From Object to Concept

Global Consumption and the Transformation of Ming Porcelain

Stacey Pierson

香港大學出版社
Hong Kong University Press

This publication has been generously supported by the Sir Y. K. Pao Publication Fund for publications in Chinese art and architecture.

Hong Kong University Press
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road
Hong Kong
www.hkupress.org

© Hong Kong University Press 2013

ISBN 978-988-8139-83-5

All rights reserved. No portion of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed and bound by Paramount Printing Company Limited, Hong Kong, China

Contents

Illustrations

Introduction

Ming ceramics are among the most widely admired ceramics in the world. From the first blue and white porcelains and celadon stonewares seen in Europe, to the technologically advanced monochromes of the early 15th century and the sophisticated polychromes of the Chenghua period (1465–87), this category of ceramics is extensive and diverse. As everyday objects and 'works of art', Ming ceramics have also been collected and consumed continuously since the Ming period (1368–1644) itself, both within China and elsewhere. In consequence, Ming porcelains and stonewares can be seen in most museum and public collections of Chinese art worldwide. They also appear regularly in the literature of 'Chinese art', in commercial sales of Chinese ceramics and other objects, and in visual representations of things Chinese.

Ming ceramics are therefore a well-established category of Chinese ceramics, and one which now has a relatively long history in both connoisseurship and scholarly studies of ceramics, both in China and elsewhere.[1] In Chinese history, certain Ming-period ceramics have been praised and singled out by collectors from the Ming period onwards and ceramic archaeology has been dominated by sites dating from the Ming period, such as the imperial kilns at Jingdezhen and the multiple sites for Longquan ware in Zhejiang province.[2] As a result, there are numerous studies of most aspects of Ming ceramics and Ming ceramics appear in the canonical historiographies of both Chinese ceramics and Chinese art in general, in Chinese and other languages. More recently, Chinese ceramics of the Ming period have begun to be used as data for studies of worldwide commodity exchanges, which position Ming ceramics, especially porcelain, as a significant factor in the development of global economic activity in what is known as the early modern world.[3] In these studies, Ming porcelain, and that of the succeeding Qing period (1644–1911), is seen to have had a significant impact on world cultures as a consequence of global consumption.

Most of the existing literature in various languages on Ming ceramics consists of surveys of individual objects, such as in museum or exhibition catalogues focusing on Ming ceramics, or selected studies of the remains of Ming pieces from archaeological sites. In conjunction with the use of Chinese porcelain as an exemplar in world history texts, the English-and European-language literature further presents a view of Ming ceramics which is object-or material-focused and is essentially outward-looking, such that we can identify a wide range of Ming characteristics in ceramics of that period and we can describe the impact

of Ming ceramics on other cultures. However, as a result of this outward focus, we have very little information about the impact of consumption, in all forms and locations, on Ming ceramics themselves. This is not surprising, because the standard methodologies for ceramic studies, Chinese or otherwise, are those of art history or archaeology, and now perhaps 'world history', which all assume a fixed identity for the objects concerned. Ming ceramics are defined simply as Chinese ceramics of the Ming period, wherever and whenever they were or are encountered. While this approach is satisfactory in many ways, it does leave us with a problem when we encounter unusual phenomena. To take one particular case, how do we explain the transformation of Ming porcelain objects into the literary and colloquial concept of 'the Ming vase'? Today it is not unusual to have any object of antiquity or high market value (or even a person) described as 'precious as a Ming vase', but the origins of this concept have so far remained unexplored.

This conceptual transformation is not the only one that resulted from global consumption of Ming ceramics. Certain Ming porcelains were physically transformed into different objects or even visual imagery, sometimes to such an extent that the original forms or designs were completely obscured. The most familiar example of this can be seen in the 'mounting' of Ming ceramics, that is the application of metal supports or appendages to reshape or revalue sometimes relatively ordinary (by Chinese standards) pieces. This physical transformation, destructive in its methods, also often resulted in a new identity for the Chinese pieces—a bottle could become a ewer, for example, or a bowl become a *tazza*. Either way, whether intellectually or physically, there are well-known instances of the transformation of Ming ceramics that at present are simply fitted into general object surveys but that—with a little creative thinking—can be seen as part of a wider process of identity change which has yet to be recognized as such, not just in Chinese ceramics but in collected objects in general. This also requires us to think about objects from a different perspective, using methodologies from anthropology and sociology, for example, rather than art history and archaeology.

The notion of object identity and the possibility of change over time and place is one which emerged with studies of object biographies, such as in *The Social Life of Things*,[4] and some cultural historians have worked on the development and conceptions of 'art' as an object category, particularly with reference to what used to be called 'ethnographic' material.[5] But few have looked at the impact of such transformation on the actual object. It is a fact that identity transformations often involve manipulation, whether physical or conceptual, and 'Ming vases' are just one example. Another is the process of becoming an 'antique', which Baudrillard characterized as a mythological transformation and a form of marginalisation.[6] However, with Ming porcelain, such a transformation is but one aspect of what might better be characterized as a transculturative process where a new 'culture' is created through encounters between two others.[7]

The idea of transculturation is normally associated with human cultures, not objects, but its tenets might provide a way of understanding the impact of other cultures, and human agency, on Ming ceramics, and thereby their different identities across time and place. The 'Ming vase' is part of the history of Ming ceramics, but until now, there has been no way to characterize this. As this book will demonstrate, the concepts and identities associated

with Ming ceramics evolved from the consumption and reception of actual objects and is a process which is closely associated with location, both geographical and cultural. Rather than a survey of selected individual objects, therefore, of which there are many excellent ones in print, this book looks at the meaning of Ming ceramics, particularly porcelain, in the various locations in which they were consumed and how this movement across cultures has an impact on their reception, appropriation, and most importantly, interpretation, thus transforming their identity. It is not a global history of Ming porcelain, though this topic is addressed generally, nor is it a catalogue of a particular collection. The individual porcelains discussed here are referenced as part of a wider narrative about the construction of object identities, and the role of humans within this.

As the history presented here is neither linear nor comprehensive, a broadly chronological but categorical structure has been chosen to give the narrative some direction. In chapter one, the origins and nature of Ming porcelains as ceramics of Ming China are explored, in order to establish what these objects meant in their culture of origin and some of the ways in which they were appreciated in Ming-dynasty China. The next chapter examines what happened to these ceramics when they left China during and shortly after the Ming period. Without giving a history of the export trade, which has already been presented elsewhere,[8] this chapter instead examines examples of the impact of local appropriative practices on the reception of these objects and how this changes their identity from Chinese to local material culture. In chapter three, the most radical transformation of Ming ceramics is explored, from actual object to invented concept, suggesting a chronology for the development of the literary and colloquial motif of 'the Ming vase'. This transformation is the most extreme because it involves a complete rejection of the materiality of the original object, in order to invent a new concept which reflected (and still reflects) the values and prejudices of early 20th century Anglo-American society. In spite of this transformation, the original object nonetheless still exists in parallel with its linguistic alter ego in what Becker defined as the art world,[9] part of a social system that is now, for Chinese objects at least, 'global' in its widest sense. It is this last, but perhaps not final, identity for Ming ceramics which is considered in chapter four.

Ultimately, the basic thesis of this book is that objects, in particular Ming porcelains, have more than just 'social lives'. They also have what might be called 'cultural lives' in the sense that objects can change their identities as often as humans do, and the ways in which this is effected can reveal much about the societies in which the changes take place. Objects have agency but so do humans in their treatment of objects. As this book will demonstrate, an object can be transformed physically as well as conceptually, consequently having an impact on many aspects of human cultural life. At the same time, a category of object can be treated in different ways within the same society and time period, as we will see.

The conceptual landscape for this book is grounded therefore in several different disciplines, including the author's own, art history. In order to reveal the processes of object identity transformation in the case of Ming porcelain, it was necessary to delve into literary history and theory, world history and its issues, as well as cultural anthropology and sociology. The focus nonetheless is on a type of object, whether actual or imagined, so that object studies form the foundations of the arguments presented. It is entirely possible that some key

tenets of other scholarly disciplines have been mis-or re-interpreted in ways which might seem cavalier; but the intention is to suggest a new way of looking at a group of very familiar but not well-understood objects from China, and, by extension, a new, more comprehensive approach to object study.

1

Porcelain in Ming China (14th–17th centuries)

Introduction

In Ming China, porcelain was an important domestic product that was consumed at all levels of society. It was also exported and given as foreign tribute, collected and written about by Chinese consumers; its manufacture created and supported a vast industry employing thousands. Large quantities of Ming-period porcelain survive today, and its production sites have been extensively excavated. Much therefore is known about the mechanics of Ming porcelain but rarely is it considered as a manufactured product that can illuminate aspects of Ming daily life and economics. Instead, Ming porcelain objects are traditionally studied as works of art and thus subjected to the hierarchies and methodologies associated with the history of art.[1] Certainly, it was long assumed that this was a primary way in which Ming porcelains were appreciated in Ming China, but that raises several other problems, not least the necessity to define the term 'art' in a Ming Chinese context, and the position of ceramics within this. Such definition has been undertaken elsewhere,[2] and it is in fact but a minor aspect of the consumption of porcelain in Ming China.

With a view to situating porcelain in the wider context of Ming culture, here we will focus, instead, on porcelain in general, rather than exclusively on individual porcelain objects, an approach to history-making which is inherently problematic. Where individual porcelains are significant for our discussion, they will of course be given due consideration. What follows is a study of the major themes associated with porcelain in the culture of Ming China. This provides a starting point and background for the primary focus of this book: how and why Ming porcelain was transformed outside of China.

Porcelain Manufacture and Technology in Ming China

Location: Jingdezhen and Its Porcelain

As a ceramic, the fundamental factors concerning and underpinning Ming porcelain are its materials, production and manufacture. Generally speaking, ceramic objects are the product of the transformation of one material, clay, into another, ceramic. Technology is a key factor in the visual appearance of porcelain objects and, therefore, their appreciation and analysis. It

is also very much characterized by location. In Ming China, porcelain was made at a number of different locations, but its production was centred at Jingdezhen in Jiangxi province, southeast China. By the Ming period, this location already had been producing ceramics for one thousand years and specifically porcelain wares since at least the 10th century.[3] The earliest porcelains from Jingdezhen were of a different chemical structure[4] but by the early Ming period, the body material consisted of locally-sourced kaolin (china clay) plus china stone, with a glaze based on glaze stone and glaze ash in varying proportions.[5] This combination produced a hard, strong and translucent porcelain that would set the standard for porcelain production and connoisseurship worldwide.

Jingdezhen was chosen (and was successful) as a production site because it was well-located for raw materials, fuel and transportation. It became, in fact, the 'porcelain city', which it is still designated today. The study of Jingdezhen, its history, economy, and society has proved to be of interest in multiple fields of scholarship,[6] not just art history, because a significant amount of relevant data survives from the Ming period and later which can tell us much about this area's economic and social development.[7] The study of Jingdezhen also illuminates important innovations in China's technology. For example, it was here that certain new kiln designs were pioneered and implemented, mineral technologies developed, and mechanized production methods introduced into a large-scale workshop or factory system that pre-dated similar such developments in Europe.[8] The volume of production at Jingdezhen in the Ming period is notable, especially at certain periods in the 16th century, surpassing all other contemporary ceramic production sites in China. For example, in 1547 (Jiajing 嘉靖26年), over 120,000 porcelains were ordered for the court.[9]

Because Jingdezhen is so well documented and excavated, the traditional historiography of Ming porcelain focuses on what was produced at Jingdezhen rather than other locations; this is reinforced by the high proportion of Jingdezhen porcelain in the export trade and overseas markets. Nonetheless, much of the Chinese porcelain from the Ming period which survives today, within China or elsewhere, was indeed made at Jingdezhen and this apparent dominance is based on evidence from surviving pieces as well as from archaeology. The other production sites for porcelain in the Ming period include, for example, a number of locations in Fujian province, which produced Dehua or 'blanc de chine' ware and 'Swatow' or Zhangzhou ware at Pinghe and other sites.[10] However, these are rarely classified as 'Ming porcelain' in a collective sense because Jingdezhen porcelain occupies such a central position.

Domestic Markets, Distribution and Classification

The position of ceramics in Ming China is also defined by their role in the Ming economy and commerce. Thus it is important to remember that one reason southern porcelain became such a successful product in Ming China and beyond is the geographical location of Jingdezhen and its proximity to excellent raw materials and transport links. It was also situated in a region which was characterized by active merchants and a highly developed trade network. As a result, Jingdezhen has been described as 'one of the first great industrial centres in China, and probably one of the earliest in the world', hence its popularity as a model for

studies of global exchange and economics.[11] Ming Jingdezhen became an industrial centre when both the quantity and quality of production increased dramatically.[12] While many have ascribed this to practical factors such as raw materials, labour supply, management, etc., Michael Dillon has demonstrated that the local transportation system and access to a nationwide marketing network, especially Jingdezhen's position within the well-studied and successful Huizhou merchant community, were equally if not more important.[13] Crucially, Jingdezhen was located on the river Chang which connected it to main arteries of river transport.[14] Through this, Jingdezhen ceramics were transported all over China and the world, as we will see in the next chapter.

It is significant that Jingdezhen had been a market town (*zhen* 镇) before becoming an industrial centre; it had also been a distribution centre for ceramics produced in other local regions. Even before the Ming period, it was a location for ceramic production as well as commerce.[15] The marketing network thus established revolved around the guilds, and these in turn were managed by brokers overseeing warehousemen and wholesalers.[16] Much of this activity was private and separate from the section of Jingdezhen that was given over to state-controlled production, that of the official or 'imperial' kilns.

The state could and did impose taxes on Jingdezhen production, products and producers which is why much helpful data survives in the form of local gazetteers or *difangzhi* 地方志 compiled by local magistrates.[17] One of the most detailed with respect to Jingdezhen is the *Jiangxi sheng dazhi* 江西省大志.[18] In another example, written just after the end of the Ming period, the commerce of Jingdezhen was described in the 1682 gazetteer *Fuliang xianzhi* 浮梁县志 as follows:

> … There is one town, Jingde, a large urban area in the south of the county [Fuliang county].
>
> As for its line of business, this is where the potters and the ceramics traders are … Boats and carts crowd together here, merchants and traders rush about, people from the five directions mingle, all spreading out their wares, so numerous it is truly magnificent![19]

A gazetteer for Hejian states: 'The salt merchants come from Cangzhou and Tianjin, the wood merchants from Zhending. Those who sell porcelain and lacquerware come from Raozhou and Huizhou', [20] thus confirming the Huizhou connection and demonstrating how, for the Ming government at least, porcelain was commodified. There is even textual evidence from the merchants themselves, in the form of merchants' manuals, as Anne Gerritsen has pointed out.[21] In one of these the route from Huizhou to Jingdezhen is clearly described.[22]

Thus as part of the successful Huizhou network and as a sprawling market town, Jingdezhen exploited the locally available raw materials to make a product that could be widely and easily distributed and, crucially, was desirable both at home and abroad. Consumers of this porcelain included members of the court and the scholarly classes. It is through the writings of the latter that we find information (albeit limited) about how much some porcelains and ceramics cost once they got to market. As Clunas has noted, relatively speaking, porcelain was cheap for wealthy people in the Ming period. It was also for the most part used in quantity rather than as individual items for upper class daily life activities. In the 1562 inventory of a Ming official whose belongings were confiscated after he was

found to be corrupt, porcelains are listed as large groups of items such as incense burners, bowls, flower pots, etc.[23] These represent huge amounts of tablewares which were probably therefore used for entertaining and events such as feasts. What is very interesting, but to this author's knowledge not mentioned elsewhere, is that, according to a Ming text cited by Clunas, ceramics for such uses were available for rental much as they are today in the West.[24]

While this indicates that much Jingdezhen porcelain was unremarkable, even within the Ming period certain taxonomical conventions existed (and are still used) which are related to the standards established for writing about Chinese objects, both in Chinese and other languages. One of the most prominent of these conventions is the use of imperial reign periods to periodise the ceramics.[25] Thus the porcelain traditionally is named after, or classified by, the reign period in which it was made, such as 'Ming dynasty, Chenghua period (1465–87)' 明成化. [Fig.1.1] Official porcelain was made at Jingdezhen from the very first Ming reign period, that of the Hongwu emperor 洪武 (1368–98), during which time commissions were sent from the court on a regular basis to kilns and workshops set aside for what is traditionally called 'imperial production'.[26] As a result, most surviving Ming porcelain objects today are classified in Chinese using a binary system such as 'imperial' 官 (*guan*)/'non-imperial' 民窑 (*minyao*; 'folk ware' or 'commercial'), 'domestic' 国内 (*guonei*)/'export' 国外 (*guowai*), demonstrating that production is defined by consumer type in the literature. This was not necessarily the case during the Ming, however, when the broad classification 'imperial' was used differently.[27] Instead, specific reign periods were mentioned in the cultural literature, such as 'Xuande' 宣德 (1426–35) or 'Yongle' 永乐 (1403–24), with reference to some ceramics and other objects.[28]

Certainly, those porcelains made at what today are often misleadingly called 'the imperial kilns' 御器厂 (*yuqichang*) were, in the early 15th century, given a trademark which designated (in theory at least) separate production and raw materials. This trademark, or 'reign mark', also appears on other official products of the period, including metalwork and lacquer ware.[29] But whether it was used exclusively at only those designated kilns at Jingdezhen is not known, especially because records attest that in some periods demand from the court was such that 'imperial' production had to be contracted out to non-official kilns which may have been able to apply the reign mark.[30] In any case, we can only guess at the purpose of the reign mark. Instead of being an indicator of quality and exclusiveness, as it is interpreted today, could it have been a way of identifying commissioned pieces? Similar inscriptions on earlier ceramics suggest that this might be the case. For example, the inscription on some 10th-century Ding wares reads *guan* 官 ('official') or *xin guan* 新官 ('new official'); we might point also to the functional inscriptions on the ceramic figures in what is known as the 'terracotta army'.[31]

The reign mark also may have been a way of designating or separating those porcelains that were made using separate raw materials, as there are references in Ming and later texts to the ring-fencing of certain raw materials for exclusive use at 'imperial' kilns, the clays being called *guan tu* 官土 or 'official clay' in Ming texts.[32] A precedent for this can been seen in the production of Ru ware during the Northern Song period (960–1127) when imperial orders were supplied from pre-existing kilns and these orders specified the use of particular

raw materials.[33] For the most part the raw materials for Ming porcelain made at Jingdezhen were sourced locally, but at times they were brought in from further afield as good-quality supplies diminished.[34] This occurred at various times during the Ming period, most notably during the reign of the Jiajing emperor (1522–66) when extravagant court orders were difficult to fill without contracting out production and searching more widely for the best raw materials. This system of contracting out production was known as *guanda minshao* 官搭民烧 ('official partnership with private kilns') and was introduced in the 16th century.[35]

Another interpretation of reign marks is that they designated time:

> The reign titles of emperors, and the written characters of the Chinese language that embody them, may well be the most widely understood pieces of Ming Chinese outside the Chinese-speaking world, through their presence on the base of the ceramic vessels that are one of the period's most enduring and widely dispersed physical legacies.[36]

Such marks thus situate the object within a specific time period which in fact would also be useful for separating these objects from more general productions of the same factory or workshop, which usually are not dated or inscribed. Unlike signatures on individually-produced works of art, however, reign marks do not singularise a piece, even though today the implication is that a ceramic with a reign mark was 'used by the emperor'. There is no avoiding the fact that even marked porcelains from Jingdezhen were essentially mass-produced, using a range of related materials and manufacturing methods which had the opposite effect of standardizing the objects.

Workshops, Makers and Regulation

This standardization began with the raw materials, which, for the imperial kilns at least, were controlled. For Jingdezhen porcelain these were kaolin, a white-firing clay, and porcelain stone, a low-clay acidic rock which was also used as a glaze material. To these were added mineral pigments for decoration, including techniques discussed in the next section such as underglaze painting (using cobalt and copper) and overglaze enamels (with iron, copper and manganese). Similar pigments were used for producing monochrome or single-colour glazes. During the Ming period, monochrome-glazed porcelains were a popular style and were also considered necessary for several types of court commissions, including ceramics in dedicated colours for imperial ceremonial altars.[37] The colours for certain porcelain products were thus highly regulated, in keeping with imperial practice at the time.[38] This regulation of the appearance and production of imperial luxury products and commodities extended in ceramic terms to decoration, the types of motifs and the colours used to paint them. For example, there is a uniformity of designs and colours on products found in imperial tombs and other locations which suggests that design patterns were used, and it is likely that these would have been provided by a drawings office administered by the court.[39] Evidence of how this itself was regulated can be found in the *Da Ming huidian* 大明会典 (Collected Statutes of the Ming Dynasty), chapter 194, which quotes an order for porcelains sent to Jingdezhen in 1433 from the Bureau for Imperial Use requesting the manufacture of 433,500 pieces

of porcelain 'in accordance with patterns to be brought there by an official of the Board of Works (*Gong bu* 工部)'.[40] It is through these regulations and their surviving records that imperial commissions can be identified, and they are one of the reasons why much is known about the design of 'imperial' Ming porcelain.[41]

Along with regulation, production methods were also highly systematized as these ceramic products were made in factory or workshop settings, some larger than others, but nonetheless, not, as is often (and wishfully) assumed, as individual products of independent potters. Apart from the use of the potter's wheel (human-powered) the factories were not mechanized in the same way as European industrial revolution-era factories were. But the production process consisted of multiple, consecutive stages manned by different workers who performed the same actions all day long—a form of assembly line. That is why we can say that the products were standardised and mass-produced. A partly idealized series of images of this process and production method was created in the 19th century [Fig. 1.2].[42] However, it was also described in detail (but with later illustrations) in the 1637 text *Tiangong kaiwu* 天工开物 or 'The Exploitation of the Works of Nature',[43] which is arranged as a manual or encyclopaedia of various technologies. For example, in Part II there is a chapter on 'Ceramics' which describes, minutely but not necessarily accurately, the manufacturing processes for tiles, bricks, water jars and white porcelain.[44]

The nature of factory production is crucial for understanding the status and economics of porcelain (and other ceramics) in Ming China. But in Western connoisseurship today, the description of Ming porcelain as factory ware is deemed to be a pejorative interpretation of an exceptionalised type of object, one that is instead a 'work of art'.[45] This relates to the disdain accorded to 'factory-made' ceramics in early 20th-century Britain by critics and studio potters such as Bernard Leach (1887–1979), who were themselves informed by the ideals of the Arts and Crafts Movement of the 19th century.[46] The present-day attitude towards mass-produced ceramics thus presupposes that factory-made products were deemed inferior in Ming China as well, but there is, as yet, no evidence of this. In fact, as we will see in the next chapter, factory-made objects were often presented as evidence of China's achievements to foreign rulers, with reign-marked pieces given as imperial gifts.[47] This is partly because the production process was extensive but only partly mechanized and much of the power was provided by humans, apart from the firing in the kilns. Thus many, many human workers were required to support this industry, as well as vast quantities of raw materials, a clear indication of productivity. For example, during the Jiajing reign period, more than 10,000 people in Jingdezhen were involved in ceramic production.[48]

Rather unexpectedly, however, there are references in surviving Ming and Qing texts to named potters of the Ming period, not associated with the imperial factory, such as 'Hao nineteen' 昊十九 and Zhou Danquan 周丹泉.[49] The first of these potters is mentioned quite specifically in the diary of Li Rihua 李日华 (1565–1635) whose *Weishui xuan riji* 味水轩日记 (Diary from the Water Tasting Studio) was compiled in the early 17th century. The diary entries for the years 1609 to 1616 give a glimpse of the lifestyle of a member of the educated civil service elite in the later prosperous years of the Ming dynasty.[50] Fortunately for us, Li was also an artist and collector, so his diary contains much useful information

about contemporary collecting activities and practices. Porcelain was part of his collection, and he discusses deals made and conversations held with a potter from Jingdezhen referred to as 'Hao nineteen' (昊十九), although we should be careful with this designation, as it is not clear what his actual role in the creation process was. It is unlikely that Hao nineteen was one of the lowly staffers who prepared the clay or trimmed the pieces after throwing.

