

PROBLEMS OF AUTHOR AND TITLE OF THE *HOU-HUA-LU*

CHUANG SHEN

The author of the present *Hou-hua-lu* (後畫錄) is Yen Tsung (彥崇), a monk of the T'ang Dynasty. This book is a small volume in two parts: a short preface dated in the 9th year of the Chen Kuan era (635 A.D.) of the T'ang Dynasty, and his critical evaluation of some twenty-six painters.

According to the *Li-tai-ming-hua-chi* (歷代名畫記)⁽¹⁾ of Chang Yen-yüan (張彥遠), a Sui (隋) monk Yen Tsung (彥崇) also wrote his "Critical Evaluation of Painters", although the specific title of this work has not been given by Chang Yen-yüan. However, it is highly likely that two monks of two different dynasties would have the same name, and both write about paintings.

After an examination of Chang Yen-yüan's LTMHC, it will be noted that between chüan 7 and chüan 9, there are twenty-six passages quoted from the writing of the 'Sui' monk. Curiously, the painters associated with twenty-six quotations are virtually identical to the group of painters that appear in the present *Hou-hua-lu* attributed to the T'ang monk. Thus, very likely, the Sui monk and the T'ang monk are actually the same person. Moreover, the "Critical Evaluation of Painters" attributed to the Sui monk actually is the *Hou-hua-lu* attributed to the T'ang monk. Unquestionably, the author of this work in painting is the T'ang monk, not the Sui monk. And, through other evidence, it can be determined that its title may not originally have been *Hou-hua-lu* either. Therefore, there are at least two problems concerning this *Hou-hua-lu*: its author and its title. Meanwhile, there are two areas of information, the examination of which throws light on my conclusions: the preface of this *Hou-hua-lu*, and the passages quoted from the so-called *Hou-hua-lu* which now exist in Chang Yen-yüan's LTMHC and other works of some T'ang and Sung writers.

THE PROBLEM OF THE AUTHOR OF THE *HOU-HUA-LU*

At the very beginning of the preface, the opening sentence says: "for

(1) See Section II of Chapter I of LTMHC 敘畫之興廢 or "On the Vicissitudes of the Art of Painting". English translation see W. Acker: "T'ang and Pre-T'ang Texts of Chinese Painting", p. p. 143-144, Leiden, 1954.

the *Ti-ching-ssu-lu* (帝京寺錄, Record of the Temples of the Capital of the Empire), I, Yen Tsung, am contemplating the masterpieces (of art) in the Capital," and at the end of the preface, the date 635 mentioned above is given. On the basis of these two facts, the author of this *Hou-hua-lu* certainly should not only be a monk of the T'ang Dynasty, but also a co-author of the *Ti-ching-ssu-lu*. On the other hand, of course, we might assume that the preface dated 635 is only an addition of the later period, the book was originally written by the Sui monk Yen Tsung. However, such an assumption is very difficult to be supported by literary evidence, and is therefore not tenable. Because, as far as the available materials are concerned, there was a monk, Yen Tsung, in the Sui Dynasty, and he was a prominent figure of many Buddhist writings. According to chüan 33 of the *Sui-shu* (隋書, The History of the Sui Dynasty), there are two books bearing the same title, and the title, *Ching-shih-ssu-t'a-chi* (京師寺塔記, Notes on Temples and Pagodas in the Capital), is quite close to the so-called *Ti-ching-ssu-lu* mentioned by the preface of *Hou-hua-lu*. The 10 chüan version was compiled by Liu Miu (劉繆), an author of the Liang Dynasty, and the two chüan version was compiled also by a monk T'an Ching (曇景), again a writer of the Liang Dynasty. Although the titles of these two books are quite close or similar to the *Ti-ching-ssu-lu*, yet, certainly, the Liang writing *Ching-shih-ssu-t'a-chi* is certainly not the *Ti-ching-ssu-lu*. Similar to this is another book of the same category, entitled simply *Ssu-t'a-chi* (寺塔記, Notes on Temples and Pagodas) which is recorded in chüan 5 of the *Ta-T'ang-nei-tien-lu* (大唐內典錄). The author of this *Ssu-t'a-chi* is again a Sui monk. But his name is Ling Yu (靈祐), not Yen Tsung.

