Ancient objects suddenly emerged from the ground easily arouse intense excitement, which is often channeled into three different approaches to antiquities. The scholarly mind tends to place objects in their original context, and to study them in relation to the historical period when they were produced or interred, even though specialists from different disciplines would emphasize different contextual loci. Contemporary popular attention, however, may be caught by some features that have nothing to do with the origin of the objects. On one hand, antiques can be bestowed an “afterlife” or a “cultural biography” in the wake of their discovery by those who discover and appreciate them; their meanings are invented and accumulated either in the context of exchange or exhibition, or because of their entanglements with current events. On the other hand, antiques may also serve as a vehicle to evoke historical memories that are irrelevant to the objects’ production and interment but meaningful to their discoverers and admirers; the significance of antiques lies in their triggering something other than their own existence.

This paper explores a fourth aspect of the excitement generated by unexpected archaeological finds. Instead of focusing on how antiquities are studied and perceived, I ask how newly unearthed objects inspire other types of cultural production that would otherwise have not come into being. I do not aim at any inquiries based on classicism, in which attention is focused on the application of past styles or motifs in current works; this has long been an established topic in art-historical research. Rather, I analyze various cultural products that are derived from or caused by archaeological discoveries.

More specifically, this paper centers upon the “Wu Family Shrines” uncovered in eighteenth-century China. I discuss how the excavation of
the ancient monuments first stimulated the discoverer, who happened to be an eminent literati painter, to produce a group of paintings to depict his discovery. I examine how the preservation of the archaeological site then led to the creation of a brand-new stele to commemorate the collective efforts of the contributors to that endeavor. Finally, I investigate how the need to capture the carvings in the discovered shrines further brought about competition in the market of woodblock prints.

Since this study touches upon mediums ranging from painting to stele to print, I also consider whether the medium is the message, as Marshall McLuhan claimed.4 Whereas painting is normally distinguished by its representational capacity, the stele genre is noted for its commemorative nature, and the print for its facility in mass reproduction. This paper suggests that, in the case of the Wu Family Shrines, the representational painting in fact conveyed the wish for documentation and remembrance, the commemorative stele signaled the mood of celebration and discrimination, and the mass-reproduced print demonstrated the concern for readability and authenticity.

The Paintings: Documentation and Commemoration

In the eighth month of 1786 Huang Yi (1744–1802) stopped by Jiaxiang on his way back to Jining, both in present-day Shandong. Reviewing the local gazetteer in the county office, Huang noticed the report of a Han stele inscribed with incomprehensible text and three Han shrines incised with exquisite images, half buried at Mount Ziyun, approximately thirty li south of the county town of Jiaxiang. Huang immediately had some rubbings made, and was delighted to discover that the stele had been erected for Wu Ban, and that one of the shrines had been built for Wu Liang, both of whom had been active during the Han dynasty.

To retrieve more Han monuments, Huang Yi soon returned to Jiaxiang and investigated the site in person the following month. He first unearthed and cleaned the carved stones of the Wu Liang Shrine. Then, with the help of local assistants, he fully exposed the twin que gate-pillars that had sunk eight to nine chi belowground.5 To the north of the gate-pillars lay the toppled stele in honor of Wu Ban, distinguished by its triangular head and its perforated upper body. Next, Huang discovered two groups of carved stones, one in front of the Wu Liang Shrine and the other behind it. He identified them as the front and the rear chambers of the Wu Family Shrines.

After the excavation, Huang Yi moved the stone engraved with the meeting of Confucius and Laozi back to Jining and had it installed in the Hall of Comprehending Ethics (Minglun Tang) in the prefectural school there. He also conferred with local scholars, mainly Li Dongqi, Li Kezheng, and Gao Zhengyan, on how best to deal with the remaining finds. Together they formulated a plan to preserve all the stones in situ, likely the first archaeological preservation in early modern China. Huang Yi later recounted the entire process of this exciting discovery in his 1787 essay entitled “A Brief Record of Preserving the Wu Family Shrines” (“Xiu Wushi citang jilüe”).6

In addition to his textual account, Huang Yi also provided a visual record of this event. His painting entitled Searching for Steles at Mount Ziyun (Ziyun Shan tanbei tu) is one leaf in an album now in the Tianjin Municipal Museum of Fine Arts (hereafter the Tianjin album; fig. 1).7 In this painting Huang Yi placed himself in the middle ground, between the gate-pillars and the scattered stone slabs. Two persons accompany him, with one of the
little group pointing to the tumbled monuments ahead. Two donkey carts in the foreground indicate how the group traveled to the site, while the upland village in the background signifies that the site was at the foot of a hill.

To load the pictorial form with more precise content, Huang Yi placed a colophon next to the painting:

In the fall of the bingwu year of the Qianlong reign [1786], I saw the gazetteer of Jiaxiang County. [It mentioned that] at Mount Ziyun were small stone chambers lying apart and an ancient stele with a perforation. I had the rubbings made and examined them carefully. [It dawned on me that they were] the stele for Wu Ban— a chief clerk of Dunhuang in the Han dynasty — and the carvings for the Wu Liang Shrine. [I] went with Li Dongqi, Li Kezheng, and Gao Zhengyan to investigate [the site]. One after another, [we] sought and found three stone chambers in the front, rear, and left, [a stone with] the image of omens, the gate-pillars of the Wu family, [a stone] with the image of Confucius meeting Laozi, etc. [I] have never acquired so many steles as this [discovery], which is one of the most joyful events in my life! Together with those who appreciate antiquities, [I] had the Wu Family Shrine rebuilt and had the steles placed inside. [I] moved the stone with the image of Confucius meeting Laozi to the Hall of Comprehending Ethics in the prefectural school in Jining. [These arrangements shall make these stones] remembered forever by posterity.8

The colophon is evidently condensed from Huang’s lengthy report.9 However brief, the colophon suffices to help the viewer, who may or may not have read the report beforehand, to identify the mountain afar, the participants in the project, and the stones lying on the ground. The painting focuses on the investigation and excavation Huang conducted in the ninth month of 1786, but the colophon covers a longer span, which includes what happened before and after the excavation. If the painting highlights a single moment, then the colophon relates the extended duration of a process; image and text thus complement each other to document this significant event.

Far from having an archival purpose, Huang Yi created his visual record to share this magnificent discovery with friends who could understand and appreciate his efforts. Weng Fanggang (1733–1818), for instance, saw the Tianjin album leaf between 1792 and 1793, and on it wrote a colophon expressing his regret that even though he twice traveled to Shandong after the excavation, a heavy load of duties kept him from visiting the site in person.10 More importantly, Weng recalled that he had received an earlier version of this painting in 1787, when he supervised educational affairs in Jiangxi. Although that earlier painting is no longer extant, Weng’s poetical colophon for that painting, also entitled Searching for Steles at Mount Ziyun, still exists. In his colophon, Weng first acknowledged the significance of the discovery:

The carved stones of the Wu Family Shrines
[are where]
The virtuous and sages left their forms and molds.
For centuries [they] were concealed in the wild field,
Yet suddenly [they] offered up the precious signs,11
[Appendix 1a]

He then complimented Huang on his good fortune to serve in the hometown of Confucius and his principal followers. For Weng, the painting inevitably triggered thoughts of the ancient Lu state, the cradle of Confucian culture:
Fig. 1 Huang Yi (1744–1802). Searching for Steles at Mount Ziyun. 1792–1793. Album, ink on paper; 51.5 x 17.8 cm. Tianjin Municipal Museum. From Tianjin shi yishu bowuguan canghua ji (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1963), vol. 2, p. 147.

