

*The Classic of Changes. A New Translation of the I Ching as Interpreted by Wang Bi.* Translated by Richard John Lynn. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994. pp. ix, 596. ISBN 0-231- 08294-0.

1994 was the seventieth anniversary of the publication of Richard Wilhelm's (1873–1930) celebrated translation into German of the Chinese classic, the *Yi jing*, under the title, *I Ging, Das Buch der Wandlungen*. In the decades following its publication in Germany, Wilhelm's translation was translated into the major European languages and the English translation by Cary F. Baynes—including a foreword by Carl Gustav Jung (1875–1961)—which appeared in 1949, has had a tremendous influence on the twentieth century Western reader's understanding of the *Yi jing*. The numerous reprints which have been published the last thirty years speak for themselves. Concurrently, a number of other translations of the *Yi jing* have been published or re-issued, most notably perhaps those by James Legge (1814–97) and John Blofeld, but it is fair to say, I think, that none of these rivalled Wilhelm's translation in popularity or perceptiveness. It is also significant that a full translation of the *Yi jing* profiting from the great advances in major sinological disciplines (such as, for example, the studies of the oracle bones of Anyang or the archeological texts of later periods) has not been attempted during this period.

In China Li Jingchi (d. 1968?), Qu Wanli (1907–78), and Gao Heng (1900–86) initiated an approach of context criticism in *Yi jing* studies which views the book in a sociological and historical context. Some Western scholars have continued this approach: in 1974 Gerald W. Swanson (b. 1938) submitted a dissertation, "The Great Treatise: Commentary Tradition to the 'Book of Changes'", to the University of Washington, in which he translated the *Xi ci zhuan*, "The Commentary on the Appended Phrases", basing himself primarily on Han dynasty (202 BC–AD 220) commentators. This trend was taken several steps further by Edward L. Shaughnessy in his study in "textual archeology" in his dissertation, entitled "The Composition of the Zhouyi" from 1983, and by Richard A. Kunst, who translated the older part of the *Yi*

*jing* in his dissertation, “The Original Yijing: A Text, Phonetic Transcription, Translation, and Indexes, With Sample Glosses”, from 1985. More than anything these studies paved the way for an appreciation of the *Yi jing* as a very complex work of literature dating to various periods before the Christian era.

The present new translation by Richard J. Lynn does much the same with regard to the commentary tradition. As is well known, both Wilhelm’s and Legge’s translations are based on the edition compiled on imperial order in 1715, the *Yuzuan Zhou yi zhezong* by Li Guangdi (1642–1718), which in turn is based on the commentaries by Cheng Yi (1033–1107) and Zhu Xi (1130–1200). These commentaries had become orthodox and were thus supposed to represent a perfect timeless interpretation, the so-called “book of wisdom approach” which Wilhelm’s translation subsequently helped to establish in the West.<sup>1</sup> Looking beyond the commentaries by Cheng and Zhu, Lynn says his approach

is entirely different. The commentary of Wang Bi (226–49) is the historical product of a certain time and place—as are those of Cheng Yi and Zhu Xi or anyone else—a product that can tell us much about the development of Chinese intellectual thought during a particularly creative period of the tradition. It stands in great contrast to the later commentaries by the Song Neo-Confucians, the products of a different but equally creative age, and its presentation in the form of an integral English translation—with comparisons with the commentaries of Cheng Yi and Zhu Xi—should, it is hoped, reveal how much variety and vitality traditional Chinese thought could achieve. (p. 8)

Practically all existing editions of the *Yi jing* are based on Wang Bi’s *Zhou yi zhu*, “Commentary on the Changes of the Zhou”. This edition can be traced back through Lu Ji (AD 188–219), Zheng Xuan (AD 127–200), Xun Shuang (AD 128–90), and Ma Rong (AD 79–166) to Fei Zhis’ (c.50 BC–AD 10) *gu wen* (old text) edition. At the Imperial Academy of the Western Han the *jin wen* (new text) edition of Shi Chou (1st cent. BC), Meng Xi (1st cent. BC), Liangqiu He (1st cent. BC), and Jing Fang (77–37 BC) was taught, and this was ultimately the edition that was carved on stone during the Xiping reign period (AD 172–8). These steles were lost in the turmoil following the collapse of the Han Empire, and although the texts of Jing Fang and Meng Xi survived into

---

<sup>1</sup> The “book of wisdom” tradition may have found its new authoritative translation in the joint efforts of Rudolf Ritsema and Stephen Karcher: *I Ching. The Classic Chinese Oracle of Change: The Divinatory Texts with Concordance*, Shaftesbury, Dorset: Element Books, 1994, pp. 816. This translation has also appeared as Vols. 62–4 (1993–5) of the *Eranos Yearbook*. In the introduction Ritsema and Karcher state, “The *I Ching* offers a way to see into difficult situations, particularly those emotionally charged ones where rational knowledge fails us, yet we are called upon to decide and act. ... The *I Ching* is able to do this because it is an oracle” (p. 8).

the Sui dynasty (581–618), the *jin wen* tradition was discontinued during the third century AD. Since Wang Bi did not write a commentary on all of the Ten Wings, Han Kangbo's (d. c. AD 385) commentary on the *Xi ci zhuan*, the *Shuo gua*, the *Xu gua*, and the *Za gua*, is included in the *Zhou yi zheng yi*, "The Correct Meaning of the Changes of the Zhou", by Kong Yingda (574–648). Lynn describes Kong Yingda's commentary as "largely a subcommentary to Wang's *Zhouyi zhu*" (p. 5).

Lynn's translation is based on *Wang Bijijiaoshi*, 2 vols., ed. by Lou Yulie (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1980), which, in addition to Wang Bi's commentaries on the *Yi jing* and the *Lao zi* as well as fragments of his notes on the *Lun yu*, contains the biography of Wang Bi by He Shao of the Jin dynasty (265–420) and Wang Bi's famous essay on the *Yi jing*, the *Zhou yi lie li*, "General Remarks on the Changes of the Zhou". Lynn has translated both He Shao's biography in the introduction (pp. 10–14) and Wang's general remarks as an introduction to the complete *Yi jing* translation (pp. 25–46, including notes).

The arrangement of the translation of the *Yi jing* includes both the texts of the sixty-four hexagrams and the Ten Wings in a sequence that differs from all existing editions. The translation commences with the *Xi ci zhuan*, "Commentary on the Appended Phrases", and notes (pp. 47–101; all translations are Lynn's unless otherwise noted), followed by the *Xu gua*, "Providing the Sequence of the Hexagrams", and notes (pp. 103–12), the *Za gua*, "The Hexagrams in Irregular Order", and notes (pp. 119–26), and *Shuo gua*, "Explaining the Hexagrams", and notes (pp. 119–26). These Wings are here presented as introductory reading to both the texts of the sixty-four hexagrams, which they usually follow, and to Wang Bi's interpretations of these texts.

The relevant paragraphs of these Wings are repeated as commentaries under each hexagram in the central part of the translation, "The Sixty-Four Hexagrams, with Texts and Commentaries" (pp. 127–551). Thus, for example, hexagram no. 43, Guai (and not Kuai as Lynn has it!), starts with the hexagram text known as the *Tuan*, "Judgment" which is followed by the "Commentary on the Judgments" (*Tuan zhuan*), the "Commentary on the Images" (*Da xiang zhuan*), the "Commentary on the Appended Phrases" (*Xi ci zhuan*), "Providing the Sequence of the Hexagrams" (*Xu gua*), and "The Hexagrams in Irregular Order" (*Za gua*). Only then comes the text belonging to the first line of the hexagram-introduced as "First Yan"-followed by the "Commentary on the Images" (*Xiao xiang zhuan*), etc. This composition, repetitive though it may be, conveniently brings together the different interpretations of the various Wings, which are clearly printed in separate paragraphs headed by captions in uppercase letters.

The commentaries by Wang Bi and Han Kangbo are interspersed among the various texts mentioned above, but although these commentaries are enclosed in braces and printed in a slightly different font it is often difficult

to distinguish between the main text and commentary, especially when one wants to carry out a quick check on the translation of a certain passage. It would have been a great help to the reader if text and commentary had been as clearly separated as the different Wings. Most of the sixty-four hexagram chapters are followed by 1–2 pages of Lynn’s own notes in small print. In these notes one will also find paragraphs translated from the commentaries by Kong Yingda, Cheng Yi, and Zhu Xi, where these differ substantially from Wang Bi’s.

The book concludes with a short (in this reviewer’s opinion, too short) bibliography (pp. 553–6), a glossary which translates Chinese terms and gives the Chinese characters (pp. 557–74), a list of proper names (including Chinese characters), explanations, and dates (pp. 575–80), and, finally, an index (pp. 581–96). The latter is devised so that it enables the reader to look up topics such as, e.g., “body parts”.

General reading has not revealed any major flaws in the translation, which seems to be perfectly sound. However, on closer inspection one may find a number of minor inaccuracies. Thus, in the translation of the *Xi ci* on p. 51, the two sentences, “Arouse means ‘to move.’ Thus to be moved so as to be without blame is inherent in the remorse one feels for one’s mistakes” (lines 18–20), appear to be part of the text of the *Xi ci*, whereas they are actually Han Kangbo’s commentary (cf. Lou Yulie, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 539). On p. 53, at the beginning of paragraph 5, there is no brace indicating where Han Kangbo’s commentary begins. Still, these are trivial matters.

