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At the outset of the Dazhong xiangfu era (1008-1017), a monk called Juecheng from the Western Region came to lodge at Chuanfayuan of Xingguosi. Though he was still only about forty years old, he knew by heart forty-odd volumes of sūtras and sastras. Ding the Duke of Jin interviewed him and was delighted with his quickness of mind and intelligence. Later Juecheng composed a "Panegyric of Imperial Virtue" for His Majesty, which was an extremely rich example of classical style. His Majesty asked him what he desired [as a reward]; he said only that he sought a monk’s robe made of gold brocade to take back and place at the foot of the Diamond Throne [of the Buddha]. Accordingly, the Imperial Workshop was directed to make one as a present for him. Juecheng was a ksatriya from the land of Gulanzu, by his own account. He was a skilled painter, and once did a picture of Śākyamuni’s face on the north wall of Yitang, in a manner wholly different from our own paintings.

The above is an account of "Juecheng’s Painting" (Juecheng hua 覺稱畫) (Fig. 1), one of the thirty-two "Stories of Recent Times" (Jin shi 近事) told by Guo Ruoxu 郭若虚 (c. 1041-c. 1098) in his Record of Painters and Paintings Seen and Heard (Tubua jianwenzhi 標畫見聞志), the most important eleventh-century text on Chinese painting. These thirty-two stories represent Guo’s most original and most fascinating writing in the book. Each story, whether its length is long or short, reads as an individually-designed key to understanding an individual aspect of the practice of painting in China of the late tenth and eleventh centuries. It invites the reader to imagine, to investigate, and to reconstruct. For students of Chinese art, each story can be a case study; the results may vary, but the experience is always refreshing. The present study of the Indian Buddhist monk Juecheng is intended to explore in a small yet specific way the interrelation and interaction of some art-related things and some art-interested creatures in the given time of the early eleventh century.

At the time when Juecheng arrived in China, Buddhism was enjoying popular popularity thanks to the ardent imperial patronage initiated by the two Song dynastic founders, Taizu 太祖 (r. 960-976) and Taizong 太宗 (r. 976-997). For example, when Taizu came to the throne, he immediately lifted the ban on Buddhism placed in 955 by the Later Zhou ruler Shizong 後周世宗 (r. 954-959). Six years later the emperor dispatched a mission of 157 Chinese monks headed by Xingjin 行勤 to India in search for original Buddhist Sanskrit scriptures for translation. Starting in the 970s, partly encouraged by the Chinese emperors' enthusiasm, Indian monk scholars traveled to the Chinese capital in fair numbers, often bringing with them Buddhist relics and Sanskrit texts written on palm leaves. The reign of the third emperor Zhenzong 真宗 (r. 976-1022) (Fig. 2) has been regarded by historians as the apex of Song imperial patronage of Buddhism. Although from 1008 onward Zhenzong became deeply engaged in Daoist practices of auspicious omens, especially those related with the fabricated tianshu 天書 (Texts from Heaven), he still kept Taizong's 992 call for the final unification of the Three Great Teachings (Sanjiao 三教) of Confucianism, Daoism and Buddhism into the same Dao despite their different origins and approaches.

A more specific date for Juecheng’s arrival in the Chinese court—the ninth or tenth month of the third year of Dazhong xiangfu (1010)—can be confirmed by Song sources. Although that year does not seem to have had any particular significance in Chinese history, there is much about Juecheng’s story that is intriguing and exciting. The location was the Chuanfayuan 傳法院 (Dharma-transmission Cloister) of Xingguosi 興國寺 (Monastery for the Prosperity of the Nation) in the capital Bianjing. The leading characters were the Indian monk painter Juecheng (Bodhikirti?), the Chinese emperor Zhenzong and Ding the Duke of Jin. Why did Juecheng go to China? How was he able first to delight the learned and powerful Ding "with his quickness of mind and intelligence," and then to impress the emperor with his stylish writing of a "Panegyric of Imperial Virtue"? What role did the high court official play in the presence of visiting foreign monk artists? How was Juecheng’s painting related to Chinese Buddhist painting of the time? And above all, what does the story reveal about the world of Chinese court and Buddhist art in the early eleventh century?

THE LOCATION:
XINGGUOSI AND CHUANFAYUAN

Xingguosi is the short form for Taiping xingguosi 太平興國寺 (Monastery for the Peace and Prosperity of the Nation), one of the major Song imperial Buddhist monasteries located southwest of the Imperial Palace within the Inner City walls (Fig. 3). The monastery has an unusual history, as told by the
Hanlin Academician Yang Yi 杨亿 (974-1020, jinsi 992) (Fig. 4): Taiping xingguo was built on the site of the old Longxingsi (Monastery of the Dragon for Prosperity), which was abolished and turned into Longxingcang (Warehouse of the Dragon for Prosperity) by the Later Zhou ruler Shizong. At the beginning of the Song dynasty the then abbot made frequent petitions by beating the court drum to have the monastery restored. His Majesty [Taizu] was so annoyed that he sent a palace eunuch with the authority of the imperial sword to interrogate the abbot, with these remarks: “This monastery was already abolished by the previous court into a warehouse for army provisions. How dare you show such contempt of the present imperial court! Now I have been ordered by the court to have you beheaded!” His Majesty added, “If the abbot is scared and bravely clings to life, behead him immediately; if he is fearless in face of death, then let him live.” At the interrogation the abbot was calm and fearless, holding his head high to receive beheading. Having heard the eunuch’s report, His Majesty was so impressed and moved as to decide to have the monastery restored. The restoration was carried out by the government and [upon its completion] the monastery was of immense magnificence.12

The imperial status of Xingguo was further strengthened during Taizong’s reign by serving as a key site for various imperial events,13 in particular the activities at its Yijingyuan 聖經院 (Sūtra-translating Cloister). The construction of Yijingyuan under Taizong’s auspices started in 980 in support of and to provide accommodation for a monumental translation project by three Indian monk scholars, Dharmabhadra or Faxian 法賢 (also known as Tianxizai 天息灾, d. 1000), Dānāpāla or Shihú 施护 (d. 1018) and Dharmadeva or Fatian 法天 (d. 1001), all of whom knew the Chinese language.14 When the cloister was completed two years later under the supervision of a senior palace eunuch (neishi 内侍) named Zheng Shoujun 鄭守釧, it consisted of the main hall Yijingtang 聖經堂 (or its abbreviation Yitang 譯堂, Hall of Sūtra-translation), the east-wing Runwengang 潤文堂 (Hall of Polishing the Style) and the west-wing Zhengyitang 正義堂 (Hall of Verification of Meaning). In 981 Taizong granted to Yijingyuan a plaque with the two characters Chuan fa 傳法 ( Transmitting the Dharma), written from his imperial hand. This imperial favor instantly changed the name of the cloister to Chuanfangyuan.15

The same year of 981 saw the completion of the monumental set of 130,000 woodblocks in Chengdu and their shipment to the capital for printing the famous first Song edition of the Buddhist Tripitaka Kaibao 僧寶 using a new agency, Yijingyuan 印經院 (Sūtra-printing House), was built close to Yijingyuan.16 Accordingly, another new agency, Yijingyuan 印经院 (Sūtra-printing House), was built close to Yijingyuan.16 A Chinese staff composed of court officials and of monks versed in Sanskrit was assigned to assist in the translation project and the initial team included the high court official Zhang Ji 張洎 (933-996) as text editor (runwenguan 潤文官).17 On the twenty-third day of the tenth month in the third year of Yongxi (27 November 986) Taizong personally wrote a preface to the first compilation of the translated sūtras in ninety-seven jian 卷 completed by Faxian, Fatian, Shihú, and Zhang Jì from 982 to 986, known as Xinyi Sansang shengjiao xu 新般三藏聖教序 [Preface to the Newly Translated Sacred Teaching of the Tripitaka].18 It is clear that by the early eleventh century when Ju-cheng lodged at Chuanfangyuan, the cloister had already become a highly organized Buddhist institution under generous imperial patronage with a ritualized complete production line of translation, editing and polishing, verification, and publication.20

DING THE DUKE OF JIN

Some time during Ju-cheng’s lodging at Chuanfangyuan, he was given an interview by Ding the Duke of Jin. The duke, whose full name was Ding Wei 丁謂, 21 Weibhi 謝之, was a native of Changzhou, Suzhou 蘇州長洲 (modern Wuxi, Jiangsu 江蘇省).22 Ding was a child prodigy. At three sui 歲, he could recite scores of ancient classical poems; by six or seven, Ding was already well versed in the abstruse Buddhist scripture Huayan jing 華嚴經 (Avatamsaka-sūtra) — a gift and passion he had with him through the end of his life. The meeting with Wang Yucheng 王禹偁 (954-1001, jinsi 985) in 991 was Ding’s first important step toward his ambition. Wang was not only a leading figure in the early Song gwen 古文 movement but also an enjoying enormous imperial favour from Taizong at that time.23 Wang was so impressed by Ding’s literary talent that he wrote of Ding as a rising “giant Confucian scholar” (jieru 巨儒) whose prose can be likened to Han Yu 韓愈 (768-824) and Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (772-819) and whose poetry likened to Du Fu (712-770).24 Wang’s enthusiasm and support seemed to have helped Ding win distinction in his jinshi examinations the following year. Afterwards, Ding’s official career was on a steadily fast track, rising from a regional official to the nobility. Below are some of the highlights of his career:

- 995, thirty sui, Fuzhou fiscal commissioner (zhuanyaoshi 福州轉運使, rank 6b).
- 999, thirty-four sui, vice director of the Headquarters Bureau in the Ministry of Works (gongbu yuanwailang 功部員外郎, rank 6b).
- 1006, forty-one sui, acting state finance commissioner (quan sanshi shi 欽司三使) and commissioner for the construction of the Daoist Temple of Jade Purity (xian Yuqiongsheng shi 修玉清宫使).
- 1009, forty-four sui, state finance commissioner (sanshi shi 三司使, rank 4a) with the imperially granted prestige of wearing a purple-gold fish-shaped pouch.
- 1012, forty-seven sui, vice minister of revenue (hubu shilang 戶部侍郎, rank 3b).
- 1016, fifty-one sui, minister of justice (xingbu shangshu 刑部尚書, rank 2b).
INTERVIEW I: JUECHENG AND DING WEI

According to Guo Ruoxu, Juecheng was from the Western Region. Although Juecheng’s native country Gulanzuo remains unidentified, other Song sources point to Central India (Zhong Tzialhlu 中天竺). Juecheng claimed himself to be a ksatriya (Shadilishi 削帝利氏) which defined him as a member of the royal or warrior lineage in the caste system of traditional India. It is worth noting that many of the Indian monks who came to Northern Song China were of the ksatriya caste, including Fatian, Faxian and Shihu. The official history of the Song dynasty has an interesting record, which reads:

According to the customs of India, when a king dies, the crown prince will succeed to the throne; afterwards all other princes will have to make their vows to become monks and will not be allowed to stay in their native lands.

