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Abstract

Despite the importance of the mural as a medium during the Yüan dynasty, scroll paintings of the period have usually been studied in isolation from wall painting as a contemporary Yüan practice and as a long-standing, archaeologically documented tradition. The present article examines from this point of view some scroll paintings attributed to two leading Yüan court painters from the area of present-day northern Hopeh, He Ch’eng (1223-c.1316) and Liu Kuan-tao (fl. late 13th-early 14th century), together with some related scroll paintings.

In the first half of this study, the author argues that the styles of these artists had their roots in north-Chinese wall painting, and explores the possibility that they may be placed more narrowly in a local northern-Hopeh history of wall-painting extending back to the tenth century. He also draws attention to the particular importance of northern-Hopeh painters at the Yüan court, their professional interconnections, their mastery of different genres, and their involvement in the painting of murals. Concluding this part of the discussion, the author notes the tendency of modern art historians to apply the standards of literati painting to other Yüan scroll-painting styles, which leads to a view of those styles as having been formed in a context of relative intimacy, whereas in some cases they may have been significantly determined by a public context of spectacle.

In the second half of the article, the author seeks to reconstruct more fully the stylistic profiles of the He Ch’eng and Liu Kuan-tao workshop traditions, taking into account several surviving scroll paintings in museum collections that have not previously been associated with either of the two artists.
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Chung Yüan-style Wall-Painting in Northern Hopeh

A succession of important tomb excavations since the 1970s has transformed our understanding of the history of Liao 遼, Chin 金, and Yüan 元 dynasty wall painting in northern Hopeh 河北, including the area of modern Peking 北京. Since Peking was successively the site of the southern capital of the Liao (Nanking 南京 or Yen-ching 燕京), the middle capital of the Chin (Chung tu 中都), and the capital of the Yüan (Tatu 大都), northern Hopeh was a continuously important area under these dynasties, from the tenth to the fourteenth century. The murals found in the tombs are primarily figural, but the artists were also called upon for many other subjects, including animals, architecture, flower-and-bird compositions, and landscapes.

Many of the excavated Liao and Chin tombs in northern Hopeh were executed in a style that was first created under the Liao. Although they broke less with T'ang 唐 painting and its additive pictorial logic than did their contemporaries to the south under the Five Dynasties 五代 and Sung 宋, Liao wall painters and their Chin successors in the area did engage with the new Five Dynasties / Sung developments to the south to some degree. Notably, they moved toward a more integrated space in their paintings, and also expanded the scope of naturalistic observation at the level of pictorial detail, particularly as regards elements of what we would now call material culture. The resulting style—or stylistic range—is entirely distinctive, characterized by a frank, monumental, and somewhat stiff handling of form (fig. 1). 1

In the northern Hopeh area, most tombs with wall paintings of this kind were constructed for Han Chinese families. However, versions of the same style can also be found in Liao tombs with Ch’i tan 契丹 occupants, not only in Hopeh but also to the north and east in Inner Mongolia 内蒙古, Liaoning 遼寧, and Kirin 吉林. Indeed, the style had a tenacious presence all over the far north of China, surviving there into the late Chin and Yüan periods. 2

---

1 The earliest example is a tomb (923) from a Khitan aristocratic cemetery at Pao shan 寶山 in Inner Mongolia, just 30 miles from the northern Liao capital (Shang ching 上京). The Khitan subject matter aside, the paintings faithfully preserve a version of T'ang style. Liao tomb paintings discovered in several late eleventh–early twelfth century tombs of the Chang family at Hsüan hua 宣化 to the north-west of Peking maintain different versions of the style already present in the Pao shan tomb of 923. The literature on Liao tomb murals is long: a recent overview is by Tsao Hsing-yüan, Differences Preserved: Reconstructed Tombs from the Liao and Sung Dynasties (Seattle: Douglas F. Cooley Memorial Art Gallery, Reed College, 2000).

2 An alternative view as regards the Yüan material is that of Nancy Shatzman Steinhardt who argues that their style derives from book illustration in other parts of the Mongol empire. See Nancy Shatzman Steinhardt, “Yuan Period Tombs and Their Decoration: Cases at Chifeng,” Oriental Art, N.S. vol. 36, no. 4 (Winter 1990-91), pp. 198-221.
One northern-Hopeh tomb which is decidedly not decorated in this style is a late Liao (early twelfth century) tomb at Chai t'ang 齋堂 in Peking. The murals of the Chai t'ang tomb were executed in a lively and fluid style of figure painting that one more readily associates with north-central China—the Chung yün 中原 region, where it was the mainstream style of professional painting from the Five Dynasties onwards (fig. 2). This second style—or, more accurately, family of styles—is the one that is relevant to the present paper. At one pole of its spectrum its exponents employed fluctuating, sometimes agitated brushwork, while at the other pole they used longer brushstrokes in rhythmically echoing patterns. Underpinning the style in all its versions was an organic sense of form in multi-directional movement, as part of a fully integrated, optically convincing space. This approach—one of the major versions of what art historians in a shorthand way often term Sung realism—was initially developed by Five Dynasties and Northern Sung artists in the tenth century, and was still flourishing in the fourteenth century, not only in murals but also, of course, in scroll paintings. Among excavated tomb murals, it is most commonly found in Honan 河南 and Shansi 山西, but the Chai t'ang tomb is one of a number of examples from elsewhere in north China. Although future excavations may alter the picture, at the present time there is no way to know whether the Chai t'ang tomb murals were painted by local artists, or by a workshop from outside the northern Hopeh area. But whoever was responsible for painting them, their existence demonstrates that in the early twelfth century at least, there was a taste in northern Hopeh for the Chung yün style of the Sung alongside the T'ang-oriented Liao style. There is also stylistic evidence in certain Liao-style murals that in northern Hopeh the Chung yün style sometimes influenced the Liao style, which suggests that the Chai t'ang tomb was not an isolated occurrence.

3 The Archaeological Bureau of the City of Peking, ... [et al.] 北京市文物事業管理局等, “Pei-ching shih Chai t'ang Liao pi hua mu fa chieh chien pao 北京市豊堂遠壁畫墓發掘簡報 [Excavation of a Liao tomb with mural paintings at Chai t'ang in Peking].” Wen wu 文物, 1980, no. 7, pp. 23-7 and plates. The use of the Chung yün style in northern-Hopeh tomb murals certainly predates Liao control of the area, as shown by the murals in the 923 tomb of Wang Ch'u-chih 王處直 in Chü yang (figure). Strictly speaking, however, Wang Ch'u-chih's tomb is equally relevant to the Liao tradition, and as such represents the moment just before there was a forking of stylistic traditions in the north.

4 See Kao gu yü wen wu 考古與文物, 1997, no.4, pp. 8-11, for a Yüan tomb of this kind in Shensi.

5 For example, the Liao murals in the tomb of the merchant Han Shih-hüan 韓師訓 at Hsüan hua 宣化 differ from the Chang 張 family tomb murals, also at Hsüan hua, in incorporating elements of the Chung yün style. See Chang chia K'ou Municipality Hsüan hua District Cultural Relics Bureau 張家口市宣化區文物保管所, "He-pei Hsüan hua Hsia pa li Liao Han Shih-hüan mu 河北宣化下八里遠韓師訓墓 [The tomb of Han Shih-hüan at Hsia pa li in Hsüan hua, Hopeh].” Wen wu, 1992, no. 6, pp. 1-11 and plates.
The Chai t'ang murals would not require attention in an article on Yuan dynasty painting if it were not for the fact that there exists a stylistic connection between them and the work of the Yuan court painter, He Ch'eng 何澄 (1223-c.1316), from Ta tu, which represents a later development of the Chung yün style (fig. 21). To be sure, He Ch'eng's work is stylistically even more similar to certain examples of Chung yün-style painting from elsewhere in north China, such as the twelfth-century Shansi murals at Yen shan ssu 岩山寺 (see below). Still, one cannot but wonder whether this visual link between a northern-Hopeh monument and the work of a later painter from the same area might not point to some local historical connection. Although the evidence is fragmentary and thus inconclusive as to the extent and distinctiveness (particularly in relation to adjoining Shansi) of any local tradition of Chung yün-style painting in northern Hopeh, it is nonetheless intriguing and worth a brief discussion at the beginning of this study. Any style practised at the Yuan court would have had local as well as regional roots, and the Chai t'ang murals and related paintings hint at what those roots were for the styles associated with He Ch'eng and his northern-Hopeh successors. Moreover, the fact that the visual evidence largely takes the form of wall painting is not merely an accident of the surviving material but, as I shall show, reflects a real connection between the Yuan court painters and the practice of large-scale wall painting. Discussions of style in early Chinese painting are often quite abstract. Even the little we know about Chung yün-style painting in northern Hopeh is helpfully suggestive of the kind of concrete context in which styles were developed and transmitted.

