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Archaeology started rather late in China. The first large-scale state-sponsored excavation directed by indigenous scholars began in December 1928 when Fu Sinian 傅斯年 (1896–1950), the director of the new Institute of History and Philology, charged China’s first Anthropology Ph.D., Li Ji 李濟 (1896–1979), to establish an office near Anyang in Henan Province (Fig. 1).¹ In the late Qing dynasty, accidental finds of oracle bones and bronzes gave some indication of the region’s extensive deposits in Bronze Age materials. Late nineteenth-century looting of bronze artefacts and tomb goods propelled a thriving Tianjin art market.² These amateur, unofficial excavations produced finds that entered the market without provenance. But as soon as government fieldwork and excavations began systematically, the Anyang area did indeed prove to contain the remnants of the last Shang (c.1150–1050 BCE) capital and its royal cemetery. Quite
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dramatically, in just one year, the nascent field of Chinese archaeology went from being a small enterprise of a few test pits to being the locus of spectacular bronze and jade discoveries dating to the end of the first dynastic period (Fig. 2). The excavation photographs suggest the potential drama in the archaeological work process at this time. Shi Zhangru 石璋如 (1902–2004) and others establish a measured work grid with rope and stakes along the stone foundation of a Shang palace in a reclaimed field. In the massive pit of the later excavation photograph, a Shang necropolis extends forty feet below ground. Spectacular finds in fifteen campaigns continued unabated until the summer of 1937 when the Japanese invasion forced an exodus of the Chinese government into the interior. Archaeology in Bronze Age sites came to a halt as precipitously as it began. These rather dramatic historic circumstances pressed researchers to develop new research sites away from the war zone (Fig. 3). The capital was moved to Chongqing and scholars relocated all their field specimens, notes, libraries, and archaeological finds, in addition to the entire collection of the former
Figure 2. Xibeigang site, royal tomb 1001. 28 May 1935. Shi Zhangru, Head of the Yinxu Excavations for the IHP, photographer. © Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Republic of China.

Figure 3. The Republican Government’s Northwest History and Geography Research Group on their way from Lanzhou to Dunhuang, c.1942–4.
imperial palace, to the interior. Over 16,700 crates weighing thousands of tons were sent to Guizhou, Sichuan and Yunnan from the coast.\(^3\) The north-west and south-west became the new base for Republican research and intellectual efforts for the next eight years.

The shift to a new geographical home base changed the landscape of archaeology. It also changed the kinds of questions that researchers were able to ask and the type of objects they would investigate. In nine short years from the inception of the Anyang digs to the 1937 exodus, the history of early China had been rewritten. But then, due to the war, scholars had to rise quickly to the challenge of investigating new terrain. The rate of academic inquiry and discoveries during this time was fast-paced; these were exciting times. In addition to formal, state-sponsored archaeological projects, many artists and small teams of researchers emulated the spirit of the Anyang inquiry, striking out on their own and in small government teams, to create a new history of Chinese art and culture based on concrete specimens, excavated evidence, and direct observation.\(^4\) Artists, in particular, developed a new approach to studying objects; \emph{meishu kaogu}—an archaeology of art—drew on a German style of art history transformed by excavated objects from extensive campaigns in Greece and Turkey. Archaeology of art was established as a new methodology to formulate an understanding of stylistic chronology and material culture (Fig. 4).\(^5\) In wartime China, the land-locked interior became the focus of these efforts and the frontier of Inner Asia became the new intellectual centre during the Sino-Japanese conflict.

**New research methods to uncover the old**

To be sure, scholars had focused on the inner frontier before the 1937 exodus. While excavations took place in the east at Anyang, researchers in
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\(^3\) 范19-2-8 (d. after 30 Aug. 1938), IHP. Overall, almost 16,700 boxes of relics and research materials, including archaeological finds, were transported out of Nanjing at the onset of the war. On 14 August 1937, 80 boxes of the most important treasures were transferred via Hankou to Changsha and then moved to Guiyang. Beginning in November 1937, the remaining majority of relics were transferred in two ways. Just fewer than 9,400 boxes were transferred by boat from Hankou to Chongqing and 7,300 boxes were transferred by railway via Xian to Baoji, Shaanxi; they were then trucked to Hanzhong and transferred again by vehicle from Hanzhong to a Chengdu storehouse.

\(^4\) Chen (1997); Dunhuang Academy (2002); Editorial (1942); Editorial Page (1942); Fa (1944); Fu (1929–33); Fu (2003); He (1943); Shi (2002); Xia (2002); Wei (1941); Zhu (1942).

\(^5\) Marchand (1996; 2003).
Figure 4. Wang Ziyun, sculpture of horse at Jianling, the necropolis for Suzong (711–62), in situ, Liquan, outside of Xian, 1944. Suzong (Li Xiang 李享) was a son of the Tang Emperor Minghuang. Photo courtesy of Wang Qian.
archaeology’s new associated fields of anthropology and ethnography found ready research grounds in the south-west. Li Guangming 麗光明 (1901–46) and Wang Yuanhui 王元輝 (1900–92) completed their survey of Qiang people in Sichuan Province in 1929; Ling Chunsheng 凌純聲 (1902–81) and Rei Yifu 芮逸夫 (1898–1990) conducted a thorough investigation of Miao ethnic linguistics in western Hunan in 1933; and Zhou Zhenhe 周振鶴 researched Qinghai ethnicity and folk customs in the early 1930s. The motivations for such broad and deep considerations of the frontier were connected to the uncertain nature of borderlands in imperial history and their equally imprecise status in modern nation-building. The frontier was an unknown entity—a ‘blank ground’ 白地; for political and economic purposes it was necessary to determine the boundaries of the new state and identify the population it encompassed. For intellectuals, defining the boundaries of common cultural experience was a question of modern identity and history writing. Li, Wang, Ling, and Rei’s studies directly addressed the multi-ethnic nature of the inner frontier. And it was, in part, their focus on ethnicity and the role of the minorities in a modern Han state that would frame the kind of research scholars conducted once the north-west and south-west cultural regions became home during the war. Frontier studies also gave vent to a long-standing preoccupation with ethnicity and Han identity that can even be traced back to the Han dynasty during the second century, particularly focused on the south-west and north-west (Fig. 5). In eighteenth-century paintings of the Miao people in Guizhou Province (located in southern China near the Vietnamese border) and of Tibetans across the empire under Emperor Qianlong (r. 1736–95), court painters satisfied the imperial demand for typifying and categorising frontier peoples in an ethnographic paradigm.

Li Ji, considered to be the father of Chinese archaeology, was trained as an anthropologist, demonstrating how close the links were between these new disciplines in the early twentieth century. His Harvard dissertation explored the ethnographic formation of Chinese people. It

7The photographer Zhuang Xueben was referring to northern Xikang (now northwest Sichuan) and southern Qinghai—both areas are part of Khams, the eastern part of cultural Tibet. Zhuang Xueben 莊學本 (1937), 1.
8Wang Mingke (1997); (2003).
reflected contemporary worldwide racial preoccupations, focusing on physical traits including a close comparison of forehead, nose and eyes, and hair.10 Although he wanted to return to China to conduct skeletal measurements—the core data for his study—he settled on 110 Chinese students and ‘Chinese laborers’ in the Boston area for his control group and conducted detailed biometrics. While this may have been the only pool available to him, he also appears to divide them according to class and intelligence.11 This legacy of physical anthropology remained with

10 Li Ji (1923; 1928), pp. 10–28.
11 Ibid., p. 8.
him through the Anyang digs; using the skeletal remains from Yinxu, Anyang, he proposed a racial interpretation of early China and advanced the claim that the skulls of five different races were present in the excavation pits. (This, of course, proved to be wrong—later scholars argue that the skeletal remains were indicative of regional not racial variation.) Thus, the fields of archaeology and anthropology were intertwined since their inception, placing questions of genetic and physical traits in the foreground.

