

長河落日

早期青瓷随笔

Essay on Ancient Celadon

秦 伟 著



K8)6.3/49

长河落日

早期青瓷随笔



一轮华日

沉落在远古的长河

流逝的繁星

陪伴着它的身影

长河两岸

还留有它清晰的足迹

逝水的波丘

映照着余晖的残阳

你是宇宙的魂灵

还是自然的生命

你吮吸大地的乳汁

还人类以绿色辉煌

你是秋的成熟

你是冬的沉稳

你用绿波的光影挥洒天地

生生不息的长河

隐着你沉默千年的呼吸……

你的辉光再一次升起

升起在我驰骋的心天

天风迎候着远古的圣曲

流云张开着希望的羽翼

黎明初现 霞光璀璨

你说 我就在你们的身边

首都师范大学图书馆



21693506

图书再版编目 (CIP) 数据

长河落日：早期青瓷随笔/秦伟著.

—武汉：湖北美术出版社，2004.8

ISBN7-5394-1570-3

I.长...

II.秦...

III.①随笔—作品集—中国—当代②抒情诗—作品集—中国—当代

IV.I217.2

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字 (2004) 第070009号

责任编辑：余 澜

摄影：郭 青

英文翻译：冯京葆

版式设计：秦 伟

封面设计：秦 伟 邝 夫

封面题字：邝 夫

长河落日 早期青瓷随笔[©] 秦 伟 著

出版发行：湖北美术出版社

地 址：武汉市武昌雄楚大街268号C座

电 话：(027)87679520 87679521

邮政编码：430070

电脑制作：中视国信影视文化发展有限公司

印 刷：北京建宏印刷有限公司

开 本：180 x 285 1/16

印 张：8.25

印 数：3000册

版 次：2004年7月第1版2004年7月第1次印刷

I S B N 7-5394-1570-3/I.61

定 价：65元



目 录

序 言	贺云翱作	5 - 13
-----	------	--------

试论早期青瓷的审美意趣	秦伟	14 - 24
-------------	----	---------

上篇 · 文章 图录 (26-95)

商代早期

初升的曙光	原始青瓷圈底尊	26 - 27
-------	---------	---------

西周

盘筑人生	青釉尊	28 - 29
巫祝的心愿	青釉夔龙纹双耳罐	30 - 31
心灵之窗	青釉双耳罐	32 - 33
“尊”贵之躯	青釉尊	34 - 35

春秋

“蟠龙”鼎	青釉双系鼎	36 - 37
手印的启迪	青釉印纹筒形器	38 - 39

春秋—战国

曾经的壮美	青釉牺鼎	40 - 41
生活乎？艺术乎？	青釉器座	42 - 43
天地交响	瓷盘、青釉甬钟	44 - 49
“钟”声长鸣	青釉簠于	50 - 51
远古风韵	青釉夔龙提梁盂	52 - 53
历史的“权”衡	青釉权	54 - 55
庄重之“鼎”	青釉鼎、青釉鼎(战国)	56 - 59
我是农民	青釉农具	60 - 61

战国

谁的杯？	麻布纹把杯	62 - 63
“面具”	青釉兽面三足洗	64 - 65
体验“得逝”	青釉竖凹棱纹双环耳罐	66 - 67
平凡，永恒的主题	青釉碗	68 - 69
生命之光	青釉龙	70 - 71
“艺术花插”	青釉直管香熏	72 - 73
我看“高古玉”	青釉壁	74 - 75
净手器	青釉净手器	76 - 77
陌生的“你”	青釉大口尊	78 - 79
鸟盖香熏的启示	青釉鸟盖香熏	80 - 81

汉代

“神物”鸛鹄	青釉猫头鹰盖罐	82 - 83
“奖杯”该给谁？	青釉高足直口壶	84 - 85
神骥天骄	青釉马	86 - 87
瓷片之美	瓷片系列	88 - 93
收藏感悟 与你对话	青釉竖条纹钵(战国)	94 - 95

下篇 · 欣赏 (98-129)

序言

贺云翱

《长江文化》论丛
南京大学历史文化与
自然遗产教学研究所

主编
副教授 贺云翱



朋友们从京城带来一部书稿，并说作者想请我为其写一序言。此前，在电话中已听讲书稿是谈“原始青瓷”的，我对“原始青瓷”仅知皮毛，何敢写序呢，便推辞了一番。待拿到书稿后，方感此书颇为有趣，作者秦伟是位女士，她不是专门的考古者，这本书也不是纯粹的学术专著，因此并不需要我去费力地对她的研究成果做什么评说。但是，让人奇怪的是，作为非专业人士，秦伟同志为什么会对三千多年前的“原始青瓷”情有独钟呢？而且，她的这本书回避从纯文物学或考古学的角度去讨论“原始青瓷”，例如，在书中我们看不到按照严密的考古类型学原则去做排队分期，也没有多少繁缛的专业术语的描述，而是随作者的兴致所至，用“原始青瓷”作为观照心灵的对象，谈美、谈艺术、谈生活，一抒感悟和胸臆。在阅读中，你会感觉到，那些两三千年的古物，似乎仍然生活在今人中间，可以做朋友式的感情上的共鸣与对话，可以跨越时空拨动人们的心弦，引起读者精神的愉悦。作者的行文，没有多少功利性的目的，俨然是一种悠然的散步，笔端甚至不时带有一些浪漫，体现的是对古瓷的另一视角的解读，自然，当涉及到历史与器物层面时，也有另一番识见，此外，在不同的文章后面，作者还附上几十件实物照片和资料，又增加了全书的学术价值，似乎有“各爱其爱，各美其美”的用心。恕我孤陋，用这种手法去表述“原始青瓷”的书稿，以前真的还没拜读过，文物价值的“多面性”诸如历史价值、科学价值、艺术价值、文化价值（文化表征、文化识别、文化认同、文化传承诸价值等）以及情感价值等，在这里获得了又一种表现形式。既如此，我便有意为这部别具特色的作品写几句话。