In April 1610 Li noted: 'Nineteen is a skilled ceramicist. Everything he makes in the style of the Yongle, Xuande and Chenghua kilns is near-true. As a person he is elegant, enjoys chanting poetry, and likes painting.'[51] In the same entry, Li then states that he met Hao in the spring of 1598 while buying imperial wares [御用各色窑器] from several kilns at Jingdezhen (an interesting admission in itself). 'Even then his hair was white. I gave him an order to make shallow bowls in a flowing mist style [流霞盏], glazed in a secret colour that combines cinnabar and lead, and paid him thirty taels in cash. Then I had to leave and he promptly forgot all about the bowls with the flowing mist.' He goes on to say that he had received a letter from Hao: 'Today the letter arrived telling me that Nineteen completed fifty items, then gave them to Shen Biehe [沈别贺] to bring to me, but they have disappeared.'[52] According to Timothy Brook, 'Shen was a notorious hustler from Hangzhou who kept tax accounts for one of the princely establishments'.[53] As Li notes, 'None of the gentry will have anything to do with him. No surprise that my bowls have flown.'[54] Clearly, at least for some later Ming consumers of porcelains, contemporary styles were less desirable than those of the earlier Ming and it was relatively straightforward to order copies of earlier wares, presumably with reign marks. This might help to explain, or at least provide a different explanation for, the numerous later Ming porcelains with reign marks of earlier periods, such as Xuande or Chenghua, rather than assuming an archaizing trend in design.

Apart from this diary, there is further physical evidence of the existence of Hao who, like most 'potters' at Jingdezhen, came from a family involved in that industry. His brother, Hao the Tenth, also a potter, left behind an intriguing piece of Ming porcelain which hitherto has not been noted in any English-language texts, probably because it is not a vessel. In the Jiangxi Museum, the province where Jingdezhen is located, is a round blue and white porcelain epitaph tablet dedicated to Wu Bangzhen 吴邦振 (aka Hao the Tenth 昊十) which, in addition to featuring a long inscription detailing his family tree and the *feng shui* of the burial, is also (as is necessary with such objects) dated to the twenty-fourth year of Wanli 万历 (1596).[55] The existence of such an epitaph tells us that the Wu family was, or professed to be, of some importance in Jingdezhen, but this should not be read as the naming of an 'artist' in the sense of the European notion of the authored 'masterpiece'. With a few exceptions, ceramics at Jingdezhen were not 'signed' in the Ming period, unlike some sculptural ceramics from workshops in Fujian and Jiangsu. This includes imperial or official Jingdezhen ceramics.

Official ceramic production at Jingdezhen was also discussed in another text which has received very little attention in ceramic scholarship but includes an interesting anecdotal description of production at Jingdezhen during the Hongzhi 弘治 period (1487–1504). The text is an essay called *Guan tao shuo* 观陶说 (Talks on Looking at Ceramics) by Shao Bao 邵宝 (1460–1527), who was Minister of the Nanjing Board of Rites (a very prominent position) and stationed in Nanchang, Jiangxi province during the late 15th century.[56] The

essay is informal in nature, like the main text in which it appears. Here he recorded his observations of production at the official kiln workshops in Jingdezhen during his tenure, listing and describing some of the processes involved in production. For example, he says: 'To make vessels from clay is difficult! The clay after quarrying in the mountain is just stone. [It is then] pounded to become powder, washed with water, levigated through channels, thickened [by soaking up the excess water] with bricks, and mixed well into wet clay. Only then can one knead and shape it.'[57]

At the end of the description of manufacture, Shao compares this process to that of 'a gentleman pursuing moral cultivation in order to become something useful':

> [His] qualities are equivalent to clay; [his] diligent study is equivalent to the pounding; [his] cautious attitude is the washing; [his] frugality is the levigation; [his] following righteousness is the drying; [his] practice of earnestness is the kneading; [his] observing rituals is the shaping; [his] investigating the essence is the trimming; taking of friends as teachers is the grinding; [his] writings of poetry are glazing; manifesting proper deportment is the decorating; [his] self-testing and verifying is the removing of the flaws. [This process takes a gentleman] 10 years for the faster ones, [or] 30 to 40 years for the slower ones. Even then [he] might not [have the chance] to look up at the emperor's gate and enter his service. [He] might even end his life in the rustic mountains. So, how do [you] feel about ceramics? I, Bao, have just compared ceramics with men, and only then found that [becoming useful] is harder [for men].[58]

As has been noted by its translator, this text is possibly unique for the analogy it makes between Jingdezhen ceramics and the moral self-cultivation of a Confucian gentleman.[59] Along with the comments from Li's diary, this suggests that the common assumption held by connoisseurs today of a general negative opinion of Jingdezhen ceramics among members of the Ming scholarly class (in contrast to 'elegant' Song stonewares) was perhaps not universal; Jingdezhen could be viewed as a location for morally improving craft production, and its objects, particularly the finer court products and copies thereof, could be appropriate for collecting.

While not noted in the literature, except with reference to two potters, there were also in the Ming and Qing periods numerous private kilns and potteries operating in Jingdezhen, and this may be where the Wu family name attained its prominence.[60] Nonetheless, under the Ming administrative system, private artisans were required for a period to also dedicate some of their time to working in the imperial factory to fulfil corvée labour requirements.[61] The imperial factory was of course extensive; according to 19th century texts, there were fifty-six kilns operating in 1430 and twenty-three specialized workshops. In the 16th century, there were 300 to 500 craftsmen (including potters) employed in this manufacturing complex, all with corvée obligations.[62] The private sector consisted of family enterprises, like that presumably of Wu Bangzhen.[63]

The other 'potter' associated with Jingdezhen whose name comes down to us from the Ming is most often noted for his ability to make copies of earlier wares, particularly Song ceramics such as Ding ware. Zhou Danquan (fl. late 16th–early 17th centuries) is mentioned in the *Jingdezhen taolu* 景德镇陶录 (Records of Jingdezhen Ceramics), which was first published in 1815 and translated into French and English in the mid-19th and 20th centuries respectively.[64] This text will be quoted at length because, although written in the Qing

period, it may reveal much about Ming attitudes towards both ceramics and the art market and illuminate aspects of contemporary Ming culture.

> At the end of the Ming period there were Chen Zhongmei and Zhou Danquan; both were skilled in copying antique ware vessels. [Since the wares] were taken to distant places [for sale], the people of [Jingde] zhen rarely acquired them. Zhou's ware is well-known.[65]

> During the Long[qing] and Wan[li] eras, there was a man named Danquan; originally registered in Wu [Suzhou], he came to Changnan [Jingdezhen]. In making vessels, his was a famous hand of the times and he was especially good at copying antique vessels. Every time a famous vessel-type was produced, everyone wrangled to buy them. Zhou, however, would reserve the best pieces for his own pleasure; the others he took to Su[zhou], Song[jiang], Zhang[zhou] and Chen[jiang?] to sell to collectors. Even experts were fooled. His copies of Ding-ware tripods, and Ding-ware vessels, of 'King Wen caldron' incense burners and libation jars ornamented with animal faces and halberd ears, all were so close to the originals as to be without parallel. People spent a thousand gold-pieces [to buy his wares] in the competitive market. Even today this is still talked about.[66]

Unlike (so far as we know) Hao Nineteen or Ten, Zhou Danquan specialized in making fakes and was recorded as such for posterity. The culture of fakes and collectors will be discussed later in this chapter, but it is clear from the mentions of both these 'potters' that production of porcelain in the Ming was much more complex than is commonly assumed or reflected in the official literature. Neither Hao nor Zhou would likely be considered 'artist-craftsmen' in the modern sense, except perhaps in their obvious production skills. Apart from one interesting fact: in the National Palace Museum in Taiwan is a yellow-glazed 'archaistic' porcelain *ding* which is signed 'Made by Zhou Danquan' 周丹泉制.[67] [Fig. 1.3] This form of signature is unusual in Ming ceramics, as we have seen, because very few 'signed' Ming-period ceramics survive. Most of those with what are assumed to be 'names' actually have imperial reign marks, which are of course anonymous in their identification. Other Ming signed ceramics tend to come from the Dehua kilns in Fujian mentioned earlier, where in the late Ming certain sculptors of figurines signed their work (e.g. He Chaozong 何朝宗, fl. 1522–1612), or the Yixing kilns in Jiangsu province, which were famous for their teapots, many of which were sculptural. It is this quality which perhaps lends itself to the stated authorship of these ceramics because sculpture is a singular skill much admired in other materials (e.g. rhino horn, ivory or silver); it contrasts with the dozens of processes often involved in making a standardized ceramic vessel.

Zhou Danquan appears to have signed his work for a different reason—commercial desirability or 'branding', if you will. There must therefore have been a market for his particular wares, as is attested by the textual references noted above, although this phenomenon is not usually noted in traditional historical surveys of 'Ming ceramics'.[68] In Taiwan, the signed piece by (presumably) Zhou Danquan is singled out as an important piece in the collection of Ming porcelains, but, as we will see in chapter four, that does not mean it was or is admired in China as a piece by a master faker. Its prominent position in the National Palace Museum collection is also somewhat ironic because this collection was founded with a large supply of objects from the former imperial palace in Beijing. Presumably, then, most of the pieces

on display were formerly in the imperial collection. The Zhou piece is displayed with other later Ming porcelains, including a number with reign marks, thus confirming its relative value today. This type of display of singular 'masterpieces' of Ming ceramics reinforces the modern assumption that ceramics (especially those designated 'imperial') were highly valued in Ming China, because such ceramics are valued today. However, it is clear that only some ceramics were so valued, when they could become individualized objects through transformation into collectible antiques, desirable fakes, or containers for gifts—even then they were perhaps less valuable than the gift itself.[69] For the most part, ceramics in Ming China were functional objects made from a readily available, not inherently valuable, material.

Visual Appearance and Reception: Techniques, Decoration and Forms

One might therefore consider the value of ceramics in the Ming period from a different perspective, that of aesthetics and associated techniques, especially form and decoration. The most visible manifestation of the highly developed technology applied at Jingdezhen, and the visual characteristic that made its porcelain so appealing, was its hard white surface and the colours and painting which could be and were applied to it. One of the most common decorative techniques used in the Ming period was that of underglaze cobalt blue painting. [Fig. 1.4] This technique was not technically difficult, but it produced a strong visual result which had worldwide appeal. 'Blue and white', as such wares are popularly known, was not a style created in the Ming period (we would have to look back to the Tang dynasty (618–907) to trace its origins),[70] but it is Ming 'blue and white' which was encountered in the greatest numbers around the world. It is this material which further stimulated the taste for Chinese porcelain (and for China itself, as some have suggested)[71] globally.

As it happens, underglaze blue painting is an ideal decorative technique for a mass-produced product which was transported long distances domestically and worldwide. The technique consists of painting pigment directly on to the clay body before firing. It is therefore slightly absorbed by the clay and later protected by a fired glaze layer. As a result, the decoration is essentially permanent and extremely durable—like the porcelain material itself. However, 'blue and white' was not necessarily the only type of porcelain common in Ming China, nor was it the most popular with consumers in China. Based on the large proportion of polychrome wares recovered in excavations of the Ming levels at Jingdezhen,[72] a decorative technique that appears to have appealed to the Ming Chinese consumer was that of overglaze enamel decoration. This technique is more colourful than underglaze blue painting; it involved the use of up to five colours during the Ming period. It was also a more complicated technique because it was a two-step process involving painting underglaze blue first, either as outlines in the *doucai* 斗彩 technique [Fig. 1.5] or as highlights in the *wucai* 五彩 technique [Fig. 1.6], and then the colours in a separate, additional application on top of the glaze. This necessitated two firings because the first firing was at a high temperature for the initial glaze and the second firing was at a much lower temperature for the overglaze enamels. Both *doucai* and *wucai* decoration are mentioned in Ming texts, especially the highly prized *doucai* wares of the Chenghua reign period; Chenghua *doucai* wares are

also highly valued in today's market for Chinese porcelain.[73] Overglaze enamel decoration is significantly less durable than underglaze blue because much of it lies on the surface of the glazed porcelain body. It was not, therefore, an ideal porcelain type for export in the Ming period, although some examples found their way as far as Europe (see chapter two).

As noted previously with reference to design regulations in court porcelain, another type of porcelain popular in Ming China was one covered with monochrome coloured glazes. [Fig. 1.7] Monochrome colours were popular in a wide range of Ming ceramics (including architectural) but, again, in vessels the colours were sometimes prescribed by their usage. For example, the primary monochrome glaze colours used on porcelains for official ceremonies in the Ming period were red (copper), yellow (iron), white (colourless) and dark blue (cobalt).[74] Other monochrome colours, not evidently associated with any particular rituals or religion, were also used, such as turquoise, brown, iron red and copper green. The monochrome glazes were made using mineral pigments, including the cobalt that was also used for underglaze painting, in a variety of base glazes, both high firing and lower firing. For example, cobalt blue monochromes were made with a standard high firing porcelain glaze, whereas iron red (a more orange colour than copper red) and copper green monochromes were made using lower firing lead-fluxed base glazes.[75] Interestingly, these latter two colours appear on a Ming porcelain type that was exported in the 16th century. It was and is popular in Japan, hence its common classificatory name of '*kinrande*' 金襴手 or 'gold brocade' ware. These wares are normally simple porcelains decorated in blue and white inside and monochrome glazes outside, that are in turn embellished with gold-leaf patterns (see Fig. 2.7 in the next chapter). Several examples of these have been found in European and American collections with further embellishments of silver gilt mounts of the 16th to 19th centuries which transform the Ming porcelains into recognizably European forms, such as the *tazza*, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

Like so many other techniques used in the creation of Ming porcelain, both overglaze enamels and monochrome glaze colours had been used and developed before the Ming period. With the former, the earliest examples demonstrating this technique were not porcelain at all but rather stonewares made at what are today known collectively as the Cizhou kilns. These kilns were spread widely throughout North China, but the main excavation site (but not the only production site) is located at Guantai, Cixian, Henan province.[76] Here, enamels, as they are popularly known today, were first used at the end of the 12th century. The range of colours was quite limited, consisting of black, red and yellow, but the effect was striking. Until that time, most 'Cizhou' wares were black-and-white or brown-and-white, so the addition of new colours was notable. At Jingdezhen, where most Ming porcelain was made, enamel decoration had been used experimentally during the Yuan period (1279–1368),[77] but it was not until the early 15th century that single-colour enamels were introduced and then, in the second quarter of the century, multiple colours.[78]

What is interesting is how this decorative technique evolved during the Ming period, from a complex process with full underglaze blue outlines for all the design elements (*doucai*) to a simpler version with most of the outlining carried out in on-glaze enamels (*wucai*). This transition took place in the early years of the 16th century so that by the Jiajing reign period

the latter technique was standard. It appears to have been much less admired in later periods, however, as the Qing copies of Ming enamelled wares usually utilize the *doucai* technique. With this technological shift, we see yet another example of the non-linear development of ceramic technology in China. The classic progressive model of technological history does not allow for such movement from complex methods to the more simple, but in China, at least with ceramics, that was often the case. As has been noted elsewhere, a most striking example of this is found in glaze technology which saw the introduction of high-fired glazes before low-fired glazes, thus a less sophisticated technology followed the advanced version.[79] What is at issue here therefore is our model of technological development.[80] Certainly there is no reference in Ming ceramic-related literature to the notion of low-fired Han lead glazes being less sophisticated than high-fired Shang celadons (nor the use of such technical descriptive terms).

A similar parallel can be seen in the development of monochrome glaze colours in the Ming period. One of the earliest to be developed, for example, was a monochrome copper red, which is one of the most difficult colours to achieve.[81] One sees versions of this in earlier Song-period porcelains from Guangxi,[82] but in the Ming period, what is notable is that, according to the archaeological record, this glaze appears before monochrome yellow, which is technically simpler. However this is analysed, what is now evident is just how important colour was in ceramics for certain Ming consumers (something also notable in other Ming arts), in contrast to the ware with a relative lack of colour (just one) which was more popular overseas: blue and white.

But even within this limited category of single-colour decoration, technology continually advanced, as can be seen in the refinement of the cobalt mineral pigment. Throughout the Ming period, there were numerous empirical experiments with cobalt from various different sources and in various concentrations; true refined cobalt, free of impurities, was developed in the Wanli reign period (1573–1619).[83] At the same time, experiments continued with body materials, with glaze chemistries and viscosities, with kiln designs and fuels, as well as with forming methods. If judged from surviving finished pieces, Ming ceramics, particularly 'imperial' examples, can seem conservative; but if looked at from a technological perspective, this was clearly a time of experimentation and technological advances, particularly in terms of decoration.

Designs and Form

The whiteness of Ming porcelain, or really porcelain in general, makes it an ideal surface for decoration, but the fine-grained texture of Ming Jingdezhen porcelain also enabled the production of designs and forms of many types. While the common manufacturing process for underglaze-decorated Ming porcelain required much of the decoration to be painted on to a dry but not fired surface (thus porous and slightly absorbent), the texture of this surface was very fine, so skilled painters could create almost any design imaginable. What this means for Ming-period porcelain is that the decoration was not limited by inferior materials or a lack of skill, so the designs reflected Ming taste and approaches across the media, in terms of style, technique, colour and aesthetic. What might be called the Ming aesthetic (in the Baxandall sense of 'the

period eye'), reflected in surviving Ming porcelains, can also tell us something about how such objects were appreciated in Ming China, in addition to any contemporary texts.

The blank slate of porcelain was, at that time, decorated with designs and motifs that were universally popular, using a wide range of painting techniques; these even included text as part of or the whole design. Text can be, and is often, seen as a foundation of Chinese culture, and in the Ming period, its importance was as strong as ever. The text used on Ming porcelains was often simple, consisting of such meaningful characters such as 'long life' 寿, 'good fortune' 福, 'happiness' 喜, as well as everyday terms such as 'tea' 茶 or 'meal room' 食房. Text could also take the form of poems written on porcelains [Fig. 1.8] in standard forms of calligraphy or, as will be discussed below, dedicatory inscriptions. Thus the medium of porcelain fitted into a pre-existing taste for decorative text and writing, writing as art, without having to be specially treated, unlike metalwork, which necessitated the engraving process for applying text, or textile embroidery or weaving, which also required complex processes to add text. With porcelain, text could be applied much as with ink on paper or silk.

This easy adaptability was also suited to figurative painting, and most Ming porcelain was decorated with pictorial designs, narrative scenes or collections of motifs. Geometric designs were rare as the main decoration and usually only appeared as borders, in the form of key frets for example. In fact, many designs on Ming porcelains are framed by borders, or in later examples, cartouches, which suggests that porcelains in any form were seen as a pictorial surface.[84] This aesthetic, combined with the taste for text or calligraphy, is part of what defines the visual characteristics of Ming porcelain. In terms of the inspiration for the designs most often seen on Ming porcelains, this also reveals a particular taste in Ming China for designs (as well as inscriptions) with standardized, recognizable or 'auspicious' meanings, such as 'long life' or 'good fortune', in lieu of text. Motifs could also be purely decorative but within a relatively restricted range of patterns, and, significantly, they are standardized patterns rather than freehand drawings. This is related to several aspects of Ming society. Firstly, with the few exceptions noted previously, the decorators of porcelains were not individually recognized artists. The painting on porcelain therefore was not meant to represent an identifiable individual style, unlike, say, that of a famous painter or calligrapher. Even the named 'potters' are not described in Ming (and later) texts in the same way as painters or calligraphers, who are simply named. Hao Nineteen, for example, was not called by his surname 'Wu' 吴 but rather as no. 19, a *taoshi* 陶事 or 'maker of pottery', and unlike the work of painters, his pieces do not have individual titles.[85]

A second aspect of Ming society which defined the appearance of its porcelain was the conception of porcelain as a material. It was not (and still is not) inherently a valuable material, being made from clay, and thus individual ceramics were not of great monetary value until or unless they had been exceptionalised in some way. This could be done by commissioning, for example, so that a piece became valuable for its purpose and uniqueness. A porcelain could also become an antique, and therefore valuable within that category of object, but in the Ming period it was usually other types of ceramics that were collected as antiques, not porcelains, with just a few exceptions. According to middle and later Ming connoisseurship texts, most of the antique ceramics collected were Song stonewares (including

Ding ware, which is not a true porcelain), and the most acceptable porcelains were those made in two reign periods—Xuande and Chenghua in the fifteenth century.[86] Thus, for the most part, porcelain was a contemporary ceramic material that suited a lot of purposes but not that of 'art', and it therefore was decorated in a style that was expected of an object in regular and common use. Interestingly, it was considered acceptable for this mainly quotidian purpose at different levels of society. Everyone, including the emperor, came to need ceramics, and porcelain was the most widely used of the ceramic body materials available at that time. For example, in Ming China, porcelain was not only used as a surface for decoration in the contemporary style but also for making a wide range of contemporary forms and shapes. Because it was a fairly plastic ceramic, almost any shape could be made in porcelain, and thus these shapes can tell us much about Ming taste in objects. Generally speaking, one sees the expected dishes, bowls and drinking vessels which, to the present-day connoisseur, can be and are said to reflect Ming approaches to such ordinary forms. However, porcelain could also be used to replace more monetarily valuable materials (silver, gold or bronze, for example) when cheaper alternatives were needed, and it could also reflect the Ming interest in the potential of technology to imitate other materials in a skeuomorphic manner. For example, porcelain was used to make fake lacquer, wood or metalwork; the only reason for this would be to demonstrate technical mastery which clearly then had some aesthetic and commercial value in Ming China.[87]

Since porcelain could be decorated and shaped in most of the ways desired, it could also contribute to the Ming aesthetic of archaism. This was reflected in the taste for things of the past, whether the actual things, or copies of them, or simply decorative references to them.[88] In Ming porcelains (and other decorative arts), 'archaism' or 'copying the ancient' (*fang gu* 仿古)[89] was adopted in several ways, through forms of the past (often from other materials such as bronze), designs from the past from a wide range of materials, texts of the past, in the form of Tang or Song poems painted on vessels, or even reign names from the past, such as a 'Xuande' reign mark painted on a Chenghua-period vessel, for example.[90] This practice has a long history in the arts of China and was well developed as an identifiable style by the Ming period. Most scholars do not think of archaism in terms of design, but a recent study of decorative arts of the Ming and Qing discusses it as a notable approach to decoration.[91] In ceramics, however, it was certainly part of the decorative and formative repertoire without being prescriptive; if surviving objects are anything to judge by, there was no single definable 'archaistic' look or design, except in the case of porcelains made for official rituals or ceremonies.[92] An examination of such objects with archaistic designs and/or forms reveals a range of motifs and patterns which are recognizably archaistic, as well as certain forms which fall into this category and which are to some degree standardized. For example, beyond those made for specific court uses, there is a range of forms both loosely or more closely based on ancient bronzes which were fashionable in the Ming period. These include incense burners of *gui* 簋 form, the *jue* 爵 cup in blue and white, the *hu* 壺 form which evolved into the 'temple vase', the *gu* 觚 and even drums. These also indicate that certain aspects of 'the past' were popular in the Ming, and thus archaism itself was subject to fashion.