When archaeologists, artists, and researchers were inspired to conduct fieldwork, their studies were shaped by early twentieth-century concerns of physical anthropology. Art discovered in situ took on the racial and ethnic qualities of the Han and non-Han framework of intellectual activity during this period. In the case of Buddhist Archaeology, the proximity of artefacts to non-Han ethnic groups in frontier zones proved a ready ground for researchers to explain the links between icon and ethno-history. This essay considers the ways in which ethnographic concerns and finds in frontier zones were central to the new discipline of the archaeology of art (meishu kaogu). To establish the framework of discussion, I explore briefly the intellectual stakes of these methods.

Chinese researchers were deeply affected by a range of European theories of culture and research in developing their own brand of archaeology of art. Especially key was the work of the German archaeologist Adolf Michaelis (1835–1910). Guo Moruo (1892–1978) translated Michaelis’ Die archäologischen Entdeckungen (Leipzig, 1904), in 1947. Guo started the translation in 1929 when he was in Japan; but it is clear that Michaelis’ ideas of ‘spade archaeology’ as the necessary precursor to writing art history circulated widely well before the publication date. Guo was the editor of the highly respected Arts and Literature Journal, where influential scholars published opinions on establishing an intellectual roadmap for developing the north-west, problems associated with the Dunhuang site, and other key issues in archaeology. Michaelis’ programme to study works of art in their original content (his ‘source material’ was in Greece and Italy) was consistent with the expansive sense of history that held sway in the circles associated with National Institute of History and
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12 Li Ji (1977); Li Ji’s theory of five racial types in Anyang skeletal remains has since been discredited, see Keightley (1978).
Philology in China. Thus, the attraction of the archaeology of art as a theoretical and practical exercise as espoused by Michaelis was that it echoed the ideology of Republican scholars in China.

Meishukaogu solved looming problems with the study of art, according to Ruan Rongchun; scholars had relied on subjectively formed opinions about the history of art based on objects in connoisseurs’ collections (to which access was extremely limited and based on personal relationships) rather than a systematic engagement with art broadly.\(^{14}\) Three main factors explain why in the face of art-historical archaeology older connoisseurship techniques were considered inadequate, according to Ruan.\(^{15}\) Traditional collecting practices stopped at acquisition; only a simple apparatus was in place to note differences between the collector’s own objects, but no adequate methods were available to categorise larger groups of material. Second, relics in a single collection did not come from known places. Encounters with objects were accidental and random, occurring either at the market or at fellow collectors’ homes; there was no academic interface. Before the late Qing there was no concept of field research, either. Third, categorisation schemas were not based on scientific or objective criteria; instead typologies were subjective (and not widely held or agreed upon among a number of scholars). The discipline of art-historical archaeology solved these problems and filled a void.

Both Buddhist archaeologists and Meishukaogu artists were committed to a new approach to gathering information about art, conducting extensive reviews of objects out in the field. While much of Buddhist material was above ground, and therefore particularly suited to the artists and their informal understanding of archaeology, early archaeologists also engaged in excavation. This movement, while not under the auspices of any one entity, was made up of professionals, para-professionals with expertise in adjacent fields such as epigraphy and geography, and amateurs who learned on the job. During the period from 1928 to 1937 archaeology became a well-honed set of practices during the Anyang years; at the start of the war we enter a new phase of para-archaeology, which did not always build on the expertise of earlier skills and successes.

\(^{14}\) 中国美术考古学的历史，理论与实践 [The History, Theory and Practice of Chinese Archaeology of Art], pp. 91–4, chap. in Ruan Rongchun 阮荣春, et al. (2004).

\(^{15}\) Ibid; Yang (1997).
Buddhist archaeology and the archaeology of art: some beginnings

In the frontier areas and border zones opportunities for striking new finds were plentiful and field-changing. Two artists, Zhang Daqian 張大千 (1899–1983) and Wang Ziyun 王子雲 (1897–1990), were each committed in their own distinct ways to creating a systematic index to long-forgotten artisinal arts associated with tomb and temple painting (Fig. 6). While not self-proclaimed meishu kaogu practitioners, their field research can be productively understood in this context. They were interested in capturing pictorially the history of China’s art in Buddhist and mortuary ruins by cataloguing chronological development and style (Figs. 7 and 8). For Wang Ziyun this included reproducing the designs on Neolithic pots, Buddhist icons, stone engravings, tomb figurines, and Buddhist murals. In this view of his research workroom at Northwest University, Xian, one sees a display of articles gathered during his tenure as director of the Education Ministry’s Northwest Art and Relics Team 教育部藝術文物考察團, in the 1940s. Wang’s copy of a mural’s large donor figure, Cao Yuanzhong, who ruled (944/945–974 CE) the small but independent Dunhuang-area kingdom during the third quarter of the tenth century, is mounted on the back wall; rubbings from Han tombs appear on the upper walls. It is the display of these together as much as it is the actual objects themselves that is important to Wang. Central to the methodology of meishu kaogu is the placing of like objects together comparatively to construct a larger continuum in the history of art.

Zhang’s capture of Buddhist wall painting involved a different type of collecting; primarily interested in painting, he recorded hundreds of Buddhist mural compositions on canvas. In a photograph taken in spring 1942, his Tibetan painting assistants copy a mural of Manjusri on his lion vehicle in cave 159 (Fig. 9) in faithful detail, first tracing the contour lines of the original on a blank canvas and then adding details and colour directly in front of the wall painting during their sixteen-month stay in Gansu copying Yulin and Mogao murals. Zhang relied on a wide range of artists, family members, students, and friends—sometimes approaching twenty in number. In another photograph, taken a year later, he and his entourage assemble in the Gobi desert, including his five Qinghai painting assistants, his third wife, and the photographer James Lo and his wife, Lucy (Fig. 10).

Zhang and Wang’s commitment to collecting specimens and bringing them back to the studio has its roots in larger trends in historical studies:
high value was placed on fieldwork and verifiable evidence in all sectors of the humanities during the Republican period. In addition to Zhang’s independent (personal) trip and Wang’s Education Ministry expedition, the National Museum, the Geography Institute and the Academia
Figure 7. Wang Ziyun’s research work room and exhibition space displaying samples, drawings and recreations of Neolithic pots, Han tomb figures, tomb relief rubbings, and tenth-century Dunhuang wall paintings, Northwest University, Xian, c.1944–5. Photo courtesy of Wang Qian.