This seems to offer some explanation for both the relatively large number of ksatriya monks arriving in China and their impressive learning and knowledge as able scholars and translators of Buddhist texts.

Ding’s lifelong interest in Buddhism went far beyond Huayanjing of his childhood. On the fourteenth day of the ninth month in the fifth month of Tianxi (22 October 1021) the then grand councilor Ding submitted to Zhenzong a 30-juan anthology of selected Buddhist scriptures he had annotated, for which he was rewarded generously. Less than two months later (12 December 1021) he was appointed sūtra-translation commissioner and text-editor by request of the eminent Indian monk translator Dharmapala or Fahu 法護 (d. 1058). As a rising star official of multiple talents in the early eleventh-century Chinese court, Ding Wei had ample experience of receiving foreign monk scholars. For example, in the third year of Jinde (1006), Ding Wei met with the Japanese Tiantai monk pilgrim Jakusho 寂照 (957-1034). Thus, when Ding Wei interviewed Juecheng in 1010, the two were well matched. Both were in their forties. Both were well learned; Juecheng “knew by heart forty-odd volumes of sūtras and sastras,” whereas Ding had a photographic memory and was able to recite a text of several thousand words after a single reading. Guo Ruoxu’s account of the meeting has only one brief sentence: Ding “was delighted with Juecheng’s quickness of mind and intelligence.” Ding’s delight may have come partly from the fact that he himself was well known for his intelligence and wit.

INTERVIEW II: JUECHENG AND YANG YI

Yang Yi was a close junior associate of Ding’s. Despite the age gap of eleven sui, the two were alike in more than one way. Yang was also a literary prodigy, only even better recognized for his tongzi 童子 degree granted by Taizong in 984 when he was just eleven. Yang and Ding attained their jinshi degrees in the same year of 992 (Ding was thirty sui and Yang only nineteen). Both were leading figures of the Xikun 西崑 poetry society, and both were appointed court officials for sūtra-translation at Chuanfayan (Ding was commissioner and Yang editor). Yang’s interview with Juecheng is not mentioned by Guo Ruoxu but recorded by himself under the title “Monk Juecheng from the Western Region” (Xiyou seng Juecheng 西域僧覺稱) (Fig. 5):

Ding the Duke of Jin interviewed [Juecheng] and was so delighted with his quickness of mind and intelligence that he immediately had him escorted to my place, together with an interpreter. I welcomed him with tea and fruits. Then I asked him questions. He answered through an interpreter: “When I arrived at this country, I found pigs and sheep being slaughtered and their meat hung in the markets for sale. It was a painful scene to see, which only tells how cruel-hearted the people are here. Throughout the whole of my Western lands, no one ever eats meat.” When I asked him if he would like to stay long in this land of China, Juecheng said: “I only wish to make a pilgrimage to Mt. Wutai and will return home after paying my homage to Bodhisattva Manjusri.” So clearly he missed his homeland and did not like to stay longer. Then Juecheng asked for a piece of paper and a bamboo brush and wrote several dozen words horizontally in Sankrit. I asked the reverend Jing to translate them, as follows:

I prostrate myself [before the Buddha] to defeat the powers of all evils:
I am a man of wisdom and my name is Juecheng;
I have been a monk practicing meditation for nineteen monastic years,
And I can expound the meanings of millions of Gathas.
The above account sheds light on two more interesting aspects of the interview. First, the Chinese court officials communicated with Juecheng through a monk interpreter named Jing or Weijing 惟淨 (973-1051), the chief Chinese translator at Chuanfayan. Second, the purpose of Juecheng's visit to China was not to participate in the sutra-translation at Chuanfayan, unlike Fatian, Faxian or Shihu before him, but as a pilgrim to pay a visit to Mahāsthāma on Mt. Wutai, that is to say, more like the noted Japanese monk pilgrims Chōnen 奈然 (938-1010) or Jakusho in their respective visits to early Song China in 984 or 1006.  

Xingguosi was a favorite lodging place for visiting foreign monks, and an imperial edict issued in 1006 specified: “If there are Indian monks who are well versed in Sanskrit and helpful in sutra-translation, all of them are ordered hereby to have their accommodations at Chuanfayan.” Juecheng's accommodation at Chuanfayan have followed the 1006 imperial edict. After all, he was an Indian monk well versed in Sanskrit. Another interesting note on Juecheng's natural disgust at witnessing the slaughter of pigs and sheep in the Chinese markets: in the second month of 1010, only seven months before Juecheng's arrival in the Chinese court, Ding Wei had petitioned to ban physical punishments and the slaughter of animals on the emperor's birthday, Chengqianji 承天節 (Day of Receiving Heaven's Mandate), a request which was granted by Zhenzong. This small episode, however incidental it might be, helps to tell more about the Chinese court official's delight in meeting with the Indian monk scholar. It was most likely through the recommendation of Ding Wei as well as Yang Yi that Zhenzong granted an audience with Juecheng.

THE IMPERIAL AUDIENCE: JUECHENG AND ZHENZONG

There was another important factor for Juecheng to receive the imperial audience: his own literary writing. His confident self introduction in four lines has been cited above. As recorded by Yang Yi and followed in exactly the same words by Guo Rouxu (see Figs. 5 and 1), Juecheng had another and more important piece of writing, “Shengdesong 圣德颂 (Panegyric of Imperial Virtue)” for His Majesty, which was an extremely rich example of classical style. "Shengdesong was an archaic literary form that probably originated in the Han dynasty and that became increasingly popular from the Tang to the Northern Song. For example, after Taiizong ascended the throne in 977, Diao Kan 刁衎 (945-1013), who had lost his office as grand supplicator (taizhu 太祝) at the Court of Imperial Sacrifices (Taihangsi 太常寺) earlier due to his long-term sick leave, composed a Shengdesong for the new emperor. Taiizong was so pleased as to restore Diao to his former office. The most famous piece of Shengdesong in the Northern Song court was composed by the Confucian scholar Shi Jie 石介 (1005-1045, jinshi 1030) for Emperor Renzong (r. 1022-1063) on the twenty-first day of the third month in the third year of Qingli (2 May 1045), thus known as Qingli Shengdesong 慶歷聖德頌. Thanks to its instant fame and wide circulation ever since its appearance, this masterpiece of literature has survived in its full text: 240 lines of four characters or syllables (sijuan 四言) each in an archaic style that can be traced back to the time of Shijing 詩經 (Book of Songs, before 600 BCE). Here is a taste of its flavor. The panegyric begins with a description of the time of dawn when Renzong, riding on his dragon carriage, is slowly coming out through the gates of the Inner Court to meet his high officials; then it describes Renzong's mandate from Heaven:

大聲洪洪
震搖六合
如乾之動
如雷之發
His voice is so loud and powerful
It shakes high and low in all directions,
Like the motion of Heaven,
Like the roaring of Thunder.

After a lengthy and elaborate narration of Renzong's wisdom and benevolence as ruler for twenty-two years, the panegyric ends with this formulaic couplet:

臣願陛下
壽萬千年
Your humble servant wishes His Majesty
Longevity of ten thousand years!

Juecheng wrote his Shengdesong in Sanskrit. After it was presented to Zhenzong (most likely by Ding Wei on Juecheng's behalf), an imperial order was issued and immediately delivered to Chuanfayan by Ding Wei to have the Sanskrit writing translated by Weijing. Juecheng's Shengdesong must have been regarded as an important document since Weijing's translated text was collected into the 1018 Dazhong xiangju fabao lu 大中祥符寶錄 [Imperial Catalogue of the Dharma Jewel Compiled in the Dazhongxiangju Era] by Zhao Anren 趙安仁 (958-1018, jinshi 983) and Yang Yi under Zhenzong's auspices. It is a long text of 904 characters (Fig. 6), which starts by establishing Zhenzong's royal Buddhist lineage:

世間王中我王勝
Of all the world's sovereigns, Your Majesty is the most powerful,

最上自在無等倫
And enjoy the greatest freedom beyond any comparison;

第一佛子極尊高
As the Buddha's First Disciple with the utmost esteem and dignity,

文殊種中出目前
[Your Majesty] come from the royal lineage of Mañjuśrī.