The *Sui-shu* was compiled by a group of scholars under the direction of Chang-sun Wu-chi (長孫無忌) and was completed in the first year of the Hsien Ch'ing era (656 A.D.). While the *Ta-T'ang-nei-tien-lu* was compiled by an anonymous monk of the Hsi-ming temple (西明寺), and was completed in the first year of the Lin Te era (664 A.D.). Liu Miu, as well as the monk T'an Ching and Ling Yu, were all minor writers. But Yen Tsung, was a prominent figure about Buddhist writings. If he had really written a book about the temples of the capital and entitled *Ti-ching-ssu-lu*, it could not possibly have been neglected by the compilers of either the *Sui-shu* or the *Ta-T'ang-nei-tien-lu*. And since the works of the minor writers have been recorded, while nothing is said of the major figure Yen Tsung, it is

very clear that he must not have written any thing about the temples of the Sui capital. If the Sui monk Yen Tsung is not the author of the *Ti-ching-ssu-lu*, certainly he cannot have been the author of the *Hou-hua-lu* either. Because as we determined above, the author of the *Hou-hua-lu* is also the author of the *Ti-ching-ssu-lu*.

Having established that there is no possibility that the Sui monk Yen Tsung wrote anything about either painting or temples, we shall now try to examine the other question whether the T'ang monk Yen Tsung is the real author of the *Ti-ching-ssu-lu*, as the preface of the *Hou-hua-lu* indicated.

In chüan 59 of the *Hsin-T'ang-shu* (新唐書, The New History of the T'ang Dynasty) and chüan 67 of the *T'ung-chih* (通志), compiled by the famous Sung scholar Cheng Ch'iao (鄭樵), there is recorded a book entitled *Ta-T'ang-ching-ssu-lu-chuan* (大唐京寺錄傳, Record of the Temples of the Great T'ang Capital). This book contains ten chüan, and its author is Yen Tsung (彥宗). Certainly, this character 宗 is a mistake for the other character 宗. Since the Sui monk Yen Tsung died in 610, before the establishment of the T'ang Dynasty, historically it would be impossible to have "Ta-T'ang", literally the great T'ang Dynasty, on the top of his book's title. The title recorded in the *Hsin-T'ang-shu* and *T'ung-chih*, although not precisely the same as that mentioned in the preface of the *Hou-hua-lu*, it is, nevertheless, close enough to it. More significant is the author of the ten chüan book has been confirmed by the *Hsin-T'ang-shu* and the *T'ung-chih* as the T'ang monk Yen Tsung.

Curiously, perhaps, the title *Ta-T'ang-ching-ssu-lu* that appears in the *Hsin-T'ang-shu* and *T'ung-chih* is more likely to be the original title of the T'ang monk Yen Tsung's writing about the temples of the capital than the other title, *Ti-ching-ssu-lu*, mentioned by the preface of the *Hou-hua-lu*. The author of this paper would like to point out two facts which tend to confirm this particular point.

In the first place, the T'ang monk Yen Tsung was one of the disciples of the great Buddhist priest Hsüan Chuang (玄奘, 602-664 A. D.). Hsüan Chuang's biography was written by another monk Hui Li (慧立),⁽²⁾ but when Hui Li passed away, Yen Tsung was selected to prepare annotations and commentaries for it. In addition to that work, he also wrote a preface for

(2) The earliest English translation of this biography was made by Samuel Beal. See his "*The Life of Hiuen-Tsiang by Shaman Hwei Li*", London, 1884.

this biography. Originally, the biography was compiled with the title *Ta-tz'u-en-ssu-san-tsang-fa-shih-chuan* (大慈恩寺三藏法師傳) by its author Hui Li. But when the preface was finished, Yen Tsung added two characters "Ta-T'ang" at the top of the original title of the biography. Thus, clearly, Yen Tsung had a habit of putting the two words "Ta-T'ang" at the top of a completed title. On the other hand, his record about the temples may originally have been simply entitled *Ching-ssu-lu*. Because he lived in the T'ang Dynasty, the record of the temples of the "Ching", namely, the capital, would clearly indicate the capital of the T'ang Dynasty. But Yen Tsung still added the "Ta-T'ang" at the top, just as he added the same words at the top of the biography of Hsüan Chuang. Obviously, the title of the biography and the title of the record of the temples of the capital correspond to each other, and together, they explain that Yen Tsung really had habit of putting the words "Ta-T'ang" at the top of the title of a piece of writing.