It is Lynn’s introduction that attracts the more serious objections. On p. 2 of his introduction, he states,

Each hexagram is accompanied by a hexagram name (*guaming*), a hexagram statement (*guaci*) or “Judgment” (*tuan*) and line statements (*yaoci*) for each of the six lines. The line statements have a sequential or associational organization based on the general topic given in the Judgment; each states a specific, differentiated instance or variation of the topic. ...

This is simply not the case, which becomes very obvious if one consults the tabulations of these texts in Gao Heng, *Zhou yi gu jing tong shuo* (Xianggang: Zhonghua Shuju, 1963, 1983), pp. 12–15, 18–36, and 49–86. The way the hexagram names are related to the hexagram statements (or judgments) on the one hand, and to the line statements on the other brings out the difference between these two sets of text. In the majority of the cases there are no connections between the hexagram statements and the hexagram names, whereas the opposite holds true for the relationship between the line statements and the hexagram names. In forty-eight of the sixty-four hexagram chapters the name of the hexagram (which frequently suggests the topic) is commented upon in at least three line-texts. So it would be more correct to say that the line statements are variations of the topics

suggested by the hexagram names and not some “general topic given in the Judgment.”

Furthermore, the fact that the hexagram statements and the line statements do not have much in common is so obvious that from very early on it was incorporated in the traditional account of the origin of the *Yi jing*: Fu Xi created the diagrams, King Wen added the hexagram statements, the duke of Zhou added the line statements, and Confucius authored the Ten Wings (cf., e.g., Iulian K. Shchutskii, *Researches on the I Ching*, Moscow, 1960; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979, p. 133). Lynn is, of course, familiar with this account and he refers to it on p. 4, but evidently he fails to see the significance of a multi-author tradition that reflects an early awareness of the textual differences. This is also mirrored in those Wings that comment on the hexagram and line statements. It has long been recognized that the *Xiang zhuan*, The Commentary on the Images, the two chapters of which make up the third and fourth Wings, divides into two entirely different texts: The *Da xiang zhuan*, The Commentary on the Great Images, which comments on the hexagram statements (or Judgments), and the *Xiao xiang zhuan*, The Commentary on the Small Images, which comment on the line statements. Lynn does mention that “the Judgments have ‘Great Images’” and “the line statements have ‘Little Images’” (p. 2), but he does not elaborate on the distinction between the two, and throughout his translation Lynn renders both in English as “Commentary on the Images.”

Still on p. 2 of the introduction, Lynn writes, “the names and statements probably date from the ninth century B.C.—the hexagrams themselves may be much older—and constitute the first layer ....” It seems that the hexagrams as we know them, i.e. solid and broken lines in groups of six, are a comparatively late invention which may have been triggered by the meeting between the ancient divination method and the later *yin yang* cosmology of the Ten Wings or similar texts. Archeological evidence predating the Qin dynasty suggests that numerals in groups of six may well have been the predecessors of the hexagrams, as Zhang Zhenglang suggested in his pioneering article, “Shi shi chu qingtongqi mingwen zhong de Yi gua”, (1980), *Kaogu xuebao* 4pp. 403–15. Although Lynn refers to the “more recent advance in archaeology, paleography, and textual studie” (p. 4), he does not seem to relate that in any way to the hexagrams. Thus it remains unclear if he thinks that the hexagrams as we know them today date back to before the ninth century BC or whether he is in fact referring to the numerals found on early shells and bones.

At the bottom of p. 2 the following statement commences:

All Ten Wings are traditionally attributed to Confucius (551–479 B.C.); however, individual Wings actually date from different periods, with some predating his time while others date as late as the third century B.C. Only the Commentaries on the Judgments and

Commentaries on the Images, which for the most part seem to date from the sixth or fifth century B.C., appear to have been the direct product of Confucius' school, if not the work of Confucius himself. The remaining Ten Wings [sic] consist of later materials, which may contain some reworking of earlier writings—even from before Confucius's time.

Today not many scholars who have familiarized themselves with the *Yi jing* tradition would maintain that any of the Ten Wings predate the traditional dates of Confucius, let alone consider them to be the work of Confucius himself. The tradition linking Confucius with the *Yi jing* is a very shaky one that may have originated in the late third century BC or later.

With reference to the eighth Wing, the *Shu gua*, “Explaining the Trigrams”, Lynn says that much of the explanations of the trigrams is “couched in terms of yin-yang dualism and the theory of the *wuxing* (five elements)...” (p. 3). Notwithstanding the fact that strictly speaking, the concepts of *yin* and *yang* do not constitute a dualism, there is no evidence of the theory of the five elements or phases in the Ten Wings.<sup>2</sup> Except for the first three paragraphs, the *Shuo gua* is basically a tabulation of the eight trigrams and their various correlations, and it is a common misconception that the five elements are among the correlations mentioned. In *Science and Civilisation in China*, Vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), Joseph Needham tabulated the correlations to the eight trigrams, and in column 7 he listed the five elements, but there is, in fact, not much textual evidence for this. The correlate to the trigram *Kun* is said to be earth, which is a translation of *di*, whereas earth of the five elements is *tu*. The correlate to *Zhen* is said to be wood but the closest the *Shuo gua* comes to that is *cang lang zhu*, “green bamboo shoot”. The correlate to *Gen* is also said to be wood, but the *Shuo gua* merely says *guo lao*, “fruit of trees and plants”, and *qi yu mu ye*, “as to its [i.e. *Gen*'s] [relationship] to trees, it is those with many joints”. Finally, the correlates to *Dui* are said to be both water and metal, but there is absolutely nothing in the *Shuo gua* that may warrant such a statement. It is also, I think, significant that none of the Han commentators cited by Li Dingzuo in the *Zhou yijijie* finds references to the five elements in the *Shuo gua*.

As has become customary, Lynn refers to the Wing known as the *Wen yan zhuan*, “Commentary on the Words of the Text”, as one or more “fragments of an apparently lost commentary on the hexagrams as a whole” (p. 3) because

---

<sup>2</sup> The five phases do occur in one of the texts accompanying the Mawangdui silk manuscript of the *Zhou yi*. In a passage reminiscent of the *Xi ci*, part 2, paragraph 8, the five phases are introduced into cosmological speculations involving *yin* and *yang* as well as the eight trigrams; see, e.g., Chen Songchang and Liao Mingchun, “Bo shu *Er san zi wen*, *Yi zhi yi*, *Yao shi wen*”, Mawangdui boshu zhuanhao, ed. Chen Guying, Daojia wenhua yanjiu, Vol. 3, Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 1993, pp. 434f.

it only comments on the first two hexagrams of the *Yi jing* in the present edition, *Qian* and *Kun*. In the light of the special positions these two hexagrams came to occupy during the Han dynasty as the paragons of *yin* and *yang*, it may be worthwhile considering the possibility that the *Wen yan zhuan* was never intended to be a commentary on all sixty-four hexagrams.

Finally, the section “How to Form a Hexagram: The Yarrow Stalk Method” in the Introduction (pp. 19–21), which supposedly follows Zhu Xi’s reconstruction of a method explained in an enigmatic passage of the *Xi ci*, is unnecessarily complicated and leaves the reader somewhat confused. Admittedly, the numerology of the *Yi jing* is at times difficult, bordering on the incomprehensible, but Lynn is not exactly trying to help or explain when, for example, he states, “If the first set results in a 5 (which becomes a 4, with a value of 3)...” (p. 20). I shall return to this statement shortly; meanwhile, it is generally recognized that the *Xi ci* passage on which Zhu Xi’s reconstruction is based, translates something like the following:

The number of the Great Expansion is fifty; of these forty-nine are used. [These forty-nine] are divided into two to represent two. Suspend one in order to represent three. Draw them (i.e. the yarrow stalks) by [groups of] four to represent the four seasons. Go back to the remainder [and place this in] the space between the fingers in order to represent the intercalary [months]. In five years there are two intercalations, therefore twice [return the remainder to] the space between the fingers and afterwards suspend [these; i.e. the stalks placed between the fingers].

(*Xi ci* 1.8)

This is usually understood to be a description of the diviner’s manipulation of the yarrow stalks in the process of obtaining a hexagram figure. The number of stalks to be used is fifty, of which one is immediately discarded. The remaining forty-nine are randomly divided into two bundles. From one of these bundles one stalk is removed to be held in one hand, and the remaining stalks in the bundle are counted through in groups of four until there is a remainder of one, two, three or four sticks, which are held in the hand together with the one stalk picked up earlier. The second bundle is likewise counted through in groups of four and the remainder of one, two, three or four is placed with the stalks picked up earlier. What has just been described constitutes the first of three counting operations necessary for obtaining one line of a hexagram. The stalks that have been picked up are put aside, whereas those remaining on the table are rebundled so the second operation may commence. The second and third counting operations proceed just like the first, except that initially one stalk is not picked up to be held in the hand (as Lynn has it; see his “Operation two”, p. 20).