This was also true of designs or motifs which could represent the archaic but in ways which were complex to decode, at least from the perspective of today's observer. Some of these designs appear to have been decorative, for example those with imitation 'hanging blade' designs (from Shang bronzes). Narrative scenes from ancient stories (such as *San guo yan yi* 三国演义 or Story of the Three Kingdoms) might also fall into this category, but they are often interpreted as didactic in purpose. However, other designs which were inspired by the past were also functional in the sense that they determined how the ceramic would be used. A very good example of this, which has been the subject of an extensive study by Maggie Wan, is the 'Eight Trigrams' (*ba gua* 八卦) design on porcelains for the Jiajing court.[93] That the use of this motif was functional as well as decorative is proved by its application in traditional as well as reverse order: 'the configuration of the Eight Trigrams on Jiajing official porcelain is closely connected to popular Daoist concepts of internal alchemy and ritual, which pervaded the court during that period.'[94]

We should also consider that the subjects of some designs could themselves be archaistic in their references to the past, and that archaism rather than instruction might have been their purpose. For example, on a porcelain tile in the British Museum, we can see a civil official holding a tally, standing on a bridge which leads to what appear to be imperial palace structures enveloped in clouds. One of these structures is identified by inscription as the Fengtian men 奉天门 or 'Service to Heaven Gateway'.[95] This would have been the gateway to the Service to Heaven Hall, which was a real place located in the early Ming imperial palace at Nanjing. This tile is dated by an inscription at the top to 1551, thus during the Jiajing reign period, and the subject matter references a palace location from the Hongwu period in the early Ming (1368–98), where the emperor would have received congratulatory memorials from officials.[96] In both subject and inscription the Jiajing emperor is visually associated with the founder of the Ming, Hongwu, because he had essentially to start his own lineage upon the death of his predecessor.[97] The text appearing above the main image on this tile is that of an imperial edict concerning moral behaviour, rare enough on porcelain, but what is interesting for our purposes is the shorter inscription (Fengtian men) relating to a location from the past. It is this location, and the reference to it, which would have made this tile most meaningful at the time it was made, and knowledge of this helps to date the piece.[98]

Archaism could also be filtered through earlier period styles. One might find, for example, a Ming Chenghua mark and period porcelain with a form and glaze style based on a purportedly Song original [Fig. 1.9], which has been related to a trend for Southern Song (1127–1279) academy painting styles in the 1440s.[99] This type of archaism could be extended to a bronze form with a Song-style glaze which may have been inspired by a Song interpretation of that same form, rather than an ancient bronze original. These examples demonstrate that 'the past' could be very distant or somewhat more recent in terms of decorative inspiration and that its transmission as a style may not have been direct. This can sometimes take quite sophisticated forms in Ming ceramics; a famous example is the Chenghua-period blue and white porcelain with a Xuande reign mark mentioned previously which was excavated from the Chenghua levels at Jingdezhen.[100] There must have been consumers who would have understood the meaning of such a subtle reference, just as there may have been consumers

who were misled, whether intentionally or not.[101] Broadly speaking, Ming ceramics, therefore, were a form of visual communication, just as paintings with inscriptions on them were at the same time.

Another social trend reflected visually in Ming porcelain is the taste for foreign things, or at least things that looked foreign to the Ming consumer. As early as the beginning of the 15th century, porcelains were being made in foreign shapes, some which are now widely believed to be Chinese, such as the 'moon flask' or *baoyueping*/*bianhu* 宝月瓶/扁壶, which had been adopted from Middle Eastern glass forms. This is usually said to be a reflection of the Yongle emperor's imperial programme, involving the travels of Zhenghe, etc., but foreign shapes were also taken from other cultures closer to home, such as Tibet, where a textile form was borrowed for porcelain vessels in China, the so-called 'monk's cap ewer' or *sengmaohu* 僧帽壶.[102] Interestingly, 'foreign' inspiration for designs on Ming porcelains could also take the form of text. One sees, for example, Tibetan script on several surviving early 15th-century Ming vessels; in the later Ming, during the Zhengde 正德 reign (1506–21), one also sees Arabic and Persian script on porcelains. Some of the best known of these porcelains take the form of functional vessels for use in calligraphy, such as brush rests, or associated forms such as table screens [Fig. 1.10]. The foreign text on these vessels ranges from the truly mundane ('brush rest') to the somewhat more meaningful, such as a passage from the Koran, but in both cases the foreign text is presented as decorative and part of the design. It functions in much the same way as the Chinese text discussed previously, which often similarly describes what is seen on a porcelain vessel or what it is to be used for ('tea', 'long life', etc.).

A final issue which should be considered is the relationship between the visual appearance and function of porcelain in Ming China. Porcelain clearly was considered to be an acceptable material for the production of a wide range of objects, much wider than those made in stoneware or wood, for example. This is partly to do with its adaptability—almost any form or decoration could be made from it or on it. But it is also because the material itself was abundant and did not have any intrinsic value. In contrast to precious metals, for example, or lacquer, which was incredibly labour-intensive to produce, there seemingly was no object for which porcelain was deemed unsuitable. Both everyday and religious vessels, burial goods and trade items were made of porcelain, and porcelain objects were used at all levels of society. Owning gold plate was an obvious visual sign of wealth, so its use always made a statement about its owner. In contrast, using porcelain in certain situations might suggest straitened financial circumstances, simple efficiency or simply a desire for good performance. You could cook, pickle, chill, serve, sit on, etc. a porcelain object but not gold, silver or lacquer ones.

Thus in terms of use value porcelain in some ways had greater value than more precious materials in the Ming. It was used not only as a building material but also to make furniture in the form of garden seats, which are still being manufactured and enjoyed today. Bird feeders were also made of porcelain, as well as cricket jars for cricket games,[103] land deeds for burial sites, ritual vessels for imperial ceremonies, and so on. It was a material that defined, reflected and supported multiple aspects of life and death in Ming China.

Appendix

Text of Shao Bao's *Guan tao shuo* (from the online *Wenyuange* edition of the *Siku quanshu*)
Rongchuntang qianji 榮春堂前集, *juan* 9, 13–14

觀陶說

邵子觀于景德之陶歷群工所咸造焉客或嘆曰吁陶之為器其難矣哉方其取土於山猶夫石也碓而粉之澄之以水濾之以渠浥之以甓和之以漿始可以揉而規之又必削其未整焉因以壞者什一磨其未澤焉壞者什二潤之以膏飾之以采内諸火而出焉壞者什五其幸不壞者璽隙疣玷又什之三盖自始規而至成器以獻于尚膳其不得與焉者多矣然取土而舁者若干人碓者若干人澄者濾者浥者和而揉者削者磨者潤且飾者納諸火者各若干人凡越工者十而后器斯得其成也其獻之上不過備一御耳為之如是其難而用之不以為異是可嘆也邵子曰是誠難矣雖然吾猶以為易也夫取土而制其質澄濾浥和而後就規刮磨潤飾而後就火苟不壞者皆成器矣器而獻之不過三月則離山野而薦諸郊廟陳諸宮寢祭祀享燕實與有用

14

焉斯亦異矣視其為之之難亦何負哉乃若君子之修身以待用者材以為土學以為碓戒以為澄省以為濾從義以為浥力行以為和循禮以為規研精以為刮師友以為磨出詞以為潤表儀以為采自試而徵之以去其疣隙玷璽近者十年遠者三四十年曾不得望君門而效用焉甚或終其身於山野其視夫陶也又何如邪寶方陶於人才知其難焉故陶吾猶以為易也客起而謝曰吾聞萬室不足於一陶今乃知其難若是雖然器猶末也請著以為說俾用才者知焉

Notes

Introduction

1. For a good overview of the state of the field of Ming ceramics in Chinese, see Wang Guangyao 王光尧, *Mingdai guanting taoci shi* 明代官廷陶瓷史 (History of Ming Imperial Ceramics), Beijing, 2010; in English, see Jessica Harrison-Hall, *Ming Ceramics in the British Museum*, London, 2001.
2. Among the major publications on these subjects are Fung Ping Shan Museum, *Jingdezhen chutu taoci* 景德镇出土陶瓷 (Ceramic Finds from Jingdezhen Kilns), Hong Kong, 1992 and Zhejiang sheng wenwu ju 浙江省文物局, *Zhongguo Longquan qingci* 中国龙泉青瓷 (Longquan Celadon of China), Zhejiang, 1998.
3. The most recent and comprehensive example of this is Robert Finlay, *The Pilgrim Art: Cultures of Porcelain in World History*, Berkeley, 2010; for the Ming period, see also Stacey Pierson, 'The Movement of Chinese Ceramics: Appropriation in Global History', *Journal of World History* 23, no. 1 (2012): 9–39.
4. Arjun Appadurai, ed., *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, Cambridge, 1986.
5. James Clifford, ed., *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*, Cambridge, MA, 1988; Nicholas Mirzoeff, ed., *An Introduction to Visual Culture*, London, 1999.
6. Jean Baudrillard, *The System of Objects*, trans. James Benedict, London, 2006, pp. 80, 88.
7. For discussions of transculturation with reference to objects, see for example: Nicholas Mirzoeff, 'Transculture: from Kongo to Congo', in *An Introduction to Visual Culture*, London, 1999, chap. 4, pp. 129–161 and Elizabeth Hutchinson, *The Indian Craze: Primitivism, Modernism and Transculturation in American Art, 1890–1915*, Durham, 2009. The original concept was developed in Fernando Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*, trans. Harriet de Onís, New York, c.1947 (and multiple reprints).
8. Most recently in Rose Kerr and Luisa E. Mengoni, with Ming Wilson, *Chinese Export Ceramics*, London, 2011 and William R. Sargent, *Treasures of Chinese Export Ceramics from the Peabody Essex Museum*, New Haven, 2012.
9. Howard S. Becker, *Art Worlds*, Berkeley, 1982.

Chapter 1 Porcelain in Ming China (14th–17th centuries)

1. In China, the framework for the study of ceramics is primarily archaeology. Categorically, ceramics are usually defined as 'craft' (*shouyi* 手艺 or *gongyi* 工艺) or 'antiques' (*guwu* 古物 or *guwan* 古玩). However, with the recent spectacular sales of Ming and Qing ceramics at auction, their status as collected items is changing, and sometimes now they are described as 'works of art' (*yishu zuopin* 艺术作品) in consequence.
2. See Craig Clunas, *Art in China*, Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 175–191.

3. Rose Kerr, ed., *Ceramic Technology*, vol. 5, part 12, of *Science and Civilisation in China*, Cambridge, 2004, p. 184; Fung Ping Shan Museum 1992, pp. 11–12.
4. Kerr ed. 2004, pp. 214–216.
5. Kerr ed. 2004, pp. 560–562.
6. A good overview in English of Jingdezhen as a place and as a location for ceramic manufacture and production, from a historian's perspective, is given in Anne Gerritsen, 'Ceramics for Local and Global Markets: Jingdezhen's Agora of Technologies', in Dagmar Schafer, ed., *Cultures of Knowledge: Technology in Chinese History*, Leiden, 2012, pp. 161–184.
7. With reference to porcelain, specific textual sources surviving from the Ming period are not numerous, but plenty of data concerning production, manufacture and distribution can be found in a fairly wide range of documents and texts. Edicts concerning official porcelains can be found in the various editions of the *Ming shilu* 明实录 (Veritable Records of the Ming Dynasty) and the *Ming shi* 明史 (History of the Ming; compiled in the Qing period); and concerning taxation, ceremonial requirements, etc., in the *Da Ming huidian* 大明会典. Information about raw materials, colours, etc., can be found in the *Jiangxi tongzhi* 江西通志 (Jiangxi gazetteer), which was begun in the Jiajing period (1522–66). The earliest surviving edition is from 1525. Much useful data concerning Jingdezhen production during the 16th century can be found in the Jiangxi provincial gazetteer, *Jiangxi sheng da zhi* 江西省大志, which was compiled in 1556 and reprinted with additional material in 1597. As noted by Rose Kerr (2004) in her much needed English-language survey of the primary literature of ceramics in Chinese, the most useful section of the second edition of this text is the chapter called *Tao shu* (book of ceramics–*juan* 7). Margaret Medley completed an extensive study of this section which was published in part in Rosemary Scott, ed., *The Porcelains of Jingdezhen*, London, 1993, pp. 69–82. As she notes, some of the information from the Ming period comes from unusual sources, such as the *Shuibu beikao* 水部备考 (handbook produced for the Board of Public Works for the Water Transport and Canals department), Wanli edition. Anecdotal descriptions of Jingdezhen porcelain and production can be found in more personalised Ming-period writings such as Wang Shimao's 王世懋 16th-century *Minbushu* 闽部疏 (Memorials about Fujian Province) or the classic connoisseurship text, the *Gegu yaolun* 格古要论 (1388, and later editions). A comprehensive selection of historical texts on Chinese ceramics is provided in Xiong Liao 熊寥 and Xiong Wei 熊微, comps., *Zhongguo taoci guji jicheng* 中国陶瓷古籍集成 (Annotated Collection of Historical Documents on Ancient Chinese Ceramics), Shanghai, 2006.
8. See Michael Dillon, 'Jingdezhen as a Ming Industrial Center', *Ming Studies* 6 (Spring 1978), pp. 37–44 and for a European perspective, Maxine Berg, 'Asian Luxuries and the Making of the European Consumer Revolution', in Maxine Berg and Elizabeth Egar, eds., *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century: Debates, Desires and Delectable Goods*, Basingstoke, 2003, pp. 228–244.
9. Rosemary Scott and Rose Kerr, *Ceramic Evolution in the Middle Ming Period: Hongzhi to Wanli*, London/Singapore, 1994, p. 8; *Jiangxi sheng da zhi* 江西省大志 (1597 edn.), chap. 7, pp. 33a–44b. For more figures tabulated in English, see Kerr ed. 2004, p. 199.
10. For general introductions to these wares in English, see: Kerr and Mengoni 2011, chap. 7; Rose Kerr, John Ayers and Ho Chuimei, *Blanc de Chine: Porcelain from Dehua*, Richmond, 2002; Rita C. Tan et al., *Zhangzhou Ware Found in the Philippines: "Swatow" Export Ceramics from Fujian 16th–17th century*, Manila, 2007. In Chinese see: Fujian sheng bowuguan 福建省博物馆, *Zhangzhou yao* 漳州窑, Fuzhou, 1997; Wang Wenjing 王文径, *Zhangpu yao* 漳浦窑 (Zhangpu Kilns), Zhongguo Fujian gu taoci biaoben daxi 中国福建古陶瓷标本大系, Fuzhou, 2004; Chen Jianzhong 陈建中 and Chen Lifang 陈丽芳, *Dehua yao* 德化窑 (Dehua Kilns), 3 vols., Zhongguo Fujian gu taoci biaoben daxi 中国福建古陶瓷标本大系, Fuzhou, 2005; Fujian sheng bowuguan, ed., *Dehua yao* 德化窑, Beijing, 1990.

11. Michael Dillon, 'Transport and Marketing in the Development of the Jingdezhen Porcelain Industry during the Ming and Qing Dynasties', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 35, no. 3 (1992), p. 278; Liang Miaotai 梁淼泰, *Ming Qing Jingdezhen chengshi jingji yanjiu* 明清景德镇城市经济研究, Nanchang, 1991. Recent global studies in English include Finlay 2010.
12. Dillon 1978, pp. 37–44.
13. Dillon 1992, p. 278.
14. Dillon 1992, p. 279; Kerr ed. 2004, p. 240.
15. Dillon 1992, p. 279; Kerr ed. 2004, p. 185.
16. Dillon 1992, pp. 279–280; Christine Moll-Murata, 'Chinese Guilds from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Centuries', in Jan Lucassen et al., ed., *The Return of the Guilds*, Cambridge, 2008a, pp. 213–248. One must bear in mind that there has been some debate about the definition of 'guilds' as applied to pre-20th century China. See for example: Lu Zuoxie 吕作燮, 'Ming Qing shiqide huiguan bing fei gongshangye de hanghui' 明清时期的会馆并非工商业的行会 (Ming-Qing Guilds and Non-commercial, Non-industrialized Professional Associations), *Zhongguo shi yanjiu* 3, 1982, p. 66.
17. Anne Gerritsen, 'Fragments of a Global Past: Ceramics Manufacture in Song-Yuan-Ming Jingdezhen', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 52 (2009), p. 138.
18. Wang Zongmu 王宗沐, *Jiangxi sheng da zhi*, preface dated 1597, reprinted in the *Zhongguo fangzhi congshu*, Taiwan, 1989, no. 779; also the focus of a paper by Margaret Medley, 'Organisation and Production at Jingdezhen in the Sixteenth Century', in Rosemary E. Scott, ed., *The Porcelains of Jingdezhen*, London, 1993, pp. 69–82.
19. Translated in Gerritsen 2009, p. 140.
20. Timothy Brook, *Confusions of Pleasure: Commerce and Culture in Ming China*, Berkeley, 1998, p. 118.
21. Gerritsen 2009, pp. 117–152.
22. Gerritsen 2009, p. 145.
23. The inventory of goods belonging to Yan Song 严嵩 (1480–1565). Timothy Brook, *The Troubled Empire: China in the Yuan and Ming Dynasties*, Cambridge, MA, 2010, pp. 187–88; Craig Clunas, 'The Cost of Ceramics and the Cost of Collecting Ceramics in the Ming Period', *Oriental Ceramic Society of Hong Kong Bulletin*, no. 8, 1986–88, p. 48.
24. Clunas 1986–88, p. 48.
25. Benjamin I. Schwartz, 'Some Stereotypes in the Periodization of Chinese History', in *China and Other Matters*, Cambridge, MA, 1996, pp. 18–43.
26. Kerr ed. 2004, p. 188. For the Chinese perspective and definition of 'imperial', which views this as production in a separate kiln system, see Wang Guangyao, *Zhongguo gudai guanyao zhidu* 中国古代官窑制度 (China's Ancient Official Kiln System), Zijin shuxi 6, Beijing, 2004.
27. Instead, from the Zhengde reign period, references to the 'imperial vessels factory' (*yuqi chang* 御器厂) appear, which refer to the location rather than the consumer. Kerr ed. 2004, p. 188 and fn. 283, citing the *Jiangxi sheng da zhi* 江西省大志 and the *Jingdezhen taolu* 景德镇陶录.
28. For example, in Shen Defu's 沈德符 *Wanli ye huo bian* 万历野获编 (Random Gleanings of the Wanli Period, 1606) as noted in Craig Clunas, *Superfluous Things: Material Culture and Social Status in Early Modern China*, Cambridge, 1991; Honolulu, 2004, p. 104: 'Thus the prices of Yongle carved red lacquer, Xuande bronzes and Chenghua porcelain vie with those of antiques.'
29. See 'Inscriptions on Ming Lacquer', in Peter Lam, ed., *Layered Beauty: The Baoyizhai Collection of Chinese Lacquer*, Hong Kong, 2010, pp. 191–200. Lacquer examples from both the early and later Ming periods were recently published in Li He and Michael Knight, *Power and Glory: Court Arts of China's Ming Dynasty*, San Francisco, 2004, nos. 50, 53, 54. A famous cloisonné example with a Xuande reign mark can be seen in the British Museum collection, 1957.0501.1.

30. Perhaps through the system of *guanda minshao* 官搭民烧 'official partnership with private kilns', which is discussed below. Medley 1993, p. 80; Kerr ed. 2004, p. 200; Dagmar Schafer, 'Inscribing the Artifact and Inspiring Trust: The Changing Role of Markings in the Ming Era', *East Asian Science, Technology and Society: An International Journal* 5 (2011), p. 260.
31. For a discussion of the latter, see Anthony J. Barbieri-Low, *Artisans in Early Imperial China*, Seattle/London, 2007, pp. 7–9; Schafer 2011a.
32. For example in the *Jiangxi sheng da zhi*, *juan* 7, pp. 4a–b (Zhongguo fangzhi congshu, Taipei, 1998 edn.). Kerr ed. 2004, pp. 235–236.
33. See Tsai Meifen, 'The Role of the Government in the Development of Ceramics in the Sung Dynasty', in *China at the Inception of the Second Millennium: Art and Culture of the Sung Dynasty, 960–1279* 千禧年宋代文物大展, Taipei, 2000, pp. 321–337; English language supplement, pp. 86–93, esp. 322–323/90–91 for Ru and Guan wares.
34. Scott and Kerr 1994, p. 8.
35. As recorded in the *Fuliang xianzhi* 浮梁县志 (1682 edn.), *juan* 4, p. 46b. See Kerr ed. 2004 on *guanda minshao*, p. 200; Medley 1993, p. 73.
36. Craig Clunas, *Empire of Great Brightness: Visual and Material Cultures of Ming China, 1368–1644*, London, 2007a, p. 21; for reign marks as a visual representation of Ming time, p. 24.
37. Christine Lau, 'Ceremonial Monochrome Wares of the Ming Dynasty', in Rosemary Scott, ed., *The Porcelains of Jingdezhen*, London, 1993, p. 90, 99, citing the *Ming shilu*, vol. 80, p. 4193 (Taipei, 1962) and Li Dongyang 李东阳 et al., *Da Ming huidian* 大明会典 (Collected Statues of the Ming), 5 vols., 1587; reprinted, Taipei, 1963, *juan* 201, p. 2715.
38. Kerr ed. 2004, pp. 202–206. Official consumption in general was also regulated in that lower ranked officials were not allowed silver tableware and were confined to porcelain or lacquered wood examples. As noted in the *Ming shi* (comp. Zhang Tingyu 张廷玉, 1739; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), p. 1072, cited in Craig Clunas, 'The Art of Social Climbing in Sixteenth-Century China', *The Burlington Magazine* 133, no. 1059 (June 1991), p. 371.
39. Margaret Medley, 'Imperial Patronage and Early Ming Porcelain', *TOCS* 55 (1990–91), pp. 31–32.
40. Translated by Medley in Medley 1990–91, p. 37. Li Dongyang et al. 1963, chap 194, p. 2632.
41. Kerr ed. 2004, p. 190, with Ming examples cited in the *Jiangxi sheng da zhi*, 1597 edn.
42. There are examples of these in many European and American museums. See for example the export watercolours depicting porcelain production in the Winterthur collection, c. 1820, watercolour on paper, 2003.47.14.1–10. Recently published in Ronald W. Fuchs II with David S. Howard, *Made in China: Export Porcelain from the Leo and Doris Hodroff Collection at Winterthur*, Delaware, 2005, figs. 1–10. Another set of 24 can be seen in the Victoria & Albert Museum, London: E.-59-1910. These are dated 1770–1790. A set in the National Palace Museum, Taipei, attributed to three painters, was published in National Palace Museum, *Emperor Ch'ien-lung's Grand Cultural Enterprise; Qianlong huangdi de wenhua daye* 乾隆皇帝的文化大业, Taipei, 2002, no. V-I.
43. By Song Yingxing 宋应星 (b. 1587); for an English translation, see E-Tu Zen Sun and Shiou-Chuan Sun, trans., *T'ien-kung k'ai-wu by Sung Ying-hsing. Chinese Technology in the Seventeenth Century*, Philadelphia/London, 1966. This book was recently the subject of a dedicated study in English by Dagmar Schafer: *The Crafting of the 10,000 Things: Knowledge and Technology in Seventeenth-Century China*, Chicago, 2011.
44. Sun and Sun trans. 1966, pp. 135–158. It should be noted that two editions of the *Tiangong kaiwu* [henceforth *TGKW*] appeared before 1644 but no new ones were printed in the Qing period. Various sections were preserved in the *Gujin tushu jicheng* 古今图书集成 and two other compendia of the 18th and 19th centuries. A Ming copy was reprinted in Japan in the 18th century, and only later were two Ming copies discovered in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The first Chinese reprint of the original

1637 edition, based on the Japanese version and the texts of the 18th century, was published in 1929 (the Tao edition). It is from this edition that the illustrations have been taken, so they are of Qing date, not Ming. Sun and Sun trans., pp. ix–x. A number of studies have been published recently which focus on the illustrations to the *Tiangong kaiwu*, including Peter J. Golas, '"Like Obtaining a Great Treasure": The Illustrations in Song Yingxing's *The Exploitation of the Works of Nature*', in Francesca Bray et al., ed., *Graphics and Text in the Production of Technical Knowledge in China: The Warp and the Weft*, Leiden/Boston, 2007, who presents a complete chronology of them on pp. 594–597. With reference to porcelain in the *TGKW*, Schafer (2011b) notes that in both images and text 'the work process is somewhat vaguely explained' (p. 149) and in (2005) that the *TGKW* should perhaps be seen as a metaphysical statement as much as a technical treatise because Song could not claim any experience with crafts or technology (p. 54). The problems with recreating some of the technologies and techniques described in the *TGKW* were also explored by various authors in Yabuuchi Kiyoshi 藪内清, ed., *Tenkō kaibutsu no kenkyū* 天工開物の研究 (Studies on the *Tiangong kaiwu*), Tokyo, 1953. On ceramics, pp. 123–136.

