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By the second half of the eighteenth century, the commodification of literati painting had long been accepted fact, even if formalized demarcations of a discussed artist's professionalism were still sometimes felt necessary in a biography. But if there were few true amateurs of any note in the eighteenth century, not every literati painter was a full-time professional. For many, a semi- or occasional professionalism was the norm as they pursued other careers. Luo Ping was an artist of this kind, who seems never to have considered the role of painter as his primary social identity. From a career point of view, his life was largely structured as a series of patronage episodes in which he attached himself to a succession of patron-protectors for whom he fulfilled roles that evolved over the years but were never restricted to painting. For his early patrons, his duties are likely to have been secretarial in a very broad sense, extending to ghost-painting (for Jin Nong) and editing publications for Jia Yu Shiquan. During his sojourns in the capital, on the other hand, he benefited from a certain celebrity status. He made himself available for banquets or parties, where he was famously good company, telling ghost stories and drawing on his prodigious memory and discernment to recite choice lines of contemporary poetry, as he played the role of a living link to an older generation of southern bohemians. Living separately, Luo avoided the indispensable obligations of an artist-in-residence. He did not produce patron-paintings for his patrons and others (and was undoubtedly remunerated in one way or another) but appears to have done so selectively, where he saw an intersection between his own artistic interests and those of the recipient.

In all this one may discern, as one factor determining his behavior, a strategic effort to protect his art by embracing a modernized version of the literati ideal. The literati artist was ideally an amateur beholden to none but himself, who could intervene artistically at will on the model of the poet. But painting was more easily commodified then poetry, with the result that literati professionalism became consistent in the art world as early as the sixteenth century. The market offered possibilities of autonomy and independence, to be sure, but could also be imprisoning, especially for the most thoughtful artists. Luo Ping in response positioned himself on the margins of the market, freeewing himself to practice painting on the models of poetry and scholarship by taking the role of literati painter seriously as an at least partly livable reality. In the process, he invented new possibilities for literati painting (wenrenhua) that were themselves made possible by the earlier innovations of Gao Qipei (1690–1734) during the decades either side of 1700.

In order to appreciate just how radical a disruption of the existing literati painting field was accomplished by Gao Qipei, it is worth briefly considering how wenrenhua came into being. When literati painting fully crystallized as a distinctive art form at the beginning of the fourteenth century, it broke with other painting traditions in China, both secular and sacred. Those traditions, which were to continue for many centuries thereafter, took the pictorial image as both starting point and end point. They principally engaged with human experience through the capacity of the image to produce modes of seeing on every level, from optical experience to imagery visions. Eschewing this focused internal consistency, literati painters working in the wake of the loss of China to the Mongols, from Zhao Mengfu (1254–1322) to the generation of Huang Gongwang (1269–1354) and Wu Zhen (1280–1354), gradually constructed an alternative and heterogeneous artistic space that would make room for the special skills of an educated elite. By the second quarter of the fourteenth century, this new form of painting had found the means to reconcile the capacities of the pictorial image with those of calligraphy and text (both poetry and prose), which participated in the art work in the form of inscription on the picture surface. The most important of these means was a reconfiguration of the relation between the physical surface in which the pictorial image crystallized and the space of visual experience that the image conjured up. The literati painters of the Yuan dynasty treated the former as semi-autonomous, continuous if not identical with the surface in which the calligraphic image crystallized. This surface space, which possessed its own specific depth and internal complexity, thus became the interface between the more expansive visual space of the depicted scene and the textual space of the calligraphed inscription. Wenrenhua took form in the fourteenth century, therefore, as a practice of painting that was image-centered, certainly – as such justifying its categorization as painting – but not image-identified.

None of this would have been possible, however, if literati painting had not also subordinated its image component to the brush trace that generated it. The brush trace, whether used depictively or inscriptionally and regardless of its role in semiotic communication, always indescendently referred back to the artist as well. The fact that neither image nor inscriptional text could come into being without the brush trace gave the brush trace an implicit primacy over the pictorial image, itself more closely linked to a sharable act of looking. Image-centered rather than image-identified, literati painting until the end of the seventeenth century largely developed under the hegemony of the indexical brush trace.

Note:
1. The artist in question is Gao Qipei. His work was highly influential, and his methods of painting and calligraphy are often cited as examples of the new style of literati painting.
2. This refers to the period of literati painting in China, characterized by the blending of painting and calligraphy in a single work of art.
3. The brush trace is an important element in literati painting, serving as a record of the artist's individual style and technique.
4. The level of comprehension and appreciation of literati painting by the general public was limited, leading to a focus on the artist's personal style and the symbolic meaning of the brush trace.
5. The indexical brush trace is a term used to describe the idea that the brush stroke is a record of the artist's physical action, akin to a fingerprint.
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By the second half of the eighteenth century, the commodification of literati painting had long been accepted fact, even if formalized denials of a deceased artist's professionalism were still sometimes felt necessary in a biography. But if there were few true amateurs of any note in the eighteenth century, not every literati painter was a full-time professional. For many, a semi- or occasional professionalism was the norm as they pursued other careers. Luo Ping was an artist of this kind, who seems never to have considered the role of painter as his primary social identity. From a career point of view, his life was largely structured as a series of patronage episodes in which he attached himself to a succession of patrons-protectors for whom he fulfilled roles that evolved over the years but were never restricted to painting. For his early patrons, his duties are likely to have been secretarial in a very broad sense, extending to ghost-painting (for Jin Nong) and editing publications for Juang Shiquan. During his sojourns in the capital, on the other hand, he benefited from a certain celebrity status. He made himself available for banquets or parties, where he was famous good company, telling ghost stories and drawing on his prodigious memory and discernment to recite choice lines of contemporary poetry, as he played the role of a living link to an older generation of southern behemoths. Living separately, Luo avoided the formidable obligations of an artist-in-residence. He did of course produce paintings for his patrons and others (and was undoubtedly remunerated in one way or another) but appears to have done so selectively, where he saw an intersection between his own artistic interests and those of the recipient.

