sciendo

Art History & Criticism / Meno istorija ir kritika 16
ISSN 1822-4555 (Print), ISSN 1822-4547 (Online)
https://doi.org/10.2478/mik-2020-0011

Loreta POŠKAITĖ
Vilnius University. Institute of Asian and Transcultural Studies, Vilnius, Lithuania

AUTHENTICITY/GENUINENESS/TRUTH (*ZHEN* 真) IN CHINESE TRADITIONAL ART THEORIES AND AESTHETICS

Summary. The uniqueness of Chinese traditional art and aesthetics is often presented by the popular Chinese saying "art is manifestation of *Dao*", which could mean manifestation of truth or authenticity, since *Dao* 道 in Classical Daoism was understood as authentic being and a source of authenticity. However, the meaning of authenticity/truth (*zhen* 真) in Chinese aesthetics and theories of art seems less discussed, and far more complicated, than the term *Dao*. This article argues that *zhen* is no less important for understanding the nature of artistic creativity and expression in Chinese arts and their theories in the historical perspective, and the issue of likeness in art in particular. It demonstrates how this term is related to the evaluation of the work of art, the artist's expression and self-expression, and his/her relation to the "object" represented in art; in other words, with representation, imagination and morality, which is evident in such compounds as "drawing truthfulness" (*xie zhen* 写真), and "to create the truth" (*chuang zhen* 創真). The article deals with the conceptual and historical analysis of the term *zhen*, aiming to survey the differences and changes of its meaning in theories of painting, literature and "aesthetics of things" (antiquarianism), and to reveal the relations between its philosophical and aesthetic interpretations, especially evident in the Ming dynasty.

Keywords: Daoism, authenticity, genuineness, truth, expression, painting, poetry.

There is a long-standing tendency in the discourse of comparative studies of Classical Chinese and Western art and its theories (and aesthetics) to contrast them on the basis of Western theories of mimesis and expressionism, arguing for the indifference of Chinese artists and aestheticians to the view of art as the imitation of reality. This tendency goes back to the first extensive investigations of Chinese painting and its theory by Osvald Siren,[1] George Rowley,[2] Mai-Mai Sze,[3] and was later summarized by Richard Sclafani in his proposition of two paradigms, namely, the Western paradigm of imitation and the Chinese paradigm of Dao as the possible framework for comparative studies.[4] Many such studies until today are more or less based on those paradigms, highlighting the expressive nature of Chinese art and a search of artists/art perceivers for the higher reality or manifestation of Dao behind the forms/appearances of things, or meaning beyond the images and words.[5] For example, one of the most prominent scholars in comparative aesthetics and philosophy, Francois Jullien, argues that Chinese literati painters prefer to "cut short the exacting realism of the object" and "to hide things away" through the structure of "emerging-submerging", "appearing-disappearing" or way of "*de*-picting", thus "cor-responding" (*ying* 应) the very process of the movement and transformation of things rather than rendering the form proper to the object; in a word, they seek out resemblance through the "nonresemblance", "by quitting form" and liberating themselves from the constraint of that form.[6] However, this move "beyond" the form or image, according to him, in no way means the disconnection from things and avoidance of resemblance, but rather implies paradoxical co-existence or unity of resemblance and nonresemblance.[7] Before Jullien, George Rowley also pointed to the exceptional attentiveness of Chinese artists to the structures and forms of natural world, such as the patterning of bird's feathers, anatomy of insects or structure of stones, while at the same time, paradoxically, avoiding excessive depiction of that world.[8] This paradoxicalness was partly explained by Gao Jianping in his book about the expressive act in Chinese art (mainly

literati painting). When discussing Chinese painter's particular and typical way of looking at the world – contemplation (*guanxiang* 貫想), as penetration "through the surface of the objective world", he specified, that "Chinese were not content with merely gazing at the thing they are going to paint", since they "believed a painter should obtain the nature of the object, or *de-qi-tian* 得其天. To them the nature, principle, spirit, or soul of the object was much more important than its surface or appearance".[9]

All those interpretations and comparisons of Chinese and Western aesthetics are mostly based on the analysis of Chinese literati painting (*wenrenhua* 文人画) theory, and in particular landscape painting as the expression of formless Dao, as if it could represent Chinese aesthetics in its entirety.[10] Accordingly, their conceptual analysis is concentrated on the category of Dao and modes of its manifestation, specified in such Chinese aesthetic terms as *qi* 气 (vital energy), *xiang* 象 (image), *xu* 虚 (emptiness), *dan* 淡 (blandness), *li* 理 ("principle"), *yi* 意 (idea), *yin-yang* 阴阳, etc.[11] But, it also could be said that all those terms were associated with the requirement to express some kind of authenticity or truth, following the Daoist notion of Dao as a symbol or name for the ontological and epistemological truth or authenticity of being,[12] as well as Martin Heidegger's idea about art as "the truth setting itself to work".[13] However, what kind of truth – the one of nature,[14] the individual/subjective feelings of the artist, one's self, things as they are by themselves, reality, or the truth of nature/things mediated through the artist's perception, or of something else? The issue becomes even more complicated if we take into account not only Chinese landscape but other painting genres and arts (portraiture, literature), and take account of the fact that Chinese traditional art theories and aesthetics were shaped by Confucian and Daoist (and Buddhist) values and ideals, with the former's estimation of traditional norms/forms and "realism", and the latter's preference for the spontaneous expression of vital/creative energy (*qi*) and imagination/fantasy (*xiangxiang* 想象, *kongxiang* 空想). And it was this imagination/fantasy, which, on the one hand, sometimes in Chinese literature became the best way for manifesting "truth", while, on the other hand, made the reception of that "truth" in Chinese literature even more problematic.[15] The final confusion of the problem of "truth" or "truthfulness" in Chinese art and aesthetics is brought on by terminology, since this word is the English translation of Chinese *zhen* 真,[16] which, however, is elsewhere translated as "authenticity",[17] "reality"/"real",[18] "genuineness",[19] or "true".[20] The place of this term in the studies of Chinese art theory and aesthetics seems to me also rather contradictory. For example, the Russian sinologist Krivtsov in his book about Daoist aesthetics has included it into the list of main Daoist aesthetic categories,[21] although it was not included in the huge (1031 pages) Russian encyclopedia of Chinese art (from the five-volume encyclopedia "Spiritual culture of China").[22] Gao Jianping also considers it an important concept, "frequently used in critical writing",[23] but it was discussed only fragmentarily by him and other scholars. It rarely figures in the indexes of many books on Chinese art theories and aesthetics.

By appealing to Gao's statement that the meaning of this term has changed over time in the history of Chinese painting theory,[24] further in this article I will survey the differences of this meaning not only in painting aesthetics, but also in theory of portraiture and literature, and explore the relations between its philosophical and aesthetic interpretations. I would argue that *zhen* reveals the complicated status of likeness in art and is very important for understanding the nature and values of artistic creativity and expression in Chinese art theories from the historical perspective. In general, it is concerned with the evaluation of the work of art, psychology of artistic expression and self-expression, the issues of representation, imagination and morality (or moral nature of the artist). I will start with the discussion of the philosophical roots of this aesthetic term in Daoist philosophy, and then will survey its treatment in the texts of two contemporaries from 9–10th century – Sikong Tu and Jing Hao. The second part of the article will explore the differences of its meaning in landscape and portraiture painting theory, as well as in the culture of antiquarianism ("aesthetics of things") of the late imperial period.