Fig. 2 After Huang Yi. Searching for Steles at Mount Ziyun. Handscroll; ink on paper; 31 x 138 cm. From Christie’s auction catalogue, (Hong Kong: 31 October 2004), lot 416.

Fig. 3 After Huang Yi. Searching for Steles at Mount Ziyun. Handscroll; ink on paper; Private collection, Taipei. Photos by author.
Huang Yi is holding an office in Zou and Lu,  
Plowing daily the meaning of the Classics.  
While I am laboring in Jiangxi,  
Dabbling in Lake Poyang and Mt. Lu.  
[1] lift horns and roots,  
[Dreaming] of the Rivers Huai, Si, Zhu in sleep.\textsuperscript{12}  
[Appendix 1b]

At the end of the poem, Weng described what he saw in the painting, and wished Huang would grant him a copy to embellish his own studio:

Bleak, bleak, the grass in the chilly wild,  
Desolate, lonely, the two chariots.  
In between is the brace of the ages.  
[And] the green peak in the wake of autumn rain.  
If [you] could produce an additional painting for me,  
[I shall have it] mounted to privilege [my]  
Bao Su Studio.\textsuperscript{13}  
[Appendix 1c]

Weng received the wished-for painting in the winter of 1787, after he had been informed of the discovery and had helped financially in restoring the Han monuments.\textsuperscript{14} Still, Weng’s mood was elated, as he wrote in his colophon: “Huang sending [the painting] to Weng is a gratification truly beyond words.”\textsuperscript{15} Not having had the pleasure of witnessing the discovery, Weng found that the painting brought the obscure site and the historical moment to life. For Weng, a learned scholar who cherished the past, the painting even served as an allusion to the Confucian legacy that the retrieved Han monuments were believed to represent.

Hong Liangji (1746–1809) also received a painting from Huang, in about the summer of 1788, when he worked for the local government in Kaifeng, Henan.\textsuperscript{16} Before he saw the painting, like Weng, Hong had been aware of the discovery and had financially assisted in preserving the Wu shrines.\textsuperscript{17} According to Hong, Huang sent the painting to him and asked for a poem in return. In his return poem, Hong offered his reading of the painting:

With the Yellow River moving southward and changing the land,  
Sharpened stones are angular, [surviving] houses are few.  
Not following monstrous waves to the vast sea,  
Inside [the stone chambers] are sages and the virtuous who have firmly grounded their feet.  
...  
How elegantly the guests who visit steles arrive,  
Imprinting the earth to make steles and to erect a large building.  
Mistaking the master of Lu by the side of the road,  
Are the restless passersby with a carriage and two horses.\textsuperscript{18}  
[Appendix 2]

Hong eulogized the ancients engraved on the stones, crediting the survival of the monuments through floods to their miraculous power. It is obvious that Hong overinterpreted the painting, viewing the sparseness of the houses in the background as a consequence of floods, and mistaking the people with a carriage in the foreground as mere passersby. Nonetheless, Hong’s poem and preface perfectly manifest how Huang used the painting as an agent to encourage his friends far away from Shandong to participate in the event by exercising their literary imaginations.

Based on the writings of Weng and Hong, it is evident that Huang Yi produced more than one painting to represent his discovery of the Wu shrines. Weng clearly stated that the painting he saw in 1787 was a different version of the painting he examined between 1792 and 1793 (i.e., the
one in the Tianjin album. Judging from Weng’s description, however, in both paintings the composition and main motifs—mountains afar, carriages nearby, and monuments in between—were nearly identical. The painting Hong received in 1788 seems to differ from those sent to Weng only in the minute detail of having one carriage, not two.

The abovementioned are by no means the only paintings in circulation depicting Huang’s discovery of the Wu shrines. The handsscroll recently auctioned by Christie’s and the one owned by a private collector in Taipei are two examples (hereafter the Christie’s handsscroll and the Taipei handsscroll, figs. 2, 3). The similarities between the two paintings are obvious: both bear the identical inscription with the title Searching for Steles at Mount Ziyun; both are handsrolls but maintain the basic composition and major motifs as seen on the Tianjin album leaf. Their differences are, however, substantial. First, the Christie’s handsscroll starts, like the Tianjin album, with a simple house behind a slope, whereas the Taipei handsscroll adds walls and trees behind that simple house, giving the impression that the house is part of a larger compound (fig. 4). Secondly, the Christie’s handsscroll is replete with dry, parallel, repetitive strokes, whereas the Taipei handsscroll displays greater dimensionality of brush strokes and more variations in the density of ink tonality, in this respect more closely approaching the quality of the Tianjin album (fig. 5). And thirdly, the stone slabs in the Christie’s handsscroll are oddly two-dimensional and unrealistically positioned relative to the line of the slope, whereas the illusion of depth in the Taipei handsscroll is even more plausible than that in the Tianjin album (fig. 6). The most intriguing aspect of the handscrolls is, however, the date of the inscription they share:

On the sixth day of the third month of the xinhai year [1791], [I] visited the carved images of the Wu Family Shrines. [I] have never acquired more steles than by this endeavor. [I] paint [the scene] to please myself. Huang Yi.
Huang discovered the Wu shrines in the fall of 1786, not in the spring of 1791. The erroneous date immediately puts the authenticity of both handscrolls into question. And yet the forgeries were not pure inventions without any reliable visual source at the very outset. The incorrect date was somehow made up and crept into the long and treacherous process of (re)production and circulation.

Huang Yi visually documented the Wu shrines not only for friends living afar, but also for friends nearby. Sun Xingyan (1753–1818), for example, was once guided by Huang Yi to the site at Mount Ziyun when he was transferred to an official position in Shandong in 1795, long after he had known of the discovery and had been a sponsor of the preservation project.20 Apparently pleased with Sun’s visit, Huang made a painting to commemorate their tour of the Wu shrines. Moved by Huang’s enthusiasm, Sun composed a poem in response:

The stone chambers for centuries are open for you,
On the green [we] visited the ancient and roamed around together ...

A pair of stone gate-pillars are half buried by dust,
Who would have asked after myriads of trees
with peach blossoms [nearby]? ...

To paint is to hand down a legend for the future,
[Which is our] friendship on bronze and stone
and [our] affinity with brush and ink.21
[Appendix 3]

Unlike the paintings Huang sent earlier to Weng and Hong, the painting Huang made for Sun was not to document his discovery of the Wu shrines, but to commemorate their visit to the site, a token of their friendship deeply rooted in their shared antiquarianism. We do not know if Huang simply repeated or modified his ready composition Searching for Steles at Mount Ziyun, small individual variations notwithstanding, or drew something entirely different for the occasion.