45. In present-day Chinese texts on ceramic history, the fact of their production circumstances is not what classifies or qualifies the objects in connoisseurship. In these texts, ceramics are treated as a separate, fully formed tradition with the criteria for connoisseurship traditionally focused on formal characteristics—forms, decoration, techniques of both, etc. In general texts on the history of Chinese art in Chinese, ceramics appear as part of the object chronology, as they do in histories of Chinese art in Western languages, with perhaps less emphasis on ceramics than is usual in these latter types of art histories.
46. Stacey Pierson, '"The Sung Standard": Chinese Ceramics and British Studio Pottery in the 20 Century', in Stacey Pierson, ed., *Song Ceramics: Art History, Archaeology and Technology*, Colloquies on Art and Archaeology, no. 22, London, 2004, p. 82.
47. Shafer 2011a, p. 251. As Shafer suggests, the reign mark 'effectively displayed the dynasty's power and each ruler's proprietary right to porcelain.'
48. Kerr ed. 2004, p. 209, citing the *Ming Shizong shilu* 明世宗实录 (Veritable Records of the Shizong [Jiajing] Reign), *juan* 240, p. 5; Taipei reprint, 1962–67.
49. The fact that these 'potters' were not associated with the imperial factory may be why their names have been passed down to us. Most of the information about Ming porcelain production is focused on the imperial factory as this was activity that was deliberately recorded for regulation and taxation. Unlike painters in court workshops, the makers of standardized items would not have been identified. The popular notion of Ming 'imperial' ceramics as works of art or the products of independent craftsmen is therefore even less applicable to the Ming period.
50. Li Rihua, *Weishuixuan riji*, ed. and annot. Tu Youxiang 屠友祥, Song Ming Qing xiaopin wenji jizhu 2, Shanghai, 1996 [henceforth *WSXRJ*]. For a discussion in English of this text, see Craig Clunas, 'The Art Market in Seventeenth Century China: The Evidence of the Li Rihua Diary', *History of Art and History of Ideas* 1 (2003), pp. 201–223.
51. 十九精于陶事, 所作永窑宣窑成窑, 皆逼真。人亦文雅好吟, 喜绘画。*WSXRJ* 1996, p. 92. English translation from Brook 2010, p. 207.
52. *WSXRJ,* 1996, p. 92 where Shen Biehe is written 沈别驾. English translation from Brook 2010, p. 207.
53. Brook 2010, p. 207.
54. Brook 2010, p. 207. *WSXRJ*, 1996, p. 92.
55. Excavated in 1973 at Duobaogong and now in the Jiangxi Provincial Museum. Published in Zhang Bai 张柏, ed., *Zhongguo chutu ciqi quanji* 中国出土瓷器全集 (Complete collection of ceramic art unearthed in China), 16 vols., Beijing, 2008, vol. 14, no. 220. The text on the tablet consists of 359 characters and is written in concentric circles with two large characters in the centre: 墓誌 'tomb tablet'.

56. The essay is part of the longer text *Rong chun tang ji* 容春堂集 (Collection of the Hall Where Spring Appears). For the English translation and information about Shao, see Stephen Little, 'Shao Bao on Porcelain: A Ming Scholar-Official's View of Jingdezhen', paper presented at the conference 'Asian Ceramics: Effect of Religion and Ritual'; held at the Field Museum, Chicago, IL, 24–26 May 1996; available online through *ACRO: Asian Ceramics Research*; http://acrochicago.homestead.com/Little.html (accessed 4 August 2012). Edition consulted by Little: Shao Bao**,** *Rong chun tang ji*, 1518 edn., *juan* 9, 13a–14a, 'Essay on Ceramics', reprinted, Shanghai, 1991. Shao Bao does not appear in L. Carrington Goodrich and Chaoying Fang, eds., *Dictionary of Ming Biography*, 2 vols., New York/London, 1976.
57. Little 1996 translation.
58. Little 1996. The original text is reprinted in the Appendix.
59. Little 1996.
60. Ouyang Shibin 欧阳世彬, 'A Study of Ceramics Made at Ching-te-chen Commercial Kilns during the 15th Century', *Meishushi yanjiu jikan* 美术史研究集刊 7 (July 1999), pp. 58–87.
61. Christine Moll-Murata, 'Guilds and Apprenticeship in China and Europe: The Ceramics Industries of Jingdezhen and Delft', paper presented to the S.R. Epstein Memorial Conference: "Technology and Human Capital Formation in the East and West", 18–21 June 2008, http://www2.lse.ac.uk/economicHistory/Conferences/Epstein%20Memorial%20Conference/PAPER-MollMurata.pdf, p. 4, referencing Kerr ed. 2004, p. 209 (accessed 4 August 2012) and generally on Chinese guilds, Moll-Murata 2008a, pp. 213–248. On taxation, see Ray Huang, *Taxation and Governmental Finance in Sixteenth-Century Ming China*, Cambridge, 1974, pp. 32–38. A comprehensive overview of the porcelain industry at Jingdezhen, up to the present day, is given in Jingdezhen shi difangzhi bangongshi 景德镇市地方志办公室, ed., *Zhongguo cidu Jingdezhenshi ciyezhi, Shizhi er juan* 中国瓷都·景德镇市：瓷业志：市志2卷 (Monograph on the Porcelain Industry of China's Porcelain City Jingdezhen), 2 vols., Beijing, 2004.
62. Moll-Murata 2008b, p. 3; Kerr ed. 2004, p. 209.
63. Moll-Murata 2008b, p. 4.
64. The *Jingdezhen taolu* 景德镇陶录 (1815), originally by Lan Pu 蓝浦, has been the source for much information about Jingdezhen and its ceramic production. Parts of it were translated by Stephen W. Bushell; and a full English translation was published by Geoffrey Sayer, *Ching-te-chen T'ao-lu,* or *The Potteries of China*, London, 1951. It has recently been the subject of a chapter of a Ph.D. thesis by Ellen Huang, 'China's China: Jingdezhen Porcelain and the Production of Art in the Nineteenth Century', University of California at San Diego, 2008.
65. Ellen Johnston Laing, 'Chou Tan-Ch'uan is Chou Shih Ch'en. A Report on a Ming Dynasty Potter, Painter and Entrepreneur', *Oriental Art* 21, no. 3 (1975), p. 224, fn 2. Edition consulted: *Meishu congshu* II, 8, Taipei, 1963, pp. 208–209.
66. Laing 1975, p. 224, fn. 3.
67. See http://www.npm.gov.tw/exh95/lateming/works/work_06_en.html (accessed 4 August 2012).
68. See http://www.npm.gov.tw/exh95/lateming/index.html for catalogue information on this piece (accessed 4 August 2012).
69. See Clunas, 'Gifts and Giving in Chinese Art', *TOCS* 62 (1997–98), pp. 1–18.
70. The earliest porcelains decorated with underglaze cobalt blue, and therefore 'blue and white', were made at kilns in Henan province during the Tang dynasty. The style was then next produced on a much larger scale in south east China, at Jingdezhen, during the Yuan period. For a broad history of blue and white in China, see Stacey Pierson, *Chinese Ceramics: A Design History*, 2009, London, p. 34.
71. As suggested in the popular book by John Carswell, *Blue and White: Chinese Porcelain Around the World*, Chicago, 2000.

72. See for example, Fung Ping Shan Museum 1992.
73. For example, Shen Defu in the *Wanli ye huo bian* (1591), as noted in Clunas 1986–88, pp. 50–51. In a recent auction, a single Chenghua *doucai* stem cup sold for 23,060,000 HKD. Christies Hong Kong, 1 June 2011, lot no. 3582.
74. Lau 1993, p. 94.
75. For detailed information (and glaze recipes) about monochrome glaze production in China, see Nigel Wood, *Chinese Glazes: Their Origins, Chemistry and Recreation*, London, 1999.
76. Department of Archaeology, Beijing University et al., *Guantai Cizhou yaozhi* 观台磁州窑址 (The Cizhou Kiln Site at Guantai), Beijing, 1997.
77. Fung Ping Shan Museum 1992, figs. 177, 178.
78. The earliest polychrome examples with underglaze blue are those from the Xuande period and these appear to have been a special commission for a Tibetan temple. The most famous surviving example belongs to the Sa'gya Temple in Sa'gya county, Tibet. Published in Beijing Cultural Relics Publishing House, *Gems of China's Cultural Relics; Zhongguo wenwu jinghua* 中国文物精华, Beijing, 1993, no. 34. Related sherds were also excavated at Jingdezhen in 1988. See Hong Kong Urban Council, *Imperial Porcelain of the Yongle and Xuande Periods Excavated from the Site of the Ming Imperial Factory at Jingdezhen*, Hong Kong, 1989, no. 89.
79. Pierson 2009, p. 14.
80. Francesca Bray, 'Technics and Civilization in Late Imperial China: An Essay in the Cultural History of Technology', *Osiris*, 2nd Series 13, *Beyond Joseph Needham: Science, Technology, and Medicine in East and Southeast Asia* (1998), pp. 11–33.
81. This is because copper is a volatile pigment and sensitive to both glaze chemistry (and consistency) and firing atmosphere. Wood 1999, pp. 168–169.
82. Rosemary Scott, 'Southern Chinese Provincial Kilns: Their Importance and Possible Influence on South East Asian Ceramics', in Rosemary Scott and John Guy, eds., *South East Asia and China: Art, Interaction and Commerce*, Colloquies on Art and Archaeology in Asia, no. 17, London, 1995, p. 194.
83. The sources of cobalt used in Chinese ceramics from the Tang through the Qing period have been subject to numerous and still inconclusive studies. In summary (from Kerr ed. 2004, pp. 658–692), in the Ming period, two types were used, one with a significant iron component and the other with manganese. It is the high iron cobalt which is traditionally said to have been sourced outside of China, particularly near Kashan in Persia. Persian cobalt-decorated ceramics have been analysed, and one type made there does feature high iron cobalt. The other does not. This would mean that Jingdezhen potters would have had to know that this was a source, specify which Kashan cobalt they wanted, and assume that miners in Kashan could tell the difference. In Ming texts, cobalt is sometimes referred to as *huiqing* 回青 or Mohammedan blue, and this is thought to be confirmation that it was imported. However, this could be a reference to Yunnan, which was also a source for cobalt, or even to Central Asia. In other texts, the description *sumali* 苏麻离 is used, possibly referring to Qamsar. Other sources for high manganese cobalt used in the Ming include Zhejiang and Jiangxi. Ming 'imperial' porcelains are sometimes authenticated by the supposed source of the cobalt used, as there appear to have been patterns in the use of the two different types of cobalt. For example, in the Hongwu period, high manganese cobalt was used, whereas in the Xuande period, a mixture of both cobalts is apparent. See R. Wen et al., 'The Chemical Composition of Blue Pigment on Chinese Blue-and-White Porcelain of the Yuan and Ming Dynasties (AD 1271–1644)', *Archeometry* 49, no. 1 (2007), pp. 101–115. The assumption that 'imported' cobalt was superior does not seem to be borne out in the usually very high quality Xuande court wares. Thus with reference to Ming blue and white, the interest in the source of cobalt used for decoration is slightly out of proportion to its applications and significance. For information about the mixing of cobalts and refining methods in the later Ming period, see Scott and Kerr 1994, p. 9; Wang Qingzheng 汪庆正, ed., *Qinghua youli hong* 青花釉里红 (Underglaze Blue and Red), Shanghai, 1987, p. 12.

84. A pictorial reading of such framing devices in late Ming and Qing ceramics is presented in Jonathan Hay, *Sensuous Surfaces: The Decorative Object in Early Modern China*, London, 2010.
85. Li Rihua referred to the Yuan painter Huang Gongwang by his sobriquet—the 'silly Daoist' 大痴, not as 'the painter'. See *WSXRJ*, p. 86.
86. The Ming 'literati' responsible for such texts of course had different responses to ceramics and other objects, but one text was cited more often than others and thus was somewhat influential in its opinions. In the early Ming (1388 and later) text by Cao Zhao 曹昭, the *Gegu yaolun* 格古要论, Song stonewares (not defined broadly as such) are described much more favourably than those of the Yuan period, even if they are a continuation of Song production at the same site. One of the earliest surviving editions of this text is in the collection of the Percival David Foundation [henceforth, PDF] library at SOAS. The version published between 1388 and 1397 (the Shu Ming edition) was translated and published in English by Percival David, trans. and ed., *Chinese Connoisseurship: The Ko Ku Yao Lun, the Essential Criteria of Antiquities*, New York/Washington, 1971, where Song ceramics are discussed on pp. 139–143.
87. This practice is normally associated with Qing porcelain, but it started in the Ming period.
88. Hay 2010, p. 10.
89. The introduction to a recently published series of conference papers on the subject of archaism in Chinese culture provides a useful summary of the current thinking on this aspect of Chinese cultural studies. See Wu Hung, ed., *Reinventing the Past: Archaism and Antiquarianism in Chinese Art and Visual Culture,* Chicago, 2010.
90. Tsui Museum of Art, *A Legacy of Chenghua: Imperial Porcelain of the Chenghua Reign Excavated from Zhushan, Jingdezhen*; *Chengyao yizhen: Jingdezhen Zhushan chutu Chenghua guanyao ciqi* 成窑遗珍：景德镇珠山出土成化官窑瓷器, Hong Kong, 1993, pp. 110–111. This is the earliest excavated example of such a practice. The use of such apocryphal reign marks further complicates the interpretation of the function and meaning of reign marks in general.
91. Hay 2010, pp. 157–161.
92. The *Ming shi* is quite specific when certain ancient bronze shapes ordered by the court in porcelain are named, such as the *jue* 爵 and the *dou* 豆. See Lau 1993, p. 86 citing the *Ming shi*, *juan* 47, p. 540.
93. Maggie C. K. Wan, 'Motifs with an Intention: Reading the Eight Trigrams on Official Porcelain of the Jiajing period (1522–1566)', *Artibus Asiae* LXIII, no. 2 (2003), pp. 191–221.
94. Wan 2003, p. 192.
95. Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 239, fig. 9:52.
96. John D. Langlois, Jr., 'The Hung-wu Reign, 1368–1398', in Frederick W. Mote and Denis Twitchett, eds., *The Cambridge History of China*, vol. 7, *The Ming Dynasty, 1368–1644, Part I*, Cambridge, 1988, p. 109.
97. Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 239, fig. 9:52.
98. Stacey Pierson, 'On Location: Situating Chinese Ceramics', *TOCS* 73 (2010), p. 97.
99. Maxwell K. Hearn, *Splendors of Imperial China: Treasures from the National Palace Museum, Taipei*, New York, 1996, pp. 94–95.
100. See note 90.
101. It has been suggested that this piece is a random survivor from the actual Xuande period, but it is very unlikely that such a piece would have survived the succeeding three reign periods after that of Xuande and before Chenghua, only to be dumped in a Chenghua-period sherd heap.
102. James Watt and Denise Patry Leidy, *Defining Yongle: Imperial Art in Early Fifteenth Century China*, New York, 2005, p. 17. The broader history of the interaction between Tibet and China during the Ming period is explored in Weirong Shen, '"Accommodating Barbarians from Afar": Political and Cultural Interactions between Ming China and Tibet', *Ming Studies* 56 (Fall 2007), pp. 37–93.

103. Archaeological evidence from the imperial kilns at Jingdezhen suggests that the references in some Ming texts to the popularity of cricket games at the Xuande court may in fact have been true. See for example Liu Xinyuan, 'Amusing the Emperor: the Discovery of Xuande Period Cricket Jars from the Ming Imperial Kilns', *Orientations* 26, no. 8 (1995), pp. 62–77.
104. Sunchuan Clarence Eng, 'The Use of Ceramic in Chinese Late Imperial Architecture', Ph.D. thesis, SOAS, University of London, 2008, pp. 125–127, 422–423.
105. Peter Lam, ed., *A Legacy of the Ming: Ceramic Finds from the Site of the Ming Palace at Nanjing; Zhu Ming yicui: Nanjing Ming Gugong chutu taoci* 朱明遗萃：南京明故宫出土陶瓷, 香港中文大学文物馆, Hong Kong, 1996.
106. Chang Foundation Museum 鴻禧美術館基金會, *Xuande Imperial Porcelain Excavated at Jingdezhen; Jingdezhen chutu Ming Xuande guanyao ciqi* 景德鎮出土明宣德官窯瓷器, Taipei, 1998, figs. 18–21, p. 122.
107. For example, the jars with the inscription *Neifu gong yong* 内府供用, one of which can be seen in the Percival David Collection, British Museum, PDF 518.
108. Hay 2010, p. 21.
109. Ming Wilson, *Rare Marks on Chinese Ceramics*, London, 1998, p. 22.
110. Wilson 1998, p. 22.
111. Craig Clunas, 'The Other Ming Tombs: Kings and Their Burials in Ming China', *Transactions of the Oriental Ceramic Society* [henceforth, *TOCS*] 70 (2007), pp. 9–10 and *Screen of Kings: Art, Power and Imperial Clan in Ming China*, forthcoming.
112. Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 274; on *meiping* in Ming burials, see also Kong Fanshi 孔繁峙, 'Shi tan Ming mu suizang meiping de shiyong zhidu' 试谈明墓随葬梅瓶的使用制度 (The use of *meiping* jar grave goods in Ming tombs), *Wenwu* 12 (1985), pp. 90–91. The Wanli emperor's tomb, Dingling, is the only one to have been excavated to date.
113. From the tomb of King Zhuang of Liang, 9th son of the Hongxi emperor, d. 1441. See Hubei sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo 湖北省文物考古研究所 et al., 'Hubei Zhongxiang Mingdai Liangzhuangwang mu fajue jianbao' 湖北钟祥明代梁庄王墓发掘简报 (A Brief Report on the Discovery of the Ming-dynasty Tomb of King Zhuang of Liang at Zhongxiang, Hubei), *Wenwu* 5 (2003), pp. 4–23. This piece was recently published in Yang Xiaoneng, 'Ming Art and Culture from an Archaeological Perspective—Part 1: Royal and Elite Tombs', *Orientations* 37, no. 5 (June 2006), fig. 8. The object is in the Hubei Provincial Institute of Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.
114. The tomb of Prince Zhoujing, Henan—see Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 12, no. 235.
115. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 14, no. 213.
116. Like other tomb goods, the difference in quality and presentation of the ceramics found in elite tombs also reflects social hierarchies and the status of the occupants. The tomb of King Zhuang is one of the most lavishly furnished of all the princely tombs. Yang 2006, p. 45.
117. Zhang Bai ed., 2008, vol. 13, no. 114.
118. A recently published example can be seen in Zhao Yueting 赵月汀, ed., *Huangdi de ciqi*: *Jingdezhen chutu "Ming san dai" guanyao ciqi zhenpin huicui* 皇帝的瓷器：景德镇出土"明三代"官窑瓷器珍品荟萃 上：永乐卷 (The Emperor's Porcelain: A Collection of Porcelain Treasures from Three Ming Reign-periods Excavated at the Imperial Kilns at Jingdezhen), 2 vols., Shanghai, 2010, vol. 1 (Yongle 永乐), no. 63.
119. Clunas 2007, Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 46.
120. For example, ancestral ceremonies and burial objects as well as ownership of burial land were subjected to often strict rules and requirements in the Ming period, overseen by the Ministry of Rites or *Libu* 礼部. See Charles Hucker, 'Governmental Organization of the Ming Dynasty', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 21 (Dec. 1958): 1–66; see pp. 33–35 on the Ministry of Rites.

121. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 1, no. 167.
122. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 1, no. 165.
123. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 1, no. 160.
124. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 1, no. 151.
125. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 1, nos. 187, 186.
126. Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 47.
127. See Fung Ping Shan Museum 1992.
128. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 13, no. 115; Hubei sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo 湖北省文物考古研究所 et al., 'Wuchang Longquanshan Mingdai Chuzhaowang mu fajue jianbao' 武昌龙泉山明代楚昭王墓发掘简报 (A Brief Report on the Discovery of the Ming-dynasty Tomb of King Zhao of Chu at Longquanshan in Wuchang), *Wenwu* 2 (2003), pp. 4–18.
129. Eg. Lau 1993, p. 86.
130. Hsieh Ming-liang 谢明良, 'Some Issues Related to Chinese Ceramics of the Fifteenth Century', *Meishushi yanjiu jikan* 美术史研究集刊7 (July 1999), p. 44.
131. This is the tomb of the young girl identified as being of the Hešeri 赫舍里 clan, which has been widely publicized in Chinese. See for example Beijing wenwu yanjiusuo 北京文物研究所, *Beijing kaogu sishi nian* 北京考古四十年 (Forty Years of Beijing Archaeology), Beijing, 1990, p. 209. For the ceramics from the tomb, see Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 1, nos. 176, 177. The tomb was recently the subject of a short film on CCTV, http://www.cctv.com/program/civilization/20090710/103722.shtml (accessed 4 August 2012).
132. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 1, no. 176.
133. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 1, nos. 177, 180.
134. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 15, no. 219. In this tomb, the Daoist figures indicate the religious nature or character of the burial, a notable feature of both elite and non-elite burials in the Ming dynasty. Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 46.
135. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 15, no. 220.
136. The figurines were part of a set of tomb sculptures; the tomb is located in Nancheng county, Jiangxi province. They were recently published in English in Yang Xiaoneng 2006, p. 46, fig. 12.
137. Hsieh Ming-liang 1999, p. 40.
138. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 14, no. 190–191.
139. Shelagh Vainker, *Chinese Pottery and Porcelain*, London, 1991, p. 170. For an extensive history of the subject, see Joshua Chun-chong Yiu, 'The Display of Fragrant Offerings: Altar Sets in China', DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2006. Altar sets in general, consisting of either three or five pieces, began to appear in the Northern Song period, probably introduced by Buddhist temples. These can be seen in Song and Yuan woodblock-printed books. Machida International Print Museum, *Exhibition of Ancient Chinese Woodblock Prints: Third Section of an Exhibition of 2000 Years of Chinese Printing*, Tokyo, 1988, as cited in Robert Mowry, ed., *Hare's Fur, Tortoiseshell and Partridge Feathers: Chinese Brown- and Black-Glazed Ceramics, 400–1400*, Cambridge, MA, 1996, p. 264, note 9.
140. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 7, no. 192.
141. He does not appear in the *Dictionary of Ming Biography*, for example.
142. For two published examples from the Qing period, see Wilson 1998, no. 10 and no. 52.
143. This is also the case in the tombs of non-imperial consorts, such as Lady Tsai whose tomb of 1464 was mentioned above with reference to the pre-Chenghua *doucai* bowl.
144. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 13, no. 116.
145. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 13, nos. 117, 118, 122.
146. Hsieh Ming-liang 1999, pp. 41–43.