Any discussion of Chung yün-style painting in northern Hopeh must look back to the great wall-painter, Kao I 高益, in the mid-tenth century. At the very beginning of the Sung dynasty, Kao, from Cho chün 濟郡 (located to the south of modern Peking), fled Liao-controlled northern Hopeh to go to the Sung capital of K'ai feng 开封. There he became one of the leading court painters under T''ai tsu 太祖, holding the prestigious rank of Tai chao 待詔. Kao’s success at the Northern Sung court in
itself indicates that he can only have been a Chung yüan-style artist, and this is
cirmed by the plausible attribution to his authorship of the lost original of the
well-known composition known as Clearing the Mountains of Demons [Sou shan t’u
搜山圖]. Although Kao I’s many celebrated wall paintings have not survived, two
very fine sets of slightly later Chung yüan-style murals have been brought to
light in two pagoda crypts from 977 and 995 in Ting chou 定州 to the south-west of
Peking(figs. 3, 4). Between these and the Chai t’ang tomb murals I know of no
other examples, but two guardian figures from an early twelfth-century tomb in
Ching hsing hsien 井陘縣, contemporary with the Chai t’ang tomb, should also be
mentioned. After 1126, when the Jurchen conquest removed the political
boundaries that had separated painters in Liao territory, including northern Hopeh,
from their counterparts in the central part of the Chung yüan region, the presence
of the Chung yüan style in northern Hopeh can only have been further facilitated. In
the absence of excavated examples, the Chin dynasty murals from Shansi and Honan

7 According to Liu Tao-ch’un 劉道醇, Kao I originally painted the scroll for Sun Ssu-hao 孫四皓, who then presented it to T’ai tsung 太宗, who in turn appointed Kao to a position as Tai chao 待詔. (See Evaluations of Sung Dynasty Painters of Renown, pp. 23-5). The Sou shan t’u 捕山圖 has many surviving versions, a number of which are listed in James Cahill, An Index of Early Chinese Painters and Paintings: T’ang, Sung, and Yüan (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1980), pp. 21 and 228. The most important discussions of the theme are two articles by Chin Wei-no 金維諾: “Sou shan t’u 捕山圖,” in Chang-kuo mei shu shih lun chi 中國美術史論集 (Taipei: Nan t’ian shu chü, 1995), vol. 1, pp. 170-174; and “Sou shan t’u yü Liu li T’ang jen wu t’u”- Ou Mei fang wen san chi chih san 「捕山圖」與「琉璃堂人物圖」—歐美訪問散記之三 [Notes on a visit to Europe and the United States, part 3: Sou shan t’u and Liu li T’ang jen wu t’u],” in Chang-kuo mei shih lun chi, vol. 1, pp. 191-6. Chin noted that a Yüan version in the Palace Museum, Peking, preserves elements of Liao style. Having initially argued that this was evidence of Liao influence on Kao I’s art, in his second article Chin amended this opinion, suggesting that the Yüan version may reflect a late tenth-century version by a Ch’I tan contemporary of Kao I, Yeh lü t’i tsu 耶律題子, who came to K’ai feng as an envoy and may have seen Kao I’s composition. He goes on to suggest that Kao I’s own style may be reflected in the fragmentary pai miao 自描 version preserved among the leaves of the famous “Wu Tao-tzu” album in the Jungkue Collection.

8 Ting hsien Museum 定縣博物館, “He-pei Ting hsien fa hsien liang tsu Sung tai t’a chi 河北定縣發

9 He-pei sheng wen hua chü wen wu kung tso tui 河北省文化局文物工作隊, “He-pei Ching hsing
hsien Shih chuang Sung mu fa chüeh pao kao 河北井陘縣柿莊墓發掘報告 [Excavation of a
Sung tomb at Shih chuang in Ching hsing hsien, Hopeh],” Kao ku hsüeh pao 考古學報, 1962, no.
2, pp. 31-73.
that will be introduced later in this article may serve to give some sense of the stylistic profile of northern-Hopeh murals of that period. Certainly, some sort of local tradition of Chung yuàn-style wall painting must have existed by the early thirteenth century at the very latest. Without that, it would be hard to to account for the later emergence of He Ch'eng, from Ta tu, and his protégé Liu Kuan-tao 劉貫道, from Chung shan 中山 [modern Ting chou] to the south-west of Ta tu. Both of these men were all-round masters whose versatility recalls that of the wall-painters responsible for the decoration of tombs and temples.

The relevance of wall painting to He Ch'eng’s art can be introduced through one of two surviving works now generally accepted to be from his hand, The Taoist Official of Water, painted c. 1311 (fig. 5). The painting is a fragment of a much longer handscroll, and is fragmentary even as regards the part of the composition it preserves, since a section is lost in the middle. It is certainly possible to reconstruct a lineage for this work in terms of scroll paintings alone, starting with the relevant scroll from a triptych of three hanging scrolls representing the three Taoist Officials of Heaven, Earth, and Water in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, usually dated to the twelfth century. The theme of the Three Officials was closely associated with late T'ang painters in Szechwan, so the Boston painting may rework a late T'ang composition of this kind. However, one striking difference between He Ch'eng’s painting and the Boston scrolls, in addition to its focus on the Official of Water alone, is its baimao execution, reminiscent of earlier fen ben records of wall-paintings. The painting quite faithfully preserves the style seen in a mid-twelfth century mural depiction of the defeat of Mara at Yen shan ssu 岩山寺 near Wu t'ai shan 五台山 in Shansi by the Chin court painter, Wang K’ui 王逵 (b. 1099) (fig. 6). The Taoist Official of Water can also be compared with a mural painted just a few years earlier in the Hall of the Water Spirit [Shui shen tien 水神殿] in the Temple to the Five Peaks [Wu yüeh miao 五嶽廟] at Fen yang 汾陽 in Shansi (fig. 7). (The


11 Wu T‘ung notes the connection to T’ang painting in the most extensive discussion of these paintings to date (Tales from the Land of Dragons: A Thousand Years of Chinese Painting, pp. 149-50, Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1997).


13 The wall paintings are likely to have been executed shortly after the Shui shen miao was built.
precise iconographic relationship between the Water Spirit and the Taoist Official of Water is not yet clear to me). But comparison with the Fen yang murals reveals the transcendent quality of the Ta tu artist’s masterpiece, with its mastery of complex formal arrangements and inspired bushwork. More closely comparable to He Ch’eng’s scroll in terms of quality, and uncannily close to it in style, is a famous stele engraving of a demon, attributed in a Ming dynasty inscription to the hand of Wu Tao-tzu 吳道子 (fig. 8). The stele, together with a second stele with the same image re-engraved under the Ch’ing, still stands today outside the Te ning Hall 德寧殿 of the Temple to the Northern Peak [Pei yüeh miao 北嶽廟] in Ch’ü yang 曲陽 in northern Hopeh. The Hall itself is decorated with wall paintings, as yet very badly published. From the available descriptions it appears that the paintings on the east and west walls together depict the Water Spirit under a form close to that of the Taoist Official of Water. According to Huang Miao-tzu 黃苗子, the Ming engraving reproduces one minor demon from the top left of the west wall composition, and thus preserves a fragment of a mural of much the same theme as He Ch’eng’s handscroll. The stylistic similarity to He Ch’eng’s painting is perhaps explained by the fact that Te ning Hall was built at Mongol imperial command c. 1268-70, and would presumably have been decorated with wall paintings at that time or shortly after, when He Ch’eng was in his late forties. It is, however, currently impossible to ascertain whether the existing murals are early Yuan in date, far less whether He Ch’eng had a hand in their design or execution.

The equal kinship between Liu Kuan-tao and wall painters can be seen from the only painting currently accepted as his work, an undated short handscroll composition on silk depicting a gentleman at leisure entitled Whiling away the

14 The connection was noted by Lawton (Chinese Figure Painting, pp. 157-8), who adduced the stele engraving as evidence that the scroll may originally have been derived from a mural in the Wu Ta-tzu tradition.
16 On the Temple of the Northern Peak, see Nancy Shatzman Steinhardt, “The Temple to the Northern Peak in Quyang,” Artibus Asiae, vol. 58 (1998), no. 1/2, pp. 69-90; and “Taoist Architecture,” in Stephen Little, ... [et al.], Taoism and the Arts of China (Chicago: the Art Institute of Chicago, 2000), pp. 67-8. In the former article the author begins by dating the building to the late 1260s, noting a 1268 inscription and a 1270 prefectural record, and ends by dating it to 1270. In the latter article she gives a date of 1267.
Summer (fig. 9). Although some of the objects and costumes depicted in the picture are contemporary in style, others are not. Particularly interesting are the parallels to Southern Dynasties tomb representations of the third-century historical figures known as the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove. Thus, for example, the musical instrument behind the man is there found associated with Juan Hsien 阮咸 (230-281), while his costume is substantially the same as that worn in the tomb depictions by Juan hsien’s uncle, Juan Chi 阮籍 (210-263), who also had a reputation as a musician. If the figure was ever specifically identified, this information was lost by the early fifteenth century. At that time, Yü Ch’ien (1366-1427) added a colophon to the scroll that describes the figure as “a gentleman of times gone by” but does not risk a specific identification. Along different lines, the screen-within-a-screen motif implies that Liu Kuan-tao was aware of similar earlier scroll-painting compositions, and indeed specifically knew the composition of Playing Wei ch’i in front of a Double Screen, attributed to the tenth-century artist Chou Wen-chù 周文矩, of which a version survives in the Palace Museum, Peking. As Wu Hung has shown, it is certainly possible to place Whiling away the Summer within a narrow history of such double-screen scroll compositions, or within a broader history of scroll paintings of gentlemen portrayed on couches with screens at their back.

However, the connections to wall painting are equally strong, and are perhaps more fundamental to Liu Kuan-tao’s craft. The two female attendants, one carrying a landscape fan, are more elaborate versions of figures that appear in Chin dynasty tomb murals in Honan. In a tomb excavated at Lao wan chuang 老萬庄 in Chiao tso Municipality 焦作市, there are four such pairs of attendants (fig. 10), while in another tomb excavated at Wang shang ts’un 王上村 in Teng feng County 登封縣 one finds two groups of attendants, one of whom carries a very similar landscape fan (fig. 11).