So far most commentators and translators agree. It is when it comes to translating these operations into numbers that may be applied to the lines

of a hexagram that disagreement occurs. From the *Qian zuo du*, one of the apocryphal commentaries on the *Yi jing* from the first century AD, it is evident that a broken *yin* line of a hexagram corresponds either to the number six (in which case the line is said to be “old” or “changing”) or the number eight (in which case it is “young” or “static”), and the line corresponds to the number nine (“old” or “changing”) and the number seven (“young” or “static”). Zhu Xi’s reconstruction of the divination procedure as detailed above seeks to bridge the gap between the results of the manipulations of the yarrow stalks and the numbers the *Qian zuo du* correlates to the hexagram lines. In the first counting operation, the number of stalks picked up may be either nine or five, i.e. first one stalk is picked up and then the remainders of the two bundles are added. If the remainder of the first bundle is one, the remainder of the second bundle will be three; if the remainder of the first bundle is two, the remainder of the second bundle will be two; and if the remainder of the first bundle is three, the remainder of the second bundle will be one. Thus in those cases the remainders will add up to four plus the one stalk initially picked up. If the remainder of the first bundle is four, the remainder of the second bundle is also four, in which case the remainders will add up to eight plus the one stalk initially picked up. For the second and third counting operations the same figures apply, except that initially one stalk is not picked up.

Returning to Lynn’s statement quoted above (which follows Zhu Xi), it says in its entirety,

It is from the sum of the three values that result from the three sets of operations that a line is formed. If the first set results in a 5 (which becomes a 4, with a value of 3) and the second and the third sets each result in a 4 (value 3), the sum value is 9, which defines an “old” yang line... . (p. 20)

If, on the other hand, the result of the first set is nine, it “becomes an eight, with a value of two ...” (*ibid.*). So in order to make ends meet, Zhu Xi disregards the first stalk that is picked up and rather arbitrarily assigns the numerical values three and two to the results of the counting operations (not only Lynn but also R. Wilhelm and J. Blofeld follow Zhu Xi’s interpretation).

In fact, a much simpler and more logical explanation presents itself if one concentrates on the number of stalks that remain on the table after the three counting operations. As demonstrated above, the first counting operation removes either nine or five stalks from the total of forty-nine, and the two subsequent operations each removes eight or four. Depending on the outcome, this means that after the first operation, 40 or 44 stalks are left on the table; after the second operation the total is 32, 36 or 40, and after the final operation there are either 24, 28, 32 or 36 stalks left. Now one merely has to count the number of groups of four on the table (6, 7, 8 or 9) to obtain a hexagram line.

## List of Characters

- cang lang zhu* 蒼筤竹  
*Da xiang zhuan* 大象傳  
*di* 地  
*Dui* 兌  
*Gen* 艮  
*gu wen* 古文  
*guaci* 卦辭  
*guai* 夬  
*guo luo* 果蓏  
*jin wen* 今文  
*Kaogu xuebao* 考古學報  
*Kun* 坤  
*Lao zi* 老子  
*qi yu mu ye, wei duo jie* 其於木也爲多節  
*Qian* 乾  
*Qian zuo du* 乾鑿度  
*Shuo gua* 說卦  
*Tu* 土  
*Tuan* 彖  
*Tuan zhuan* 彖傳  
*Wang Bi ji jiaoshi* 王弼集校釋
- Wen yan zhuan* 文言傳  
*wuxing* 五行  
*Xi ci zhuan* 繫辭傳  
*Xiang zhuan* 象傳  
*Xiao xiang zhuan* 小象傳  
*Xu gua* 序卦  
*yang* 陽  
*yaoci* 爻辭  
*Yi jing* 易經  
*yin* 陰  
*Yuzun Zhou yi zhezong* 御纂周易折中  
*Za gua* 雜卦  
*Zhen* 震  
*Zhou yi gu jing tong shuo* 周易古經通說  
*Zhou yi ji jie* 周易集解  
*Zhou yi lue li* 周易略例  
*Zhou yi zheng yi* 周易正義  
*Zhou yi zhu* 周易注

Bent Nielsen  
Department of Asian Studies  
University of Copenhagen

The present volume brings together reprints of thirteen articles by the expert on the Han dynasty. The articles were published in books and journals during the period 1978–92 and are here printed in chronological order: Ch. 1, “Man and Beast: The Hybrid in Early Chinese Art and Literature” (pp. 38–54); Ch. 2, “Water, Earth and Fire: The Symbols of the Han Dynasty” (pp. 55–60); Ch. 3, “The Han View of Comets” (pp. 61–84); Ch. 4, “The Authority of the Emperors of Ch’in and Han” (pp. 85–111); Ch. 5, “The Term K’an-yti and the Choice of the Moment” (pp. 112–20); Ch. 6, “Imperial Sovereignty: Tung Chung-shu’s Contribution and His Predecessors” (pp. 121–42); Ch. 7, “The Cult of the Dragon and the Invocation for Rain” (pp. 142–59); Ch. 8, “Divination by Shells, Bones and Stalks during the Han Period” (pp. 160–90); Ch. 9, “The Oracles of the Clouds and the Winds” (pp. 191–213); Ch. 10, “The Almanacs (Jih-shu) from Shui-hu-ti: A Preliminary Survey” (pp. 214–35); Ch. 11, “The Chüeh-ti Games: A Re-enactment of the Battle between Ch’ih-yu and Hsüan-yüan?” (pp. 236–48); Ch. 12, “The Failure of the Confucian Ethic in Later Han Times” (pp. 249–66); and Ch. 13, “The Imperial Tombs of the Former Han Dynasty and Their Shrines” (pp. 267–99).

Most of the articles appear with new information appended in square brackets in the footnotes, and an addendum has been added to three articles (Chs. 7, 9, and 10). Apart from being preceded by an introduction, “The History of the Early Empires” (pp. 1–37), in which Loewe is careful to acknowledge the value of contributions of scholars working in other fields thus “framing a major chronological context within which the Han achievement should be placed” (p. 11), this collection of articles has been provided with maps of the Former and the Later Han dynasties (figs. 1 and 2), a “List of Figures” (pp. xi–xii), a “List of Abbreviations” (pp. xvi–xvii), a “List of Han Emperors” (pp. 300–1), a glossary of Chinese characters (pp. 302–16), an updated bibliography (pp. 317–42), and, most importantly, an index (pp. 343–53). This apparatus welds together what was otherwise thirteen independent studies so they become a major multi-faceted contribution to our understanding of the intellectual history of the Han dynasty (one will, of course, have to forgive the unavoidable repetitions that have not been edited out). Rather than being a chronological treatment of the subject, the nature of the work dictates a thematic approach.

As the title suggests, the book deals with both political and religious practices and how these interrelate in the intellectual life of Han China. In many cases the impetus to write the individual articles seems to have been one or more of the countless invaluable archaeological discoveries of recent decades, e.g. maybe the most famous of all, the richly furnished tombs of Mawangdui. Michael Loewe’s intimate familiarity with the traditional written sources of

the Han dynasty forms what are often highly illuminating points of departure for discussions of the archaeological finds. During the course of the book the reader will encounter a number of educated guesses, but they are invariably presented as such, and Loewe, of course, always acknowledges his sources most meticulously.

One of the main themes of the book seems to be how the Chinese world utterly changed during the period 213 BC to AD 220. Loewe analyses how these changes apply to the ideology of the state (Chs. 2, 4, 6, 12, and 13), the religious beliefs and interpretations of mythology (Chs. 1, 7, and 11), and the intellectual outlook (Chs. 3, 5, 8, and 9). It is, of course, only possible for the sake of presentation to draw such clear distinctions between the contents of the various articles; the very strength of Loewe's scholarship is his interdisciplinary approach.

In Han politics Loewe stresses the shift from relying on the power of an army to relying on such diverse factors as ethical principles, moral leadership, the right cycle of the Five Phases *wu xing*, and the Mandate of Heaven (*tian ming*). This process lasted for two centuries and was accompanied by the struggle between the partisans of two conflicting views of government which Loewe terms adherents of expansion and adherents of reformism or entrenchment. The reign of Emperor Wu (141–87 BC) would serve as a good example of the former, whereas the decades leading up to the usurpation of imperial power by Wang Mang in AD 9 may exemplify the latter attitude. The Han empire had gradually evolved from the foundation following the successful conquest on horseback by Liu Bang into a complex bureaucratic state, and in Ch. 12 Loewe analyses in some detail the complicated and delicate nature of the imperial government as it had taken form in the 1st century AD.

During the greater part of the Han, the heads of the empire tended to be—at best—religious figureheads and not persons involved in practical policies, and those statesmen who exercised the power of government were beyond the Emperors' control (p. 86). The members of the civil service vied with rival factions and/or relatives of the Emperor's consorts for influence and power, and this difficult situation was further complicated by the growing number of eunuchs who participated in the struggle for power during the Later Han dynasty. The Han emperor was mainly important as a symbol of dynastic continuity and “titular supreme authority from whom others derived their powers” (p. 260). Imperial power itself was derived from the concept of the Mandate of Heaven, a concept dating back several centuries to the Zhou dynasty, or from more recent cosmological ideas such as that of the Five Phases. Within these frameworks it was possible to level criticism at the Emperor, i.e. the government or the faction in power, by interpreting various anomalies as signs or omens from Heaven or indications that the cycle of the Five Phases was somehow out of order.

Another recurring theme is what Loewe calls the “comparatively late ra-

tionalisation and standardisation, based on philosophical principle” (p. 142) of very early religious and mythological ideas. Such developments may be traced in art (see Ch. 1) or in cults and religious practices (see Ch. 7). But the dichotomy of intuition and reason is also discernible in the approaches to various forms of divination, which may “form a meeting place for philosophical or scientific enquiry, religious ritual and the irrational response to undefined urges of instinct or the call of myth” (p. 191). Loewe relates the shift from an intuitive to an intellectual approach to divination to the compilation of diviner’s manuals. The document may have emerged at a stage when divination in its real form, that depended on unconscious powers of vision, had given way to the next stage, when intellectual powers were being invoked, memories were being consulted or some form of instruction sought (p. 81).