In all this one may discern, as one factor determining his behavior, a strategic effort to protect his art by embracing a modernized version of the literati ideal. The literati artist was indeed an amateur beholden to none but himself, who could intervene artistically at will on the model of the poet. But painting was more easily commoditized then poetry.

With the result that literati professionalism became common in the art world as early as the sixteenth century. The market offered possibilities of autonomy and independence, to be sure, but could also be imprisoning, especially for the most thoughtful artists. Luo Ping in response positioned himself on the margins of the market, freeing himself to practice painting on the models of poetry and scholarship by taking the role of literati painter seriously as an at least partly livable reality. In the process, he invented new possibilities for literati painting (wenrenhua) that were themselves made possible by the earlier innovations of Gao Qipei (1660–1734) during the decades either side of 1700.

In order to appreciate just how radical a disruption of the existing literati painting field was accomplished by Gao Qipei, it is worth briefly considering how wenrenhua came into being. When literati painting fully crystallized as a distinctive art form at the beginning of the fourteenth century, it broke with other painting traditions in China, both secular and sacred. Those traditions, which were to continue for many centuries thereafter, took the pictorial image as both starting point and end point. They principally engaged with human experience through the capacity of the image to produce modes of seeing on every level, from optical experience to imaginary visions. Escalating this focus on internal consistency, literati painters working in the wake of the loss of China to the Mongols, from Zhao Mengfu (1254–1322) to the generation of Huang Gongwang (1269–1354) and Wu Zhens (1380–1354), gradually constructed an alternative and heterogenous artistic space that would make room for the special skills of an educated elite.

By the second quarter of the fourteenth century, this new form of painting had found the means to reconcile the capacities of the pictorial image with those of calligraphy and text (both poetry and prose), which participated in the art work in the form of inscriptions on the picture surface. The most important of these means was a reconfiguration of the relation between the physical surface in which the pictorial image crystallized and the space of visual experience that the image conjured up. The literati painters of the Yuan dynasty treated the former as semi-autonomous, continuous if not identical with the surface in which the calligraphic image crystallized. This surface space, which possessed its own specific depth and internal complexity, thus became the interface between the more expansive visual space of the depicted scene and the textual space of the calligraphed inscription. Wenrenhua took form in the fourteenth century, therefore, as a practice of painting that was image-centered, certainly – as such justifying its categorization as painting – but not image-identified.

None of this would have been possible, however, if literati painting had not also subordinated its image component to the brush trace that generated it. The brush trace, whether used depictively or inscriptionally and regardless of its role in semiotic communication, always insidiously referred back to the artist as well. The fact that neither image nor inscriptive text could come into being without the brush trace gave the brush trace an implicit primacy over the pictorial image, itself more closely linked to a sharable act of looking. Image-centered rather than image-identified, literati painting until the end of the seventeenth century largely developed under the hegemony of the indexical brush trace.
During the first half of the eighteenth century, however, just prior to Luon Ping’s emergence as an artist, literati painting underwent a revolutionary change. Although, to be sure, many literati artists continued to work in the old manner (as would their successors down to the twentieth century), the most independent-minded artists took the literati tradition in a new direction. The key figure was Gao Qipei, who, at the end of the seventeenth century, took up a micro technique of performance painting — painting using the fingernails, fingers, and palms of the hand rather than the brush — and turned it to serious intellectual purpose.

Gao belonged to the world of Han Chinese hangers-on, a group that occupied a privileged but awkward position between the Manchu rulers of China and their Han subjects. Although he spent most of his life working as an official in the field administration, he painted poetically, largely in his leisure time. Gao’s decision to discard the brush allowed him to intensify the visceral immediacy that had been a feature of the work of some of the most independent-minded seventeenth-century artists, from Xu Wei (1521–1563) at the beginning of the century to Bada shanren (1626–1703) and Shi Tao (1642–1707) at the century’s end (Figs. 25, 26). At the same time, the intensified physicality of finger painting resonated with the importance of martial values among the hangers-on; in the eighteenth century the genre was taken up by hangers-on artists who used finger painting to convey their sociocultural distance.

For our purposes, however, a much more important aspect of Gao’s painting was its reconsideration of the status of the pictorial image in literati painting. Abandoned the brush’s codified control, and hence the inherited visual formulas associated with that control, Gao needed to find another way of assuring the aesthetic coherence of his paintings. He solved this problem by expanding the capacity of the pictorial image to resonate with other images. Whereas the classicizing evocation of old master imagery had retained an authority even among artists as iconoclastic as Shi Tao and Bada shanren, Gao Qipei refused to give the past any absolute authority, devoting even more attention to the visual culture of his own day and to personal observation of the world. With the eccentricity of the finger painting technique as an ally, Gao deliberately set out to depict what had never been depicted before, exploding the traditional boundaries of literati image-making (Figs. 27, 28).

Gao’s unbridled inventiveness gave the metaphoric density of the image its capacity to evoke and create relationships between images of diverse kinds — a disjunctive character that allowed “high” and “low” resonances to coexist. The contrast with the unifying layers of art-historical allusion supported by theoretical inscriptions, which characterized the work of contemporary classicizing artists such as Wang Hui (1632–1717) and Wang Yungti (1642–1715), could not have been more striking. The return to the brute image implied at the same time a thematization of looking as the foundation of the pictorial image, shared between artist and viewer. This fundamental aspect of non-literati painting was not absent from the literati tradition, which evolved in constant dialogue with its non-literati counterparts. In the seventeenth century it was, for example, central to the carefully crafted art of Chen Hongshou (1598–1652), which subsequently became a point of reference for many eighteenth- and nineteenth-century painters, literati or otherwise. Although Gao, too, may be counted among those who learned from Chen Hongshou, a more important influence in his case was Bada shanren, whose explorations of point of view and depictions of the act of looking were in turn indebted to the specular non-literati images of Zhou school pupils of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries — the great decorators (in the non-pejorative sense of the term) of their time. Not surprisingly, even the inscriptive components of Gao’s paintings are treated imagistically, and their texts, too, place a premium on striking visual images. In Gao’s painting, the importance of looking tended to relativize the iconographical principle of self-reference (embodied in the brush trace). In line with this, his use of the hands and fingers replaced brush trace with something closer to mark.

