

德化瓷  
TE HUA PORCELAIN



# 德化瓷器展覽

香港中文大學・中國文化研究所・文物館  
一九七五年一月至六月

## An Exhibition of Te Hua Porcelain

ART GALLERY

INSTITUTE OF CHINESE STUDIES

CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

JANUARY TO JUNE 1975

## 道謝

這個展覽會的出品全部由敏求精舍會員及華光草堂提供，又蒙敏求精舍陶瓷小組協助籌備工作，謹此致謝。

## Acknowledgement

All the exhibits have been loaned by members of the Min Chiu Society and by the Wah Kwong Collection. Grateful thanks are due to the lenders and to the ceramics sub-committee of the Min Chiu Society who helped to put together the exhibition.

# 德化瓷展覽簡介

福建省中部德化縣從宋元之際開始生產白瓷，至今不斷。這種白瓷我們稱為德化（窯）瓷。德化窯又稱“福窯”，從前亦有人稱為“建窯”或“白建”，但建窯一名在較早時是宋代建安烏泥窯（主要生產“兔毫斑”茶碗）的專名，似乎不應引伸為福建省不同地點所產的瓷器的共名。福窯一名則較後起，一直是德化窯的別名。

德化窯的創始時代，到目前為止尚未能確定，因為未找到絕對可靠的證據。最近數十年在印尼和菲律賓各島嶼都曾發現大量的早期德化白瓷<sup>①</sup>，又從近年來考古人員在德化縣調查所得的結果，可知這種早期的白瓷是在德化屈斗宮燒製的<sup>②</sup>。但無論在東南亞出土的白瓷或在屈斗宮窯址所發現的，都只可以說是屬於宋末元初的時期，而無法進一步斷定其是否宋代遺物。從歷史的觀點來看，德化窯在宋末應該已開始生產瓷器，因為在南宋時中國瓷器的產量和品種都有顯著的增加。當時朝廷為了增加稅收，曾極力鼓勵對外貿易，而出口商品的主要種類是絲織和瓷器。為了應付大量的需求，沿海各地紛紛建立瓷窯。德化窯很可能是在這時“應運而生”的。有一點可以肯定的是，德化窯從創始時期直至明代中葉都是以生產出口瓷為主，市場是東南亞各地。這種瓷器的質地是比較粗陋的，器形也只限於盆和淺盤之

類（展品1, 4, 5）。到明代嘉靖以後，因為西洋人東來，東南亞的政治和貿易概況都有很大的轉變。德化瓷的海外銷路也一度轉弱。同時，江南地區漸趨富庶，為了迎合新興市民階級和士大夫對工藝美術品和案頭雅玩的需求，德化窯的陶人便開始生產文房用具和書齋的陳設品以及各種塑像。晚明文獻上所記福窯產品往往提及“博山佛像之類”<sup>③</sup>。展覽中的各種香爐（展品36—43）和文房用品（展品53—63）大部份是明末至清初的製品。以這一些展品和其他年代的器物比較，我們不難看出明末清初是德化窯發展的高峯時期。當時的德化窯器，瓷質潔白，透光則泛紅色，釉面光瑩潤澤，比之明代中期及以前的牙黃色而無光澤的製品，於技術和美術上都有進步。於造形方面，大部份是仿古器物，尤其是古銅器。但晚明的仿古，和清代的泥古式倣製古物的趣味大不相同。晚明仿古有兩個特點：第一，陶工所仿製的器物都是造形比較簡潔的一類（如觚形花瓶和簋形香爐等），這是符合當時美術風尚的；再者，晚明陶人所製的器物，無論是仿古或“創新”，都一定顧及陶瓷的屬性，不會產生不自然和生硬之感。更重要者，晚明人對古物形式的處理是靈活的，於是有些仿古之器亦是創體。例如展品40號，利用元代器物常見的象鼻造形作為鼎形香爐的三足，香爐的器身則作六角形。這一種形制和主題組合是以前所無