Juecheng moves on to address the permanence of Zhenzong's emporship:

彼須彌山不可壞
Like the mountain of Meru that cannot be destroyed,

大海中水不可竭
Like the waters of the ocean that cannot be dried,

日月光明無可窮
Like the radiance of the sun and moon that cannot be exhausted,

願王同彼常住世
May Your Majesty live eternally in this world!
The greatness of the Chinese emperor is further commended through a set of powerful allegories:

如日雖有光明照
As for the sun, although it shines brightly,
不能冬時使華開
In winter time it cannot make flowers blossom;
我王功德實光明
Your Majesty's virtues accumulate so much energy of brightness,
常能普照勝過日
They can illuminate all things all time, thus surpassing the sun.
如月十五當盛滿
As for the moon, only when it grows full on the fifteenth day,
即有圓光能照明
Its disk can become bright enough to illuminate;
我王善法利合生
Your Majesty utilizes the Dharma to benefit all creatures,
常能月滿勝過月
Like an ever-illuminating disk, thus surpassing the moon.
如雲致雨功難具
As for clouds, although they are ready to bring rain,
安能非時使雨施
They cannot make rain fall any time, can they?
我王法雨潤無窮
Your Majesty's Dharma Rain falls timely all the time
常能普潤雲無比
To moisten all things all time, thus better than clouds.

Then, Zhenzong is given promise of buddhahood:

願王壽命一劫中
May Your Majesty live as long as a Kalpa
後當不久速成佛
Afterwards on a fast path to become a Buddha.

Juecheng calls himself "Your humble servant" to the Chinese emperor:

臣子覺稱雖讚嘆
However your humble servant Juecheng expresses his admiration,
王德無邊無有窮
Your Majesty's virtues are greater beyond any limit or boundary.

Finally and toward the end of the panegyric Juecheng emphasizes his sincerity and expresses his eagerness for an imperial audience:

覺稱今時無所欲
Juecheng presently has no worldly desires,
不求財富及資緣
Not for money or wealth, nor for alms or donations.
一切皆忘希取心
The impurity of the mind has been abandoned totally.
但發至誠伸讚歎
Paeans are sung out of my utmost sincerity.
然有一事深所樂
Yet, there is one thing to delight me deeply,

To be able to see Your Majesty's august visage.

Four lines skipped here

I am longing to be present in the front of Your Majesty.

And wish to be granted an imperial audience.

The panegyric ends with the date of "the fourth day of the eleventh month" (13 December 1010), written one month or so after Juecheng's arrival in the Chinese court. The above few passages, only about one fourth in length of the original text, are sufficient enough to tell why Ding Wei was impressed by Juecheng's writing and called it "an extremely rich example of classical style."

Zhenzong was obviously very pleased as he granted Juecheng the requested audience, in which Weijing once more seems to have been the interpreter. By the end of the audience Zhenzong granted two more requests from Juecheng: a monk's robe made of gold brocade from the Imperial Workshop to take back to India for the Diamond Throne of the Buddha and the imperial permit to visit Mt. Wutai on a pilgrimage to pay homage to Manjusri. In this light, Juecheng's two pieces of writing are actually two parts of the same: his four-line self-introduction written during his interviews with Ding Wei and Yang Yi was actually a cover letter for his Shengdezong in order, first, to have their recommendations for an imperial audience with Zhenzong and then to make his two requests during the audience. He certainly succeeded in both.

JEUCHENG THE MONK PAINTER

Juecheng was a monk painter. Monk painters from India had already been present in the Chinese court of the early sixth century and the most famous of them was Jiaotuo (Buddhabhadra?), according to the art critic Yao Zui (537-603). A Chinese text dated 696 records six painted scrolls of foreign and Buddhist subjects by Jiaotuo in a private collection and by the mid-ninth century Jiaotuo's painting of a certain Shen (deity or guardian king) could still be seen on the temple doors of Shaolinsi (Shaolin Temple) at Songshan (Mount嵩山). Probably as a token of his gratitude for the imperial favor and hospitality he received during his stay there. Monk painters from India continued to make their presence in the Chinese court during the Sui and the early Tang, including Tanmo (Dar Mochi) and Jingang (Sanzang) 金刚三藏, although records of their artistic activities remain scanty and none of their paintings have survived.

Juecheng's activities in early eleventh-century China are intriguing, for despite the large number of Buddhist monks from India arriving in the early Northern Song court, few of them were painters. In fact, Juecheng seems to have been the only one recorded in the surviving Song sources. There is,
however, no mention of any of the circumstances under which Juecheng painted the Buddha icon at Chuanfayuan. Possibly it was at the request of a senior translation monk or official, or on his own initiative as a token of gratitude for the hospitality he had received during his stay. We can never know for sure. Based on his choice of a Buddha icon as his subject, mural as his medium, and Chuanfayuan as his location, what can be inferred is that Juecheng was a specialist in Buddhist icons, skilled in painting murals, and confident in working in a public space.

Juecheng might well have been the author of another recorded painting. Among the gifts Juecheng brought from India to the Chinese emperor was a jingangzuo zhenrong 金刚座真容 or literally “a portrait of the Diamond Throne.” The so-called jingangzuo 金刚座 refers to the Vajrasana Buddha, a well-established Buddhist iconography in India long before the eleventh century that depicts the historical Buddha Sakyamuni with his right hand in the earth-touching gesture (bhūmisparsa mudrā), calling the earth to bear witness to the moment of his attainment of enlightenment, as seen in some ninth-century stone sculptures of the Pala period. In other words, jingangzuo is a visual synecdoche by which the Diamond Throne is put for the Vajrasana Buddha. As well recorded first by Yang Yi and then by Guo Ruoxu, there was another jingangzuo in Juecheng’s life, the one for which he requested Zhenzong to have a kasaya of gold brocade made. Could the two jingangzuos be actually the same Diamond Throne or Vajrasana Buddha? Most likely so. In this interpretation, Juecheng brought the portrait of the same Vajrasana Buddha, painted by himself as a votive or devotional painting, to the Chinese emperor to see, thus making his kasaya request to the Chinese emperor so powerful as believable and persuasive. If this was the case, we have come to learn something more about Juecheng: not only he also painted portable Buddhist icons, but also his trip to China was thoroughly prepared.

How did Juecheng’s Buddhist painting differ from Chinese Buddhist painting of the eleventh century? Murals from the Ajanta caves datable to the late fifth and early sixth century are the earliest surviving Buddhist paintings in India, including this Seated Buddha (Fig. 7) on the rear wall of Cave 2. The intense color scheme, the heavy shading and modeling, the play of light and shadow, the contrast between the Buddha’s voluminous naked body—including his hands and feet—and the simple and flat abstraction of his monk’s robe; and the emphasis on the solemnity of the iconic face, all have been considered characteristic of Indian Buddhist painting. Juecheng’s painting at Yiitang may have borne some traces of this classical style in the light of Juecheng’s obvious theological conservatism or orthodoxy as exhibited in his disgust at butchering of pigs and sheep in the Chinese markets.

That Juecheng was the only known Indian monk painter visiting early eleventh-century China does not mean that other Indian Buddhist paintings were not present in the Northern Song court. For example, in the eleventh month of the fourth year of Chunjua (993) “a picture of the Bodhi tree drawn on white cotton cloth (哈跌白幡)” was among the many gifts presented to Taizong by the Indian monk Juexi 覺喜 (Bodhisnandi). Guo Ruoxu also mentions an instance as the first of his two annotations to Yang Yi’s account of Juecheng’s painting:

Of old, an Indian monk brought across with him a white cotton cloth with an image on it that also was not the same as [our] usual iconography; presumably following what they call “likeness to the truth” in the West. 

It is not clear if this Indian monk of the old past was Juexi of 993 or if the image depicted a Bodhi tree.

DAI KUI AND NEW IMAGES OF CHINESE BUDDHIST ART

Guo Ruoxu’s other annotation is even more stimulating:

[Our] present facial type [of the Buddha images] had its origin in the Indian figures carved and fashioned by Dai Kui of the Jin to make them look respectable to the Chinese viewers, but it has undergone quite a few changes with the passage of time.

Dai Kui 蕃术 (c. 347-c. 396) may not be known to many students of Chinese art today because none of his works survive and there is relatively little modern scholarship on him. Historically, the fourth-century Chinese artist and the eleventh-century Indian monk painter have nothing to do with each other; art historically, the two are related in terms of the stylistic and iconographical development of Buddhist art across time and space. To understand what new Buddhist imagery or style Dai created and how it is related to Juecheng’s painting, it is necessary and proper to take a brief look at Dai’s life and art.