众所周知，中国是世界上著名的“瓷器之国”，如果在古代中国“四大发明”之外再加一项发明的话，那就应该是瓷器。换句话说，瓷器及其工艺对东亚乃至整个人类的贡献是无法尽说的。而谈及中国瓷器，不能不关系到“原始青瓷”，因为，目前文物考古界已经证明，中国瓷器至少在3000多年前的殷商时代已经产生，它的最早的物质文化形态就被称之为“原始青瓷”或“原始瓷器”。在这里，回顾一下“原始青瓷”的发现和过程是有意义的。

“原始青瓷”的问题最早是由考古学家发现并提出的。20世纪50年代，在河南郑州商代遗址中，出土了一批商代瓷器，由此引发了中国瓷器究竟是从什么时代产生的学术讨论。1960年8、9月间，考古学家安金槐先生在《文物》杂志上发表《谈谈郑州商代瓷器的几个问题》一文，先生在肯定瓷器应具备胎骨是用高岭土作成（有的胎骨属

SBM 65/08

石英或长石等粉末)；有光亮的釉；质坚硬、火候高、叩之作金石声；胎骨不吸水等四个特征的前提下，根据郑州发现的商代瓷器化学分析结果，认为“郑州商代遗址中出土的瓷器，已完全具备了早期瓷器的特征”。而且，先生还主张，郑州商代瓷器应是在郑州附近烧制的。在此之前，中国瓷器产生的时间有商代、周代、汉代、晋代、唐代甚至还有宋代一说，安先生文章的发表，自然会引起考古界及古陶瓷界的重视。这一时期，周仁先生等还对中国科学院考古研究所在陕西张家坡西周遗址发现的早期陶瓷碎片及安徽省文物工作队在安徽屯溪西周土墩墓中发现的类似标本做了化学测试，当时的结论是这些陶瓷标本的质地与“瓷”的定义还有差别，至于其产地“可能是在‘吴越’地区烧造的。”（周仁等先生的文章见《考古》1960年9期和1961年8期）。很显然，这一时期，文物考古界和陶瓷科技考古界的不同专家对“原始青瓷”的定性及产地是有分歧的。

到了1973年，李知宴先生在《文物》第2期上发表了《关于原始青瓷的初步探索》一文，李先生基本赞同安先生的观点，并又从胎料组成、釉料成分、烧成温度、胎体吸水性及真比重、硬度、显微结构等多方面对“原始瓷”做了研究，再次强调“商周青釉器物是原始瓷器”，并提出“从商周青釉器物到北朝青瓷（按：先生为什么未提南朝青瓷？）和唐、宋及明代瓷器，正说明我国瓷器发展和成熟的不同阶段”，“把商周青釉器物拿到瓷器发展的全过程来认识，……它是我国瓷器发展史上一个重要的环节，即发生阶段，意义十分重大”。也是在同一年，还有另一种学术观点存在，如“中国科学院冶金陶瓷研究所对西周青釉器物（按：即“原始瓷器”）进行了化学分析、物理性能测定、显微镜定量分析和x光射线定性分析之后，认为烧成温度在1200℃左右，已基本烧结，吸水性很弱，矿物组成已接近瓷器，但在原料处理和坏泥练制上还比较原始，尚不完全符合瓷器的定义，”根据这种情况，冯先铭先生提出这种青釉器似应称“釉陶”为宜（文见《文物》1973年7期）。

事隔两年之后，1975年，李科友、彭适凡二先生在《文物》第7期上刊发《略论江西吴城商代原始瓷器》一文，文章利用江西吴城遗址丰富的商代瓷器出土资料，分析了它们的造型及纹饰演变，文章强调吴城商代遗址中出土的瓷片经由景德镇陶瓷研究所化验，其化学组成和郑州二里冈、安阳殷墟以及西安张家坡、皖南屯溪的原始瓷器几乎完全一致，二位先生推断“在三千四、五百年前的商代中期，我国南北各地就已能普遍地利用瓷上来烧造原始瓷器”，“吴城及其他商代遗址中出土的青釉器物，无论其胎质、火候、釉色和物理性能等方面，都接近魏晋时期的青瓷，和后代的著名瓷窑产品的某些特征也基本相符，因此，我们完全有理由说它是我国最早的青瓷”。此后，李家治先生等又从陶瓷科技考古角度对“原始瓷”做了进一步研究，也证实“原始瓷”质地的化学构成与陶器包括同一时期的白陶器相比，具有明显的突变现象，它们之间具有“质”的差异（李家治先生文见《考古》1978年3期）。到这时，尽管对“原始瓷”的定性、名称、产地等还有这样那样的看法，但它乃为“瓷器”的属性则已没有根本分歧，就是说，关于“原始瓷”究竟是属于“陶器”范畴还是“瓷器”范畴的学术讨论到这时基本上告一段落，所以，在1982年，由冯先铭、安志敏、安金槐、朱伯谦、汪庆正等一批著名陶瓷考古专家主持的《中国陶瓷史》（文物出版社出版）付梓时，“原始瓷”的学术地位就完全获得承认了。

纵观这一较为漫长的过程，我们可以看到，文物考古界和古陶瓷界的一批知名学者围绕着“原始瓷”的发现和定性问题，在《文物》和《考古》等不同的学术阵地上，

运用各自掌握的资料和方法论，不断阐述着各自的观点和理由，也逐步推动着许多考古学者去不断地寻求证据，互补不足，辨明真实，揭示奥秘，假如只有一个声音，一种方法，我们哪里能享受到这种科学讨论的精彩呢？！