Zhang Dainian, in his study of the key Chinese philosophical concepts, puts *zhen* (as "authenticity" in the

English translation of his book) into the class of epistemology, more concretely, theory of truth, pointing out its first occurrence in *Laozi* and *Zhuangzi*.[25] In *Laozi* the word *zhen* was used only 3 times (in ch.21, 41 and 54)[26] as an adjective and noun (the latter in the compound *zhizhen* 质真 ("essential/simplistic authenticity" in ch.49) for the description of Dao and virtue (*de* 德), but without any explanation. However, more extended explanation is given by Wang Bi in his commentary of this text. He treated *zhen* as one of the most important values, the characteristics of the sage (*shengren* 聖人) and the essence (*jing* 精) of Dao, accordingly its preservation – as the main purpose of self-cultivation and the means in attaining Dao.[27] On the conceptual level, Wang Bi equated *zhen* with the "one" (*yi* 一, translated by Richard Lynn as "integrity")[28] and simplicity (*pu* 朴),[29] and related to the "freedom from the capacity for knowing and from feeling desire",[30] "maintenance of quietude"[31] and following one's nature or being self-so (*ziran* 自然).[32] The association of *zhen* with *ziran* was further extended in *Zhuangzi*, in which this term occurs 44 times[33] as an adjective (in the compound "true knowledge" (*zhenzhi* 真知), "authentic person" (*zhenren* 真人) and a noun (translated by various translators as "truth",[34] "true nature",[35] "natural disposition,"[36] and "authenticity".[37]) It is associated here with something original and primordial (in the ontological sense – as one's primordial nature). For the thrust of this article, the most important meaning seems to me an epistemological one, evident in the ideal of "true knowledge" as the knowledge or acceptance of things as they are self-so and the world in its unity,[38] and psychological one, evident in relation of *zhen* to the guarding of one's true nature, proper self-cultivation and sincere self-expression. The latter is revealed very well in the dialogue between Confucius and the old fisherman (in ch.31), who criticizes Confucius' adherence to ritual norms and benevolence, suggesting instead to guard his *zhen* ("truth" in Watson's translation):

"By the 'Truth' I mean purity and sincerity in their highest degree. He who lacks purity and sincerity cannot move others. Therefore he who forces himself to lament, though he may sound sad, will awaken no grief. He who forces himself to be angry, though he may sound fierce, will arouse no awe. And he who forces himself to be affectionate, though he may smile, will create no air of harmony. True sadness need make no sound to awaken grief; true anger need not show itself to arouse awe; true affection need not smile to create harmony. When a man has the Truth within himself, his spirit may move among external things. That is why the Truth is to be prized!"[39]

This Daoist ideal of authenticity and sincere self-expression, or the unity of *zhen*, primordial human nature, naturalness and reserve in self-expression has inspired early poets, such as Tao Yuanming 陶淵明/Tao Qian 陶潜, who aimed to cultivate the true (*zhen*) in his poor hut and praised the uncorrupted men of antiquity for their embracing the true (*zhen*). He was himself praised for his achievement in "true antiquity" (*zhen gu* 真古)[40] and described as "truthful and spontaneous" (*zhen zide* 真自的). The poetry of Li Bo 李白 was also characterized as "natural and truthful" (*tian zhen* 天真).[41] There is no wonder, that investigators of Chinese literature and its aesthetics have related *zhen* to human nature and the authenticity of a poet's feelings, since almost all classical theories of literature have emphasized a direct relationship between Chinese literature (poetry) and music as its source, and the latter was treated and valued as the direct expression of emotions/feelings (*qing* 情) and embodiment of authenticity.[42] But it was in 9–10th century, when a search for the "true beauty" (*zhen mei* 真美) and true painting was celebrated by two contemporaries in poetry and painting theory, that is, Sikong Tu 司空圖 (837–908) and Jing Hao 荆浩 (855–915).

The most important treatise *Twenty four modes (moods/categories) of poetry (Er shi si shi pin* 二十四詩品) by Tang poet-critic Sikong Tu is written in poetic and highly suggestive style, pregnant with "Daoist rethoric of mystery and profundity"[43] and fraught with Daoist ideas, terms and symbols, as well as images of music and painting. The term *zhen* was used here in the descriptions of 11 modes.[44] Sikong Tu actually starts his text with the description of genuine form (*zhen ti* 真體) and relates it to something potent and undifferentiated (*xiong hun* 雄浑): "The greatest functioning extends outward; the genuine form is inwardly full. Reverting to the

empty brings one into the undifferentiated; accumulating sturdiness produces the potent" （大用外牿。真體内充。返虛入浑。積健為雄）.[45] Stephen Owen is right in pointing out, that "elusiveness is more than a value for Sikong Tu; it is an obsession"; that his "language is so elastic that contradictory and even incommensurate interpretations all flow with equal ease from the same lines", when one tries to translate them from Chinese into another language, thus it is too often not clear what subject Sikong Tu is writing about – a poet, his text, the manifestation of text or its reception in the reader's mind.[46] And this is especially evident in this second stanza, since the compound *zhen ti* "may either be [...] genuine form of potent, undifferentiated mode", or "having true feelings or experience within", or "to take the genuine [way] as one's form".[47] I would prefer the latter meaning, since it is further associated with something which "passes beyond the images and attains the center of the ring" (*chao yi xiang wai* 超以象外, *de qi huan zhong* 得其環中). *Xiang wai* (one of a key and most specific terms in Sikong's theory) refers "to something that lies 'outside' the definite form" or resists the distinctiveness of form, thus is compared here with billowing rainclouds and long winds in the empty vastness, while "center of the ring"(compound from Zhuangzi) refers to "the still unrealized power for transformation".[48] In my opinion, such undifferentiatedness (or undifferentiated potentiality) is for Sikong Tu the most valuable condition and the highest mode of authenticity, which the poet should strive to attain (but without striving), and in which the opposition of inner and outer, or the form and formlessness blurs out.

It also could be related to Sikong Tu's idea of aesthetic suggestiveness, formulated by compounds "flavors beyond the delicious" (*weiwai zhi zhi* 味外之旨), or "images beyond the image" (*xiang wai zhi xiang* 象外之象), as well as the word *hanxu* 含蓄 ("reserve" or "holding back and storing up"), which is described in mode 11 and considered by many scholars the most important category in Sikong Tu's theory of poetry.[49] According to Owen, it could be taken as characterization of personality as well as the manner of expressiveness, meaning "a reserve of unexpressed significance or emotion that lies implicit behind or beneath the words".[50] It could be considered a sign of the authenticity, since the begining of its description reminds me of the words from *Zhuangzi* (dialogue between Confucius and fisherman, in ch.31, quoted above): "It does not inhere in any single word, yet the utmost flair is attained. Though the worlds do not touch on oneself, it is as if there were unbearable melancholy. In this there is that 'someone in control', floating and sinking along with them. It is like straining the thickest wine, or the season of flowers reverting to autumn." (不著一字。盡得风流。語不涉忧。).[51] Further, Sikong mentions "someone in control" or "real master", with which one floats and sinks, implying "the master of universe", which was spoken about in *Laozi* and *Zhuangzi*, as showing no signs, leaving no trace, having no form. However, this "real master" could be here not only Dao, but also "the force of poetic creativity that controls composition", or "major theme of composition",[52] or "the unity of authors psyche".[53] All in all, it indicates a kind of intensive and multiple reality, which can be expressed in a most authentic way only with reservation. I would argue that Sikong Tu explores here the Daoist concept of "simple authenticity" – *zhizhen* 質真 and the ideal (or mode/condition) of undifferentedness as the feature of a real form, demonstrating the distrust in definite/surface form, which was reflected in his compound "meaning beyond the words" (*yan wai zhi yi* 言外之意) and had to be represented through reserve (*hanxu*).