147. Examples of these were made in celadon stoneware and *qingbai* porcelain up to the end of the Song period.
148. The hoard found at the village Hejiacun is the largest Tang hoard found to date. Examples of gold, silver and objects of other materials recovered from the hoard were recently published in English in Carol Michaelson, *Gilded Dragons: Buried Treasures from China's Golden Ages*, London, 1999; Qi Dongfang, 'The Burial Location and Dating of the Hejia Village Treasures', *Orientations* 34, no. 2 (2003), pp. 20–24; and in James C. Y. Watt, ed., *China: Dawn of a Golden Age, 200–750 AD*, New York, 2004.
149. This hoard contained mainly ceramics from Southeast China, *qingbai* and Longquan wares. See Asahi Shimbun, ed., *Newly Discovered Southern Song Ceramics: A Thirteenth Century 'Time Capsule'; Fūin sareta Nansō tōji ten* 封印された南宋陶磁展, Tokyo, 1998.
150. This site was discovered during roadworks in the area. Some of the many ceramics discovered here were published in English in James C. Y. Watt, ed., *The World of Khubilai Khan: Chinese Art in the Yuan Dynasty*, New York, 2010, and in Chinese in Chen Yongzhi 陈永志, ed., *Nei Menggu Jininglu gucheng yizhi chutu ciqi* 内蒙古集宁路古城遗址出土瓷器 (Porcelain Unearthed from Jininglu Ancient City Site in Inner Mongolia), Beijing, 2004.
151. Eg. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 12, nos. 239, 238, 237, 236.
152. Zhang Bai ed. 2008, vol. 13, no. 123.
153. The main inscription is dated 1555. The text is a communication with the spirit world and includes biographical details of the deceased, an epitaph, a eulogy and a record of re-internment. The name of the deceased was Pan Zhaosheng, literary name Xianwen. He died in AD 1545 and was re-interred in 1555. His sons commissioned the epitaph tablet from Jingdezhen to record this event. PDF B633, in the British Museum. On Ming ceramic epitaph tablets, see Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 43.
154. For example, the piece in the British Museum collection, 1975.1028.23, a blue and white jar with an inscription dated 1549 which declares a wish for a son as the reason for a temple donation.
155. Both of these are in the Percival David Collection, on display in the British Museum: PDF 237 and PDF B613, B614.
156. See note 139.
157. PDF 680. The inscription visible in fig. 1.13 has been translated as: The faithful disciple Chen Biao, of the Chen family in Liren village in the Fouxian district of Raozhou prefecture in the province of Jiangxi, rejoices to send a set of three vessels, an incense burner and [two] vases, as an offering to the Guanwang Temple of Shuntian Prefecture in Beijing, in prayer for the support and protection of the whole family, that they may have peace and prosperity, and that their business affairs may flourish. Made on an auspicious day [the twentieth] in the fifth month [which corresponds to June] of the ninth year of the Hongzhi period [AD 1496] by the disciple Chen Cun'er.
158. Anthony du Boulay, 'Oriental Ceramics in National Trust Houses and Their Importance in Producing Documentary Evidence', *Oriental Art* XLVII, no. 2 (2001), pp. 21–24.
159. British Museum collection, OA F326+, published in Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 312, fig. 11:99. The painting is in the National Palace Museum, Taipei.
160. PDF A815. Published in Wilson 1998, no. 40.
161. Wilson 1998, p. 100.
162. Clunas 1986–88, p. 48; Clunas 1991/2004, p. 132, Goodrich and Fang 1976, p. 828.
163. See Hay 2010, pp. 344–349.
164. On Ji Cheng and the significance of his text, see Klass Ruitenbeek, *Carpentry and Building in Late Imperial China: A Study of the Fifteenth-Century Carpenter's Manual, Lu Ban Jing*, Brill, 1996, pp. 30–31; Vera Schwarcz, *Place and Memory in the Singing Crane Garden*, Philadelphia, 2008, pp. 23–24; and Jack Goody, *The Culture of Flowers*, Cambridge, 1993, p. 352. The original text has been

translated into English by Alison Hardie: Ji Cheng, *The Craft of Gardens*, trans. Alison Hardie, New Haven, 1989. The term 'systematic' is taken from *xitong de* 系统的, as translated by Craig Clunas, *Fruitful Sites: Garden Culture in Ming Dynasty China*, London, 1996, p. 138. However, this text concentrates on rocks and pavilions (see Clunas 1996, pp. 174–176 for discussion); there is more about flowers specifically in other late Ming texts with a wider subject matter, such as the *Treatise on Superfluous Things* (*Zhangwu zhi jiaozhu* 长物志校注, Nanjing, 1984, p. 41), by Wen Zhenheng 文震亨 (1585–1645). See Clunas 1996, p. 167 and Clunas 1991/2004 for a book-length study of this work.

165. Hay 2010, p. 344.
166. Clunas 1991/2004.
167. Discussed in Patricia Sieber, 'Seeing the World through *Xianqing ouji* (1671): Performance, Visuality and Narratives of Modernity', *Modern Chinese Literature and Culture* 12, no. 2 (2000), pp. 1–43; and briefly in Hay 2010.
168. H. L. Li, trans., *Chinese Flower Arrangement*, Philadelphia, 1956, p. 101–103. Note that the most valuable ceramics are Song stonewares.
169. Clunas 1986–88, p. 49; Clunas 1991/2004, pp. 82–89; and Frank Trentmann, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Consumption*, Oxford, 2012, p. 58.
170. Duncan Campbell, 'Yuan Hongdao's "A History of the Vase"', *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 5, no. 2 (Dec. 2003), pp. 77–93. Edition cited: Qian Bocheng 钱伯城, ed., *Yuan Hongdao ji jianjiao* 袁宏道集笺校 [The Complete Works of Yuan Hongdao: Annotated and Collated], 3 vols. (Shanghai: Guji chubanshe, 1981), vol. 2.
171. Campbell 2003, p. 78.
172. Campbell 2003, p. 84.
173. See David, trans. and ed. 1971, pp. 139–143.
174. Clunas 1986–88, p. 49, citing Wen Zhenheng, *Zhangwu zhi jiaozhu*, Nanjing 1984, pp. 317–318.
175. Clunas 1986–88, p. 51; Shen Defu, vol. 2, p. 613.
176. Clunas 1986–88, p. 51; Shen Defu, vol. 2, p. 613.
177. See, for example Clunas 1991/2004.
178. Clunas 1986–88, p. 50.
179. Clunas 1986–88, p. 51, citing Jiang Shaoshu 姜绍书 (fl. c.1640–80), *Yunshizhai bitan* 韵石斋笔谈 [Jottings from the Yunshi Studio] (Shanghai, 1935–37), *juan* 1, p. 8.
180. Brook 1998, p. 760, citing *Dijing jingwu lüe* 帝京景物略 [Sights of the Imperial Capital] (1635; reprinted, Beijing: Beijing chubanshe, 1980).
181. Brook 1998, pp. 225–226.
182. Laing 1975, p. 224—her trans., citing Jiang Shaoshu, *Yunshizhai bitan*, chap. 1, *Meishu congshu*, vol. II/10, pp. 185–186.

Chapter 2 Ming Porcelain in the World (16th–17th centuries)

1. Brook 2010, pp. 219–220.
2. Berg 2003.
3. Stacey Pierson, *Collectors, Collections and Museums: The Field of Chinese Ceramics in Britain, 1560–1960*, Oxford, 2007.
4. Kerr ed. 2004, pp. 716–717, citing Yu Changsen, *Yuandai haiwai maoyi* 元代海外贸易 (Overseas Trade in the Yuan Dynasty) (Xi'an: Xibei daxue chubanshe, 1994), pp. 90–98, 106–116.
5. Brook 2010, p. 219; Francois Gipouloux, *The Asian Mediterranean: Port Cities and Trading Networks in China, Japan and Southeast Asia, 13th to 21st Century*, Cheltenham, UK/Northampton, MA, 2011, pp. 84–86.

6. Brook 2010, p. 219.
7. Kerr ed. 2004, p. 717, quoting the *Ming shi*, comp. Zhang Tingyu 张廷玉 et al., 6 vols. (1739; reprinted, Taipei: Guofang yanjiuyuan, 1962), chap. 324, pp. 3, 13, 16.
8. Kerr ed. 2004, p. 717.
9. Brook 2010, p. 222.
10. Kerr ed. 2004, p. 717.
11. Roxanna Brown, *Ming Gap and Shipwreck Ceramics in Southeast Asia: Towards a Chronology of Thai Trade Ware*, Bangkok, 2009. For a general history of Vietnamese ceramics, see John Stevenson and John Guy, *Vietnamese Ceramics: A Separate Tradition*, Chicago, 1997; John A. Stevenson and Donald Wood, *Dragons and Lotus Blossoms: Vietnamese Ceramics from the Birmingham Museum of Art*, Seattle, 2011.
12. William S. Atwell, 'Time, Money and the Weather: Ming China and the "Great Depression" of the Mid-Fifteenth Century', *Journal of Asian Studies* 61, no. 1 (Feb. 2002), p. 88.
13. Shelagh Vainker, *Chinese Silk: A Cultural History*, London, 2004, p. 169; Gang Deng, *Maritime Sector, Institutions and Sea Power of Premodern China*, Westport/London, 1999.
14. Andrew Watsky, 'Locating "China" in the Arts of Sixteenth-Century Japan', *Art History* 29, no. 4 (Dec. 2006), pp. 600–624. Han mirrors have been excavated in Japan. See for example, Walter Edwards, 'Mirrors on Ancient Yamato: The Kurozuka Kofun Discovery and the Question of Yamatai', *Monumenta Nipponica*, 54, no. 1 (Spring 1999), pp. 75–110. For a survey of Chinese ceramics found in Japan, see *Nihon shutsudo no Chûgoku tôji* 日本出土の中国陶磁 (Chinese Ceramics Excavated in Japan), catalogue of an exhibition held at Tokyo National Museum, Tokyo, 1975, and Hasebe Gakuji 長谷部楽爾 and Imai Atsushi 今井敦, *Nihon shutsudo no Chûgoku tôji* 日本出土の中国陶磁 (Chinese Ceramics Excavated in Japan), vol. 12 of *Chûgoku tôji* 中国の陶磁 (Chinese Ceramics), Tokyo, 1997.
15. Watsky 2006, p. 616.
16. Watsky 2006, p. 616.
17. Nicole Coolidge Rousmaniere, 'Dining on China in Japan: Shifting Taste for Chinese Ceramics in 15th- to 17th-century Japan', in Stacey Pierson, ed., *Transfer: The Influence of China on World Ceramics*, Colloquies on Art and Archaeology in Asia, no. 24, London, 2009, p. 52.
18. Richard Wilson, 'Notes on Chinese Ceramics Excavated in Japan', in Judith G. Smith, ed., *Tradition and Transformation: Studies in Chinese Art in Honor of Chu-tsing Li*, Seattle/Kansas, 2005, p. 482.
19. Rousmaniere 2009, p. 52.
20. Rousmaniere 2009, p. 53.
21. R. Wilson 2005, p. 481; Hasebe and Imai 1997, no. 69.
22. R. Wilson 2005, pp. 483, 485; Hasebe and Imai 1997, no. 89; Barbara Seycock, 'Trade Ceramics from Selected Sites in Western Japan', *Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association Bulletin* 26 (2006), pp. 131–139.
23. Gipouloux 2011, chap. 6.
24. Rousmaniere 2009, p. 49; Tsuji Nobuo in Nicole Coolidge Rousmaniere, ed., *Kazari: Decoration and Display in Japan, 15th–19th Centuries*, London/New York, 2002.
25. Rousmaniere 2009 notes that specific decorative rules were imposed and sumptuary laws were issued with increasing regularity in the early 17th century, p. 27.
26. Morgan Pitelka, *Handmade Culture: Raku Potters, Patrons and Tea Practitioners in Japan*, Honolulu, 2005, p. 40.
27. Rousmaniere 2009, p. 51.
28. Rousmaniere 2009, p. 51.
29. Oliver Impey, 'Chinese Porcelain Exported to Japan', *Oriental Art* XLV, no. 1 (Spring 1999), p. 18.
30. R. Wilson 2005, p. 487.
31. Hasebe and Imai 1997, nos. 83, 84.

32. Song tea bowls were brought to Japan by Buddhist monks, and these are said to have inspired the production of Raku ware locally. Pitelka (2005) argues that this narrative is, however, overly simplistic, p. 3. Specially commissioned *qingbai* porcelain sutra covers, a form not in use in China, were also made for temples in Japan. Impey 1999, p. 16; Hasebe and Imai 1997, no. 24. Evidence from tags found in the Sinan shipwreck suggest that the shipment was bound for a Japanese temple, the Tōfuku-ji; see Munhwa Kongbu Munhwajae Kwalliguk 文化公報部文化財管理局, ed., *Sinan Haejŏ Yumul* 新安海底遺物 (Objects from the Sinan Shipwreck), Seoul, 1985.
33. Kerr and Mengoni 2011, p. 130; Julia Curtis, *Trade Taste and Transformation: Jingdezhen Porcelain for Japan, 1620–1645*, New York, 2006.
34. Curtis 2006, fig. 9, pp. 41–42. Acc. No. B69P98L.
35. Seizo Hayashiya, 'Chinese Ceramics in Japanese Collections', in Seizo Hayashiya and Henry Trubner, *Chinese Ceramics from Japanese Collections, T'ang through Ming Dynasties*, New York, 1977, p. 18.
36. Seizo Hayashiya states that in the 1630s, over 50,000 pieces were brought to Japan by a single merchant in Sakai; see Hayashiya and Trubner 1977, p. 18.
37. Olah Csaba, 'Troubles during Trading between Japan and China in the Ming Period', in Angela Schottenhammer, ed., *The East Asia Mediterranean: Maritime Crossroads of Culture, Commerce and Human Migration*, Weisbaden, 2008, pp. 317–318.
38. Kenneth R. Robinson, 'From Raiders to Traders: Border Security and Border Control in Early Choson, 1392–1450', *Korean Studies* 16 (1992), p. 96; Philip de Heer, 'Three Embassies to Seoul: Sino-Korean Relations in the Fifteenth Century', in Leonard Blussé et al., eds., *Conflict and Accommodation in Early Modern East Asia*, Leiden/New York, 1993, pp. 240–258.
39. Heekyung Lee, 'The Introduction of Blue-and-White Wares from Ming China to Choson Korea', *Oriental Art* 45, no. 2 (1999), p. 26 and 'Institutions and Vessels in East Asia: Exploring a New Approach for the Study of Medieval and Early Modern Wares, Applied to the Origin of Early Ming Imperial Underglaze Blue Ceramics and Their Introduction into Korea', Ph.D. dissertation, SOAS, University of London, 2003.
40. H. Lee 1999, p. 31, referencing the *Choson Wangjo Sillok* 朝鮮王朝實錄 (Annals of the Choson Dynasty), *Yijo Sillok* 李朝實錄, vol. 7: *Sejong Sillok* 世宗實錄, *kwon* 41, p. 605; *Yijo Sillok*, vol. 8: *Sejong Sillok*, *kwon* 49, pp. 35–36; Jay Levenson, ed., *Circa 1492: Art in the Age of Exploration*, New Haven, 1991, p. 426 where it is also stated that these included vessels with dragon and cloud designs.
41. Yong-i Yun and Regina Krahl, *Korean Art from the Gompertz and Other Collections in the Fitzwilliam Museum: A Complete* Catalogue, Cambridge, 2006, p. 7.
42. Yun and Krahl 2006, p. 7.
43. Yun and Krahl 2006, p. 7.
44. Donald N. Clark, 'Sino-Korean Tributary Relations Under the Ming', in Denis Twitchett and Frederick W. Mote, *The Cambridge History of China*, vol. 8, *The Ming Dynasty, Part 2*, Cambridge, 1998, pp. 279–281.
45. Kerr ed. 2004, pp. 537, 719.
46. Kerr ed. 2004, pp. 719–720.
47. Chinese blue and white porcelain was first exported to the Near East in the 9th century. John Carswell, *Blue and White: Chinese Porcelain Around the World*, Art Media Resources, 2000; Finlay 2010, chap. 5.
48. Ayse Erdočdu, 'Chinese Porcelains', *Arts of Asia* 31, no. 6 (Nov.–Dec. 2001), pp. 88–89: Regina Krahl, with J. Ayers and N. Erbahar, *Chinese Ceramics in the Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul*, 3 vols., London, 1986; Takatoshi Misugi, *Chinese Porcelain Collections in the Near East: Topkapi and Ardebil*, Hong Kong University Press, 1981 (English edition).
49. In the Ottoman Topkapi Saray collection is an album painted in Tabriz (Iran) c. 1470–80 which demonstrates that Chinese porcelain, of either Yuan or early Ming date, was considered a valuable category of object as it is depicted being transported on carts during what has been interpreted as a wedding

procession; see Levenson ed. 1991, p. 206, no. 100. These blue and white wares may have been part of the bride's dowry and thus were considered important objects with an exchange value as established by the local nuptial system. There are also miniature paintings which depict blue and white wares on display in niches in palace locations, as well as literary references from the early Safavid period which suggest that porcelains were displayed in palace buildings specifically dedicated to the material, such as the *chinikhaneh* or 'China house'. The *chinikhaneh* or 'China house' in its best known form from the 17th century, was a type of architectural space which consisted of multiple shelves and niches installed on walls in which were placed ceramics for display, thus making the ceramics part of the architecture of the room. For a recent discussion, see Kishwar Rizvi, 'Sites of Pilgrimage and Objects of Devotion', in Sheila Canby, ed., *Shah 'Abbas: The Remaking of Iran*, London, 2009, p. 104.

50. J. A. Pope, *Chinese Porcelains from the Ardebil Shrine*, Washington, D.C., 1956; Misugi 1981; and more recently, Canby 2009.
51. Rizvi 2009, p. 102.
52. See L. Golombek and D. Wilber, *The Timurid Architecture of Iran and Turan*, Princeton, 1988, p. 177.
53. Rizvi 2009, p. 103. Interestingly, the niches are shaped for vertical forms such as bottles or jars but almost none of these survive. This was noted by Regina Krahl, 'Chinese Ceramics in Early Safavid Iran', in Sheila Canby and Jon Thompson, eds., *Hunt for Paradise: Court Arts of Safavid Iran, 1501–76*, Milan, 2003, p. 258, but has not been discussed elsewhere. It is surprising if one considers that most of the surviving ceramics from the Ardebil Shrine are large dishes.
54. Rizvi 2009, p. 121.
55. Kishwar Rizvi, 'The Imperial Setting: Shah 'Abbas I at the shrine of Shaykh Safi al-din Ishaq', in Sheila Canby, ed., *Safavid Art and Architecture*, London, 2002, p. 14.
56. A *waaf* was a form of a charitable donation with a long history in the Islamic world. Shrines all over Iran received valuable gifts which would bestow spiritual benefit on the person buried there, but farms, etc. were also given as *waaf* to help support the institutions. 'Abbas's gift was also to demonstrate the dynastic and purely Iranian nature of his Islamic belief—sufi rather than sunni, as with the other more orthodox shrines; the gifts were part of this as representations of earlier historical periods presented in an up-to-date space. Canby 2009, p. 14.
57. Rizvi 2009, p. 104.
58. Canby 2009, p. 22.
59. A thorough attempt to trace their history and provenance has been made by Pedro Carvalho, 'Porcelains for the Shah: Ardabil and the Chinese Ceramics Trade in the Persian Gulf', *TOCS* 66, pp. 47–56, following on from Pope 1956.
60. Which has recently been added along with its main site to the UNESCO World Heritage List.
61. For a complete list of the remaining ceramics see Pope 1956.
62. These have been the subject of a book-length study: Yolande Crowe, *Persia and China: Safavid Blue and White Ceramics in the Victoria and Albert Museum, 1501–1738*, London, 2002, and several are published in Canby 2009. Some have white decoration on a blue ground, which is a style known from 14th-century China, while others have more conventional blue decoration on a white ground, classic 'blue and white', often with Chinese design elements such as waves or dragons.
63. See Lisa Golombek, Robert B. Mason and Gauvin A. Bailey, *Tamerlane's Tableware: A New Approach to the Chinoiserie Ceramics of Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Iran*, Islamic Art and Architecture, no. 6, Costa Mesa/Toronto, 1996 for a comprehensive discussion and typology of these.
64. This discussion is based on work previously published in Pierson 2010 and Pierson 2012.
65. For a summary of these approaches, see C. Gosden and Y. Marshall, 'The Cultural Biography of Objects', *World Archaeology* 31, no. 2 (Oct. 1999), pp. 169–178.
66. Peter Burke, *Cultural Hybridity*, Cambridge, 2009.