Figure 8. Wang Ziyun measuring excavated Northern Dynasties (datable to the fifth to sixth centuries) Buddhist sculpture, from the ruins of the Zhongsheng Temple in the western suburbs of Xian, February 1941. Photo courtesy of Wang Qian.
Sinica—a science and humanities research arm of the Republican government—sponsored three expeditions in 1942 and 1944 to obtain scientific data on the Dunhuang caves, nearby Buddhist ruins, and Silk Road tombs of the north-west. Shi Zhangru, who played a critical role in the Anyang digs during the previous decade as lead measuring specialist and then headed for the Bronze Age excavations at Yinxu, travelled throughout the north-west with Lao Gan 劳翰; in addition to documenting the Buddhist caves at Dunhuang and Yulin they also surveyed the Han watchtowers and Heicheng, the Tangut site near the Gansu-Ningxia
Figure 10. Zhang Daqian (eighth figure from left), with Qinghai painting assistants (centre), army guards (right), James and Lucy Lo (fourth and fifth figures from left), and his nephew (far left), Dunhuang area, spring 1943. Photo courtesy of The Lo Archives.
border in 1942–3. Xiang Da 向達 (1900–66), the eminent historian from Peking University based with other national university faculty in Lizhuang, Sichuan for the duration of the war, led the Northwest Scientific Research Team 西北科學考察團 collaborating with Xia Nai 夏鼐 (1910–85) and Yan Wenru 謝文儒 (1912–94), Xiang’s student. In a series of two on-and-off-again campaigns, they conducted excavations from Lanzhou out to Dunhuang exploring remnants of the Great Wall, Toba Wei tombs and other Northern Dynasty remains that represent the cultural remains of ethnic minorities from the medieval period. Together with Shi and Lao, their efforts constitute the origins of Buddhist archaeology in the first half of the 1940s. The multicultural objects and traditions they documented encouraged an ethnographic impulse in their fieldwork. Due to the fact that many Silk Road objects were the product of Tibetan, Tangut, Turkic, Sogdian, and Khotanese cultural traditions and these objects were often connected to the Buddhist temple, the study of Buddhism during the Republican period became inextricably linked with frontier minority cultures.

One of Xiang Da’s missions was to buy loose, individually circulating manuscripts in Dunhuang and neighbouring communities. In correspondence back to the director of the Institute of History and Philology, Xia Nai recounts the possibility of buying Tangut manuscripts (written in a dead language none of the researchers were trained to read); in others Xia describes how Xiang barterings with a miller to trade grain for medieval Dunhuang texts. Clearly Chinese archaeologists and Buddhist historians were conducting a salvage project in Silk Road sites in the aftermath of the British and French removal of much of Dunhuang’s manuscript treasures. What was left of portable materials in the area circulated in the hands of private individuals. The caves themselves, containing thousands of square metres of murals dating to the fifth–thirteenth centuries, were largely intact, but unprotected (the exterior antechambers had collapsed

16 Shi Zhangru 石璋如 (1996).
17 The earlier History and Geography team, funded by the Boxer Indemnity Foundation, was co-administered by the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, the Central Museum and Geography Research Institute; the 1944 expedition was organised by the Institute of History and Philology.
18 The details of Tangut manuscripts unearthed in Ningsia, and their possible acquisition, are described in Xia Nai’s letter to Fu Sinian, 李38-5-17, 26 March 1945; a fragment of Lotus Sutra, one of sixty Northern Dynasties-period texts supposedly found August 1944 inside a late Qing sculpture, is explained in a letter from Xia Nai to Fu Sinian, 李38-5-5, 25 Nov. 1944. In other correspondence to Fu Sinian, Xia discusses Tibetan manuscripts (from the Dunhuang caves) in the possession of the Education Ministry 李38-4-11, 31 July 1944, IHP.
over the centuries) and the wall paintings were exposed to the elements. Xiang Da’s main mission was to gather what was left of the transitive archaeological remains and to establish proper administration of the exposed cave shrines.

Purity

The frontier was a place to recapture the multicultural dimensions of Buddhism and its relationship to an imperial Han-centric history, and as such it was also a site of purity and cultural simplicity. These cultural concerns of tradition propelled anthropological work as well as archaeology in the Republican period. Scholars and painters were interested in shapes and forms that evoked an early period, which had become unavailable during the later dynastic period and were preserved in an unadulterated state deep in the interior away from modernisation or the taint of foreign cultures. As it became increasingly clear to Chinese scholars by the early 1940s, the caves at Dunhuang still contained c.25,000 square metres of wall painting dug into the living rock. And its stylistic diversity spanning eight centuries in dark caves suggested a preserved treasure of fixed cultural experience untouched by the modern world. The influx of foreign cultures during the late Qing, when China’s semi-colonial ports on the coast were occupied by European, American, and Japanese officials and merchants, was culturally problematic for many modern Chinese intellectuals.19 The West was admired for its scientific achievements—and in post-4 May China (the 4 May movement was from 1915 to 1921), science was a tool to overcome the limitations of premodern culture. But the subjugation of China under a modern system of unequal treaties as a result of the Opium and Arrow Wars (1839–40; 1856–60) also meant that Western forces devalued China’s cultural relevance, particularly the significance of its modern experience. Despite the technological progress and commercial infrastructure of the International Concessions, these spaces were understood as zones of Chinese inadequacy. The interior was uncomplicated by the contingencies of semi-colonial modernity. The pace of change along China’s coast was peripatetic; but due to geography and economics, the north- and south-west remained largely closed, involved in little exchange with outside communities. And in the north-west, the locus of Buddhist remains, the extreme desert terrain added to its isolation.

19 Barlow (1997).
Consequently, art in this interior was of immense interest and provided an outlet for a nationalism fueled by the Japanese invasion. In a general way, artistic archaeology (*meishu kaogu*) and Buddhist archaeology—neither of which required (but did not exclude) digging and were suited to the diminished resources of wartime circumstances—were efforts to locate a primitive cultural tradition in the north- and south-west beyond the pressures of the war and a Western-style modernity.

Early anthropologists and ethnographers articulate clearly that the inner frontier was the essence of this purity that they craved. In the early 1940s, Hu Qingchun 胡慶鈞 (1918– ), an ethnographer of the Institute of History and Philology, explained to Fu Sinian— the director of the Institute—how the words of Confucius a millennium earlier echoed his recent findings on the frontier:

I’ve noticed the ‘sinicization’ problem in Miao area specifically, and found one interesting example. As a result of Western invasion of China in the past century, the progressive (or avant-garde) thrust of the Han people is ‘Westernization,’ or so called ‘Modernization’; but the Miao’s progressive (avant-garde) force is Sinicization, not Modernization. Therefore, Confucius’ famous quote ‘Our lost ritual or propriety can be found with the Barbarians,’ is well applicable; and the slang that I have heard from the Shanghai-Nanjing area ‘country girls always imitate the Shanghai style, but they’re not similar; when they are finally similar to Shanghai, Shanghai has already developed a new style,’ also seems to be applicable here.20

Hu’s point describes how the most essential elements of pure Han culture would be best preserved by the ethnographic primitive—by peoples out of touch with recent technological advances and culturally inferior, or less civilised, than the mainstream Han population (largely on the coast). It is an odd argument to make—that the core of a culture’s traditions are best preserved by an inferior sector—but it also makes sense if one considers the thrust of the argument in terms of political conditions. That is, in the worst of times, because earlier, out-of-date trends trickled to backward places and trends are slow to change there, a dominant culture can go back to the frontier or the primitive stronghold to rediscover itself. This is essentially what happens in the Republican period in the north- and south-west frontier; archaeology reclaims unadulterated cultural ‘essence’ in the face of Western colonial culture and the fear of the extinction of Chinese traditions under the Japanese.