通过和本书作者的电话交谈，我感觉到，也许，由于职业的限制，秦伟同志当初或许并不十分了解以上所说的详细过程，亦尚未洞彻“原始瓷器”在中国陶瓷发展史上非凡的地位，甚至还不完全熟悉它曾经牵扯到那么多学术大家对它的科研投入，然而她以一位知识女性的直觉和艺术专业的素养，看到这类瓷器的质朴、单纯、简洁、素雅、憨厚，逐渐认识到它代表着一个时代和一种文化的风范，代表着一种变腐泥为佳器的技术体系和审美体系，因此对它产生了特别的喜爱和祈求理解的强烈兴趣，同时，经过长时间地积累，她又从“美术考古”角度对其展开深入的观察和研究，从而形成了自己独到的学术观点，这是十分难能可贵的，也填补了原始瓷器及早期瓷器研究领域的一个空白。

在这里，我还想就“原始瓷”的名称谈一点想法。我和秦伟同志在电话中不止一次地讨论过：既然学术界已经将这类器物纳入了“瓷器”的范畴，为什么还要称之为“原始瓷器”呢？“原始”者，难免让人觉得其面目原始，技艺低下，形体粗陋，而实际上，我们看到的不少商周青瓷器不仅造型端庄，而且釉色纯正，胎釉结合牢固，声如金石，纹饰精美，做工和烧制技术均属上乘，用“原始”称之，似委屈了这类瓷器的精致和地位。过去，不少研究者对这一命名做过解释，那是因为这种瓷器“原料的处理和坯泥的烧制方面还不是那样精细，胎骨也不那样致密，烧结程度也不那样高”，因此才叫它“原始瓷器”，可是，其实，从物质文化发展过程而言，几乎所有的器类在其早期阶段甚至不同阶段都有技术及外观上的局限性，但在考古界，并没有原始陶器、原始玉器、原始漆器、原始金银器等这类称呼，“原始瓷器”之本质已归属瓷器，又考虑到它在质量和发展阶段上的特殊性，我们似乎更赞同安金槐先生曾经用过的“早期瓷器”这一命名，或者为突出其釉色，也可称其为“早期青瓷”，以区别于东汉以后出现的瓷器或青瓷。在这一方面，我非常敬佩安先生的卓见，他不仅最早对“早期瓷器”做了系统研究，并且对其名称、产地等也有自己的主张，只不过在后来先生又改用“原始青瓷”一说，甚至他还放弃了一直坚持的黄河流域和长江流域的早期瓷器各自都有自己的产地的说法，而认为“我国原始瓷器发源地很可能是在长江中下游地区”（见《中国古陶瓷研究现状及展望》，中国陶瓷工业杂志社，1994年。并参见《安金槐考古文集》，中州古籍出版社，1999年版）。其实，先生早期的主张直到今天对研究早期瓷器而言仍有十分重要的参考意义。当然，过去对“原始青瓷”的称呼问题也有专家提出异议，如宋伯胤先生就力主放弃“原始青瓷”一说，而径称其为“瓷器”（见周仁先生等编《中国古陶瓷论文集》中宋伯胤先生文章，此蒙南京大学考古学博士魏女同志惠告）。但是，陶瓷考古界似乎迄今并未改变使用“原始青瓷”这一名称。关于这一问题，我和秦伟同志在电话中商讨过多次，我们认为，过去考古界所认定的许多“原始青瓷”实物，确实可以归之为“早期青瓷”或“早期瓷器”一类，但是，在夏商之际甚至商以前出现过一类“亦瓷亦陶”的器物，如本书所介绍的一件约属于马桥文化偏早期的“青瓷圈底尊”，虽未做过化学成分分析，但从外表上观察，其似具有若干“原始”的特点——瓷胎的特征尚不明显，烧结度不很高，釉极薄，做工也不太精致，与印纹硬陶较为接近，就这些器表可以看到的现象，称其为“原始青瓷”或许更为恰当。因此，是否能够放弃“原始青瓷”一称？“原始青瓷”究竟属于瓷器发展史中的哪一阶段？它与“早期青瓷”或“早期瓷器”以及后来完全成

熟的瓷器的差别究竟表现在哪些方面？如何界定这些差别？诸如此类的问题看来还可以开展进一步讨论。

“原始青瓷”经过漫长的发展阶段，进入“早期青瓷”或“早期瓷器”时期。据冯先铭先生等所主编的《中国陶瓷史》归纳，早期青瓷到商代中期已具规模，在空间分布上，于黄河流域的河南、河北、山西及长江流域的湖北、湖南、江西、苏南等地皆有出土，在器种上则有尊、鬲、钵、罐、瓮、豆、簋等区别，纹饰可见方格纹、篮纹、叶脉纹、锯齿纹、弦纹、席纹、S形纹、圆圈纹、绳纹等。到了西周时期，其分布区域上扩大到北京、河北、山东、河南、山西、陕西、安徽、湖北、江苏、浙江、江西等省区，常见器型为鬲、尊、豆、簋、瓮、盘、罐、盂、盥、钵等，器物上多装饰方格纹、篮纹、云雷纹、席纹、叶脉纹、齿状纹、划纹、弦纹、S形纹、乳钉纹、圆圈纹、曲折纹等。春秋时期，早期青瓷的制作方法已由过去的泥条盘筑法变为轮制成型，器形更加规整，胎壁益薄。这一时期，长江中下游地区的青瓷工艺已发展到很高的水平，胎质细腻，釉色清亮，器种繁多，器型或仿青铜礼器或仿玉礼器，出现了成套的列鼎、编钟、钲干等，有的器物塑造出兽头、龙身、瑞鸟等装饰，明显表现出烧制技术的进步、使用范围上的扩大和文化涵义上的丰富，形成了与同时期青铜器、玉器等主流物质文化并驾齐驱的格局与特征，展示了中国作为瓷器大国在青瓷技术和文化上的深广积累，从而为秦汉以后瓷器一族在物质文化领域里长期独领风骚奠定了坚实的基础。