20 Honan Provincial Museum 河南省博物館 and Chiao tso Municipality 焦作市博物館, “He nan Chiao tso Chin mu fa chüeh chien pao 河南焦作金墓發掘簡報 [The excavation of a Chin dynasty tomb at Chia tso in Honan],” Wen wu, 1979, no. 8, pp. 1-11 and plates--see especially plates 1a and b, and 2a and b; Cheng chou Cultural Relics Team 鄭州市文物工作隊, “Teng feng Wang shang pi hua mu fa chüeh chien pao 登封縣王上壁畫墓發掘簡報 [The excavation of a tomb
In Liu Kuan-tao’s scroll, the landscape fan is one of three such depicted landscape paintings, the second being on the plectrum guard of the long-handled, stringed instrument, and the third on a screen within the screen. Highly skilled depictions of landscape paintings were a feature of tomb murals all over north China from at least the T’ang dynasty. The earliest known is the elaborate six-panel landscape screen from Fu p’ing 富平 in Shensi which dates to the eighth century, followed by a northern-Hopeh example--two horizontal landscape screens in the Later Liang tomb of Wang Ch’u-chih 王處直 in Ch’ü yang.21 The Wang shang-ts’un landscape fan is a high-quality example from the twelfth century. Two depicted landscape screens from the 1260s are comparable to the screen landscape in Whiling away the Summer, one being the well-known landscape in the 1265 tomb of the Ch’üan chen 全真 Taoist religious leader, Feng Tao-chen 馮道真, in Shansi, the other recently discovered in a 1269 Shensi tomb (figs. 12, 13).22

Several factors determined the recurrence of this motif over many centuries. The first and most obvious factor has to do with the context of the tomb: the landscape serves as an understated indication of paradise, a connotation that is probably not absent from the landscapes in Whiling away the Summer,23 with its

---

21 For the Fu p’ing paintings, see Ching Tseng-li 井增利 and Wang Hsiao-meng 王小蒙, “Fu p’ing hsien hsien ti T’ang mu p’i hua 富平縣新發現的唐墓壁畫 [The newly discovered wall paintings in a T’ang tomb in Fu p’ing County],” K’ao gu yü wen wu 考古與文物, 1997, no. 4. For Wang Ch’u-chih’s tomb, see He-pei sheng wen wu yen chiu so 河北省文物研究所, Pao ting shih wen wu kuan li ch’u 保定市文物管理處, Ch’ü yang hsien wen wu kuan li so 曲陽縣文物管理所, “He-pei Ch’ü yang Wu tai p’i hua mu fa chüeh chien pao 河北曲陽五代壁畫墓發掘簡報 [Preliminary report on a Five Dynasties tomb with wall paintings at Ch’ü yang in Hopeh],” Wen wu, 1996, no. 9, pp. 4-13 and plates; Luo Shih-p’ing 羅世平, “Lüeh lun Ch’ü yang Wu tai mu shan shui p’i hua ti mei shu shih chia chih 剃頭曲陽五代墓山水壁畫的美術史價值 [On the art historical significance of the landscapes murals in a Five Dynasties tomb at Ch’ü yang],” Wen wu, 1996, no. 9, pp. 74-5.


23 Suzuki Kei 鈴木敏 related long ago related the screen painting within the “inner screen” of Whiling away the Summer to the landscape mural in the 1265 tomb of Feng Tao-chen 馮道真 in Shanhs in “A Few Observations Concerning the Li-Kuo School of Landscape Art in the Yüan dynasty,” Acta Asiatica, vol. 15 (1968), pp. 54-5. Marsha Weidner also notes muralist features in Liu Kuan-tao’s figure-painting style in “Aspects of Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court.”
Taoist overtones. Another factor is, one might say, professional. Versatility must have been one of the main qualifications for the workshops involved in decorating the tombs, and was probably guaranteed by the workshop master's own wide range of skills, without which he would not have been able to supervise the work of his assistants. In this sense, for all practical purposes except connoisseurship, the versatility of the workshop and that of the master-painter are indistinguishable. Master wall painters were all-round artists, who by demonstrating a mastery of landscape as well as figure painting established their versatility for all to see. In sum, the depicted landscape picture is, on the one hand, a vestigially or explicitly religious motif and, on the other, the signature motif of a master-painter, advertising his (or his workshop's) technical and artistic mastery, his understanding of his tradition, and his professional pride. All of this carries over into Liu Kuan-tao's handscroll.

A few scholars such as Suzuki Kei and Marsha Weidner have noted the stylistic links between scroll-painting and mural-painting, particularly in regard to Liu Kuan-tao's Whiling away the Summer. However, by and large modern art history tends to explain Yuan-period scrolls solely in terms of the history of scroll painting. The fact that the only Yuan wall paintings one can see today are from temples and tombs, and are largely products of local and regional workshops, has led scholars to place them in a separate category and to see them as part of a history separate from what is implicitly seen as the "higher" tradition of scroll painting, a medium whose perceived superior status has much to do with its increasing association with the literati during the Yuan period. In many specific cases this approach does no particular damage to the study of scroll painting, but sometimes—as in the case of He Ch'eng and Liu Kuan-tao—it distorts our understanding of the visual character of their work. It conditions us to understand their characteristic scroll-painting styles as having been formed in a context of intimacy, whereas they may in fact have been significantly determined by a public context of spectacle. Given the well-established importance of wall-painting at the Yuan court, this problem is not simply restricted to He Ch'eng and Liu Kuan-tao, or even to artisan-trained artists of their kind, but also involves many other artists as well who might be termed literati professionals. Ultimately, we need to move toward a more integrated stylistic history of Yuan painting that does not place artificial barriers between murals and scroll-paintings.

The remainder of this paper explores these issues further with particular attention to three interrelated topics: the importance of painters from northern Hopeh at the Yuan court, the importance of wall paintings at the court, and finally the two
workshop traditions associated with the names of He Ch’eng and Liu Kuan-tao.

Northern Hopeh Painters in Ta-tu

He Cheng and Liu Kuan-tao belong to a somewhat larger group of highly skilled workshop-trained professional artists from northern Hopeh active at the Yüan court that also included the sculptor Liu Yüan 劉元, the portraitist Li Hsiao-yen 李肖岩, and at least one other all-round artist, Li Shih 李時.24 In fact, the local contribution to Yüan court art was still more extensive, because it also involved several literati painters specializing in landscape and related genres, the most famous being Li K’an 李衎.25 In regional terms, one of the most striking and unexpected features of the line-up of Yüan court artists specifically concerns the most versatile, all-round professional painters, for whom figure painting was the most basic skill, who had always been the backbone of mural painting production. Under the Yüan, the only such artists from north China—the role of southern artists being a separate question which lies outside the bounds of the present study—seem to have been those from northern Hopeh. Where, one wonders, are the all-round artists from Honan and Shansi in particular, which had flourishing wall-painting traditions under the Chin and the Yüan dynasty? In the absence of evidence to the contrary, one must wonder

24 Liu Yüan 劉元 was from Pao ti 寶坻 (modern Tientsin), Li Hsiao-yen 李肖岩 from Chung shan 中山 (modern I chou), and Li Shih 李時 from Ta-tu 太都. One other northern-Hopel figure painter who worked as a court artist is Shih Kang 史岡 from Yung ch’ing 永淸, but he may not have been a professional artist of quite the same type as the others. See “Yüan tai hua chia Shih Kang mu chih pa 元代畫家史岡墓志銘 [On the tomb epitaph of the Yüan painter Shih Kang],” Wen wu, 1997, no. 7. Also worth noting is a local painter listed in Hsia Wen-yen’s 夏文彥 T’u hui pao chien 圖繪寶鑑—Chiao Shan-fu 景善甫—who is described as skilled in many different genres, above all portraiture.

25 These educated court artists from Hopeh included Li K’an 李衎 (1245-1320) and Li Shih-hsing 李士行 (1283-1328) from Chi ch’iu 赤丘 (modern Peking), Kao K’e-kung 高克恭 (1248-1310) from Ta-tu 太都, Liu Yin 劉因 (1249-93) from Jung ch’eng 容城, Su Ta-nien 蘇大年 from Chen ting 嗣亭 [modern Cheng ting 正定], and Liu Yung 劉昞 from Chi hsien. The above painters are discussed by Yü Hui 余輝 at various points in “Yüan tai kung t’ing hui hua shih chi chia tso k’ao pien 元代宮廷繪畫史及佳作考辨 [Masterworks and history of Yüan court painting],” which appeared in Ku kung po wu yüan yüan k’an 故宮博物院院刊 in three parts: 1998, no. 3, pp. 61-78; 2000, no. 3, pp. 25-35, and 2000, no. 4, pp. 49-59. Numerous other artists from northern Hopeh, specializing in landscapes, trees, bamboo, and the like have biographical notices in Hsia Wen-yen’s T’u hui pao chien. Several are discussed by Marsha Weidner (“Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” pp. 88-9), among them Ch’iao Ta 蕭達 who served in the Han lin Academy 翰林院, and Han Shao-yeh 韓紹業 who served in the Imperial Clothing Bureau 御衣局. The others were not necessarily active at court or, in some cases, even in Ta-tu. Earlier, under the Chin, the landscape painter Jen Hsiün 詹景 from I chou 易州 [modern I hsien 易縣] had worked at court. See Ch’en Kao-hua 陳高華, ed., Sung Liao Chin hua chia shih liao 宋遼金畫家史料 (Documentary materials on Sung, Liao, and Chin artists) (Peking: Wen wu ch’u pan she, 1984), pp. 795-9.
whether the Hopeh masters did not manage to monopolize court-artist positions at the particular expense of their Honan and Shansi colleagues. A guild-like protectionism of this kind would contrast sharply with the situation as regards landscape and related subjects, for which the court made use of a wide range of educated painters from all over north China, particularly Shansi, Hopeh, and Shantung, as well as from south China.\(^{26}\)