Dai Kui was a child prodigy and eminent figure in the Six Dynasties with rare accomplishments as scholar recluse, musician, calligrapher, painter and sculptor. His repeated declinations of and escapes from Emperor Xiaowu’s (孝武帝 c. 373-396) repeated summons for high court office made him the most famous zhengbi 徽士 (scholars solicited by the emperor) of his time. In his teens Dai Kui had already established his fame as painter of murals in the newly-completed imperial Buddhist monastery Waguansi 瓦官寺 in 364. Among Dai Kui’s well-known paintings was The Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove (Zhulin qixian 竹林七賢) which, in Gu Kaizhi’s (c. 345-c. 406) view, surpassed all previous paintings of the subject; in particular Gu praised Dai’s portrayal of Ji Kang 秋康 (223-262) as the best of all. Gu himself also painted the Seven Sages, possibly inspired or influenced by Dai’s work. Today students of Chinese art can still get a sense, however vague it may be, of Dai’s painting of the Seven Sages in a late fourth-century tomb molded–brick relief from
Xishanqiao, Nanjing, depicting the celebrated theme of the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove and Rong Qiqi (Zhulin qixian yu Rong Qiqi 竹林七賢與榮期) (Fig. 8), which was made from an earlier and well established yang 粉 拓 of the subject. Dai’s painting was praised by the influential Six Dynasties art critic and theorist Xie He 謝赫 (c. 457-c. 532) as being “rich in human emotions and expressiveness” (qingyun lianmian 情韻連繩), as “the model for all artistic crafts” (baisong shufan 百工所范), and as “the true leading master after Xun [Xun] and Wei [Xie]” (Xun Wei zhishou shiwei lingxiang 菅 功爾衛爾之後，實為領袖).74

Dai Kui’s fame in and contribution to Chinese art history was his leading role in transforming the import Buddhism images in both painting and sculpture into a new sinitized Buddhism imagery that was required, in Guo Rouxu’s words, to “look respectable to the [Chinese] viewers.” Guo’s main source may have come from the early Tang monk scholar Daoshan’s 道宣 (596-667) account of how a new sixteen-foot wooden statue of Amitayus Buddha for the monastery Lingbaosi 靈寶寺 in Kaiyuan temple, 会稽山 (in modern Zhejiang) was created by the artist:

[ detachment; 畢之古製像, 略皆朴拙。至於開闊, 不足動心。素有簡信, 又甚巧思, 方欲改觀威容, 庶參真極。注應經年乃成成遂。東夏制像之妙, 未之有如上之像也。]

In [Dai] Kui’s opinion, the images of the Buddha made in Middle Antiquity had almost all been crude and over-simple, and in their function of inspiring vision lacked the power to stir the viewer’s heart. Since he was both pure in faith and highly innovative, he was spurred to carve a new image of dignity and majesty, so as to attain the utmost in truthfulness. He pondered the problem for years on end and finally succeeded in producing a statue that represented the wonder of China’s Buddhism image-making more than anything previously known.75

As sculptor, Dai Kui was best known for his set of five Buddha statues made for Wuguansi.76 According to Zhang Yanyuan, a painting of Mañjuśrī by Dai Kui for an unidentified monastery and Gu Kaizhi’s painting of Vimalakirti for Wuguansi were saved from Emperor Wuzong’s 武宗 (r. 841-846) persecution of Buddhism in 845 by the grand councilor Li Deyu 李德裕 (787-850) and placed together on the same outside west wall of the main hall of the monastery Ganlusi 甘露寺, which was built by Li when he served as surveillance commissioner (guanchashi 觀察使) in Zhexi 浙西 (present-day Zhenjiang 長江) back in the 820s and, thanks to Li’s power as grand councilor, was exempt from demolition in 845.77 Some scholars have interpreted Zhang’s above record of the pairing of the Gu-Dai paintings as the plausible iconographical and stylistic models for the depiction of the famous Vimalakirti – Mañjuśrī debate from the Vimalakirtinirdeśa Sūtra on the top register of a pair of early sixth-century Northern Wei stone relief panels in the Binyan Cave 3, Longmen 龍門 near Luoyang 洛陽.78

Although further archaeological evidence is still needed to identify any specific traces of Dai Kui’s style in surviving early Buddhist sculptures or paintings, there are examples resulting from the kind of sinitization credited to him. For instance, this standing Buddha statue of 537 (Fig. 9a) from Wanfosi 万佛寺 (Monastery of the Ten Thousand Buddhas) in Chengdu belongs to the sinitized new Buddhism iconography that departs drastically from the “crude and over-simple” type directly after the Gupta (320-647) Indian model—like this one of 529 also from Wanfosi (Fig. 9b)—not only in that the Chinese-style long robe is marked with a large ornate sash in the center decorated with meticulously carved brocadal and floral designs and the sweeping linear patterns create a rhythmic flowing movement, but also in that the figure’s chest becomes flat and the body disappears underneath the robe.79 It looks as though the monk’s robe of the Indian Buddha is replaced by an elaborate Chinese court robe in the guan bodai 簡衣博帶 fashion80 to lend dignity and royal status to the image, thus making it, in Guo Rouxu’s words, “look respectable.”

The eccentric scholar-official art critic and collector Mi Fu 密斯 (1052-1107) informs us a bit more of this new sinitized Buddhist image by describing a Guanyin icon by Dai Kui in his own collection as having “the dignified and serene appearance of a celestially handsome man” (tiannian duanming 天男端静).81 A quick comparison of the late seventh-century Buddha Preaching the Law (Fig. 10) and the Ajanta Seated Buddha (see Fig. 7) shows how much Chinese Buddhist art had developed. The two share a closely similar iconography for the preaching Buddha, both seated in a lotus position with the hands in the vitarka-mudrā. However, their style differs. As Roderick Whitfield points out, “the system of colour shading and highlighting seems to derive from Central Asia, but once more it is the continuous ink line, seen in its most eloquent in the heads of the monk disciples surrounding the Buddha, that is the decisive element in determining the Chinese origin and early Tang date for this painting.”82 By the tenth and eleventh centuries Chinese Buddhist art had been so sinitized with strong emphasis on the play and display of lines and linear patterns, as seen in this mural fragment of T'ou Bodhisattvas Preparing Incense (Fig. 11) (Nelson-Atkins Museum), that no wonder Guo Rouxu concludes that Juecheng’s painting of the Buddha at Chuansiyuan was “in a manner wholly different from our own paintings.”

CONCLUSION

Juecheng’s visit to China in 1010 was not a momentous historical event, but like one of myriad fallen leaves in the late autumn landscape of North China, Juecheng’s presence in the Chinese court was transient, unlike some later foreign monk painters in China such as the Nepali Buddhist Anige (1245-1306) or the Italian Jesuit Giuseppe Castiglione (better known by his Chinese name Lang Shining 郎世寧, 1688-1766).83 Nev-
ertheless, Juecheng's story tells us much about that particular historical time and location. Foreign Buddhist monks—many of whom were scholars or persons with specialized skills—made preparations prior to their arrivals in China. Knowledge of China and Chinese culture and customs, proficiency in the Chinese language and literary style (or, failing this, access to a qualified and highly-regarded interpreter or translator), and other specialized talents such as painting were desirable. Diplomatic gifts of precious value such as Sanskrit texts, relics of the Buddha, Buddhist images of painting and sculpture to the Chinese emperor were appropriate. Juecheng's 1010 panegyric to Zhenzong, written on the fourth day of the eleventh month (12 December), reveals how eager he was to obtain an audience from the Chinese emperor. The imperial audience not only guaranteed the return of generous favors from the Chinese emperor such as appointments, honorific titles and purple robes, and permits to visit Mt. Wutain and other sacred sites, but also served as the key to other successes in China. It is incredible to see that virtually no Indian monk had missed this unwritten routine.44

Thanks to continuing imperial patronage, Chuanfayuan of Xingguozi played a prominent role in the integration of Buddhism in early Song China for a full century from its establishment in 982.55 It was an imperial institution. For visiting Indian monks, no location was more important than Chuanfayuan as both lodging and workplace. It was the center not only for Indian monks in China but also for Indian monks and their Chinese counterparts to work together, especially with the imperial appointments of the some of the highest court officials in charge of translation activities. Acquaintance, recognition and recommendation from these Chinese high officials were of great importance for the well being of the Indian monks. Interviews such as those given to Juecheng by Ding Wei and Yang Yi were valuable opportunities for Indian monks to impress Chinese officials with their learning and talents and for Chinese officials to learn from them and make their acquaintances. Juecheng's Shengdesong was translated into the Chinese classical seven-syllable (gisean 七言) poetic format by Weijin before it could be read by Ding Wei and Zhenzong. The complicated issue of quality in Song translation of Sanskrit texts would become clearer if Juecheng's original Sanskrit text had survived.66 Despite several major crises,77 Chuanfayuan and its host monastery Xingguozi were further elevated during the later decades of the eleventh century to become a key location of the new imperial cult.88 In addition, the close interactions between Confucian scholar officials, like Ding Wei and Yang Yi, and foreign and Chinese Buddhist monk scholars, like Juecheng and Weijin, took place in the early eleventh century intellectual milieu with continuing court debates on the position of Buddhism in the early Song Confucian revival of wen 文 (culture), exemplified by the advocacy and relationship of Wang Yucheng and Zanning 贊寧 (919-1001), the monk scholar and leading Buddhist official at the Taizong court.89 Indeed, Buddhism in Song China distin-

guished itself no longer as a dynamic religion but as an influential philosophy. One prominent characteristic of this process was institutionalization and Chuanfayuan was such an illustrative case.90 The close of Chuanfayuan in 1082 marked the end of the large-scale court sponsorship of Buddhist translation in Song China which in turn, in Jan Yun-hua's words, "was the conclusion of Indian Buddhist expansion to East Asia."91

Guo’s close ties to the early Song imperial house made him an insider in the eleventh-century Chinese court.92 The investigation of "Juecheng's Painting" also excites our attention to Ding Wei the Duke of Jin. Ding’s exceptional talents included every accomplishment expected of a high-profile scholar-official in the early eleventh-century Chinese court, ranging from politics, economics, finance and building construction to music, chess, poetry, calligraphy and painting, not to mention knowledge and learning of Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism. He was, as Guo tells us, one of the three most eminent collectors of rare books, calligraphy and painting in the early Northern Song.93 Ding was the most controversial and thus the best known of the three dukes ennobled by Zhenzong in the second month of 1022 only two weeks before the emperor’s death. Only five months later he was banished to the remote Yazhou 咸州 (modern Hainan, Hainan) by Zhenzong’s widow the empress dowager and regent Liu 劉皇后 (969-1033, r. 1022-1033) for conspiracy charges.94 When his house was confiscated, more than ninety scrolls of the hard-to-find wintry landscape paintings by the celebrated Li Cheng 李成 (919–967) and other paintings of like quality were found in his collection.95 Ding Wei spent his next and last fifteen years of life in exile during which he created some of the best literary writings not only of his life but also of his time.96 His peaceful death in 1037 accompanied with his silent recitation of Buddhist sutras and by way of the Daoist metamorphosis already made him into a legend in the literary imagination of the late eleventh century.97 In addition to "Juecheng’s Painting," Guo Ruoxu dedicates two more "stories of the recent times" to Ding Wei, which seems to have made Ding an arbiter of taste and the most eminent and active scholar official participant in the world of early Northern Song court art.98 In short, Ding Wei deserves a separate study.