过去，对早期青瓷的产地也有争议，或说制作于南方，或说南北皆产，由于它的出土分布面是那么广，时代延续又长，器类、器型、质地很是复杂，我们认为它的产地应当不局限于一地，南北皆有更接近事实，秦伟同志书中所收材料既有北方的产品，也有南方的器物，就证明了这一点，当然，由于这本书还不是专门的学术专著，相关问题无法在书中展开讨论，这是可以理解的。

我相信，这部书稿只是秦伟同志有关“原始瓷器”及早期瓷器认识的第一步，今后，随着她对材料的进一步熟悉和开拓，对其历史、艺术、科学、文化诸方面价值的进一步发掘，更有系统、更有学术价值的作品还会问世，这样，中华民族先人创造的最早阶段的瓷器对今天和未来的人们会有更多的倾诉、更多的奉献。

是为序！

2003年9月9日晚

笔于南京大学文科楼考古研究室

Preface

Yun'ao He

Chief editor of the topics on the Culture of the Changjiang River
President of the Institute of Culture and Nature Relics of Nanjing University
Vice professor of the History Archaeology Laboratory of the History Department of Nanjing University

The author of an unpublished book which a friend of mine brought from Beijing requested me through him to write a preface for it. I had learned from our prior telephone conversation that the book was about "primitive celadon". As I thought I knew little about this topic and would not be able to write anything at all about it I made a futile attempt to decline the offer. However I found the draft of the book extremely interesting once it was given to me. The author, Wei Qin, a lady, is not an archeologist by training and her book is intended to be anything but academic. Accordingly I do not have to make any comment at all on her research results, which I might otherwise have had to with quite an effort. What puzzles me most is the special passion Mrs. Wei Qin, a non-professional, has for "primitive celadon". Interestingly, she tries to avoid in her book the discussion of this issue from the perspective of pure cultural relics and archaeological studies. For instance, in her book, strict taxonomy in archaeology is no where to be seen in determining the order of the artifacts. Nor is there an employment of special jargons which are usually explained and described in excessive detail in other circumstances. It is with passion and interest that she approaches the topic of "primitive celadon" in conjunction with the discussion of esthetics, art and life, sharing what she feels about them. Reading her book will make you feel as if those ancient objects of two to three thousand years of age were live in front of all of you, with which you can have a dialogue by sharing your emotions with them as you would do with friends. Indeed they may transcend both time and space to touch your soul string as if your soul were a musical instrument which then would react to them with ecstasies. Looking at the style of the book, one may feel that its author is not looking for anything sensational or practical. In fact, you may find that reading through it you feel like taking sa graceful promenade, with a touch of romance found here and there. What the style reflects is an interpretation of ancient ceramics from a new perspective. With this in mind, it is then natural that she has complete new ideas in discussing history and relics. She has included dozens of photographs and information to illustrate various articles in the book, which actually enhances its academic value. You may say the intention of the author is to let all her readers find the parts interesting to them. It is perhaps my ignorance that makes me say, for which I apologize, that I have never read any book on "primitive celadon" with this style. This is a brand new approach to the multi-facade nature of cultural relics, such as historical values, scientific values, artistic values, cultural values (by which I mean values of cultural symbolism, cultural identity, cultural recognition, cultural heritage, etc), and emotional values. Considering all this, I am pleased to write a few words for this unique work.

As is well-known, China got its English name from the word china, meaning a country of ceramics. If there was an invention that proceeded the "famous four inventions" China is known for, it should be ceramics. Ceramics and its manufacturing process have undoubtedly made a major contribution to the civilization in East Asia and the whole world. It is natural to talk about the "primitive celadon" when one talks about ceramics, and ceramics from China in particular as archaeological evidences as of now indicate that China began to produce ceramics in as early as the Yin and Shang Dynasties 3000 years ago. The earliest cultural form of ceramics is the "primitive celadon" or "primitive ceramics". It is therefore useful to spend a moment reviewing the development of the "primitive celadon" and research activities related thereons.

"Primitive celadon" was initially proposed as an issue for study by archaeologists. In the 1950s, some ceramic pieces from the Shang Dynasty were unearthed at an archaeological site of the Shang Dynasty in Henan Province, which roused an academic debate as to when China began to produce ceramics. In August and September 1960, Mr. Jinkui An, an archaeologist, published an article entitled A Few Issues of the Shang Dynasty Ceramics from Zhengzhou on the journal of "Cultural Relics". While affirming the four pre-requisites that ceramics should have. Namely, it should have a body, made of kaolin (some body is made of feldspar), it should have glaze, it is hard, with high temperature firing, sounds like bell when knocked at, and the body does not absorb water. Chemical analysis of the Shang Dynasty ceramics gives him reason to believe that "these ceramics from the Shang dynasty unearthed at Zhengzhou have all the features of proto-ceramics." Mr. An also proposes that these ceramics of the Shang Dynasty should have been made somewhere close to Zhengzhou. Before this discovery it had been thought that China began to produce ceramics in the Shang, Zhou, Han, Jin, Tang and even Song Dynasties. The article written by Mr. An certainly would arouse great interest among archaeologists and ceramists. During the same period of time when the article was published, Mr. Ren Zhou and some other people conducted chemical testing of samples of ceramics taken from historical sites discovered at Shangxi and Anhui. The conclusions reached were that these ceramics did not really qualify as real ceramics and that they might have been produced at Wuyue region. (ref. Mr. Zhou's articles can be found in the journal Archaeology, issue No.9, 1960 and issue No.8, 1961). Obviously, archaeologists studying cultural relics and archaeologists studying ceramic technology had different views about the definition and place of first production of "the primitive celadon".