Further more, it can be seen that the addition of the words is not merely a personal idiosyncrasy of Yen Tsung himself, but more likely was the custom of the T'ang Dynasty in general. There are many books or short essays bearing these two characters i.e. Ta-T'ang, in their titles, especially among Buddhist writings. For instance, the record of Hsüan Chuang's travel from China to India is entitled *Ta-T'ang-hsi-yü-chi* (大唐西域記). The descriptive catalogue of Buddhist writings compiled by the famous monk, Tao Hs'üan (道宣) is entitled *Ta-T'ang-nei-tien-lu* (大唐內典錄). The collected biographies of those Buddhist pilgrims who travelled from China to India or Chinese-Turkestan seeking Indian sutras that was compiled by the monk Yi Ch'ing (義淨) is entitled *Ta-T'ang-hsi-yü-ch'iu-fa-kao-seng-chuan* (大唐西域求法高僧傳). And the annotations of Buddhist terminology compiled by the monk, Hsüan Ying (玄應), is entitled *Ta-T'ang-chung-ching-yin-yi* (大唐衆經音義). More significant is that most of the mentioned writings were written in a general period very close to each other.⁽³⁾ According to these examples, we can probably say that the use of "Ta-T'ang" these two

(3) This biographical-record, according to the record found in chüan 10 of the *Ta-T'ang-nei-tien-lu*, was compiled in 661 A.D. Among other Buddhist writings which bear the two words "Ta-T'ang" in their titles, is the *Ta-T'ang-chung-ching-yin-yi*, which is a compilation of the mid 7th century. More specifically, it was compiled earlier than the Ling Te era, but later than the Chen Kuan era. And the *Ta-T'ang-nei-tien-lu* was a compilation of 664 A.D.

words at the very beginning of a work's title, is probably a customary usage of the early T'ang Dynasty.⁽⁴⁾ So, Yen Tsung's use of "Ta-T'ang" in the titles of his writings, therefore simply corresponds to the practice of his period. If this is the case, then, undoubtedly, the T'ang monk Yen Tsung should be considered the author of the so-called *Ti-ching-ssu-lu* instead of the Sui monk whose name has the same pronunciation.

The following materials will directly confirm our assumption that the *Ti-ching-ssu-lu* that is mentioned in the preface of the *Hou-hua-lu* was written by the T'ang monk Yen Tsung. In chüan 10 of the *Ta-T'ang-nei-tien-lu*, a book is recorded with the title *Ta-T'ang-ching-ssu-t'a-lu-chuan* (大唐京寺塔錄傳, A Biographical-record of the Temples and Pagodas of the Capital of the Great T'ang Dynasty). Below the full title of this record, a short note says "one pu (部). ten chüan. Compiled in the first year of the Lung Shuo era (661 A.D.)." And, on the left of the title, in a longer note the name of the author, T'ang Yen Tsung appears, along with the story of why this biographical-record was compiled.⁽⁵⁾ Thus, we finally obtain the full title, the date, the number of chüan of its contents, and the name of the author, from the helpful *Ta-T'ang-nei-tien-lu*. This proves that what I assumed above (e.g. that the title *Ta-T'ang-ching-ssu-lu-chuan* which is recorded in the *Hsin-T'ang-shu* and the *T'ung-chih* would be close to the original title) is true.

(4) Aside from these Buddhist writings usually associated with the two words "Ta-T'ang," the non-Buddhist writings occasionally also had the custom of putting these two-words on the top of a title, such as the *Ta-T'ang-hsin-yü* (大唐新語) written by Liu Su, and the *Ta-T'ang ch'uan-tsai* (大唐傳載) by an anonymous writer. In other categories this custom also existed; such as in stone steles, a stele written by Yen Shih-ku (顏師古) is titled *Ta-T'ang-cheng-chou-teng-tz'u-ssu-pei* (大唐鄭州等慈寺碑). The essay written by the Emperor T'ai-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty to praise the marvelous career of the Buddhist priest Hsüan Chuang for his sutra translation is entitled *Ta-T'ang-san-tsang-sheng-chiao-hsü* (大唐三藏聖教序), written in the 22nd year of the Chen Kuan era (648 A.D.).