Juecheng’s painting of a Buddha image at Chuanfayuan offers Guo Ruoxu a chance to discuss China’s assimilation of the imported Indian Buddhist iconography in connection with the celebrated scholar artist Dai Kui. Dai’s fame in the Six Dynasties-Tang period came from both his multiple artistic talents and, more importantly, his zhengshi elite status. However, the eleventh century, if not earlier, saw the gradual disappearance of Dai Kui’s popularity and by the turn of the twelfth century he lost his public spotlight almost completely except for a few sources. The most telling evidence for such loss of popularity is revealed in a simple comparison: Dai Kui is given a long biographical account with eighteen painting titles listed under his name by Zhang Yanyuan, together with the names of Gu Kaizhi and Lu Tanwei; but he is totally excluded in the
1120 imperial painting catalogue Xuabe huapu 宣和畫譜, while Gu and Lu as well as other Six Dynasties artists remain listed.  The low status of sculpture in the hierarchy of traditional Chinese art and society was part of the reason but there were other art historical factors.

From the second half of the eleventh century to the early twelfth, imperial patronage, the single most important source of art patronage in Song society, seemed to be slowly and steadily shifting away from Buddhism to Neo-Confucianism in ideology and propaganda, from large-scale wall paintings to portable scrolls in format, from old-established narratives to newly-experimented subjects in content, and from illustrating the past to expressing the present in approach. Moreover, the increasingly active participation of a new generation of scholar officials as amateur artists and critics, who climbed their bureaucratic ladders mostly through the civil service examination system and were versed in poetry as self-expression, would have made the fourth-century Buddhist painter and sculptor Dai Kui look really out of date despite his celebrated zhengbi status. Although these tentative clues are all too vague for this short study, they might suggest some helpful hints to the reason why Guo Ruoxu wanted to mention Dai Kui in the time when the artist had already lost popularity. In any event, it is worth exploring why and how Dai Kui, who enjoyed so much fame in his time and was so highly hailed by Xie He, would go into oblivion in the later history of Chinese art and, more intriguingly, why Guo Ruoxu attempts to excite a fresh interest in the artist by recalling his contribution to the history of Chinese Buddhist art.

There is another unanswered question. In the various accounts of Juecheng from the Song sources found in this study, there is not a single mention of Juecheng's contact with any Chinese painters either within or outside the court. If this was simply a matter of fact, this is odd, for the early eleventh-century Chinese court, including the imperial painting academy, was filled with master painters of Buddhist subjects in the formats of both temple walls and portable scrolls, such as Wu Zongyuan 武宗元 (d. 1050), Wang Duan 王端, Gao Wenjin 高文進 (c. 950-after 1022), Wang Daozhen 王道真, Li Yongxi 李用及 and many others, not to mention the eminent Buddhist monk Yuan'ai 元顕 who not only served as the personal imperial portrait painter for both Taizong and Zhenzong, but also painted Buddhist wall paintings at Xiangguosi. Had Juecheng met with any of them, not only Guo Ruoxu's account of "Juecheng's Painting" but also part of the history of Chinese painting in 1010 would have been written differently.

Neither Yang Yi nor Guo Ruoxu tells how long Juecheng stayed in China or if and when he returned to India. Fortunately, one early eleventh-century Buddhist source does: the monk's robe of gold brocade Juecheng had requested during his audience with Zhenzong was made by the Imperial Workshop in the sixth month of the next year or the fourth year of Dazhong xiangfu (1011). After receiving the newly-made beautiful kasaya of gold brocade to bring back to offer to the Vajrásana Buddha, the overjoyed Juecheng wrote his second panegyrical (Fig. 12), a 784-character text in the same qiyuan format with a 48-character preface in the archaic siyan style and presented it to Zhenzong as a token of his deep gratitude. Again, under an imperial order Juecheng's Sanskrit text was immediately taken to Chuanfayuan, but this time, not by Ding Wei but by a palace eunuch messenger (zhongshi 中使) named Luo Zhibin 羅自賓. No translator's name was mentioned but Weijin was the most likely one, for he translated Juecheng's first, thus knowing his literary style. The following ending lines afford a rare glimpse into the working of not only Juecheng's mind but probably also, and more importantly, the mind of all Indian Buddhist monks who paid visits to the early Song Chinese court as either pilgrims or translators:

王如甚深大寶海 Your Majesty is like a deep sea of great treasures;
廣集一切妙珍財 That houses everything wonderful and precious,
小臣猶比求寶人 Your humble servant is like a treasure-hunter,
乘御經書如舟楫 Riding on the boat of sacred sūtras.
以宿緣力為先標 The fruit of the previous lives is my oars to row forward,
來求功德大法財 Seeking a great Dharma treasure of [Your Majesty's] virtues.
今得見王賜法衣 Now I see the Dharma robe bestowed by Your Majesty,
已獲大利還鄉國 The great treasure I have caught to bring back to home
我王大恩大德惠 My thanks to Your Majesty's grace and generosity,
賜袈裟衣被佛身 For bestowing the kasaya to dress the body of the Buddha.
(此處四行省略) (Four lines skipped here)
願此佈施果無虛 May this imperial charity boundlessly fruitful
一切衆生離貧苦 To make all living beings freed from poverty and suffering.

According to the same Buddhist source:

His Majesty [Zhenzong] read the panegyrical and afterwards ordered to have it kept in the Inner Court [library]. In the seventh month of that autumn [1011] Juecheng departed on his return journey to India. [Before his departure] His Majesty sent a palace eunuch messenger to cheer him with the imperial farewell gifts of twenty thousand coins as well as tea and medicines.

The Indian monk painter Juecheng was in China for ten months or so during the insignificant year of 1010-11.
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1 THJWZ, juan 6, 492b and see also Fig. 1. The translation is cited from Kuo Jo-Hsi's *Experiences in Painting* (T'U-HUA CHIEN-WEN CHIH): An Eleventh Century History of Chinese Painting Together with the Chinese Text in Facsimile, trans. and anno. Alexander Coburn Soper (Washington, D.C.: American Council of Learned Societies, 1913). 92-93, with modifications.

2 The book serves not only as a sequel to Zhang Yanyuan's *Lida minghua ji*, but also as a rich source for the 1120 imperial painting catalogue *Xuanbe huanpu* compiled under Emperor Hui-tsung's 徽宗 (1101-1125) auspices and a direct link for Deng Chuo's 鄧誠 (c. 1109–c. 1179) *Huaji* 畫紀. 2 For example, "Icon of Maitreya" (Gushi xiang 宣氏象), another of Guo's thirty-two stories (THJWZ, juan 6, 492b), has been such a case study by this author, see Heping Liu,'Empress Liu's Icon of Maitreya: Portraiture and Privacy at the Early Song Court," *Artibus Asiae* 63/1 (2003): 125-90.

3 Both historical sources and modern scholarship on early Song imperial patronage of Buddhism are abundant. For a recent close study with a useful bibliography, see Huang Chi-chiang, "Imperial Rulership and Buddhism in the Early Northern Sung," in *Imperial Rulership and Cultural Change in Traditional China*, eds. Frederick P. Brandauer and Chun-chih Huang (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994), 144-87.

4 The mission, departed on the eighteenth day of the second month in the fourth year ofQiande (21 April 966) was the largest of the kind in the history of Chinese Buddhism, see SS, juan 23, 23, CB, juan 7, 168, YH, juan 160, 308b, and FZTJ, juan 43, 49b.

5 According to Jacques Gernet's count, toward the end of Zhenzong's reign in 1021, the number of Buddhist monasteries and cloisters statewide was close to 40,000 with an officially ordained clergy of 458,835 (397,625 monks and 61,210 nuns), the highest since the Tang persecution of Bud-
克为高排名的文武官员。根据王维之的《1024-1025, jingshi 1067》记录，当这些文武官员的首领被张说诵读时，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：“张说的诗歌在文学上的贡献是不可忽视的。” (王说文章则讲述了高排名的文武官员的首领的高排名的文武官员的首领，文武官员们也参与其中。然后林池在文武官员面前分享了他的想法：
It is worth noting the different means of communication between the Chinese emperor and visiting Japanese monks. For example, in 984 Taizong granted an audience with Chónen. Chónen did not speak Chinese but was skilled in the I-style Chinese calligraphy, thus writing to communicate with Taizong; the same was true of communication between Zhenzong and Jakusho in 1003; see SS, juan 491, 14315, 14314, 14316.

Official permits were required for all foreign monk pilgrims to visit Mt. Wutai. Obtaining the imperial permit would enable them to get room and board and other conveniences from local official and Buddhist institutions along the route and in the mountain. For example, Fatian, after his arrival in Fuzhou in 974, was granted permission to travel to Mt. Wutai to pay homage to Manjūsāri, SHY "Dāo-Shī" 2.5, 789A.

Yao, Xi Huaqin 納道臣, "Sequel to Evaluations of Painters," in SHQS, I, 5b. Yao's record of Faijuzi and two other monk painters named Jīdū 聖度 and Mopó 摩婆提 (Marabodhi) is among the earliest surviving records of any Indian monk painters' presence in China.