的，但是這香爐卻是一件又“古雅”又有新意的美術品。

德化窯的製作方法和德化瓷土的特性亦有關係。德化縣和鄰近地區所產瓷土，含鹼化物較多，不需太高溫度，即可成瓷，而且瓷胎的玻璃化程度較高，釉面瑩潤可愛，但其質軟，燒窯時易變形，“燒製盤盂徑口在八寸以上者每多拗曲，較小者亦不能太薄”<sup>④</sup>。早期的德化瓷，器身厚重，也就是避免燒製時變形的緣故。至於塑像，除特別加厚器壁之外，還要採用較硬的瓷土。近代的德化窯像用的是德化縣附近之四班所產瓷土，德化土因太軟不適用。因為瓷土質軟而可塑性強，方使用模製坯。早期的德化窯，甚至圓形器也每每不用陶輪而用模製。瓷器的特質和製作方法也間接地影響德化窯在明末以來的發展方向。以上說過明末德化窯曾大量製造各種陳設品和塑像。這固然是為了適應需求，但另一個主要原因是德化瓷質脆軟，製成盞蓋之類的日用瓷，器壁厚而易破碎，實用條件不如景德鎮瓷。德化縣志述及明清之際的製作也說：“罌瓶罐甌，潔白可愛，飲食之器多龔拙，有細者，較之饒州所作，終不可及。”但德化瓷的釉面潔白瑩潤，製成“美術瓷”則極受歡迎。這樣便決定了德化窯向美術瓷發展的路線。

德化瓷的裝飾手法主要有四種，即印花、貼花、劃花和透雕。這些技法也是適應德化瓷土的特性的。印花裝飾與用模製坯的工作過程是分不開的，只要在陶范上刻陰線花紋，製坯後便是瓷坯的凸

花（例見展品2—3）。貼花是先用手捏或模印製成各種花紋圖案，然後貼上器坯的外表（例見展品19—21）。這兩種裝飾手法元明間是最常用的，但入清以後則漸以印花為主。劃花是在器坯上刻劃花紋，從明末清初開始漸多應用，其中比較特別的是用劃花手法寫文字題記（例見展品25, 33），以文字為瓷器上的裝飾，從清初開始也常見於景德鎮的青花瓷。透雕的手法較後起，大概於清代中葉才出現。還有一種最少見的裝飾手法是彩繪。從幾件傳世品和在窯址發現的碎片看來，釉下彩只有明末至清代中葉才有製造，而且以青花為主。展品53號的釉下彩山水筆斗大概是清初的製品，但所用的彩料未能確定。這一類德化器極為罕見。傳世的清代德化瓷也有施釉上彩的，但數量不多。在古窯址迄今尚未發現過有釉上彩的碎瓷片，但一九三六年的德化瓷業調查報告則有關於釉上彩裝飾的記載<sup>⑤</sup>。

德化窯的製瓷技術，還有一點值得提及的，就是瓷窯的構造。至遲在明代晚期，德化陶人便改進了古代的龍窯為“階級窯”<sup>⑥</sup>。這種窯的設計保存了龍窯的基本優點，但燒成質量比龍窯好。明代晚期德化窯出品之精美大概和瓷窯的改進有關。其後“階級窯”不但為華南其他地區所採用，而且對日本陶窯的設計影響極大。現代香港比較大規模的製磚工場所用磚窯也是從德化的階級窯發展而來的。

從康熙晚期開始，德化窯又再燒造外銷瓷，由荷蘭東印度公司運銷歐洲。十八世紀（雍正、乾隆年間）是德化瓷銷行歐

洲的全盛期。爲了適應顧客的趣味，部份塑像和日用器具的造形也接受外國的影響（如“送了觀音”後來有點像“聖母與聖嬰”），但這種外銷瓷在國內流傳並不多。

德化窯從清代乾隆以後，便日漸衰落。一九五一年興建新瓷廠時，人數才二十三人，但近年來已得到恢復和發展。

從來研究德化窯，最大的問題是斷代。早期的外銷瓷（元代至中明）因爲瓷質和造形都比較特殊，容易辨認。但是從明代晚期開始，德化窯器的質素已達極高水平，其後康熙、雍正、乾隆時出品亦不能過之。而明末清初盛行的形式，清代不斷有仿製，所以晚明至清中葉的出品，很不容易斷定年代。一般來說，中明以至清初的瓷色是白中泛紅，清代的釉色是白中帶青，這是因爲時代不同，窯的構造和火焰的性質都有變化的緣故<sup>(7)</sup>。但是這並不是個絕對的斷代標準，因爲古代燒窯往往不能對火焰的性質（氧化或還原）完全控制，而燒窯時窯內各部的氣氛也不能一致。

明清景德鎮瓷器的款識是鑑定年代的重要根據，但德化器則多數無款，即使有，也於事無補。在德化瓷器底部刻劃或印上的年款絕大多數是“大明宣德年製”和“大明成化年製”雙欄六字款，這兩種年款都不可靠。而明末名陶工如何朝宗等名款亦多假冒。另外有一些不是年號亦不是人名的款識。大概是瓷作坊商標性質的符號，也不能作爲鑑定的憑據。

