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During the waning years of the Qing empire, the *National Essence Journal* (*Guoci xuebao* 國粹學報) was published in Shanghai by the Society for Preservation of National Learning (*Guoxue baocunhui* 國學保存會), a group composed of poets, painters, epigraphists, and intellectuals broadly engaged in discussions of literature and civilization. The journal’s pages served as a multi-layered cultural space through which contributors and readers alike could constitute themselves as Chinese subjects and also as historical subjects. Creating such a space for envisioning the nation was a sensitive task; China was in a state of confusion following its losses in the first Sino-Japanese war, the damage of the Boxer Rebellion, and the uncertain policies of an uncertain court. The journal’s founders and editors were committed to distilling precisely what it was about Han culture and the “yellow race” (as they described it) that could serve to define a modern nation. Hence it may not be surprising that visual images figured prominently in the journal. Of particular interest was painting. Concrete yet malleable, being easily framed and positioned in print, painting provided a direct means of making identity visible.

The very fact that painting was reproduced in a journal dedicated to the nation, that it was acknowledged by the editors as emblematic of modern China, powerfully conditions response to it. Still, to draw seamless connections between the nation and the paintings may be to make false assumptions about the editor’s presentation of both, and especially, about the ways in which painting was seen and its status in the journals. To complicate this issue, new collotype printing technology used in the journals fused together representation and reality. The paintings in the journals, in short, created a conundrum for the editors: What
was to prevent painting from being seen differently as it moved into new contexts? How could an image serve the editorial charge of national self-definition? And would that prospect ultimately weaken or strengthen the production of a unified Chinese national culture? These questions had lasting relevance. Even as late as 1926, after the term “national painting” (guohua 國畫) had entered into the Chinese language and the genre had started to take a more definite shape, it was thought to be “an inchoate cultural product,” remarked upon at the time as “a big mess, but because of its affinity with the National Essence school… held up as a kind of national essence.”

What this big mess might mean, and how painting participated in focalizing the “nation” at a time of intense anxiety about national representation, is the subject of this article. For from its initial appearance in the journal in 1907, painting mattered to the Society for Preservation of National Learning. It was part of an emergent national patrimony exhibited between the journal’s covers. Although other objects—ceramics, jades, pieces of calligraphy, and so on—were reproduced in the journal behind the pages devoted to paintings, the editors clearly privileged painting as an art form. Paintings reproduced within the journal were contributed by Society members, mailed to the Society’s offices on Shanghai’s Fourth Street in photographic form. Alternatively, paintings could be donated, permanently or short-term, to the Society’s Storing Books Tower (Cangshu lou 藏書樓), a library with painting and natural specimen rooms.

As part of their commitment to shaping their readers’ eye, the journal editors found themselves sliding back and forth between promoting inherited modes of looking that had to do with cultivation of the eye of the man of letters and modern modes of looking encouraged at exhibitions. This case study will take us first to the 1908 and 1909 journals celebrating the founding of the society and of the journal itself, to pictorial compendia that
at such a moment of self-definition most clearly expose society members as archetypical elite, fully engaged in connoisseurial practices, foregrounding their own acuity of eye as a means of distinguishing themselves as a social and cultural group. Then we will move into contemporary visual fields of exhibition fora, in which good looking is not only the purview of an elite. Exhibitions were sites where science and education, the street market, and the nation merged together through spectacle. At the end of the article, we will return to the special pictorial issues of the journals, to index the editorial insistence on the experiential aspect of looking at pictures to the kinds of looking encouraged in expositions, locally and abroad, in spite of the possible threat to the editors’ own authority. The critical interest here is not whether Society members were traditionalists or reformists in their production of a national visuality, since they could be both, simultaneously. Rather, it lies in how such hesitant and hopeful experimentation with the eye sheds light on the role painting and visuality played in the continuing labor of making a Chinese nation.

Underpinning this case study are the terms “visible” and “visual.” The former is understood as the social and historical operations of the latter—visibility a socially and culturally inflected agreement on “how we see, how we are able, allowed, or made to see, and how we see this seeing or the unseen therein.” Peter de Bolla reminds us that “we cannot imagine that we see with disinterested eyes,” making the “visibility of visuality” in other spaces and times a troubling tropological problem: “if we are to take as axiomatic that visuality is as much constructed in and through social, cultural, and discursive forms as those things that we might loosely and anachronistically take to be self-evidently visible, then we shall need to examine the range of possible activities within the visual field that might have been available for any period.” Thus, this exploration will move from study of the scholastic
eye to a public eye encouraged to see things in a particular way by curatorial strategies of display, and all that might entail for early twentieth-century readers of the journal and for us.