Overall, his paintings succeed or fail to the degree that they manage to generate a tension between image and mark.

Today, the importance of Gao Qipei’s art as a catalyst and model for literati painting outside the court during the second quarter of the eighteenth century has been lost (or on the calligraphic model. The ability of these sometime officials to exploit any professionalism in which they engaged depended, therefore, on their capacity to draw on this capital. But Gao Qipei had opened their eyes to the possibilities of mark-making, so in many instances they significantly pushed the brush trace in the direction of the mark (Figs. 30, 31). Within the parameters of this enriched concept of the brush trace, they followed Gao in exploring the possibilities of metaphoric density in the pictorial (as well as the calligraphic, inscriptive, and textual) image. This gave them a way of engaging in the social and political debates of their time without putting themselves at risk, for they could use this magnetic density and its accompanying affective layering to address (and at the same time mask) their own complex personal relations to state ideology, the common culture of the populace at large, and
During the first half of the eighteenth century, however, just prior to Luoxiong’s emergence as an artist, literati painting underwent a revolutionary change. Although, to be sure, many literati artists continued to work in the old manner (as would their successors down to the twentieth century), the most independent-minded artists took the literati tradition in a new direction. The key figure was Gao Gipei, who, at the end of the seventeenth century, took up a micro-technique of performance painting—painting using the fingernails, fingers, and palms of the hand rather than the brush—and turned it to serious intellectual purpose.

Gao belonged to the pan Chinese hansomse, a group that occupied a privileged but awkward position within the Mandchu rulers of China and their Manchu subjects. Although he spent most of his life working as an official in the field administration, he painted poetically, largely in his leisure time. Gao’s decision to discard the brush allowed him to intensify the visceral immediacy that had been a feature of the work of some of the most independent-minded seventeenth-century artists, from Xu Wei (1521–1593) at the beginning of the century to Bodai shaman (1628–1703) and Shitao (1642–1707) at the century’s end (figs. 27, 28). At the same time, the intensified physicality of finger painting resonated with the importance of martial values among the hanzheng; in the eighteenth century the genre was taken up by hanzheng artists who used finger painting to connote their socratic ethos.

For our purposes, however, a much more important aspect of Gao’s painting was its reconsideration of the status of the pictorial image in literati painting. Absent the brush’s colliding control, and hence the inherited visual formula associated with that control, Gao needed to find another way of ensuring the aesthetic coherence of his paintings. He solved this problem by expanding the capacity of the pictorial image to resonate with other images. Whereas the classicizing evocation of old master imagery had retained an authority even among artists as iconoclastic as Shitao and Bodai shaman, Gao Qipei refused to give the past any absolute authority, devoting even more attention to the visual culture of his own day and to personal observation of the world. With the eccentricity of the finger painting technique as an artist, Gao deliberately set out to depict what had never been depicted before, exploring the traditional boundaries of literati image-making (figs. 27, 28). Gao’s unbridled inventiveness gave the metaphoric density of the image—its capacity to evoke and create relationships between images of diverse kinds—a disjunctive character that allowed “high” and “low” resonances to coexist.9

The contrast with the unifying layers of art-historical allusion supported by theoretical inscriptions, which characterized the work of contemporary classicizing artists such as Wang Hui (1632–1717) and Wang Yuanqi (1642–1715), could not have been more striking.

The return to the brute image implied at the same time a thematicization of looking as the foundation of the pictorial image, shared between artist and viewer. This fundamental aspect of non-literati painting was not absent from the literati tradition, which evolved in constant dialogue with its non-literati counterparts. In the seventeenth century it was, for example, central to the carefully crafted art of Chen Hongshou (1598–1652), which subsequently became a point of reference for many eighteenth- and nineteenth-century painters, literati or other.10 Although Gao, too, may be counted among those who learned from Chen Hongshou, a more important influence in his case was Bodai shaman, whose explorations of point and view and depictions of the act of looking were in turn indebted to the spectacular non-literati images of Zhu school painters of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—the great decorators (in the non-pejorative sense of the term) of their time. Not surprisingly, even the inscriptive components of Gao’s paintings are treated imagistically, and their texts, too, place a premium on striking visual images. In Gao’s painting, the importance of looking tended to relativize the iconical principle of self-reference (embodied in the brush trace). In line with this, his use of the hands and fingers replaced brush trace with something closer to mark. Overall, his paintings succeed or fail to the degree that they manage to generate a tension between image and mark.