In 1973, an article entitled Preliminary Studies of the Primitive Celadon was published by Mr. Zhiyan Li in the journal Cultural Relics, in which Mr. Li presented his views which were basically in line with Mr. An's. He also showed his research results about the primitive celadon from the perspective of the body components, glaze elements, firing temperature, porous structure, microscopic structure, etc., qualifying celadon ware from the Shang and Zhou Dynasties as true proto-ceramics. He proposed that there were different stages of porcelain development and maturity starting with the Shang and Zhou celadon ware, through the Bei Dynasty celadon (Why didn't he mention the Nan Dynasty celadon?) followed by the porcelain during the Tang, Song and Ming Dynasties. In that same year, the Institute of Metallurgical Ceramics of the Academy of Sciences of China studied the celadon ware (i.e. primitive ceramics) from the Xi Zhou Dynasty by analyzing its chemical components and physical properties, and by making quantitative and qualitative analysis respectively under a microscope and through X-ray. This study led them to conclude that the celadon ware tested was fired at a temperature of 1200 degree Celsius, basically vitrified and almost waterproof; and that its mineral composition was close to that of porcelain though it still could not meet the definition of porcelain in terms of raw material treatment and paste preparation. In line with this academic view which became prevalent in that year, Mr. Xianming Feng proposed that it would be more appropriate to call this kind of celadon ware "glazed pottery" (Ref. Cultural Relics, issue No. 7, 1973).

Two years later, in 1975, Mr. Keyou Li and Mr. Shifan Peng co-authored an article entitled A Sort Study of the Proto-Ceramics Ware of the Shang Dynasty from Wucheng of Jiangxi Province on issue No. 7 of Cultural Relics. In this article, they discussed the evolution of its shape and decoration on the basis of the richness of Shang Dynasty ceramics unearthed at Wucheng of Jiangxi Province. It was stressed in the article that the results of chemical testing, conducted by the Jingdezhen Ceramics Research Institute, showed that the ceramics unearthed at the Wucheng site of the Shang Dynasty had an identical chemical composition with that of the proto-ceramics discovered at Erligang of

Zhengzhou, Yinxu of Anyang, Zhangjiapo of Xi'an, and Tunxi of south Anhui province. The two gentlemen therefore concluded, "during the period of Mid-Shang Dynasty about 3400 to 3500 years ago, Kaolin or pottery clay was extensively used to produce proto-ceramics in various places in both north and south China". They went on to say, "The ceramic ware unearthed at Wuchang and other Shang Dynasty sites were similar to the celadon from the period of Wei and Jin Dynasties in terms of its body quality, firing, glaze color and physical properties. It also had some basic features to be found on the porcelain products fired at famous kilns from later periods. We therefore have every reason to believe that these were the earliest ceramics from China". Later, Mr. Jiazhi Li made further studies on "proto-ceramics" from the perspective of scientific archaeology of ceramics, which also demonstrated that the chemical composition of the "proto-ceramics" represented a major difference from pottery ware including white pottery ware from the same period of time. There was a qualitative difference between them, said Mr. Li (Ref. Issue No. 3 of Archaeology, 1978). As of now, despite the different views as regards the definition, name, place of production, etc. on 'proto-ceramics', practically everyone agreed that they were ceramics. This means that the academic debate about whether "proto-ceramics" were covered under "porcelain" came to an end. As a result of this, the academic position of "proto-ceramics" was fully recognized at the time when the book entitled *A History of Chinese Porcelain* published by Cultural Relics Press jointly written by Mr. Xianming Feng, Mr. Zhimin An, Jinkui Zhu, Qingzheng Wang, and some other experts on ceramics archaeology was sent to the press.

Looking at this long process, we can see that evidently some famous scholars from both cultural archaeological field and ancient ceramics field tried to present their respective views and theories on different academic battle grounds of Cultural Relics and Archaeology relying upon their own information and methodologies. This actually encouraged many archaeologists to continuously look for new evidences, learn from each other, discover truths, and explain mysteries. Had there been only one voice and one methodology, we would not have had the pleasure of enjoying such an excellent academic discussion.

A telephone conversation I had with the author of this book makes me feel that perhaps because she was in a different profession, Mrs. Wei Qin might not have been aware of all the details discussed above, nor would she have realized the extraordinary position of "proto-ceramics" had in the development of Chinese ceramics, and she might not even have any clue to the research activities that so many scholars and experts had conducted on this issue. I felt that she, relying upon her intuition of a knowledgeable woman with artistic training, was able to see the crudity, purity, simplicity, undecorated elegance, and straightforwardness of these ceramic ware, and realized gradually that they represented the style of a time and culture and a technical system with an esthetic approach developed from producing extraordinary objects out of ordinary clay. She therefore began to have a special passion for it and strong desire and interest to understand it. At the same time, with long time studies and an active involvement, she made a profound observation and study of it from the perspective of "artistic archaeology", therefore forming her own unique academic views. This is something extraordinary and valuable in itself. And this has opened a new field of study in primitive and early ceramics.

I would like to share with you my views on this term of "primitive ceramics". This is an issue that I and Mr. Wei Qin discussed many times over our telephone conversations. Since academically speaking, it is recognized as having been covered under "ceramics", why is it that it is still labeled as "primitive ceramics"? Talking about "primitive", one cannot help feel that it is something primitive, with no technical and artistic value, and in a crude and ugly form. As a matter of fact, a large number of the celadon ware from the Shang and Zhou