**A First Look at the National Essence Journal**

From its earliest publication in 1905 until its final imprint in 1911, each issue of the journal typically included two or three portraits of scholars or sages (huaxiang 畫像) such as Confucius and Laozi with encomia, and, beginning in 1907, a small number of photo mechanically reproduced diagrams of plants or animals in the biology section (bownupian 博物篇) and a few paintings in the newly denoted “fine arts” section (meishupian 美術篇), an analytical category which will be explored below. The pictures were grouped at the beginning of each journal on medium weight white paper (contrasting with the newsprint quality paper on which the essays were printed), separated by protective sheets of tissue, the size of the 5 ¼ x 8 inch page expanding incrementally during the final years of publication. On the occasion of the special third and fourth anniversaries of the society and journal, in 1908 and 1909, text was supplanted by visual images. The founding of the society was marked not with essays but with pictures, including an extensive section on painting (tubua 圖畫), as well as reproductions of epigraphic rubbings (jinsi 金石), art objects (meishupin 美術品), and photographs of “historical sites” (guji shuying 古蹟攝影).

Paintings typically are laid out on the pages with labels identifying the dynasty in which the painting was produced, the artist’s name, and the title of the painting. Printed text does not encroach on the image, but frames it carefully, noting “see the painting to the right” or “to the left,” as though walking a reader through a gallery. Text also can create a literal frame for pictures, inky micrographic characters (graphs of miniscule size about the size of a tiny fly head) gathered up around the edges of the photographs as though flies
sticking to the frames <fig. 1>. Such labels create an air of conclusiveness; the lines are set in print, mechanical font contrasting with the uncertain legibility of the brushed inscriptions on the images.

If the intent of the editors was to provide an experiential viewing of ancient paintings for the journal readers, however, curiously enough they seem to fail: unlike the text, the paintings can be practically invisible. Many collotype reproductions do not attain the “visual” in a higher “formal” sense: one cannot see the length of silk in a scroll, the seals and inscriptions on the painting, and in many cases, the complete painted surface. The silk and paper support for the painting is reproduced on the journal page as dark and shadowy. Fragmented details of the scrolls offered up for inspection, enlarged so that they seem to never have had any frames or borders, are magnified to the extent that they do not make visual sense. Some paintings, conversely, are reproduced as miniatures, too small to make out. Other reproductions tantalizingly reveal passages within the painted pictures quite clearly, only to fade where brushstrokes most fine and delicate are transformed into indistinguishable blots and smudges or are not to be seen at all.

The point here is not that the pictures ought to be reproduced in a particular way, but that they are reproduced in no particular way. There is no unified mode of presentation. Any expectation of moving easily from one image to the next is denied by the inconsistent presentation and technology: from macro view to micro, from encyclopedic (showing a full scroll, including the dowels, the seals and inscriptions, and the complete painted surface) to fragmentary, from crystal-clear reproductions to shadowy blocks of black and grey. Such fluidity both frustrates and engages the reader; it also begins to suggest that what was important about the paintings and how to look at them were still unsettled, as the new visual culture of a modern China in this, one of its very first iterations, was still being defined.
Since the paintings cannot easily be apprehended with the eye, then, what is the meaning of the viewing experience that the editors make much of? How are we to understand the editor’s references to “viewing” (fan 觀)? On the one hand, the technique of collotype printing, using graduated gray half tones more subtle than lithographs, might argue that the editors were doing the best they could to circulate the images.\textsuperscript{10} The painter Huang Binhong 黃賓虹 (1865-1955) writes at length about the need for a reproduction technology that matches \textit{jinshi} 金石 metal and stone rubbings, not ephemeral Ming wood blocks, as a means of transmitting pictures, and comments on the success of the journal in this regard.\textsuperscript{11} Regardless of whether the painter’s intent was abstract brushwork or fidelity to an object out there in the world, Huang points out, the painting can be made real through the right kind of copy. Hence, the photomechanical reproductions of painting in the journal effectively work in a familiar way, an ancient way, by making the paintings of artists as diverse as the Ming-dynasty professional painter Qiu Ying 仇英 (act. early 16\textsuperscript{th} century) and the Qing court painter Wang Yuanqi 王原祁 (1642-1715) present.

On the other hand, as noted, the technology seems to have faltered: ink tones typically fade together, creating blocks of visually undefined marks. The editors do not acknowledge this aspect of the technology. A picture from the Jin-dynasty painter Gu Kaizhi’s 顧愷之 (c. 344-c. 406) \textit{Admonitions of the Court Instructress to the Court Ladies} scroll 女史箴圖, only attains the level of visibility to a viewer who already knows what the picture looks like, possibly from reading textual descriptions of it.\textsuperscript{12} In some sense, then, it was the much lauded collotype reproduction of the photographed painting rather than the painting itself that was on display. Beyond Huang Binhong’s positioning of the technology within print traditions, Shen Tang’s 沈唐 observation, for instance, about a particular set of
pictures that “because we have been able to photograph the authentic album at a smaller size, we have been able to preserve its antiquity” (茲以原本縮影故仍其舊) is consistent with the general attitude of the editors towards the technology. It is new, it is modern, and for all its obvious faults, it is scientifically archival, capturing the authenticity of the original. But at the same time, the value of the technology relied in large part upon the written word; the technology was impressive because the editors said so, rather than because they demonstrated it to be so. Reproduced paintings slipped between written description of them and the vagaries of the collotype.