Today, the importance of Gao Qipei’s art as a catalyst and model for literati painting outside the court during the second quarter of the eighteenth century has been lost from view. Yet Luoxiong, in addition to being influenced directly by Gao, emerged as a painter within an artistic milieu that owed everything to Gao’s revolution. Among the earliest artists to realize the significance of what Gao had done were four from the region of northern Jiangsu and southern Shandong: Gao Fenghuang (1683–1749), Li Shan (1686–1762), Li Fuyun (1695–1754), and Zheng Xie (1693–1765)—all of whom served at one time or other in the lower levels of the fiscal administration, all of whom had direct contact with Gao, and all of whom were in contact with each other. Apart from some experiments in finger painting that are significant mostly for the way they advertise the artists’ debt to Gao, these sometime-magistrate artists did not themselves discard the brush. In the public mind the cultural capital of a government-official identity was associated, in the realm of painting, with brush mastery on the calligraphic model. The ability of these sometime officials to exploit this professionalism in which they engaged depended, therefore, on their capacity to draw on this capital. But Gao Qipei had opened their eyes to the possibilities of mark-making, so in many instances they significantly pushed the brush trace in the direction of the mark (figs. 30, 31). Within the parameters of this enriched concept of the brush trace, they followed Gao in exploring the possibilities of metaphoric density in the pictorial (as well as the calligraphic, inscriptive, and textual) image. This gave them a way of engaging in the social and political debates of their time without putting themselves at risk, for they could use this magistral density and its accompanying effective laying-to-address (and at the same time mask) their own complex personal relations to state ideology, the common culture of the population at large, and...
social convention. The work of these artists was a central presence in the mid-century art world of Luo Ping's younger days and provided him with possibilities that he adopted from time to time throughout his life. Orchids, Bamboo, and Rock (cat. 24), for example, reinterpret a compositional mode associated with Zheng Xie, and it was Li Shan's experiments with layered washes that served as the starting point for Luo's own in paintings such as Drunken Zhong Kui (cat. 1) and Colored Liushu (cat. 23). A second dimension of Gao Qipei's influence during the second quarter of the eighteenth century can be seen in the reaction of a professionalized literati artist operating between Hangzhou and Yangzhou: Hua Yan (1682–1756). Hua's development of one strain of Gao Qipei's thinking is especially relevant here because it would subsequently prove formative for the art of Luo Ping, who matched Hua's powers of depiction and facility with the brush. What Hua particularly responded to in Gao Qipei's painting was the fact that Gao regularly enriched his unprecedented images with an explicit thematization of visual attention, usually by drawing attention to the act of looking itself. Numerous paintings by Hua Yan similarly stage the immediacy of being in the world via the visual motif of a person or animal intensely engaged in an act of directed looking—a motif that draws from the viewer an equivalent intensity of visual attention (fig. 32). Some of these paintings borrow specific formulae from Gao Qipei. But Hua was careful—and here again he was following Gao—to ensure that the viewer's attention, thus engaged, is further rewarded by the complexity of the painting's presentational dimension as an ink and color on paper (or silk) surface. The result is a striking tension between registers of visual attention, which can be understood as a knowing acknowledgement of painting's semiotic mediation of visual experience. Like Hua Yan and Gao Qipei before him, Luo Ping possessed the technical skills to translate his observational and imaginative curiosity into pictorial images belonging to almost any genre. Luo's study of Hua Yan's work is on view in his Drunken Zhong Kui (cat. 1), which creates a tension between the dramatic materiality of the ink wash of the rock and the narrative element of the figures. Luo's 1774 album Insects, Birds, and Beasts (cat. 22) —clearly directly inspired by Gao Qipei—takes the act of looking as its very theme. Numerous other paintings similarly demons-
social convention. The work of these artists was a central presence in the mid-century art world of Lu Ping’s younger days and provided him with possibilities that he adopted from time to time throughout his life. Orchids, Bamboo, and Rock (cat. 24), for example, reinterpret a compositional mode associated with Zhenji Xie, and it was Li Shan’s experiments with layered washes that served as the starting point for Lu’s own in paintings such as Drumskem Zhong Kui (cat. 1) and Colored Listhe (cat. 23).

A second dimension of Gao Qipei’s influence during the second quarter of the eighteenth century can be seen in the reaction of a professionalized literati artist operating between Hangzhou and Yangzhou: Hua Yan (1682–1756). Hua’s development of one strain of Gao Qipei’s thinking is especially relevant here because it would subsequently prove formative for the art of Lu Ping, who matched Hua’s powers of depiction and facility with the brush. What Hua particularly responded to in Gao Qipei’s painting was the fact that Gao regularly enriched his unprecedented images with an explicit thematization of visual attention, usually by drawing attention to the act of looking itself. Numerous paintings by Hua Yan similarly stage the immediacy of being in the world via the visual motif of a person or animal intensely engaged in an act of directed looking – a motif that draws from the viewer an equivalent intensity of visual attention (fig. 32). Some of these paintings borrow specific formulae from Gao Qipei. But Hua was careful – and here again he was following Gao – to ensure that the viewer’s attention, thus engaged, is further rewarded by the complexity of the painting’s presentational dimension as an ink and color and paper (or silk) surface. The result is a striking tension between registers of visual attention, which can be understood as a knowing acknowledgement of painting’s semiotic mediation of visual experience. Like Hua Yan and Gao Qipei before him, Lu Ping possessed the technical skills to translate his observational and imaginative curiosity into pictorial images belonging to almost any genre. Lu’s study of Hua Yan’s work is on view in his Drumskem Zhong Kui (cat. 1), which creates a tension between the dramatic materiality of the ink wash of the rock and the narrative element of the figures. Lu’s 1774 album Insects, Birds, and Beasts (cat. 22) – clearly directly inspired by Gao Qipei – takes the act of looking at its very theme. Numerous other paintings similarly demon-
state that the thematicalization of visual attention was part of his inheritance from Hua Yan and Gao Qipei. None, perhaps, does so more vividly than his Ghost Amusement handscroll (cat. 21), so it is worth pointing out that Liao's claim to be able to see ghosts can be understood as a metaphor for the autonomy of vision and, by extension, of the psychophysically defined individual.8

Ultimately, though, Liao Ping's greatest debt to Gao Qipei came through his teacher, Jin Nong (1687–1763), whose paintings produced between about 1748 and 1763 constitute a third, delayed reaction to Gao's revolutionary approach to the pictorial image. Jin's unacknowledged but profound debt to Gao Qipei was not stylistic—Jin possessed only a very limited pictorial craft and tended to reduce motifs to signs—and only rarely concerned subject matter, but was instead conceptual. No eighteenth-century artist exploited as fully and boldly as Jin Nong the possibilities of image density that Gao opened up. Moreover, no painter outside the court addressed more directly than Jin Nong the court's contemporary harnessing of the image to ideological purpose. This was Jin's own double legacy to Liao Ping, who as a young man was drafted into the production of many of Jin's paintings. Jin's oeuvre took form—most unusually for a Chinese painter—as a systematic and self-conscious pursuit of the unprecedented image, pictorial grain by pictorial grain. In fact, Jin Nong, who had first made his name as a calligrapher during the second quarter of the eighteenth century, had earlier taken the same approach in calligraphy to script types. Like his contemporaries Zheng Xie and Yang Fu (1696–1762), he had intensively read the image dimension of both individual characters and whole transcribed texts, thereby relativizing the importance of the brush trace. By the time he turned to painting, therefore, he already thought of the brush trace in imagetic terms, a feature that gives his pictorial images a special, graphic character. A purely stylistic assessment of Liao Ping's relation to Jin Nong is no less misleading than a similar assessment of Jin's relation to Gao Qipei, because it can only register the difference between an art that reduces experience to sign and one that is capable of evoking the immediacy of experience. Once again, the most profound debt was of a conceptual nature. It was to Jin that Liao Ping owed the model of a selective practice of painting, one that eroded the diary-like, autobiographical documentation of a life in favor of a practice of painting as calculated intervention in a pre-existing genre with historically constituted conventions. Continuing in this line, Liao rediscovered the path not taken by literati painting: that of the early Zhao Mengfu before 1300, prior to the construction of a unified space of literati painting when image and vision had not yet become subject to the ideology of the brush trace.8 This return to beginnings in literati painting echoes the attention to the earliest sources in the epigraphic scholarship practiced by so many of Liao's friends.