67. This is the implication in studies of 'Chinese influence' on foreign ceramics. See for example, Carswell 1985/2000, Finlay 2010, and general texts like Twitchett and Mote 1998.
68. Qarachaghay was governor of Ardebil from 1617 to 1619 and a number of Chinese porcelains with his inscription are in the Ardebil Shrine collection. It has been suggested that he gave the porcelains to the Shrine directly, to complement the gift from the Shah. Canby 2009, p. 142. They are further discussed in Pierson 2012.
69. Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner, and Bernhard Jussen, *Negotiating the Gift: Pre-Modern Figurations of Exchange*, Gottingen, 2003, pp. 9, 10, 13.
70. Anna Jackson and Amin Jaffer, eds., *Encounters: The Meeting of Asia and Europe, 1500–1800*, London, 2004, p. 66, no. 5.16
71. Ibn Battuta, *The Travels of Ibn Battuta, A.D. 1325–1354*, trans. H. A. R. Gibb, 3 vols, Cambridge, 1958–71; Ellen Smart, 'Fourteenth Century Chinese Porcelain from a Tughlaq Palace in Delhi', *TOCS* 41 (1975–77), pp. 199–230.
72. Jackson and Jaffer 2004, p. 63.
73. Jackson and Jaffer 2004, p. 63 and the *Baburnama* (Memoirs of Babur, 1453–1530). An edition in English, *Baburnama: Memoirs of Babur, Prince and Emperor*, was published by the Modern Library in 2002, where a *chinikhaneh* is mentioned on p. 59 and vessels of porcelain on pages 292 and 373.
74. Jackson and Jaffer 2004, p. 64, no. 5.15.
75. Evelyn Welch, 'Public Magnificence and Private Display: Giovanni Pontano's *De splendore* (1498) and the Domestic Arts', *Journal of Design History* 15, no. 4 (2002), pp. 211–221.
76. Jackson and Jaffer 2004, p. 67, no. 5.18.
77. Misugi 1981, p. 23, vol. 2.
78. Misugi 1981, p. 23, vol. 2; David J. Roxburgh, ed., *Turks: A Journey of a Thousand Years, 600–1600*, London, 2005, p. 447.
79. See Joyce Hedda Matthews, 'Toward an *Isolario* of the Ottoman Inheritance Inventory with Special Reference to Manisa (ca. 1600–1700)', in Donald Quataert, ed., *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550–1922: An Introduction*, Albany, NY, 2000, p. 58.
80. Erdočdu 2001, pp. 88–89.
81. Erdočdu 2001, pp. 88–89.
82. Roxburgh ed. 2005, p. 465.
83. Lynda Carroll, 'Could've Been a Contender: The Making and Breaking of "China" in the Ottoman Empire', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 3, no. 3 (Sept. 1999), p. 177.
84. Erdočdu 2001, p. 88.
85. TKS 15/4386, 15/2663.
86. See David M. Robinson, 'The Ming Court and the Legacy of the Yuan Mongols', in David M. Robinson, ed., *Culture, Courtiers and Competition: The Ming Court (1368–1644)*, Cambridge, MA, 2008, pp. 401–410.
87. Erdočdu 2001, p. 89.
88. Roxburgh ed. 2005, p. 466.
89. TKS 15/2944.
90. Roxburgh ed. 2005, p. 465.
91. Roxburgh ed. 2005, p. 465.
92. E.g. TKS 15/2761. Roxburgh ed. 2005, no. 350.
93. There are examples of Isnik wares with foreign metal mounts in European collections, however.
94. Jay Levenson, ed., *Encompassing the Globe: Portugal and the World in the 16th and 17th Centuries*, Washington, D.C., 2007, p. 110. On artificialia: 'The *Kunstkammer* included not only natural objects that revealed God's ingenuity but also human handiwork that showed the artist's ability to compete

with the divine by combining imagination with technical skill. In addition to ethnographic works from distant cultures, this category extended to marvellous artworks wherever they may have originated, including beautifully constructed scientific instruments utilized to understand and master the phenomena of the world.' p. 128.

95. TKS 15/2771.
96. Roxburgh ed. 2005, p. 464; TKS 15/1853.
97. As confirmed by an inscription on a bowl in the Museo degli Argenti, Palazzo Pitti, Florence. Rosamund E. Mack, *Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade and Italian Art, 1300–1600*, Berkeley, 2002, p. 206, note 57.
98. Erik Ringmar, 'Audience for a Giraffe: European Expansionism and the Quest for the Exotic', *Journal of World History* 17, no. 4 (Dec. 2006), p. 381.
99. Ringmar 2006, p. 382.
100. Suzanne B. Butters, 'The Uses and Abuses of Gifts in the World of Ferdinando de' Medici (1549–1609)', *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance* 11 (2007), pp. 243–354.
101. David Whitehouse, 'Chinese Porcelain in Medieval Europe', *Medieval Archaeology* 16 (1972), p. 75, citing an 18th century source cited by Arthur Lane, *Italian Porcelain* (London: Faber and Faber, 1954). According to Stefano Carboni, 'the earliest evidence of Chinese porcelain belonging to Venetians is found in the estate inventory of Jacobello del Fiore, who died in Venice in 1439, which lists … a bowl of porcelain.' *Venice and the Islamic World, 828–1797*, New Haven, 2007, p. 265.
102. Karl-Heinz Spiess, 'Asian Objects and Western European Court Culture' in Michael North, ed., *Artistic and Cultural Exchanges Between Europe and Asia, 1400–1900*, Farnham/Burlington, 2010, p. 26.
103. Iside Carbone, 'The Enchantment of Chinese Porcelain in Italy: Artistic Fruition, Technological Creativity and Intercultural Discourse', in Stacey Pierson, ed., *Transfer: The Influence of China on World Ceramics*, Colloquies on Art and Archaeology in Asia, no. 24, London, 2009, p. 81.
104. Eva Strober, 'The Earliest Documented Ming Porcelain in Europe: A Gift of Chinese Porcelain from Ferdinando De' Medici (1549–1609) to the Dresden Court', first published in the handbook for the International Ceramic Fair and Symposium, London, 2004, p. 27; www.haughton.com/articles/archive/2005/9, subsequently published in Gugong bowuyuan, ed., 2007 *nian guoji Zisha yantaohui lunwenji* 2007 年国际紫砂研讨会论文集 (Proceedings of the 2007 International Symposium on Zisha Wares), Beijing, 2009; Spiess 2010, p. 26.
105. Mack 2002, p. 110.
106. Ibid.
107. Mack 2002, p. 110; Kerr ed. 2004, pp. 747–748.
108. Kerr ed. 2004, pp. 748–749. This flask is now in the Musée National de Céramique, Sévres, France.
109. Strober 2004, p. 27.
110. Strober 2004, p. 28; Maureen Cassidy-Geiger, *Fragile Diplomacy: Meissen Porcelain for the European Court, ca. 1710–63*, New Haven, 2007, p. 5.
111. Strober 2004, p. 5.
112. Butters 2007, p. 278, described here as a shrimp. Dresden inv. No. P.O. 3479.
113. Strober 2004, p. 31.
114. From G. Pontano, *I libri delle virtu sociali* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1999) (*De splendore* 1498), cited in Welch 2002, p. 2.
115. Strober 2004, fig. 8 and Cassidy-Geiger 2007, p. 5. For a similar example in the Topkapi collection, see Krahl with Ayers and Erbahar, 1986, vol. II, no. 1881–91, pp. 676–678.
116. James Boyajian, *Portuguese Trade in Asia Under the Habsburgs, 1580–1640*, Baltimore, 2007.
117. They were used as tablewares, items for display, diplomatic gifts and collectibles. There are few literary references to such uses but there is an interesting comparison of the shell of the very rare 'turban snail' (a truly exotic, luxury object) to the lustre of Chinese porcelain, which dates from the 16th or

17th century. See Antje Scherner and Dirk Syndham, eds., *Princely Splendour: The Dresden Court, 1580–1620*, Milan, 2005, p. 83.

118. Whitehouse 1972, p. 71; Jackson and Jaffer 2004, p. 47, fig. 4.3. The bowl is also recorded in a 15th-century inventory.
119. See Oriental Ceramic Society, *Chinese Export Art in Schloss Ambras: A Lecture Given by Sir Harry Garner on the Occasion of the Second Presentation of the Hills Gold Medal*; 5 June 1975; London, 1975.
120. See note 94.
121. See V&A catalogue information reference for M.16–1970; published in Jackson and Jaffer 2004, p. 47, fig. 4.4. The pair to this piece was sold in 1970 by Sotheby's.
122. Stacey Pierson, *The Percival David Foundation of Chinese Art: A Guide to the Collection,* London, 2002, p. 71.
123. Gillian Wilson, *Mounted Oriental Porcelain in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, Los Angeles, 2000, p. 12; Mimi Hellman, 'The Nature of Artifice: French Porcelain Flowers and the Rhetoric of the Garnish', in Alden Cavanaugh and Michael E. Yonan, eds., *The Cultural Aesthetics of Eighteenth-Century Porcelain*, Farnham, 2010, pp. 40–41; Kerr and Mengoni 2011, p. 87.
124. See catalogue information for c.222–1931 and Maria Antonia Pinto de Matos, 'The Portuguese Trade', *Oriental Art* XLV, no. 1 (1999), p. 25.
125. Reino Liefkes and Hilary Young, *Masterpieces of World Ceramics*, London, 2009, pp. 68–69.
126. Pinto de Matos 1999, p. 25.
127. Appadurai ed. 1986.
128. Clifford ed. 1988.
129. Metropolitan Museum of Art, acc. no. 61.196.
130. The problem of the art historical category 'Islamic' is discussed in Sheila S. Blair and Jonathan M. Bloom, 'The Mirage of Islamic Art: Reflections on the Study of an Unwieldy Field', *Art Bulletin* 85, no. 1 (March 2003), pp. 152–184.
131. Some of this tableware arrived in Europe from the Near East, as the finds (primarily cups for coffee drinking) from Buda and Eger castles in Hungary demonstrate. A probate inventory of 1587 records examples of Chinese porcelain used in Hungary by the sultan's court and archaeological finds confirm use by private individuals. Ibolya Gerelyes, 'Types of Oriental Pottery in Archaeological Finds From the 16th and 17th Centuries in Hungary', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung.* 61, no. 1–2 (2008), pp. 66, 70. Gerelyes notes that these Chinese porcelains 'arrived on Hungarian soil as part of the material culture of the Turks.'
132. Most of the literature concerned with Chinese 'armorial porcelain' focuses on the Qing period examples that were part of a widespread consumer pattern in the 18th century.
133. Levenson ed. 2007, figs. C20, C15.
134. Walters Museum website: http://art.thewalters.org/viewwoa.aspx?id=411, object no. 9.1616 (accessed 4 August 2012).
135. Jorge Alvares (d. 1521) was the first Portuguese to visit China, in 1513. See Pinto de Matos 2002, p. 37; A. J. R. Russell-Wood, *The Portuguese Empire, 1415–1808: A World on the Move*, Baltimore, 1998, p. 3; Levenson ed. 2007, p. 277.
136. As translated and illustrated in Gerald Davison, *The New and Revised Handbook of Marks on Chinese Ceramics*, Somerset, 2010, p. 143, no. 1895.
137. Levenson ed. 2007, C15.
138. For its use by Michelangelo, see for example: Charles Burroughs, 'Michelangelo at the Campidoglio: Artistic Identity, Patronage and Manufacture', *Artibus et Historiae* 14, no. 28 (1993), pp. 85–111.
139. BM 1925.0512.1. Published in Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 313, fig. 11:103. *Kraak* is a style of blue and white porcelain that was developed in the 16th century and was made primarily at Jingdezhen. Its

design is characterized by radiating panels of decoration around the sides of vessels, primarily bowls and dishes. The name it is known by now was given to it in the mid-17th century, and of course it was not known as such in China. As this type of porcelain is blue and white and highly decorated, the usual assumption is that it was primarily made for export. Most of the extant examples have indeed come from overseas locations, whether shipwrecks or collections, but that is not to say that it was not consumed in China. Several examples have been found in Chinese tombs, including some in the later Ming imperial tombs. See Jiangxi Province Team of Cultural Heritage, 'Jiangxi Nancheng Ming Yi Xuanwang Zhu Yiyin fufu hezangmu' 江西南城明益宣王朱翊釗夫妇合葬墓 (The Joint Tomb of Zhu Yiyin, the Ming Prince Xuan of Yi, and his Wives at Nancheng, Jiangxi), *Wenwu* 8 (1982): 16–32; Yao Chengqing 姚澄清, Sun Jingmin 孙敬民 and Yao Lianhong 姚连红, 'Shitan Guangchang jinian mu chutude qinghua cipan' 试谈广昌纪年墓出土的青花瓷盘 (A Brief Discussion on the Blue and White Porcelain Plates Unearthed From Datable Tombs in Guangchang), *Jiangxi wenwu* 2 (1990): 92–95, 134. These finds and others have been discussed by Li Baoping in '*Kraak* Porcelain from Chinese Tombs and Jingdezhen Kilns: Discoveries and Associated Issues', a paper prepared for the conference 'Cultures of Ceramics in Global History: 1300–1800', held at the University of Warwick, 22 April 2010. Like other blue and white wares, *kraak* was made in a range of qualities; what distinguishes it as a group or collective style type is simply the placement of the decoration in radiating panels around the sides.

140. Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 313.
141. BM 1957.1216.19. Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 300, fig. 11:63.
142. The Willem Claesz Heda (1594–c.1681) painting is in the Hamburger Kunsthalle. Information from Jessica Harrison-Hall, posted on the British Museum web page for this object: http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/search_object_details.aspx?objectid=255538&partid=1&searchText=hydra+latin&fromADBC=ad&toADBC=ad&numpages=10&orig=/research/search_the_collection_database.aspx&currentPage=2 (accessed 4 August 2012).
143. V&A 2904–1876.
144. Julie Emerson, Jennifer Chen and Mimi Gardner Gates, *Porcelain Stories: From China to Europe*, Seattle, 2000, p. 252; Levenson ed. 2007, C17, 18; Maria Antonia Pinto de Matos, 'Chinese Porcelain in Portuguese Written Sources', *Oriental Art* XLVIII, no. 3 (2002), p. 39.
145. Pinto de Matos 2002, pp. 36–37.
146. Pinto de Matos 2002, p. 37.
147. Pinto de Matos 2002, p. 37.
148. Emerson, Chen and Gates 2000, p. 252; Levenson ed. 2007, C17, 18.
149. Gipouloux 2011, pp. 123–125; Donna Pierce and Ronald Otsuka, eds., *Asia and Spanish America: Trans-Pacific Artistic and Cultural Exchange, 1500–1850; Papers from the 2006 Mayer Center Symposium at the Denver Art Museum*, Denver, 2009.
150. Emerson, Chen and Gates 2000, p. 135.
151. Maura Rinaldi, *Kraak Porcelain: A Moment in the History of Trade*, London, 1989, pp. 63–64; Daisy Lion-Goldschmidt, 'Ming Porcelains in the Santos Palace Collection, Lisbon', *TOCS* 49 (1986), pp. 79–93.
152. S. A. M. Adshead, *Material Culture in Europe and China, 1400–1800*, Basingstoke, 1997, p. 130; Linda Shulsky, 'Chinese Porcelain in Spanish Colonial Sites in the Southern Part of North America and the Caribbean', *TOCS* 63 (1998–99), p. 86; Linda Shulsky, 'Phillip II of Spain as Porcelain Collector', *Oriental Art* XLIV, no. 2 (1998), pp. 51–54.
153. Jaume Coll Conesa, 'Documented Influence of China on Maiolica in Spain and New Finds of Chinese Ceramics with Dates to the 16th Century', in Stacey Pierson ed., *Transfer: The Influence of China on World Ceramics*, Colloquies on Art and Archaeology in Asia, no. 24, London, 2009, p. 123.
154. Conesa 2009, p. 134, quoting J. P. Desroches, 'Las porcelanas', in *El San Diego, un tesoro bajo el Mar*, Madrid, 1995, pp. 310–369.

155. Pinto de Matos 1999, pp. 28–29; along with a charger in the Peabody Essex Museum (PEM-AE 85571) and at least 11 other pieces identified in Sargent 2012, p. 66.
156. George Kuwayama, *Chinese Ceramics in Colonial Mexico*, Los Angeles, 1997, p. 28, no. 1. However, one scholar believes that, because of the buildings represented in part of the design, this piece and the 4 others like it which are known may have a history associated with Mexico (Sargent 2012, p. 49); Macao has also been suggested (Lion-Goldschmidt 1978, p. 154).
157. Maria Antonia Pinto de Matos, ed., *Chinese Export Porcelain: From the Museum of Anastacio Goncalves, Lisbon*, London, 1996, p. 138, no. 63.
158. The traditional date for the founding of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) is 1540.
159. Pinto de Matos ed. 1996, p. 138.
160. Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 379, fig. 12:73.
161. Dana Leibsohn and Carolyn Dean, 'Hybridity and its Discontents: Considering Visual Culture in Colonial Spanish America', *Colonial Latin American Review* 12, no. 1 (June 2003), p. 6.
162. The term was coined by the Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz in 1940 and refers to the creation of new cultures through encounters with others. An example related to objects in Africa is discussed in Nicholas Mirzoeff, 'Transculture: from Kongo to Congo', in *An Introduction to Visual Culture*, London, 1999, chap. 4.
163. Dennis O. Flynn and Arturo Giraldez, 'Born with a Silver Spoon: The Origins of World Trade in 1571', *Journal of World History* 6, no. 2 (Fall 1995), pp. 201–221; Katharine Bjork, 'The Link that Kept the Philippines Spanish: Mexican Merchant Interests and the Manila Trade, 1571–1815', *Journal of World History* 9, no. 1 (Spring 1998), pp. 25–50; William S. Atwell, 'International Bullion Flows and the Chinese Economy circa 1530–1650', *Past and Present* 95, no. 1 (1982), pp. 68–90.
164. Flynn and Giraldez 1995, p. 203.
165. Etsuko Miyata Rodriguez, 'Early Manila Galleon Trade: Merchants' Networks and Markets in 16th and 17th Century Mexico', in Donna Pierce and Ronald Otsuka eds., *Asia and Spanish America: Trans-Pacific Artistic and Cultural Exchange, 1500–1850; Papers from the 2006 Mayer Center Symposium at the Denver Art Museum*, Denver, 2009, p. 42.
166. Rodriguez 2009 and Shulsky 1998–99, p. 84.
167. Museo Franz Mayer and Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, *The Grandeur of Viceregal Mexico: Treasures from the Museo Franz Mayer*, Houston, 2002, p. 32.
168. Robin Farwell Gavin, Donna Pierce and Alfonzo Pleguezuelo, *Ceramica y Cultura: The Story of Spanish and Mexican Mayolica*, Albuquerque, 2003.
169. Jean McClure Mudge, *Chinese Export Porcelain in North America*, New York, 1986, pp. 43–44; Natale Zappia, 'Porcelain and Cocoa: the Pacific Rim and the Early Modern World Economy', University of California, Santa Cruz, Center for World History, http://www2.ucsc.edu/cwh/porcelainpaper.htm. This is the same word for 'pebbles' in modern Spanish. Museo Franz Mayer and Museum of Fine Arts, Houston 2002, p. 18.
170. E.g. T. Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company, as Recorded in the Dagh-Registers of Batavia Castle, Those of Hirado and Deshima, and Other Contemporary Papers, 1602–1682*, Leiden, 1954 and Christiaan J. A. Jorg, *Porcelain and the Dutch China Trade, 1729–94*, trans. Patricia Wardle, The Hague, 1982.
171. Chuimei Ho, 'The Ceramic Trade in Asia, 1602–82', in A. J. H. Latham and Heita Kawakatsu, eds., *Japanese Industrialization and the Asian Economy*, London/New York, 1994, p. 36.
172. The standard reference on this is Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*, Berkeley/London, 1988.
173. Jorg 1982.
174. Levenson 1991, p. 117.

175. Jane Campbell Hutchison, *Albrecht Durer: A Guide to Research*, New York/London, 2000, pp. 123–124. Rembrandt is also known to have been a collector as his Chinese porcelains were sold off in 1660, and thus the porcelains would have been of Ming date, at the latest.
176. Mentioned in Michael Sullivan, *The Meeting of Eastern and Western Art*, Berkeley/London, 1989, p. 91.
177. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, attributed to Bernart van Orley, c. 1492–1542, and mentioned in A. I. Spriggs, 'Oriental Porcelain in Western Painting', *TOCS* 36 (1967), p. 74.
178. Spriggs 1967 and Timothy Brook, *Vermeer's Hat: The Seventeenth Century and the Dawn of the Global World*, London/New York, 2008, p. 76.
179. Brook 2008, pp. 62–63.
180. Rinaldi 1989, p. 45.
181. Volker 1954.
182. C. van der Pijl-Ketel, '*Kraak* Type Porcelain and Other Ceramic Wares Recovered from the Dutch East Indiaman the "*Witte Leeuw*", Sunk in 1613', *TOCS* 67 (2004), p. 91, note 3.
183. Brook 2008, p. 59.
184. Claire Le Corbeiller and Alice Cooney Frelinghuysen, *Chinese Export Porcelain*, special issue of *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 60, no. 3 (Winter 2003), p. 8.
185. Le Corbellier and Frelinghuysen 2003, p. 8 and Volker 1954, p. 148.
186. Rinaldi 1989, pp. 118–119.
187. Le Corbellier and Frelinghuysen 2003, p. 11; a practice which was seen frequently in domestic Chinese ceramics, such as those made in Near Eastern glass forms, mentioned in chapter one. These were foreign forms for Chinese consumption, rather than foreign forms for foreign consumption, as with the *klapmuts*.
188. Le Corbellier and Frelinghuysen 2003, p. 11 and Volker 1954, p. 142.
189. AK-RBK 14774. Jorg, for example, believes that this shape is actually just a development of an earlier Chinese shape. Christiaan J. A. Jorg, *Chinese Ceramics in the Collection of the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam: The Ming and Qing Dynasties*, Amsterdam, 1997, p. 60.
190. For example, inv. No. AK–RAK 1991–21 in the Rijksmuseum. See Jorg 1997, p. 64.
191. Jorg 1997, p. 273.
192. Norman Bryson, *Looking at the Overlooked: Four Essays on Still Life Painting*, London, 2004, p. 99, quoting Schama 1988.
193. Bryson 2004, p. 104.
194. Bryson 2004, p. 124.
195. This painting is illustrated in Sam Segal and William B. Jordan, *A Prosperous Past: The Sumptuous Still Life in the Netherlands, 1600–1700*, The Hague, 1988, fig. 7.1, p. 124. It is said to be in a private collection and formerly of the Lorenzelli Gallery, Bergamo (Italy).
196. The 'magic fountain' motif is so called because it is apparently derived from European prints of the 16th century and it consists of a fountain with either a horse or an elephant in front of it. Both can be seen on an example in the Percival David Collection, PDF 689, in the British Museum.
197. BM 1963.0520.7, Harrison-Hall 2001, pp. 384–385, fig. 12:79.
198. Ibid.
199. Ina Baghdiantz McCabe, *Orientalism in Early Modern France: Eurasian Trade, Exoticism and the Ancien Régime*. Oxford/New York, 2008, pp. 80–81; Barry Shifman and Guy Walton, eds., *Gifts to the Tsars, 1500–1700: Treasures from the Kremlin.* New York, 2001, p. 36.
200. Anthony Farrington, *Trading Places: The East India Company and Asia, 1600–1834*, London, 2002.
201. Pierson 2007, p. 28.
202. Pierson 2007, pp. 19–20.
203. Pierson 2007, p. 20.
204. V&A 7915–1862.

205. Le Corbellier and Frelinghuysen 2003, fig. 2.
206. Pierson 2007, pp. 22–23.
207. The *Madre de Dios*, 1592, according to James McDermott, *Martin Frobisher, Elizabethan Privateer*, New Haven/London, 2001, p. 398.
208. Pierson 2007, p. 24.
209. Japan Society, New York, *The Burghley Porcelains*: *An Exhibition from The Burghley House Collection and Based on the 1688 Inventory and 1690 Devonshire Schedule*, New York, 1980.
210. Richard Grassby, *The Business Community of Seventeenth-Century England*, Cambridge, 2002, p. 340.
211. Pierson 2007, p. 29.
212. Susan Bracken, '"Chyna" in England Before 1614', *Oriental Art* XLVII, no. 2 (2001), p. 9.
213. Arthur MacGregor, ed., *Tradescant's Rarities: Essays on the Foundation of the Ashmolean Museum, 1683, with a Catalogue of the Surviving Early Collections*, Oxford, 1983. The earliest royal porcelain rooms or 'cabinets' were built in Holland around 1645. This is said to have established a fashion for such rooms within European courts, and through their relations with other courts, in England in the late 17th century. See Tessa Murdock, 'Les cabinets de porcelain', in Georges Brunel, ed., *Pagodes et dragons: exotisme et fantasie dans l'Europe rococo 1720–1770*, Paris, 2007, pp. 42–49; John Ayers, Oliver R. Impey and J.V.G. Mallet, *Porcelain for Palaces: The Fashion for Japan in Europe, 1650–1750*, London, 1990; Michael E. Yonan, 'Igneous Architecture: Porcelain, Natural Philosophy, and the Rococo *cabinet chinois*', in Alden Cavanaugh and Michael E. Yonan, eds., *The Cultural Aesthetics of Eighteenth-Century Porcelain*, Farnham, 2010, pp. 65–85.
214. Pierson 2007, pp. 30–31; see Arthur MacGregor, *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*, London, 1989, p. 59.