While it would not be accurate to draw strict equivalences between the text and image, there are points of contact in how they both operate. In a seminal article that begins to lay out a cognitive image history for China, Richard Vinograd has drawn attention to resonant modalities of text and image:

The concept of painting as description…[is] prominent in the writings of scholar-artists and their apologists. Description implies a deferral of the presence of the object through transposition into language, as well as a process carried out over time. The cognitive processes associated with pictorial description, understood as a counterpart of verbal description, may involve recollection, metaphorizing, and comparison of distinguishing elements.¹⁴

Play between legible text and paintings that remain recalcitrantly invisible is not new. There is evidence that in the imperial past, written description of paintings stood in for paintings; artists claimed to have made copies of famous Song landscapes, for example, based solely on formal description in words.¹⁵ Vinograd reminds us that we should pay serious attention to the editors’ insistence on a textual understanding of the paintings in the journal, and how it speaks to traditional ways by which an elite defined himself: through a
linguistically-based connoisseurship, in which images take on the illusory form of written communication. Take, for instance, the album of six Song and Yuan paintings described above by Shen Tang. Among the paintings, there is one leaf of misty bamboo attributed to Guan Daosheng 管道升 (1262-1319), another of a scholar’s hut at a mountain pass to Ma Yuan 馬遠 (act. ca. 1190-1225), and a third of intricately articulated architecture to Zhao Boju 趙伯駒 (d. ca. 1162), all celebrated for belonging to the Chinese official Zhang Zhidong 張之洞 (1837-1909). Much like historical catalogs of painting collections, each leaf in the album is described in the journal by subject matter and, although three lack signatures or seals, the editor attests to their authenticity as Song-Yuan work in the text. Implied in the evaluation is a working knowledge of Song and Yuan painting styles, possibly garnered through study of paintings in the flesh, but just as likely garnered through study of inventories and essays on paintings.

Shen Tang recognizes the photographs of the Song and Yuan paintings in the journal as limited copies (limited by their miniaturization) that still manage to celebrate the authentic album; the aura of the original is maintained because there is an original at hand—the adequateness of the copy has been approved and communicated by the editors in a time-honored way: through writing. That is to say, the journal privileges not the relationship of the artist to the painting or the relationship of the editors (and readers) to the artist but the relationship of the editors to the painting. In pointing towards issues of authenticity, the editors suggest that the original painting’s brushstrokes are singular, and resist the anonymity of the darkened or manipulated collotype copy. If a reader can’t see the strokes (or read the strokes), it is because his or her eye is insufficiently trained and informed; theirs is. In exploiting the weaknesses of collotype technology (i.e. exaggerating its perfection and
speaking of images in the journal as if they were in fact all clearly reproduced), the editors turn the readers from simple observers into marginal participants in this scholastic visual domain: they testify to them about what is on view, thereby bringing themselves into the picture, so to speak, and causing the readers to rely not on what they can see, but on the words they can read, to understand the images.  

Other paintings bear on this issue. Descriptive comments on a two-leaf album by Jin Nong 金農 (h. Dongxin 冬心 1687-1763), one of the “Eight Eccentrics of Yangzhou,” help demarcate literary frames around the visual in the journal. Jin was recognized for his intellectual brilliance and was also a prolific artist, and his pretty compositions of pockmarked fragrant orange <fig. 2> and wing-shaped water chestnut in this particular album may point to his success at an art market that extended beyond “elegant gentlemen and old collecting families.” Yet Deng Shi’s description of the paintings unequivocally locates Jin within the formation of a lofty scholarly culture. It reads, in part:

Zhang Guatian 張瓜田 [Zhang Geng 張庚, 1685-1760] says: “Dongxin’s casual brush evokes the ancients. That it departs from the practiced hand is because he has looked at many traces of the ancients (gǔjì 古蹟).” [Zhang] also says: “His placement of flowers, wood, different leaves, and color is quite extraordinary. It’s not something to be seen in this mundane world. His brush follows his will.”

Deng allows the language of the eighteenth-century critic Zhang Geng to stand in for his own. The passage becomes one of genealogy, of classification and categorization on the basis of understanding and interacting with a brush performance through time. Those unfamiliar with the fraternity of collectors of ancient paintings invisibly (to those outside the
realm of connoisseurship) propping up Jin’s hand, or unable to see the material connections between this and other pictures in the journal, simply have to take the editor’s word for it.

It is through this displacement or elision, text for work, operating on several levels, that the editors are able to claim a tenuous cultural position, what Laurence A. Schneider calls “[t]he poet’s compulsion to preserve and transmit essences and traditions [that was] in part a drive to save for themselves some essential role in the envisioned new society.” Such “essences and traditions” in the journal are inseparable from elite archetypes. The model of the erudite but impoverished scholar, disenfranchised but nevertheless a patriot (ai guo zhe 愛國者), surfaces repeatedly.