Before Gao Qipei, then, literati painting was image-centered but brush trace-controlled; after him, it remained image-centered, but the possibility existed of placing authority between the brush trace and the image itself. If we make the mistake of judging Liao Ping's art by pre-Gao Qipei criteria, we will see him as an ecletic artist whose severe lacks coherence, switching between styles and genres with disconcerting regularity. Worse, we will take his refusal to assert the authority of the brush trace as a mark of timidity—a failure of character. The modern view of Liao Ping as a second-rank painter derives from this misplaced assessment of his art, whose qualities and significance lie elsewhere. Liao Ping's art needs to be seen on its own, post-Gao Qipei terms as an expression of image and visual attention which has as its backdrop the Qing state's discovery of the ideological potential of the image to manipulate appearances for political profit. Similarly, Liao's openly rhetorical deployment of the resources of style and gesture belongs to the same eighteenth-century world in which court painting was subordinating those artistic resources to ideological purpose.

What, then, was Liao Ping's own contribution? The answer helps to explain his elusiveness: his art opens up the territory of what we today call the unconscious. Here one must take the unconscious as much in a social as in a private sense, for his paintings are as concerned with articulating the normally undelivered stakes of Qing-period politics and culture as they are with exploiting a more purely private terrain.

There was, of course, no concept of the unconscious as such in eighteenth-century China. But if we understand the unconscious to be the concept by which we today acknowledge the existence of such disruptive and only partly controllable forces as desire, envy, fear of death, disruption of intersubjective boundaries, gender instability, or the compulsion to gain power over others, then it is undeniable that Liao Ping's contemporaries were obsessed by the possibility of articulating those same forces in language. This obsession—expressed most comprehensively in the great novel of the period, The Story of the Stone (Honglou meng, also known as The Dream of the Red Chamber)—translated a collective dissatisfaction with the claims of organized religions and state ideology to be able to account for psychic forces through fixed cosmologies. Part of the modern difficulty with Liao Ping's art derives from the fact that he was perhaps the first major artist in Chinese history for whom the unconscious was just as central as conscious perception to the personal experience that his painting sought to articulate visually. As Richard Vinograd has shown, by seeking rational, purposeful explanations for his paintings, we largely miss the point of an art concerned with the in-between, the beyond, and the underneath.12

The artist's lifelong project is already announced in the great Ghost Amusement handscroll painted circa 1710 (cat. 21), through which he declared his independent identity as a painter following the death of Jin Nong. It is characteristic of the handscroll's status as a post-Gao Qipei painting that its imagery can be traced back to such marginal resources as temple painting, pornographic painting, festival masqueartes, and even manuals of forensic science that had themselves borrowed from the European anatomical drawings of Andreas Vesalius (p. 195, figs. 38a-b, 39). Yet too much attention to sources ends up betraying the visual effect of the paintings, which is genuinely strange, imposing Liao Ping's visions as vision of a unique kind. He painted much of the imagery while the paper was wet. The bodies' bounding edges are blurred, and bleed into a vaporous and sometimes eerily luminous glow. Ghostly existence is seen by the artist and as he sees it as the limbs it was believed to be. Embodying the larger eighteenth-century fascination with the supernatural and with concepts of reincarnation, so vividly on display in The Story of the Stone and in the explosion of ghost stories, these ghosts are figurations of darker psychic forces, operating as much on the social as on the personal level. In this sense, Liao Ping's well-documented claim that he could actually see ghosts was no gimmick, and his lifelong insistence on their reality was less eccentric than clear-eyed.

Beyond the Ghost Amusement handscroll, Liao Ping's œuvre reveals an artist whose conceptualist focus on pictorial ideas consistently serves a preoccupation with what cannot and yet must be said. Included in this exhibition are paintings in which the artist makes us aware of the sexuality of Jin Nong (Portrait at Mt. Dongzi, cat. 13), works through the loss of his own artistic identity to his teacher (Figures and Landscapes, after Poems by Jin Nong, cat. 8; Landscapes, Flowers, and Plants, cat. 9), creates images of male potency whose explicitness brings into view the male of impotence (Orchids, Bamboo, and Rock, cat. 24; Portrait of Deng Shifu Standing on the Summit of Mount Ti, cat. 29), exposes the impossibility of reconciling hedonism and respectability (Portrait of Yuan Mei, cat. 14); makes himself a medium (in the strongest sense) of artists of the past, just as he did for the living artist, Jin Nong (Copy of Three Horse Paintings by Members of the Zhao Family, cat. 55); calls into question ontological boundaries between reality and representation (The Si Studied of Cheng Fangguo, cat. 31); presents himself as both of this world and outside it (Portrait of Mt. Bamboo Hut, cat. 16) and stages his own transformation into a remembered image (Portrait of Liao Ping at Age Sixty-Four, cat. 34).14 In a more public direction, the Ghost Amusement handscroll was far from the only ghost painting by Liao to evoke the underside of the Qinglong-period social order, and Insects, Birds, and Beasts (cats. 22) shows him cooperating with Jiang Shiqian in manuscript commentaries on the possible destinies of those pursuing government careers in Qing China. Even the apparently decorative painting Colored Lichens (cat. 23) conspicuously breaks the literal taboo on public acknowledgement of the importance of commerce.15