當然，窯址的調查和發掘都會對斷代研究提供重要條件，但是這項工作還是在初步階段。例如在較早的窯址，如屈斗宮等地，尚未發現瓷窯的建築。在各地明清考古工作中，德化瓷出土甚少。重要者只有明定陵（神宗墓）中出土的一件花觚（見英文簡介插圖），但這至少證明了這一類觚形器至遲在萬曆年間已有生產，而且爲宮廷所採用。在外國則有些十八世紀的收藏目錄可供參考，可以知道清代德化外銷瓷的主要品種，偶然有些器物則可以用其他條件來輔助斷代工作。例如明末德化窯曾生產瓷簫笛，頗引起當時文人的注意<sup>(8)</sup>。傳世的德化笛子，可以從它的基音的音高來斷定是明或清代所製。總的來說，德化瓷的斷代遠不如景德鎮瓷那樣有一定的規律，這目錄內所定的展品年限也只好放寬。有一部份展品只定爲明或清代而不再細分。

德化窯在中國陶瓷史上有很高的地位，但現時我們對德化窯的認識還是不夠全面，以後進一步的研究，有賴於學者和陶人的共同努力，以期獲得更確實的知識，並更能適當地接受和發揮這一個工藝傳統。

## 參考書目

- ① 見Van Orsay de Flines, E. W., *Gids voor de Keramische Verzameling*. Batavia, 1949 (English edition, 1969) Plates 32, 33.  
Locsin, Leandro and Cecilia, *Oriental Ceramics discovered in the Philippines*, Tokyo, 1967.
- ② 陳萬里、馮先銘：“故宮博物院十年來對古窯址的調查”《故宮博物院院刊》第二期，北京，1960。  
廈門大學人類博物館：“德化屈斗宮窯址的調查發現”《文物》1965·2。
- ③ 陳懋仁《泉南雜誌》
- ④ 高振西《福建永春德化大田三縣地質礦產》（宋伯胤《談德化窯》引。見《文參》1955年四期。）
- ⑤ 王調馨《德化之瓷業》，1936年福建協和大學福建文化研究會出版。
- ⑥ 參看《中國的瓷器》第一篇第二章；和周仁、李家治著“中國歷代名窯陶瓷工藝的初步科學總結”（《考古學報》1960年一期）
- ⑦ 參看葉喆民《中國古陶瓷科學淺說》41—48頁。1960，北京輕工業出版社。
- ⑧ 周亮工《閩小記》下卷載：“德化瓷簫笛，色瑩白，式亦精好，但累百枝，無一二合調者。合則聲淒朗，遠出竹上。”

# INTRODUCTION

The particular porcelain which is the subject of this exhibition has been variously known in the past in China as *Fu Yao* (福窑), *Chien-yao* (建窑) and *Te-hua Yao* (德化窑). The first two names are derived from the name of the province, Fukien, in which the Te-hua district (*hsien* 縣) is situated, but the term *Chien Yao* also applies to a distinctively different product of another district of Fukien, that is to say the "hare's-fur" glazed tea-bowls of Chien-yang. The term *Fu-yao* seems always to have applied to the wares from Te-hua but it still suffers from being too general. In the west, this ware has been known as *blanc de Chine*, and sometimes as *Te-hua*. The meaning of "blanc de Chine" is, of course even more generally embracing than "Chien-yao" or "Fu Yao". Even if it has the sanction of a long period of usage it is liable to confuse the uninitiated. It also causes difficulties in definition when one is referring to earlier wares made in Te-hua before exports to Europe began in the seventeenth century. For the sake of clarity, the name Te-hua is used in this catalogue.

In spite of the confusion of names few observers will fail to recognise a piece of Te-hua, old or new, once they have been shown an example. Te-hua ware owes its distinctive quality to the clay in and near Te-hua from which the porcelain is made. Analyses of the clay used in Te-hua in the present day as well as samples of Sung and Ming Te-hua ware all show that the clay has a high alkali content. This is perhaps the chief cause for the porcelain to vitrify at a lower temperature than that of the porcelain of Ching-te-chen, and the wares of the Te-hua may be classified as "soft porcelain". The physical characteristics of this ware is that it tends to warp during firing and it scratches easily in use. One way of minimising unwanted changes of shape during firing is to increase the thickness of walls of the vessels. This measure is especially necessary in the case of figures – which often

show "firing cracks" on the inside of the thick walls. On the other hand, because the porcelain is completely vitrified, the surface takes on a most attractive liquid quality which is enhanced by the air bubbles trapped in the glaze giving it a pearly sheen.

The high plasticity of Te-hua clay lends itself to moulding as a means of shaping. Students of Te-hua porcelain have often remarked upon the fact that early Te-hua pieces are often moulded as opposed to being thrown, even in the case of circular vases or bowls which might have been more effectively and efficiently formed on the wheel. The use of moulding as the chief shaping process also explains why there are relatively few circular forms in the repertory of Te-hua wares.