Dynasties we see are not only elegant in shape, but also have pure and correct glaze colors with glaze firmly applied on the paste, sounds like a bell when being knocked at, has exquisite decoration and patterns, so much so that they were very sophisticated in makings and firing technique. The qualification of "primitive" seems to have downgraded the exquisiteness and position this category of ceramics deserve. Many researchers have made explanations of this terminology in the past, saying "the treatment of the raw material and the firing of paste were not so fine, the body was not dense enough, and the vitrification was not sufficient". This is why this type of ceramics was named "primitive ceramics". In terms of the process of material civilization, however, almost all wares had room for improvement in technology and appearance during their early stages and indeed various stages of development. In the field of archaeology, there is not such thing as primitive pottery, primitive jade ware, primitive lacquer ware, and primitive gold or silver ware. In essence, "primitive ceramics" indicates it is already ceramics. Actually we would rather call it "early ceramics" especially in consideration of its quality and stage of development, which was an expression adopted by Mr. Jinkui An. Or you may also want to name it "primitive celadon" to better reflect that fact that it has glaze on it as opposed to ceramics or celadon after the Dong Han Dynasty. In this regard, I admire the excellent judgment of Mr. An, who not only conducted systematic studies of "primitive ceramics", but also formulated his own ideas as to its name and the place of production. It is only some time later that he reversed to the terminology of "primitive celadon" and even abandoned the theory which he had been defending for quite a while that early ceramics from the basins of the Yellow River and the Yantze River had their own places of origination, replacing this with the new theory that "Chinese ceramics most probably originated from the middle and lower reaches of the Yantze River" (Ref. The present Status and Prospects of Research on Ancient Chinese Ceramics, 1994, China Ceramics Industry Press. Also Ref. A Collection of Archaeological Articles by Mr. Jinkui An, 1999, Zhongzhou Guji Press). As a matter of fact, Mr. An's earlier theory is still very useful for today's study of early celadon. Of course, it was true that various experts had different opinions about the name of "primitive celadon". For instance, Mr. Boyin Song strongly proposed to replace "primitive celadon" with simply "ceramics" (Ref. article by Mr. Boyin Song contained in A Collection of Papers on Ancient Chinese Ceramics. I'd like to express my appreciation to Dr. Nu Wei, an archaeologist from Nan Jing University, for having shared with me this source of information). Despite all this, it seems archaeologists are still using this terminology of "primitive celadon". I have discussed this issue with Mrs. Wei Qin in many telephone conversations. In our opinion, it is true that many of the "primitive celadon" as recognized by archaeologists can be covered under "early celadon" or "early ceramics". However, there are objects which were "neither ceramics nor pottery" from the period of the Xia and Shang Dynasties, or even before. The "Round Base Celadon Zun" shown in this book, for instance, from the early period of Ma Qiao Culture, appears to have certain "primitive" features though no test has been conducted on its chemical property. This object does not have a full feature of ceramic paste, its vitrification is not very deep, has a thin glaze, and is not so fine in making. Indeed it is more like stamped hard pottery ware. Based on the appearance of them it would be more appropriate to call them "primitive celadon". Can we therefore abandon "primitive celadon"? To which stage should "primitive celadon" really belong? What are the real differences, if any, between "primitive celadon" and "early celadon" or "early ceramics"? How then should these differences be defined? It is likely that debates around these issues will continue.

After a long period of development, "primitive celadon" moved into the period of "early celadon" and then "early ceramics". According to the theory in the book entitled A History of Chinese Porcelain authored by Mr. Xianming Feng and some others, early celadon ware were rather extensively produced already by the middle of the Shang Dynasty as they have been unearthed in such places as Henan, Hebei, and Shanxi provinces along the Yellow

River, and Hubei, Hunan, Jiangxi, South Jiangsu provinces along the Yantze River. There were various types of these ware including Zun, Lei, bowl, jar, Weng, Dou, and Gui. In terms of line ornamentation, there were such patterns as matrix, basket, tree leaf, sawtooth, music string, straw mat, "S" shape, circle, rope twisting, zigzag, etc. In early period of the Chun and Qiu kingdoms, the earlier method of celadon making which had been "construction with paste ropes" was replaced by that of "wheel spin formation", so that the ware shape became more regular and neater and the paste wall was becoming increasingly thinner. During this period, the quality of celadon at the middle and lower reaches of the Yantze River was much higher with fine paste and bright glaze. A large variety of vessels also emerged. Some were based on the shape of bronze ware or jade ware. Others were in the form of whole set of Dings, group bells, or Chunyu. Some were even sculptured in the shape of animal head, dragon body, bird, etc. All this demonstrated a major progress in firing technology, a larger scope of usage, and an enriched cultural dimension, so much so that they were as important as other mainstream cultures as in the form of bronze ware and jade ware. This also showed that China, as a major country for ceramics, was well developed in terms of celadon technology and culture, which laid a solid foundation for the unique role ceramics and porcelains were to play in China's material and cultural civilization.

There has been disputes as to where the early ceramics were first produced. Some thought it was south China and others both south and north China. It is our opinion, however, that it should be more than one place of its origination as they were unearthed in so many different places, covering a long period of time, and with differences in form, shape and quality. I would say it is closer to fact by saying that they were originated in both south and north China. Mrs. Wei Qin has a collection of celadon ware coming from both south and north China, which also proves this point. Of course, it is understandable that relevant issues are not discussed in this book as it is not academic in nature.

I believe this book only represents the first step Mrs. Wei Qin takes on her journey to understand "primitive celadon" and early ceramics. With more learning and research, and better understanding of their historic, artistic, scientific, and cultural aspects, she will surely be able to come up with works that are more systematic and with higher academic values. In this way, early celadon will have an opportunity to better interact with people of today and future, demonstrating its contribution to the development of human history and culture.