Chapter 3 Porcelain as Metaphor—Inventing 'the Ming Vase' (18th–20th centuries)

1. Porcelain in general as a metaphor for various human qualities, such as desire and the body, is discussed in Cavanaugh and Yonan, eds. 2010, pp. 1–3.
2. Cynthia Payne, *The Independent*, 2 May 1987, cited in Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard, 'Reporting Speech in Narrative Discourse: Stylistic and Ideological Implications', *Ilha do desterro: A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies* 27 (1992), p. 72; http://www.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/desterro/article/viewFile/8759/8119.
3. Defense Atomic Support Agency, 'Operation Minute Gun. Shot Ming Vase', Interim Summary Report, Nevada Test Site, 1969. Defense Technical Information Center document POR 6337. http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a286666.pdf (accessed 28 August 2012).
4. Cited in a letter of 1629, extracted in Adolf Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*, Cambridge, 1882, p. 205.
5. Vinnie Norskov, *Greek Vases in New Contexts: The Collecting and Trading of Greek Vases—An Aspect of the Modern Reception of Antiquity*, Aarhus, 2002, introduction.
6. Michael Vickers, 'Value and Simplicity: Eighteenth-Century Taste and the Study of Greek Vases', *Past and Present* 116 (Aug. 1987), pp. 98–137.
7. For example, in Emerson and Pope there are references to both porcelain and silver vases. Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Poems*, Boston, 1847, 'Woodworks II', p. 79; Henry W. Boynton, ed., *The Complete Poetical Works of Alexander Pope*, Cambridge edition, Boston/New York, 1903, 'The Rape of the Lock', p. 90, line 122.
8. *Ten Thousand Things* was an exhibition of objects collected by the American merchant Nathan Dunn (1782–1844); it was first displayed in Philadelphia in 1839 and then in London in 1942. William B. Langdon, *Wan-t'ang jen-wu = "Ten thousand Chinese things" : a descriptive catalogue of the Chinese*

collection in Philadelphia, with miscellaneous remarks upon the manners, customs, trade, and government of the Celestial Empire, Philadelphia, 1839; William B. Langdon, *Wan tang ren wu, Ten Thousand Things relating to China and the Chinese, an Epitome of the genius, government, history, literature, agriculture, arts, trade, manners, customs, and social life of the people of the Celestial Empire, together with a synopsis of the Chinese Collection*, London, 1842; John Haddad, 'The Romantic Collector in China: Nathan Dunn's Ten Thousand Chinese Things', *Journal of American Culture* 21, no. 1 (Spring 1998), pp. 7–26; Elizabeth Hope Chang, *Britain's Chinese Eye: Literature, Empire and Aesthetics in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, Stanford, 2010; Catharine Pagani, 'Chinese Material Culture and British Perceptions of China in the Mid-nineteenth Century', in T. J. Barringer and Tom Flynn, eds., *Colonialism and the Object: Empire, Material Culture and the Museum*, London, 1998, pp. 28–40; Helen Saxbee, 'An Orient Exhibited: The Exhibition of the Chinese Collection in England in the 1840s', Ph.D. dissertation, Royal College of Art, 1990.

9. For example: Jackson and Jaffer 2004; David Porter, *Ideographia: The Chinese Cypher in Early Modern Europe*, Stanford, 2002; E. H. Chang 2010.
10. See for example, Berg 2003, pp. 228–244, Robert Batchelor, 'On the Movement of Porcelains: Rethinking the Birth of Consumer Society as Interactions of Exchange Networks, 1600–1750', in John Brewer and Frank Trentmann, eds., *Consuming Cultures, Global Perspectives: Historical Trajectories, Transnational Exchanges*, Oxford, 2006, pp. 95–121, and E. H. Chang 2010.
11. Clunas 2007, pp. 224–225.
12. Frances Wood, *Did Marco Polo Go To China?* Boulder, CO, 1998. Of course many did (and still do) believe that he went to China so his text is relevant for the present discussion.
13. Jonathan D. Spence, *The Chan's Great Continent: China in Western Minds*, New York, 1999, introduction, pp. xii–xiii.
14. Peter Jackson, 'Marco Polo and His "Travels"', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 61, no. 1 (1998), p. 84 and generally for a measured bibliographic history of the Travels.
15. P. Jackson 1998, p. 86.
16. Clunas 2007, p. 211.
17. See chapter one, note 90.
18. Porter 2002, pp. 35–39.
19. Porter 2002, p. 35.
20. Samuel Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumus* or *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, 4 vols., London, 1625, vol. III, p. 96.
21. Chen Shouyi, 'John Webb: A Forgotten Page in the Early History of Sinology in Europe', in Adrian Hsia, ed., *The Vision of China in English Literature of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Hong Kong, 1998, p. 94; David E. Mungello, *Curious Land: Jesuit Accommodation and the Origins of Sinology*, Honolulu, 1989, p. 110.
22. Chen Shouyi 1998, p. 111.
23. Some of this travel literature is discussed in John Barnard, ed., *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, vol. 4, 1557–1695*, Cambridge, 2002, p. 273.
24. Pierson 2007, p. 27.
25. Porter 2002, p. 137; Pierson 2007, pp. 33–34.
26. For example, p. 66 of *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. II, 2008 edition (Cosimo, Inc.), which says: 'The Illustrious Hongvou, founder of the dynasty of *Ming*…'.
27. The full title of the first English translation is: *The General History of China. Containing a Geographical, Historical, Chronological, Political and Physical Description of the Empire of China, Chinese-Tartary, Corea and Thibet*, London, 1736.
28. Porter 2002, p. 138.
29. Porter 2002, p. 184; see note 7 for full Pope citation.

30. Fa-ti Fan, *British Naturalists in Qing China: Science, Empire and Cultural Encounter*, Cambridge, MA, 2004.
31. Robert Fortune, *Yedo and Peking: A Narrative of a Journey to the Capitals of Japan and China*, London, 1863, p. 364.
32. See Joseph Marryat, *A History of Pottery and Porcelain: Medieval and Modern*, London, 1857, p. 240.
33. Steve Clark, ed., *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*, London, 1999.
34. Marryat 1857, p. 202.
35. Jeffrey A. Auerbach, *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display*, New Haven, 1999.
36. Marryat 1957, p. 264.
37. Launched in 1859. Claire Tomalin, *Charles Dickens: A Life*, London, 2011, p. 304.
38. 'Curious Old China', in Charles Dickens, ed., *All the Year Round*, vol. 14, part III, p. 66.
39. Stanislas Julien, trans. and Alphonse Salvetat, annot. with Johann Joseph Hoffman, *Histoire et fabrication de la porcelaine chinoise*, Paris, 1856 ([Whitefish, MT], 2009), p. 95. On the *Jingdezhen taolu*, see Peter Lam, 'Chinese Making China: Technical Illustration in the *Jingdezhen taolu* (1815)', in Stacey Pierson and Ming Wilson, eds., *The Art of the Book in China*, Colloquies on Art and Archaeology in Asia, no. 23, London, 2006, pp. 117–137; E. Huang 2008.
40. Pierson 2007, p. 68; Stephen Calloway, *The Cult of Beauty: The Aesthetic Movement, 1860–1900*, London, 2011.
41. Pierson 2007, pp. 65–66.
42. Pierson 2007, pp. 65–66.
43. Pierson 2007, pp. 66–68.
44. Pierson 2007, p. 70.
45. Such as Murray Marks and the Duveens. See Pierson 2007, p. 66 and pp. 80–81.
46. Captain J. H. Lawrence-Archer, 'Chinese Porcelain—particularly that of the Ta Ming dynasty', *Art Journal*, New Series, XIV (1875), p. 251.
47. Pierson 2007, p. 61.
48. Lawrence-Archer 1875, p. 251.
49. On the ideals of the Arts and Crafts Movement, see Wendy Kaplan, ed., *The Arts and Crafts Movement in Europe and America: Design for the Modern World, 1880–1920*, New York/London, 2004.
50. See for example, Judith Green, 'Ancient China/Modern Art', in Christiaan J. A. Jorg, ed., *The History of Collecting Oriental Ceramics in East and West: Proceedings of the Symposium in the Groninger Museum, 13 and 14 November 2003*, Amsterdam, 2005, pp. 87–99.
51. Julien, Salvetat, and Hoffman 1856/2009.
52. The first book dedicated to marks was published in 1863 [Chaffer's *Marks and Monograms on Pottery and Porcelain*] and this included a section on 'Oriental porcelain—Chinese' which references Julien's translation of the *Jingdezhen taolu*. Subsequently, no respectable collector's library was complete without a dictionary of 'marks' on ceramics.
53. Lawrence-Archer 1875, p. 251.
54. Jennie J. Young, *The Ceramic Art: A Compendium of the History and Manufacture of Pottery and Porcelain*, New York, 1878, p. 138.
55. Frank T. Robinson, 'Boston Artists' Studios. No. III', *The Decorator and Furnisher* 6, no. 1 (Apr. 1885), pp. 17–19.
56. Robinson 1885, p. 19.
57. C de K (full name not given), 'The Ming Vase', *The New York Times*, 19 February 1888.
58. Hope Chang 2010, pp. 14–15.
59. Italo Calvino, 'Quickness', in *Six Memos for the Next Millennium*, Cambridge, MA, 1988, p. 32; Wilkie Collins, *The Moonstone*, Leipzig, 1868.

60. C de K 1888, Part II.
61. The term ‘cultural icon’ is used here in reference to Tomaselli and Scott’s *Cultural Icons*, as ‘constructed icons’ which are usually associated with the 20th-century practice of manufacturing signs (in semiotic terms) to sell a product or idea (Keyan G. Tomaselli and David Scott, *Cultural Icons*, Walnut Creek, CA, 2009, p. 18). Certainly ‘the Ming vase’ is a sign that resembles (its) object, whether that object is ‘a thing in the real world, an idea or another sign’. (Ibid) The ‘vases’ have an imitative quality, but one that can be deceitful, as we have seen with the myth of the singular, ‘precious’, Ming vase. Clearly the manufacturing of object-related icons was happening in the 19th century as well.
62. William Anderson, *Descriptive and Historical Catalogue of a Collection of Japanese and Chinese Paintings in the British Museum*, London, 1886.
63. *The Academy and Literature* 30 (1886), pp. 399–400.
64. See for example, the Swedish ‘classic’: Sven Lindqvist, *Myten om Wu Tao-tzu* (*The Myth of Wu Tao-tzu*), [Stockholm] 1967.
65. BM 1945.0927.1.
66. There are numerous histories of the Portland Vase and its reconstruction. See for example, Susan Walker, *The Portland Vase*, London, 2004; Milo Keynes, ‘The Portland Vase: Sir William Hamilton, Josiah Wedgwood and the Darwins’, *Notes and Records of the Royal Society, London* 52, no. 2, 1998, pp. 237–259.
67. James Dyer Ball, *Things Chinese: Being Notes on Various Subjects Connected with China.* London, 1892.
68. For example: *Cantonese Made Easy* (1888); *The English-Chinese Cookery Book: Containing 200 Receipts in English and Chinese* (1890).
69. Dyer Ball 1892, p. 366.
70. Dyer Ball 1892, p. 367.
71. On the *Tao shuo* and its relationship to both earlier and later texts on ceramics in China, see E. Huang 2008.
72. In Qing texts in general, not just ceramic-related ones, the Ming period is often negatively assessed, reflecting a traditional approach to historiography in China which disparages a dynasty that fell. On Ming and Qing official historiography in China, see Achim Mittag, ‘Chinese Official Historical Writing under the Ming and Qing’, in José Rabasa et al., eds., *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, vol. 3, 1400–1800*, Oxford/New York, 2012, pp. 30–32.
73. In fact, the first English-language book-length study dedicated to Qing porcelain was not published until 1951—Soame Jenyns, *Later Chinese Porcelain: The Ch’ing Dynasty, 1644–1912* (London: Faber and Faber, 1951). However volume II of R. L. Hobson’s *Chinese Pottery and Porcelain* of 1915 includes a section on Ch’ing porcelain.
74. See Pierson 2007, pp. 75–80.
75. S. W. Bushell, *Oriental Ceramic Art*, New York, 1897. This is partly based on Bushell’s translation of the *Tao shuo* and other Chinese texts. See chapter four for discussion.
76. Edith Wharton, *The Fruit of the Tree*, New York, 1907, book I, pp. 218–219.
77. Wharton 1907, p. 288.
78. Pierson 2007, pp. 35–37.
79. Linda Merrill, *The Peacock Room: A Cultural Biography*, Washington, D. C., 1998, p. 270.
80. See Gerald Reitlinger, *The Economics of Taste, vol. II: The Rise and Fall of the Objets d’Art Market since 1750*, London, 1964, p. 313 onward for prices.
81. Edith Wharton and Ogden Codman, *The Decoration of Houses*, New York, 1897, p. 78. I am grateful to Patricia Pierson for bringing this work to my attention.
82. Frank Jewett Mather, ‘An Art Museum for the People’, *The Atlantic Monthly* 100 (Dec. 1907), p. 734.

83. Gail Anderson, ed., *Reinventing the Museum: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on the Paradigm Shift*, Walnut Creek, CA, 2004, p. 213; Robert E. Weir, *Class in America: H to P*, Westport, 2007, p. 554.
84. Samuel Merwin, *The Charmed Life of Miss Austin*, New York, 1914, p. 192.
85. Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams: An Autobiography*, Washington, 1907; Boston and New York, 1918.
86. Adams 1907/1918, p. 391, said as a criticism of both inflated values for art and frivolousness with regard to world events.
87. Adams may also have been a collector of Ming porcelain as he stated in a letter to a friend: 'I buy only Ming porcelain'. To John Hay, Paris, 7 November 1900. Ernest Samuel, ed., *Henry Adams, Selected Letters*, Cambridge, MA, 1992, p. 395.
88. 'An Instrument of the Gods', by Lincoln Colcord, p. 87. The story also features a number of common Chinese stereotypes of the time. Boston, 1919.
89. The first printed reference to the preciousness of a Ming vase appears in a short poetic musing on the coming dawn by P. W. Yuille in 'The Lift of the Morning', *The Cornhill Magazine* 149 (1934), pp. 86–87. In this, the author states that the dawn silence 'is as precious as a Ming vase', thus providing the first use of this form of simile as well, p. 86.
90. Henry James, *The Portrait of a Lady*. Harvard Classics Shelf of Fiction, vol. 11, New York, 1917/2000, chap. 49, p. 7.
91. Peter Sandiford, 'Craftsmanship and Education', *School and Society*, eds. James McKeen Cattell et al., 8, no. 186 (1918), p. 69.
92. Herbert Edward Read, *Art and Industry: The Principles of Industrial Design*, London, 1934, pp. 21–23; Roger Eliot Fry, 'The Artist's Vision', in *Vision and Design*, London, 1920, cited in Pierson 2007, p. 114 [Fry] and Pierson 2004, p. 85.
93. Read 1934, pp. 21–23.
94. C D Malmgren, 'Anatomy of Murder: Mystery, Detective and Crime Fiction', *The Journal of Popular Culture* 30, no. 4 (Spring 1997), pp. 115–135.
95. Isabel Ostrander, *Suspense*, New York, 1918, p. 86.
96. A good historical overview, with critical essays on topics related to motifs in detective fiction is provided in Charles J. Rzepka and Lee Horsely, *A Companion to Crime Fiction*, Chichester/Malden, MA, 2010.
97. Kathlyn Rhodes, 'The Ming Vase', *The Strand Magazine* 61 (1921), p. 140.
98. Rhodes 1921, p. 141.
99. Rhodes 1921, p. 145.
100. John D. Swain, 'Logan Berry, From Oregon', *Munsey's Magazine* 75, no. 2 (1922), p. 376.
101. For a recent discussion, see Yunte Huang, *Charlie Chan: The Untold Story of the Venerable Detective and His Rendezvous with American History*, New York, 2010.
102. Horace Annesley Vachell, *Quinney's Adventures*, London, 1924.
103. Deborah Cohen, *Household Gods: The British and Their Possessions*, New Haven, 2006, p. 160.
104. Dashiell Hammett. *The Maltese Falcon*. New York, 1930.
105. The literature of the treasure motif, and its corollary the treasure hunt, is extensive but lacking a monograph on the subject. For selected treatments, see for example: Joseph Kestner, *Masculinities in British Adventure Fiction, 1880–1915*, Farnham/Burlington, 2010; Laurence Kitzan, *Victorian Writers and the Image of Empire: The Rose-Colored Vision*, Westport, 2001.
106. Mitzi M. Brunsdale, *Icons of Mystery and Crime Detection: From Sleuths to Superheroes*, Santa Barbara, 2010, p. 650.
107. Rex Dark, *The Ming Vase Mystery*, London, 1936, frontispiece summary.
108. Dark 1936, e.g. pp. 10, 75.

109. Ironically, an actual Ming vase did become dangerously valuable recently, with the record-breaking sale of an early 15th-century vessel in Hong in 2011. Sotheby's Hong Kong, 'The Meiyintang Collection, part II', October 2011. The sale price was £14 million, thus generating a lot of Ming-vase related headlines.
110. This process mirrors that of the interpretation and reception of 'Gandharan sculpture', as discussed by Stanley Abe in 'Inside the Wonder House: Buddhist Art and the West', in Donald Lopez, ed., *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*, Chicago, 1995, pp. 63–106.
111. Rex Stout, *The Broken Vase*, New York, 1941; Boston, 1988, pp. 144–145.
112. Linda Rosenfeld Pomper, Jeffrey P. Stamen, and Norman R. Weiss, 'Research on the Question of Dating Chinese Famille Noire Porcelain', in Blythe McCarthy, ed., *Scientific Research on Historic Asian Ceramics: Proceedings of the Fourth Forbes Symposium at the Freer Gallery of Art*, Washington D. C., 2009, pp. 104–112.
113. James J. Lally, 'Collecting Chinese Ceramics in America: Morgan and Freer', *TOCS* 73 (2010), pp. 25–37.
114. Stout 1941/1988, p. 44.
115. Stout 1941/1988, p. 44.
116. Kent Baxter, 'Nancy Drew and Her Sister Sleuths: Essays on the Fiction of Girl Detectives (review)', *The Lion and the Unicorn* 33, no. 3 (Sept. 2009), pp. 418–422.
117. Carolyn Keene, *The Clue of the Leaning Chimney* (Nancy Drew book 26)*,* New York, 1949.
118. 'Jiggs and Maggie in Court', William Beaudine, director, released in USA 12 December 1948.
119. Michael Scriven, 'The Present Status of Determinism in Physics', *The Journal of Philosophy* 54, no. 23 (1957), p. 739.
120. Eric Berne, *A Layman's Guide to Psychiatry and Psychoanalysis*, New York, 1957, p. 60.
121. P. G. Wodehouse, *The Luck of the Bodkins*, London, 1956, p. 12.
122. *The Simpsons,* season 5, episode 1F11, 'Ming vase on a ladder' sketch, written by John Swartzwelder.
123. These are still available for sale and are referenced in the main guide to American comics, Robert M. Overstreet, *The Overstreet Comic Book Price Guide*, New York, 1993 edition consulted.
124. *The Adventures of Rin Tin Tin,* series 5, episode 23, first broadcast 23 March 1959. Screen Gems, USA.
125. Yuille 1934.
126. Joseph Fields, Oscar Hammerstein and C. Y. Lee, *Flower Drum Song: A Musical Play*, Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1959, p. 20.
127. A. J. McClane, 'From Aawa to Zooplankton', *Field and Stream* 70, no. 7 (1965), p. 128.
128. See Wayne D. LeBaron, *America's Nuclear Legacy*, Commack, NY, 1998, for information about the Nevada tests which began in 1951.
129. Defense Atomic Support Agency, 'Operation Minute Gun. Shot Ming Vase. Interim Summary Report', Nevada Test Site, November 1969, Defense Technical Information Center document POR 6337; accession number ADA286666, 1968; http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a286666.pdf (accessed 28 August 2012).
130. U. S. Department of Energy, Nevada Operations Office, 'United States Nuclear Tests: July 1945 through September 1992', DOE/NV--209-REV 15, December 2000; http://www.nv.doe.gov/library/publications/historical/DOENV_209_REV15.pdf (accessed 4 November 2010).
131. Defense Nuclear Agency, 'Operation Minute Gun Shot Hudson Seal Summary Report', ADA286667, May 1969, p. 11. http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA286667 (accessed 28 August 2012).
132. Defense Nuclear Agency 1969, p. 14 of the pdf file, p. 10 of the original report.
133. BBC bans sex pistols god save the queen, 13 May 1977. http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/the-bbc-bans-the-sex-pistols-quotgod-save-the-queenquot (accessed 4 November 2010).
134. Hergé, *The Blue Lotus*. English edition, London, 1983, p. 16. The title is also given in Chinese: 藍蓮花. The Tin Tin reference was first noted by Jessica Harrison-Hall.

135. Hergé 1983, p. 55.
136. Homay King, *Lost in Translation: Orientalism, Cinema and the Enigmatic Signifier*, Durham, 2010, pp. 44–74.
137. Mantegna's *Adoration of the Magi* (1495–1505); Whistler's *Purple and Rose*: *The Lange Lijzen of the Six Marks* (1864); and Matisse's *Les Pensées de Pascal* (1924).
138. See 'I'm a Ming Vase but also a PC', http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gkvtmiRWypE (accessed 2 August 2012).
139. See http://adsoftheworld.com/media/print/artengo_tennis_shoes_ming_vase (accessed 19 June 2010).
140. Widely reported, see, for example: http://www.look.co.uk/pictures/victoria-beckhams-dramatic-style-transformation/victoria-beckham-wearing-a-red-roberto-cavalli-dress-2005#./victoria-beckham-wearing-roberto-cavalli-to-elton-johns-annual-party-20?&_suid=134564350483909738591063552051, image 86 (accessed 22 August 2012).
141. See http://digi.color-swatches.com/ace/colors-for-your-life/ming-vase/b44-7/swatch.html (accessed 28 August 2012).
142. The 'Priceless Ming Vase' weapon appears in Worms World Party of 2001. http://www.worms2.com/main.html?page=good&area=weap,weapons guide, F10–F12 (accessed 22 August 2012).