---

20 Hu (1941).
The two artists, Zhang Daqian and Wang Ziyuan, were drawn to caves, tombs and ruins beyond the reach of average travellers. Both spent considerable time at Dunhuang in 1941–3, the Buddhist cave-shrine site that British audiences had become well acquainted with decades earlier. In 1906 Sir Aurel Stein had purchased portable treasures from its hidden library discovered in 1900; his camel caravan is shown loaded with treasure (Fig. 11). Stein’s finds were deposited in London in the British Library and British Museum; later a portion was eventually sent back to India (post-independence) due to financial support his expeditions received from the colonial British government in India. Stein’s documents were and still are the most important extant medieval documents of the Silk Road. In China there was an acute awareness of how much a loss these manuscripts were to modern Chinese scholarship. Much of popular opinion was focused on what was gone, not what remained. By 1910 four-fifths of the cache of portable documents were in Europe. Although all of the wall painting and 2,500 sculptures remained in situ, there was little awareness nationally of this remaining storehouse of medieval painting and three-dimensional art. But with the move to the interior during the war years, remote sites on the Silk Road became accessible and popular.

Archaeology of the Shang royal sites in 1928 was new and exciting for a nascent Republican China, but the Dunhuang material perhaps struck even a deeper cord on many complex levels. The sheer vastness of the Dunhuang site and the ‘finds’ that were spirited away from China to Europe drew on nationalism during the war; the site became a symbol of national essence. Also, the fact that its Buddhist wall paintings represented a pure, untouched cultural record uncontaminated by modernisation was one of the primary factors behind the site’s popularity. By reclaiming the site through copies, research artists elevated a golden age no longer in the modern Chinese imagination; their work restored the historical memory of China’s reach westward into Central Asia during the Han-Tang dynasties—the halcyon years of Chinese rule into this region. While a significant number of the population of the vast lands of the west and south were ethnic minorities, the preponderance of Chinese language material in Dunhuang’s manuscripts and in wall inscriptions made it easy to set aside its multi-ethnic dimensions and claim a Han dominance in an open empire with a long history. A site like this established the groundwork for territorial claims for the country’s boundaries in the modern period. Zhang memorialised the rediscovery of this forgotten past in a seal he
Figure 11. Aurel Stein’s caravan laden with Silk Road treasures from Dunhuang, marching over high dunes of the Taklimakan Desert, south of the Tarim River, Xinjiang. Team includes, Hassan Akhun, Turti, and Naik Ram Singh. Photographer: M. Aurel Stein, 1906–8. © The British Library.
applied to the surface of his copies, that read ‘laoqi dunhuang’ (long forgotten Dunhuang). He applied this seal to many of his Dunhuang copies, including on the lower left corner of the bodhisattva reproduction (Fig. 12).

The layers of loss and recuperation were manifold. In making the case for the nationalisation of the site and moving it into government hands, Xiang Da, the scholar of Buddhist culture and Tang history and leader of the history expedition sent by the national research institute, described the loss of the site as dataable in the first instance to the late tenth century when the region ‘fell to the barbarians’. The Tang style of the seventh to ninth centuries established the Silk Road link to the Imperial capital, Chang’an. But it was a widely held belief that the aesthetic value of the site drops precipitously after the period of Tibetan control from 781–848, and then later when the Tanguts establish a presence in the region in 1035. Xiang Da writes that the site had been forgotten because after this takeover by ethnic minorities of the north-west, no (Han) men of letters visited or wrote about it; it is only when Qianlong establishes control in his military campaign of ‘Pacification of the Tribes of the northwest’ in the mid-eighteenth century that visitors begin to stop at the site (again). Dunhuang then re-enters the humanistic map. As with Zhuang Xueben’s notion of the Tibetan-Yi Minority corridor (Qinghai and north-west Sichuan) being a ‘blank ground’ or void, the Northwest Corridor from Shaanxi to Xinjiang had been erased from Han consciousness for 800 years, Xiang asserts. Thus the modern effort to recuperate control over the Silk Road reached back to the medieval period when first the Tibetans (in the eighth century) and then the Uighurs (tenth century) limited contact of metropolitan China to points west.

The inscriptions and manuscripts at Dunhuang, largely in Chinese, constituted evidence of how this zone once belonged to a larger empire from at least the Han Dynasty to the early Song (second century BCE to eleventh century CE). Evidence can be read in many different ways. And artistic remains served as tactile proof of Han Chinese cultural dominance (real or imagined). Zhang Daqian’s copies of the Dunhuang murals, such as a painting of a bodhisattva holding a scroll, typically depicted to the left of Sakyamuni preaching, evoked the frontier and the close connection between Han imperial interests and Buddhist monuments that spread along the Silk Road (Fig. 12). Zhang’s paintings often contained copies of

21 Fang Hui (Xiang Da) 方囘 (向думал) (1942); reprinted (1944): 44–7.
Figure 12. Zhang Daqian (1899–1983) and Shawo Tsering (Ch. Xiawu Cairang 夏吾才讓) (1922–2004). Copy of a bodhisattva (possibly Ananda) from Yulin cave 8 (DRA YL14), 1942. © National Palace Museum, Taiwan.
figures and motifs from the kingdoms of these frontier groups and he brought to life that history through Sinicised copies.

Xiang Da and other scholars, such as Chen Yin’ge 陈寅恪 (1890–1969) and Chen Yuan 陈垣 (1880–1971), wanted to recuperate a Chinese cultural presence in the north-west, revitalise a Han-Tang identity, and take back the intellectual momentum in Buddhist studies enjoyed by foreign institutions and affiliated scholars, who possessed the bulk of the manuscripts. 22 Xiang and Yu Youren 于右任 (1879–1964), the Director of Control Yuan (the ministry responsible for censure and audit 監察院), who visited Dunhuang in 1943, also, ironically, wanted to save the site from its most celebrated resident, Zhang Daqian. 23 Zhang had been living at Dunhuang on and off since May 1941 and by the time that both Xiang Da and Yu Youren arrived the following year Zhang had already been tearing off systematically the outermost layers of the wall paintings dating to the Tangut (1035–1227 CE) and the later Guiyijun (914–1006 CE) periods—searching for earlier layers that were ‘more Chinese’ buried underneath the later redeedications by ‘minority’ patrons. Zhang highly valued the murals of the earlier periods, such as the N. Wei (386–539), Sui (581–618), and early-high Tang (618–766). In addition to the political associations of a Tang Central Asia when the imperial court exerted a strong presence along Silk Road communities, from an aesthetic perspective Zhang viewed Wei-Tang brushwork as simultaneously achieving the qualities of spontaneity and realism. Zhang and the larger scholarly community rejected the sophisticated precision of the later paintings as formulaic and rote; there was little patience for eleventh- and twelfth-century overdrawing, executed by Tibetan, Tangut, and Mongolian painters.