The decoration techniques are also to a certain extent conditioned by the properties of the clay. The most commonly employed means of decorating Te-hua wares are moulding and applique, both of which are particularly suited to working with a plastic clay. Moulded designs on the earliest wares are distinguished by very fine freely-drawn lines engraved into the mould giving the effect of decorating by "slip-painting" on the plain surface. Moulding is the most persistently used technique throughout the entire history of the ware, whereas the applied technique was mainly used in the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries. Incised designs were also popular in the seventeenth century, the decoration being floral in the late Ming and mostly calligraphic in the early Ching. Piercing does not agree particularly well with Te-hua clay and probably was not employed as a decorating technique until well into the Ching period.

Underglaze decoration is known both from surviving examples and in the form of sherds found at the old kiln sites, but it probably began only towards the end of the Ming period. All the underglaze decorated sherds illustrated in the kiln investigation reports look late eighteenth century at the earliest. How-



ever, the fact that Te-hua produced any blue and white at all seems to have been largely forgotten in recent times. Sung Po-yin<sup>1</sup>\*, who has written the most comprehensive report on the Te-hua kilns so far, remarks that it is curious that there should be almost no existing record of Te-hua blue and white. The brush pot (No. 53) in the exhibition is the more rare because it is neither underglaze red or blue. The shape of the pot and the style of the brush work suggests an early Kang-hsi date.

Again, overglaze enamel decoration seemed to have begun during the Ming/Ching transitional period, judging from surviving examples. It is interesting to note that Wang T'iao-hsing<sup>1</sup> reported in 1936 that a certain amount of overglaze decoration was still carried out at Te-hua at the time.

The Te-hua potters are justly famous for the invention of the so-called "climbing down-drought kiln". It consists of a series of five to ten inter-connecting chambers built on an incline of 15 to 20°. This is a development of the "dragon kiln" widely used in South China from an undetermined early date and was especially popular in the Sung and Yuan periods. The celadons of Chekiang, for example, were all fired in dragon kilns up to the Yuan period, as have been shown by excavations at Lung-chuan. Until recently the dragon kiln was used at Shek-wan, the famous pottery at Fu-shan, Kwangtung, and there survives in Castle Peak in Hong Kong today a small dragon kiln built after the Shek-wan model. The climbing down-drought kiln, or the stepped kiln (or the "egg-shaped" kiln, as it is sometimes called in China), retains all the advantages of the dragon kiln such as simplicity in construction, a relatively even distribution of temperature within the kiln and a large capacity which reduces the cost of production. The major additional advantage of the stepped kiln is a more easily controlled reduction atmosphere resulting in greater uniformity in the quality of the products. The stepped kiln was subsequently adopted by many potteries in Fukien, Hunan, Kiangsi and Southwest China, and remains in use in these areas even today. The large scale brick kilns operating in Hong Kong today is basically of this same construction, although it is com-

monly known in the trade as the "Taiwan" kiln, probably because it has been introduced from Taiwan. The design of Japanese kilns is also greatly influenced by the stepped kiln of Te-hua. Because of its wide occurrence this kiln is often referred to in general books on pottery kiln as the "typical Far-eastern climbing down-drought kiln".

The date of the invention of the stepped kiln is not exactly known. The normally reliable and exact Chou Jen<sup>2</sup> simply states that it came into existence in Ming/Ching, and the investigators have so far found no kiln structure in Ming or earlier sites in Te-hua. However, if one may associate the quality of the porcelain with kiln design, then one can postulate that the stepped kiln probably began at the turn of the sixteenth century — as the quality of Te-hua wares become noticeably better at this time. This improvement can be demonstrated by two pieces in the exhibition: a tripod incense burner with a "dropped base" (No. 35) and a covered box (No. 3). The former is dressed in an uneven warm-coloured "Ting-type" glaze and can be dated to the early fifteenth century on account of its form (the constricted mouth, "dropped base" and animal mask legs) which can be compared to celadon pieces of the early Ming period. The latter is in a uniform liquid white glaze and can be dated to the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century by its potting and the vertical ribbing on the sides which is characteristic of Te-hua pieces of that period. The improvement in the quality of the porcelain must have occurred over some time in the second half of the fifteenth century — point to an advance in firing methods and perhaps improved kiln design.