Huang Yi’s depictions of the Wu shrines in situ surely seem unique when appreciated singly, whether painted as mementos of discovery or friendship. But when the scene is juxtaposed with others as in the Tianjin album, its uniqueness becomes secondary to a more complicated interplay between documentation and commemoration. The

Fig. 5 Upland houses in Searching for Steles at Mount Ziyun. (a) the Tianjin album, (b) the Christie’s handscroll, (c) the Taipei handscroll.
Tianjin album is composed of twelve leaves, which exhibit Huang Yi’s major acquisitions in Shandong between 1775 and 1793. It depicts him retrieving Han stones inscribed with texts, examining Han stones engraved with images, and obtaining rare and precious rubbings of Han steles. The entire album ends with the leaf entitled *Celebrating Steles at the Little Penglai Pavilion (Xiao Penglai Ge hebei tu)*, portraying Huang sharing a new acquisition—the rubbings of a broken stele dated to the year 173 from Qufu—with his friends in his studio, the Little Penglai Pavilion (fig. 7). According to Huang’s colophon, while his family and relatives raucously honored his fiftieth birthday, he preferred to quietly celebrate the steles he procured with bosom friends. As the album shows, the collection he was celebrating was not limited to the Qufu rubbings obtained on his birthday, but went back eighteen years to his first advance in the search for ancient steles, and retraced his every major achievement thereafter. No doubt each leaf individually was intended to document a discovery Huang stumbled across at a specific moment in a specific place, but as a whole they were meant to memorialize the lifelong accomplishment of Huang in his dogged and passionate practice of visiting steles. The leaf illustrating the search for steles at Mount Ziyun is therefore retrospectively interwoven into Huang Yi’s intellectual biography, while also serving as a visual record of a remarkable discovery and, at the same time, as a commemoration of friendship.
The Stele: Celebration and Discrimination
Not long after the excavation, about the winter of 1787, a brand-new stele was produced and installed in situ. The stele was incised with Weng Fanggang’s essay entitled “The Record of Re-erecting the Stones of the Wu Family Shrine” (“Chongli Han Wushi citang shi ji”; fig. 8).²⁶

Less ambiguous than the paintings, this stele was intended to commemorate the preservation project initiated by Huang Yi. As Weng Fanggang clearly described in his essay, Huang and his local assistants “gathered all the stones, established a building at the site, erected an enclosing wall for fortification, named [the site] as the Wu Family Shrines with an inscribed plaque, and asked natives to guard it.”²⁷ More details were provided by Huang’s own aforementioned report. Huang felt obliged to take care of the unearthed stones because he was the one who had had them exposed to the world. Due to the weight and quantity of the stones, Huang decided that it would be more feasible to preserve them on site than to move them elsewhere. The building was thus constructed to shelter the stones, and the wall to define the protective boundary that would enclose the two gate-pillars. Inside the building the stele for Wu Ban was placed at the center and other carved stones along the four walls. A wooden plaque inscribed with “The Wu Family Shrines” was hung above the door to mark the building. Huang was pleased that the preservation turned archaeological finds into public property. Instead of being monopolized by a handful of collectors for a limited time, the Wu shrines preserved in situ would be appreciated and cherished by the public for many generations to come.²⁸

Given that Weng Fanggang had never been to the site, he must have followed Huang’s report when he composed his essay for the commemorative stele. Nevertheless, the main focus of Weng’s essay was not on details of the preservation project but on the significance of the discovery. Weng began his essay with the revered Song scholar Ouyang Xiu (1007–1072) and his catalogue The Record of the Search for Antiquities (Jigu lu). Mourning for the loss of the past, Ouyang Xiu was probably the first scholar who consciously took notes on ancient monuments that had been abandoned or neglected for centuries in the wild. Although Ouyang claimed that he had set foot in
all the important ruins, Weng pointed out that his renowned catalogue did not include the Wu shrines.

Weng traced the first documentation of the Wu shrines to Zhao Mingcheng (1081–1129), a Song scholar who was said to have compiled some information on the Wu shrines in five chapters (juan), but whose text was no longer available.23 Only the efforts of a third Song scholar, Hong Gua (1117–1184), who included the inscriptions and images of the Wu shrines in his books Lishi and Li xu, had, to Weng’s great delight, survived to Weng’s own time. Even so, as Weng lamented, the original printings of Hong’s books, already scarce in the thirteenth century, were almost unobtainable in the eighteenth.

It is in comparison with early documentation of the Wu shrines that Weng Fanggang defined Huang Yi’s epochal contribution. Due to Hong Gua’s books, many scholars were aware of the existence of the Wu shrines, but few had seen the original monuments. Even Hong himself grounded his study of the Wu shrines on the rubbings owned by the contemporary collector Liang Jiheng.39 In his essay Weng recalled how he and Huang had always regretted being unable to examine some older rubbings of ancient monuments since they began to study ancient stelae together in 1777.31 Neither had ever imagined that they would get to inspect the stones of the Wu shrines in person. Huang’s discovery in 1786 was therefore a groundbreaking event. Henceforth those who cared about ancient texts (and images) would have more reliable, even firsthand, materials at their disposal. Although Weng was in Jiangxi, the hometown of Hong Gua, when Huang retrieved the precious stones in Shandong, Weng’s mood was jubilant. He exulted in his essay that “Huang Yi’s excavation was arguably a greater achievement than Hong Gua’s publication.” The newly erected stele was thus not merely to commemorate the restoration, but mostly to celebrate the discovery.

It is worth mentioning that because of his discovery Huang Yi eventually obtained the older rubbings of the Wu shrines that he and Weng Fanggang had craved. More privileged than Weng, Huang was invited to appreciate the allegedly Tang

---

Fig. 8. List of donors at the end of Weng Fanggang, Record of Re-erecting the Stones of the Wu Family Shrines. Ink rubbings; h: 31–31.5 cm, w: 89.5–90 cm. Princeton University Art Museum. From Cary Liu, Recarving China’s Past, p. 193.
rubbings when Wang Xuejiang procured them in 1775 (fig. 9). To his regret, however, Huang did not make any tracing copies, and was thus unable to double-check details afterward. Huang sent Wang Xuejiang rubbings imprinted from the original stones after he recovered the Wu shrines. To show his gratitude and recognition, Wang went so far as to grant Huang his prized "Tang rubbings." Huang Yi consequently had the good fortune both to discover the Wu shrines and to possess their most valuable rubbings.

In addition to its celebratory function, the 1787 stele also served to distinguish a unique group of scholars who were enthusiastic about the study of ancient steles. To carry out the preservation plan, Huang Yi started a fund-raising campaign shortly after the excavation. He and local scholars took the lead in contributing money, hoping to inspire more donations from patrons all over the country who valued the discovery and understood the importance of the preservation. To honor the contributors, Huang proposed to have their names and donated amounts engraved on the stele. In the end, eighty donors were recorded on the stone. Their donations ranged from one thousand to fifty thousand qian, with Huang Yi's forty thousand plus one hundred thousand the largest donation, and Bi Yuan's (1730–1797) fifty thousand the second largest (fig. 8).