The Daoist ideal of sincere self-expression is also represented in *Zhuangzi* by the image of a true painter (in ch. 21), using the phrase *jieyi panbo luo* 解衣般礴贏 ("had taken off his robes, stretched out his legs, and was sitting naked"), which became one of the most important themes and ideals in Chinese painting theory and criticism. It was embodied in one painting style and highest rank of the painters – so-called "untrammeled" (*yi pin* 逸品), which was taken as protest against the orthodox manners of faithful depiction of and fidelity to the forms.[54] It was also manifested in the Ming dynasty's so-called "wild and heterodox school" of painting.[55] However, the meaning of *zhen* in painting theory seems more complicated and contradictory, if looked at from the historical perspective and the variety of genres. This was

especially evident in the late Ming dynasty art and its theories, as I will demonstrate later in this article.

According to Gao Jianping, the term *zhen* ("truth" in his translation) in painting "originally had two meanings", referring to "verity in opposition to falsity" and "to essence in opposition to appearance", while later (from Song to Qing dynasty) it was associated with the painter's natural actions in wielding the brush, or "capturing the truth with brush" through the appearance, and very likely the relationship between the painter and nature – "being true to the unique communication of the painter with nature precisely at the moment of painting."[56] The example of the second original meaning of *zhen* (as inner essence in opposition to appearance) he takes from the famous fragment of *Bifaji* (*Notes on Brushwork*) by Jing Hao, who was concerned with the true/authentic representation (image) of the world in painting, thus introducing a new understanding of painting as the embodiment of truth rather than beauty. This was discussed in the dialogue between the old man (Daoist immortal) and the student about the meaning of painting, in which the former disagrees with the proposition of the latter, that "painting (*hua* 畫) means appearance (*hua* 華)" and that "it is enough to pay respect to lifelikeness and thus obtain the truth (*zhen*)". The Old man argues: "Painting means to paint (*hua* 畫). One examines the appearances of the objects and grasps their truth (*zhen* 真). He can only grasp the appearance from the appearance of the object, and the reality (*shi* 實) from the reality of the object. He must not take the appearance and call it reality. If you do not know this, you may get lifelikeness, but you can never demonstrate the truth. […] Lifelikeness means to achieve the form of the object but to leave out its vital force. The truth means both the vital force and the form are living. If the vital force only reaches the appearance instead of the whole image, the image is dead."[57]

At the first glance, this fragment seems to have the most clear and concrete definition of *zhen*. But after checking its few English translations one could realize that it is a most ambiguous and problematic one. Many renderings, especially those which add the words "inner" and "outer", or choose such terms as "spirit" and "substance", lead to what Martin Powers calls "the essentialist reading of the text" in the style of Platonic philosophy and classical European thought, since "The contrast between outward form and inner "reality", or the eternal battle between falsehood and truth, matter and spirit, implies a world of discrete identities in which the essence of each is obscured by the "accidents" of external form".[58] I do not intend to discuss all those Eurocentric translations and interpretations of this fragment.[59] As I understand it, Jing Hao considers authentic/true (*zhen*) image to be alive (or fraught with vital energy – *qi*) and manifested through its matter/nature or "physical essence" (*zhi* 质).[60] But the painter has to create that authenticity (*chuang zhen* 創真) by selecting (*qu* 取) the most important elements/structures/patterns through his studies of the laws of nature (the existence of the thing to be painted) in the process of its timely changes, or letting his/her brushwork to be led by "true thought" (*zhen si* 真思). In this sense, *zhen* could be associated with the significance (or what seems to the painter the most significant in the "object"), thus referring, in Powers' words, to "a match between the expressive figures of the painting and those of natural objects", although later (in Song literati painting theory) it was rather associated with "a match between the expressive figures in the painter's mind and those that appear in his or her work".[61] Accordingly, its meaning came closer to the term *yi* 意 (idea/meaning/mood/concept/intent or "general image"), which became one of the most important terms in literati painting (*wenrenhua*) theory and criticism for the description of the working of the artist's mind in the process of painting and his/her response to (communication with) the real world through the contemplation (*guanxiang)* and imagination, as well as the deeper meaning of the image/painting beyond that image or scene.

The latter aspect was later developed by the Qing art critic Huang Yue 黄钺 (1750–1841) in his text *Twenty four modes/moods/categories of painting* (*Er shi si hua pin* 二十四畫品). This text, considered by some scholars "one of the most poetic pieces on painting",[62] is concerned with the issue or spirit of true creativity and authenticity in the art of painting.

The latter is articulated in the description of its features/modes by using poetic form and highly suggestive language, full of Daoist terms and rhetorics of mystery, and could be understood as a response to Sikong Tu's text (and maybe responsible for the popularization of Sikong Tu's text, which, according to Owen, was ignored by Chinese literati and artists until the middle of the 17th century).[63] Huang Yue, like Jing Hao, starts his discourse and list of modes (or categories) from "vital rhythm"(*qiyun* 气韵), which was included into the first canon/law of painting – *qiyun shengdong* 气韵生動 in Six Canons (*liu fa* 六法) by Xie He 谢赫. According to Huang Yue, it is that spontaneous energy, which should resonate in the heart of the painter and which brings him (as well as the viewer) back into the depths of undifferentiated unity (or that, which "is neither small nor big" 无小无大).[64] This unity or something marvelous is behind the world of human proportions and images ("marvel beyond the painting" – *miao zai hua wai* 妙在画外), although it could be discerned in the sound of the string, smoke in the air or wave in the sea, which immediately disappear into this limitless flow of universal vital energy. In this short text the term *zhen* is used only three times – in the description of modes 8,11 (*zhen* as Dao) and 22 (*zhenren*). Looking from the general context, the way to the authenticity lies in the "plain and clumsy/awkward" (*pu zhuo* 扑拙) mode (8), which Huang Yue compares to the wildness of antiquity (in opposition to "civilized artificiality").

However, his ideal of authenticity could be related to many other modes of painting, such as "quietness and remoteness" (mode 7 *dan yuan* 澹远, which Huang describes by the metaphors of autumn and listening to the music of nature instead of the *qin*), "circularity and unsophisticatedness" (mode 16 *yuan hun* 圆浑, in which the creative genius of the painter is compared to "precreative" muddiness of nature, and his vision is oriented towards the simplicity or things "as they are" instead of refined details); "simplicity and cleanness" (mode 20 *jian jie* 简洁, which again stresses the search for the simplicity and "traveling behind the boundaries of things", in order to catch by the brush that marvelous (*miao* 妙) moment, which lies in the invisible and abstruse; thus catching it seems like listening to the voiceless bird); "wilderness and coldness" (mode 13 *huang han* 荒寒, represented by the images of uncontrollable streams of water and huddle of mountains and stones, which are the real source of the inspiration for the painter instead of cultivated fields and water channels). Such wilderness of the landscape and the manner of the painter Huang Yue compares to the taste of wonderful tea, which contains sweetness in its bitterness. Those associations let me conclude that he is exploring the idea of "simplistic authenticity" – *zhizhen* 質真, mentioned in "Laozi" ch.41, at the same time emphasizing the ideal (or mode/condition) of undifferentedness as the feature of a real form, and demonstrating distrust in definite/surface form, which was reflected in his compound "marvel beyond the painting" (*miao zai hua wai* 妙在畫外). Still the problem of authenticity seems to lie for him not in the representativity or non-representativity of forms, but rather in the style/way of their representation, namely, the vitality of the brush. Because, according to Gao Jianping, "brushwork was the challenger who continuously tried to overcome the demands of likeness to form. However, brushwork never tried to completely break away from form and enter a phase of free development. It fought with form, but it also needed to keep form as something to fight with. They both intended to reach a deep level meaning within the objective world, but they wanted to do so through the appearance of the world".[65] It was the form of formless Dao, which could resolve such a fight.