It has been generally believed that Ming pieces display a warm pinkish colour by transmitted light while Ching pieces are white. This "rule" is much frowned upon nowadays but is perhaps not entirely untrue. A series of colour slides were taken at the Art Gallery of a selected group of Te-hua pieces (from the present exhibition) by both reflected and transmitted light under the same conditions. These show clearly that:

- (1) the pink colour of Te-hua porcelain by transmitted light is a property of

\* Numerals refer to the bibliography at the end of the Introduction.

the glaze. Where the body is exposed on both surfaces, such as the base of covered boxes and some incense burners, the colour is always white.

- (2) Pink patches are not related to the thickness of the glaze.
- (3) The incidence of pink colour is higher among pieces of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is rarely observed in either very early or modern pieces.
- (4) On earlier pieces the pink colour by transmitted light is not uniformly distributed over the surface even if the colour is quite uniform by reflected light. By the early eighteenth century the colour, whether pink or white, is more uniform by both reflected and transmitted light.

These pink patches are probably caused by a higher concentration of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  ions over  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  ions in the glaze. Yeh Che-min<sup>3</sup> asserts in a very general way that the atmosphere in Te-hua kilns in the mid-Ming period was oxidising, thus giving rise to  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  ions. This seems to be corroborated by the results of the analyses of the glazes of samples of early Te-hua ware at the Research Institute of Silicate Chemistry and Technology, Academia Sinica<sup>4</sup>. The Ming sample showed a higher percentage of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  than  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$ , whereas the glaze of a "Sung" Te-hua bowl contained only  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  ions. Needless to say, further analysis of more examples must be done before firm conclusions are drawn. Perhaps Mossbauer spectroscopy would be the best method for this study (of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}/\text{Fe}^{3+}$  ratio and the environments of the ions).

The exact beginning of Te-hua pottery is as problematic as the beginning of the stepped kiln. While Chinese investigators all declare the earliest type of Te-hua to be Sung, art historians in the west generally believe the same type of ware, excavated in large numbers in the Philippines and Indonesia along with the "early blue and white", to be Yuan. At the same time most catalogues list certain types of celadons found together with these early Te-hua's and blue and whites as Sung. While the archaeological evidence is not conclusive,

a late Sung date would agree well with the historical records on the flourishing trade between the Fukien coast and the Philippines in late Sung times. However, this is minor point and sooner or later we shall know the answer for sure. What is well established by both archaeologists and historians is that the earliest wares of Te-hua were mainly produced for the export trade. The forms of such pieces were singularly limited. Circular boxes, straight edge circular dishes and some dishes moulded in the shape of a wooden tub comprise the major part of the repertory. Throughout the fifteenth century, covered boxes and bowls remained the most common forms although the quality of the glaze continued to improve and gradually took on a warmer tone – as previously discussed. Then came the change in the trade pattern in South-east Asia with the coming of Europeans in the sixteenth century. The overseas market for Te-hua weakened temporarily and this coincided with what is known amongst contemporary historians in China as the period of incipient capitalism in the Chiang-nan area. The economic prosperity, combined with the long traditions of scholarly and artistic activities in this area, resulted in a great flourishing of every form of art from calligraphy and paintings to decorative objects fashioned out of a great variety of materials – with the cities of the lower Yangtze valley as the centres of activity. The potters of Te-hua, having participated in the earlier overseas trade boom and having themselves perhaps acquired some of the tastes of the incipient bourgeoisie now turned their attention to the production of finer articles to suit the tastes of the well-to-do home market – in the Chiang-nan area. This resulted in the creation of one of the most attractive groups of porcelain ever produced in the history of Chinese ceramics. The characteristics of this group may be described as "restrained baroque" and "creative archaism". These seemingly contradictory descriptions happen to fit the spirit of the age which was indeed full of contradictions. Exhibits 54 and 55 serve to illustrate. No one would deny that these articles for the scholar's table are elegant and tasteful objects, but there are elements of

extravagance in the disposition of the bodies of the dragons on top of the seals and in the folds of the Bodhidharma on the desk screen. In spirit one might compare such objects to the paintings of Chen Hung-shou and others like him in the seventeenth century. The creative archaism is illustrated by an incense burner (No. 43). It is made to look like an object of antiquity, but of course no person in antiquity would even imagine using, let alone making, an object like this. Thus the description of creative archaism may seem to fit the case. In a way, the two characteristics of this style are really one. One may say that the archaic elements in this ceramic composition provides the restraint to the almost over-inventive imagination of the potter resulting in tendencies towards the baroque. Exhibit No. 40 illustrates both characteristics well. Its basic outline is simple but not uncomplicated in parts, it suggests antiquity but in the spirit of the late Ming. Sometimes the restraint is the stronger element, as in the two wine pots (Nos. 33, 34), and sometimes the restraint is complete as in the case of the bottle (No. 23) which approximates to the great expression of Chinese ceramic art in the late Sung. Sometimes the archaism is pure, as in the case of this *Ku*-shaped vase (No. 24). That these objects, in particular the *ku*-shaped vase, were made in the Wan-li period is confirmed by the find of a *ku*-shaped vase (see Figure) in the tomb of Emperor Shen-tsung.

