (S. 9) auf Tang-zeitliche Erscheinungen schließen können. Ebenso lassen sich gegen Mairs Argumentation alle diejenigen Einwände ins Feld führen, die üblicherweise von Vertretern einer autochthonen Entwicklung gegen die Annahme von Einflüssen und kulturelle Diffusion vorgetragen werden. Wenn auch über manche Frage noch längst nicht das letzte Wort gesprochen ist, so hat Mair doch mit seiner eindrucksvollen kulturgeschichtlichen Studie seine These von dem indischen Ursprung des Bildvortrages überzeugend untermauert. Das Buch ist nicht nur eine sehr gelehrte Untersuchung, sondern dürfte wegen seiner Thematik und nicht zuletzt wegen seiner Lesbarkeit weit über den Kreis der Orientalisten hinaus großes Interesse finden.

Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer, Universität München

Charles Lachman, trans.: *Evaluations of Sung Dynasty Painters of Renown: Liu Tao-ch'un's Sung-ch'ao ming-hua p'ing. T'oung Pao Monographie 16*, with an introduction by Charles Lachman. Leiden/New York/København/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1989. 128 pp. 60 pp. Pl. G 64/US\$ 32. ISBN 90–04–08966–7.

Osvald Sirén once remarked that a deeper understanding of Chinese Painting “must be based to a larger extent on historical records and writings by Chinese critics of the last thousand years than on the scanty products of ancient painting that still may be seen” – thus giving us the first history of art criticism in his classic *The Chinese on the Art of Painting*. Since its publication in 1936 (Peiping), an astounding number of translations have followed his pioneer work, only to mention Susan Bush's and Hsio-yen Shih's most recent and admirable anthology *Early Chinese Texts on Painting* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985). Charles Lachman's complete and well-annotated translation of Liu Tao-ch'un's 劉道醇 *Sung-ch'ao ming-hua p'ing* 宋朝名畫評 (*SCMHP*) brings us another step closer to the goal Sirén wrote of.

The assessment of Liu's *SCMHP* by art historians has not been unanimous. Lin Yutang, for example, glossed in his *The Chinese Theory of Art* (New York, 1967, p. 89) that it did not deserve to be translated. Lin's slighting comment might have been caused by his stronger inclination to the philosophy of art as put forth in the writings of literati such as Su Shih 蘇軾. Liu's evaluation of Sung painters, however, just precedes the emerging of the *wen-jen-hua* 文人畫 -aesthetics which then should dominate art criticism of the Sung. But here, precisely, lies the value of the *SCMHP*, as it offers a different perspective on the history of painting of this period.

Not much is known about Liu Tao-ch'un – a native of the Northern Sung capital Kaifeng – other than that he wrote two books on the history of painting: the *SCMHP* and an evaluation of *Five Dynasty Painters of Renown; A Supplement* (*Wu-tai ming-hua pu-i* 五代名畫補遺) in the preface of which (dated 1059) the former is mentioned. Also Kuo Jo-hsü 郭若虛 refers to the *SCMHP* in his *T'u-hua chien-wen chih* 圖畫見聞誌 (written c. 1075). The problems of dating the work are discussed by Lachman on pp. 2–3.

As an evaluator of painters, Liu continues the traditional grading of artists into three classes. The new organizational scheme of his book, however, is that of subject matter. The ninety-one painters discussed by Liu are classified according to *genre* in the following six categories: (1) Figure Painting (40 entries), (2) Landscape (18 entries), (3) Domestic and Wild Animals (19 entries), (4) Birds and Flowers (22 entries), (5) Demons and Spirits (4 entries), (6) Architecture (7 entries).

In each category, the painters, some of whom have more than one entry, are graded according to the classes “inspired” (*shen* 神), “subtle” (*miao* 妙), and “talented” (*neng* 能). In the case of figure painting, there is a subdivision

into “upper,” middle,” and “lower” grades. The entries in the “inspired” class are followed by a brief individual evaluation (*p’ing* 評) of the artist; those in the other classes are evaluated in groups. The entries offer critical comments, biographical sketches, and anecdotes about the painters.