In sum: readers who engaged in close reading of paintings and texts in the journals might find themselves in a position of complicity with the editors. It was one which was in some important senses unproblematic. After all, the editors positioned themselves as heroes emerging from political chaos, able to keep their loyalties in view at all times, even as the state was falling apart. And what could be more appealing than seeing painting as it had long been viewed, from a position of cultural authority? To do so would mean overlooking all of the visible problems of collotype print technology and instead relying on the eye and prose of the connoisseur who had access to authentic objects.

Yet, can we dismiss the paintings as simple artifacts of elite cultural practices so easily and thereby overlook the Society’s own claims for an experiential appreciation of painting with which we began this exploration? Indeed, it can be argued that the painted pictures are newly important to the nation precisely because they are fragmented, ambiguous, and indistinct; unlike the other visual objects reproduced clearly in the pages of the journal in strongly graphic black and white, they underscore a new-fashioned dimension of framing—national art display. The exhibitionary dimension of the journal is an integral part of an
“epochal” shift at the time;\textsuperscript{22} “participation in fairs at home and abroad was, indeed, warmly enthusiastic.”\textsuperscript{23} Painting, like other material objects to which access had been largely circumscribed to private collectors, was being made available first-hand to the public. In a profound sense, that very transition was one which required sensitivity on the part of the journal editors to the visual modernity of the exhibition.

**On Exhibitions**

In the introduction to an anthology dedicated to nineteenth-century visual culture in Europe and North America, Vanessa Schwartz and Jeannene Przyblyski observe that “our sense of a distinctively ‘modern’ mode of perceptual/cognitive experience…begins its lineage in the reality-based entertainment and information technologies of nineteenth-century panoramas, wax museums, illustrated newspapers and the like.”\textsuperscript{24} Exhibitions can easily be added to this list. In China, from the 1870s, appreciation for foreign exhibitions (typically called \textit{bicaihua} 比赛会 or \textit{bolanhui} 博览会) in mass media did in fact center on their visuality.\textsuperscript{25} Exhibitions were broadly celebrated for their public spectacle—early advertisements for exhibitions in \textit{Shenbao}, for instance, describe them as the “world of the eye” (\textit{yanjie} 眼界).\textsuperscript{26} Further, discussion about exhibitions consciously recognized their relevance to the creation of a national identity: \textsuperscript{27} exhibitions were about the nation and were not, as \textit{Shenbao} readers would have normally expected, solely “about pleasing the senses [literally, traveling through ear and eye 並不以為耳目之遊].”\textsuperscript{28} Exhibitions in the late nineteenth century shaped perception of what the fora accomplished as a visual arena (exhibitions in China only began to flourish around the same time the \textit{National Essence Journal} was first published). How did they challenge time-honored notions of authenticity and authority in display that we have already found at play in the journals? In the early 1880s and
1890s, when international exhibitions first came to the attention of Chinese travelers, the nature of the visual was put under the most intent regard. For example, in notes accompanying an ode to Japanese exhibitions (J: bakurankai) written in the winter of 1878 and the spring of 1879, Huang Zunxian 黄遵宪 (1848-1905) defines them this way:

*Hakurankai* are opened according to time (for example, say, such-and-such a year and such-and-such a meeting), place (for example, the Tokyo meeting or Kyoto meeting), or good (such as silk meetings, or meetings for tea or cotton). For the purpose of encouraging industry, these sorts of meetings are everywhere. The products of the five continents and ten thousand states, even if they are not natural products, are all ranked in a series, to allow people to imitate them.30

*Hakurankai* in Huang’s sights are commercial venues, expressly linked to industry and development of technology. They are defined in spatial or temporal terms, or by manufactured articles—silk, tea, cloth—which become an unending stream of images from “everywhere,” as Huang puts it, the “five continents and ten thousand states.” Ranking the objects on display lends to their imitation, or, in Walter Benjamin’s words, the “bent toward overcoming the uniqueness of every reality by accepting its reproduction.”31 Mimesis becomes part of the condition of being modern.