Apart from these tasteful objects the Te-hua potters began in the late Ming to make figures of popular deities, Buddhist or otherwise (Nos. 74, 75). Stylistically the late Ming Te-hua porcelain figures are closely related to those carved in wood, bamboo and ivory. On the other hand, there was relatively little change in the style and treatment of these figures until well into the eighteenth century. The method of construction was to mould or sculpt individual parts such as heads, bodies and hands separately and then assemble them before glazing. Again this technique persisted to at least the middle of the Ching dynasty. The dating of Te-hua figures is further complicated by the persistent use of signatures, in seal or written form, of famous potters who lived in



插图：明定陵出土白瓷花瓶

*Figure: Ku-shaped white Vase found in the tomb of Emperor Shen-Tsung of Ming.*

the late Ming and early Ching periods.

Some of the "archaistic" elements in the decorative motifs commonly used in late Ming times were inherited, perhaps without break, from Yuan times. Such elements are the elephant trunks in No. 40 and the "lion mask" in Nos. 36-38. The latter is found on the sides of incense burners of the Yuan period, which has its ancestry in the circular "monster masks" on sixth century Buddhist sculptures (as discussed by Wai-kam Ho<sup>6</sup>) rather than the "p'u-shou" masks holding ring handles on vessels of the Han period. This mask was re-introduced into China during the Yuan period and has remained ever since after being transformed into the "lion mask".

Another point of interest regarding the incense burners such as Nos. 37, 38 is that it is on such censers that the marks of Hsuan-te and Cheng-hua most often appear. Although

most of them must have been made in the late Ming and early Ching periods, the question must remain that some of them may be of the period of the mark, or, at least, they were made from Hsuan-te "proto-types" — as is the case with bronze incense burners.

As, in the figures, the early Ching shapes of Te-hua vessels are difficult to distinguish from those of the late Ming, especially as there is hardly any difference in quality. It is not until the eighteenth century that new forms begin to emerge making it possible to date certain types with greater accuracy. A pair of small cups in the exhibition (No. 12) can be compared with the form of many monochrome cups of the Yung-cheng period, and the incense burner (No. 50) can similarly be judged to be eighteenth century by its shape and the mark of "Hsuan-te" which is in a Ching style of seal script. The vase (No. 32) whose form is determined by decorative rather than functional considerations may also be taken to be of an eighteenth century date on account of this characteristic as well as the quality of the glaze. Ching archaism can be distinguished from Ming archaism in that it is neither creative or restrained. Further it often shows a remarkable lack of sensitivity to the aesthetic quality of the objects copied even if it is more "accurate" in certain details (No. 44).

It remains to reiterate that most dates attributed to Te-hua wares of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries are by no means certain. Although the work of P.J. Donnelly<sup>3</sup> has considerably advanced our knowledge of Te-hua wares and their dating, especially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, many problems still remain. Until more accurate information is obtained from excavations at the kilns, there is still plenty of scope for analytical and comparative studies on Te-hua porcelain.

J.C.Y. WATT  
Curator

**Note.** This introduction is a revised version of a paper delivered to the Hong Kong Oriental Ceramic Society in March, 1976

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Sung Pai-yin  
宋伯胤  
"On the kilns of Te-hua", WWTCTL, 1955. 4.  
pp. 55-71 (English translation in P.J. Donnelly  
"Blanc de Chine" pp. 304-321.)
- (2) Chou Jen and Li Chia-chih.  
周仁 李家治  
"An Investigation on the Technical Aspects of  
Ancient Chinese Ceramics". Kaogu Xuebao,  
1960 1, pp. 89-104. — eight plates.
- (3) Donnelly, P.J.  
"Blanc de Chine". London, 1969, pp. 38-39.
- (4) Wang T'iao-hsing.  
王調鼎  
"The Pottery Industry of Tehua" Fukien Christian  
University, 1936.
- (5) Yeh Che-min.  
葉喆民  
A Simple Account of the Science of Ancient  
Chinese Pottery Ceramics (Chung-kuo Ku T'ao-  
tsu K'e-hsueh Ch'ien-shuo).  
中國古陶瓷科學淺說
- (6) Ho Wai-kam.  
Notes on Chinese Sculpture from Northern Ch'i  
to Sui. Part 1. Archives of Asian Art, No. 22  
(1968-69), pp. 6-55.