In his introduction, Lachman discusses the special features of the *SCMHP*, first of all, Liu’s own mode of organization according to “subject matter.” This concept of different *genres* of painting offers Liu Tao-ch’un new criteria for evaluation. Traditionally, the quality of a work of art was viewed as an expression of the artist’s “quality” of character – an idea also prevalent in later Sung art criticism and *wen-jen-hua*-aesthetics. Such an artist-oriented approach, however, does not play a significant role in Liu’s evaluation, neither does the category of “social status” which we find, as an organizational principle, applied together with that of “subject matter” in later works, such as the imperial catalogue *Hsüan-ho hua-p’u* 宣和畫譜 (written c. 1120). According to Lachman, Liu’s classification into subject matter, rather, allows him to judge “artistic quality based on the formal properties of the work of art itself” (p. 4).

Not surprisingly, most of his subject classes are concerned with matters that did not play a significant role in scholar painting. About a third is devoted to the first and for Liu apparently the most important category, that of figure painting (where we also find the mentioned additional sub-classification applied). In terms of number of entries, the category “landscape” ranges in 4th position. In this category, Li Ch’eng 李成 and Fan K’uan 范寬 are the only ones in the “inspired” class; Kao K’o-ming 高克明 leads the “subtle” class in which also Hsü Tao-ning 許道寧 and Yen Wen-kuei 燕文貴 are placed; Chü-jan 巨然 is rated as “talented,” only to mention a few examples.

In line with the preference for figure painting, about a third of the painters listed have had appointments at the Sung Academy of Painting. Lachman argues, though, that Liu Tao-ch’un leans neither towards the emerging tradition of scholar painting nor to the “professional tradition” of the Academy of Painting. Liu’s method of determining the worth of a work of art – not according to the loftiness of character or social status of the artist but on the basis of its intrinsic artistic quality – is viewed by Lachman as “a dramatic departure from tradition” (p. 7).

Textual differences of the various editions of the *SCMHP* are briefly discussed in the introduction. The original Chinese of the *Ssu-k’u ch’üan-shu* edition is reproduced in the Appendix. An extensive bibliography and an index of names in the *SCMHP* supplement this very fine piece of philological scholarship.

Lachman does not include the translation of a preface which is, in the various editions, connected with the text. He excludes it, as he argues in a footnote (p. 3, n. 10), because Sirén as well as Bush and Shih have already translated it in full and, judging from discrepancies in content and style, it does not seem to have been “originally intended for the *SCMHP*.” Since there is, however, the tradition of reading preface and text together, inclusion of the preface would have rounded off the translation and enhanced the reference value of the book.

But this, of course, does not significantly lower the worth of the translation. Lachman’s book not only contributes considerably to the understanding of early Sung pre-*wen-jen-hua*-aesthetics and criticism as well as to the social history of painting; the solid scholarship, the meticulous annotation, and the comprehensive documentation with cross-references to a wealth of other related texts and histories, make it into a very valuable reference work in the history of Chinese painting.

Given the diverse insights into the historical and social context of the work, supplied by Lachman in the introduction and notes, the reader might only wish the author had given him a more substantial explication of the book (as from his doctoral dissertation of which the translation was originally a part), not just an – albeit dense – nine page introduction. For, as he quotes Kumārajīva, only rendering a translation, even an admirably well-annotated one, can be as “flavourless” as chewed rice given to someone else. But has this not always been the “flavour” of scholarly translations and sound reference works?

Karl-Heinz Pohl

Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen

---

Ronald G. Knapp: *China’s Vernacular Architecture: House Form and Culture*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989. xi, 195 pp. US\$ 38. ISBN 0–8248–1204–2.

Drei Jahre nach seinem Buch *China’s Traditional Rural Architecture* (University of Hawaii Press, 1986; vgl. die Besprechung in *Monumenta Serica*, Bd. 38) hat Ronald G. Knapp nun einen weiteren Band zur volkstümlichen säkularen Architektur Chinas vorgelegt. Im vorhergehenden hatte er einer bestimmten regionalen Bautradition zunächst nur ein einzelnes eigenes Kapitel gewidmet („The Rural Dwelling on China’s Taiwan Frontier“). Im vorliegenden Fall dagegen beschäftigt er sich über das ganze Buch hinweg ausschließlich mit einer einzigen Provinz, Zhejiang 浙江.