In his introduction, “The History of the Early Empires”, Loewe traces the history of Chinese studies, which initially largely ignored the almost two thousand years of Chinese imperial history between the classical period of the Zhou dynasty and the centuries following the advent of the Jesuits. The primary concern of the early missionary sinologists was to be able to communicate with the Chinese officials and to appear as men of culture and letters by demonstrating their knowledge of the Chinese classics. At the beginning of the twentieth century great advances in the study of the Qin and Han dynasties were achieved with the pioneering efforts of Edouard Chavannes, who translated many chapters from the *Shi ji*, and some decades later by Homer H. Dubs, who translated from the *Han shu*. The expeditions by Sir Aurel Stein in 1900–1 and 1907–8, and by Sven Hedin from 1927 to 1934 resulted in the discovery of thousands of bamboo strips containing historical documents from the Han dynasty. Controlled excavations of Han sites and tombs have since then increased the number of manuscripts dramatically, which, together with a great number of truly astonishing archeological finds, has provided us with a larger as well as a more detailed picture of the Han empire, as Loewe’s scholarship amply demonstrates.

Bent Nielsen  
*Department of Asian Studies*  
*University of Copenhagen*

*Hōbōgirin VII: Daijō-Daishi*. Ed. by Hubert Durt. Paris: Librairie d’Amerique et Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1994. 268 pages + 10 plates. ISBN 90-6831-605-2, ISSN 2-87723-135-6.

This, being the seventh volume of the important French-Japanese Buddhist dictionary, has been awaited with great expectations. As was the case with Vol. 6, which appeared in 1983, the present volume maintains a very high standard of its contents, and the sheer amount of information it offers is

indeed staggering. The strong bent towards esoteric Buddhism which is featured by many of the articles in this volume is a virtual feast for students of this particular tradition. This volume of the *Hōbōgirin* contains the following articles.

*Daijō* (Mahāyāna) by Hubert Durt. This constitutes a major article on a central topic in the study of Buddhism, and Durt's extensive knowledge of the topic is clearly brought out. Especially the ease with which he deals with detailed and more abstruse points of the Sinitic Mahāyāna canon and its related traditions is evident throughout the article. When dealing with the formation of the Mahāyāna Tripiṭaka it is only natural to place great importance on the Chinese translations; however, we should not forget that the actual dating of much of this material is still surrounded with considerable uncertainty. The review section of the secondary studies in Western and Japanese languages is useful, although not as complete as one could wish. An important and interesting sub-section discusses the issue of militarism and violence in Mahāyāna (pp. 793–94), but seems to overlook the condoning of torture and punishment in the *Gaṇḍavīyha*. On the negative side the article holds a number of problems. Generally it relies too heavily on old research, in addition to the fact that it draws overly much on the Chinese primary sources. The section dealing with the cardinal doctrines of Mahāyāna (pp. 782–83) is much too short and superficial. Strangely enough the esoteric aspects of the tradition are not mentioned at all! While the information on Mahāyāna in China and Japan is both bountiful and important, for some reason Korea and Tibet have been left out of the discussion. How could that be? It is sometimes hard to see the author's criteria for stressing some aspects of Mahāyāna over others, and personally I find the overall organization of the article very disorderly, with basic data, surveys, historical accounts, and terminologies thrown together. The problem is perhaps that Durt tries to cover too much in too limited a space. Finally I miss a more plausible account of the doctrinal rise of Mahāyāna, which after all is a central issue for the history of this brand of Buddhism.

*Daijuki* ("patient endurance") by H. Durt. This cardinal virtue of the *bodhisattva* and its development is traced all the way back to the various accounts of the Buddha's former lives as told in the *Jātakas* and the *Avadāna*. Through a careful survey of the canonical material Durt traces the doctrinal basis for this important *bodhisattva* quality. The author's great familiarity with the primary sources is evident, although this often allows him to be side-tracked to follow more secondary considerations, such as when he devotes a lengthy passage to discussing a tradition involving taking pleasure in self-inflicted pain (pp. 810–11). Although self-mortification could be considered as part of a *bodhisattva*'s practice, it is mainly connected with the issue of purification, and hence belongs in a different category of Buddhist practice. The article is concluded by a presentation of "patient endurance" in Japanese and Chinese Buddhism, including popular traditions

*Daikai* (“Great Ocean”) by H. Durt. This article contains a detailed investigation of the use of this concept in the primary sources relating to the Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna traditions. The author signals the special importance it played in the *Avataṃsaka* tradition. Perhaps some more attention could have been placed on the image of the “great ocean” in the Chinese Buddhist sources where it crops up constantly.

*Daikichijō daimyō bosatsu* (Mahāśrī mahālakṣmī) by Robert Duquenne. Śrī Lakṣmī is a well known female deity in the Hindu pantheon, but in the present short article the author focuses on her role within the esoteric Buddhist tradition as a member of Avalokiteśvara’s sphere in the Garbhadhātu Maṇḍala. The reader is provided with succinct information, including details on the ritual aspects of this deity; however, it is slightly irritating to find her *mantra* rendered in Japanese transcription and not in the original Sanskrit.

*Daikokuten* (Mahākāla) by N. Iyanaga. This article purports to be a detailed study of this major esoteric and Tantric Buddhist deity; however, the merit of this study is in my opinion mainly limited to the role of Mahākāla in Japanese Buddhism. As such it is both useful and highly informative. The author obviously knows his subject very well, and the reader is offered a veritable feast of insights on the topic. In addition the article features a number of fine illustrations (placed at the back of the volume). The section dealing with Mahākāla in China is rather superficial, as it does not take into account recent studies done in the West. This is particularly the case with the author’s treatment of the Dunhuang material, and one could at least expect him to indicate the existence of this material in the bibliography. For some odd reason Iyanaga fails to discuss the Mahākāla cult in Tibet, which is rather strange. The deity is known as one of the most important protectors in Tibetan Tantric Buddhism, and a section on its role there would seem to be a must for an article of this type. We are in effect provided with an article written from a strictly Japanocentric point of view, and which is therefore of limited value.

*Daimoku* (The Title of the Lotus Sūtra) by G. Jenner. This is a very short article consisting of a few pages only. It discusses briefly the contents of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* in relation to its title, a few passages on the scripture as reflected in the Chinese tradition of commentaries, and the major part devoted to the role of the title in the teachings of Nichiren.

*Daimyōbyakushin* (Mahāvidyā Gaurī) by R. Duquenne. This is a short article on another esoteric divinity, which together with the other “Bodhisattvas of Good Fortune”, are considered by the author to be a transformation of Śrī Devī. The article places the divinity in the context of the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra* and other esoteric *sūtras* such as the *Mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa*, etc., and provides additional information on iconography.

*Dairaku* (Mahāsukha) by Ian Astley. This lengthy article traces the usage of *sukha* or bliss back to its Indian origin, through the Pali scriptures, and then ends with a discussion of *mahāsukha* (“Great Bliss”) in the Tantric Buddhist tradition. Part of the article deals with *mahāsukha* in the context of Shingon Buddhist ritualism and is highly technical and arcane. As a whole it reflects the author’s expertise on this topic within the East Asian tradition. Despite the fact that this article does contain a discussion of Mahāsukha in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism, its treatment of the extensive Tibetan Tantric material available on the subject is much too general. Somehow this is in line with other articles in the dictionary, which in my opinion do not take the abundant Tibetan material seriously enough. This problem may have something to do with the fact that those writing for the *Hōbōgirin* consist of a small and very narrow group of scholars, most of whom are specialists in the field of East Asian Buddhism.

*Dairiki Daigo Myōhi* (Mahābala-mahārakṣa-vidyārājī) by R. Duquenne. This female protector is connected with the Garbhadhātu Maṇḍala and the author traces it to the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*. Otherwise the article provides no historical background. There is a one-sided stress on the role of the divinity in the Japanese Shingon tradition, and on its ritual role in particular. The associated *mantra* and *bija* are rendered in transcribed Japanese instead of the original (?) Sanskrit. It appears that the iconography of this female protector resembles that of Acala or Fudo Myōō, and I would have liked the author to address this issue, which is hardly a coincidence.

*Dairiki Kongō* (Mahābala-vajra) by R. Duquenne. This article deals with a prominent esoteric protector of the *vidyārāja* class who is associated with both the Vajradhātu and the Garbhadhātu *maṇḍala*. Beyond that there is also no attempt to account for the history of this deity here with the focus being on the ritual role of the protector in mainstream Shingon. Duquenne successfully distinguishes between the deity under discussion, the *bodhisattva* Vajrapāṇi, and the generic class of protectors known as *jingang lishi* (“powerful guards holding *vajras*”). I could not help wondering why when the author refers to the (*Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* T. 273), he refers to the vastly out-dated article by Liebenthal instead of Robert Buswell’s recent study of the entire scripture.