In the archaeology researching institute,
Arts Building
Nanjing University
Sep. 9th, 2003

试论早期青瓷的审美意趣

秦 伟

不知从哪一天起，历史的星空把我心灵的指针引向了如火如荼的远古年代，从此便使我意与古会、情思难返。面对这些飘飘而去的千年古人留下的精妙作品，我常常感到喉头哽咽。

它们是远古先民与宇宙自然对话留下的真实心声。是淳厚质朴、超然脱俗的人性再现。它们的上面凝聚了无数魂灵的智慧 and 思想。我们只有惜之、爱之而永远无法再复制、重现它们的精神。在论述它们时，我是战战兢兢且心怀崇敬之情。对于这些远古优秀的作品遗存，我深感对它们真是无权指手划脚，我只有深深地感叹古人的伟大，感叹他们浪漫不羁的思想和超凡的艺术创造。我只有抑制住自己兴奋的心情再一次去默默地欣赏……

在进入主题之前，我们先了解一下早期青瓷产生和发展的源流，以便能深切地体味其厚重的历史感。

早期青瓷出现于商代前期，如“湖北黄陂盘龙城商代前期遗址出土原始瓷器，胎质坚硬色黄白，有的涂绿釉或黄釉。”①“河南郑州人民公园商代前期早期墓出土釉陶尊，表面有淡黄色釉，肩部皆印有细篮纹，陶胎坚硬，火候甚高。”②等等，无可置疑地说明了这些器物均具备了早期青瓷的基本属性。至西周晚期呈现了蓬勃的发展势头，到了春秋战国时期，它们制作精良、纹饰细密，可以说进入了南方早期青瓷器的鼎盛期。虽然商周青铜器的铸造无论是工艺水平还是造型纹饰，都达到了同时期艺术审美的最高水准，代表了那一时期统治阶级共同的审美情趣，但早期青瓷比之于青铜器更具有清洁卫生实用，工艺制作简单，原料方便易得等优点，所以一经出现便博得了贵族阶级的喜爱。因此在“春秋战国时期，在吴越两国境内，青瓷器的发展已经达到广泛使用的新阶段，并且部分地代替了铜器和漆器的使用范围。”③这一时期的青瓷器不仅造型和类别比较复杂，而且其纹饰也趋多样化。

早期青瓷是在青铜文化与陶文化融合发展基础上产生的一种新的艺术形象，并以新的生命形式开启人类陶瓷艺术的先河。“陶瓷”真是一个响亮而伟大的名字！中国之所以被英文译成“china”，早期青瓷应是首当其功。如果没有它的出现，便没有后来那些光怪陆离的瓷器。早期青瓷庄严、稳重的造型既体现了青铜器劲健有力的阳刚之美，又不乏泥土细腻温和的柔美之秀。如果说它有着青铜器雄浑宏大的精神气势，质朴淳厚的泥土就是它的灵魂和血脉。它用自己所独有的气质向世人展示其两者兼而有之的庄重与典雅，尊贵与质朴，超然与现实的浪漫精神和审美情趣及刚柔相济的气韵风骨。青铜器那刚劲有力的线条所表现出的狂野、豪放的张力与泥质胎体媚丽柔婉的内蕴结合，形成了早期青瓷独具特色的艺术形式及造型韵味。纵观它的发展历程，商周时期的青瓷器轮廓线条简约明了，却真实的表现了其童年时代的稚朴天真，西周晚期至春秋战国，青瓷的发展之势恰如风华正茂、激情勃发的青年阶段，此一时期的作品均呈现出一种遒劲挺拔、昂然向上的精神风貌。尤其是春秋战国时期仿青铜礼器的制作水平，已完全达到了形神兼备的艺术审美效果。

但是，早期青瓷并不完全是青铜器形式与内容的翻版，不同的时代背景、不同的思想理念，以及不同的材料和工艺流程，又使它们具有了完全别样的审美意趣。

一、青铜时代的一枝奇葩

（一）材料的柔婉

中国商周青铜器化学成分是锡青铜和铅锡青铜。由于坚硬的青铜材质使器物本身所体现的线条挺直、棱角锐利、气势冷峻，所以常常令人有敬畏之感。而早期青瓷是泥土作胎，其质朴谦和、细腻柔婉的品质，常常能够给人以完全不同的心理感受。

人类生于土地，长于土地，而最终又归于土地，自古人类就有着化解不开的土地情结。对泥土有着特殊的情感和体悟，与泥土有着任何文化物质形式都无法替代的密切关系。从最初粗糙的泥塑造型，到学会制作使用陶器，人类在前进发展的过程中，不断进行着与土地的心灵交汇而赋予了泥土多姿多彩的新的生命形式。直到商代前期青瓷的出现时，陶器的发展已有了几千年的历史，制作陶器的技术也已相当成熟。基于泥土的柔婉性和可塑性，人们完全能够根据头脑中所设计的各种器形，运用各种不同的方法，轻松随意的制作出理想的器物。尤其是春秋战国时期，人们对泥土的驾驭能力几近达到炉火纯青的地步。正是出于人们对泥土的深厚情感和对泥性的深刻理解与良好把握，才使得这一时期的青瓷以全新的艺术形态和广泛的实用价值，与庄严神圣的青铜器争奇斗艳，仿佛碧绿丛中的一枝奇葩，美不胜收。早期青瓷器以其丰厚的底蕴演奏了一曲柔婉深沉的歌。

（二）工艺的别致

尽管先秦时期的很多青瓷器在器形制作上模仿青铜器造型，但不同的工艺手法使得这类作品具有了不同的审美意趣。古代青铜器的工艺手法主要是陶范法与失蜡法两种，而早期青瓷却是运用和泥、搓条、盘筑、拼接、印纹、划刻、施釉、烧制等工艺手法形成的。早期青瓷的每一件作品都是伴随着作者情感的心曲，在富有动感的手的节奏中缓缓成型。这个过程本身就已超越了单纯模仿的意义。在这个过程中，更重要的是体现人与泥土的亲及心性的沟通。当人们把河水注入散发着清香的泥土中的时候，泥土便拥有了灵动而奇特的生命。人们把活好的泥料先搓成泥条，再根据头脑中器物的形状，把泥条一根根首尾相接，盘旋而上。在柔软的泥条的缓缓盘升中，人们欣赏泥条在手中千变万化的神奇，享受泥条带给人的瞬间韵律般的美妙。在这里，人作为创作主体，用双手直接与大自然亲密对话，用心灵倾注对泥质的理解和对作品创作的热情。灵动的泥条在人们的手里盘筑出丰富多彩的生活，盘旋起斑斓璀璨的人生。其实，人们在盘筑自己的人生时，也盘筑起远古人类浩瀚的历史。每件青瓷器都是陶瓷史上的一段章节，而由此贯穿的历史就是以早期青瓷作为开篇所抒写的人类陶瓷艺术的巨制鸿篇。