For all the selectivity of his interventions and conceptual approach to his themes, Liao Ping's principal means re-
state that the thematic variation of visual attention was part of his inheritance from Hua Yan and Gao Qipei. None, perhaps, does so more vividly than his Ghost Amusement handscroll (cat. 22), so it is worth pointing out that Lao's\ claim to be able to see ghosts can be understood as a metaphor for the autonomy of vision and, by extension, of the psychophysically defined individual.39

Ultimately, though, Lao Ping's greatest debt to Gao Qipei came through his teacher, Jin Nong (1687–1763), whose paintings produced between about 1748 and 1763 constitute a third, delayed reaction to Gao's revolutionary approach to the pictorial image. Jin's unacknowledged but profound debt to Gao Qipei was not stylistic – Jin possessed only a very limited pictorial craft and tended to reduce motifs to signs – and only rarely concerned subject matter, but was instead conceptual. No eighteenth-century artist exploited as fully and boldly as Jin Nong the possibilities of image density that Gao opened up. Moreover, no painter outside the court addressed more directly than Jin Nong the court's contemporary harnessing of the image to ideological purpose. This was Jin's own double legacy to Lao Ping, who as a young man was drafted into the production of many of Jin's paintings. Jin's oeuvre took form – most unusually for a Chinese painter – as a systematic and self-conscious pursuit of the unprecedented image, pictorially driven by pictorial genre. In fact, Jin Nong, who had first made his name as a calligrapher during the second quarter of the eighteenth century, had earlier taken the same approach in calligraphy to script types. Like his contemporaries Zheng Xie and Yang Fu (1696–1762), he had intensified the image dimension of both individual characters and whole transcribed texts, thereby relativizing the importance of the brush stroke. By the time he turned to painting, therefore, he already thought of the brush stroke in imagistic terms, a feature that gives his pictorial images a special, graphic character. A purely stylistic assessment of Lao Ping's relation to Jin Nong is no less misleading than a similar assessment of Jin's relation to Gao Qipei, because it can only register the difference between an art that reduces experience to signs and one that is capable of evoking the immediate of experience. Once again, the most profound debt was of a conceptual nature. It was in Jin that Lao Ping owed the

There was, of course, no concept of the unconscious as such in the eighteenth-century China. But if we understand the unconscious to be the concept by which we today acknowledge the existence of such disruptive and only partly controllable forces as desire, envy, fear of death, the dislocation of intersubjective boundaries, gender instability, or the compulsion to gain power over others, then it is undeniable that Lao Ping's contemporaries were obsessed by the possibility of articulating these same forces in language. This obsession – expressed most comprehensively in the great novel of the period, The Story of the Stone (Heng ou meng, also known as The Dream of the Red Chamber) – translated a collective dissatisfaction with the claims of organized religions and state ideology to be able to account for psychic forces through fixed cosmologies. Part of the modern difficulty with Lao Ping's art derives from the fact that he was perhaps the first major artist in Chinese history for whom the unconscious was just as central as conscious perception to the personal experience that his painting sought to articulate visually. As Richard Vinograd has shown, by seeking rational, purposeful explanations for his paintings, we largely miss the point of an art concerned with the in-between, the beyond, and the underneath.40

The artist's lifelong project is already announced in the great Ghost Amusement handscroll painted circa 1700 (cat. 21), through which he declared his independent identity as a painter following the death of Jin Nong. It is characteristic of the handscroll's status as a post-Gao Qipei painting that its imagery can be traced back to such marginal resources as temple painting, pornographic painting, festival masquerades, and even manuals of forensic science that had themselves borrowed from the European anatomical underdrawings of Andreaus Vesalius (p. 195, figs. 38a–b, 39). Yet too much attention to sources ends up betraying the visual effect of the paintings, which is genuinely strange, imposing Lao Ping's visions as vision of a unique kind. He painted much of the imagery while the paper was wet. The bodies' bounding edges dissolve, bleed, and sink into a vaporous and sometimes eerily luminous gloom. Ghostly existence is seen by the artist and by us as the limbs it was believed to be. Embodying the larger eighteenth-century fascination with the supernatural and with concepts of reincarnation, so vividly on display in The Story of the Stone and in the explosion of ghost stories, these ghosts are figurations of darker psychic forces, operating as much on the social as on the personal level. In this sense, Lao Ping's well-documented claim that he could actually see ghosts was no gimmick, and his lifelong insistence on their reality was less eccentric than clear-eyed.

Beyond the Ghost Amusement handscroll, Lao Ping's output reveals an artist whose conceptually focused pictorial ideas consistently serve a preoccupation with what cannot and yet must be said. Included in this exhibition are paintings in which the artist makes us aware of the sexuality of Jin Nong (Portrait at Mt. Dongzi, cat. 13), works through the loss of his own artistic identity to his teacher (Figures and Landscapes, after Poems by Jin Nong, cat. 8; Landscapes, Flowers, and Plants, cat. 9), creates images of male potency whose explicitness brings into view the male lore of impotence (Orchids, Bamboo, and Rock, cat. 24; Portrait of Deng Shiu Standing on the Summit of Mount Tai, cat. 29), explores the impossibility of reconciling hedonism and respectability (Portrait of Yuan Mei, cat. 14), makes himself a medium (in the strongest sense) of artists of the past, just as he did for the living artist, Jin Nong (Copy of Three Horse Paintings by Members of the Zhao Family, cat. 57), calls into question ontological boundaries between reality and representation (The Sir Studio of Weng Fangqiu, cat. 31), presents himself as both of this world and outside it (Portrait of Mr. Bamboo Hat, cat. 16), and stages his own transformation into a remembered image (Portrait of Lao Ping at Age Sixty-Four, cat. 34).41 In a more public direction, the Ghost Amusement handscroll was far from the only ghost painting by Lao Ping to evoke the underdrawings of the Qiansong-period social order, and Insects, Birds, and Beasts (cat. 22) shows him cooperating with Jiang Shiqian in mendant commentaries on the possible destinies of those pursuing government careers in Qing China. Even the apparently decorative painting Colored Lights (cat. 23) consciously breaks the literal taboo on public acknowledgement of the importance of commerce.42