*Dairin* (Mahācakra) by R. Duquenne. This article is devoted to a discussion of the *vidyārāja*, Mahācakra or Great Wheel. Extensive attention is given to the ritual aspects of the Mahācakra cult, including the *maṇḍala*, *mudra*, *mantra*, etc., with particular focus on the scriptures connected with Amoghavajra. For some unknown reason the discussion of the iconographic aspects of this protector is less detailed than is usually the case with Duquenne’s articles, and I would also have liked him to include a discussion of the image of the protector found at Mt. Baoding in Dazu, Sichuan (group no. 21). The article is concluded by a useful list of the scriptural sources for the main ritual, as well as corresponding rites

*Daiseishi* (Mahāsthāmaprāpta) by H. Durt. This is a fairly substantial article on Avalokiteśvara's companion, the *bodhisattva* Mahāsthāmaprāpta. Naturally the author focuses on the role of this *bodhisattva* within the Pure Land tradition, and provides a detailed and very useful discussion of the many scriptural sources. One of the most interesting parts of the article deals with the role of the esoteric Mahāsthāmaprāpta in the calendrical and astrological lore of Japanese Buddhism. In contrast the iconographic part of the article is rather weak, and only discusses the in the Japanese context. An extensive presentation of the iconography of Mahāsthāmaprāpta in Chinese Buddhist art would have been in order. Lastly it should be mentioned that Durt has included a passage on the *bodhisattva* in Korean Buddhism, an area which the dictionary normally ignores, and for this he should be thanked.

*Daishi* (Great Master) by Antonino Forte deals with the institution of the Buddhist master in China and Japan. The article opens with the usage of this title in pre-Buddhist China, and then moves on to its use in Chinese Buddhism in general. Great stress is placed on the use of the title in sectarian contexts, and in particular in that of the Tiantai/Tendai schools. The final part of the article is devoted to a discussion of *daishi* in Japan. In contrast to many of the other articles in this volume, Forte's contribution has a strong historical bent, which lends itself well to the topic in question.

The good thing about the recent volumes of the *Hōbōgin* is that its articles are not just entries appearing in alphabetical order, but each of them constitutes a substantial scientific paper with an abundance of tightly packed information, yet organized within an easily accessible frame of reference. This makes the dictionary's entries really worthwhile for the user, who is usually provided with a succinct but nevertheless comprehensive guide to the subject in question. In other words the *Hōbōgin* is much more than a mere dictionary, it is a virtual treasure house of Buddhist studies, as indicated by its title.

On the negative side there is a fundamental problem concerning the justification for the dictionary, a problem in fact which has bothered me for years. As it is today, the *Hōbōgin* is an impressive, if not mammoth undertaking, and the compilation of each volume obviously places an immense load of work on the shoulders of the editor-in-chief, not to mention the contributors, who have to live up to the meticulousness and very high standard for which the dictionary is so famous. However, in my opinion, the quality alone does not justify the long time it takes for each volume to appear. It stands as a fact that the present publication has been under way more than ten years! As I pointed out above, this over-long process—no doubt caused by the great concern for detail and accuracy—actually works in diametric opposition to the purpose of the dictionary, as it causes some of its articles to be outdated before they even emerge from the press. When taking into account that the dictionary has only come to the term *Daishi*, i.e. the beginning of the letter

*D* in the alphabet, and if future volumes will take on average ten years to appear, we cannot expect the *Hōbōgirin* to be completed before sometime well into the twenty-fourth century! The consequence of this is that if the dictionary is ever completed, it will have to be revised in its entirety, simply because the major part of its entries will be completely outdated, as is in fact already the case with the first several volumes. In effect a project for all eternity! If I were to offer a realistic solution to this absurd situation, I would suggest that the editor-in-chief quickly organizes a co-editorial panel of competent scholars, commissions the articles to go into the dictionary to them and their associates in such a way that a volume can appear each year, or at the most every other year. Only in this way can the *Hōbōgirin* hope to be the effective research tool it was originally intended to be.

(HHS)

Jo-shui Chen, *Liu Tsung-yüan and Intellectual Change in Tang China, 773–819*. Cambridge Studies in Chinese History, Literature, and Institutions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. ISBN 0-521-1964-6.

Liu Zongyuan (773–819) is one of the Tang dynasty's great literati and a seminal thinker, whose significant contributions to China's intellectual history were in many ways never superseded. Previous studies of this important literatus and thinker—both Oriental and Western—have tended to focus on his role as a poet and essayist: after all he was the founder of the special type of prose known as “nature essays”. Despite the fact that his thought and religious sentiment have been acknowledged, they are always seen as being of secondary importance. The present study is a new attempt at placing Liu Zongyuan centrally in the intellectual development among Confucian literati of the late Tang, and to re-assess the role of his thought in relation to the early philosophical discourse that later led to the rise of the tradition known as “Neo-Confucianism”. Since this important question has never been adequately addressed before, Chen's study must be considered an especially welcome contribution. It contains the following chapters in addition to the introduction, conclusion, glossary, bibliography, and index.

1. Literati and Thought in the Early and Middle Tang. In this chapter Chen provides the general historical and intellectual background for Liu Zongyuan's life and thought. It focuses on the intellectual climate in the Twin Capitals of the Tang, with special emphasis on the situation in the aftermath of the An Lushan Rebellion of AD 757–63. The respective roles played by Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism in this fertile intellectual and religious milieu are discussed at great length. The significance of the interaction between Confucian literati and Buddhist monks is emphasised, as well as developments within the sphere of literature.

2. Liu Tsung-yüan and the Circumstances of Ch'ang-an. Here the author discusses the family background and early career of Liu Zongyuan, the establishment of his own family, and political connections, including his mentors and peers. It also provides information on the events leading up to the attempt at usurpation of political power by the clique of Wang Shuwen (d. 805), of which Liu was a member.
3. 805: The Abortive Reform. This chapter deals in great detail with the events of the *coup d'état* by Wang Shuwen's reform group, and the consequences its members faced in the aftermath of its failure. The subsequent banishment of Liu to Yongzhou, located in the southern part of modern Hunan, signalled the practical end of his political career.
4. Declaration of Principles: *Tao* and Antiquity. In this chapter Chen discusses how Liu's banishment to Yongzhou constituted the *de facto* starting point of his new career as a writer and thinker. Of great importance is his formulation of the concept of "antiquity" (*gu*) which he employed to characterize the Way (*dao*). In connection with this seminal aspect of Liu's thought, the author provides a survey of this concept as found in other contemporary literati, including Han Yu. From this we see that the Dao of Liu Zongyuan was chiefly concerned with what Chen refers to as "public-spiritedness" in the manner of Confucius, and "the Tao as the Way of government". Lastly Dao meant for Liu the way of the human realm, i.e. the moral laws governing the behaviour of men. The chapter also discusses Liu's rejection of the Heavenly Way, which signalled an extreme departure from the Confucian tradition.
5. Heaven, the Supernatural, and *Tao*. Here the author treats such issues as superstition, compares the role of the sage in Confucianism and Daoism, Liu's naturalistic notion of Heaven, i.e. Heaven as nature, and how Liu's thought differed from that of his peers, including Han Yu, Lü Wen, and Liu Yuxi. Lastly the issue of Confucian revival as opposed to Confucian innovation is critically examined.
6. Literary Theory, Canonical Studies, and Beyond. In this chapter Chen provides a detailed survey of the literary theories of Liu Zongyuan, including the range of his interest and studies in the Classics. His role as a second-generation *guwen* master is given special attention, and the author shows that Liu only became seriously involved in this new literary development after his banishment to Yongzhou. From this it is also evident that as far as attitudes to the purpose of literature go, there was not much difference between the views of Liu and Han Yu, perhaps the greatest proponent of this movement. The chapter is concluded by a presentation of Liu's understanding of what constituted a true teacher, who in his view "should be someone who showed people how to be human, how to follow the *Tao*".
7. Sources of Liu's Confucian Thought. Liu Zongyuan's social background as a member of an average aristocratic family of the Guan-Long group is seen as a main reason for the express focus on man (*ren*) in his thinking. Extra-

mundane and supernatural concerns are generally absent from the writing of Liu, because they are seen as irrelevant to the basic human condition. As an extension of this, radical Mencian humanism and the associated concept of righteousness constitute chief elements in the formulation of his concepts of humanity and “social” equality. At the end of the chapter the author introduces a Buddhist parallel to Liu’s Confucian thought. Here Chan Buddhist “inventions” are seen as having provided inspiration for the development of his thought.

8. The Private Sphere. In contrast to the previous chapter, which dealt with Liu’s public thought, this final chapter deals with the other side of Liu Zongyuan’s philosophy, namely his own beliefs and convictions regarding himself as a person. Here the author discusses Liu’s Confucian sense of mission, how he came to terms with the fact that due to his political involvements as a youth he was barred from serving the people, his Buddhist heart, and how he reached consolation and sublimation through nature.

Jo-shui Chen’s study is a welcome contribution to the study of the intellectual history and religion of the Tang, and is especially important for shedding new light on the philosophy and thinking of Liu Zongyuan. The book is well structured and balanced, and provides with its highly text-historical approach very interesting reading. One of the great assets of the present study is the author’s great penchant for historical detail and his familiarity with the sources. These qualities allow the reader immediate access to the central issues under discussion, and make the author’s arguments appear substantial and well founded. Chen’s solid understanding of the world of the Tang literati makes the life and times of Liu Zongyuan become truly “alive”. Perhaps the most significant aspect of this study is its focus on Liu’s distinct and practical understanding of Confucianism and how to realize its ideals in governing the country. The author makes a wise and useful distinction between “Confucian revival” and “Confucian innovation”, and demonstrates that Liu Zongyuan’s philosophy belonged to the former category, while the Neo-Confucian developments of the Song belong to the latter.