(5) The story of why the T'ang monk Yen Tsung compiled this 10 chüan book runs like this: "Yen Tsung, the monk of the Hung-fu Temple (弘福寺) of the capital, considered that the pagodas and temples of the capital, possess a great deal of the ethereal or supernatural representations, which were sufficient to influence the humble hearts; lead them harmoniously to open their hearts and sincerely to believe in Buddhism. The Liang Dynasty, to the south of the (Yangtse) River, has compiled 10 chüan (about the artistic representations of the temples and pagodas), and the Posterior Wei Dynasty which established its capital in Lo-yang also has used five rolls (to represent the same subject). Only the famous temples and well known pagodas which are located in the imperial living-area to the south of the River Wei, had no list and description of these subjects at all. Zealously, (Yen) Tsung started this work. He established his writings and collected them together. The individual style of his writing is realistic. Events have their historical derivation, and he also has his principles."

On the basis of the above discussion, it is quite clear that the author of the so-called "Critical Evaluation of Painters" mentioned in the note of Chang Yen-yüan's LTMHC, as well as the so-called *Hou-hua-lu*, is the T'ang monk Yen Tsung. However, there is still the question of why Chang Yen-yüan mistook the Tang monk Yen Tsung for the Sui monk Yen Tsung. Two answers suggest themselves. In the first place, although these two personal names are different in written form, yet, they are quite the same in their pronunciation. The two monks bearing the same name are obviously very easily confused, and this is probably the main reason for Chang Yen-yüan's mistake.

In the second place, the Sui monk, Yen Tsung, is a very important figure among Buddhist writers. He knew Sanscrit,⁽⁶⁾ and translated sutras from the Sanscrit into Chinese. He was also an important writer on Buddhist subjects generally, and wrote in addition many prefaces for the Chinese translated sutras.⁽⁷⁾ From Sui to the early T'ang (chronologically, from the late 6th cent. to the early 7th cent.), Buddhism have continuously increased in popularity in China. Most of the Buddhists recited sutras, and

- (6) According to Yen Tsung's biography in chüan 2 of the *Hsü-kao-seng-chuan* (續高僧傳) compiled by the monk Tao Hsüan, there are at least three passages which indicate that Yen Tsung was a master of Sanscrit. The first passage is:

"In the 2nd year (of the K'ai Huang era; 562 A.D.), Yen Tsung was permitted to enter the capital....where he lived in the temple of Ta-hsing-shen. So, sutras like *Fa hua* (i.e. Saddharma-pundarika) *Wei-mo* (i.e. Vimalakirti-nirdesa), *Leng-chia* (i.e. Lanka), *Sh'e-lun* (i.e. Mahayana-samparigraha), and *Shih-ti* (i.e. the 22nd chapter of the 60 chapter version of Hua-yen sutra; Avatamsaka), all in their Sanscrit versions were taught by Yen Tsung himself."

The second passage runs like this:

"In the second year of the Jen Shou era (602 A.D.),....again, Yen Tsung was ordered by the Emperor to translate the Chinese sutras in the Sui Dynasty into Sanscrit. He collected his translations into 10 chüan, which was given by the imperial order to the countries of Chinese-Turkestan."

The third passage concerned is:

"In the later period, the sutras he recited were more than 4,000 chieh (偈), and also more than 13,000 words of the Sanscrit sutras. Moreover, he can recite all of them in seven days, as his usual practice. He has joined the work of translation for a long time; he has a marvelous understanding in Sanscrit. Masters of this country (i.e. the Sui China) all respected him. Regarding the individual pronunciation or character, and the textual investigation and explanation, they can seldom make them correspond (from Sanscrit to Chinese). Therefore, he wrote the dissertation of Pien-cheng (辯正), to provide the formula for translation."

- (7) There are at least 15 sutras with prefaces written by the Sui monk Yen Tsung. According to the *Ta-T'ng-wei-tien-lu*, and *K'ai-yüan-shih-ch'iao-lu* (開元釋教錄) chüan 7, the titles and the dates of these sutras were as follows:

1. *Ta-ch'eng-fang-huang-tsung-ch'ih-ching*, (大乘方廣總持經) the preface for this sutra was made in the 2nd year of the K'ai Huang era (582 A.D.).

since the Sui monk Yen Tsung was a translator, and also wrote the prefaces for certain sutras, his name would naturally be familiar to the majority of Chinese Buddhists. Thus, it is not difficult to imagine that the name of the Sui Yen Tsung would have been widely known during his life-time, and also after his death.