（三）理念的出新

青铜艺术是中国远古艺术园林中的一块瑰宝。尤其是商周时期的青铜器，不论是其庄严沉稳的造型还是繁缛精丽的装饰，无不体现出神秘、威严、震慑之感。它是商周统治者“祭祖神、通天地”的祭祀法宝，又是统治阶级权利地位的象征。它们被人们赋予了神的强大力量而呈现出一种至高无上的威严。尽管在先秦时期青瓷的部分器物造形上还留有青铜器的影子，但不同的时代背景导致其思想文化及人的精神意识的差异，使早期青瓷逐渐踱出了森严、恐怖的众神的阴影，具有了比之更加清新愉悦的审美意蕴。正如美学家宗白华先生所言：“这就是艺术抢先表现了一个新的境界，从传统的压迫中跳出来。”^④刚刚挣脱精神束缚后的先秦社会，“重人轻天”的思想使人们比以往更加关注个体生命的价值及精神世界的自由抒发。反映在早期青瓷器的创

作上多了人性的亲切，少了宗教的威严；多了思想的飞扬，少了神灵的羁绊；多了世俗的应用，少了礼制的奢华。其清丽自然的艺术形象和审美情趣，使人们从中充分感受到一种超然物外的精神享受，由此表现为先秦时期的人们更注重欣赏和表现其艺术审美价值。

二、奇异的生命华彩

（一）富有诗意的造型美

陶器的最早出现源于实用，同时在实用的过程中不断发展变化，逐步呈现出多姿多彩的器形或超越实用的功能，渐渐溶进了丰富的精神信仰和动人的思想情感。不同的功能则在造型上体现着不同的美感。不同的时代又呈现出不同的审美趣味和文化理念。

早期青瓷是陶器发展到最高阶段的产物。从它刚刚诞生那天起，就以清丽的釉色，典雅的风范博得了人们的喜爱。在现实生活中，开始逐渐取代了陶器并且部分地替代了青铜器的使用。无论是作为祭祀礼器还是生活器具，在造型上都充分体现出实用与信仰完美结合的设计理念。

祭祀礼器本是贵族阶级拜祖祭神器物，蕴含着浓厚的宗教色彩。它不同于一般的生活器具，融实用功能、精神寄托和艺术创造于一体，或运用异型的变化体现宗教的神秘，运用庄重的造型强调神的尊严。如先秦时期的一件青釉提梁盃，一看便知是件蕴含着宗教信仰的艺术作品。作者运用夸张的艺术手法，把四灵巧妙地组合在一件器物上，圆润而饱满的玄武作为器身，纤细虬长的青龙作为提梁，朱雀、白虎作为装饰元素，丰富了器物的造型。这里有器形（壶身）的圆满，有线形（提梁）的流畅，有神光的辐射，有艺术的夸张。富有诗意美的造型设计与四只可爱的神兽形象有机结合，稳重而又不失活泼，给人以精神和艺术上的双重享受。在生活实用器的设计中，则体现出轻巧方便、实用合理的特征，在这类作品的身上，我们似乎能看到更多的世俗化的亲切。

不同的时代文化背景，必然产生不同的思想理念。在器物造型上也必然呈现出不同的审美特征。

商周时期的青瓷器造型仍然是古陶器形的延续。尽管远古陶器有着相当丰富的造型变幻，但早期青瓷与之相比却略显单薄，大都以圆形器为主，器形圆满古拙。代表商代造型艺术最高水准的当属一件青釉弦纹尊，这是流行于贵族阶层的一种酒具。其器形工整对称，呈现着庄重之感。虽然口径远远大于底部，但工匠们在器物外形上运用流畅的曲线，把鼓腹巧妙地收在接近底足的部位，免除了器物的不平衡感。而外撇的小足与尊的大敞口上下呼应，不仅使器物更沉稳、优美，又平添了尊贵庄严的气势。然而，同样作为酒具的春秋时期的青釉尊在造型上却发生了很大的变化。它的体态更加挺拔秀美，宽宽的口沿舒展外撇，扁鼓腹圆润秀巧，底足外沿也相应变宽。三者之间比例和谐，呈现着收放有序的形体韵律，几乎接近古希腊毕达哥拉斯所发现的黄金比。和谐的比例使人观之恰似一位亭亭玉立的少女，非常富有韵味。其劲健洗练的造型又透着一种崇高的阳刚之气。这是先秦时期强调艺术情感和刚柔相济的审美思想的最佳体现。

早期青瓷还有很多仿生造型，它们有的源于宗教信仰幻化出的神物，有的完全师法自然。先秦时期的青釉牺鼎属于异形的造型，所谓异形，是指器物造型中一种不规则的、非对称式的造型。然而其打破常规的设计手法，却有其独特的审美趣味。鼎有着悠久的历史。它最早源于远古陶鼎的造型，为此史学界曾称中国文化为“鼎鬲”文化。大汶口文化的彩陶鼎，彩绘鲜艳，但圆形器身与三支高足的组合有些生硬，造型上缺乏庄重且略显稚拙。而早期青瓷三足鼎不仅器形工整，并且呈现多样化的趋势。青釉牺鼎就是鼎的造型中很独特的一类，它是以饕餮为原型，将其以高浮雕或模印的形式塑造在鼎的口沿一侧。兽蹄形的三足与高耸的兽面相呼应，生动有趣。腹