Despite the many qualities of the present study, it is neither flawless, nor can it be considered exhaustive as far as the many facets of Liu Zongyuan’s personality and thought are concerned. The claim in the preface that the present “book is the first comprehensive study in a Western language of Liu Tsung-yüan” is hard to accept in the light of the older study by Nienhauser *et al.* (New York, 1973). Nienhauser’s collective effort was certainly not comprehensive, but neither is Jo-shui Chen’s. In order to come up with such a study one would have to account fully for Liu Zongyuan’s entire range of writings, including his prose works, poetry, memorial inscriptions, and letters. And as regards his thought one would have to show a much better understanding for his religious sentiments, especially those connected with Buddhism. The author does not even come close to providing a survey of Liu Zongyuan’s literary merits, including a covering analysis of his writings, nor

has it been his intention. Liu's intellectual side, on the other hand (provided we exclude Buddhism), is dealt with in the most admirable way by Chen. This leaves us with the problem of Liu Zongyuan's Buddhist sentiment, and the question as to whether he was only superficially interested in this religion, i.e. that it only served him as an intellectual stimulation, or whether he should be counted as a true believer. As I see it Chen's attempt to solve this issue is only partly successful, and in my opinion does not do full justice to the legacy of Liu Zongyuan, or to the extant sources.

Chen has chosen to deal with this issue under the heading "Buddhist Sensitivities". In my opinion the range of sources on which the author bases his understanding of Liu's involvement with Buddhism is too limited. When Chen further asserts that "his involvement with Buddhism and Taoism was not really deep. In reality, his Buddhist and Taoist ideas and sentiments mainly represented his reactions to his failure in public life" (pp. 186–7), I find that he misses the point. What is most serious here is the fact that Chen completely ignores Liu's personal practice of Buddhism. According to Liu's own statements, he studied Buddhism with Zhongsun (n.d.), a disciple of the renowned Tiantai Master Yunfeng Fazheng (724–801), and a Chan master named Chao (n.d.). Information to this effect can be found in the letter *Song Sun shangren fu zhongcheng shufu zhao xu*, and in the poem *Qianyi Chaoshi yuan tu*, both of which are contained in *Liu hedong ji* (Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe edition in 2 vols., pp. 423–4, 686–7). Whether this indicates that Liu Zongyuan was a Buddhist or not is an open question, but the information provided by the above two sources certainly shows that he did take his commitment to that religion seriously. Furthermore I cannot agree that "Liu's opposition to Southern Chan Buddhism was strong and consistent" (p. 176, also n. 54). While it may be true that he was critical with regard to certain aspects of Chan, his admiration for Huineng (638–713), the so-called Sixth Patriarch of Southern Chan, cannot be denied. Finally, the author could have paid more attention to the fact that both Li Hua (715–66) and Liang Su (753–93), leading literati in the *guwen* movement, were both devout Buddhists, which can be ascertained from reading their Buddhist writings. This, I believe, would also have helped towards a better understanding of Liu Zongyuan's Buddhist side.

In addition Chen's study contains a number of problematic generalizations and minor mistakes. In his assessment of the role played by Han Yu he writes that "Han not only defended and promoted Confucian values vehemently, but also challenged Buddhist and Taoist world views to the core ..." (p. 4). Nothing could be more misleading! While Han Yu did promote Confucian values, he never came even close to understanding basic Buddhist and Daoist beliefs, not to mention their doctrines. This is the reason why his *Yuandao*, as well as the *Memorial on the Buddha's Fingerbone*, are basically sinophobic and sycophantic rejections of these traditions, based on pre-defined cultural biases rooted in Confucianism. Nowhere in these texts

does Han Yu demonstrate any real knowledge of Buddhist or Daoist tenets, but faults them chiefly because they are not in conformity with his own understanding of the Confucian Way.

Chen also contends that Chan was the most important of the Buddhist schools during the Tang (p. 14). This is simply not correct. Chan was obviously a major Buddhist tradition which rose to eminence during the second half of that dynasty, and which made a great impact on Chinese Buddhism in the Five Dynasties Period and the Song, but it was by no means the most important, neither spiritually, politically nor intellectually. By the early ninth century Chan was not “new” (p. 178), but had been around as a distinct tradition with its own history for at least one and a half centuries.

In the same vein his characterization of Tang Daoism is simplistic and superficial (pp. 15–17). The continued use of concepts such as “Taoism” and “religious Taoism” to indicate two different strains of that tradition, i.e. elite philosophy vs. popular beliefs, makes no sense. There are no grounds for asserting such distinctions during the Tang. Unfortunately this mistake is further elaborated on in the author’s unfounded criticism of Eric Zürcher (p. 108, n. 42). Elsewhere Chen states that the Buddhist community of Cbangan had suffered a decline after the An Lushan rebellion (p. 61). This is not evident from the contemporary Buddhist sources, and hence it is not a view I would endorse.

When discussing Confucian and Buddhist beliefs I would be very cautious of placing the concepts of Heaven and *karma* on the same footing (p. 112, n. 58). One is an operating agent essentially beyond the human sphere, the other is a natural causative mechanism within the human sphere. Contrary to Chen’s view I find that Liu actually endorsed the Buddhist law of *karma* when he said, “Merit is self-attained [through men’s own actions], and disaster is self-inflicted” (p. 112).

In the seventh chapter Chen uses the Chan reformation of Chinese Buddhism, what he refers to as “the Ch’an revolution”, as a parallel to Liu Zongyuan’s reform of Confucian thought (p. 159). However, I am not sure I can agree with this. Many of Chen’s observations of Chan history and doctrine are superficial, or otherwise taken out of context. Simply because Chan generally stresses a utilitarian approach to spiritual cultivation, there is in my opinion no evidence for a link between that tradition and Liu’s Confucian thought. So much more so since there is essentially nothing in Liu’s own writings on Confucianism that reflects the imprint of Chan ideology, a fact which the author himself acknowledges (p. 159).

In the final chapter the author treats Liu’s nature experiences in a strangely compartmentalized way by talking about his mystic experiences as divorced from his Buddhist and Daoist sentiments. This is illogical.

Despite the misgivings enumerated above, one should not be led to the conclusion that this work is not worthwhile. *Liu Tsung-yüan and Intellectual Change in T’ang China, 773–819* is in fact an extremely well written study,

the many qualities of which far outweigh the occasional glitches. It provides the field of Tang intellectual history with new insights, and through its re-evaluation of Liu Zongyuan succeeds in placing him and his thought, in particular that pertaining to Confucianism, in an even more central role than has been the case before. For anyone seriously interested in medieval Chinese philosophy and intellectual history this book should not be missed, and for scholars interested in the dawn of Neo-Confucianism it is clearly a must. The value of the book is further enhanced by its beautiful lay-out and instructive maps.

(HHS)

Marcus Günzel, *Die Morgen- und Abendliturgie der chinesischen Buddhisten*. Seminar für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Göttingen, 1994. pp. 238 (paperback).

Since Holmes Welch's important work, *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism 1900–1950*, appeared there has been a lack of noteworthy studies on contemporary Chinese Buddhism, and in particular to those concerned with its practice. With the appearance of the present book this situation has now been somewhat remedied. Although placed firmly within the context of Chinese Buddhist ritual, Marcus Günzel's study is limited to the tradition of the morning and evening rituals (*zhaomu kesong/zaowan kesong*) as seen against the background of Buddhist monasticism in contemporary Taiwan. The author has had three extended stays at the Shengling Temple in Taipei over a five year period, and it is on the basis of his observations in this Buddhist community, and by participating in the daily rituals, that this study has come about. It is divided into three parts as follows: (I) General introduction and historical survey of the liturgical manuals for the Morning and Evening Rituals; (II) Text and annotated translation of the *Fomen bi bei kesong ben*: this part features a line by line translation of the liturgical text; (III) Text and annotated translation of the Chinese commentary to the *Fomen bi bei kesong ben*; Appendix reproducing the original Chinese text.

Obviously the author has great experience and knowledge of the workings of a Buddhist temple in modern Taiwan, and his study yields many interesting observations that could only have been available to an insider. In many ways this is what makes the present study so important, but it would also seem to be partly to blame for its various shortcomings, to which I shall return below. First it should be said that the present study is a highly competent undertaking, which reveals the author's ability to treat the material under discussion in a structured and well balanced manner. His knowledge of contemporary Chinese Buddhism is impressive, and he is always prepared to supply useful annotation on the various obscure points in his discourse. The historical presentation of the liturgical manuals under

discussion is done with great care and detail, and it is obvious that Günzel has been diligently plowing through the available primary sources. For these reasons *Die Morgen- und Abendliturgie der chinesischen Buddhisten* is much more than a study of the most basic rituals performed in Buddhist temples in contemporary Taiwan, it is a fine introduction to the performing tradition of Chinese Buddhism, including its extensive array of beliefs and practices.

As indicated above there are a number of weaknesses in the present study. First of all it has a serious methodological problem as regards its overall purpose. When an author deals with Buddhist ritual, one would at least expect a rudimentary theoretical outline, or a more methodological framework in which the author accounts for the hows and whys regarding his approach to the topic under discussion. This is lacking. As the kind of rituals dealt with here are highly structured events performed to the accompaniment of chanting and various percussion instruments, in the setting of a special sanctified hall, and based on a distinct and fairly fixed liturgical literature, he really had ample opportunity, not to mention reason, to provide such a methodological framework.