Although the T'ang monk Yen Tsung wrote several essays which except for his *Hou-hua-lu*, all deal with the principles of Buddhism, he was nevertheless described as "not clever" and "merely good in learning."⁽⁸⁾ Therefore we must imagine that his essays must not have been commonly noticed by his contemporaries, and his name was much less known than the Sui monk Yen Tsung, perhaps even rendered virtually anonymous in comparison. So, although the T'ang monk was the real author of the writing about the twenty-six painters, yet, when Chang Yen-yüan quoted from this writing about painters he still neglected this T'ang minor Buddhist writer, and erroneously selected the name of the Sui monk Yen Tsung as the author of his quotations. Hence the mistake happened in Chang Yen-yüan's LTMHC.

2. *Ta-sui-yeh-pao-tsa-pieh-ching*. (大隋業報差別經). The preface was made in 582 A.D.
3. *Yi-hsiang-ch'u-sheng-p'u-sa-ching* (一向出生菩薩經), prefaced in the 5th year of the K'ai Huang era (585 A.D.).
4. *Wen-shu-shih-li-hsing-ching* (文殊師利行經). Prefaced in the 6th year of the K'ai Huang era (586 A.D.).
5. *Ta-wei-teng-hsin-jen-wen-yi-ching* (大威燈仙人問經). Prefaced in 586 A.D.
6. *Pa-fu-ming-hao-ching* (八佛名號經). Prefaced in 586 A.D.
7. *Hsi-yu-chiao-liang-kung-te-ching* (希有校量功德經). Prefaced made in 586 A.D.
8. *Shan-hung-ching-shih-ching* (善恭敬師經). Preface made in 586 A.D.
9. *Ju-lai-shan-fang-pien-shan-ch'iao-chou-ching* (如來善方便善巧呪經). Preface made in the 7th year of the K'ai Huang era (587 A.D.).
10. *Chin-kang-ch'ang-to-lo-ni-ching* (金剛場陀羅尼經). Preface made in 587 A.D.
11. *Fu-pen-hsing-chi-ching* (佛本行集經). Prefaced in 587 A.D.
12. *Shih-erh-fu-ming-shen-chou-ch'u-chang-mieh-tsui-ching* (十二佛名神呪除障滅罪經). Prefaced in 587 A.D.
13. *Hsü-kung-yün-p'u-sa-ching* (虛空孕菩薩經). Prefaced in 587 A.D.
14. *Yüeh-shang-nü-ching* (月上女經). Preface was made in the 11th year of the K'ai Huang era (591 A.D.).
15. *Shan-ssu-t'ung-tzu-ching* (善思童子經). Preface was made in 591 A.D.

Besides, there is one more bearing the Sui Yen Tsung's preface, but without its date of translation: *Pu-k'ung-chüan-so-kuan-shih-yin-hsin-chou-ching* (不空羼索觀世音心呪經). And in addition to this list, there is the *Hsin-ho-chin-kuang-ming-ching* (漸合金光明經) which bears no preface of Yen Tsung; but according to the *Ta-T'ang-wei-tien-lu* chüan 5, the collation and the comparison of its textual errors were worked out by Yen Tsung too.

(8) Quoted from the biography of Yen Tsung himself. This biography can be found in chüan 4 of *Sung-kao-seng-chuan* (宋高僧傳), which was compiled by Tsan Ning (贊寧) of the Sung Dynasty.

THE PROBLEM OF THE TITLE OF THE *HOU-HUA-LU*

As we already learned above, the title of the T'ang monk Yen Tsung's writing related to painting is *Hou-hua-lu*. But, as Chang Yen-yüan himself indicated in one of his notes in the second section of the first chapter of his LTMHC, this book seemingly bore another title. Here is the text of Chang's note:⁽⁹⁾

"....The Emperor Wu of the Liang dynasty, Yao Tsui of the Ch'en dynasty, and Hsieh Ho (of the Southern Ch'i), the Sramana Yen Tsung of the Sui dynasty, and in the T'ang dynasty the present of the Censorate Li Sze-chen, the Corrector of Texts in the Department of the Imperial Library Liu Cheng, and the Drafter of Documents (in the Han Lin Academy) Ku K'uang, all wrote books with 'Critical Evaluations of Painters.'...."