As one might expect, the literary record confirms that tight bonds united at least three, and perhaps four, of the leading Hopeh artists. He Ch‘eng was one of the most favored and highly ranked court artists of the earlier part of the dynasty, alongside Liu Yüan and the Nepali artist, Anige 阿尼哥.\(^{27}\) He was summoned to court under Khubilai (r. 1260-94) to serve as Painter-in-Attendance [tai chao]. Some time during the period 1308-11 he was given the prestige title of Superior Grand Master of the Palace [T‘ai chung ta fu 太中大夫] attached to the Palace Library [Pi shu chien 秘書監], and in 1312 he was further promoted to Grand Academician of the Institute for the Glorification of Literature [Chao wen kuan ta hsüeh shih 昭文館大學士] and Grand Master for Palace Attendance [Chung feng ta fu 中奉大夫]. Several stories attest to the esteem in which he was held by Yüan emperors from Shih tsu 世祖 to Jen tsung 仁宗. Already in his late sixties when Khubilai died in 1294, he was active at court for a further twenty years.\(^{28}\) He Ch‘eng’s exceptional longevity, combined with the special attachment of Khubilai and his two immediate successors to the old painter, may have had the effect of artificially holding back the careers of other court artists. The artist most affected was probably Liu Kuan-tao, to whom He Ch‘eng finally passed the torch shortly before his death. The Hsin Yüan shih 新元史 (New

\(^{26}\) For the Hopeh artists, see the previous note. The Shansi artists include Hao Ching 郝經 (1223-75) from Ling ch‘uan 河川, Li Chou 李侗 (c.1260-c.1338) from He tung 河東 [T‘ai yüan 太原], and Sa Tu-la 萨都剌 (1272-c.1353) from Yen men. The Shantung artists include Chang K‘ung-sun 張孔孫 (1233-1307) from Tung p‘ing 東平, Wang Shih-hsi 王士熙 from Tung p‘ing 東平, and Shang Ch‘i 商琦 from Chi yin 淄陰 (modern He ts‘ue 淄澤). See Yü Hui, “Yüan tai kung t‘ing hui hua shih chi chia tso k‘ao pien.” Artists from different areas of north China sometimes worked together, as in the case of the Hopeh artist Li Shih-hsing 李士行, who was a close collaborator of the Shantung artist, Shang Ch‘i 商琦.


\(^{28}\) On He Ch‘eng’s career, see Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” pp. 112-4; Yü Hui, “Yüan tai kung t‘ing hui hua shih chi chia tso k‘ao pien [Masterworks and history of Yuan court painting, part 1]. Ku kung po wu yüan yüan k‘an, 1998, no. 3, pp. 62-3 and 77-8. The textual evidence for He Ch‘eng’s life and art is collected in Chen Kao-hua, Yüan tai hua chia shih liao [Documentary Materials on Yuan dynasty painters] (Shanghai: Shanghai jen min mei shu ch‘u pan she, 1980), pp. 256-9. I follow Yü Hui on the dates of his life.
History of the Yüan) notes that He Ch’eng was over ninety (c. 1313-16) when he
told Shih tsu [who died in 1294] “I am extremely old; my follower Liu Chung-ch’ien 劉仲賢 can now receive the imperial commands.” Liu thereupon became extremely famous in the capital. This passage, with its clear inconsistencies, has always puzzled scholars. But I would suggest, that the way to understand it is to take Shih tsu as an error for Jen tsung, [r. 1312-20] in line with the mention of the artist’s advanced age, and to take Liu Chung-ch’ien as an error for Liu Chung-hsien 劉仲賢, i.e. Liu Kuan-tao.

He Ch’eng’s identification of Liu Kuan-tao as his follower does not mean that
Liu had initially trained with the older artist. In fact, Liu had entered court service in
1279 as a portraitist, as reported by Hsia Wen-yen 夏文彦 in his T’u hui pao chien 圖繪寶鑑:

In the sixteenth year of the Chih Yüan 裕宗 reign [1279], his portrait of Yü
tsung [i.e. Khubilai’s son, Jiggim] received imperial approval [from
Khubilai], and he was appointed to a post in the Imperial Wardrobe Service
[Yü i chü 御衣局].

至元十六年寫裕宗御容稱旨，補御衣局使。

His success as a court artist in a wider sense, however, would undoubtedly have
depended upon the goodwill and support of a highly-placed court artist of similarly
broad range, so it is not surprising that he would have attached himself to He
Ch’eng, becoming a follower of the latter. Only after He Ch’eng’s retirement did Liu
Kuan-tao reach the height of his own fame, though for how long is unclear, since the
date of his death is not known.

It is possible that Liu’s own influence at court is reflected in the appointment of
a portraitist from his hometown of Ting chou, Li Hsiao-yen, who became one of the
leading portraitists at the Yüan court c. 1320-30. If Li’s status as Liu Kuan-tao’s

---

29 Hsin Yüan shih 新元史 242/12b-13b, cited by Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol
Court,” p. 112.

30 Although the discrepancy between He Ch’eng’s age and the mention of Khubilai has been noted by
others, the argument that Liu Chung-ch’ien 劉仲賢 was in fact Liu Chung-hsien 劉仲賢 (i.e. Liu
Kuan-tao) -- the first two characters are the same, and the third characters are similarly
pronounced -- has not been made previously, as far as I know.

31 Hsia Wen-yen 夏文彦, T’u hui pao chien (Hua shih ts’ung shu, ed.), p. 128.

32 On Li Hsiao-yen 李青岩, see Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” pp. 55-6; Yü
Hui, “Yüan tai kung t’ing hui hua shih chi chia tso k’ao pien, hsü i [Masterworks and history of
Yüan court painting, part 2], Ku kung po wu yüan yüan k’an, 2000, no. 3, pp. 29-32. Yü Hui shows
that Li was active in Peking, though not necessarily the court, by around 1312.
protégé is uncertain, it is on the other hand quite sure that Liu Kuan-tao’s long-term influence at court was extended by another artist, Li Shih. Li, who hailed from Ta tu itself, became Liu Kuan-tao’s student in the period following He Ch’eng’s retirement.\footnote{33} Since Li Shih was active as a court painter from 1342 up until the end of the Yüan dynasty, this lineage of three northern-Hoheh painters—He Ch’eng, Liu Kuan-tao, and Li Shih—spans the entire history of the Yüan.\footnote{34}

**Wall-painting in Ta tu**

The rough plan of the Yüan capital, Ta tu, has been reconstructed by modern excavators, who have also identified a number of richly decorated stone structural elements from important buildings. Unfortunately, few contemporary Yüan depictions of the city survive to help us reconstruct its appearance further. One rare example is a handscroll in the Nelson-Atkins Museum, traditionally misidentified as a Chin dynasty painting depicting *Chao Yü’s Pacification of the Barbarians*, which contains a striking depiction of the imperial palace (fig. 14).\footnote{35} In a 1993 article, Fu Hsi-nien 傅熹年 convincingly reattributed the painting to an unknown early fourteenth-century artist.\footnote{36} As he shows, the scroll depicts episodes from the official career of an unidentified southerner recruited to the Yüan bureaucracy c. 1272-6. The third episode shows him wearing his new Mongol official robes, having left his former Sung robes in a pile in front of an inner palace gate. The quite elaborate depiction of the palace is unlikely to be fanciful, since the landscape sections of the scroll compare closely with the one surviving signed work by the leading court painter Shang Ch’i, who may have been assisted on this project by an architectural specialist.\footnote{37}

It has long been known that the Yüan imperial palace and princely palaces were lavishly decorated not only with scrolls, but also with wall paintings—a T’ang

\footnote{33} On Li Shih 李峙, see Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” pp. 72 and 112, who cites his biography in *Hsin Yüan shih* 242/12b-13b.

\footnote{34} See previous note for Li Shih.

\footnote{35} *Eight Dynasties of Chinese Painting*, pp. 37-40.

\footnote{36} Fu Hsi-nien 傅熹年, “Fang Mei so chien Chung-kuo gu tai ming hua cha chi, hsia 訪美所見中國古代名畫札記, 下 [Notes on old Chinese paintings seen during a visit to the United States, part 2],” *Wen wu*, 1993, no. 7, pp. 73-5.

\footnote{37} Shang Ch’i’s 邵 Slots surviving signed work is a handscroll in the Palace Museum, Peking, entitled *Spring Mountains*. See *Chung-kuo hua ch’ien chi* 中國繪畫全集 (Peking: Wen wu ch’u ban she, and Hang chou: Che chiang jen min mei shu ch’u ban she, 1999), vol. 7, no. 74. On Shang Ch’i, see Yü Hui, “Yüan tai kung t’ing hui hua shih chi chia tso k’ao pien, hsü i,” pp. 25-6; Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” pp. 70-1.
practice that had remained particularly important in the north. Studies by Marsha Weidner and more recently Yü Hui 余輝 have presented textual evidence confirming that in north China a socially diverse range of painters continued to participate in high-level mural projects, as had already been the case under the T’ang. Thus, under the Yüan many educated painters, even scholar-officials, were active muralists alongside their artisan-trained colleagues, most often specializing in landscape, bamboo, and the like. The bulk of the murals, however, whether in palaces, residences, or temples, would have been figure paintings, which required a different kind of artist. Specific commissions of this kind are recorded for He Ch’eng and Li Shih. He Ch’eng was placed in charge of the painting of the Hsing sheng kung 興聖宮 in the imperial palace during the Chih ta period (1308-11). In 1342 Li Shih painted two murals in the Ch’ing ning tien 淸寧殿, also in the imperial palace, entitled “The Imperial Concubines Fan and Feng” and “The Admonitions Presented to the T’ang Empress Ch’ang sun.”