In December 1942, Fu Sinian and Li Ji, the director of the government-supported Institute of History and Philology and the director of its Archaeology Division, wrote to Yu Youren, Chief Control Yuan, exposing Zhang’s ruinous treatment of the Dunhuang murals. 24

We received a letter from the Sichuan Museum’s Director Feng Hanji 馮漢驥 and Huaxi University 華西大學’s Museum Director Zheng Desheng 鄭德坤, . . .

---

23 Yu Youren 于右任 (1942).
24 Fu and Li (1942).
Dunhuang’s Caves of the Thousand Buddhas still have N. Wei, Sui, Tang, Song, Yuan, and Ming-Qing wall painting. Zhang Daqian has cut into the walls of the caves copying the wall painting of each period. But not all of these [period wall paintings] are on one surface. The earlier layers are in the interior or innermost sections. People of later periods covered the outer layers with mud and made new paintings [on top].

Mr. Zhang wants to know every layer of the traces of artists from every dynasty. First Zhang paints [copies] the outer layer, then he peels off the outer layer, and then after he copies that layer, he peels and paints the next layer. He wants to capture the painting style [method] of each dynasty.

. . . [Y]ou cannot do this well. After you take off the layer, you ruin the layer. So Mr. Zhang has made great benefit and progress in art. However, regarding the issue of culture, it is a kind of irretrievable loss.

They then explain how they were hesitant to send Yu third-hand information about this destruction, but recently an eyewitness confirmed the rumours.

This year (1942) the Northwest History and Geography Investigative Team [hired some additional participants], . . . Xiang Da [was one] and he is a professor of the four United Universities that moved [to Sichuan] and we invited him to participate. Mr. Xiang is an authority in Dunhuang studies. He is recognized nationally and internationally as an expert.

During September [1942], the History and Geography Team went west to Dunhuang, and [we] received information about what was going on with our own eyes at Qianfodong. Mr. Zhang has hired four lamas as assistants all day, and they are a big help in the caves.

Mr. Zhang likes the N. Wei, Sui, and Tang a lot. But when he sees Song-Yuan-Xi Xia (paintings) on top of N. Wei, Sui, and Tang, he does exactly what he wants. He takes the outer layer and cruelly chops and splits it to expose the lower layer. Usually, the outer layer is destroyed. The upper layer is totally destroyed and the lower layer is also destroyed because of his peeling [of mural layers].

The number of caves and compositions are both numerous. And the composition subjects are still recognizable. Also among these are Zhang Daqian’s personal marks [directly on the wall]. This is proof of Mr. Zhang’s squandering behavior. Where he is doing copying work, without respect he casually marks the contour lines, takes instruments and equipment and puts them against the wall. He does not care whether or not these hurt the wall painting surface.

Mr. Xiang thinks that if this kind of behavior continues, after two to three years Qianfodong wall painting will be totally destroyed. Because the article [written by Xiang Da]. . . was mailed to Chongqing’s Public Record 大公報, and [also] published in the Yunnan Daily 雲南日報, hopefully this will catch the public’s attention and correct it.

In (Xiang Da’s) article Zhang Daqian is not mentioned by name. His contribution to Dunhuang painting [studies] is vast, ruining wall painting is also
enormous. When we blame him for his terrible behavior we can keep in mind his contribution.

Mr. Zhang’s ability in art and his dedication to ancient drawing and scholastic depth are of great depth. There has to be a way to benefit our national cultural activity. But Dunhuang’s Qianfodong is our country’s incomparable national treasure. And it is known all over the world. In matters like this, we cannot just let one or two people’s interests ruin it.

... I dare to beg you to send a telegraph, and state that Zhang’s peeling of the wall painting’s layers, casually tracing the contour lines, and leaning equipment against the wall, must stop. I have high expectations as Mr. Xiang has already said that Qianfodong should be transformed into a national property and someone sent to administer and control [the site]. Let us preserve the things that have been ruined. Mr. Xiang’s suggestion, is not yet executed, so I hope, dear Sir, you will do something to conserve the treasure of our nation so that it can be preserved permanently. …

I, Fu Sinian, would be the gracious recipient if you can do this.

In another version of the same letter, transcribed by the Institute’s secretary, one passage clearly indicates the core of the problem.25

Although Mr. Daqian’s painting is a highly exalted treasure by the artist, however, from the point of view of preserving archaeological things, we do not yet know how to permanently preserve peeled layers. So when Mr. Zhang copies the wall painting, the layer is ruined when he peels it. This is very beneficial for Mr. Zhang’s progress in his artistic development, but from the point of view of culture, it is an incomparable loss. You ruin an antique because you love it.

This letter did have an impact on the government officials; in six months, Zhang was gone from Dunhuang. And as he passed through Lanzhou his luggage was inspected to make sure he was not bringing out any relics from the site. But somehow this behaviour did not diminish his reputation; he goes on to be heralded as one of the most important painters of the twentieth century.

While it is hard to find a plausible explanation for his destroying murals at a site widely recognised as national property and one of the world’s most spectacular collections of medieval murals, we can view his actions in a broader Republican context as a search for the primitive. As he ‘excavated’ down to find a more natural painting state, he attempted to uncover art that had been lost from Chinese history to the modern sensibility. The outer layers hid the true early drawing, much like Hu Qingchun’s analogy (cited above) about the fashion of frontier girls preserving the earlier styles of cosmopolitan culture which had since been replaced. That is, for many

25Fu and Li (1942).
Republican intellectuals and artists, the pure essence of the centre’s flourishing culture was best preserved in the margins. The caves could not have been a more apt metaphor for the cultural primitive hidden away for rediscovery by the centre after frontier treasures had been erased from cultural memory. Buddhist archaeology, and specifically the study of monuments in which artists such as Zhang and Wang identified important period styles and designs, was bound with a sense of recovery of a lost and valuable past so that his contemporaries still recognised his contributions (despite real damage caused by the artist himself).

The interest in recovering lost artistic styles was ultimately connected to the actual French, British, Japanese, American, and Russian removal of Dunhuang objects from the 42,000-manuscript library, as established scholars were very aware of the disappearance of materials by looting and purchase during the semi-colonial period through to the end of dynastic China in 1911. Republican intellectuals were determined to undo as many of the mistakes and lack of oversight during the late Qing government that lead to vulnerability of historical monuments all over China. So Zhang’s efforts to locate primitive forms of artistic expression were imbricated in larger academic initiatives to transform the wrongs during this pre-imperial period and celebrate past cultural achievements.