The equivalent term of the English translation "Critical Evaluations of Painters" in Chinese is "Hua P'ing" (畫評). According to this quoted note of Chang Yen-yüan's, the book of the Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty, Yao Tsui (姚最), Hsieh Ho (謝赫), Li Sze-chen (李嗣真), and Liu Cheng (劉整), as well as Ku K'uang (顧況) and the monk Yen Tsung himself all were entitled *Hua-p'ing*. This statement could be initially interpreted thus, but most of the mentioned writers' works have their own titles—Yao Tsui's bears the title *Hsü-hua-p'in* (續畫品), Hsieh Ho's is called *Ku-hua-p'in-lu* (古畫品錄), and Li Sze-chen's small volume has *Hou-hua-p'in* (後畫品) as its title. All these titles must have been known to Chang Yen-yüan. However, instead of pointing out these titles one after the other, in his note, he only uses the so-called *Hua-p'ing* as the designation for all of them. This is actually a simplified way to speak of all of these different authors as a whole.

But in chüan 69 of Cheng Ch'iao's *T'ung-chih*, appeared three of the authors' names from Chang Yen-yüan just mentioned list of seven painting critics. Associated with their names were the titles of their writings; *Ku-hua-p'in-lu* of Hsieh Ho,⁽¹⁰⁾ *Hua-hou-p'in* (畫後品)⁽¹¹⁾ of Li Sze-chen. Curiously, Ku K'uang's writing is still called *Hua-p'ing*. According to

(9) Acker op. cit. p. 144.

(10) In *T'ung-chih*, this book is actually recorded as *Ku-chin-hua-p'in* (古今畫品), its author is Hsieh Ho. But this book has never been mentioned by any other record or painting texts. Most probably, this is an incorrect record of Hsieh Ho's *Ku-hua-p'in-lu*.

Chang Yen-yüan's list, Hsieh Ho, Li Sze-chen, and Ku K'uang's names appeared altogether. Again, according to our above assumption, *Hua-p'in* is assumed as the general name of all of those seven authors' works. But why when Hsieh's and Li's works were called by their individual titles, was Ku's writing really called *Hua-p'in*? This unusual nomenclature indicates that perhaps *Hua-p'in* is only a general term in Chang Yen-yüan's note. It is used to refer all of the seven authors' writings as a whole. But in Cheng Ch'iao's *T'ung-chih*, *Hu-p'in* is the individual title of Ku K'uang's writing, just as *Ku-hua-p'in-lu* and *Hsü-hua-p'in* are titles for Hsieh Ho's and Li Sze-chen's writings. It no longer implies any general idea, as is the case when it appears in the note in Chang Yen-yüan's book.

The following facts support this particular point. Chang Yen-yüan himself in Ku K'uang's biography⁽¹²⁾ recorded that Ku had written a *Hua-p'ing*. To combine this fact with the *T'ung Chih's* record as a whole, it is quite possible that *Hua-p'ing* is actually the real title of Ku K'uang's writing on painting. Thus, as a temporary conclusion, *Hua-p'ing* is the general term for several writings on the one hand, and also the real title of Ku K'uang's own writing on the other.

The second case could also be true of Yen Tsung's writing. In chüan 69 of the *T'ung-chih*, there is recorded a book entitled *Hua-p'in* (畫品). It consists of only one chüan, and its author is the monk Yao Pao (彦保). Most probably, the monk Yen Pao is the T'ang monk Yen Tsung. Because the character Pao and the character Tsung, generally speaking, are quite similar to each other in their written forms, especially when they are very cursively written, or when they are read carelessly, Tsung could very possibly be read as Pao. The two characters P'in and P'ing also are quite similar in their pronunciations. Thus, *Hua-p'ing* could very easily be recognized as *Hua-p'in* or vice versa. According to Chang Yen-yüan's note, when the book of Yen Tsung's writing on painting was copied, "mistakes and omissions have been made again and again," so 琖 may very easily have been misread as 驚. And again through the close pronunciations of P'in and P'ing, the correct character may also have been replaced by the other character. What Cheng Ch'iao had to go on the Sung Dynasty for his *T'ung-chih*, is nothing but just one of these badly transcribed late T'ang copies.

(12) See Chang Yen-yüan *LTMHC* chüan 10.