The omission of Liu Kuan-tao, as Li Shih’s teacher and He Ch’eng’s follower, is no doubt just an accident of the historical record. A possible exception is a story in the Ch’o keng lu 敗耕錄 which mentions a “Supervisor Liu” sent to Nanking from the capital to oversee a temple mural project in 1329 or shortly after. As Weidner has pointed out, a “Supervisor Liu” also appears in the Yüan tai hua su chi 元代畫塑記, in connection with a temple sculpture project in Ta tu in 1317. The 1317 reference is almost certainly to the sculptor Liu Yüan, who would then have been near the end of his career, and would not have been alive at the time of the Nanking mural project. Whether or not the later “Supervisor Liu” was in fact Liu Kuan-tao remains an open question, since we do not know when Liu Kuan-tao died. The lack of textual

38 Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” Yü Hui, “Yüan tai kung t’ing hui hua shih chi chia tso k’ao pien.” Unfortunately, circumstances did not permit me to do the further research on the literary sources that would have been necessary for a full treatment of this topic.

39 The list of educated wall-painters is long—including Li K’an 李едь, Shang Ch’i 邵琦, Chiao Meng-fu 趙孟頻, Chang Yen-fu 張彦輔, Li Shih-hsing 李士行, Liu Yung 劉雄, Puguang 普光, and Wang Yüan 王淵. See Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” pp. 69-72, for a discussion of some of the textual evidence.

40 The specificity of skills is dramatized in a story involving Wang Yüan 王淵 recounted in T’ao Tsung-i’s 陶宗儀 Ch’o keng lu 敗耕錄. In 1329 or shortly after, Wang was dispatched to Nanking as part of a wall-painting team under the direction of “Supervisor Liu” from Ta tu to decorate the Temple of Great Assembled Blessings and Soaring Dragons. Ordered by the Supervisor to paint a large-scale mural composition of demons, Wang eventually had to go back to the Supervisor for advice on how to carry out such a project. Cited by Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” pp. 71 and 218, n. 109.

41 Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” pp. 112-3.

42 Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” p. 72.

43 Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” p. 218, n. 109. For the story, see note 40.
evidence on Liu's wall-painting activities notwithstanding, the He Ch'eng--Liu Kuan-tao--Li Shih lineage of artists surely played a key role in the production of wall paintings in Ta tu.

The He Ch'eng Workshop Tradition

From this point of view, the fact that none of their murals seems to have survived means that the surviving scroll paintings from this school become important as evidence for a practice of painting at the Yüan court that extended far beyond the scroll-painting medium. At the beginning of this article, I examined two handscrolls by He Ch'eng and Liu Kuan-tao in the light of the history of wall-painting. I now want to take up that question again and similarly examine a number of other scrolls that can be attributed to the larger school of painting with which the names of He Ch'eng and Liu Kuan-tao are associated. In doing so, I shall use the concept of "workshop traditions." Of course, workshops were headed by specific painters, and scroll paintings left the workshops bearing the names of those painters. But today the paintings have often lost their original connection with the master of the workshop, and are known to us either under the name of a different, now more prestigious artist, or simply as anonymous works. Moreover, when the original master of a workshop died, a new master took over, but the younger master's artistic profile may not be clear to us. It may make sense, therefore, to think less in terms of specific painters than in terms of workshops, and less in terms of specific workshops than workshop traditions, to which we can provisionally attach the names of He Ch'eng and Liu Kuan-tao, a little like brandnames. (A similar approach could be applied to tomb decoration, even in the absence of names of specific artists). Later research may help to refine this scheme, allowing us, for example, to identify the profile of Li Shih's art. For the moment, however, it is more practical to restrict the discussion to the He Ch'eng and Liu Kuan-tao workshop traditions.

As represented by an apparently autograph work, the fragmentary Taoist Official of Water, He Ch'eng's mode of painting is comparatively loose--both at the level of individual brushstrokes, and in structural terms (figs. 5,15). The emphasis is on movement and light; the performance is exciting. In the best passages he manages to suggest a volatile presence that has just snapped into focus for a magical instant captured by the artist. A second autograph handscroll on paper has survived, which has some of the same characteristics but belongs to a very different genre. Returning Home, illustrating T'ao Ch'ien's famous poem in one continuous depiction, is based on Li Kung-lin's interpretation of the same theme, lost but preserved
in Sung copies, which was made up of several separate compositions (fig. 16). So close are the correspondences that He Ch’eng must have encountered a version of Li Kung-lin’s composition, presumably in Ta tu. In this regard, the painting parallels Liu Kuan-tao’s *Whiling away the Summer* which, as suggested earlier, similarly demonstrates close study of a significant earlier scroll painting. Visual connections of this kind attest to the access to important works in art collections in the capital, including the imperial collection, that success as a court artist would have brought. Through such reinterpretations, He and Liu took part in a wider pictorial dialogue in Ta tu that also involved scholar-official artists like Chao Meng-fu 趙孟頫.

To pursue that question further would lead this article away from its main theme. Instead, let me point out that on another level *Returning Home* has a close kinship with a number of Chin and Yüan tomb murals depicting wall paintings of narrative subjects whose action is set in a landscape. These “paintings within paintings,” like the tomb depictions of landscape fans and screens noted earlier, are funerary parallels to the paintings depicted on fan and screens in *Whiling away the Summer*. Two examples are in the Chin dynasty Wang shang ts’un tomb that I have already cited for its depiction of a landscape fan. Whereas the painted attendants are to be understood as occupants of the internal space of the tomb residence, the figures in the narrative paintings of Taoist subjects together with the birds and flowers in the adjoining murals are to be understood as representations on the walls of the residence of the dead, to be appreciated by the tomb occupants (fig. 17).

Although they are painted directly on the wall like any other mural, the depiction of the architectural framing of the compositions gives away their second-order status as paintings within paintings. From a thematic point of view, therefore, these paintings are depictions of “real” murals. On the other hand, from the point of view of their execution they are essentially the same as “real” murals. As such they give us a vivid idea of how a narrative muralist would have worked in a residential context. Stylistically, they have much in common with *Returning Home*, from the simple but dramatic close-up landscape setting, with its expressive use of trees in the Li-Kuo tradition, to the linear, clearly legible figures and animals. Two more such Taoist murals, similarly representing narrative paintings on the walls of the residence of the

---

44 On this painting, in the Kirin Provincial Museum, see Hsüeh Yung-nien 薛永年, “He Ch’eng ho t’ai ti ‘kui chuàng fú’ 何澄和他的‘歸莊圖’ [He Ch’eng and His *Returning Home*],” *Wen wu*, 1973, no. 8, pp. 26-9; Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” pp. 114-25. See also Fu Hsi-nien’s 傅惠綾 discussion of another thirteenth-century (Chin or early Yüan) example of a continuous representation of the theme in the Cleveland Museum, in “Fang Mei so chien Chung-kuo gu tai ming hua cha chi, hsia 訪美所見中國古代名畫札記,下,” pp. 77-80.
dead, have survived in the Shansi tomb of Feng Tao-chen (1265), previously cited in relation to Whiling away the Summer for its landscape screen (fig. 18).46 Although there are no precise compositional parallels with Returning Home, and there is an obvious difference of quality, the murals and the scroll painting share the same basic stylistic approach. Thus, both of the scrolls generally accepted as He Ch’eng’s autograph work show wall-painting connections.

One anonymous painting that can be attributed to the He Ch’eng workshop tradition is Rafis on Lu kou (fig. 19). This large (143.6 × 105 cm.) hanging scroll on silk commemorates the construction (from the late 1260s onwards) of the Yüan imperial palace through a depiction of Lu kou Bridge 鄂溝橋 to the west of Ta tu, where rafts of logs destined for the building work were delivered (fig. 3).47 This commemorative subject matter suggests a date near the beginning of the dynasty, in the late thirteenth century. The painting has a complex composition, with much detail, but the landscape is in He Ch’eng’s style, as seen in Returning Home. A similarly nervous contour line (also used for many of the logs), and a taste for dramatic overlaps of form and for contrasts of pale and dark passages, unite the two works (figs. 16,20). The architectural elements, though more freely painted in the case of Returning Home, are structurally very similar. The same is true of the figures (figs. 21,22). Only the horses are notably different, those in Returning Home being much more convincing anatomically, and closer to what was understood in the Yüan to be the Han Kan 韓幹 tradition. However, one of the few facts known about He Ch’eng is that he copied at least one of Li Kung-Lin’s horse paintings, so one might suggest that this was a specific area in which his access to old paintings at court led to significant progress in his art.48 All in all, the painting is acceptable as an early product of the He Ch’eng workshop, on which He Ch’eng himself may have been assisted for at least some of the architectural painting and the application of colors.