Secondly Günzel seems to overlook the fact that he is dealing with a religious performance, and that it is not enough simply to say what is going on in the various stages of the rituals under discussion in accordance with the text of the manuals. What I miss is one or more actual descriptions of the actual proceedings of the rituals discussed in the book. This might also have occasioned the author to look at ritual practice from an anthropological point of view, something which certainly would not have decreased the value of his findings.

Thirdly the author commits the rather basic mistake of letting material from a highly localized Buddhist community, namely that of Northern Taiwan serve as representative for all of China. This would of course be permissible if he had first documented that his information was indeed based on general information about Buddhist rituals in China as a whole (something which he unsuccessfully attempts on pp. 15–18). Unfortunately this is not the case. Even if the author should want his study to be chiefly representative of Buddhist rituals in Taiwan, he has apparently overlooked Ōfuchi Ninji's important work, *Chūgokujin no shūkyō girei—Bukkyō, Dōkyō, Minkan shinkō* (Tokyo: Fukutake shoten, 1983), a major part of which is devoted to a discussion of Buddhist rituals in the setting of modern Chinese society.

Finally Günzel's study suffers from its overly literary form. He remains largely satisfied with a discussion of the contents of the rituals he treats, and fails to perceive that there could be a wide difference between the way the rituals are supposed to be, and the way they are actually performed (although this may not be the case in the rituals in which he has participated). Having myself participated many times in Buddhist rituals in the PRC, I know for a fact that there is an abundance of local variations in the way seemingly

identical rituals are performed in the Buddhist temples. There is for example a noteworthy difference in the way Buddhist rituals are carried out in the north and south respectively, including styles of chanting. Likewise there is a wide variety of liturgical manuals on the market, many of which are issued by individual Buddhist institutions and groups of believers, and which therefore account for certain variations. This is perhaps even more so the case today in the PRC, with Buddhism undergoing reconstruction, than was the case in late imperial China.

Despite the various minor snags and the somewhat “stiff” structure of Günzel’s work, it is in my opinion one of the most interesting and useful studies on the practice of Chinese Buddhist rituals to appear in many years. Where Holmes Welch’s now classic studies provided detailed information on the practice of Chinese Buddhism from the “out-sider’s” point of view, the present publication supplements—from the “inside”—many of the insights gained from the former in much greater detail. For anybody interested in East Asian religion, and Chinese Buddhism and its rituals in particular, *Die Morgen- und Abendliturgie der chinesischen Buddhisten* is a must.

(HHS)

Jacques Gernet, *Buddhism in Chinese Society*. Translated by Franciscus Verellen. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995. pp. 435.

In recent years there has been a virtual spate of translations of French studies on Chinese religions into English, and the present work is one such venture. Although the bibliography and notes have been up-dated to a considerably degree, the main body of the work is a rather faithful translation of Jacques Gernet’s classic study, *Les Aspects Économiques du Bouddhisme dans la Société Chinoise du V<sup>e</sup> au X<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, which first appeared in 1956.

The book is divided into five parts and contains the following chapters in addition to the introduction, appendices, glossary, bibliography, and index: (1) Immediate Facts: this discusses the number of temples and their inmates, and the general effects of Buddhism on the Chinese economy; (2) Secondary Facts: The Fiscal Deficit; this chapter treats the issue of taxation, the fiscal status of temple lands and holdings, and indirect means of taxation; (3) The Indian Heritage: with its point of departure in the Indian Buddhist sources on temple property and individual ownership by members of the *saṃgha*, this chapter deals with consecrated property, and the right of inheritance by Chinese monks and nuns; (4) Lands and Dependents: here the author discusses what he refers to as “Buddhist Colonization”, the formation of landed estates, and monastic encroachment on farmlands; (5) Industrial Installations: this is perhaps the most technical chapter in the book, and it treats the issues of water-powered mills and oil presses; (6) Commerce and Usury: the Indian

background is described, such as contact with precious objects and barter, commerce, the commercial activities engaged in by the Chinese Buddhist communities, and loans granted to members of the *saṃgha*; (7) The Circuit of Giving: this chapter discusses the various types of offerings given to the temples, the Inexhaustible Treasures, and charitable activities; (8) Economics and Religion: under this heading the author treats what he perceives as the original characteristics of Buddhist faith in China; (9) The Popular Social Environment: in this chapter the issues of cult groups and Buddhist associations are presented; (10) The Wealthy Laity: here Gernet discusses traditional behaviour of the wealthy Buddhist laity, together with the political effects and implications; (11) The Ruling Class: in referring to the Confucian bureaucrats as “Rationalists”, the author describes their attitude to the Buddhist church, including those of them who were actually practising Buddhists; (12) Internal Contradictions in the Buddhist Movement in China: this constitutes the very brief conclusion of the book, in which the author sums up his findings in a few paragraphs.

Since its appearance Gernet’s study has remained an indispensable reference work for anybody interested in the history of Chinese Buddhism, in particular that of the pre-Song, and it has served as a source of inspiration for the work of important scholars in the field such as Kenneth Ch’an, Tonami Mamoru, *et al.* During my own student days in the Department of Chinese Art and Culture at the University of Copenhagen, Gernet’s book was considered a must, and I remember fondly the many hours spent on reading it. One of the great assets of this work is the extensive amount of sources it takes into account, a feat that falls little short of being intimidating. Needless to say, Gernet’s study is still a highly important work, despite the fact that it is now almost forty years old.

However, it should also be appreciated that four decades of research on the history of Chinese Buddhism since the appearance of Gernet’s book have altered our perceptions and understandings considerably. And given the fact that the present translation remains close to the original study, it should come as no surprise that *Buddhism in Chinese Society* today appears somewhat outmoded on a number of points. Perhaps the most significant shortcoming that I see is its rather weak overall methodology. The book is divided into thematic chapters, and under general headings the author discusses the issues in a purely trans-historical manner, bundling together as it were information culled from a historically diverse and very wide range of sources. On the basis of this he then constructs general conclusions with much of the data taken out of their historical, geographical, and cultural context. This causes the discussion to appear slightly chaotic and at times downright garbled, as when he draws general conclusions about the status of Buddhism based on sources from the Northern Wei, the Tang, or even the Song. When, for instance, the author uses information on the expansion of the monastic manors under the Northern Wei and the mid-Tang more or less simultane-

ously, he commits, in my view, a serious mistake. The composition and size of Chinese society, as well as the physical and geographical settings of the two periods, were highly diverse, and it is therefore not permissible to align data from the two dynasties as if their social and cultural realities were more or less the same. What results from such over-simplification is a distorted picture of the role played by Buddhism in the periods under discussion. The size of the *samgha*, their organization, their lands, monasteries, political organization, and the Chinese population in general, as well as the extent of the territory controlled by these two dynasties, differed greatly. Hence the reader would have been better served if Buddhism and its economy during the Northern Wei and the Tang had been treated separately. In short I find that a greater degree of historical contextualization would have enhanced the value of the work, which could have been achieved by adopting a more chronological approach to the data.

Related to this problem, but different in character, is also the way Gernet treats the material from Dunhuang, which obviously plays a major role in his study. There can be no argument against the historical importance of the manuscripts found at the Mogao Caves. However, it is also necessary to be aware of their limitations as primary sources, and the author tends to treat them as if the information they yield is representative for the late Tang in general. I would strongly warn against this. As has been pointed out by other scholars previously, Shazhou (Dunhuang) is situated in the arid and extreme west of Gansu province (Hexi), a *caravanserai* with a very special geographical setting and a multi-ethnic population. In addition it had a much greater density of Buddhist institutions than was common in similar small prefectures elsewhere in China at that time. Hence, Dunhuang was governed by norms that were in many ways distinctly local. Furthermore, it was completely cut off from the rest of China during the Tibetan occupation (c. AD 780–848), and moreover it was never under the effective control of the central Chinese government after the 770s. The situation in which the local Buddhist community found itself was therefore not representative of the rest of the realm, and neither are the corresponding data.

Another peculiar point in the book is the author's apparent anti-Buddhist attitude, which I find difficult to explain, and which in the context of the present study appears entirely misplaced (pp. 249, 252–4, 280, 285–6, 289–90, 292–4, etc.). It would appear as if Gernet's disregard for the Chinese Buddhists is somehow connected with the question of conventional Christian or perhaps even Confucian morality. I am sure most readers will agree that the author often sounds like a modern Han Yü! However, like every other major religion, the Buddhist institutions in China were filled with people, i.e. human beings, and that they should engage in numerous suspect activities involving economic transactions seems self-evident. Why would anyone think that Buddhists are better people than followers of any other major religion? However, the way the Chinese Buddhists are described by the author

makes them look like a bunch of utterly immoral and corrupt individuals, whose only concern was to squander the wealth of the Empire. As examples of Gernet's view on Buddhism, he makes most itinerant monks out to be con-men and fortune tellers who lured the devout with their petty tricks, or otherwise fanatics who loved to mutilate themselves. In the same vein he argues that the Chinese had no genuine religious interest in Indian Buddhism, but were merely interested in techniques (pp. 252–3). In comparison it would seem that the members of the Catholic church also have had (and still have) a fondness for religious bigotry and self-mutilation. Elsewhere he argues that the Confucian literati who sought the company of Buddhist monks, only did it out of fashion or for political motives, and not because they cared much for Buddhism (pp. 279–80, 286–7). Such views are not only wrong in view of the extant sources, but are entirely misleading as they fail to account for the countless pious and honest individuals—irregardless of social class—who have constituted the average Chinese Buddhist down through the centuries. If Gernet had wanted to make a study on the corrupt activities committed by Buddhist temples and influential political figures in China, undoubtedly an academically interesting and useful project, it would have been more worthwhile as a comparative study, e.g. such as seeing it in the light of the economic role played by the Vatican or the Catholic churches in medieval Europe.