The development of native industries folds in neatly with the commercialization of culture on a national scale; Huang finds domestic products such as “cotton cloth, silk textiles… ceramics, porcelain… lacquerware, bamboo, bronzes, jeweled implements, paper folding fans and round fans”32 to represent “Japan” rather than individuals or local communities. He goes on to mention the attendance of the imperial family at the exhibition, through its visit to the exhibition grounds publicly enhancing the Meiji government.
European exhibitions were seen to accomplish similar goals of using display to establish and advertise the economic and political well-being of the modern nation. Scholar, translator and staff member for the statesman Li Hongzhang 李鴻章, Ma Jianzhong 马建忠 (1845-1900), also, for example, wrote about the “marvelous” dimension of the pursuit of national wealth at the 1878 Paris Exhibition in a letter to his superior. From Ma’s account, it is evident that crowds of viewers, especially foreign viewers, returned again and again to such exhibitions because they deliberately displayed things intended to inspire awe: the first, resourceful inventions and newly conceived novelties; juxtaposed against them were irreplaceable originals, authentic and singular, owned by the aristocracy, such as jewelry and antique bronzes. The exhibition was a space for showing off both, for construction of a superior national self-representation, aiming at “an uninterrupted monologue of self-praise.” And as showing off increasingly was recognized as a legitimate technique of the nation, so too dissatisfaction with the representational strategies for “China” solidified. In his letter to his superior on the 1878 Paris Exposition, Ma adds:

It is said that there were some important things missing from the Chinese display. Thus although silk and tea are major Chinese products there was no display of the different silks produced by China’s provinces nor of the different varieties of Chinese teas. It was also said that the ceramics on display were not very old and that the embroidery was not refined or of a high quality; neither had a single redeeming feature. It was also said that the agricultural implements and wax figures on display all resembled mere toys. It would seem that mighty China ultimately could not even match up to the islands of Japan. Can it be that this was because the management of Japan’s display was entrusted to the Japanese themselves, whereas the organization of China’s display was entrusted to Westerners?
Like Huang, Ma clearly understands exhibitions as a space in which the national identity is defined and made available for consumption and dispute. Yet it is clear from his account that two not entirely complementary exhibitionary themes were at work: modernity, as represented by relatively generic reproducible items which anyone could value and copy, and tradition, as represented by singular items (jewels or regional silks) whose very singularity was enhanced by association with a cultural elite.

And this brings us to the second point: that visitors to the exhibitions aided the development of the new visuality. Journalist, translator and forerunner of “treaty port intellectuals,” Wang Tao 王韬 (1828-97) wrote of his trip to Great Britain: “In the English capital right now there are a lot of exhibitions, and the international exhibition in particular makes for a huge spectacle …Masses of people, from far and wide, poor and wealthy, enter and are allowed to look as visitors, about 100,000 a day. It's like a big market in China.”

Unlike earlier examples of seeing in the journals where the editors treat readers as passive observers to their own cultural authority, in contrast, within the exhibitionary arena, everyone gets to become a participant. And witnessing draws us back to the problem of having to “view” (lan) an object, as the National Essence Journal editors put it (note the connoisseurial term). Witnessing is a way of marking truth and determining the social and cultural status, the “uniqueness” and invention of an object on display, the civilization and culture of the exhibitor. However, it works most effectively when it is a collective act, not an individual one: “about 100,000” visitors a day in London, “like a big market in China.”

We can see the comparative importance of the witnessing audience in making display real in China when we compare an 1886 Dianshizhai buaban representation of a commercial exhibition in the Shanghai Xiyangguan 西洋馆 of Japanese wax figures with an earlier Japanese print of a similar show in Edo (Tokyo). The Japanese print focuses not on the
activity of the crowds or on the space and time of the exhibition, but solely on specific objects being displayed there: the life-like dolls (ikimono 活人形) representing creatures from the classic Chinese bestiary Shanhaijing 山海经 <fig. 3>. The Chinese newspaper lithograph takes pains to verify the presence of the public. It depicts a group of visitors who include a man in Japanese robes gesturing with a pointer, clusters of women and children, and a ticket-taker at a table <fig. 4>. The composition situates the viewer of the print in a stable position at the fringes of the group, looking in. The intention of the first picture is to present an artifactual exhibition as though revealed for the first time to a solitary visitor to the show; the second, to display a spectacle making the fake figures real for all -- the new expansion of the visual arena of display is what intrigues the Chinese illustrator.

But how was the symbolic, determined by exhibition authorities, squared with frameworks of display apparently dispassionate, rational, and unideological? The displays were understood to be scientific, without political bias, and this claim was broadly accepted. Even the students who successfully opposed Qing court participation in an exhibition of the Hall of Mankind (J: Jinruikan 人類館) at the Fifth Domestic “Encouraging Industry” Exhibition in Osaka in 1903, for instance, where the “inferior races” of China, Korea, the Ryukyu Islands, India, Hawaii, Taiwan and Java were grouped under the heading of “raw barbarian races” (shengfanzhong 生番種) were more concerned with the submersion of China with six other peoples than with the fact of the exhibit itself. As one protester lamented, “Although we Chinese are inferior, why should we have to be classified together with these six races?”