The attraction of archaeology and the allure of the field were linked to a preference in modern Chinese historical studies, as we have established, for actual objects and substantiated evidence gathered in the field. Gu Jiegang (1893–1980), the leader of the yigupai, ‘doubting the old’ school represented a larger intellectual trend, rejected Pre-Shang history as being the stuff of folklore including the largely mythical ‘three sovereigns’ and ‘five emperors’. The interest of discovering history in tactile, physical terms was echoed in Fu Sinian’s positivistic and proscientific framework for research. In his inaugural speech as the first director of the Institute of History and Philology in May 1928, Fu urged scholars to get out of the libraries and into the field. Fu’s perspective, located somewhere between Ranke and Qing old-text kaozheng research methods, according to Wang Fansen (the current director of the IHP), opposed theory and interpretation in order that ‘the facts would be naturally revealed’ through concrete data. Fu’s paradigm reflects both the iconoclasm and nationalism typical of May Fourth intellectuals. In aligning himself with Gu Jiegang

26 Ruan (2004), et al., p. 93; Gu (1926–41; 1931); Wu and Zhao (2003).
27 Fu (1928): 1.
and emphasising science and reform, it is indeed ironic that, contrary to expectations, the finds from the Anyang excavations proved consistent with traditional book-based accounts of early history, particularly the late Shang.\textsuperscript{29}

Zhang Daqian’s copying project at Dunhuang

The notion that the field held the clues to a long history of art is the basis of the artistic archaeological work of Zhang Daqian’s project at Dunhuang. Despite his blatant destruction of cultural property, Zhang saw the value of investigating paintings on cave walls because they provided raw data for his larger project of creating a pictorial canon of period painting styles. Wang Ziyun, who obtained two degrees in sculpture in France, where he studied from 1931 to 1937, was interested in the history of design, decorative motifs and sculpture (Fig. 13).\textsuperscript{30} In both cases, the larger trend to contextualise objects in a spatial and temporal continuum and to recuperate gaps of knowledge about early art based on first-hand knowledge was critical in terms of shaping approaches to the study of Dunhuang.

As established, Zhang Daqian arrived with a small entourage in May 1941 at the desert oasis of Dunhuang; its wall was the most complete collection of painting from the fifth to thirteenth centuries anywhere in China. Yulin, a sister site, had paintings dated to the early ninth to the twelfth century. During his two years based at Dunhuang, Zhang made additional copying trips to two other smaller cave sites in the region (the Eastern and Western Caves of the Thousand Buddhas); his coverage in his copies of the range of styles and subject matter in these four cave sites was fairly thorough. Despite his interest in early murals below the later paintings, he did make copies of the outer layers before destroying them. When he first arrived, he expended his first efforts in removing sand from the mouths of lower caves and assigning numbers for organisational purposes (which he noted directly on the murals themselves). This tendency to write freely on the walls and touch the murals were what would bring him censure and cause his departure.

\textsuperscript{29}Trigger (2006), pp. 265–6. There were, of course, many periods that were still not resolved such as the existence of Xia dynasty and the specific start and end dates of the first three dynasties. The recent Xia-Shang-Zhou Chronology Project, 1996–2000, was organised to settle those outstanding questions of dynastic time Li (2002).

\textsuperscript{30}Wang Qian (1995).
Figure 13. Wang Ziyun (1897–1990), second from left, front row, in graduation photo with classmates and teachers, École nationale supérieure des arts décoratifs de Paris. Advanced Sculpture degree awarded 15 February 1937 (undergraduate degree studied 1931–5).
Writing later in 1947, when he published the plates of his Dunhuang copies, Zhang describes how the known historical record of pictorial tradition had no real traces of the Six Dynasties, Sui and Tang (fourth to eighth centuries). He began marketing his extended exposure to this site as unique, establishing himself as a special interpreter of the past. He rhapsodises that before he came to Dunhuang he could only dream of finding the treasure trove of painting that he saw upon arrival.\(^{31}\) Zhang describes early primitive painting as if it were part of a dream—equating his unconscious with forgotten memories of a collective artistic past.

Zhang came to the site in June 1941, but by the late fall he sent his son back to Xining to establish a liaison with officials at Ta’ersi (Kumbum), the large Gelukpa monastery that was the primary regional temple for the (current) fourteenth Dalai Lama, and, as a result, received sustained patronage that supported extensive building projects.\(^{32}\) Zhang had met five monk painters at Kumbum in spring 1941 before he first went west; their mastery over icon, complex Buddhist narrative, and especially colour impressed him. After spending a summer at the site, he realised their expertise was essential and hired them for the remainder of his sojourn. When he returned to the site in March 1942, these five painters from Qinghai accompanied him. Although they were based at Ta’ersi on a long-term project their home was Wutun—an important cluster of villages to the south of Xining famous for the great skill of its artists identified as the Rebgong style or school.

The expertise of these first-rate painters in fine-line drawing, colouring, and Buddhist compositions transformed Zhang’s attempts and brought them to a professional level. Zhang is conscious of their contributions and notes the names of individual painters in the copies’ inscriptions; Shawo Tsering’s co-authorship is noted in the rendering of a bodhisattva from Yulin cave 14 (Fig. 12). Zhang’s other painting assistants, such as his nephew Zhang Xinde 張心德 (1922–53) and students such as Xie Zhiliu 謝稚柳 (1910–97), had no experience with complex Buddhist narrative depictions; collaborating with regional artists, who regularly executed complex Buddhist compositions for high-level patrons in one of China and Tibet’s largest temples, enabled the team to capture the complexity of Dunhuang’s wall painting.

Zhang and his assistants experimented with ways to convey the antiquity of the murals, including the use of diffuse brushwork and few

\(^{31}\) Zhang Daqian [1947].

\(^{32}\) Fraser (2010); Hu Suxin (Fraser) (2009).
contour lines; some sections are intentionally unfinished. For example, he depicts facial features in the copy of the Vessantara jataka tale, but they are only faintly rendered. In this Buddhist story the householder gives away all his possessions and brings his family to live a life of poverty in the forest to gain good merit (Fig. 14). Fine boundary lines shape the multicoloured landscape, but few interior contour lines or texture strokes define the mountains. On one level the pictorial reticence echoes the partially damaged state of the painting—much of the surface definition typically provided by the overdrawing is gone—but Zhang rarely shies away from providing full surface details even when the original is unclear. Therefore, one could argue that Zhang used this fainter brushwork to suggest the antiquity of the tale's setting occurring during one of the Buddha's previous lives. What is clear is that, by emphasising the ruinous and ancient quality of the wall paintings, Zhang emphasises that the wall paintings sit within a deep past slightly obscured, rather than being wholly visible; this coheres with the sense of loss and ruin associated with the north-west. The response from the wartime Nationalist audience to Zhang's copies was extremely favourable; Zhang's representation of ancient ruins and the way they evoked the lost empire of the Silk Road brought him acclaim in painting circles and among the public. His first public forum for the Dunhuang copies was opened on 14 August 1943 in an exhibition in Lanzhou, and then later in two 1944 exhibitions in Chongqing and Chengdu; he continued to gain critical acclaim precisely for this ability to evoke the past in a modern idiom.

Zhang repackaged the paintings to appeal to the mainstream, but ironically only with help from the cultural ‘margins’. In fact, Zhang was well suited to ‘translate’ the interior for a nationalist audience. Nanjing officials and their families moved inland, but their knowledge of the multi-ethnic population and cultures in the region was minimal; coastal officials would not have been savvy about minority arts. Zhang, born in a Han-majority part of Sichuan but acculturated to the diverse social fabric of the province and the Tibetan frontier, was able to work between Tibetan and Han traditions. Nonetheless, he displayed a total disregard for them, destroying what he perceived to be an early minority culture, literally hacking through it.