Among the eighty donors, Weng Fanggang was probably a pioneer in the practice of visiting steles; he began investigating ancient monuments in the region where he held an official position. Long before Huang Yi's excavation, Weng Fanggang in 1771 compiled The Record of Bronzes and Stones in Guangdong (Yue dong jinshi ji), taking full advantage of his post as supervisor of education in Guangdong Province since 1764. Huang Yi's own adventures, including the unearthing of the Wu shrines, also had everything to do with his official appointment as an assistant to canal transportation in Shandong Province. It was Bi Yuan who led the most vigorous search team during his administration of Shaanxi Province from 1767 to 1786. Bi initiated a catalogue project for The Record of Bronzes and Stones in Shaanxi (Guanzhong jinshi ji),

Fig. 9. Story of Min Ziqian, Wu Liang Shrine, Jiaxiang, Shandong. 2nd century. Ink rubbing once collected by Wang Xuejiang and Huang Yi and believed to be a Tang production. Palace Museum Beijing. From Zhongguo meishu quanjì, shufa zhuanke bian, vol. 1, pl. 72.
which was finished about 1782. The gifted young scholars Bi Yuan recruited for his head office then implemented the practice of investigating steles wherever they were sent, tactfully combining their eager search for steles with their duty to compile county gazetteers. Among them, Zhang Xun created separate chapters to accommodate his notes on the steles he examined when he assembled the gazetteers for Xingping (1777) and Fufeng (1781), both in Shaanxi. Likewise, Qian Dian (1744–1806) included more accounts of steles in the gazetteer he composed for Hancheng (1784). Sun Xingyan, who won Bi Yuan’s full support, incorporated his notes of local steles into the gazetteer of Liquan (1784). Hong Liangji, who stayed with Bi Yuan longer than others, also reported on steles in detail in the gazetteer he was responsible for in Chunchua (1784). Sun and Hong even worked together to produce the Chengcheng gazetteer (1784). It is thus not surprising that Bi Yuan and his active staff all contributed to the preservation of the Wu shrines.

Some donors did not have the opportunity to exercise their privilege as scholar-officials to record antiquities until after their preservation of the Wu shrines. Feng Minchang (1747–1806), for instance, surveyed local monuments for the county gazetteer of Meng in 1790, under the supervision of Bi Yuan after he was transferred to administer Henan Province. When Xie Qikun (1737–1802) compiled the provincial gazetteer for Guangxi in 1801, he also finished The Outline of Bronzes and Stones in Guangxi (Yue xi jinshi lüe), a work comparable to Weng Fanggang’s earlier catalogue on Guangdong. Instead of working in far-flung outposts, the senior scholar and high-ranking official Qian Daxin (1728–1804) preferred to investigate the remains in his hometown. Carrying out his project in Yin in Zhejiang Province, Qian published an extensive account of steles in the county gazetteer in 1788. Wu Yi (1745–1799) also worked assiduously in and around his hometown, itemizing stone steles in the county gazetteers he made for Yanshi (1788) and Anyang (1793) in Henan Province.

Much as the institutional mechanism of compiling gazetteers facilitated the practice of investigating steles in the eighteenth century, the most ambitious among the donors did not confine themselves within a regional framework. They were either frequent travelers or accomplished rubbing collectors, or both. Weng Fanggang, again, took the lead in putting together a comprehensive book entitled The Record of Bronzes and Stones in the Western and Eastern Han Dynasties (Liang Han jinshi ji) in 1789. More than a simple catalogue, the book consisted of Weng’s personal opinions, his discussions with friends, and his disagreements with past scholars about Han relics all over the country. It also included Huang Yi’s report and Weng’s essay about the preservation of the Wu shrines, making both texts more widely known to the public. Sun Xingyan, who had been given a tour of the foot of Mount Ziyun by Huang and had compiled quite a few gazetteers, also produced The Record of Visiting Steles around the World (Huanyu fangbei lü) in 1802. The book was no more than an inventory enumerating hundreds of steles Sun had investigated, but it covered a time frame longer than the Han period. The most inclusive work was Wang Chang’s (1724–1806) Assemblage of Bronzes and Stones (Jinshi cuibian), which came out in 1805. Like an encyclopedia, the book not only provided basic information about each stele, such as measurement, location, and transcription, but also collected all the related comments on each stele from Song forerunners to Qing contemporaries.

Moreover, the eighty donors listed on the stele were all connected one way or another. Some
were related by blood, such as Qian Daxin and his
nephew Qian Dian, and Weng Fanggang and his
son Weng Shupai (1765–1809). Some developed
a close friendship because of a shared birthplace.
Wu Yi and Wang Fu (1738–1788) both came from
Yanshi, Henan; Sun Xingyan, Hong Liangji, and
Zhao Huaiyu (1756–?) all grew up in northern
Jiangsu. Many of the donors were associated in
a kind of senior-junior relationship that was estab-
lished through learning, working, or promotion in
civil-service examinations. Huang Yi claimed to be
a disciple of Bi Yuan; so did Sun Xingyan, Hong
Liangji, Wang Fu, and Gui Fu (1736–1805). He
Yuanxi (1766–1829) was Qian Daxin’s pupil. Feng
Minchang, Song Baocun (1748–1818), and Jiang
Deliang (1752–1793) were Weng Fanggang’s fol-
lowers. These donors’ common interests in antiquities,
history, and literature gave rise to continual com-
nunications that formed a network that facilitated the
flow of information. The preservation of the Wu
shrines was an excellent test of this network.

It is noteworthy that the network of
antiquarians who supported the preservation
of the Wu shrines overlapped that of the literati
who advocated evidential analysis of ancient
texts. Established in the seventeenth century, the
so-called evidential study (kaozheng xue) reached
its peak in the second half of the eighteenth
century. Derived from the field of classical learning,
 evidenced scholarship emphasized careful review
of the Confucian canons, bringing to bear philology,
etymology, and phonology in order to correctly
grasp the essence of Confucianism. This critical
approach was applied to various branches of
knowledge, including historical research. No longer
confined to received texts, many evidential scholars
turned to inscriptions on excavated bronzes and
retrieved steles, and considered them to be primary
sources of greater reliability. Epigraphy, along with
philology, etymology, and phonology, became an
essential tool for reconstructing the past. The
fascination with ancient monuments in Huang Yi’s
generation was therefore an outgrowth of the
dominant evidential scholarship.

This distinctive eighteenth-century scholarly
community for evidential study through investi-
gating steles, as embodied by the donors of the
Wu shrines, inevitably created its own distinctive
shared cultural codes. Those who knew Han steles
well would have understood the format Huang
Yi proposed for listing donors, which, as Huang
explained in his report, was intended to reproduce
the Han convention.\textsuperscript{57} Those who often studied Han steles would also have appreciated the calligraphic style Weng Fanggang chose for his commemorative essay, which, as Weng declared in a poem, was meant to match the Han monuments referred to in the essay, the "clerical style of calligraphy" (\textit{jishu}) having developed in the Han period.\textsuperscript{58}

The most revealing example of the coded communication was probably a Han image Huang Yi copied for Wu Yi. In examining the rubbings taken from a Han shrine at Jinxiang in Shandong, Huang Yi spotted an incised figure without any identifying inscription that greatly resembled his good friend Wu Yi. Huang made a linear tracing copy of the figure and sent it to Wu (fig. 10).\textsuperscript{59} Rather than Wu's own portrait, the Jinxiang image became the sanctioned representation of Wu Yi after his death. It appeared in the opening pages of a posthumous collection that Wu's son assembled in his honor. The image even served as an icon to which Wu's friends expressed their grief at his death. Wang Fu composed a poem in memory of Wu Yi based on this image:

Writing books just in wait to be stored in famous mountains,
[Your] ancient appearance was disseminated from a stone chamber.
Without the elegant envoy who visited steles,
Who would have wiped off the dust from the Han carvings?\textsuperscript{60}

[Appendix 4]

Moving in the same circle as Wu Yi, Wang Fu had no difficulty in decoding the messages underlying Huang Yi's copy of the Han rubbing that bore Wu's likeness. First of all, there was a temporal trick. With his Han-dynasty "likeness," Wu Yi could be simultaneously an ancient in the present and a contemporary in the past. Wang's poem also contained a double reading. "The elegant envoy who visited steles" may refer to Huang Yi, as he uncovered Wu Yi's likeness in the deserted Han stone chamber, or the envoy may be Wu Yi, inasmuch as Wu himself had a lifelong practice of visiting steles.