For all the selectivity of his interventions and conceptual approach to his themes, Lao Ping's principal means re-
main painterly. All his paintings share a fundamental pictorial craft. He employs a fluid, at times nervous, brush trace, which is not calligraphic but form-generating, sometimes combined with layered, interpretanting washes of ink or color. The brush trace and ink wash together generate an image, a scene, that usually appears to be caught in movement, as if suddenly encountered, in many paintings this effect is intensified by an oblique tilting of the image that gives its impression of sliding across the field of view. Still, the delicate and yet intense immediacy that characterizes all his work does not serve to reinforce one's confidence in the world of appearances. On the contrary, its rationality lies in the staging of an experience of heightened awareness, through an excess of effect over visual information that was intended. I believe, to destabilize the viewer, enabling the realization that what truly matters lies beyond what one sees. While Luo himself might have articulated this rationale in Chan Buddhist terms, the privilege of historical hindsight allows us to see in it today a familiar, modern attention to forces that operate on us from beyond an invisible boundary and define an interior beyond - of the individual and of the collectivity.

1. The first of his patrons, Jin Nong, for whom he worked as a private secretary, was also the one for whom he did the most painting. In the role of initiatory break, his later patron-protege included Sheu Dencheng (Hengshou and southern Jiangsu), Gong Xianglan (Hunan), Zhang Siquan (Yunnan and Hubei), Yang Lian (Beijing), Meng Fengxing (Beijing), Fankuan (Beijing) and, at the end of Luo's life, Zeng Yu (Yanhu). From interviews with Yang and Xian Huan, he was called upon his students and family to act as amateur coaches, which in Luo's case is probably less an indication that he was entrusting proteges-students more than he was a way of promoting himself (as a prodigy).


3. The later evolution of the role of seed impressions in ink painting, which from the late Ming on became expensive as well as important, did not disturb this system because abstract seal carving, as it emerged in the late Ming, used metal tools to translate the brush trace into the shown format of the seed from which impressions were made, hence the term "seed trace" to describe the seal-carver's mark.

4. It should be noted that Guo yiqi's initiative was anticipated to some degree in the seventeenth-century bath by made artists such as Chao Huangqin, who gave various clouds to the image, and by the self-constructed tradition of women's painting, which by and large tended to distance itself from a practice based on the controlling brush trace in favor of a practice that foregrounded compositional position and notoriously favored the image.

5. I am indebted to Michel Mathieu, who has encouraged my thinking on the eighteenth-century attention to image by making me aware of the direct threat to the supremacy of the brush trace that it represented.

6. Io is not convenient that Guo's intervention occurred around the same time that the Qing court was establishing a painting academy. In Qing court painting, all levels and ages, including literary scholars, were placed at the rhetorical service of ideological statements embedded in the pictorial image. I am indebted to the exhibition concept of ink painting as described above. Guo was probably with this development at court, and was eventually drawn into himself during the 1700s. His painting outside the court, however, at some point the court's emphasis on the image and was a relative to court painting. For his brief, see 1982.

7. A notable example of such influences in the work of Luo Ping is his 1980 painting " emit. Xiang Yun Chai Collection (Vogel 1982: pl. 90).

8. See cat. 22, " de, Birds, and Beasts, for a clear example of this approach practiced by Luo Ping himself, in collaboration with Yang Shuanglu.


10. Even if the means are different, this knowledge parallels those in court paintings' adaptations of perspective drawing; indeed, Hu's unity absolute, perspectival conventions in one of his own paintings. This was noted by Libing Liu in a seminar paper on Hu Xue, which prompted my thinking about the specific importance in the eighteenth-century context of the relation of image to landscape.

11. It is important to distinguish between (a) socially networked personal (self-portrait), which interrelates the normative structured relations of the collective, and (b) the psychologically defined sense of oneself as a unique individual (self-identified "body") constituted of desires and needs. The sense of self in eighteenth-century China was conditioned by this necessity to negotiate the relation between the two. For a fuller discussion, see Hui 2001: pp. 274–81.

12. Luo did not entirely avoid this kind of diary-like practice, which is often associated with Stile and later shown but can also be seen in self-portraits by Guo yiqi, Gao Penghuan, and Li Shou. A 1985 album of flower paintings by Li can in a private Hong Kong collection (Stuckey 1998: cat. no. 86) is an example of this practice.


15. This is perhaps a good place to mention that I do not share the opinion that Jin Nong's great friend, 1990 in the Tumbling Museum (cat. 106) was painted by Luo Ping as his self-portrait. In my view the painting is as consistent with Jin's own calligraphically inspired personal craft as it is inconsistent with Luo Ping's more painterly craft, which he would never have done entirely completely.

16. If the face of Luo Ping in Portrait of Langmu sheng Wearing a Colored Robe and Bamboo Hat (p. 73, fig. 15) is the work of a professional portraitist, the same is not true, in my view, of the rest of the painting, and in this sense it may be considered a self-portrait. Note also the placement of Luo's inscription and absence of the signature that one would expect if another artist had been responsible for the entire image rather than just the face. The Portrait of Luo Ping of Apr. Fifty Four (cat. 34) presents a different case. Although not a self-portrait from the point of view of the work's execution, the combination of the presence of Luo's calligraphic and an epigraphic-like inscription by Shao Shanzhang, which must predate Luo's death, makes it likely that it was painted according to Luo's instructions in anticipation of its use as a memorial image. The memorial purpose of the image probably explains the absence of the portrait's signature.
mained painterly. All his paintings share a fundamental pictorial craft. He employs a fluid, at times nervous brush trace, which is not calligraphic but form-generating, sometimes combined with layered, interpenetrating washes of ink or wash traced lines. This whole strategy is to create an image, a scene, that usually appears to be caught in movement, as if suddenly encountered. In many paintings this effect is intensified by an oblique tilting of the image that gives it the impression of slipping across the field of view. Still, the delicate and yet intense immediacy that characterizes all his work does not serve to reinforce one's confidence in the world of appearances. On the contrary, its rational lie in the staging of an experience of heightened awareness, through an excess of effect over visual information that was intended, I believe, to destabilize the viewer, realizing that the realization that what truly matters lies beyond what one sees. While Luo himself might have articulated this rationalism in Chan Buddhist terms, the privilege of historical hindsight allows us to see in it today a familiar modern attention to forces that operate on us from beyond an invisible boundary and define an interior beyond – of the individual and of the collectivity.