# 目錄

## 蓋盒

1. 印花「一把蓮」紋蓋盒 元—明初  
徑：10.5公分
2. 印花牡丹楞紋蓋盒 中明  
徑：15公分
3. 印花牡丹楞紋蓋盒 中明  
徑：13公分
15. 八角劃花水仙三友紋刻字杯 清初  
徑：10公分
16. 八角貼花八仙小杯 清初  
徑：9.5公分  
底「梅花」款

## 盤・碗・杯

4. 印花淺碗 元  
徑：10.5公分
5. 素身淺碗 元  
徑：19公分
6. 印花纏枝紋小碗 早明  
徑：10公分
7. 劃花折枝牡丹紋大盤 明末  
徑：34公分
8. 素身盤 清初  
徑：20公分
9. 劃花牡丹紋碗 明末清初  
徑：16公分  
底「清製」款
10. 撇口大洗子 早清  
徑：24公分
11. 弦紋高足杯 明  
高：13.3公分
12. 球形小杯一對 清，雍正乾隆間  
徑：8公分
13. 素身小碗一對 清，雍正乾隆間  
徑：7公分
14. 暗花八角形小杯一對 底回紋 清初  
徑：6.3公分
17. 荔枝小把杯 晚明  
長：7.5公分
18. 鳳頭小匙羹 晚明  
長：9.3公分
19. 貼梅花玉蘭犀角形杯 清初  
長：13.5公分
20. 貼梅花小杯 清初  
長：8公分
21. 貼花犀角形杯 清初  
長：14公分
- 瓶・觚・壺
22. 雙獸耳瓶 明末  
高：18.5公分
23. 素身一統瓶 明末清初  
高：18.5公分
24. 劃花纏枝花卉紋觚 晚明  
高：22公分
25. 刻字劃花瓶 清，十八世紀  
高：21.5公分
26. 素身六角小瓶一對 清  
高：13公分
27. 素身膽瓶 清  
高：32公分
28. 貼花螭虎紋小膽瓶 清，雍正、乾隆間  
高：11公分

29. 貼花梅花紋小膽瓶 清初  
高：10.5公分
30. 螭虎翻口瓶 清，乾隆、嘉慶間  
高：16.5公分
31. 方耳雙環扁肚瓶 清，十八世紀  
高：13.5公分
32. 如意耳雙環瓶 清，十八世紀  
高：18.5公分
33. 茄形刻字劃花壺 早清  
高：13公分  
「宣德」劃款
34. 荷花蓋鈕龍把壺 晚明  
高：16公分

### 薰・爐

35. 獸足突底爐 早明  
徑：15公分
36. 雙獸耳爐 明末清初  
徑：13.5公分  
底「文榮」款
37. 雙獸耳爐 明末清初  
徑：13.5公分  
底「成化」六字款
38. 雙獸耳爐 明末清初  
徑：13公分  
底「宣德」六字款
39. 雙耳獸足鼎爐 清初  
高：12.3公分
40. 天官耳象足六角爐 晚明  
高：12.5公分
41. 雙耳印花夔龍雷紋鼎 明末清初  
高：23.5公分
42. 雙獸耳印花夔龍雷紋爐 明末清初  
長：17公分  
底「成化」款
43. 雙耳獸足貼花螭曲紋簋形爐 明  
長：20公分

44. 雙獸耳夔龍紋簋形爐 清，乾隆或以後  
長：22.5公分
45. 如意耳印花八角簋爐 清中葉  
高：12公分
46. 刻花竹石牡丹三足圓爐 早清  
高：11公分
47. 刻銘文鉢 早清  
徑：13.5公分
48. 戟耳扁爐 清，雍正、乾隆間  
徑：13.5公分
49. 印花雷紋雙綢耳三足爐 清初  
徑：8.5公分
50. 雙綢耳三足爐 清，乾隆  
徑：10公分  
底「宣德」款
51. 象耳三足爐 清，雍正、乾隆間  
長：12.5公分
52. 印花八角四系薰爐 清  
高：13公分

### 文房・雜器

53. 釉下彩山水筆筒 早清  
高：13公分
54. 螭虎鈕印章一對 晚明  
高：5.5公分
55. 達摩渡江案屏 晚明  
高：9.5公分  
左上印「德化壽山」款
56. 小硯 清  
長：8公分
57. 筆山水注 清初  
長：9.5公分
58. 蟹形花插水注 清  
長：15公分
59. 梅花螃蟹洗 晚明  
長：7公分