The Jinxiang image similarly inspired Weng Fanggang to contribute his memorial poem in 1800.\textsuperscript{61} He started the poem with a profile of Wu Yi:

Mr. Wu was a follower of Hong Gua and Zhao Mingcheng,
Stones and inks, abundant in compilation and writing.
From Hebei [he] set foot in Shandong,
Through wooded graveyards [he] daily scavenged.\textsuperscript{62}

[Appendix 5a]

Weng then shifted his focus to Huang Yi, who traced the image:

Huang Yi is a person of curiosity,
Maintaining the rope [as if] to draw the ancient [from the well].
By hand [he] picked the gate-pillars of the Wu family,
While making rubbings [to fill] the bamboo cases [brought to] Jinxiang.\textsuperscript{63}

[Appendix 5b]

Ending the poem with his own participation, Weng furthered the established juxtaposition of the Jinxiang shrine and the Wu shrines:

I imitated the inscriptions of the Wu Family [Shrines], [Rendering] the small clerical scripts beside and above [the image] like steps.
Someday were [my poem and the image] inscribed together, [Their] genuine breath the mosses would quietly inhale. Honest and frank to the north of the Yellow River, Image by image the spirits would gather. Purple clouds in the mountain green, Old eagles rapidly screaming through the wind.  

Weng composed the poem for a solemn occasion, but his mood was playful. Since the Jinxiang image came from a Han shrine without cartouches, he saw it only fit to appropriate the calligraphic style for the poem from another Han shrine that was filled with inscriptions. Yet he was aware that, by the calligraphic appropriation, he might produce an ambiguity if the image and the poem were ever combined. Together, would they represent the upright Wu Yi living to the north of the Yellow River? Or, would they allude to the Wu shrines at the foot of Mount Ziyun? To make sure that the reader would not fail to grasp this cue, Weng even added a note after the poem, specifying that the “purple clouds in the mountain green” referred to Mount Ziyun, where the Wu shrines were located. Weng’s thoughts obviously drifted from the deceased friend to the cultural legacy they both appreciated. He encoded the subtle interplay between the real and the fictional with the kind of tacit knowledge shared only by those who were familiar with the practice of investigating steles and with the approach of evidential study.

In sum, the 1787 stele served to include all the donors who had helped preserve the Wu shrines. Given that the donors were bound by a specific interest in mapping the past through ancient monuments, the stele excluded all those who did not belong to this special community or did not understand its particular cultural practice. The stele therefore encompassed all the denotation and connotation — commemorative, celebrative and discriminative — derived from the preservation of the Wu shrines, and emerged as a new cultural landmark on its own.

The Prints: Readability and Authenticity
After the discovery of the Wu shrines, their carvings were circulated mainly by means of rubbings. Huang Yi was without doubt the major supplier. He quite prolifically sent rubbings to friends here and there. For many, these direct imprints became the primary sources for their studies of ancient monuments. Weng Fanggang, for example, received the rubbings of the Wu shrines successively from Huang Yi, starting from the ninth month of 1786, the very month Huang returned to Jixiang for excavation. As the first to share the extraordinary discovery, Weng was also the first to publicize the content of these rubbings in his 1789 Record of Bronzes and Stones in the Western and Eastern Han Dynasties. Even though he composed a long poem to eulogize the incised images that constituted the main body of the carvings, Weng was chiefly interested in the inscribed texts, i.e., the brief titles of the images, and therefore devoted almost all the pages to textual transcriptions. It never occurred to him that it would be worthwhile to reproduce the images. Many of his contemporaries followed the same textual approach to the Wu shrines, whether in a systematic collection like Bi Yuan’s Record of Extant Bronzes and Stones in Shandong (Shanzuo jinshi zhi) published in 1797, or in the more random commentaries of scholars such as Qian Daxin and Wu Yi. These publications may have enhanced the publicity of the Wu shrines, but they added little to their visibility. Wang Chang, one of the leading
donors to their preservation, rightly pointed out three difficulties in circulating knowledge of the Wu shrines. First, textual accounts of the engraved images, however explicit, could not create a likeness of the artwork. The viewer had to rely on rubbings for full comprehension. Secondly, to laboriously hang gigantic rubbings on the wall whenever one wished to see the carvings was hardly practicable, let alone pleasurable. And thirdly, many who were interested in antiquities would find it hard to come by the rubbings. Most of them could only imagine the look of the pictorial carvings. For Wang Chang, only print, a medium capable of reduced reproduction and mass-production, could resolve all of these "viewer-unfriendly" problems and make the Wu shrines truly known to people outside the elite community that endorsed the preservation project.

Long before Wang Chang stated the problem, Hong Gua had already tried to convert rubbings into prints in his 1167 book *Li xu*. Hong intended to maintain the visual effect of rubbings in print. Black figures with white linear details stood out from the white background, indicating that the rubbings were imprinted from stones carved in relief with incised lines to delineate details on the figures (fig. 11). The arrangement of the figures in two horizontal registers also reproduced the original format of the rubbings, even though each rubbing was too large to be reduced to book size, and had to be divided into two or three sections. As one of the very few pieces of physical evidence of the Wu shrines, Hong's prints had been greatly admired and cherished among scholars until the rediscovery of the monuments themselves in the eighteenth century.

With the unearthing of the Wu shrines, Qing scholars became discontented with Hong Gua's efforts. As Huang Yi noticed, the sequence of the divided sections published by Hong did not correctly reflect their spatial order on the three walls of the Wu Liang Shrine (fig. 12). The discrepancies certainly confirm that Hong had never examined the shrine in person. In addition, Wang Chang also found Hong's prints aesthetically unsatisfactory because the figures were poorly delineated and inaccurately portrayed. Wang further deplored the abbreviation of the inscriptions

Fig. 11. Carvings from the Wu Liang Shrine. Ink rubbing reproduced in Hong Gua, *Li xu*, juan 6 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), n.p.
in the overly reduced illustrations, which necessitated consulting the complete transcription of the inscriptions in Hong’s other book, *Lishi*, in order to understand the content of the illustrations in *Li xu*. These defects made Hong Gua’s reproduction scarcely reader-friendly.  

Qing scholars therefore felt the need to remake the prints. Among his peers, Huang Yi was probably the first to replicate images of the Wu shrines in his 1800 catalogue *Bronze and Stone Inscriptions from the Little Penglai Pavilion (Xiao Penglai Ge jinshi wenzi)*. Unlike Hong Gua, Huang Yi preferred to trace the contours of images and to have his linear tracing copies transferred onto woodblocks for printing (figs. 13A, B). Interestingly, what Huang chose to reproduce was not the images on the rubbings recently imprinted from the stones, but the images on the “Tang rubbings” he had come to possess. Since the “Tang rubbings” had been cut by scene and mounted as an album, Huang’s catalogue also exhibited one scene per page and thus fashioned a scene-by-scene viewing sequence. Whether so intended or not, turning the pages of Huang’s catalogue gave the feeling of reading a book.  