However, in the Ming dynasty *zhen* acquired a new meaning, which was developed by "wild and heterodox school" of painting, concerned with the pursuit of truth or authenticity. But this time it was explicated against the long-established tradition and old models/masters of painting. Thus in the art of Dai Jin (1388–1462), Wu Wei (1459–1508), Xu Wei (1521–1593), Lin Liang (1416–1480), Shi Zhong (1438–1506), Xu Lin (1462–1538), Guo Xu (1456–1532), Zhang Lu (1464–1538), Zheng Wenlin (1522–1566), Zhong Li (active 1480–1500), Wang Zhao (active 1506–1521) and others, *zhen* was associated with individuality, originality and spontaneity of artistic self-expression, manifested in the wild,

unrestrained, bold, "heroic", "splashy" and even eccentric brush style and behavior as a way to break any restrictions of lofty and elegant beauty of antique models.[66] Their aesthetics and new meaning of *zhen* is described very well by the literatus Lian Zining 練子寧, who compared the skill of such an "individualist" painter with the creative power of Nature and the image of the carpenter from *Zhuangzi*: "It is something the heart-mind must grasp and the hand respond to, though the heart and hand are not conscious of it, and still less can it be expressed in words, or by imitating works of art. Imitating the works of the old masters is like limiting oneself to the dust and the dirt, or the husks and chaff, without ever reaching the truth (*zhen*)."[67] According to J. P. Park, artistic originality (*qi* 奇) "was the new watchword, motto, and canon of the late Ming masters" and the way to establish or "authenticate" their elite status, as well as qualifications in the pedagogical culture of painting manuals of the time.[68] Their efforts were epitomized in the art and views of the "crazy" painter Xu Wei, who admitted, that he never consulted any manuals of painting, relying only on his inspiration and advised just to "watch how the myriads of trees out their spring greens when the east breeze arrives".[69]

However, the culmination of the "cult of originality" could be seen in the art and painting theory of "no method" (*wu fa* 无法) by famous "individualist" and the most authoritative theoretician of painting Shitao 石涛（Zhu Ruoji 朱若極, 1642–1707, who even more highlighted the importance of the artist's (his own) authentic (*zhen* 真) self as the main condition of creativity and expression (brushwork) in realization of the unity with Dao through his heart-mind and body: "I am myself because "I" naturally exists. The whiskers and eyebrows of the ancients cannot grow on my face, nor can my body contain their entrails. I express my own entrails and display my own whiskers and eyebrows. Even when there may be some point of contact with some master, it is he who comes close to me, not I who am trying to become like him. Nature has endowed me thus. As for antiquity, how could I have learned from it without transforming it?"[70] Such affirmation of the authenticity of "undivided self" and originality (*qi* 奇) is evident in the omnipresence of the word "I" (*wo* 我) in his text,[71] while his painting style of awkwardness, clumsiness and crudeness, so prevalent in the discourse of authenticity of his time, reminds the associations of *zhen* with simplicity (*pu*) and self-so (*ziran*) in Daoist philosophy, discussed above.

Shitao's views, especially the rejection of the reliance on the imitation of the past masters, as well as his fascination with the transformative power of nature as a source of creativity was shared (and influenced) by the literary theory of the Gong'an school, which could be considered a parallel to the aesthetics of "wild and heterodox" painting. For example, Lian Zining's critics of imitation of old models and ancient rules, as preventing the approach to the truth/authenticity (*zhen*) in painting, was almost repeated word by word in the advice by the writer of Gong'an school Jiang Yingke 江盈科 (1553–1605), but in relation to poetry: "In writing poetry, first seek the real (*zhen*); don't start by seeking a Tang style", and this "real" was for him poet's nature and emotions (*xing qing* 性情), reflecting his experience of the concrete reality/"actual scene".[72] Thus, the source of this real or authenticity he saw in Nature itself, and the poet has simply to trust it in its perfectness and flaws (or to be "faithful to the forms of things") in order to express his/her response to that nature in authentic way. However, some other observations by the representatives of this school (for example Yuan Hongdao) suggest the association of *zhen* (authenticity) with modernity (modern art) as well.[73]

But for the thrust of this article, particular interest is given to the concept of "truthful heart" (*zhen xin* 真心) by Li Zhi 李贄(1527–1602), whose ethics of genuineness (*zhen*) brought a new colour to the treament of this concept. Pauline C. Lee in her book about his philosophy argues, that "the ideal of genuineness – an ethics of the expression of genuine feelings – centrally animates his writings" and connects him with the writers of Gong'an school.[74] She demonstrates, how Li moves the source of authenticity from Nature to one's (artist's) heart, more concretely, "child-like heart-mind" (*tong xin* 童心), thus broadening its meaning with the Confucian-ethical

motives, inspired by Mengzi's teaching on the moral intuition and inclination, as well as by Wang Yangming's notion of "innate knowing" (*liangzhi* 良知). But his emphasis on the expression of genuine feeling, as stemming from the genuine/child-like and pure heart-mind, also reminds one of the dialogue between Confucius and fisherman in *Zhuangzi*, quoted at the beginning of the article. Moreover, it implies Daoist notion of effortlessness (or "effortless involvement"),[75] playfulness, spontaneity, natural easiness and purity. But it is this trust in the purity of one's heart-mind, which authorizes the necessity for its expression in the art of writing in a forceful and passionate way:

> "…as for those in this world who truly are able to write […] in the beginning all possess no intention to create literature. Their bosoms are filled with such and such things that they desire to spit out but not dare to. On the tip of their tongue, time and time again, they have countless things they wish to say but for which there is no proper place to speak them. These accumulate to an unimaginable height and are stored for so long that in time the force of these thoughts cannot be extinguished.
>
> Suddenly he sees a scene and his feelings are aroused. […] He snatches another's wine glass and drowns his accumulated burdens. He pours out the grievances within his heart, and for thousands of years after, people are moved by his ill fortune. As he already has spewed out jade and spit out pearls, illuminated the Milky Way, and created the most heavenly writings, he then becomes self-satisfied, goes crazy, and howls loudly, sheds tears and cries with sorrow, and is unable to stop himself. […]"[76]

However, according to Pauline C. Lee, such celebration of genuine self in no way means the celebration of egocentric individualism or individualistic hedonism, but rather encourages the emancipation from and revitalization of the conventional norms and canonical traditions.[77]

Returning to the survey of the meaning of *zhen* in Chinese painting theory, I would like to point out its third meaning, namely, "faithful/lifelike" as opposed to non-lifelike. This meaning could be discerned in the genre of portrait painting to refer to the faithful depiction of the face and is reflected in the compounds for naming portraiture, such as *xiezhen* 写真 ("to write truth", "write real", "writing true appearance", "to make a true likeness") from more extended versions *xiezhen xiang* 写真像, *xiezhen xiemao* 写真写貌. They were introduced into painting criticism in ninth/tenth century by Zhang Yanyuan 張彦遠, Zhu Jingxuan 朱景玄 and Huang Xiufu 黃休復, and have emphasized capturing the real nature of the person, or spiritual and physical likeness.[78] However, this likeness in early portraiture (character portraits, as well as portraits of emperors, Confucian worthies, good officials) was far from "realism" in the Western sense, since the most important goal, besides revealing authentic likeness, was to convey the person's social status and moral achievements, exemplary behavior. Thus the "authenticity" or lifelikeness of the image in those portraits implied some kind of idealization, or, according to Audrey Spiro, was "concerned, that is, with the depiction of persona, not personality".[79] The ideals of "mimetic" or lifelike representation assumed new importance in late Ming dynasty literary criticism and were reborn in theory of portraiture painting, which, however, was concentrated mostly on ancestor portraiture.[80] It is interesting to read about those ideals in the essay by the same writer of the Gong'an school Jiang Yingke 江盈科 in his essay *Seeking the real* (*Qiu zhen* 求真), in which he compares his treatment of the authentic poetry to a painter of portraits (*xiezhen chuanshen* 写真傳神):