Seven years later, the Qing state institutionalization of the exhibition at the 1910 Nanyang Exposition served as one pragmatic response to the problem of harnessing science
to its own authority. It also deliberately intertwined other aspects of exhibitionary culture—
new modes of seeing—in its plan: “in design as a space that united pedagogical intents with
commotion itself, capitalizing upon spectacle to capture its audience.” Commodity and
audience come together and produce each other under the rubric of education about the
nation and through spectacle; discernment of the object at the exhibition was also the act of
visitors recognizing themselves. Witnessing thus succeeded Ma Jianzhong’s measured
observation and ascertainment of historical and cultural value, of model and imitation, pure
essence and impure appearance. Display represented the nation in commodified form; it
presented visitors with witnessing as a multifaceted means of identification.

What was new about the visuality of the exhibition forum was that it opened up
modern subject positions in a most literal sense—modernity, after all, “is not just an
inventory of ideas,” but is composed of bodily practices, of “a long and heterogeneous
history of the cultural training of the senses.” The exhibition carried the impetus to a new
kind of public “seeing” for the group, offering an alternative to the kind of long educative
labor required of the elite to learn about and make sense of the material world. But its object
lessons were complicated. Commodity and copy alike were defined relationally, as was the
viewer who took in the display. It is important to note that this is not precisely a spatial or
temporal relationship, only, but something that belongs to a reality system specific to the
exhibition forum. Simulacra such as the wax mannequins of the kings of hell (“copied” a
second time in the Chinese newspaper lithograph mentioned above), for instance, can thus
stand for the real, and be perhaps even more real than the originals, as long as framed for the
visual possession and creation by a witnessing audience. What is real, rational, objective,
scientific, is what can be seen, and what can be seen is determined and confirmed by the
presence of all in the familiar yet unfamiliar surround of the market-like exhibition. The
visual arena of the exhibition thus makes the display of taxonomies of things, including cultures and races, all the more compelling, and, to those interested in creating display of the nation, all the more pragmatic.

So we see that exhibitions and how they were thought about (and by the time of the *National Essence Journal*, they were still more often read about than seen in China) had raised several issues about the nature of seeing and national identity. These might be enumerated as the authentic object versus the copy, connoisseurship versus spectacle, cultural authority versus scientific authority. For the editors, who were committed to visual display of the nation through exhibiting its cultural treasures at their offices and in the journal, these issues certainly had to be addressed. Tensions surrounding exhibitions were further amplified by the adoption of innovative print technology in the journal, allowing the mass reproduction and distribution in print of singular visual objects that were seen by the Society to be emblematic of China’s culture. All of which suggests that the editors were not simply engaging in a traditional project of connoisseurship by launching the journal—or not only that—but they were also consciously struggling to balance scholastic modes of viewing with modes of seeing that were both open to everyone, elite and non-elite alike, and also informed and structured by “modern” values about what was worth looking at and how.

**A Second Look at the National Essence Journal**

The question of what it means to see—in this case, to see painting—is at the heart of the pictorial display in the *National Essence Journal*. As mentioned earlier, the journal’s publisher, the Society for the Preservation of National Learning, chose to celebrate its founding with issues of the journal that displayed visual images. Paintings clearly played an important role in establishing the sentiment and agendas of the group. Their limited visibility was addressed and accommodated in part by promotion of scholastic modes of looking that
turned the images into something close to a symbolic language. But, as we have noted, there also was an interest on the part of the editors in giving readers a recreation of the real (which collotype reproduction was supposed to make possible), not simply an approved picture of it, so readers could have the same kind of interaction with the object that the editors had. Whether intended or not, this opened the images up for heterogeneous interpretation. And it no doubt is this aspect of the journal that most clearly relates to the developing discourse of international and cosmopolitan visual display in which art mattered not just to bolster elite social and political status, but for the nation broadly configured.

This should hardly be surprising. Society members, after all, were a cosmopolitan group. Although centered in Shanghai, journal contributors lived across China and in Japan, and hailed from different areas of the country. And, as Yü Ying-shih has pointed out, intellectually, as well, the society reached out to Japan, Europe and the States. In some profound respects it was not committed solely to privileging the “traditional” elite: it was internationalist in its values, and remarkably open to new modes of thinking about China’s history, the concept of social evolution, and a full-fledged reshaping of empire into nation or a new conception of community.41

Even the way the paintings were framed within the journal is not perhaps as complicit in older elite practices as suggested above. The fact that the paintings appear in the journal in a section on fine arts (meishu 美術) points towards an “objective” rethinking of art as a prop of the nation.42 Meishu is a borrowed neologism from Japanese bijutsu, a term which has received significant attention among historians of Japanese art.43 Wang Yong explains that in China calligraphy and painting traditionally were considered “art” in the Euro-American sense of the word, and sculpture, architecture, and handicrafts “artisinal.” When meishu first entered into the lexicon within the context of nineteenth-century exhibitions and
world fairs, it was thought to denote Western techniques of art-making. Wang notes that the term eventually came to encompass all of the arts included in this particular section of the journal: calligraphy, rare books, coins, ink cakes, seals, drama, painting, and so on. By framing painting as part of meishi, the editors (following their Japanese cohort) were able to relocate it as part of a new system of knowledge, as autonomous material traces of the nation in a labeled, factual form.