It was Wang Chang who first tackled the rubbings made directly from Huang Yi’s discovery in his ambitious *Assemblage of Bronzes and Stones* of 1805, almost two decades after the excavation. Having noted all the imperfections of Hong Gua’s work, Wang Chang formulated a different strategy for his own project. Like Hong Gua, he tried to maintain the visual effect of rubbings, but he adopted Huang Yi’s scene-by-scene rendition, including both image and text on each page (fig. 13C). He ordered the images carefully,
specifying the register and stone numbers on each leading scene in order to better anchor the reader (fig. 14A). This presentation made it infinitely easier to more or less envision the stones themselves.

Huang Yi's attempt to transform the "Tang rubbings" and Wang Chang's effort to popularize the contemporary rubbings did not slake the ensuing passion for reproducing the carvings of the Wu shrines. Feng Yunpeng, too young to be part of the elite community sponsoring the preservation of the Wu shrines, embarked on an even more ambitious project in 1820 and finally published the result in *The Index to Bronzes and Stones (Jinshi suxu)* in about 1824. As a latecomer, Feng naturally made use of all the positive features of his predecessors' works. Like Hong Gua and Wang Chang, he preferred to preserve the look of rubbings. Following the examples of Huang Yi and Wang Chang, he presented one zoomed-in scene on each page, paid heed to the spatial relationship of the images, and informed the reader of the location of each. As a vigorous competitor, however, Feng knew how to distinguish himself. Whereas Hong, Huang, and Wang separated their comments from the illustrations, Feng placed image and annotation on the same page, a design that greatly facilitated reading (fig. 17). Rather than using the standard movable type for printing, Feng preferred to present the annotations in his own versatile calligraphic style, a consuming and expensive choice that reinforced the distinctiveness of his personal presentation. Moreover, he added outer and inner frames to each page, which distanced the images from their origin as rubbings and brought them closer to book format.

It is evident that readability was both a challenge and a priority for those who wanted to turn rubbings into prints. Making the final product more like an illustrated book to accommodate the general reading experience became a favored solution. In addition, Qing scholars vaunted the authenticity of their prints. As mentioned, Huang Yi in his 1800 catalogue used the "Tang rubbings" rather than the contemporary rubbings he himself produced and distributed, for the reason that the early imprints preserved more details than the later ones, due to wear that inevitably damaged the stones over time (figs. 13A, C). Hence, even with obvious defects, Hong Gua's reproduction was still valuable, as Huang Yi admitted, in preserving some scenes that were seriously damaged by the time he retrieved the stones, particularly the depiction.

---

Fig. 14. Yao Li's Assassination of Prince Qing Ji. Wu Liang Shrine, Jiaxiang, Shandong. 2nd century. Ink rubbings represented in (a) Wang Chang, *Jinshi cuibian*, (b) Hong Gua, *Li xu*.
of the orphan of the Li family and the portrayal of
King Xiu Tu (figs. 11, 16A). Only the “Tang rubbings”
could make Huang’s work superior to Hong Gua’s
Song rubbings. Unfortunately, the “Tang rubbings”
were incomplete, containing only fourteen scenes
from the Wu Liang Shrine, far fewer than the forty-
four scenes identified by Weng Fanggang based on
the newly made rubbings (fig. 15).79

The incompleteness of the “Tang rubbings”
gave scope to competing Qing scholars. Wang
Chang, for example, gladly embraced the
contemporary rubbings provided by Huang Yi in
his 1805 collection. He established the authenticity
of his prints by being as faithful as possible to the
rubbings imprinted from the unearthed stones. He
even included the decorative patterns that merely
framed each scene and had nothing to do with
the content. Wang Chang also left damaged spots
or sections daringly blank (figs. 13C, 16B).80 Even

though Hong Gua’s reproductions were believed
to represent the carvings when the stones were
in better condition, Wang Chang blithely supple-
mented the scene depicting Yao Li’s assassination
of Prince Qing Li (fig. 14A), which was intriguingly
incomprehensible in Li Xu (fig. 14B).81

Whatever rubbings they selected to print,
Hong Gua, Huang Yi, and Wang Chang reproduced
solely the three stones that constitute the three
walls of the Wu Liang Shrine. That incompleteness
offered Feng Yunpeng scope for amplification. His
book incorporated all the stones Huang Yi and his
local assistants had uncovered at the site, including
fifteen stones from the Front Chamber, ten stones
each from the Rear and Left Chambers, the stones
with images of omens, and the stone engraved
with the meeting of Confucius and Laozi. Moreover,
Feng found ways to claim authenticity, even though
he had never had the fortune to see the “Tang
rubbings,” the best imprints of the Wu Liang Shrine in his own time. Feng was able to guarantee the quality of the rubbings used for printing by supervising, in person, their making at the site. Because of his scrutiny of crucial details on the exquisite rubbings, Feng was confident that his replication would only add to the visual information contained in the carvings. Indeed, Feng exceeded all his predecessors in his meticulous attention to details, and he made sure that his artisans took equal care. Feng’s driven perfectionism, however, could not tolerate any blank spots on rubbings. To compensate for the stones’ damaged state, he consulted Hong Gua’s Li xu. And yet, when comparing Hong’s illustration (fig. 16A) with Feng’s remediation as shown in the scene of King Xiu Tu (fig. 17), it seems clear that Feng’s efforts at repair were overtaken by creation de novo.

In any case, Huang Yi’s, Wang Chang’s, and Feng Yunpeng’s combinations of readability and authenticity, however different, all appeared to have been well received. Although it is impossible for us to track the distribution of each set of prints, they were all republished by the end of the Qing dynasty. Before the introduction of lithography, republication meant that the images on the original prints had to be copied and that new woodblocks for printing had to be cut based on those copies. In woodblock reproduction, Huang Yi’s catalogue was republished in 1834 and 1890, Wang Chang’s in 1872. After the adoption of lithography, however, it was Wang Chang’s and Feng Yunpeng’s prints that were most sought after, particularly in the Shanghai area. Three Shanghai publishers reissued Wang’s collection in 1893. Two Shanghai publishers reprinted Feng’s book, in 1893 and in 1897 respectively.