> "who be his subject's face beautiful or ugly, dark or light, fat or thin, slant or straight, smooth or pockmarked – wishes one thing only: to paint a portrait which is totally like, so that when the son sees it, he says, 'This is really my father!' […] If such things as the facial features, eyes, cheekbones, chin, and so forth are not like, and the artist merely does a mechanical depiction […] imitating the ancients in every detail, but missing the

> appearance of his actual form, then the son will not recognize his father … Such a work could not be considered a likeness, nor could it even be considered a painting."[81]

What is ironic in his words, is the fact that many Chinese *wenrenhua* artists and Western scholars interpreted such ancestor portraits as ritual objects rather than art, since the likeness of the person in them was not appreciated either in terms of self-identity (in the Western sense) or of liveliness.[82] Their "authenticity" was based on the typology of facial features or physiognomy, which reveals rather a "permanent" essence, character and fate of a person, what is called by some scholars "collective consciousness".[83] There was also another term – *zhen rong* 真容 ("real face", "genuine appearance/image"), which referred to the portrait of the person as her mimetic representation and used for the posthumous (commemorative) portraits of officials and Buddhist monks, as well as in late imperial literature for the description of women's auto-effigy portraits. However, the latter, as Judith Zeitlin demonstrates, aimed "to preserve a perfect, idealized beauty that no longer completely exists, one that may never have existed in the realm of the 'real', since the face of a woman is often remindful of pictures of the beauties (*meirenhua*) rather than her individual features".[84] Thus, the word *zhen* in this context and in the compound *zhenrong* (much like as in the former compound *xiezhen)*, according to her, "may mean "true" in the sense of "perfect" or "ideal" rather than in the sense of "real".[85]

Finally, it is necessary to point out one more meaning of *zhen* as "authentic"/"true", but in opposition to false/fake (wei 僞). It was first used in the early aesthetics of calligraphy, since one of the most important issues in its connoisseurship was the differentiation between the original work and its forgeries or copies, which have emerged since late Eastern Han period immediately together with the formation of the tradition of collecting this art. Thus in calligraphy art and theory, as Robert E. Harrist points out, *zhen* came to mean "autographic" or "original" in terms of origin (better named *zhenji* 真迹 – "original trace/vestige").[86] The rebirth of this meaning and the issue of forgery could again be seen in the late Ming dynasty, in the fashion of antiquarianism and literature of connoisseurship of "things" (mainly the works of fine and decorative art – paintings, calligraphy, ancient porcelain, bronzes, musical instruments, jade or wood carvings, stones, pieces of metalwork), which could be considered a part of what I call "aesthetics of things" (or everyday aesthetics). In the discourse of things, according to Craig Clunas, *zhen* (authenticity) became the major value or criteria of antiquities, since the production of fakes was inseparable of the art and antiquarian market of the time.[87] As it is well known, brushwork was considered the most important criterion for authenticity in Chinese calligraphy and painting, although even it could be imitated quite successfully and convince the art lover (or even the original author) with its authenticity, as many stories from the history of Chinese calligraphy and painting demonstrate. However, the problem of authenticity in art in relation to forgery and copying is too complicated and vast, thus needs a separate investigation.[88]

CONCLUSIONS

As demonstrated in this article, the term *zhen* in Chinese art and its theories was related to many aspects of artistic creativity, starting from the issues of expression and self-expression, and ending with the reception of art. Although its original meaning was rooted in Daoist Classics and Wang Bi's comments, implicating the relation of *zhen* with the concept of *Dao,* and was equated with such Daoist terms as "one" (yi), simplicity (*pu* 朴), self-so (*ziran* 自然), something original, primordial and essential (*zhizhen* 质真), still *zhen* was not restricted to the idea of something hidden/inner essence behind the outer/appearance. In various discourses, arts, contexts and historical periods *zhen* was associated with reservation of artistic expression (*hanxu*), the manifestation of vital energy (*qi*) and idea (*yi*) in landscape painting, originality and spontaneity of self-expression, original/pure nature and heart-mind, idealized or perfect image of the person, autographic. But in neither sense it can be equated with "realism" or "imitation of reality" in the Western sense, since it almost always functions between the boundaries of "real" and "non-real", thus manifesting the duality of traditional Chinese

worldview, conceptualized in the term *yin-yang*, which became a model for all Chinese aesthetic concepts, as well as the Daoist dialectics of "being" (or something) and "non-being" ("nothing").

References

Barnhart, Richard. "The 'Wild and Heterodox School' of Ming Painting." In *Theories of Arts in China,* eds. Susan Bush, Christian Murck. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Brubaker, David and Chunchen Wang. *Jizi and his Art in Contemporary China*. Heidelberg, Berlin: Springer, 2015.

Chaves, Jonathan. "The Expression of Self in the Kung-an School: Non-Romantic Individualism." In *Expressions of Self in Chinese Literature*, eds. Robert E. Hegel, Richard C.Hessney. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Chaves, Jonathan. "The Panoply of images: A Reconsideration of the Literary Theory of the Kung-an School." In *Theories of Arts in China,* eds. Susan Bush, Christian Murck. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Chen, Ji."Physiognomic consciousness as a collective consciousness in Chinese portraiture tradition." In *Consciousness, Theatre, Literature and Arts, 2011*, ed. Daniel Meyer-Dinkgräfe. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012.

Cheng, Maria, Tang Wai Hung, Eric Choy. *Essential Terms of Chinese Painting* . Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press, 2017.

Ching, Dora C. Y. "The Language of portraiture in China." In *A Companion to Chinese Art* , eds. Martin J. Powers, Katherine R. Tsiang. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2016.

Diep,Van Thi. "The landscape of the Void: truth and magic in Chinese Landscape painting." *Journal of Visual Art Practice,* 16 (2017).

Duchovnaya: *Духовная культура Китая. Искусство.* Москва: Восточная литература, 2010.

Egan, Ronald. "Conceptual and Qualitative Terms in Historical Perspective." In *A Companion to Chinese Art,* eds. Martin J. Powers, Katherine R. Tsiang. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2016.

Fan, Minghua. "The Significance of Nothingness (*xuwu* 虚无) in Chinese Aesthetics." *Front.Philos.China*, 5/4 (2010), 560–574.

Gao, Jianping. *The Expressive Act in Chinese Art*. Uppsala, 1996.

Gu, Ming Dong. *Chinese Theories of Fiction. A Non-Western Narrative System.* New York: State University of New York Press, 2006.

Gu, Ming Dong. "Aesthetic Suggestiveness in Chinese Thought: A Symphony of Metaphysics and Aesthetics." *Philosophy East and West* 53/4 (2003).

Guo, Li. *Women's Tanci Fiction in Late Imperial and Early Twentieth-century China*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2015.

Harrist, Robert E. Jr. "Replication and Deception in Calligraphy of the Six Dynasties Period", in *Chinese Aesthetics. The ordering of Literature, the Arts, and the Universe in the Six Dynasties* , ed. Zong-qi Cai Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004.