But the paintings were also framed another way. No longer personal or private possessions, and set at a distance from original uses, paintings in the journal were destined not for particular, singular consumption, but for a class of destinations, a new and diffuse context. They were brought into service as “beacons of the nation.” And although the “work of art” (meishi) and the nation were being configured during the same period of time, the pictorial record in the journal does not establish a contextual history of art structured by categories of style, influence, tradition, and technique extending back through time to the days of the mythologized golden age of the Zhou dynasty. The context it offers is instead the present-day activity of the exhibitionary practice of “witnessing,” repositioning paintings in relation to their viewers.

The collotype reproduction of Gu Kaizhi’s Admonitions scroll, for instance, is typical. On the one hand, it takes on visual symbolic power reinforcing the traditional elite because it is poorly reproduced—for example, the formal elements of the dark head of Lady Ban and trailing hem of her robes, emerging from a deep gray ground, indicate this is a figurative picture, but her face, gesture, and details of robe are lost to the eye. It requires the written testimony of the editors to establish its value, as well as the scholarly education necessary for its connoisseurial appreciation. On the other hand, it also has social power as a material trace, a restoration, of a singular Chinese treasure lost in war, still to be held nonetheless in the
hands of the viewer. The copy here is not secondary to the real; instead, it “disturb[ed] the order of priority: that the image must be secondary to, or come after, its model.” It acts as a simulacrum: the detail of Gu Kaizhi’s *Admonitions* scroll is valued in reproduction by Deng Shi. Deng, writing about the reproduction of the scroll, calls the page on which it appears a length of pure, fresh white silk (繅素如新). The page implicitly invites the viewer to affix his or her own seal, and thereby to appropriate the object to his or her collection.

Likewise, the inscriptions by Deng Shi and Weng Tonghe, for instance, dated and signed on pages adjoining or framing the collotypes of other paintings, help transform the journal into an aesthetic object. In recording a response to the painting in the journal, the editor becomes an active participant in the event of the painting, inserting himself into the cultural biography of the painting, bolstering his own position. But in doing so, the text effectively opens up the two-dimensional images into the space of the viewer by making the journal page an extension of the painted scroll (see fig. 3, 4). Moreover, at the same time that the painting in the journal takes on value as a sign imitating the real painting, as something to be savored and written about and on within a social surround and exhibition culture that embraces the copy, the collotype technology of reproduction becomes just one more artful way to make the painting real (albeit difficult to see).

The journals turn out to be even messier, however. At times the frames themselves disappear. The Yangzhou scholar and painter Liang Tan’s (梁Transactions (1864-after 1926) ink chrysanthemum (fig. 5), for instance, produced lithographically over one folded page, can easily be removed and viewed in the flesh. Its accessibility is echoed by tear-away epigraphic rubbings in the journals that permit each journal reader to hold them in his or her hands and add them to his or her collection. Calligraphy, printed on fold-out lengths of paper tucked behind front covers of the journal, called “authentic handwriting” (對不起, 原跡) in the
respective tables of contents, did the same. All of these three-dimensional printed objects invited removal and poring over, and surrendered themselves to the possibility of being stained with ink or tea, to being torn by a careless hand, pasted onto a scroll or into a picture frame, integrated into the everyday space of the reader’s studio or home.

The mass-produced collotypes of paintings, too, could also emerge from the page, though in a different way. The idiosyncratic reproductions in the journal of different parts of the painting surface, at sometimes different scales of magnification, provided multiple viewpoints of one object, encouraging the reader to pick up the journal, to twist and turn it to get a better view, to physically interact with the painting, to gauge its many incarnations. The album of Song-Yuan paintings forces the eye down close to the page and away to squint at it from a distance, so as to ascertain if mountains hide in cloudy mists or are simply a by-product of the printing technology (an inconclusive and thus open-ended process). Through this physical interaction, the weakness of the word to capture and contain the image makes itself clear. The viewer thus may find himself or herself able to reframe the reproduced paintings, to possess them first-hand. The reader is not a passive observer; the painting is not a prosaic object that fails to transcend its status as a framed copy.

Moreover, as at the 1903 Fifth Domestic Industrial Exhibition in Osaka, race matters. The journal purveys the myth of a shared Han Chinese culture, sometimes described by the editors as the “yellow race.” To look at a painting, in other words, is not only a means of connecting with past masters of the brush, but also of connecting with the “yellow race.” And even though race for them may have been defined primarily in socio-cultural terms, the language of race itself is ostensive, denoting truth and fact, a precise group definition in an international empiricist culture of social Darwinism.
In short, although the journal is riddled with traditional rhetoric and archetypes selectively recast by relatively conservative elite, as suggested in our first impression of the journal, at the same time, there is another set of social and historical referents. These fit with the educational agenda of the society, the attempt to reach beyond Society parameters, and should cause us to reconsider the position of the visual image in the journal. While the dark reproductions in the journal partially lose their separate identities, only to be distinguished by the editors through textual explanation, the reader’s eye also is given the opportunity to see the objects as though seeing them in public exhibitions, the eye awash in a parade of things, the reader a member of a generalized public readership (the “yellow race”). Such immediate and mediated visual consumption was effective in producing an embodied real history, a modern Chinese subject.