All things considered, it is fair to conclude that Huang Yi’s, Wang Chang’s, and Feng Yunpeng’s prints and reprints shaped the general impression of the Wu shrines. Only a handful of zealous devotees and local residents actually viewed the carved stones. And only a limited number of literati and collectors possessed rubbings of the carvings. The vast majority of people had to depend on prints and reprints of the carvings for leisure appreciation or for serious study. The reputation of the Wu shrines was therefore singularly established by the reproductions of reproductions (monument — rubbing — print) and by the transformations of transformations (rubbing — album — book). The firsthand monument may alone be genuine and priceless, but it is the third-hand and even fourth-hand reproductions that truly sustained the legacy of the Wu Family Shrines.
### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 武氏祠刻石 | 大河南移川變陸 | 著書正待名山矜 | 仿武氏祠 |}
| 賢聖留形模 | 削石棱棱數間屋 | 古韻先從石室傳 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 千年閔原野 | 不借大浪入論議 | 不遇風流訪碑使 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 一旦資寶符 | 中有聖賢留置足 | 誰來拂拭漢時鏡 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| ...       | 5a              | 5a              | 5a       |
| 1b       | 訪碑客至何蕭蕭 | 訪碑客至何蕭蕭 | 仿武氏祠 |}
| 黃子官書 | 輔拓地為碑營大廈 | 武君洪趙徒 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 鄉義日耕鍾 | 道旁錯記魯東家 | 石墨富編著 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 而我西江役 | 一車兩馬棲栠客 | 河北涉東齊 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 鄭陽沙匡廬 | 林家日衰捨 | 鄭陽沙匡廬 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 破損角與根 | 石室千年為爾開 | 破損角與根 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 3        | 5b              | 5b              | 5b       |
| 壽存泗洲珠 | 翠微訪觀共徘徊 | 壽存泗洲珠 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 1c       | ...             | ...             | ...      |
| 荒荒寒原草 | 一難石鎮半埋屋 | 荒荒寒原草 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 蕭夢礮馬車 | 萬樹桃花映水色 | 蕭夢礮馬車 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 中有萬古渡 | ...             | ...             | ...      |
| 碧峰秋雨餘 | 畫圖他日傳佳話 | 碧峰秋雨餘 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 儉應添畫我 | 金石交情翰墨緣 | 儉應添畫我 | 小隸旁爲 |}
| 裝軸聖寶阜 | ...             | ...             | ...      |

### Notes


8. Unless otherwise indicated, translations are my own. It is noteworthy that what Huang Yi helped to erect was a building to house the carved stones of the Wu Family Shrines. He did not restore the original structure of each shrine.

9. There are only two points in the colophon that differ slightly from Huang Yi’s earlier report. First, we
learn from the colophon that Li Dongqi, Li Kezheng, and Gao Zhengyan also participated in the excavation, whereas the three local scholars were mentioned as consultants for restoration in the report. Second, the left chamber was discovered by Li Dongqi in 1789. It was therefore unknown when Huang wrote his report in 1787. See Bi Yuan and Ruan Yuan, Shanzuo jinshi zhi (preface 1797; reprint, Shikeshiliao xinbian, ser. I, vol. 18 [Taipei: Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi, 1982]), 7.54a.


12. Ibid.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid. Weng mentioned in the poem that he had composed an essay for the stele commemorating the preservation of the Wu shrines. See the second section of this paper, The Stele: Celebration and Discrimination, for further discussion.

15. Ibid.

16. Lü Pei, ed., Hong Beijiang xiansheng nianpu (Shanghai: Dalu shuju, 1933), p. 38.

17. Hong Liangji was one of the donors who financially supported the restoration of the Wu shrines. See The Stele: Celebration and Discrimination in the second section of this paper.


21. Ibid.

22. They include the Sangong Shan stele, the Zheng Jixuan stele, the Wu Ban stele, and the Wu shrines. Only one leaf depicts monuments not produced in the Han; they are Buddhist carvings at Mt. Jinyang near Jining. They are the carvings in the Xiaotang Shan and Zhu Wei shrines, and at Liangcheng Shan and Hongfuyuan.

23. They are the rubbings of the Fanshi stele and of the Xiping Stone Classics.


26. Ibid.

27. Ibid. Huang Yi, “Xiu Wushi citang jilue,” in Weng Fanggang, Liang Han jinshi ji, 15.46a–47a.


31. Weng Fanggang and Huang Yi first met in 1777, when Huang obtained rare rubbings of the Han Xiping Stone Classics in Beijing. See Weng Fanggang, “Huang Qiu’an zhu.” in Fuchuzhai wenzhi (n.d.; reprint, Xuxiu Siku quanshu, vol. 1455 [Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1995]), 13.6a. Weng heard about Wang Xuejiang’s “Tang rubbings” in 1777, but failed in his attempt to see the rare collection in person. See Weng Fanggang, Liang Han jinshi ji, 15.17b.

32. The “Tang rubbings” are currently in the collection of the Palace Museum in Beijing. They had been made before Huang Yi rediscovered the Wu shrines, and are believed to have originated during the Song dynasty. See Ma Ziyun, “Tan Wu Liang ci huaxiang de Song ta yu Huang Yi taben,” Gugong bowuyuan yuankan, vol. 2 (1960), pp. 170–77.


34. In fact, it was Huang Yi who urged Wang Xuejiang to request the rubbings from a friend in the first place.

35. Huang Yi, “Xiu Wushi citang jilue,” in Weng Fanggang, Liang Han jinshi ji, 15.48b.


37. Weng Fanggang, “Huang Qiu’an zhu,” in Fuchuzhai wenzhi, 13.6a.

PART FOUR  QING DYNASTY RECEPTION OF THE "WU FAMILY SHRINES"


40 Qian Dia, Hancheng jinshi zhi (1784; reprint, Shike shiliao xinbian, ser. III, vol. 32, excerpted from original county gazetteer).

41 Sun Xingyan, Liqian jinshi zhi (1784; reprint, Shike shiliao xinbian, ser. III, vol. 31, excerpted from original county gazetteer).

42 Hong Lianji, Chunhua jinshi zhi (1784; reprint, Shike shiliao xinbian, ser. III, vol. 32, excerpted from original county gazetteer).

43 Hong Lianji and Sun Xingyan, Chengcheng jinshi zhi (1784; reprint, Shike shiliao xinbian, ser. III, vol. 32, excerpted from original county gazetteer).

44 Feng Minchang, Mengxian jinshi zhi (1790; reprint, Shike shiliao xinbian, ser. II, vol. 29, excerpted from original county gazetteer).

45 Xie Qikun, Yue xi jinshi lue (1801; reprint, Shike shiliao xinbian, ser. I, vol. 17).

46 Qian Daxin, Yinxian jinshi zhi (1790; reprint, Shike shiliao xinbian, ser. III, vol. 8, excerpted from original county gazetteer).

47 Wu Yi and Sun Xingyan, Yanshi xianzhi (1788; reprint, Zhongguo fangzhi congshu, vol. 442 [Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1968]).


48 Weng Fanggang, Liang Han jinshi ji, as n. 6.

49 Sun Xingyan, Huanyu fangbei lu (1802; reprint, Xuxu Siku quanshu, vol. 904).

50 Wang Chang, Jinshi cuibian (1805; reprint, Lidai bezhi congshu, vol. 4–7 [Nanjing: Jiangsu gu, 1998]).

51 Ye Yanlan and Ye Gongchuo, Qingdai xueye xiangzhuang, pp. 246, 256, 290. Sun Xingyan and Hong Lianji were from Yanghu. Zhao Huaiyu was from Wuji.

52 Identifying themselves as menren ("followers"), Huang Yi, Sun Xingyan, Hong Lianji, Wang Fu, and Gui Fu proofread different chapters of Bi Yuan’s Lingyan shanren shiji (1799; reprint, Xuxu Siku quanshu, vol. 1450).

53 He Yuanxi, ed., Zhuting xiansheng riji chao (1805; reprint, Jiaqing Qian Daxin quanj, vol. 8 [Nanjing: Jiangsu gu, 1997]). Identifying himself as alzi ("pupil"), He Yuanxi compiled Qian’s diary shortly after his death.