Hay, Jonathan. *Shitao. Painting and Modernity in Early Qing China.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Heidegger, Martin. "The Origin of the Work of Art", ch. 2, *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York: Harper Perrenial, 2001. https://doubleoperative.files.wordpress.com/2009/12/heidegger-martin_poetry-language-thought.pdf

Huang, Yue 黄钺, *Er shi si hua pin* 二十四畫品. https://baike.baidu.com/item/%E4%BA%8C%E5%8D%81%E5%9B%9B%E7%94%BB%E5%93%81/2061523?fr=aladdin

Jullien, Francois. *In Praise of Blandness. Proceeding from Chinese Thought and Aesthetics*. New York: Zone Books, 2004.

Jullien, Francois. *The Great Image Has No Form, On the Nonobject through Painting,* transl. By Jane Marie Todd. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Krivtsov: Кривцов, В. А. *Эстетика даосизма*. Москва, 1993.

Lee, Pauline C. *Li Zhi Confucianism and the Virtue of Desire*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2012.

Lynn, Richard John (transl.). *The Classic of the Way and Virtue. A New Translation of the "Tao-te ching" of Laozi as interpreted by Wang Bi*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Lynn, Richard John. "Truth and Imagination in China: Opposition and Conciliation in the Tradition", in *Imagination: Cross-cultural Philosophical Analyses*, eds. Hans-Georg Moeller, Andrew K.Whitehead. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019, 13–28.

Owen, Stephen. *Reading in Chinese Literary Thought*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Park, J. P. *Art by the Book. Painting Manuals and the Leisure Life in Late Ming China*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2012.

Park, J. P. "Art, Print, and Cultural Discourse in Early Modern China." In *A Companion to Chinese Art* , eds. Martin J. Powers, Katherine R. Tsiang. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2016.

Pohl, Karl-Heinz. "Identity and Hybridity – Chinese Culture and Aesthetics in the Age of Globalization", www.uni-trier.de/fileadmin/fb2/SIN/Pohl_Publication/identity_and_hybridity.pdf

Powers, Martin. "How to read a Chinese Painting: Jing Hao's *Bifaji*." In *Ways with words. Writing about reading texts from Early China*, eds. Pauline Yu, Peter Bol, Stephen Owen, Willard Peterson. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press, 2000.

Razumovskij: Разумовский, Константин. *Китайские трактаты о портрете*. Ленинград, 1971.

Rowley: Роули Дж. *Принципы китайской живописи* (Principles of Chinese Painting, Russian translation by V. Maliavin). Moscow, 1989.

Rowley, George. *Principles of Chinese Painting*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947.
Sclafani, Richard. "Is the Tao of Chinese Aesthetics like a Western Theory of Art? Some Issues in Comparative Aesthetics", *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 4 (1977), 49–61.
Shimada, S. "Concerning the i-pín style of painting". *Oriental art*, spring 10/1 (1964).
Strassberg, Richard E. (transl.). *Enlightening Remarks on Painting by Shih-T'ao*. Pacific Asia Museum Monographs, 1989.
Stuart, Jan. "The Face in Life and Death. Mimesis and Chinese Ancestor Portraits." In *Body and Face in Chinese Visual Culture*, eds. Wu Hung, Katherine R. Tsiang. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Asian Centre, 2005.
Sturman, Peter C. "Landscape". In *A Companion to Chinese Art,* eds. Martin J. Powers, Katherine R. Tsiang. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2016.
Sze, Mai Mai. *The Tao of Painting*. New York: Bollingen Pantheon, 1956.
Spiro, Adrey. *Contemplating the Ancients. Aesthetic and Social Issues in Early Chinese Portraiture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
Tadd, Misha. "*Ziran*: Authenticity or Authority?" *Religions,* 10/207 (2019).
Vervoorn, Aat. "Music and the Rise of Literary Theory in Ancient China", *Journal of Oriental Studies* 34/1(1996), 50–63.
Wang Shishun 王世舜, Han Mujun 韩慕君 (eds.). *Lao Zhuang cidian* 老庄词典. Shandong jiaoyu chuban shehui banfaxing, 1995.
Watson, Burton (transl.). *The Complete works of Chuang Tzu*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.
West, Stephen H. "A Record of a methods of the Brush. A Personal reading (The Codger and the Painter Wannabe)." In *Ways with words. Writing about reading texts from Early China*, eds. Pauline Yu, Peter Bol, Stephen Owen, Willard Peterson. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press, 2000.
Zavadskaya: Завадская Е. В. *"Беседы о живописи" Ши-Тао*. Москва, 1978.
Zeitlin, Judith T. "The Life and Death of the Image. Ghosts and Female Portraits in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Literature." In *Body and Face in Chinese Visual Culture*, ed. Wu Hung, Katherine R. Tsiang. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005.
Zhang, Dainian. *Key Concepts in Chinese Philosophy*, transl. by Edmund Ryden. Beijing, New Haven and London: Foreign Languages Press and Yale University Press, 2002.

Notes

[1] Osvald Siren, *The Chinese on the Art of Painting* (Peiping: Henri Vetch, 1936).

[2] George Rowley, *Principles of Chinese Painting* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947).

[3] Mai Mai Sze, *The Tao of Painting* (New York: Bollingen Pantheon, 1956).

[4] Richard Sclafani, "Is the Tao of Chinese Aesthetics like a Western Theory of Art? Some Issues in Comparative Aesthetics", *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 4 (1977), 49–61.

[5] See: Gao Jianping. *The Expressive Act in Chinese Art*. (Uppsala, 1996); Karl-Heinz Pohl, "Identity and Hybridity – Chinese Culture and Aesthetics in the Age of Globalization", www.uni-trier.de/fileadmin/fb2/SIN/Pohl_Publication/identity_and_hybridity.pdf

[6] Francois Jullien, *The Great Image Has No Form, On the Nonobject through Painting,* transl. by Jane Marie Todd (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2009), p. 9, 11–12, 33, 107–108, 111–113.

[7] "Not seeking out resemblance – the formula is definitive – does not mean distrusting all *semblance* but rather achieving a 'resemblance that does not resemble', that is not compelled by (formal) resemblance but deploys indefinitely *through* form." Ibid., 117.

[8] George Rowley: Роули Дж. Принципы китайской живописи (Principles of Chinese Painting, Russian translation by V. Maliavin, Moscow, 1989), 47.

[9] Gao Jianping, *The Expressive Act in Chinese Art*, 138–139.

[10] This is especially evident in R.Sclafani's article, mentioned above. (Sclafani, "Is the Tao of Chinese Aesthetics like a Western Theory of Art?").

[11] More on this see: Mai Mai Sze, *The Tao of Painting*; Francois Jullien. In *Praise of Blandness. Proceeding from Chinese Thought and Aesthetics* (New York: Zone Books, 2004); Fan Minghua, "The Significance of Nothingness (*xuwu* 虚无) in Chinese Aesthetics", *Front.Philos.China*, 5/4 (2010), 560–574.

[12] This is stated in Laozi ch.21, which describes Dao as follows (in Richard Lynn's translation): "Its essence is most authentic (*zhen* 真), for within it authentication occurs". Richard John Lynn (transl.), *The Classic of the Way and Virtue. A New Translation of the "Tao-te ching" of Laozi as interpreted by Wang Bi* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 87.

[13] Martin Heidegger, "The Origin of the Work of Art", ch. 2*, Poetry, Language, Thought* (New York: Harper Perrenial, 2001), 38. https://doubleoperative.files.wordpress.com/2009/12/heidegger-martin_poetry-language-thought.pdf

[14] Van Thi Diep, "The landscape of the Void: truth and magic in Chinese Landscape painting", *Journal of Visual Art Practice,* 16 (2017), 81.