The key to understanding Zhang’s approach to documenting frontier ruins is that he wanted to restore the murals to their original brilliance in his own reproductions. Every artist who arrives at an archaeological site with the hope of copying and transmitting its art has to grapple with
developing principles for addressing damage, decay, and colour change. In the case of Dunhuang, the fading and colour changes in the murals added special challenges to the documentation process. Zhang took a bold approach—one that would not be followed by subsequent artists who were more interested in capturing the current state of the paintings. He imagined the original colours and lines; in the process he created a new compositional cohesion that knits a damaged composition together. Zhang inserts himself into the logic of the old painting to create a new idiom. Guan Youhui 關友惠 (1932–), the retired head of the Dunhuang Academy art department, studied with Wang Ziyun at Xian Art Academy and frequently went to Dunhuang on copying expeditions with his teacher before joining the Institute in the 1950s. Guan describes four style types that artists used in state-supported copying work at the site.

1 The first is the objective style 客觀臨摹, ‘like a photograph’, Guan states. Damaged sections of the mural are depicted as carefully as undamaged parts of the painting. The rationale is that the artist is to record the current state of the painting, regardless of what it may have looked like originally.

2 The second type is ‘retain old colours, [but] complete lines’, 舊色完整; In this style, the artist also reproduces the palette at face value—the current appearance of the colours is retained. But the artist connects original contour lines and reinstates the compositional coherence of the original where possible.

3 The third type of copying is to ‘restore the original appearance’, 復原 (fuyuan). The rationale for this type is to account for dramatic changes in the original, particularly in palette. By researching other paintings dating to the same period, and noting standard conventions across many examples, it is possible to make an educated guess about the ‘original appearance’ of forms.

4 The fourth type, according to Guan Youhui, is the ‘inspired copy’ 行, used to make new creative works of art based on old traditions. Guan believes that modern society needs new paintings based closely on the old; new works touch the past, but the modern artist’s interpretive spirit is the primary subject or focus of the work.

33S. E. Fraser, 1999 interviews with Guan Youhui: <http://buddhist-art.arthistory.northwestern.edu/buddhistweb/index.html>.
34See Appendix I.
Zhang’s three paintings of Dunhuang copies reproduced here conform to the third style of copying—fuyuan. Even in his copy of the Vessantara Jataka, in which he intentionally omits details to indicate an affinity with the ancient, Zhang presents a definitive compositional outline (Fig. 14). In all three paintings, he removes any trace of damage and disrepair, and depicts each hue at its most saturated intensity—an idealised representation of the medieval colour palette. The figures of the bodhisattva and the offering attendant paintings are described with fine line and colours (Figs. 12 and 15). The precision of the drawing suggests a new pious work of art. No suggestion of the age of the original works appears in the copies. Instead, the colours are brought to their full (imagined) saturation and brilliance. While it is not possible to judge the original appearance of many of the figures, Zhang confidently fills in the missing contours of the composition. In the bodhisattva, Zhang adds additional flowers that are not part of the original, but on the whole the figures in these direct copies are proportionally correct and bear a strong relationship to the pictorial structure of the eighth- and ninth-century murals which they reference. One reason for this fidelity is that Zhang’s assistants were instructed to trace the original compositions on the wall; these contour lines serve as the foundation of the copies. But Zhang’s fuyuan ‘restore to the original’ style goes beyond what other artists such as Guan Youhui subsequently used, particularly in the coloration. Guan’s rationale for the third style is that oxidisation and other dramatic colour changes create misinterpretation. For example, facial contour lines in N. Wei paintings were originally flesh tone but had turned black, producing a strange, angular edge to the figures. The amber-hued faces of early Tang bodhisattvas took on a dark maroon patina over the centuries; initially twentieth-century Gansu artists did not entirely understand the skin tone conventions in Buddhist paintings developed in Indian Buddhist workshops. After careful study of damaged and undamaged portions of the caves, they were able to present their ‘corrections’ to a larger public through corrected copies. Zhang’s hue corrections and contour transformations go beyond this modest approach; they are aggressive and interventionist. The structure of the paintings is accurate, but in the application of colours such as the browns, greens, deep reds and blues, Zhang suggests definition and palette that are not visible in the extant works.
Differing styles and practices of *Meishu kaogu*

The precision of Zhang’s figural structures (if not his coloration) is what sets him apart from Wang Ziyun’s mural copies. Wang and his wife, He Zhenghuang 何正璜 (1914–94), painted in a watercolour-like style that approximates the contours of figures in early wall paintings thus rendering an impression, but not a precise record, of medieval forms. Compare, for example, Wang and He’s *apsara* to Zhang Daqian’s heavenly attendant, both after Tang dynasty figures (*c.* eighth to ninth centuries) (Figs. 15 and 16). The flying *apsara* playing a flute is a quick rendition of a figure glimpsed in a cave; it captures the spontaneous energy of Tang heavenly attendants. The addition of light brown, blue, and black small clouds adds to the sense of movement. But Wang Ziyun, trained as a sculptor and interested in writing comprehensive overviews of sculptural history and design, never produced second and third renditions of Dunhuang wall painting figures as Zhang did (Fig. 13). Zhang’s Tang figure is reproduced on silk, repainted based on sketches and tracings made in the cave, but produced at a later date in the quiet stability of the studio. Care is given to convey three-dimensionality and rotundity even against the blank ground—typical features of Tang figure painting. Zhang has applied the details to make the painting a work of fine art, smoothing out the edges in precise iron-wire line evoking the sweetness of the attendant. Wang’s painting is a quick watercolour sketch that records the general subject matter; he aims to make a record of, but not to embody, the original figure in a new form. Zhang is interested in restoring the figures to their original appearance; Wang aims to merely capture their existence. The opacity of the hue in Zhang’s copies leaves an indelible image in the viewer’s mind. We sense the hand of a painter who carefully adheres to pictorial historicity of the original work, adding line where appropriate to make a complete interpretation of the original, adhering to the boundaries. He is often inaccurate or too aggressive in his application of colour, but Zhang compels the viewer to register antiquity in a modern frame.

Each artist follows a different path in his pursuit of *meishu kaogu* (archaeology of art). Zhang’s work rests solely in painting. His

---

35 He Zhenghuang’s signature is on the verso of the Apsara scroll, but the style is completely consistent with all of Wang Ziyun’s other Dunhuang mural copies and other members of his team; e.g., Wang’s 1942 version of ‘Zhang Yichao’s Army Conquering the Tibetans and Retaking Dunhuang’ (from cave 156), his depiction of the Dunhuang environs, and rendering of other cave sites such as Qizil he investigated in 1953. Wang Huangsheng (2005).

Figure 16. He Zhenghuang (1914–94) with Wang Ziyun, Copy of Apsara in Tang Cave, Dunhuang. 1941–2. Photo courtesy of Wang Qiang.
documentation lies in the copies themselves. He and his collaborators carefully recorded pictorial details, such as the raised toe in the heavenly attendant. Zhang’s team takes care to capture the echoing circles in the scarves trailing the attendant’s body; these impart a sense of the figure’s movement and forward motion. The arms and shoulders, balanced in relation to the feet, reach to offer the tray laden with coral and semi-precious jewels. Zhang’s efforts are devoted to capturing a period style within the brushwork itself, believing that little details convey dynastic style. Wang Ziyun’s meishu kaogu efforts were spread across a range of media. He made sketches of murals, watercolour panoramas of caves, and thousands of photographs of sculpture, returning home to the studio to display these in an academic setting (Fig. 7). In his Xian studio (and in his January 1943 exhibition at the National Library in Chongqing—eight months before Zhang Daqian’s first show of Dunhuang copies) it is evident that Wang was largely interested in a historical documentation of a range of objects from many different sites—incorporating Dunhuang art into a framework that would become the basis of a larger comprehensive study he completed over the next decade, culminating in The History of Chinese Artistic Sculpture 中國雕塑藝術史.\(^{37}\) In some ways Wang treats the wall painting in the same way that he paints scenic views of the northwest. His image of a pack of camels grazing in Jiuchuan near the Gobi desert during his October 1942 sojourn, for example, has the look and feel of his copy of the apsara wall painting.\(^{38}\) Both are quick sketches to convey an impression of landscape and icons; he used the same format to paint studies of ethnographic groups in the region, too.