60. 秋葉形洗 早清  
長：14公分
61. 童子捧葫蘆形水注 明  
高：9公分
62. 童子騎象水注 晚明  
長：8.5公分
63. 鵝形水注 明  
高：9.5公分
64. 蹲踞麒麟 晚明  
高：5.5公分
65. 圓形小水丞 中明  
徑：7公分
66. 印花楞紋小瓶 明中晚期  
高：6.5公分
67. 印花楞紋小蓋罐 清，雍正、乾隆間  
高：6.5公分
68. 印花仰覆蓮瓣楞紋三層罐 晚明  
高：11公分
69. 直方耳六角小杯 明，嘉靖、萬曆間  
長：6公分
70. 方口小雀食 清，雍正、乾隆間  
長：4.5公分
71. 印花仿銅大爵杯 清  
高：30公分
72. 印花八寶紋小爵杯一對 晚明至清初  
長：9.5公分
73. 印花仿銅盅 晚明  
長：14.5公分
76. 降龍羅漢像 晚清  
高：18.5公分  
背鈐「何朝春印」
77. 觀音坐像 清，乾隆  
高：18公分  
背鈐「何朝春」
78. 獅子香插一對 清  
高：18公分

### 塑像

74. 佛立像 晚明  
高：25.6公分
75. 佛立像 晚明  
高：10.5公分

# CATALOGUE

## COVERED BOXES

1. Covered box with moulded decoration of lotus.  
Yuan-early Ming.  
D: 10.5 cm.
2. Covered box with moulded decoration of peonies.  
Mid-Ming, late 15th  
century/early 16th century.  
D: 15cm.
3. Covered box with moulded decoration of peonies.  
Mid-Ming, late 15th  
century/early 16th century.  
D: 13 cm.

## DISHES      BOWLS      CUPS

4. Shallow bowl with moulded floral pattern.  
Yuan.  
D: 10.5 cm.
5. Shallow bowl.  
Yuan.  
D: 19 cm.
6. Small bowl with moulded decoration of floral scrolls.  
Ming, 15th century.  
D: 10 cm.
7. Large dish with incised decoration of peony.  
Late Ming.  
D: 34 cm.
8. Plain dish.  
Early Ch'ing.  
D: 20 cm.
9. Bowl with incised decoration of peonies. Ch'ing-chih mark on base.  
Late Ming to early Ch'ing.  
D: 16 cm.
10. Large dish with wide rim.  
Early Ch'ing.  
D: 24 cm.
11. Stem-cup.  
Ming.  
H: 13.3 cm.
12. Pair of small cups.  
Ch'ing, (first half 18th century).  
D: 8 cm.
13. Pair of small bowls.  
Ch'ing, (first half 18th century).  
D: 7 cm.
14. Pair of octagonal cups with impressed decoration. Lozenge mark on base.  
Early Ch'ing.  
D: 6.3 cm.



15. Cup with incised decoration of pine, bamboo and prunus and inscription incised through the glaze.  
Early Ch'ing.  
D: 10 cm.
16. Octagonal cup with appliqué decoration of the eight immortals, "prunus" mark on base.  
Early Ch'ing.  
D: 9.5 cm.
17. Small cup with twig-handle.  
Late Ming.  
L: 7.5 cm.
18. Small spoon with a phoenix handle.  
Late Ming.  
L: 9.3 cm.
19. Cup in the form of a rhinoceros horn with appliqué decoration of magnolia and prunus.  
Early Ch'ing.  
L: 13.5 cm.
20. Cup in the form of a rhinoceros horn with appliqué decoration of prunus.  
Early Ch'ing.  
L: 8 cm.
21. Cup in the form of a rhinoceros horn with appliqué decoration.  
Early Ch'ing.  
L: 14 cm.

#### **VASES      JARS      BOTTLES**

22. Vase with two monster masks.  
Late Ming.  
H: 18.5 cm.
23. Slender vase.  
Late Ming to early Ch'ing.  
H: 18.5 cm.
24. Ku-beaker with incised floral decoration.  
Ming (late 16th century to early 17th century).  
H: 22 cm.
25. Vase with incised decoration of flowers and a poetic couplet.  
Ch'ing, 18th century.  
H: 21.5 cm.
26. Pair of hexagonal vases.  
Ch'ing.  
H: 13 cm.
27. Large "tan-p'ing" vase.  
Ch'ing.  
H: 32 cm.
28. "Tan-p'ing" vase with appliqué decoration of "chih"-dragon.  
Ch'ing, Early 18th century.  
H: 11 cm.
29. "Tan-p'ing" vase with appliqué decoration of prunus flowers.  
Early Ch'ing.  
H: 10.5 cm.