[15] Richard John Lynn, "Truth and Imagination in China: Opposition and Conciliation in the Tradition", in *Imagination: Cross-cultural Philosophical Analyses*, eds. Hans-Georg Moeller, Andrew K. Whitehead (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019), 13–28.

[16] Gao Jianping, *The Expressive Act in Chinese Art*, 139; Richard Barnhart, "The 'Wild and Heterodox School' of Ming Painting", in *Theories of the Arts in China,* eds. Susan Bush, Christian Murck (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 382.

[17] J. P. Park, *Art by the Book. Painting Manuals and the Leisure Life in Late Ming China* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2012), 208; J. P. Park, "Art, Print, and Cultural Discourse in Early Modern China", in *A Companion to Chinese Art*, eds. Martin J. Powers, Katherine R. Tsiang (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2016), 85.

[18] Peter C. Sturman, "Landscape", *A Companion to Chinese Art*, 183; Ronald Egan, "Conceptual and Qualitative Terms in Historical Perspective", *A Companion to Chinese Art*, 284; Jonathan Chaves, "The Panoply of images: A Reconsideration of the Literary Theory of the

Kung-an School", *Theories of the Arts in China,* 347; Ming Dong Gu, *Chinese Theories of Fiction. A Non-Western Narrative System* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2006).

[19] Pauline C Lee, *Li Zhi Confucianism and the Virtue of Desire* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2012).

[20] Robert E. Harrist Jr., "Replication and Deception in Calligraphy of the Six Dynasties Period", in *Chinese Aesthetics. The ordering of Literature, the Arts, and the Universe in the Six Dynasties,* ed. Zong-qi Cai (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004), 31–59.

[21] Krivtsov: Кривцов В. А. Эстетика даосизма (Москва, 1993), 85–87.

[22] Duchovnaya: Духовная культура Китая. Искусство (Москва: Восточная литература, 2010).

[23] Gao Jianping, *The Expressive Act in Chinese Art,* 139.

[24] Ibid., 139.

[25] Zhang Dainian, *Key Concepts in Chinese Philosophy*, transl. by Edmund Ryden (Beijing, New Haven and London: Foreign Languages Press and Yale University Press, 2002), 479.

[26] *Lao Zhuang cidian* 老庄词典, eds. Wang Shishun 王世舜, Han Mujun 韩慕君 (Shandong jiaoyu chuban shehui banfaxing, 1995), 91.

[27] See, for example, his comments on *Laozi* ch.3, 22 and 70 in: Richard John Lynn (transl.), *The Classic of the Way and Virtue,* 56, 89, 178.

[28] He comments the first sentence of ch. 10 as follows: "[...] 'integrity' [*yi*] is a person's authenticity [*zhen*]". Ibid., 65

[29] As in his comment to ch.28 about uncarved block (*pu*): "The uncarved block [*pu*] is authenticity [*zhen*]". Ibid., 103

[30] Ibid., 56, 89, 148.

[31] Ibid., 75.

[32] Ibid., 172. Some scholars even translate and conceive *ziran* as "authenticity". See for example: Misha Tadd, "*Ziran*: Authenticity or Authority?", In *Religions,* 10/207 (2019).

[33] *Lao Zhuang cidian* 老庄词典, 724.

[34] Burton Watson (transl.), *The Complete works of Chuang Tzu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968), 349

[35] Victor H. Mair (transl.), *Wandering on the Way. Early Taoist Tales and Parables of Chuang Tzu* (Honolulu: Hawai'i University Press, 1994), 321.

[36] Wang Rongpei (transl.), *Zhuangzi* (Changsha: Hunan People's Publishing House, Foreign language Press, 1999), 557.

[37] Zhang Dainian, *Key concepts*, 480.

[38] See especially *Zhuangzi* first fragment of Ch.6, in which true knowledge is attributed to true/authentic person (*zhenren*), also ch. 2.

[39] Burton Watson (transl.), *The Complete works of Chuang Tzu,* 349.

[40] Robert E. Harrist Jr., "Replication and Deception in Calligraphy of the Six Dynasties Period", 36. According to Harrist, when characterizing Tao Qian by the word *zhen*, Zhong Rong introduced this term into literary criticism for the first time.

[41] Krivtsov: Кривцов В. А. Эстетика даосизма, 85.

[42] Krivcov, 85–86; Stephen Owen, *Reading in Chinese Literary Thought* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 1992), especially the chapter on *Daxu* (*The Great Preface* (to Shijing)), 37–56; Aat Vervoorn, "Music and the Rise of Literary Theory in Ancient China", *Journal of Oriental Studies* 34/1 (1996), 50–63.

[43] Stephen Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*, 301.

[44] Namely, modes 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 20.

[45] This is S. Owen's translation. Quoted in: Stephen Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought,* 303.

[46] S. Owen, *Readings in Chinese literary thought,* 299, 301–302.

[47] Stephen Owen, Ibid., 304.

[48] Stephen Owen, Ibid., 304.

[49] Ming Dong Gu, "Aesthetic Suggestiveness in Chinese Thought: A Symphony of Metaphysics and Aesthetics", in *Philosophy East and West* 53/4 (2003).

[50] Stephen Owen, Ibid., 326.

[51] Stephen Owen, Ibid., 326.

[52] Ming Dong Gu, "Aesthetic suggestiveness", 500.

[53] Stephen Owen, 329.

[54] S. Shimada, "Concerning the i-pín style of painting", *Oriental art*, spring 10/1 (1964), 23.

[55] Richard Barnhart, "The 'Wild and Heterodox School' of Ming Painting", 365–396.

[56] Gao Jianping, *The Expressive act in Chinese Art*, 139–142, 146–147.

[57] Gao Jianping, *The Expressive act in Chinese Art*, 140.

[58] Martin Powers, "How to read a Chinese Painting: Jing Hao's *Bifaji*", in *Ways with words. Writing about reading texts from Early China*, eds. Pauline Yu, Peter Bol, Stephen Owen, Willard Peterson (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press, 2000), 229, 232.

[59] For example, *shi* (實) is translated as "the inner substance", "inner reality" or "actual [figure], *qi* 气 as "spirit", "aura", *zhi* 质 as "substance" or even "form". For those translations see: Ronald Egan "Conceptual and Qualitative terms in Historical Perspective", 285; Gao Jianping, *The Expressive Act in Chinese Art*, 140; Martin Powers, "How to read a Chinese Painting", 229, 232; Susan Bush, Hsio-yen Shih (eds.), *Early Chinese texts on Painting* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 1985), 146.

[60] Or "substantial field". For the translations of *zhi* as "physical essence" or "substantial field" see: Stephen H. West, "A Record of a methods of the Brush. A Personal reading (The Codger and the Painter Wannabe)", in *Ways with words. Writing about reading texts from Early China*, 204; David Brubaker, Chunchen Wang, *Jizi and his Art in Contemporary China* (Heidelberg, Berlin: Springer, 2015), 60–61.

[61] Martin Powers, "How to read a Chinese Painting", 236.

[62] Zavadskaya: Завадская Е. В., *"Беседы о живописи" Шу-Тао* (Москва, 1978), 21.

[63] As Owen points out, "there is no mention of '24...' until the first half of the seventeenth century, while since 17th century it has been considered the most important example of Tang poetics." S. Owen, Ibid., p. 303.