As Yü Hui has pointed out, the composition, with its low-lying mountains in a band at the top of the painting, is a highly original one in terms of the history of scroll painting.49 But if one looks at it as the work of an experienced wall-painter, used to

45 See note 20.
46 See note 22.
47 On this painting, see Lo Che-wen 羅哲文, “Yüan dai Yun fa tu k’ao 元代「運筏圖」考 [On the Yüan dynasty painting, Rafting Logs],” Wen wu, 1962, no. 10, pp. 19-23; and Yu Hui, “Yüan tai kung t’ing hui hua shih chi chia tso k’ao pien, hsü erh,” pp. 50-1. As it happens, the official whose career is depicted in the so-called Chao Yü Pacifying the Barbarians in the Nelson-Atkins Museum is shown as having been at one time responsible for selecting timber—possibly for building projects in Ta tu?
49 Yü Hui, “Yüan tai kung t’ing hui hua shih chi chia tso k’ao pien, hsü erh,” pp. 50-1.
devising compositional solutions to integrate all manner of narrative subject matter into an overall composition, it will not seem quite so unusual. The almost equal attention that is given to each area of the picture surface in terms of focus and legibility is the mark of a muralist’s mind at work.

Closely related to both *Returning Home* and *Rafts on Lu kou* is the hanging scroll, *Shooting Geese* (131.8 × 93.9 cm.), which Yü Hui has plausibly identified as a portrait of Khubilai’s successor Ch’eng tsung 成宗 hunting, dating from the 1300s (fig. 23).\(^50\) Painted on two joined vertical pieces of silk, the painting appears to have been trimmed on both sides. In its original form, it may have well have used silk of the same width as the two joined pieces used for *Rafts on Lu kou*, which are a little over 5 cm. wider. Not only can horses almost identical to those in *Shooting Geese* be found in *Rafts on Lu kou*, but so too can the landscape elements; the latter also have parallels in *Returning Home*. The three paintings may come from the same workshop at different points in its history, with varying degrees of involvement by the master. *Rafts on Lu kou* would then be the earliest work, followed by *Shooting Geese* from the 1300s, and *Returning Home*—which, according to Chao Meng-fu’s colophon, the artist painted when he was ninety—from the early 1310s. Rather close precedents for the figures, horses, and camels in *Shooting Geese* are to be found in the lively Chin dynasty murals of Hsi kuan ts’un 西關村 Tomb M1 at P’ing ting 平定 in Shansi, confirming the wall-painting connections seen elsewhere in work from the He Ch’eng workshop (fig 24).\(^51\)

In his approach to landscape, He Ch’eng seems to have retained a dependence on assertive contour strokes, dramatic washes, and expressive trees, all in a performative mode. Several impressive Yüan landscape hanging scrolls on silk, most in some version of a Li Ch’eng 李成 or Kuo Hsi 郭熙 style, and all anonymous, have good claims to be the work of painters working at the Yüan capital. Sorting these paintings out stylistically is a major project in itself, and not one th\(\backslash\) I can undertake here. However, one work which deserves discussion is a small snowscape in the style of Kuo Hsi in the Palace Museum, Peking (fig. 25).\(^52\) Its economical structure depends on swinging contours, organic masses, and simple but bold recessional devices. It is executed with a swashbuckling looseness that evokes movement even in the mountain masses. And the composition is dramatically conceived around a pavilion that is tied both to the mountain that towers above it and to the path that

---

\(^{50}\) Yü Hui, “Yüan tai kung t’ing hui hua shih chi chia tso k’ao pien, hsü erh,” p. 50.

\(^{51}\) Shan-hsi sheng k’ao ku yen chiu so, ... [et al.] 山西省考古研究所等, “Shan-hsi P’ing ting Sung, Chin pi hua mu chien pao 山西平定宋金壁画墓簡報 [Brief report on the Sung and Chin tombs with wall paintings at P’ing ting, Shansi],” *Wen wu*, 1996, no. 5, pp. 4-16 and plates.

ends ultimately at the pass. The painting thus displays many of the characteristics elsewhere associated with He Ch’eng’s performative approach to landscape, and may tentatively be ascribed to his workshop tradition.

**The Liu Kuan-tao Workshop Tradition**

The only Yüan dynasty account of Liu Kuan-tao’s art, in Hsia Wen-yen’s *T’u hui pao chien*, paints a picture of an artist with a similar all-round mastery to He Ch’eng:

He was skilled at painting Taoist and Buddhist figures, birds and animals, flowers and bamboo. In each he followed ancient models, bringing together their best points, and for this reason stood out entirely from his contemporaries. He was also good at landscape paintings in the tradition of Kuo Hsi, which in their finest sections were indistinguishable [from Kuo’s own].

Since Wu Hu-fan 吳湖帆, modern scholars have largely taken *Whiling away the Summer* as the starting-point for their attempts to understand Liu Kuan-tao’s art and oeuvre. The painting is notable for its precise visual description and its vivid evocation of both substantiality and insubstantiality. These characteristics are to be found to some degree in a second Yüan dynasty painting attributed to Liu, the great portrait of Khubilai Khan hunting in the National Palace Museum; however, that work overall has a different—albeit related—stylistic character. It appears to be a collaboration between different master-painters, with a landscape setting and camels comparable to *Shooting Geese*, and foreground figures and horses that are the work of a specialist portraitist cum horse specialist. Most recently, Hung Tsai-hsin 洪再新 has convincingly argued that it is a Yüan court work to which Liu’s signature was later added.53

Early in the twentieth century, *Whiling away the Summer* (30.5 × 71.1 cm.) (fig. 9) was mounted together with an unsigned painting of similar subject, style, and dimensions (29.9 × 66.8 cm.), *Dreaming of the Butterfly*, which its then-owner Wu Hu-fan believed to have been painted by Liu as well (fig. 26). In his words:

53 Hung Tsai-hsin 洪再新 with Ts’ai I-ch’iang 曹意強, “Pictorial representation and Mongol Institutions in Khubilai Khan Hunting,” in Cary Y. Liu and Dora C.Y. Ching, eds., *Arts of the Sung and Yüan: Ritual, Ethnicity, and Style in Painting* (Princeton: The Art Museum, Princeton University, 1999), pp. 180-201. Hung’s alternative explanation of the painting—that it dates from the mid-fourteenth century, and is a memorial portrait rather than a portrait from Khubilai’s lifetime—is less convincing, seeming to depend on a homogenized characterization of court painting style over the length of the Yüan dynasty. See also the earlier discussion of this painting by Marsha Weidner, in “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” pp. 106-11.
the draperies and facial features of its figures and all of its brush manner seem to have come from the same hand. The only difference between the two scrolls are the silks.\textsuperscript{54}

To my eyes, the brushwork of the drapery in *Dreaming of the Butterfly* is in a different mode, and is somewhat weaker; moreover, the painter had more difficulty with volumetric form, as seen in the rather flat tree trunks (fig. 27). However, even if a different hand is involved, the two paintings are undeniably products of the same workshop tradition, working in a shared iconographic and stylistic idiom.\textsuperscript{55} The painting is usually taken to depict Chuang tzu 荊子, as suggested by its traditional title and by the depiction of butterflies above the man’s sleeping head. However, a slight caveat should perhaps be attached to this identification. Although *Dreaming of the Butterfly* may have been intended as a literal reference to the famous Chuang tzu story, it could also have functioned as a trope of visual rhetoric identifying some other, later historical figure as a Taoist. Chuang tzu was, for example, an important figure for the *Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove*, who come to mind again through the motif of the musical instrument.

One other handscroll on silk, this one in the National Palace Museum, is related to both *Whiling away the Summer* and *Dreaming of the Butterfly*. Unconvincingly attributed to Chao Meng-fu, it is an illustration to T’ao Ch’ien’s *Returning Home* which has many stylistic features in common with the other two handscrolls, and is of very similar dimensions (27 × 72.5 cm.) (fig. 28).\textsuperscript{56} The drapery is closer to *Whiling away the Summer*, while the cut-off tree trunks echo those in *Dreaming of the Butterfly*. Other signature motifs of this workshop tradition are the almond eyes and long-bearded head of the main figure. It could almost be the same figure, in fact, masquerading here as T’ao Ch’ien, and elsewhere as Chuang tzu or one of the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove. The element of iconographic uncertainty notwithstanding, taken as a group the three paintings attest to a workshop production of portraits of culture heroes.

The profile of the Liu Kuan-tao workshop tradition can be expanded further by taking into account a handscroll that is closely related to *Whiling away the Summer* in a different way. *Four Scenes of Filial Piety* is an anonymous Yüan handscroll on silk whose four scenes are each followed by corresponding calligraphic texts, and, at

\textsuperscript{54} See Lee and Ho, *Chinese Art under the Mongols*, cat. no. 198.

\textsuperscript{55} Weidner ("Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court," p. 95) suggests that “it is most likely by an artist of somewhat later (perhaps early Ming) date.”

the end, a calligraphic preface dated 1330 by Li Chü-ching 李居敬 that was apparently written for a Peking collector. Here we find the same type of tightly-structured scene presented in Whiling away the Summer, the same precise description and attention to the substantiality of objects, and the same disciplined but fluid brushwork which, as we have seen, comes out of the Chung yüan regional tradition (figs. 29-32). Again one sees (landscape) paintings within paintings, albeit evoking different styles from those in Whiling away the Summer. Four Scenes of Filial Piety also shows the fruits of study of the old masters. In this case (and perhaps Whiling away the Summer as well), the painting that stands behind this one is apparently The Eighteen Scholars of the T'ang Dynasty, as seen in the compressed space and the treatment of certain trees and of the furniture. An impressive version of that painting in the National Palace Museum is attributed to Liu Sung-nien 劉松年 working from a now-lost composition itself attributed to Chou Wen-chü 周文矩.