In chüan 9 of Chang Yen-yüan's LTMHC, under the biography of the artist Fan Ch'ang-shou, Chang has a passage⁽¹³⁾ which consists of four sentences quoted from the monk writer Yen Tsung. The first sentence of this quotation also has been quoted by Chu Ching-hsüan (朱景玄)⁽¹⁴⁾ in his well known writing *T'ang-ch'ao-ming-hua-lu* (唐朝名畫錄, The Famous Painters of the T'ang Dynasty). The most significant thing is that this sentence was associated with the original title of the work from which the quotation was taken. The title given is *Hsü-hua-p'in* (續畫品, The Supplementary Classification of Painters). The author of this quotation is just the monk Yen Tsung. Very possibly, this title *Hsü-hua-p'in* is really the original title of Yen Tsung's work related to painting. Two points confirm this point:

In the first place, Chu Ching-hsüan and Chang Yen-yüan are both painting critics of the late T'ang period. But the active period of Chu is some twenty years earlier than that of Chang.⁽¹⁵⁾ So, *Hsü-hua-p'in* these three characters mentioned in the text of Chu's writing, doubtlessly, are the first indication of the full title of Yen Tsung's writing that we have. From the historical point of view, this is really a valuable preservation. And the title in the text of Chu's book is more reliable than the other title mentioned first in Chang's text in the mid-9th century and then recorded by Cheng Ch'iao in the 11th century. Because the title of Yen Tsung's book mentioned in Chang's text only consists of two words, *Hua-p'ing*, but Chu preserved it as *Hsü-hua-p'in*. Very likely, *Hua-p'ing* is nothing but a paradoxical substitution of the last words *Hua-p'in* of the three-words title. This paradox happened perhaps by the confusion of the words "P'in" and "P'ing" which are so close in their pronunciation.

In the second place, the title preserved in Chu Ching-hsüan's text contains three characters. But the first character is missing from the title

(13) This is the full passage of Chang Yen-yüan's quotation:

"The monk Tsung said; (he is) erudite but over-burdened. However, he achieved elegance. Regarding his composition, he has no patience for arranging."

(14) A Soper, translated this sentence as "(his talent) was extensive and prolific." His full translation of the *T'ang-ch'ao MHL* of Chu Ching-hsüan can be seen in *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America* IV, 1950. pp. 5-29.

(15) Soper, *ibid.* p. 5. He also pointed out in his note No. 4 that F. Hirth in his *Scraps from a Collector's note Book*, Leiden, 1905, p. 105 makes the erroneous statement that Chu flourished around 1000 A. D.. A mistake identical to that of Hirth's, was made by H. Giles, who in his *An Introduction to the History of Chinese Pictorial Art*, London, 1915, p. 78 also acknowledged the 10th and 11th centuries as Chu's active period.

recorded by Chang Yen-yüan (the same thing also happened in Cheng Ch'iao's record). Chang Yen-yüan has only some twenty years later than the active period of Chu Ching-hsüan's. How can the last word of the title be incorrectly pronounced, and again, the first word of the title is missing? Is there really such a case that two mistakes have happened together about such a simple title within a short period of twenty years? Perhaps this question could be answered by some aspects that are found in the text of Chang himself. On the one hand, as Chang has criticized in his note, "the 'Critical Evaluation of Painters' of the monk Tsung.... is the most inaccurate of all. And in the transmission of the text by copying, mistakes and omissions have made again and again. So that his book is the least worth reading". The missing of the character 'Hsü' perhaps is one of the examples of the so-called 'omissions', and the paradoxical changing from *Hua-p'in* to *Hua-p'ing* is one of the so-called 'mistakes'. Although these two kinds of mistakes, according to Chang Yen-yüan, occur in the text of Yen Tsung's book, yet now, through the above analysis, certainly, they also occur in a place as simple as the book title which consisted of only three words originally.

On the other hand, when Chang compiled his LTMHC, his attitude to writing was "to search materials extensively."⁽¹⁶⁾ Unfortunately, the materials that he collected about the monk Yen Tsung's work were incorrect. Therefore, his erroneous information mislead him into dropping a word on the one hand, and using a wrong character on the other. If this is the case, obviously, the title that contains three words and is preserved in Chu Ching-hsüan's text is more reliable than the title which only consists of two characters, and is mentioned by Chang and recorded by Cheng Ch'iao.