See Pei Xiaoyuan 裴孝源 (c. 601-c. 666), Zhengyuan gongsi huashi 貞觀公私畫史 [Inventory of Paintings from Official and Private Collections Compiled in the Zhengyuan Era], in SHQS, I, 175B.

LDMHJ, juan 7, 148A. This account of Faijuzi by Zhang Yanyuan does not seem to match that by Daozuan who does not mention Faijuzi's stay at Shaolin, thus raising the identity question of the two Faijuzi. Paul Pelliot argues that the two should be identified as the same person, see his "Notes sur quelques artistes des Six Dynasties et des Tang," "Yang Par 22" (1923), cited in Sírín, Chinese Painting, vol. 1, 69, n. 1. Pelliot's argument is followed by Soper in his Literary Evidence for Early Buddhist Art in China (Ascona: Arsibus Asie, 1959), 81 (Liáng #19) and 106 (Wéi #15). The identity question remains, however.

There are brief biographies of both Indian painters in LDMHJ, see juan 8, 150B and juan 9, 154B respectively.

According to Jan's study, the Northern Song court saw the first arrival of Indian monks in 971; between 971 and 1056 visits by more than 110 Indian monks were recorded but no painters were identified among them (except Juecheng), see Jan's detailed list, "Buddhist Relations (II)," 145-58.

This observation is based on my current preliminary research.

According to Zhipan's record, Juqiu arrived in China not alone but with another Central Indian monk named Faji 法基 (Dhamasila?) and other gifts brought by the two included Buddhist relics, Sanskrit scriptures in palm leaves, and Bodhi leaves, see FZJT, juan 44, 404B and its Chinese text cited in n. 50 above.


Jan Yün-hua points out, by citing Indian sources, that Juqiu's statement at his meeting with Yang Yi that it was painful for him to see pigs and sheep slaughtered in the Chinese markets because no one ate meat in his country seems to be exaggerated, for eating meat was lawful in India during that period, see "Buddhist Relations (II)," 155, n. 104.

The Bodhi tree is a well established symbol of the Buddha in early Indian Buddhist art of the Maurya (Ashoka) and Shunga dynasties (322-72 BCE), known as the aniconic period, as seen in the many surviving examples in stone relief at the Great Stupa, Sanchi.

See the text in smaller characters at the end of the main text (Fig. 1) and the translation is cited from Soper, Experiences, 93 with slight modifications.

See the latest sentence of the Chinese text in Fig. 1 and the translation is cited in Soper, Experiences, 93, with modifications.


Dai Kui's anecdotes are given in a number of Six Dynasties-Tang historical and literary sources, the earliest of which are in SSXY (see discussion below). Dai's official biography can be found in JS, juan 94, 1457-59. Two seventh-century Buddhist texts, Daoxuan's Huaishen shen wu jing hang dan 華神三寶週行録 and Daoxuan's jì shì 華神三寶週行録 and devotees Fuyan zhuan 法元傳记, have an account of Dai Kui as Buddhist artist, see T. 52, 2106, 416C and T. 53, 2122A, 406A respectively. For an informative collection of printed works (mostly expositive of Buddhist sources) on Dai Kui, see Chen Chih-Chun 陳奇俊, Lüshen huajia shilao 六朝書畫史料 [Historical Texts on Six-Dynasties Painters] (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1990), 134-40.

SSXY, 7.17, 121 and LDMHJ, juan 5, 142B. The location of Waguansu was a former government agency of pottery (waguan 瓦官) of the Eastern Jin (317-420). After the agency moved away, a monastery was built on the site by monk Huili 惠力 in 64 under the auspices of Emperor Ai (r. 352-366) in the capital Jiangkang 建康 (present-day Nanjing). Loehr suggested that Waguansu "was a likely setting in which Gu Kaizhi could have encountered a Dai Kui painting quite early in his career," Great Painters, 20.

Anecdotes of the Seven Sages are abundant in SSXY, see 331, 350 for a general account of them as a group. All of the Seven Sages have official biographies in JS, see juan 43, 1233-28 (Shan Tao 115A 潘, 205-288, 1231-13, Wang Rong 王戎, 334-351) and juan 49, 1139-62 (Ruan Ji 魯迅, 310-361, 1562-63 (Ya Qian 雅顧, c. 230-283), 1136-79 (Ja Jiang), 1347-75 (Xianliu 向秀, c. 228-270), and 1379-76 (Liuliu 李流, 254-330). Dai Kui was also author of the two-juan text Zhuan jizun lun 竹林七賢論 [Commentary on the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove] that has been lost except for a few passages surviving in Liu Xiaobao's 劉孝標 (463-531) commentary on SSXY, for example, see 811.2, 132 and 23.13, 194.

Gu, "Lun hua" 論花 (On Painting), cited in LDMHJ, juan 5, 142A.

LDMHJ, juan 5, 140B. Among the several other known Six Dynasties artists who reportedly painted the Seven Sages was Dai Shi dao史穀, see LDMHJ, juan 5, 142A.

This has been pointed out both by Loehr, Great Painters, 20 and by Chen, Lüshen huajia, 18.

See Nanjing bowuyuan 南京博物院 and Nanjingshi wenwu baoguan 南京市文物保管委員會, "Nanjing Xianqiao Nanchaomao jiqi zhuankan hibua" 南京西善橋南朝墓及其墓壁畫拓 [Excavation Report on a Southern Dynasties Tomb and its Molded-brick Relief at Xianqiao, Nanjing], Wenwu 1960:8-9: 36-42. For an excellent reproduction of the Xianqiao Seven Sages and Rong Qui with both brick relief and rubbing details of each of the eight figures, see Yao Qian 姚遷 and Gu Bing 合兵, Lüshen shiyu 六朝藝術 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1981), pls. 162-79.

The Xianqiao tomb relief is such a significant archaeological find that there have been considerable studies of its position in the history of Chinese painting, including any possible connections with Dai Kui, Gu Kaizhi or any other masters of the time, of Chinese, Japanese and Western scholars. Because of the limitations of this article, only a few studies can be mentioned here. The 1960 excavation report relates its figure style to Gu Kaizhi in the light of similarities of line drawing with the narrative scroll Admonitions of the Court.
Instructress to Palace Ladies (Nishi zhen tu 女史箴圖) in the British Museum (see the cited report above, 42) for a summary and examination of the Xishanqiao excavation report in English, see Sooper “A New Chinese Tomb Discovery: The Earliest Representation of a Famous Literary Theme,” Artibus Asiae 24/1 (1962): 79-86. Jin Weina 金維娜 considers Dai Kui to be the painter of the original yang for the Xishanqiao relief, see “Woguo gudai jie chu de diaozui Dai Kui he Dai Yong” 我國古代傑出的雕塑家戴逵和戴詁 [The Great Sculptors Dai Kui and Dai Yong of Ancient China], Rennin Ribao 境內日報, 24 May 1961, cited in Lin Shuzhong 林書忠, “Jiangsu Danyang Nanqi lingmu zhuanyinbihua 江蘇丹陽南齊陵墓線譜化 [On Southern Qi tombs at Huqiao and Jianshan in Danyang, Jiangsu], Wenwu 1977/1: 71; Lin himself argues for the fifth-century master Lu Tanwei 陸探微 of the Xishanqiao composition, ibid., 71-77. Ellen Johnston Laing points out at least a literary connection of the Xishanqiao brick relief with Gu Kaizhi and Dai Kui, “Neo-Taosim and the ‘Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove’ in Chinese Painting,” Artibus Asiae 36/1 and 2 (1974): 10. Loehr states that “in all likelihood, the styles of Gu an Dai were similar enough to justify linking the Nanjing bricks with either man’s work,” Great Painters, 21. Wu Hung, however, holds that evidence for such connections is still lacking; see Richard M. Barnhart 等, Three Thousand Years of Chinese Painting (New Haven: Yale University Press and Beijing: Foreign Language Press, 1997), 47. In 1968 two more brick reliefs of the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove and Rong Qiqi were found in two separate fifth-century tombs in Danyang (near Nanjing), both in a similar composition, size and style of the Xishanqiao relief, although their joint excavation report and another study were not published until 1980, so Nanjing bowuyuan 南京博物院, “Jiangsu Danyang Huqiao Jianshan lianzuo Nanchao musang 江蘇丹陽鶴橋建山南朝墓葬 [Excavation Report on Two Southern Dynasties Tombs at Huqiao and Jianshan in Danyang, Jiangsu]” and “Shitan Zhulin Qianian jing Rong Qiqi zhuanyin bianhua wenti” 詳時竹林賢士與榮卿碑形線譜化問題 [A Preliminary Study of the Three Molded-brick Reliefs of the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove and Rong Qiqi], Wenwu 1980/5: 11-17, pls. 3-5 and 18-23, 36, respectively. According to the latter, the two Danyang reliefs might have been made by a local artisan workshop (compared to the Xishanqiao relief that was based on a scroll composition from a master painter). 20-21. Zheng Minzhong 鄭民中 goes even further to argue for the artisan-painters’ (gongqian huajia 工匠畫家) authorship also for the Xishanqiao relief, see “Dai Nanjing Xishanqiao Liuchao mihuaxiang de kanfa 對南京西善橋六朝畫像的看法 [Some Thoughts on the Six Dynasties Tomb reliefs from Xishanqiao, Nanjing], Gugong bowuyuan yanjiu 1986/5, 49-54. For a recent detailed study of the Xishanqiao Seven Sages and Rong Qiqi as character portraiture with reference to the two Danyang tomb brick reliefs, see Audrey Spiro, Complicating the Ancients: Aesthetics and Social Issues in Early Chinese Portraiture (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990). Rhee’s more recent study found the most intriguing and tangible archaeological evidence thus far in the paintings of Anak tomb no. 3 near Pyongyang in North Korea dated c. 557 for the link of Dai Kui with the Xishanqiao brick relief, see Early Buddhist Art, 203-6 and the comparison of Figs. 1.66g and 1.62c. Considering that Dai Kui was credited to have created a new and influential image of the Seven Sages, that Gu Kaizhi’s painting of the Seven Sages might have been influenced by Dai, that Lu Tanwei might have studied with Gu, and that all three masters had strong influence on their contemporaries and followers (including artisan painters), this author sees the Xishanqiao brick relief in reasonable artistic historical connections with Dai Kui.