The sophisticated dialogue between Four Scenes of Filial Piety and earlier scroll painting should not blind us, however, to the painting’s links to other forms of pictorial art. Scenes of filial piety were common elements in the decoration of Liao, Chin and Yüan dynasty tombs, in the form of wall paintings and engravings on the sides of sarcophagi. Compared to this funerary tradition, the images of the Palace Museum handscroll are far more elaborate and refined, yet retain the basic narrative character of the funerary versions. The handscroll might at first be thought to

58 See the handscroll version attributed to Liu Sung-nien 劉松年 in the National Palace Museum, reproduced in Kuo li Ku kung po wu yüan, Ku kung shu hua t'u lu, vol. 16, pp. 227-30. Weidner (“Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” p. 95) notes this composition as a precursor of Whiling away the Summer.
upgrade popular images for an elite audience. However, the funerary tradition is better described in functional terms as “public” than in social terms as “popular,” since the occupants of the relevant tombs were most often members of the elite. Moreover, in tombs—and no doubt elsewhere as well—the filial piety theme was sometimes given rather complex and elaborate treatment. As evidence, one can cite the highly sophisticated integration of three stories of filial piety into a single mural composition in the late-Liao Chai t’ang tomb in Peking. It might be more accurate, therefore, to characterize the handscroll as reworking a public theme for a context of intimate viewing.\footnote{60} None of which is to deny, of course, the potential relevance to \textit{Four Scenes of Filial Piety} of the prior history of scroll paintings depicting the filial piety theme.

One figure painting in the hanging scroll format that has strong claims to belong to the Liu Kuan-tao workshop tradition is \textit{The Taoist Immortal Lü Tung-pin} in the Nelson-Atkins Museum (fig. 33).\footnote{61} As described by Marsha Weidner, who notes the similarity to \textit{Whirling away the Summer}: “the immortal is a substantial figure, with a delicately rendered face; his heavy robe falls in angular folds, and is defined with long, sharp strokes.”\footnote{62} He has one close cousin in the almond-eyed T’ao Ch’ien in \textit{Returning Home}, and others among the male figures in \textit{Four Scenes of Filial Piety}. A candidate for a more elaborate example of the religious production of the same workshop tradition is a Taoist hanging scroll in the Reiun-ji 靈雲寺, Tokyo, Chen \textit{wu and His Court} (fig. 34).\footnote{63} The taut drawing of drapery, with a suggestion of angularity within the curves, and the substantial clouds so similar to those in \textit{Four Scenes of Filial Piety}, together encourage this hypothesis. A painting of this kind would have appeared little different as a mural.\footnote{64}

Finally, landscape painting has come into play in this paper in different ways for He Ch’eng and for Liu Kuan-tao. In the case of the former artist, some works

\footnote{60} It is also worth noting the rather close stylistic links between \textit{Four Scenes of Filial Piety} and the late eleventh century jataka depictions at K’ai hua ssu 開化寺 in Shansi. See Chung-kuo mei shu ch’ian chi. \textit{Hui hua pien}: 13. Ssu mioa pi hua 中國美術全集・繪畫編; 13. 寺廟壁畫, pl. 37.

\footnote{61} The painting has most recently been published by Stephen Little in \textit{Taoism and the Arts of China}, cat. no. 120, with an attribution to the late thirteenth/early fourteenth century.

\footnote{62} Weidner, “Painting and Patronage at the Mongol Court,” p. 223, n. 21.

\footnote{63} Little, \textit{Taoism and the Arts of China}, cat. no. 108. Little dates the painting to the late Yuan dynasty. See also Lin Sheng-chih 林聖智, “Ming tai Tao chiao t’u hsiang hsueh yen chiu: ‘Hsüang ti jui ying t’u’ wei li 明代道教圖像學研究：以‘玄帝瑞應圖’ 爲例 [A study of imaging in Ming dynasty Taoism, concerning the usage of ‘The Auspicious Omens of the Dark Emperor’],” \textit{Mei shu shih yen chiu chi k’an 美術史研究集刊}, vol. 6, pp. 155-62.

\footnote{64} Two other paintings that require investigation in this context are two superb hanging scrolls in the National Palace Museum depicting the eighteen Luohans. See Kuo Li ku kung po wu yüan, \textit{Ku kung shu hua t’u lu}, vol. 5, pp. 179-82.
that can be convincingly attributed to his workshop tradition have significant landscape elements. One can thus build up a preliminary picture of the characteristics and range of his landscape style. In Liu Kuan-tao’s case, the only visual evidence for his landscape art takes the form of the landscape vignettes--the paintings within the paintings. Although these by their nature can tell us relatively little about full-scale paintings, they do suggest that his workshop tradition may have taken a more eclectic approach to landscape--in *Whiling away the Summer* the landscapes are lush and misty, suggestive of a Li Ch’eng mode, whereas in *Four Scenes of Filial Piety* we see not only another Li Ch’eng-style work but also a wintry landscape in Li T’ang 李唐 style. Moreover, all the landscape vignettes are meticulously painted, in line with the rest of the paintings within which they appear. This makes me suspect that Liu Kuan-tao’s landscape paintings proper are less likely to have been performative in He Ch’eng’s manner than carefully constructed in a way consistent with the rest of his painting.

From this point of view, a large hanging scroll in the National Palace Museum entitled *Clearing after Snow in the T’ai hang Mountains* merits attention (fig. 35). Here, looseness is replaced by an architectonic precision. The artist makes use of the angularity of what is probably to be understood as a Ching Hao 荊浩 or Kuan T’ung 關同 style to construct his composition around a buried substructure of vertical and oblique lines of force. The result is a massive stability, enlivened by the decisive bushwork, crackling passages of pattern, and play of light and dark. Although in many ways the painting is reminiscent of *Shooting Geese*, the resemblance is more general than specific. The dignified and precisely drawn figures and animals direct us instead toward *Four Scenes of Filial Piety*, whose individual compositions also share a similarly stable structure. *Clearing after Snow in the T’ai hang Mountains* may thus be considered a potential starting-point for understanding the Liu Kuan-tao approach to landscape--despite the fact that Liu was known above all for his works in the style of Kuo Hsi. When we go on look for Li-Kuo landscapes that might be ascribed to his workshop tradition, as we eventually must, we would do well, I think, to expect paintings that are characterized by the precise placement of elements in space, the structural use of light, and remarkably disciplined brushwork, as well as exceptional legibility of the paintings at every level from the overall view to the details of figures, animals, and architecture.65

---

65 Among the paintings that deserve further research in this regard are two hanging scrolls, *Sung hsii lin wu t’u* 松溪林屋圖 in the Nanking Museum (*Chung-kuo hui hua ch’ian chi* 中國繪畫全集, vol. 9, p. 69) and *Ch’iu ching shan shui t’u* 秋景山水圖 in the Palace Museum, Peking (*Chung-kuo hui hua ch’uan chi*, vol. 9, p. 64). They are of very similar dimensions and style (168 × 103 cm. as against 176.5 × 110.5 cm.), and--assuming the former work to have been trimmed--might easily have been conceived as a pair, or as wi.
Conclusion

The He Ch’eng--Liu Kuan-tao--Li Shih lineage of painters was active in the production of wall paintings as well as scrolls. The temples and palace buildings of the capital had great need of painters like them, who were proficient in every possible genre of “public” painting. The likely importance of wall paintings in their output may explain why their surviving oeuvre of scroll paintings is so small. What we can see today in scroll form is all the more precious, therefore, for it allows us to imagine, even if it cannot substitute for, the lost wall paintings which they produced. At the same time, these artists also adapted wall painting traditions to the needs of court production of scroll paintings. For He Ch’eng and Liu Kuan-tao, the shift toward scroll painting would have represented an upward move in status, taking them into the world of private patrons and collectors, and stimulating the self-conscious engagement with the history of painting through surviving works.

Distinct as they are, the two workshop traditions nonetheless share a deep kinship, rooted in their professional origins. They worked basically in the same range of genres; even their specific subjects are closely related. Stylistically, too, the evident differences should not blind us to deeper commonalities. There are, for example, close correspondences of morphological type, whether in figures or in landscape forms; the two workshops share a common heritage of form. Even in execution there is the deep, shared assumption of a fundamentally linear style—strong and bold. We might think of the two artists as representing two poles of a single local tradition (itself part of the regional Chung yüan tradition), He Ch’eng’s spontaneity contrasting with Liu Kuan-tao’s self-containment.

As has often been noted, whereas He Ch’eng’s work helped to lay the basis for the more performative dimension of Che School painting, Liu Kuan-tao’s work opened up a different path that not only influenced the more academic type of Ming court painting but also contributed to the art of independent painters such as Tu Chin 杜堇. Although by 1500 the earlier contribution of He Ch’eng and Liu Kuan-tao may no longer have been clear, and though intervening developments certainly complicated the picture as well, nonetheless the connection remains. By a historical accident, it was painters from northern Hopeh who served as one of the most important links between the northern Chung yüan tradition of the tenth to fourteenth centuries and the professional traditions of the Ming, dominated by southerners. Without their roots in wall-painting, they could not have played that role.
Fig. 1  *Spirit Orchestra* 散樂圖. Mural, 225 × 172 cm., on the east wall of the antechamber of the tomb of Chang Shih-ch'ing, Hsüan hua, Chang chia k'ou Municipality, Hopeh. 河北撫宁县宣化區張世卿墓. Liao dynasty, c.1116. From *Wen wu* 文物. 1975, no. 8, color pl. 2.