From another point of view, the title *Hsü-hua-p'in* bears more literary meaning than either the abbreviated title *Hua-p'in* or *Hou-hua-lu*, the title of the present, collected work of Yen Tsung. The word "Hou" in the title *Hou-hua-lu*, are more or less close to each other in their meaning. However, they are not the same word, either in their written forms, or in their pronunciation. There should be no reason at all that Hsü can be replaced by "hou".

Historically, the title *Hsü-hua-p'in* looks much more meaningful than the other title of *Hou-hua-lu*. Because as far as our knowledge about the

(16) See Section II of Chapter I of Chang's LTMHC p. 146.

texts of painting is concerned, the word "P'in", classification, appears for the first time in Hsieh Ho's *Ku-hua-p'in-lu*. Thereafter, there are many critics who follow his practice of making the same type of work on the classification of painters of different dynasties. For instance, Yao Tsui of the Ch'en Dynasty, has a book associated with the title *Hsü-hua-p'in-lu*. Yen Tsung was active in the early T'ang. If his book is entitled *Hsü-hua-p'in*, certainly, it would correspond to the historical development of making such classifications.

The last painter, Lu Kao (陸杲), in Hsieh Ho's book is an artist of the Liang Dynasty. But Hsieh actually neglected many artists of either the Liang or the Southern Ch'i Dynasties. So, Yao Tsui made his supplementary list to Hsieh's, and this is why the title of Yao Tsui's book begins with the character "Hsü", namely, a supplementary. However, this supplementary list supplied by Yao Tsui is still incomplete, and again this is why Yen Tsung supplied his supplementary list. For instance, the earliest painter in Yen Tsung's *Hou-hua-lu* is Chou T'an-yen (周曇妍) of the Ch'i Dynasty. Logically, his name should have been supplied by Yao Tsui rather than Yen Tsung. But as a matter of fact, Yao Tsui did not include Chou T'an-yen in his *Hsü-hua-p'in-lu*. The name of the painter Chou, seemingly, was not recorded until Yen Tsung's work. Therefore, the list of painters given by Yen Tsung actually, is not only a supplement of Yao Tsui's incompleteness, but also to that of Hsieh Ho's. Based on the case of Yao Tsui's supplementary list being called *Hsü-hua-p'in-lu*, Yen Tsung's supplement, of course, also could use the same title, *Hsü-hua-p'in*: since his supplement as well as Yao Tsui's, was written in part to supplement the incompleteness of the *Ku-hua-p'in-lu* of Hsieh Ho. Through this analysis, in conclusion, the word "Hsü" in the title *Hsü-hua-p'in* becomes very much more meaningful than the other title *Hou-hua-lu*.

If *Hsü-hua-p'in* is truly the original title of Yen Tsung's writing on painting as above mentioned, naturally, the next step in our story would be the question of when the original title become separated from Yen Tsung's work, and of course, when the new title of *Hou-hua-lu* became associated with this writing. The answers to these questions are pretty difficult to pinpoint, yet, generally speaking, it can be assumed that both events happened between the late 9th century and the late 11th century. The literary evidence available to make this point is as follow:

At the very beginning of Kuo Jo-hsü's *T'u-hua-chien-wen-chih* (圖畫見聞誌, The Experiences of Paintings), there is a bibliography of earlier works of painting, listed rough chronological order. In his bibliography, is found the name of the Tang Yen Tsung, but instead of the *Hsü-hua-p'in*, this work on painting is recorded as *Hou-hua-lu*. Since Yen Tsung's work is entitled *Hsü-hua-p'in* in the *T'ang-ch'iao-ming-hua-lu* of Chu Ching-hsüan, enwhich was assumed written in the 840's,⁽¹⁷⁾ and the same book is entitled *Hou-hua-lu* in the *T'u-hua-chien-wen-chih* of Kuo Jo-hsü, which was assumed that presumably to have been written during the 1070's A.D.⁽¹⁸⁾ Thus, obviously, the loss of the original title and the introduction of the later new title for the T'ang monk Yen Tsung's writing on painting both took place between 840 and 1074. Or, less specifically, between the late 9th and the late 11th centuries.

(17) Soper, Ibid. p. 5.

(18) Also see Soper's translation of Kuo Jo-hsü's *T'u-hua-chien-wen-c-kih* or "*The Experiences on Painting*", "*Translators' preface*" p. ix, Washington, 1951.