Chapter 4 Ming Porcelain in the Art World (19th–21st centuries)

1. See Clunas 2009, introduction, p. 9.
2. There is a significant body of literature on Ming ceramics in non-English language sources. For the most part, these treat the subject as a natural category of Chinese ceramics, as the concept and phrase 'the Ming vase' is primarily confined to the culture of English-speaking societies. For bibliographies of literature on Ming ceramics in Chinese, Japanese and other languages, see for example Wang Guangyao 2010; Kerr ed. 2004; Hasebe Gakuji, *Chūgokū no tōji* 中国の陶磁 (Chinese Ceramics), 12 vols., Tokyo, 1995–99, vols. 8–10 on Ming and related ceramics.
3. 'A Magnificent Early Ming Underglaze Copper-red Vase, *yuhuchunping*', Fine Chinese Ceramics and Works of Art, 30 May 2006. This was widely reported. See for example the Bloomberg report: Le-Min Lim, 'Las Vegas Developer Wynn Pays Record HK$78.5 Mln for Ming Vase', *Bloomberg,* 30 May 2006: http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=alq0LeAjK1_M (accessed 3 August 2012).
4. 'Steve Wynn Officially Donates Ming Vase to Macau,' http://www.a2zmacau.com/2129/steve-wynn-officially-donates-ming-vase-to-macau/ (accessed 3 August 2012).
5. Hongwu is only mentioned in Cao Zhao's preface [Tianshun (1457–64) edn.]. The date the book was written was the 21st year of the Hongwu reign period; David 1971, p. 3. In later texts, as noted in chapter one, it is usually Ming porcelains of the 15th century onward that are mentioned, such as those of the Yongle, Xuande and Chenghua periods.
6. At the time of writing, another Chinese 'vase', this time of Qing date, sold for £531,000,000. Bainbridges auctioneers, Pinner, near London, 11 November 2010. This is currently the world record for any Chinese 'work of art'. See for example Murray Wardrop, 'Chinese Vase Sells for World Record-Breaking £53.1 Million at Auction', *The Telegraph*, 11 November 2010: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/art/artsales/8127919/Chinese-vase-sells-for-world-record-breaking-53.1-million-at-auction.html (accessed 3 August 2012). To date, the piece has not been paid for, however.
7. 'Wynn Pays Record Price for Chinese Ming Vase', *China Daily*, 31 May 2006: http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2006-05/31/content_604893.htm (accessed 3 August 2012).
8. However, it had been sold by the 'unaware' collectors in 1984, then was in two private collections before being sold in 2006.

9. A hardcopy catalogue was published for this lot and its text can be found online: http://www.christies.com/LotFinder/lot_details.aspx?from=salesummary&intObjectID=4721902&sid=883af8b8-866b-4ff9-af7b-2672b4e3b09d.
10. Interview: Artworks Magazine, 15 May 2008. http://artworksmagazine.com/2008/05/steve-wynn/ (accessed 23 August 2012).
11. Interview: http://artworksmagazine.com/2008/05/steve-wynn/.
12. Li and Knight 2008.
13. The Percival David Foundation of Art, formerly at SOAS, University of London. The main collection is now displayed in the Sir Joseph Hotung Ceramic Study Centre Gallery in the British Museum. Jessica Harrison-Hall and Regina Krahl, *Chinese Ceramics: Highlights of the Sir Percival David Collection*, London, 2009. For a history of the museum, see Stacey Pierson, 'Private Collecting, Teaching and Institutionalisation: The Percival David Foundation and the Field of Chinese Art in Britain, 1920–1964', Ph.D. dissertation, University of Sussex, 2004a.
14. Pierson 2007.
15. It was published in its complete form in 1910: *Description of Chinese Pottery and Porcelain: Being a Translation of the T'ao shuo, with notes*, Oxford, 1910.
16. For a recent reprint, see Zhu Yan 朱琰, *Tao shuo* 陶说. *Xuxiu siku quanshu* 续修四库全书, vol. 1111. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1995–99.
17. Judith Green, 'Britain's Chinese Collections: Private Collecting and the Invention of Chinese Art, 1842–1943', Ph.D. dissertation, University of Sussex, 2003; Nick Pearce, 'Collecting, Connoisseurship and Commerce: An Examination of the Life and Career of Stephen Wooton Bushell (1844–1908)', *TOCS* 70 (2007), pp. 17–25.
18. The history of the Walters family and their collections is presented in William R. Johnston, *William and Henry Walters: The Reticent Collectors*, Baltimore, 1999. A more recent study of Henry Walters examines his relationship with Bernard Berenson: Stanley Mazaroff, *Henry Walters and Bernard Berenson: Collector and Connoisseur*, Baltimore, 2010.
19. See Bushell 1897/1981, preface, p. iii.
20. Bushell 1897/1981, introduction, p. 2.
21. For example in Hobson 1915, which itself would prove to be an enduring reference on the subject.
22. Stephen Bushell, *Chinese Porcelain: Sixteenth-Century Coloured Illustrations with Chinese MS Text, Translated and Annotated by S. W. Bushell*, Oxford, 1908.
23. On Xiang, see Clunas 1991/2004, p. 124; Goodrich and Fang 1976, vol. 1, pp. 539–544.
24. Percival David, 'Hsiang and His Album', *TOCS* 11 (1933–34), pp. 22–47.
25. 'A Porcelain Collector of the Ming Dynasty', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 14, no. 71 (Feb. 1909), p. 290.
26. 'A Porcelain Collector of the Ming Dynasty' 1909, p. 291.
27. Clunas 1991/2004, p.124 and David 1933–34.
28. Burlington Fine Arts Club, *Exhibition of Early Chinese Pottery and Porcelain 1910*, London, 1911.
29. Edgar Gorer, *Catalogue of Rare Specimens of Ming and early Kang-he Porcelain*. Exhibited at the Galleries of S. Gorer and Son, London, 1907.
30. Hobson 1915, vol. II, p. xvii.
31. Larry Shiner, *The Invention of Art: A Cultural History*, Chicago, 2001, p. 5.
32. S. C. Bosch Reitz, 'Two Different Kinds of Ming Porcelain', *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 14, no. 11 (Nov. 1919), p. 236.
33. Japan Society, *Chinese, Corean and Japanese Potteries: Descriptive Catalogue of Loan Exhibition of Selected Examples*; all exhibited under the auspices of the Japan Society at the galleries of M. Knoedler & Co; Chinese and Corean authenticated by R. L. Hobson; Japanese by Edward S. Morse, New York, 1914.

34. Stanley Abe, 'Collecting Chinese Sculpture: Paris, New York, Boston', in Alan Chong and Noriko Murai, eds., *Journeys East: Isabella Stewart Gardner and Asia*, Boston, 2009, pp. 432–442.
35. Shiner 2001, p. 5.
36. Rose Sickler Williams was the wife of Edward Thomas Williams (1854–1944), who had gone to China in 1887 and then served in a number of official posts there. Later he was Professor of Oriental Languages at University of California Berkeley. See 'Edward Thomas Williams, Oriential [*sic*] Languages and Literature: Berkeley', *University of California: In Memorium, 1943–1945*: http://texts.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb696nb2rz&doc.view=frames&chunk.id=div00035&toc.depth=1&toc.id= (accessed 3 August 2012).
37. 'Notes on the Veitch Collection of Chinese Porcelain in the Birmingham Art Gallery', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 4, no. 12 (Mar. 1904), pp. 232–241.
38. 'Notes on the Veitch Collection' 1904, p. 232.
39. 'Notes on the Veitch Collection' 1904, pp. 232–241. For an art historical discussion of Chinese stands, see Jan Stuart, 'Practices of Display: The Significance of Stands for Chinese Art Objects', in Jerome Silbergeld et al., eds., *Bridges to Heaven: Essays on East Asian Art in Honor of Professor Wen Fong*, vol. 2, part 6, Princeton, 2011, pp. 693–712.
40. Visual evidence for this can be seen in the well-known Chinese court paintings of the Yongzheng period, the versions of 'the Scroll of Antiquities' or *Gu wan tu* 古玩图. One version is in the Percival David Collection. See Shane McCausland, 'The Emperor's Old Toys: Rethinking the Yongzheng (1723–35) Scroll of Antiquities in the Percival David Foundation', *TOCS* 66 (2000–01), pp. 65–75.
41. F. S. K., 'A Chinese Porcelain Vase', *Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin* 14, no. 82 (Apr. 1916), p. 17.
42. Ironically now once again seeing a resurgence in popularity with Chinese collectors, about 100 years later.
43. 'A Rare Ming Vase', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 33, no. 189 (Dec. 1918), p. 194. *Fahua* wares are discussed later in this chapter.
44. As noted in chapter two, this practice, with different implications, was also employed in Japan.
45. R. L. Hobson, 'The Leverton Harris Cup', *The British Museum Quarterly* 3, no. 2 (Sept. 1928), p. 33.
46. See Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 279, fig. 11:7.
47. There is also evidence of concern about 'early Ming' attributions, an issue which will be discussed later in this chapter.
48. Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 586.
49. For example, the Hongwu-period copper red-decorated cup stand, BM 1928.0718.2.
50. R. L. Hobson, 'Peking Notes', *TOCS* 8 (1928–30), p. 36.
51. Very little is known about Raphael, apart from his collecting activities. A brief history of these can be found in Harrison-Hall 2001, p. 593.
52. The Palace Museum had recently opened in 1925 and was preceded by displays in the Institute for Exhibiting Antiquities which were first opened to the public in 1914. This history, and its consequences for the conceptualisation of the former imperial 'collections', was recently considered by Wang Cheng-hua, 'The Qing Imperial Collection, Circa 1905–25: National Humiliation, Heritage Preservation, and Exhibition Culture', in Wu Hung, ed., *Reinventing the Past: Archaism and Antiquarianism in Chinese Art and Visual Culture*, Chicago, 2010, pp. 320–341. See also Sarah E. Fraser, 'Antiquarianism or Primitivism?: The Edge of History in the Modern Chinese Imagination', pp. 342–367 in the same volume.
53. For a discussion of the transition of the objects from imperial household goods to objects in the national art collection, see Wang Cheng-hua 2010.
54. C.1037–1917. Published in Pierson 2009, p. 36.
55. BM OA 1929.1–14.1. Published in Harrison-Hall 2001, pp. 499–500, fig. 16:95.
56. Shigeru Akita and Nicholas J. White, *The International Order of Asia in the 1930s and 1950s*, Farnham, 2010, p. 208.

57. Alfred Salmony and D. E. Berenberg, 'Peking as a Museum City', *Parnassus* 3, no. 1 (Jan. 1931), p. 35.
58. Salmony and Berenberg 1931, p. 37. This was the section which Percival David paid to refurbish, as noted in the same article and in Pierson 2004a.
59. With the opening of the Palace Museum came an officially-sanctioned display and a perception that there was an authentic knowledge of Ming porcelains that could not be replicated outside China, especially with a lack of precisely dated examples.
60. Horace H. F. Jayne, 'In Defense of the Ming', *Parnassus* 2, no. 2 (Feb. 1930), pp. 18–19.
61. Jayne 1930, p. 19.
62. Eg. Burlington Fine Arts Club, *Exhibition of Early Chinese Pottery and Porcelain*, London, 1910 (illustrated catalogue published in 1911).
63. Jayne 1930, p. 19.
64. W. P. Y., 'Altar Vessels of the Wan Li Period' 55, no. 320 (Nov. 1929), pp. 252–253; WPY must have been W. Perceval Yetts.
65. R. L. Hobson, 'A Ming Porcelain Altar Set', *The British Museum Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (Dec. 1930), pp. 81–83.
66. Jayne 1930, p. 19. Interestingly, unlike Salmony a year later, who bemoans the availability of authentic objects for sale in China, Horace Jayne notes that because of 'political upheavals in China', supplies of objects for sale are limited and that 'in China certain restrictions are actually being enforced, that stone sculpture, for instance, is absolutely prohibited to be exported and that at last the Chinese are inclined to preserve their antiquities' (see p. 17).
67. A review of this exhibition appeared in *The Burlington Magazine*; see Tancred Borenius et al., 'Art Treasures Exhibition', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 61, no. 355 (Oct. 1932), p. 178.
68. Percival David, 'Description of Specimens Exhibited', *TOCS* 9 (1930–31), pp. 12–13.
69. 'Chinese Ceramics at Messrs. Sparks', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 61, no. 356 (Nov. 1932), p. 232.
70. Sparks is the subject of a current dissertation at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, where the firm's archives are located.
71. For the catalogue, see Edgar E. Bluett, *Ming and Ch'ing Porcelains: A Short Treatise Concerning Some Dated Specimens Together With Some Account of Their Distinguishing Features*, London, 1933.
72. Edgar Bluett, 'The Nien Hao and Period Identification', *TOCS* 13 (1935–36), pp. 51–63.
73. Pierson 2007, p. 147. In this period (as now), named collectors and collections were considered essential 'data' for connoisseurship writing about collected objects in general, not just Chinese ceramics.
74. R. L. Hobson, 'Ming Porcelain and Some Others from the Bloxam Collection', *Old Furniture* 5, no. 16 (1928), p. 3.
75. W. W. Winkworth, 'The David Collection Catalogue', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 65, no. 381 (Dec. 1934), pp. 264–270.
76. And, it can be argued, the literature in Chinese. Most of the Chinese texts specifically about Ming ceramics published in the 20th century have been archaeological reports or museum catalogues referencing archaeological material. The most prominent example of this is the literature of Ming imperial ceramics from Jingdezhen, which is extensive. See the final section of this chapter for a discussion of the role of archaeology in the interpretation and presentation of Ming porcelain in China.
77. A. D. Brankston, 'An Excursion to Ching-te-chen and Chi-an-fu in Kiangsi', *TOCS* 16 (1938–39), pp. 19–32.
78. B.R., review of *Early Ming Wares of Chingtechen*, by A. D. Brankston, *The Burlington Magazine* 75, no. 437 (Aug. 1939), p. 88.
79. B. R. 1939, p. 88.
80. Royal Academy of Arts, London, *Exhibition of Chinese Art—Catalogue and Illustrated Supplement* London, 1935. For a brief discussion, see Pierson 2007, pp. 154–160.
81. Bernard Rackham, review, *The Burlington Magazine* 70, no. 407 (Feb. 1937), p. 95.

82. Percival David, 'The Exhibition of Chinese Art. A Preliminary Survey', *The Burlington Magazine* 67, no. 393 (Dec. 1935), p. 246.
83. Sotheby and Co., 'Catalogue of the Well-Known Collection of Rare Early Chinese Blue and White Porcelain of the Sung, Yuan and Ming Dynasties and Some Choice Examples of Enamelled Porcelain of the Ch'ing Dynasty, the Property of Charles E. Russell, Esq.', 6 June 1935.
84. Pierson 2007, pp. 159–160.
85. http://www.bonhams.com/auctions/16789/lot/54/ (accessed 29 August 2012).
86. A well-published example is the blue and white Jiajing mark and period ewer, PDF B617. For an obituary of Russell, see Soame Jenyns, 'Charles Ernest Russell', *TOCS* 32, 1959–60, p. ix.
87. PDF B614. See Pierson 2004a, p. 142; Pierson 2007, p. 147.
88. R. L. Hobson, *A Catalogue of Pottery and Porcelain in the Collection of Sir Percival David, Bt., FSA*, London, 1934; PDF 688, 600, A644—ex Russell, 662, B658, etc.
89. Hobson 1934, pp. xi–xii; Pierson 2007, p. 152; and Lady David, 'Introduction', in R. Scott, *The Percival David Foundation of Chinese Art: A Guide to the Collection* (London, 1989), pp. 9–26.
90. Leopold Reidemeister and J Hellner, *Ming-Porzellane in Schwedischen Sammlungen*, Berlin, 1935.
91. From what is considered an important collection today: American Art Association, 'Rare Sung and Ming Porcelains and Pottery, Ch'ing Decorated Porcelains, Including Ku-yueh Hsuan and Other Imperial Wares: Collection of Mrs. S. K. De Forest', New York, 11 January 1936, Sale 4219.The American Art Association was an auction house founded in 1884 in New York. It was widely admired at the time and is credited with creating/inventing the modern auction style and enhancing the reputation of auctioneers. Its archives are located in the Frick Art Reference Library, New York City.
92. Robert Fleming Heizer et al., 'Archaeological Evidence of Sebastian Rodriquez Cermeño's California Visit in 1595', *California Historical Society Quarterly* 20, no. 4 (Dec. 1941), p. 321.
93. Heizer 1941, pp. 326–327, fn. 17.
94. This report would go on to become a seminal reference in the history of Chinese export porcelain, and the sherds discussed in it would be used to date related finds in several surface and shipwreck sites around the world. Clarence Shangraw and Edward P. von der Porten, *The Drake and Cermeño Expeditions' Chinese Porcelains at Drakes Bay, California, 1579 and 1595*, Santa Rosa, CA, 1981. A new book on the subject by Von der Porten is apparently in press.
95. A. J. B. Kiddell, 'Note on a Blue and White Vase from the Tomb of the Emperor Hsuan Te', *TOCS* 21 (1945–46), p. 17.
96. A. J. B. Kiddell, 'Further Note on a Pair of Blue-and-White Vases from the Tomb of the Emperor Hsuan Te', *TOCS* 22 (1946–47), p. 39.
97. Peter Bodde, 'Pre-Ming and Early Fifteenth Century Chinese Blue and White Porcelains', *TOCS* 21 (1945–46), pp. 16–17.
98. Oriental Ceramic Society, 'Transactions for the Year 1946–47', *TOCS* 22 (1946–47), preliminary pages, p. 7.
99. Oriental Ceramic Society, 'Catalogue of the Exhibition of Ming Blue-and-White Porcelain', *TOCS* 22 (1946–47), pp. 40–41.
100. Gerald Reitlinger and Martin Button, 'Early Ming Blue and White: I', *The Burlington Magazine* 90, no. 538 (Jan. 1948), p. 11.
101. Reitlinger and Button 1948, p. 11, quoting Honey in *The Ceramic Art of China*, London, 1944, p. 111 and fn.
102. It should be noted that Reitlinger was a dealer and thus had an interest in improving the commercial prospects for 'early Ming' porcelain.
103. Fogg Art Museum, *The Use of Blue on Chinese Porcelain of the Ming Dynasty, 1368–1644*, Cambridge, MA, 1947.

104. The catalogue was published in the museum's *Bulletin*, Jean Gordon Lee, 'An Exhibition of Ming Blue-and-White', *Philadelphia Museum of Art Bulletin* XLIV, no. 223 (Autumn 1949), pp. 1–72.
105. J. G. Lee 1949, p. 5.
106. J. G. Lee 1949, p. 6.
107. Jean-Pierre Dubosc, *A Loan Exhibition: Great Chinese Painters of the Ming and Ch'ing Dynasties, XV to XVIII Centuries, for the Benefit of The Asia Institute: March 11 to April 2, 1949*, New York, 1949; Ellen J. Laing, 'The State of Ming Painting Studies', *Ming Studies* 4 (Spring 1977), pp. 9–16 (18).
108. A. Bulling, 'Chinese Art of the Ming Period, A.D. 1368–1644', short notice in *The Burlington Magazine* 92, no. 570 (Sept. 1950), p. 271.
109. Pierson 2004a, chap. 4.
110. See Pierson 2004a, pp. 215–233 for a discussion of the museum's early activities.
111. Sotheby's London, 'Important Ming Porcelain', 24 March 1953.
112. Eg. in *The Burlington Magazine* 95, no. 600 (Mar. 1953), p. v.
113. Oriental Ceramics Society, 'Transactions for the Year 1950–51', *TOCS* 26 (1950–51), preliminary pages, p. 9.
114. Mathias Komor, *Imperial Porcelains of the Ming Dynasty (1368–1644 A.D.)*, New York, 1951.
115. See Soame Jenyns, 'The A. D. Brankston Collection of Chinese Porcelain', *The British Museum Quarterly* 19, no. 3 (Sept. 1954), pp. 54–57.
116. Soame Jenyns, *Ming Pottery and Porcelain*, 2nd edn., London, 1953/1988, p. 2.
117. Jenyns 1953/1988, p. 4.
118. Sherman Lee, 'Early Ming Blue and White Porcelains', *Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* 42, no. 2, part 1 (Feb. 1955), p. 28.
119. Lee 1955, p. 29.
120. Freer Gallery of Art, *Ming Porcelains in the Freer Gallery of Art*, Washington, D.C., 1953.
121. The Arts Council of Great Britain and The Oriental Ceramic Society, *Catalogue of an Exhibition of the Arts of the Ming Dynasty, November 15th to December 14th, 1957*, London, 1957.
122. Sir Harry Garner, 'The Arts of the Ming Dynasty: Introduction', *TOCS* 30 (1955–57), preliminary pages, p. 1.
123. E.g. Desmond Gure, 'The Arts of the Ming Dynasty', *Artibus Asiae* 20, no. 4 (1957), pp. 309–320.
124. For example, John A. Pope, 'Some Blue-and-White in Istanbul', *TOCS* 26 (1950–51), pp. 37–50.
125. Pope 1956.
126. *Chinese Art Treasures: A Selected Group of Objects from the Chinese National Palace Museum and the Chinese National Central Museum, Taichung, Taiwan. / Exhibited in the United States by the Government of the Republic of China at the National Gallery of Art, Washington [and others] 1961–1962*, Geneva, 1961. At the same time, the National Palace Museum in Taipei published a catalogue, *Underglaze Red Ware of the Ming Dynasty; Ming youli hongci* 明釉里红瓷 (Hong Kong, 1963), a very specialized topic in Ming ceramics, demonstrating the disparity in the appreciation and specialist knowledge of Ming ceramics among readers and collectors in greater China and those of the rest of the world.
127. Warren Cohen, *East Asian Art and American Culture: A Study in International Relations*, New York, 1992.
128. *Chinese Art Treasures* 1961, p. 25.
129. The fact that the conception of Song ceramics as rustic and therefore hand-crafted is still current at that time is also interesting. As noted in chapter two, this was a notion that had currency in both early modern Japan and 20th century Britain, which itself was influenced by Japanese ideals of the so-called *Mingei* (民芸 'folk craft') movement, through the agency of Bernard Leach. See, for example, Yuko Kikuchi, 'A Japanese William Morris: Yanagi Soetsu and *Mingei* Theory', *Journal of William Morris Studies* 12, no. 2 (Spring), pp. 39–45.

130. W. B. Honey, introduction to Jenyns 1953/1988, p. xi.
131. H. C. Tseng, 'Chinese Art Treasures', *Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* 59, no. 317 (1961), p. 64.
132. Art Institute of Chicago, *Ming-Ch'ing Dynasties, a.d. 1368–1644, a.d. 1644–1912*, Chicago, 1964.
133. On single-period Chinese art exhibitions in the 1950s and 1960s as a trend, see Pierson 2004a, p. 231.
134. Gerald Reitlinger, *The Economics of Taste, vol. III: The Art Market in the 1960s*, London, 1970, p. 436.
135. Reitlinger 1970, p. 436.
136. Reitlinger 1970, p. 442.
137. Reitlinger 1970, p. 442.
138. *Fahua* ware is normally a stoneware with dark blue, or sometimes turquoise, ground colours and slip lines containing yellow and green low-fired lead glazes. These were first made at kilns in north China during the Yuan period, and the tradition is associated with architectural and temple ceramic production. Some examples were also made in porcelain at Jingdezhen during the 16th century.
139. See Lam ed. 1996.
140. Enzheng Tong, 'Thirty Years of Chinese Archaeology (1949–1979)', in Philip L. Kohl and Clare P. Fawcett, eds., *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge, 1995, pp. 177–197.
141. For example, Margaret Medley, 'Ching-te Chen and the Problem of the 'Imperial Kilns', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 29, no. 2 (1966), pp. 326–338.
142. National Palace Museum, *Blue and White Ware of the Ming Dynasty*, compiled by the joint board of the National Palace Museum and the National Central Museum, 6 vols., Hong Kong, 1963 (also published in Chinese, along with a series of other books on Chinese ceramics in the 1960s).
143. For the catalogue, see Suzanne G. Valenstein, *Ming Porcelains: A Retrospective*, New York, 1970. The exhibition ran from October 1970 to January 1971.
144. Valenstein 1970, preface, p. 7.
145. John Alexander Pope, *The History of the History of Ming Porcelain*, London, 1972. This is the published version of what was presented as an OCS lecture in June 1971.
146. The most recent was in China; see Zhao 2010.
147. As described by Gerritsen 2009.

Index