Xie, Guhubin lu 古畫品錄 [Record of Evaluations of Ancient Paintings], in SHQS, I, 22. Dai Kui and Gu Kaizhi are placed by Xie He in the same third pin 丙, but Xie clearly ranks Dai Kui’s painting above Gu Kaizhi’s, as he not only hails Dai as “the true leading master after Xun and Wei” (both Xun and Wei belong to the top pin) but also criticizes Gu’s fame as being exaggerated or overstated (zheng guo qibian 僞名其事), see Guhubin lu, 16-22. For a stimulating discussion of Xie He’s view of Dai and Gu, see Chen, Liuchao huduan yanjiu 六朝畫論研究 [Studies on Painting Theories of the Six Dynasties] (Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1991), 17-19.

Daoxuan, Ji shengzhou, 416b; also Daoshi, Fayan zhulin, 386b and LDMHJ, juan 5, 142b. The translation is cited in Sooper, Literary Evidence, 21, with modifications. Daoxuan’s account of Dai Kui seems to have been the source for the late ninth-century Tang scholar official Li Chao’s 李翱 to make similar comments on the art of Dai Kui’s son Yong 隆 (378-414) who inherited his father’s artistic style: “The original images of the Buddhas were modeled after the images of foreigners, they looked so plain and humble that they failed to win respect from the [Chinese] viewers. The present-day refined sculpture style started with Dai Yong.” See Li, Shangshu gushi 尙書古史 [Anecdotes from the Minister’s Residence], in Tang Wadai biji xiaoobo daguan 唐代代筆記小說大觀 [Anthology of Miscellaneous Writings and Notebooks of the Tang and the Five Dynasties] (Shanghai: Guji chubanshe, 2000), xia, 1161. For an official biography of Dai Yong, see Shen Yue shuo (441-513), Song shu 宋書 [Annals of the (Lin) Song Dynasty], juan 93 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), 2526-78.

Dai’s five Buddha sculptures, Gu Kaizhi’s painting of Vimalakirti, and a large jade Buddha sent as a gift from the king of Ceylon to the Eastern Jin emperor Andi 晉安帝 (397-418) in the early fifth century, were known as Waguansu’s “Three Wonders” (sanjue 三絕), see Yao Silian 楷 картин (1557-67), Liang shu 梁書 [Annals of the Liang Dynasty], juan 54 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975), 800 and also LDMHJ, juan 5, 142b, including the quotation of a sixth-century account of Gu’s sensational painting of Vimalakirti for Waguansu. Sooper regards Dai’s lacquer Buddha sculptures “as the remote ancestors of the magnificent works in hollow kanbanes preserved from eighth century Japan,” Literary Evidence, 30.

LDMHJ, juan 3, 135b-164. For two official biographical accounts of Li, see JTS, juan 174, 4509-10 and XTS, juan 180, 5127-44.

Emma C. Bunker is the first to observe the striking stylistic difference between the two Binyang relief panels and relates the “painterly” Vimalakirti relief to Gu Kaizhi’s painting and the relatively stiff Maijushri relief to the “sculptor” Dai Kui, with the suggestion that the two images as well as other relief panels in the Binyang cave may have been the work of “skilled refugee craftsmen from the South (who would use) as models the famous Wu-kan-su (Waguansu) forscoses,” see Bunker, “Early Chinese Representations of Vimalakirti,” Artibus Asiae 30/1 (1968): 29. Rhee has greatly expanded Bunker’s basic argument with far more archaeological and other visual and literary evidence and closer reading of them in her recent study; most convincing to this author are the detailed examinations of those archaeological finds in China and Korea of the period and their earlier Indian and Central Asian sources to reconstruct a more tangible and reliable picture of what the work of Gu Kaizhi and Dai Kui would have looked like; see Rhee, Early Buddhist Art, II, 94-103, 111-12, 187-206, 253-50 and the related illustrations in II Plates, esp. Figs. 1.37-1.66. There is ample evidence for the south Chinese influence on the Buddhist art of Northern Dynasties China, including the Binyang Cave, as so perceptively suggested by Bunker and so strongly argued by Rhee. See also Sooper’s compelling study, “South Chinese Influence on the Buddhist Art of the Six Dynasties Period,” Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities 31 (1960): 47-112. However, both Bunker and Rhee seem to have mistaken the pairing of Gu’s Vimalakirti and Dai’s Maijushri by Li Dewu on the outside west wall of the main hall in Gansu for the original pairing of the two paintings in Waguansu (Bunker, 29 and Rhee, II, 98 [n. 193, 192 and 194]). There is no evidence for Waguansu or any other identified monastery as the original host of Dai’s painting prior to its removal to Ganlu in 845. In fact, Zhang Yanyuan’s account is the earliest surviving record of a Maijushri painting by Dai Kui. In other words, this Maijushri, if ever painted by Dai Kui, was first paired with Gu Kaizhi’s Vimalakirti to become the model for the Binyang Maijushri remains elusive.

Both Buddha statues of the Liang dynasty (502-557) were excavated in 1954-55 from the historical site of Wansfu 万佛寺 in Chengdu, see Feng Hanji 鄭漢姬, “Chengdu Wansfu shike zhaoxiang 成都萬佛寺石刻造像 [Excavation report on Chengdu Wansfu stone sculptures], Wenwu can-kao zhihao 1954/9: 110-20 and Yuan Shuguan 袁樹根, “Sichuansheng bowuguan can Wansfu shike zhaoxiang shengyi jianbao 四川省博物館藏 万佛寺石刻造像整理簡報 [Conservation Report on Wansfu Stone Sculptures from the Sichuan Provincial Museum], Wenwu 2001/10: 19-38.” The coexistence of these two Buddha images in the same time and place is intriguing: it tells the availability and vitality of various iconographic and
stylistic choices in the sixth-century production of Chinese Buddhist art, among many other things. For a more recent discussion of the Gupta-style Standing Buddha of 539, see Angela Falco Howard's catalogue entry in *China: Dawn of a Golden Age, 250-750 AD* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 218. Howard holds that the 137 Standing Buddha (Fig. 94) is fashioned according to the Gandharan style, "with its prominent display of the sandal and the artificial rearrangement of the robe, more closely resembles that of the mature Northern Wei Buddha images." See Howard, *Chinese Sculpture*, 169 and Fig 3:76. The Northern Wei connection becomes crystal clear when the Southern Liang Buddha is compared with such late Northern Wei images as the 133 Buddha in the rear wall of the central Binyang Cave and the 233 Buddha of the Tian Yanhe stele (Henan Provincial Museum), both reproduced in Howard, *Ibid.*, Figs. 3:39 and 3:66.

80 The 137 Standing Buddha (Fig. 93) is one of the seven (five standing and two seated) Buddha statues in the *baosi bodai* fashion excavated from the Wansou site, see Yuan, *Wansou shike zhaoxiang*, 20-21. The term *baosi bodai* is used by the early Han historian Ban Gu 班固 (32-92) in his *Biography of Juan Buji* [Juan Buji zhujuan 傳不疑傳] of Han shu 漢書 [Annals of the Han Dynasty]; the early Tang scholar official and Han shu annotator Yan shigou 郭氏古 (586-645) defines *baosi bodai* as "若著大衣，廣博之帶也" or "dressed in an extra large robe (baosi) with an extra wide sash (bodai)," see Han shu, juan 71 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1961), 2533-36. Thus, *baosi bodai* clearly refers to an early Han formal official or court outfit of dignity. According to Su Bai's 蘇白 study, the early use of *baosi bodai* in sinicized Buddhist art can be found in many Buddha statues of caves 6 and 11 at Yungang dated to the reign of the Northern Wei emperor Xiaowendi 孝文帝 (r. 471-499) in association of Xiaowendi's gradual reform of the court dress code in 486-495; see Su, *Yungang shiku fengyi shiluan* 云崗石窟分期論 [On the Periodization of Yungang Cave Temples], first published in Kaogu xuebao 古學報, 1978:1; and collected in Su Bai, Zhongguo shiku yanjiu 中國石窟寺研究 [Studies on the Buddhist Cave Temples of China] (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1996), 79-80. For a more recent study of the subject, see Feng chenghuo 逢成華, "Beichao baosi bodai zhangshu yuanyuan kaobian 北朝“褒衣博帶”裝束溯源考辨 [On the Origins of the *Baosi bodai* Outfit in the Northern Dynasties], Xuebao yanjiu 2006:4: 180-84.

81 See Min Huashi 畫史 [Paintings in History], in SHQS, I, 980b.


84 See Jan's year-by-year records of the activities in "Buddhist Relations (II)," 144-69.

85 The printing and publication at Yinjingyuan was abolished in 1701; with the death of the last eminent Indian monk translator Richeng 日稱 (Sāryākṣi?) in 1708, the translation activities at Chuanfayan declined to a gradual end in 1828, see SHY, "Diao-Shi" 2.9, 7893a.