54 Weng Fanggang, Fuchuzhai wenji, 22.11b.

55 Benjamin Elman, From Philosophy to Philology: Intellectual and Social Aspects of Change in Late Imperial China (Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 2001), pp. 1–122; Qi Yongxiang, Qian-lia kaojuxue yanjiu (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1998), pp. 8–110.


57 Huang Yi, “Xiu Wushi citang jilue,” in Weng Fanggang, Liang Han jinshi ji, 45.8b.

58 Weng Fanggang, “Ti Huang Xiao song Ziyuanshan tanbei tu,” Fuchuzhai shiji, 35.9b.

59 Wu Muchun, ed., Shoutang yishu (1843), ii–iii. The stone chamber at Jinxiang is better known as Zhu Wei’s shrine, although this attribution is not beyond controversy.


61 Ibid., 1a; Weng Fanggang, Fuchuzhai shiji, 54.11a–11b.

62 Ibid.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid.


66 Weng Fanggang, Liang Han jinshi ji, 15.3a–b.

67 Ibid., 15.17b–44b.

68 Weng Fanggang, “Wushi citang huaxiang shi,” in Liang Han jinshi ji, 15.48a–49b.

69 Bi Yuan and Ruan Yuan, Shanzuo jinshi zhi, 7.17a–54b. This collaborative work came out after the death of Bi. The authors gave a very detailed account of the content of the carvings.

70 Qian Daxin, Qianyantang jinshi wen wei ba (foreword 1787; reprint, Shike shiliao xinbian, ser. I, vol. 25), 1.29b–30b. Wu Yi, Jinshi yiba (1843);
71 Wang Chang, Jinshi cuibian, 20.53b.
72 Hong Gua, Li xu, 6.1a–15b. The compilers of the Siku quanshu believed that Li xu contained only ten chapters when it was first published in 1168; the version composed of twenty-one chapters was finalized in 1181. Neither was available when the Siku project started in 1772. The version included in Siku quanshu was Cao Yin's republication in 1706 (known as the Yangzhou version).
Before the Siku project was completed in 1782, Wang Rixu republished another version of Li xu in 1778 (known as the Lousong shuwu version). One of the most significant differences between the Yangzhou and the Lousong shuwu versions is that the former represents the carvings of the Wu shrines with line drawings, the latter with ink rubbings. It is not easy to decide which one is more authentic because no example from the twelfth century is extant. The illustrations in an early manuscript believed to have been produced in the Song, today in the Fu Ssu-nien Library in Taipei, are, however, in the mode of ink rubbings. In addition, the drawings seen in the Yangzhou version are very sketchy and far from the quality displayed in other Song antiquarian catalogues such as Kaogu tu. Therefore, I am inclined to believe that if Hong Gua had ever published Li xu with illustrations, he most likely used the mode of ink rubbings as duplicated in early manuscripts and the Lousong shuwu version. The figures in this paper come from the modern reproduction of the Lousong shuwu version in the Shike shiliao xinbian.
73 It is, however, uncertain whether the poor quality of the illustrations in Li xu was inherent in its original printing or developed in later reproductions.
74 Wang Chang, Jinshi cuibian, 20.54a.
75 Huang Yi, "Wu Lianq ci Tang taben," in Xiao Penglai Ge jinshi wenzi, 24a. As explained in n. 72 above, there were two different versions of Li xu showing two different modes of representing the carvings of the Wu shrines in Huang Yi's time. We do not know how Huang assessed the two versions. Nevertheless, it can be noted that his careful attention to accurate shaping and incised details was just what was lacking in the line drawings in the Yangzhou version.
76 For the newly made rubbings, Huang Yi only copied the inscriptions and had them printed in the chapter following the "Tang rubbings."
77 Feng Yunpeng and Feng Yunyuan, Jinshi suo (preface 1824; Ziyang, Shandong: the County Government, 1821–1824). Since Feng Yunpeng was the one who truly carried out this book project, I consider him the main compiler.
79 Weng Fanggang, Liang Han jinshi ji, 15.1a–30b.
80 Wang Chang, Jinshi cuibian, 20.54a–b.
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82 Feng Yunpeng and Feng Yunyuan, Jinshi suo, "Shi suo," 3.35b.
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84 Huang Yi, Xiao Penglai Ge jinshi wenzi (republished 1834; reprint, Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 1976).
85 Huang Yi, Xiao Penglai Ge jinshi wenzi (reprint, Xuandu: Yang Shoujing, 1890).
87 Wang Chang, Jinshi cuibian (republished 1893; Shanghai: Zuilutang; Shanghai: Baoshan; Shanghai: Hongbaozhai).
88 Feng Yunpeng and Feng Yunyuan, Jinshi suo (republished 1893, Shanghai: Jishan shuju; republished 1897, Shanghai: Wenzin shuju and Qianqingtang).
RETHINKING RECARVING
IDEALS, PRACTICES, AND PROBLEMS OF THE "WU FAMILY SHRINES" AND HAN CHINA

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY ART MUSEUM
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, NEW HAVEN AND LONDON
Rethinking Recarving: Ideals, Practices, and Problems of the "Wu Family Shrines" and Han China is cosponsored by the P. Y. and Kinmay W. Tang Center for East Asian Art at Princeton University, the Princeton University Art Museum, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and the B. Y. Lam Foundation. The symposium was organized by the Princeton University Art Museum in memory of Frederick W. Mote. Cosponsors included the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange, the East Asian Studies Program, and the P. Y. and Kinmay W. Tang Center for East Asian Art; with the support of the Asian Studies Center at the University of Pittsburgh, the History Department and the East Asian Library at the University of California at Berkeley.

The Recarving China's Past exhibition and publication were made possible by grants from the Getty, the E. Rhodes and Leona B. Carpenter Foundation, the Blakemore Foundation, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Princeton University Art Museum and Apparatus Fund, the Friends and the Partners of the Princeton University Art Museum, and the Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University. The project also was supported by gifts from Lillian Schloss and several anonymous donors.

Copyright © 2008 by the Trustees of Princeton University. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means including information storage and retrieval systems without written permission in writing from the Princeton University Art Museum, except by a reviewer, who may quote brief passages in a review.

Published by the Princeton University Art Museum
Princeton, New Jersey 08544-1018

Distributed by
Yale University Press, New Haven and London
www.yalebooks.com

ISBN 978-0-300-13704-0
Library of Congress Control Number: 2007943412

Managing Editor: Jill Guthrie
Project Editor: Kim Wishart
Indexer: Robert J. Palmer

Design, composition, production: Binocular, New York
Chinese typesetting: Birdtrack Press, New Haven
Printed and bound in Japan by Nissha, Kyoto

Cover illustration. Stone Chamber 1: Niche, south wall, Stone 1-5.6. Rubbing: h. 68.5 cm, w. 143.3 cm. PUAM acc. no. 2002.307.9

Frontispiece illustration: Recarved stone on north side of northeast gate-pillar (detail). Ink-on-paper rubbing. From Sekino Tadashi, Shina Santōshō ni okeru Kandai Funbo no Hyōshoku (Tokyo: Imperial University of Tokyo, 1916), pl. 26, fig. 41.

Divider page illustration: Stone Chamber 1: East wall, Stone 1-E.1. Rubbing: h. 87.5 cm, w. 199.3 cm. PUAM, acc. no. 2002.307.1.