[64] Huang Yue 黄钺, *Er shi si hua pin* 二十四畫品. https://baike.baidu.com/item/%E4%BA%8C%E5%8D%81%E5%9B%9B%E7%94%BB%E5%93%81/2061523?fr=aladdin

[65] Gao Jianping, *The Expressive Act in Chinese Art*, 146.

[66] Richard Barnhart, "The 'Wild and Heterodox School' of Ming Painting", 381–383.

[67] Quoted in: Richard Barnhart, ibid., 382.

[68] J. P. Park, *Art by the Book,* 208, 215.

[69] Ibid., 211.

[70] Shi Tao, *Hua yu lu*, ch. 3, quoted in Richard E. Strassberg (transl.), *Enlightening Remarks on Painting by Shih-T'ao* (Pacific Asia Museum Monographs, 1989), 65. According to Strassberg, Shitao in this text defines the artist's authentic self in several ways: "as a single, spiritually perceptive consciousness; as that which is empowered by Nature to exercise aesthetic choice; and, as an active, physical body in harmonious flow with the Tao." Ibid., 48.

[71] Jonathan Hay, *Shitao. Painting and Modernity in Early Qing China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 282.

[72] Jiang Yingke, *Xue tao xiao shu*, quoted in (with the change from Wide-Giles English phonetic transcription to *pinyin*): Jonathan Chaves, "The Panoply of images", 347. For for full fragment of Jiang Yingke's thoughts about the real (*zhen*) poem as based on poet's nature and emotions, see p. 353; on the faithfulness of the poet to the forms of actual things and reflection of concrete reality see p. 356–357.

[73] Jonathan Chaves, "The Panoply of images", 347–358.

[74] Pauline C. Lee, *Li Zhi Confucianism and the Virtue of Desire*, 102.

[75] Pauline C. Lee, *Li Zhi*, 70.

[76] Li Zhi, "Miscellaneous Matters" (*Za shuo* 雜說). Quoted in: Pauline C. Lee, *Li Zhi*, 128.

[77] Pauline C. Lee, Ibid., 107–108.

[78] Dora C. Y. Ching, "The Language of portraiture in China", in *A Companion to Chinese Art*, eds. Martin J.Powers, Katherine R. Tsiang (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2016), 147–148. Other scholars point out, that the term *xie zhen* first appeared in the poem by Du Fu. See: Maria Cheng, Tang Wai Hung, Eric Choy, *Essential Terms of Chinese Painting* (Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press, 2017), 213.

[79] Adrey Spiro, *Contemplating the Ancients. Aesthetic and Social Issues in Early Chinese Portraiture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 15. As she explains further, "physical likeness is irrelevant to the depiction of such figures. It is, of course, their behavior that the viewer is expected to recall, those acts that we may sum up as Virtue Triumphant. That evocation of behavior permits us to move from the most general definition of portrait, one intended to be like a specific individual, to a narrower definition, for it is intended to be like only in certain ways, in terms of specific qualities. It is the moral nature of the individual, his character, that counts, and that nature is revealed by action. […] Conduct reveals the man." Ibid., 31.

[80] At least two treatises on this subject (among three, written from the XIVth to XIXth centuries), namely, *Chuan shen mi yao* (*Secret principle of portraiture*) by Jiang Ji (1714–1787) and *Xiezhen mijue* (*Secrets of Portraiture*) by Ding Gao put emphasis on ancestor portraiture. See: Razumovskij: Константин Разумовский, Китайские трактаты о портрете (Ленинград, 1971).

[81] Quoted (with a few omissions) from: Jonathan Chaves, "The Expression of Self in the Kung-an School: Non-Romantic Individualism", in *Expressions of Self in Chinese Literature*, eds. Robert E. Hegel, Richard C. Hessney (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 142.

[82] Jan Stuart, "The Face in Life and Death. Mimesis and Chinese Ancestor Portraits", in *Body and Face in Chinese Visual Culture*, eds. Wu Hung, Katherine R. Tsiang (Cambridge, London: Harvard University Asian Centre, 2005), 214–220.

[83] Ji Chen, "Physiognomic consciousness as a collective consciousness in Chinese portraiture tradition", in *Consciousness, Theatre, Literature and Arts, 2011*, ed. Daniel Meyer-Dinkgräfe (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012), 115–124.

[84] Judith T. Zeitlin, "The Life and Death of the Image. Ghosts and Female Portraits in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Literature", in *Body and Face in Chinese Visual Culture*, ed. Wu Hung, Katherine R. Tsiang (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005), 237–238. See also: Li Guo. *Women's Tanci Fiction in Late Imperial and Early Twentieth-century China* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2015), 43–44;

[85] Judith Zeitlin, "The Life and Death of the Image", 406 (note 30).

[86] Robert E. Harrist Jr., "Replication and Deception in Calligraphy of the Six Dynasties Period", 39–40.

[87] Craig Clunas, *Superflous Things* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), 11–12, 110–115.

[88] See for example: Judith G. Smith, Wen C. Fong, *Issues of Authenticity in Chinese Painting* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1999).

Loreta POŠKAITĖ
Azijos ir transkultūrinių tyrimų institutas, Vilniaus universitetas, Vilnius, Lietuva

TIKRUMAS / TIESA (*ZHEN* 真) TRADICINĖSE KINŲ MENO TEORIJOSE IR ESTETIKOJE

Santrauka

Kinų tradicinio meno ir estetikos savitumas dažnai apibūdinamas populiariu posakiu „menas yra Dao išraiška“, kitaip tariant, tiesos arba tikrumo išraiška, nes klasikiniame daoizme Dao 道 buvo suprantamas kaip autentiška būtis ir tikrumo / tikrovės šaltinis. Tačiau pačiam tikrumo / tiesos (zhen 真) terminui kinų estetikoje ir meno teorijose skiriama žymiai mažiau dėmesio nei Dao terminui ir jo prasmė atrodo net sudėtingesnė. Šiuo straipsniu siekiama parodyti, kad ši sąvoka yra ne mažiau svarbi, bandant istoriškai suvokti meninės kūrybos ir išraiškos prigimtį kinų menuose bei jų teorijose, o ypač panašumo perteikimo (ar tikrovės pamėgdžiojimo) mene klausimą. Jame atskleidžiamas šios sąvokos ryšys su meno kūrinio vertinimu, menininko išraiška ir saviraiška, jo santykiu su meno „objektu“, kitaip tariant, atvaizdavimu, vaizduote ir morale, kuris atsispindi tokiuose žodžių junginiuose kaip „piešti tikrumą“ (*xie zhen* 写真), „kurti tiesą“ ((*chuang zhen* 創真). Straipsnyje pateikiama koncepcinė ir istorinė šios sąvokos analizė, siekiant išsiaiškinti jos reikšmės skirtumus ir pokyčius tapybos, literatūros teorijose ir vadinamojoje „daiktų estetikoje“ (senų daiktų kolekcionavime), taip pat atskleisti jos filosofinės ir estetinės interpretacijų ryšius, kurie tapo ypač akivaizdūs Ming dinastijos laikotarpiu.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: daoizmas, autentiškumas, tikrumas, tiesa, išraiška, tapyba, poezija.

Gauta 2020-05-20
Parengta spaudai 2020-10-05

Loreta POŠKAITĖ

PhD Loreta Poškaitė works as senior researcher in the Lithuanian Culture Research Institute (LCRI), associate professor in Vilnius University, Institute of Asian and Transcultural Studies. She have published a monography and more than 60 articles on Chinese aesthetics, traditional and contemporary art, Daoist and Confucian philosophy, the human body in Chinese culture, and the reception of Chinese culture in the West and Lithuania.

E-mail: lposkaite@yahoo.com; poskaiteloreta@gmail.com