Fig. 2  *Three Stories of Filial Piety* 孝悌故事. Mural, c. 120 × 150 cm., on the north wall of a tomb excavated at Chai t'ang Village, Peking Municipality 北京市門頭溝齋堂村遼墓. Liao dynasty, early twelfth century. From *Chung-kuo mei shu ch'ián chi. Hui hua piên*; 12. *Mu shih pi hua* 中國美術全集．繪畫編; 12. 墓室壁畫, pl. 169.
Fig. 3 *Indra in Attendance on Buddha* 帝释禮佛圖. Mural, c. 105 × 83 cm., west wall of pagoda crypt, Ching chih Temple, Ting chou Municipality, Hopeh 河北定州市靜志寺塔基地宮. Sung dynasty, dated 977. From *Chung-kuo mei shu ch’üan chi. Hui hua pien*; 13. *Ssu miao pi hua* 中國美術全集·繪畫編; 13. 寺廟壁畫, pl. 25.

Fig. 5 He Ch'eng 何澄 (1223-c. 1316), The Taoist Official of Water [Hsia yüan shui kuan t'u chüan] 下元水官圖卷. Handscroll, ink on paper, 49.9 × 263.5 cm. Freer Gallery of Art.
Fig. 6  Wang K’ui 王逵, *The Defeat of Mara* 降魔圖. Mural, west wall of Manjusri Hall at Yen shan Ssu, in Fan chih County, Shansi 山西繁峙縣岩山寺文殊殿. Chin dynasty, dated 1167. From *Yen shan Ssu Chin tai pi hua* 岩山寺金代壁畫, pl. 14.

Fig. 7  *Departure of the Water Spirit* 水仙出行圖. Mural, east wall of Shui hsien Tien at Wu yüeh Miao in Fen yang, Shansi 山西汾陽五嶽廟水仙殿. Yuan dynasty, beginning of the fourteenth century. From *Wen wu*, 1991, no. 12, pl. 1.
Fig. 8 *Demon.* Ink rubbing of a Ming dynasty stone engraving after a Yuan dynasty mural in Te ning Hall at the Pei yüeh Miao, Ch'ü yang, Hopeh 河北曲陽北嶽廟德寧殿. From Osvald Sirén, *Chinese Painting: Leading Masters and Principles,* vol. 3, pl. 88.

Fig. 9 Liu Kuan-tao 劉貫道 (active late thirteenth-early fourteenth century), *Whiling away the Summer* [Hsiao hsia t'ü chüan] 消夏圖卷. Handscroll, ink and light color on silk, 30.5 × 71.1 cm. Nelson-Atkins Museum.
Fig. 10  *Spirit attendants*. Mural, east wall of tomb chamber, tomb of Tsou Fu, Laowan chuang, Chiao tso Municipality, Honan 河南焦作市老萬庄鄭璣墓. Chin dynasty, c. 1199. From *Wen wu*, 1979, no. 8. pl. 2b.

Fig. 11  *Spirit Attendants*. Mural, south-east wall of tomb chamber, tomb at Wang shang Village, Teng feng County, Honan 河南登封縣王上村墓. Northern Sung or Chin dynasty. From *Wen wu*, 1994, no. 10, cover illustration.
Fig. 12 Landscape screen or mural. Mural, north wall of tomb chamber, tomb of Feng Tao-chen, Ta t'ung Municipality, Shansi 山西大同市馮道真墓. Yüan dynasty, c. 1265. From Wen wu, 1962, no. 10, pl. 1.

Fig. 13 Tomb Occupants Seated in front of a Landscape Screen. Mural, north, north-west and north-east walls of tomb chamber, tomb of Chang’an-tapuhua (Mongol) and his wife, Li Yün-hsien (Han Chinese). Yüan dynasty, dated 1269. Tungher Village, P’u ch’eng County, Shensi 陝西蒲城縣洞耳村張按答不花、李雲縷夫妻墓. From K’ao gu yü wen wu 考古與文物, 2000, no.1, pl.1.
Fig. 14 Unidentified artist, “Newly Appointed as a Yüan Official,” section 3 of Episodes from the Career of a Yüan Dynasty Official. Handscroll, ink and color on silk, $39.3 \times 396.2$ cm. (detail). Yüan dynasty, early fourteenth century. Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art.

Fig. 15 He Ch'eng (1223-c.1316), The Taoist Official of Water [Hsia yüan shui kuan t'ü chüan] (detail). Handscroll, ink on paper, $49.9 \times 263.5$ cm. Freer Gallery of Art.
Fig. 16  He Ch'eng 何澄 (1223-c.1316). *Returning Home* [T‘ao Ch‘ien kui chuang t‘u ch‘uan] 陶潛歸莊圖卷 (detail). Handscroll, ink on paper, 41 × 732.8 cm. Kirin Provincial Museum 吉林省博物館. From *Chung-kuo hui hua ch‘uan chi*, 7. *Yüan*. 1 中國繪畫全集; 7. 元. 1, pl. 2.

Fig. 17 Ascending as a Transcendant 升仙圖. Mural, west wall of tomb chamber, tomb at Wang shang Village, Teng feng County, Honan. Northern Sung or Chin dynasty. From *Wen wu*, 1994, no. 10, pl. 3
Fig. 18 Discussing the Tao 論道圖. Mural, north corner, west wall of tomb chamber, tomb of Feng Tao-chen, Ta t’ung Municipality, Shansi. Yüan dynasty, c. 1265. From Wen wu, 1962, no. 10, pl. 3.

Fig. 19 Unidentified artist, Rafts on Lu kou [Lu kou yün fa t’u] 盧溝運筏圖. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 143.6 × 105 cm. Yüan dynasty. National History Museum, Peking. From Yü Wei-ch’ao 異偉超, ed., A Journey into China’s Antiquity, vol. 4, pl. 11.
Fig. 20 Unidentified artist, *Rafts on Lu kou* [Lu kou yún fa t’u] (detail). Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 143.6 \( \times \) 105 cm. Yuan dynasty. National History Museum, Peking. From Yü Wei-ch’ao, ed., *A Journey into China’s Antiquity*, vol. 4, pl. 11.

Fig. 21 He Ch’eng (1223-c.1316), *Returning Home* [T’ao Ch’ien kui chuang t’u ch’üan] (detail). Handscroll, ink on paper, 41 \( \times \) 732.8 cm. Kirin Provincial Museum. From *Chung-kuo hua hua ch’üan chi*, 7. Yuan, I, pl. 1.
Fig. 22  Unidentifed artist, *Rafts on Lu kou* [Lu kou yün fa t’u] (detail). Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 143.6 × 105 cm. Yüan dynasty. National History Museum, Peking. From Yü Wei-ch’ao, ed., *A Journey into China’s Antiquity*, vol. 4, pl. 11.

Fig. 23  Unidentified artist, *Shooting Geese* [She yen t’u]射雁圖. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 131.8 × 93.9 cm. Yüan dynasty. National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 24 Mural, south-west wall of tomb chamber, tomb M1, Hsi kuan Village, P'ing ting County, Shansi. Chin dynasty. From Wen wu, 1996, no. 5, pl. 1b.

Fig. 25 Unidentified artist, Snowy Landscape [Hsüeh ching shan shui t'u] 雪景山水圖. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 166 × 111.9 cm. Yüan dynasty. Palace Museum, Peking. From Chung-kuo hui hua ch'üan chi; 9. Yüan. 3 中國繪畫全集, 9. 元. 3, pl. 47.
Fig. 26 Unidentified artist (attrib. Liu Kuan-tao 劉貫道), *Dreaming of the Butterfly* [Meng tieh t’u chüan] 夢蝶圖卷. Handscroll, ink and color on silk, 29.9 × 66.8 cm. Yuan dynasty. C.C. Wang Family Collection, New York.

Fig. 27 Unidentified artist (attrib. Liu Kuan-tao), *Dreaming of the Butterfly* [Meng tieh t’u chüan] (detail). Handscroll, ink and color on silk, 29.9 × 66.8 cm. Yuan dynasty. C.C. Wang Family Collection, New York.
Fig. 28 Unidentified artist (attrib. Chao Meng-fu 趙孟頫), *Returning Home* [Yüan ming Kui ch'i lai tz'u t'u chüan] 清明歸去來辭圖卷. Handsroll, ink and color on silk, 27 × 72.5 cm. Yüan dynasty(?). National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 29  Unidentified artist, *Four Scenes of Filial Piety* [Ssu hsiao t’u chūan] 四孝圖卷, section 1. Handscroll, ink and color on silk, 38.9 × 502.7 cm. Yüan dynasty. National Palace Museum, Taipei.

Fig. 30  Unidentified artist, *Four Scenes of Filial Piety* [Ssu hsiao t’u chūan], section 2. Handscroll, ink and color on silk, 38.9 × 502.7 cm. Yüan dynasty. National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 31 Unidentified artist, *Four Scenes of Filial Piety* [Ssu hsiao t'ü chüan], section 3. Handscroll, ink and color on silk, 38.9 × 502.7 cm. Yüan dynasty. National Palace Museum, Taipei.

Fig. 32 Unidentified artist, *Four Scenes of Filial Piety* [Ssu hsiao t'ü chüan], section 4. Handscroll, ink and color on silk, 38.9 × 502.7 cm. Yüan dynasty. National Palace Museum, Taipei.
Fig. 33 Unidentified artist, *The Taoist Immortal Lü Tung-pin* [Lü Tung-pin hsiang] 呂洞賓像. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 110.5 × 44.4 cm. Yuan dynasty. Nelson-Atkins Museum.

Fig. 34 Unidentified artist, *Chen wu and His Court* 天帝圖. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 122.7 × 63.3 cm. Yuan dynasty. Reiun-ji, Tokyo 東京霊雲寺.
Fig.35 Unidentified artist, *Clearing after Snow in the T’ai hang Mountains* [T’ai hang hsüeh chi t’u] 太行雪霽圖. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk, 156 × 103 cm. National Palace Museum, Taipei.