87 For example, in 999 the salt and iron commissioner Chen Shu 陳恕 (944-1021, jinshi 977) petitioned with great earnestness to abolish the activities of Chuanfayan on the ground of its wastefulness of revenues. Zhenzong rejected the petition with the reason that it had been founded by Taizu and Taizong, CB, juan 45, 965. Again during the government reform to reduce expenditures, in the early 1040s in Beijing, the then vice minister of the Court of State Ceremonial in charge of Chuanfayan, anticipating court motions to abolish Chuanfayan, proposed to abolish it on his own initiative. Zhenzong rejected the proposal by citing it as the establishment supported by his three ancestors, see Wenyang, *Xiangshan yelu*, juan shang, 1187.


89 In his preface to Zanning's collected works (also the best book biographical account of Zanning), Wang Yucheng opens with these words: "The heirs of Sāryākṣi all practice Buddhist writings as the inner teaching (neidan 内典) and refer to Confucian writings as outer learning (wutai 五外). Those skilled in writing poetry (shi 诗) are many; those versed in the refinement of culture (wen 文) are few. The only one to master all four of these [knowledge of Buddhist and Confucian writings, poetry and culture] is the Great Master [Zanning]." See Wang, *Youjie senglu Tongtai da shen jiue* 右街僧統遠大師文集序 [Preface to the Collected Works of the Central Buddhist Registrar on the Right Avenue of the Capital and the Great Master of Knowledge and Wisdom], in QSW, IV, juan 150, 414-25. For a recent study of Zanning's advocacy of Buddhism as a component of Chinese sawen in the early Song intellectual context, see Albert Welzer, "A Buddhist Response to the Confucian Revival: Tian-ning and the Debate over Wen in the Early Song," in *Buddhism in the Song*, eds. Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999), 21-61. The above translation of Wang Yucheng's words is cited in Welzer, "A Buddhist Response," 37, with modifications. See also Peter Bol, *This Culture of Ours*: *Intellectual Transitions in T'ang and Song China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992).

89 Jan, "Chuan-fa Yuan", 70-71.

89 Jan, "Buddhist Relations (II)", 139.

89 Guo had a double connection with the Song imperial house: Guo's great-aunt was Empress Guo (975-1007), consort of Zhenzong, and he himself married a great-granddaughter of Taizong. See Empress Guo's official biography in SS, juan 242, 8611-12; also Soper's account of Guo's biography, *Experiences*, 105-9.

89 THJWZ, *Xu* 序, 465a. The other two were Ma Zhihui 馬知會 (955-1019) and Guo's own grandfather. Guo Ruxu's great grandfather was the celebrated general Guo Shouwen 郭守文 (935-980) who has an official biography in SS, juan 259, 8990-9000, but Guo's grandfather, with the prestigious title of *Shuang* 双司徒, has not yet been identified.

89 See the imperial edict of Ding's banishment, "Ding Wei bian yanzhou shu chi" 丁與州司戶牋, issued on the 21st day of the seventh month in the first year of Qianxing (23 August 1022) in *Song da zhaoban* 宋大詔令集 (Compilation of the Great Song Imperial Edicts), juan 204 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), 765. Ding's sudden fall at the very height of his career, caused mainly by his close and corrupt association with the chief palace eunuch Lei Yanggu 雷允恭 (d. 1022), was not unexpected in the intense power struggle of the early eleventh-century court politics, see CB, juan 98, 2285-97; SS, juan 283, 9568-70 and juan 468, 1614-55. For an official biography of Empress Liu, see SS, juan 242, 8612-16; also Liu, "Empress Liu's Icon of Mistreya", 111-48.

89 All of these confiscated painting scrolls were turned over to the Inner Palace storehouse to become part of the Imperial Collection, see THJWZ, juan 6, 493a. It is worth noting that the majority of the 159 scrolls of Li Cheng's landscape paintings recorded in Huizong's imperial catalogue might well have come from Ding Wei's collection, see Li Cheng's biography in *XHH*, juan 11, 918-934. In his *Deyuxiatu huapin 得祿字畫品 [Descriptive Record of Paintings from the Zhao Delin Collection]*, Li Zhi 李鍇 (1059) remembers Ding Wei's seal on a painting of landscape with a wandering immortal (*yousian tu* 游仙圖) couthored by the tenth-century artists Guan Tong 閔同 and Hu Yi 胡翼, see SHQS, I, 9912-b.

89 Iketsawa, *Ding Wei yanjiu*, 219-50.

89 The late eleventh-century author Wei Tai 魏泰 (c. 1050-1110) describes Ding Wei's death as a process from "silently rejecting Buddhist
sūtras" (mosang Foshu 諸誦佛書) to "suddenly being metamorphosed [into an immortal] and vanished" (janne shuüu 竭然化去), see Wei's Dongzuan kuju 東軒筆錄 [Notes from the East Pavilion], juan 3, in SYBX, III, 2699.

96 These additional two stories of Ding Wei are "The Picture of Lying in the Snow" (Wuxue tu 歪雪圖) and simply "Ding the Duke of Jin" (Ding Jingong 丁晉公), see THJWZ, juan 6, 492a-b and 493a; and Soper's translated texts, Experiences, 91 and 95. None of these three events of Ding Wei's life are listed in Ikezawa's Ding Wei nianpu.

97 See LDMHJ, juan 5, 1424-143a and XHHP, juan 1, 63-64, respectively.

98 Guo Rouxu himself mentions Dai Kui's name one more time, not surprisingly and together with those of Gu Kaizhi and Lu Tanwei, in his discussion of collecting Buddhist and Daoist icons (Lun shouzang shengxiang 論收藏塑像), see THJWZ, juan 1, 469b. Mi Fu was certainly among the few late Northern Song authors who were still interested in Dai Kui, collected his works and wrote about him, see Huashì, in SHQS, I, 978b and 980b.

99 See DXFL, juan 16.18-22. 507b-508a. 100 DXFL, juan 16.21-22. 508a-b. 101 DXFL, juan 16.22, 508b and also FZTJ, juan 44. 404b. 102 The information for this discussion comes from Juecheng's second panegyric written in 1011, see the discussion below.
Fig. 1. Guo Ruoxu, "Juecheng's Painting." Composite arrangement of pages of 3a and 6b from Tabula i'ianwenzi, juan 6, Wenyuange Siku quanshu ed., 812.56/4a-b.

Fig. 2. Anonymous. Portrait of Emperor Zhenzong. Hanging scroll, ink and color on silk. 175.4 x 116 cm. Northern Song dynasty. c. 1022. The National Palace Museum, Taipei, Taiwan, N-31 (Photo: The National Palace Museum).

Fig. 3. Map of Location of Taiping Xingguosi (marked as Temple for Great Peace and Prosperity of the Nation) in relation to other major temples and monasteries in the Northern Song capital. (After Patricia Ebrey, "Portrait Sculptures" [T'oung Pao 83, 1997], Map 1.)
Fig. 4. Yang Yi, “Building the Monastery.” Composite arrangement of pages 112-113 from [Songshao] shishi lei yuan, juan 43, Wenyuan Siku quanshu ed, 874.579b.

Fig. 5. Yang Yi, “Monk Juecheng from the Western Region.” Composite arrangement of pages 11b-12b from [Songshao] shishi lei yuan, juan 45, Wenyuan Siku quanshu ed, 874.579b-80a.
Fig. 7. Seated Buddha. Mural detail from the rear wall of Cave 2, Ajanta. Gupta dynasty, c. 500 (After Benoy K. Behl, *The Ajanta Caves* [Abrams, 1998], 125).


Fig. 9a. (left) Standing Buddha. Gray sandstone, h.: 127 cm. Southern Liang dynasty, dated 557. Wanfosi, Chengdu. Sichuan Provincial Museum, Chengdu. (After Angela Falco Howard, *Chinese Sculpture* [Yale, 2006], fig. 3.76).

Fig. 9b. (right) Standing Buddha. Gray sandstone, h.: 158 cm. Southern Liang dynasty, dated 549. Wanfosi, Chengdu. Sichuan Provincial Museum, Chengdu. (After Falco Howard, *Chinese Sculpture* [Yale, 2006], fig. 3.75).
Fig. 10. Buddha Preaching the Law, detail. Ink and colours on silk, 139 x 107.7 cm. Tang dynasty, late seventh century. Originally from Cave 17, Dunhuang. The British Museum, London, 1919,0103,0.6 (© Copyright the Trustees of The British Museum). (See Colour Plate 2)

Fig. 11. Two Bodhisattvas Burning Ritual Incense, datable to the Guangshun reign period (951-953), from Cishengsi, Wen Xian, Henan Province, Five Dynasties (907-960). Ink and colours on clay, 175.3 x 90.2 cm. The Nelson-Akins Museum of Art, Kansas City, Missouri. Gift of Mr. C.T. Loo, 50-64 A (Photograph by Jamison Miller). (See Colour Plate 2)
Fig. 12. Juceng's second "Shengdesong" for Zhenzong, written in the sixth month of the fourth year of Dazhong xiangfu (1011), translated from Sanskrit by Weijing (?). Composite arrangement of pages 507a-508b from Dazhong xiangfu fahao lu, yuan 16, Zhonghua dazhengjing 75 (Beijing, 1984).
Plate 1. Buddha Preaching the Law, detail. Ink and colours on silk, 139 x 101.7 cm. Tang dynasty, late seventh century. Originally from Cave 17, Dunhuang. The British Museum, London, 1919,0101,0.6 (© Copyright the Trustees of The British Museum).
Plate 2. Two Bodhisattvas Burning Ritual Incense, datable to the Guangshun reign period (951-953), from Cishengsi, Wen Xian, Henan Province, Five Dynasties (907-960). Ink and colours on clay, 173.3 x 90.2 cm. The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City, Missouri. Gift of Mr. C.T. Loo, 52-64 A (Photograph by Jamison Miller).