1. The first of his paintings, Jin Nong, for whom he worked as a private secretary, was also the one for whom he did the most painting, in the role of initiatory break. His later patrons–protectors included Shen Jichang (Shanghai and northern Jiangsu), Gong Xian (Fuzhou), Zang Shuang (Shangqiu and Nanchang), Ping Lian (Beijing), Meng Fongying (Beijing), Panchan (Beijing) and, at the end of Luo’s life, Zeng Yu (Taishan).
2. There are indications that he played an administrative role as well, which helps to explain his appointment as director of an engraving in the late 1720s, prior to migration to Beijing.
3. Left in Lian, we learn from Panchan’s Western album, he called upon his students and family to act as studio assistants, which in Luo’s case is probably less an indication that he was entraining protégés more fully than it was a way of protecting himself from overproduction.
4. On Gao Qipei, see Baudrillard, 1992.
5. There is, of course, a still older literary history of literati painting that can be traced back to Su Shi (and beyond), but it is not relevant here except at the thematic level, where Su Shi was consciously evoked by eighteenth-century painters, including Luo Ping.
6. The later separation of the role of record for literati painting: from the late Ming on because expression as well as documentation, did not disturb this system because literati records, as it emerged in the late Ming, used medal tools to transfer the brush traces into the sheet format of the seal from which imprints were made. Hence the term “one broad” to describe the seal-cutter’s kind.
7. It should be noted that Gao Qipei’s initiative was anticipated to some degree in the eighteenth-century bath by male artists such as Chen Huixiu, who gave visual authority to the image, and by the self-styled tradition of women’s painting, which by and large tended to distance itself from a practice based on the conventional brush trace in favor of a practice that foregrounded compositional positioning and meticulously honed the image.
8. I am indebted here to Michelle Matassa, who has encouraged my thinking on the eighteenth-century attention to image by making me aware of the direct thrust to the imaginary of the brush trace that it represented.
9. In his consciousness that Gao’s intervention occurred around the same time that the Qing court was establishing a painting academy. In Qing court painting, all who paint images, including literati seals, were placed at the rhetorical service of ideological statements enfolded in the pictorial image. This imposition obviously undermined the “painterly” concept of literati painting as described above.
10. Gao was protégé with this development at court, and was eventually drawn into himself the 1720s. His painting outside the court, however, at some shared the court’s emphasis on the image and stand as a reliable to court painting. For his formal intricacy and visual marks making were anti-christian, anti-ideological.
11. A notable example of such influences in the work of Luo Ping is his 1896 hanging scroll Green Boat at West, formerly in the Chiang Yuan Chao Collection (Vogelsang 1995, pl. 86).
12. See cat. 32, Scheick, Bids, and Beasts, for a clear example of this approach: practiced by Luo Ping himself, in collaboration with Jiang Shuang.
13. As stated by Michelle Matassa in her catalogue entry on Colonial Japan (cat. 7b).
14. Even if the means are different, this knowledge parallels that which in court paintings’ adaptations of perspectival diagrams: indeed, this unity wholly perceptual constructs in some of his own paintings. This was noted by Liben Liu in a seminar paper on Hao Xian, which prompted my thinking about the specific importance in the eighteenth-century context of the relation of image to looking.
15. It is important to distinguish between a socially networked profession (even), which internalizes the normative structured relations of the collectivity, and (b) the panoply defined sense of oneself as a unique individual (chiefly “holy”) constituted of dreams and needs. The sense of self in eighteenth-century China was conditioned by the “holy” necessity to eradicate the relation between the two. For a fuller discussion, see Hung 2001, pp. 278-83.
16. Luo did not entirely avoid this kind of literary practice, which is often associated with Shi’s and Beds album but can also be seen in albums by Gao Qipei, Gao Fungnan, and Li Shou. A 1768 album of figure paintings by Liou in a private Hong Kong collection (Shabadan, 1991, cat. no. 80) is an example of this practice.
19. This is perhaps a good point to mention that I do not share the opinion that the Ming’s great breakthrough in 1699 to the Tianjin Museum (cat. 38) was painted by Liao Ping as his robust brush. In my view the painting is consistent with An’s own calligraphically inspired paternal craft as in correspondence with Liao Ping’s more painterly craft, which he was never able to disguise completely.
20. If the face of Liao Ping in Portrait of Liao Ping among Standing a Drunk Roland and Bamboo Hat (p. 73, fig. 13) is the work of a professional portraitist, the same is not true, in my view, of this one of the painting, and in this sense it may be considered a self-portrait. Note also the placement of Liao’s inscription and absence of the signatures that one would expect if another artist had been responsible for the entire image rather than just the face. The Portrait of Liao Ping at Age Forty Five (cat. 34) presents a different case. Although not a self-portrait from the point of view of the work’s constitution, the continuation of the presence of Liao’s name and an opaque-like inscription by Jiang Hongze, which must predate Liao’s death, makes it likely that it was painted according to Liao’s instruction in anticipation of its use as a memorial image. The memorial purpose of the image probably explains the absence of the portrait’s signature or seal.
21. Not on other paintings not included, however, would extend this field of exploration to include, for example, the intimate territories of love, loss, depression, and parent-child discourses, as well as the collectivist social territory of the government officials’ self-dependence on the state.