By that I mean that the place of the paintings in the journal permits easy migration from one way to see and visually apprehend the nation to the other (an elite determination of it in text versus something possibly more idiosyncratic in image). At a time when the concept of the nation remained problematic, the ambiguity in the journal surrounding the images encouraged the reader or viewer through the act of seeing itself to become a historical subject, to find not an easily defined vision of the modern nation laid out in word, but the performative space to envision it and one’s place in it. Hence, the fact that scholars today have not been able to come to terms with the ability of the pictorial to represent the nation at this time, and in this journal, may well be because the journal opens up to radically different views.

Conclusions

The journal editors’ ambivalence about modes of seeing painting did not last. Their display of painting was challenged in the pages of an eponymous publication by the Society
for China’s National Glory (Shenzhou Guoguang She 神州國光社,) also located in Shanghai and also edited by Deng Shi and Huang Binhong, the *Shenzhou Guoguang ji* 神州國光集 (Cathay Art Bok) [sic], a bimonthly periodical published from 1908-1912, which in turn was supplanted by the *Shenzhou Daguan* 神州大觀 (Panorama of the Divine Land), irregularly published through 1921, later followed by a sequel, *Shenzhou Daguan Xubian* 神州大觀續編 (1928-31). The latter publications were markedly different from the *National Essence Journal*. Over time they became more and more like the Japanese journal *Kokka* 國華 (first published in 1889). This was achieved by increasing the page size; by stabilizing the images at the center of the pages; by inserting protective sheets between the pages; by eliminating any textual commentary next to the images; and by using Japanese *washi* paper on the covers of some of the Society publications advertised in the journals. Most critically, the multiple perspectives and commonsensical apprehension are replaced by a standardized perspective.ª

That the term *guohua* or “national painting” is not used in the *National Essence Journal* is, in the end, perhaps appropriate, for the journal does not define style or content of painting (much as it never really says what the nation is). Professional artists are not overlooked in favor of amateurs; careful *jiehua* 界畫 “ruled line” styles of brushwork not favored above more idiosyncratic brushwork. The work of artists active during Qing dynasty is not reproduced more or less frequently than Song or Ming painters. Instead, the journal provides the opportunity to understand painting as both familiar and unfamiliar, both complete and incomplete, “[as] a product of a history already made, and which, in its limitedness, [could] be ‘completed’ only through critical intervention,” in this case, vision, touch, and other senses that the editors call into play. As these modes of looking changed to
something more pan-Asian and decidedly Japanese in nature, it is no surprise that the style of national painting became heavily imbricated with Japanese art traditions as well.

The National Essence Journal editors’ uncertain success in establishing frames for looking at painting can be further gauged by calls for guobna’s eventual “reform,” a discourse which in itself provided a new set of picture frames for an emergent transnational—yet distinctly Chinese—painting style. Years after the artist Huang Binhong and other members of the Society for Preservation of National Learning started the conversation about painting in the pages of the National Essence Journal, not only painting, but the way it was framed, continued to be a locus of controversy.54

As the National Essence Journal (if not its editors) demonstrate, however, painting can never be viewed in unitary terms. The range of cultural work performed by the painted picture is not limited strictly to tasteful aesthetic display (perhaps one reason the visual image has been consistently overlooked in scholarship on the journal today) or to contextualization through textual documentation (typically strengthening subordination of visual to text-based empirical evidence). To limit our reading of paintings to these modes suggests for us the impoverishment of reading without seeing, of seeing without reading. Painting is positioned in the journal to accomplish still more: it opens readers’ eyes to the work done in spaces of visual polysemy, spaces of multi-layered, textured symbolism, of the moment and also of the past, pointing to elegant gentlemen and to imagined but unknown readers (including ourselves), to spaces where not everyone might see things the same way. Thus, it avoids questions of what modernity looks like in painted form or when China would produce its own modern style or styles of pictorial art. Instead, it turns the ambiguity surrounding painting at the heart of “national essence” into a strength: creating space for
potentially conflicting visions of the modern nation to be accommodated, and for the duration of the publication’s short life, sustained.
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**FIGURE 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Caption</strong></th>
<th>Jin Nong, <em>Album leaf of Fragrant Orange</em>. 1908. Collotype; 5 ½ x 7/ 7/8 in. <em>Guocui xuebao</em>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placement notes</strong></td>
<td>On page 9, end of para 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FIGURE 3:**

| placement notes | On page 15, para 2 |

**FIGURE 4:**

### FIGURE 5:

| placement notes | On page 20, end of para 3 |