Wang also wrote comparative histories of sculpture and design, incorporating his photographs to create a survey of design motifs for each dynastic period.\(^{39}\) In his two-volume Pictorial Overview of Chinese Applied Arts Throughout the Ages, Wang places six small photographs of Tang floral designs in comparative display; typically these designs would appear behind Buddhist sculptures as painted aureoles and in the well (apex) of a temple ceiling (Fig. 17). Each figure is numbered and is placed in a larger design history documenting hundreds of types and variations from a range of sites. Zhang, too, was interested in creating a dynastic framework for explaining pictorial development, but in regards to Buddhist material

\(^{37}\) Later, reprinted Wang (2005b); Editorial Pages (1943a, 1943b).

\(^{38}\) Wang painted the Silk Road scene when he was in Jiuchuan, east of Dunhuang, Wang Huangsheng (2005), 3–22; sketches from his research trip are collected in Wang Ziyun (2005a).

\(^{39}\) Wang Ziyun (1955); (2007).
he limited himself to Dunhuang only, publishing a guide to the caves organised by grotto number (not by style, theme, or period).\textsuperscript{40} Many artists painted interpretations of the Dunhuang wall paintings in the 1940s when artists, government officials, and teams of researchers descended on the site and its environs; in subsequent decades there has been no shortage of new copies as painters have fervently continued the practice. A recent exhibition at the National Fine Arts Museum in Beijing brought together hundreds of examples executed from 1942 to 2005 under official auspices; although Zhang’s work was absent from the show, the enormous collection on display made clear that Zhang established the conditions and methods through which all subsequent artists would approach the site, despite his aggressive pictorial invention.\textsuperscript{41} His work at Dunhuang was a watershed event; graduates of the National Fine Arts Academy and other top art scholars were all sent to Dunhuang to make copies, beginning in the 1950s; it was a rite of passage that put young, talented artists on site with the largest gallery of early painting within China. But Zhang’s copying style will always stand out from the other early prominent artists who dedicated themselves to documenting the site. Chang Suhong 常書鴻 (1904–94), the first director of the Dunhuang Art Academy, and Duan Wenjie 段文杰, Chang’s successor, attempted to capture the antiquity of the wall paintings, but in order to do this they chose to document the murals in their current damaged state. They noted in paint all the imperfections, such as cracks, areas of peeled paint exposing dirt walls, and the present state of colours, which had changed over the centuries. While their works could be considered a more accurate register of the art historical record, it could be argued that Zhang Daqian’s freer interpretations, based on both a fidelity to the originals and his own strategic changes that resonated with the present, were more dynamic and effective.

The paintings of other artists represented in the 2008 exhibition, such as Wu Zuoren (吳作人) and Guan Shanyue (關山月), demonstrate what can be done working in the spirit of Dunhuang (Guan’s fourth style of copying). Yet, in this mode as well, Zhang excelled at incorporating a Dunhuang style into new paintings (a consideration of which is beyond the scope of this essay).

Zhang Daqian’s fame rests in part on his path-breaking interpretations of the Dunhuang murals. He was able to reintroduce long forgotten brushwork and subject matter to the repertoire of early painters. His

\textsuperscript{40}Zhang (1985).
\textsuperscript{41}Fan and Fan (2008).
copies called attention to elaborate Buddhist narrative; vignettes executed with excitement and spontaneity; donor portraits of Silk Road officials possessing great historical value; and complete icon installations preserved untouched since the Tang—these are just a few of the features that Zhang brought to a larger, nationalist audience. Zhang Daqian copies captured for a wartime audience the spirit of the old while putting the past in the context of the modern (era). Zhang's post-antiquarian sensibilities were especially popular in Shanghai, where the local media covered Zhang's comings and goings in and out of the city with great enthusiasm.42 It is often said that Zhang's genius lay in his ability to isolate the essential features of any period or style and capture them in poignant brushwork.

In the Dunhuang case, Zhang immediately recognised what was special about Dunhuang: it preserved aspects of the painterly tradition that had been long out of circulation.

The frontier for Zhang and other art-historical archaeologists was an outlet for an anxious modernity. Their copies, especially Zhang's successful adaptations done with Tibetan painters, transported the viewer to a previous moment in history, erasing years of lost territory to northern nomadic tribes and reclaiming cultural authority from foreign explorers who plundered the site. Dunhuang was the perfect cipher for recuperating these losses and recapturing cultural dominance and pride.

The question remains, why are Zhang and Wang's paintings examples of archaeology of art (meishu kaogu) and not art? That is, what makes this material archaeological? How is it different from art? One could argue that Zhang's paintings approach art in their creative spirit, but we also must remember that these works by both Zhang and Wang were first and foremost copies. Their primary function was to record an historical progression of styles and artistic production in China over the millennium and then to inspire other artists to make new works. These paintings will never be admired as independent works of art, at least in Europe and the United States; one will always refer back to the originals to ascertain their importance and meaning. But they do reflect a critical transition in the study of art and archaeology in China; they point to a period when scholars and artists realised the value of archaeological material and methods for the study of art.

Appendix

Sarah E. Fraser interview (June 1999) with Guan Youhui (1932– ) 關友惠
retired Director, Art Department, Dunhuang Research Academy

Full interview available online:

I. Guan Youhui on four kinds of copying:

1. objective style (keguan 客觀), like a photograph; damaged sections of the mural are depicted as carefully as parts of the painting that are still intact;
2. the second type is (jiuse wanzheng 魄事完整)—’retain old colours, [but] complete lines’, the current appearance of the colours is retained, but the artist connects faded contour lines; and
3. type three is ‘restore to the original’ (fuyuan 復原) appearance, relevant especially in cases of dramatic palette change or damage;
4. inspired copying (fang 仿)—see Part II below.

II. On question of new Buddhist art and ‘fang 仿’ (not linmo 臨摹, but new creative works based on the old):

社會它需要新的藝術創作．它不應該新的佛教美術創作，也需要新的景觀畫創作，也需要新的人物畫創作．那麼作敦煌研究院的新美術創作，我認為它應該逐漸探索一個具有中國佛教藝術傳統的一些特色（的路）．如果說這是一個原作原樣，它的大小，它的色彩完全一樣，像照相一樣，像照相技術，這是比喻的意思，這我們認為是臨摹．但中圍過去還有一種叫‘仿’ ’摹仿’的‘仿’，這在過去一些前人的畫畫呢，他提說呢也是說‘仿某某人’，這個‘仿’和臨摹是不一樣的，應該是有差別的，仿呢就是比較接近大意，基本仿他的風格，仿他自己的基本筆法，這是一種仿，臨摹必須要和那個完全一樣．
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