Other points of criticism that I would raise here include Gernet's oft repeated misconception that Buddhism lost its vitality and importance in Chinese society after the Huichang Suppression in the mid 840s, which is also prominently displayed in Gernet's book. In my opinion the translator ought to have corrected this old and rather serious mistake, since there are now numerous studies out to the contrary effect. Clearly Chinese Buddhism lost very little of its strength and influence in Chinese society after this relatively short period of suppression, although it is an undeniable fact that several of the old text-based schools suffered. On the contrary I would argue that Buddhism was an even more visible presence during the late Tang and Five Dynasties Period than previously, not to mention the Song. However, it is probably true that Buddhist influence at the Imperial court—and perhaps in Changan as well—was more prominent before the Huichang Suppression than after. On the other hand late Tang Buddhism is characterized by its strong regional and provincial character, which can hardly be called unimportant or insignificant. One should also not forget that the hey-day of Chan Buddhism, clearly one of the most dominant traditions of Chinese Buddhism during the late Tang, took place during the Five Dynasties Period and the early Song.

Often Gernet can be found to generalize and interpret the sources to suit his own preconceptions. It seems rather obvious that many of the people who hid themselves or took refuge in the Buddhist temples were not ordained monks or nuns, but temple servants, workers, vagrants, etc. (p. 42). Likewise

it is not at all plausible that “the majority of monks, even those entrusted with celebrating official ceremonies in the great sanctuaries, were illiterate” (p. 249), as held by Gernet. It has long been acknowledged that one of the few ways for the common Chinese to become literate in medieval China was to enter the Buddhist or Daoist monkhood. Hence even the lowliest *śrāmaṇera* would by necessity have had a rudimentary understanding of Classical Chinese, at least enough to recite the basic Buddhist scriptures. Unless of course the author thinks that they only knew the scriptures by heart (which they often did as well). And how an illiterate monk should be able to celebrate an official ceremony without being able to read the ritual manuals required is quite beyond me. Even in modern China the majority of the monks and nuns are able to read, how much more so in the Tang dynasty?

Although the original French terminology often sounds peculiar and somewhat contrived in Verellen’s translation, he has done a good job at bringing Gernet’s study up to date on a number of points. Especially the greatly expanded bibliography is both noteworthy and highly useful. Here and there we find misprints, and distinctly odd translations, such as when the devout Buddhists are said to have “roasted their fingers” (p. 251), i.e. burned off their fingers as offerings, etc

*Les Aspects Économiques du Bouddhisme dans la Société Chinoise du V<sup>e</sup> au X<sup>e</sup> Siècle* was an important work when it was first published, and has continued to be a standard study on the role played by the Buddhist economy in medieval Chinese society ever since. Hence, one can only welcome this new translation, which makes Gernet’s study more widely accessible than the original French edition. Especially so if the reader remembers that he is dealing with top notch research, anno 1956. However, I should add that I find it peculiar that so much time and money is being spent on translations such as the present one. In view of the substantial number of significant French studies on the various aspects of Chinese religion, it would be better if concerned English-speaking scholars and students took the effort to learn to read French!

(HHS)

*Kyunyō-jōn: The Life, Times and Songs of a Tenth Century Korean Monk. An Annotated Translation by Adrian Buzo and Tony Prince. University of Sydney East Asian Series, No. 6. Canberra: Wild Peony, 1993. pp. 142.*

The present publication deals with the early Koryō monk Kyunyō (923–73), who played a major role in the revival of Hwaōm thought during the tenth century, and whose songs and hymns are considered of great importance to the contemporary study of Korean classical literature. In addition to the

introduction, bibliography, and index, the book contains the following.

- The *Kyunyŏ-jŏn*. This main part of the book consists of a complete and annotated translation of the *Kyunyŏ chŏn* (The Account of Kyunyŏ), a work written in the tradition of life stories of famous monks by a certain Hyŏngnyŏn (n.d.) at the beginning of the twelfth century. This work is divided into ten chapters, each under a separate heading. All of Kyunyŏ's extant songs are included herein.
- Appendix A: The *Bhadracarīprañidhāna*. This consists of a review and partial translation of the famous section of the *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra* containing the *bodhisattva* Samantabhadra's vows, and an assessment of its importance for an understanding of Kyunyŏ's songs.
- Appendix B: The Early Korean Writing System and the Interpretation of Kyunyŏ's Songs. This appendix offers a survey of the ways classical Korean was written with the use of Chinese characters. Four types are discussed: (1) *ŭmdok*, in which the sound and meaning of the Chinese characters were adopted directly into the transcription of the Korean language; (2) *hundok*, where only the meaning of the Chinese character is used; (3) *ŭmga*, in which only the sound of the Chinese character is adopted; and (4) *hun'ga*, where the meaning of the Chinese character is initially adopted in order to obtain the phonetic value of the Korean lexical equivalent. In addition the various literary styles such as *sano-e-ga* and *hyangga*, etc., in which these systems were used. The appendix is concluded by a series of examples of Kyunyŏ's songs with annotation.

Buzo and Prince's translation appears both competent and reliable, and they are to be congratulated for their detailed work on Kyunyŏ's songs. In addition the highly useful annotation provides the reader with a solid background on the major events in Kyunyŏ's life. The extensive study and the translation of the songs in the *Kyunyŏ chŏn* offers a clear improvement on the early work by Peter E. Lee that appeared in the late 1950s.

On the negative side there are a number of points which I would like to point out. First of all the introduction focuses on the *Kyunyŏ chŏn* as a text, and only provides a brief outline of the historical reality of Kyunyŏ's life. After all, the *Kyunyŏ chŏn* is written in a semi-mythological style on a par with that of the *Samguk yusa* [Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms], and some discussion of how to distil historical information and data from such a source would seem a methodological necessity. Furthermore it would have been in order to give a survey of Kyunyŏ's major works and their importance in the context of Korean Buddhism, and Hwaŏm thought in particular; however, any such information is lacking. This is a shame since it would have

provided a fuller context for the master's life and achievements, and thereby greatly enhanced the value of the present work.

In addition the book contains various minor mistakes including a number of unfounded statements. For example, it is not true that Wŏnhyo's works have survived in fragments only (p. 1). When Kyunyŏ's works are referred to, they are not mentioned by their actual titles, but curiously in English translation only. The *Ilŭng pŏpgye to wŏnt'ong ki* [Comprehensive Record of the Ilŭng pŏpgye to] in 2 kw. is extant, but is not mentioned as such in the notes (p. 37, n. 76). In the discussion of Kyunyŏ's lineage the translators somehow mix Sŏn Buddhism into the issue, and thereby succeed in confusing matters. The Pug'ak (Northern Marchmount) and Nam'ak (Southern Marchmount) which are referred to in the text were two contending branches of Hwaŏm Buddhism during the late Silla, and they had nothing to do with Son (p. 16, n. 19). In fact the translators appear to be under the impression that Kyunyŏ's thought was influenced by Sŏn, and in turn later exerted some influence on Sŏn. This is in my opinion not the case, and if there had indeed been such a two-way influence, solid references should be given for it. For example, we do not find the slightest trace of Kyunyŏ in the thought of Chinul (1158–1210). In referring to the works of Kyunyŏ one wonders why the translators do not refer to the *Hanguk pulgyo chŏnsŏ* [The Complete Works of Korean Buddhism, 11 vols.]. This is after all the standard collection used by all serious students of Korean Buddhism (for a review of this collection, cf. SCEAR 3 (1990), pp. 146–8). In addition the transcription of the Chinese *pinyin* is slightly unorthodox.

Lastly I find that the translators use too much space on the songs ascribed to Kyunyŏ, which are found twice in the book, and thereby they end up treating him and his works as being mainly of concern to the field of literature rather than to religious thought, where they correctly belong. This imbalance is not fruitful to an understanding of the important role played by Kyunyŏ in the development of Korean Hwaŏm thought, and one could have hoped for a better assessment of the primary sources to that effect.

As pointed out above there are various minor problems with *Kyunyŏ-jŏn The Life, Times and Songs of a Tenth Century Korean Monk*, and the reader would be well advised to heed them when reading it. Nevertheless, the book is otherwise a welcome contribution to our understanding of an important figure in the history of Korean Buddhism, and as such it should not be missed by anyone interested in this topic.

(HHS)

*Zengaku kenkyū nyūmon* [Introduction to Zen Studies], Ed. by Tanaka Ryōshō. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1994.

As regards the making of useful and high-class reference works the Japanese

are unsurpassed in the field of Buddhist studies. The present publication is a guide to the study of Chan/Zen/Sōn Buddhism and is meant to cover most of the present century's scholarship on the topic. The majority of the contributors—including the editor Tanaka Ryōshō, a noted specialist on Chan Buddhism in Dunhuang—hail from the Komazawa University in Tokyo, affiliated to the Sōtō Zen School, which in many ways has spearheaded research on Zen/Chan Buddhism in Japan for the past thirty years or so. *Zengaku kenkyū nyūmon* consists of the following:

○ Part I. *Chūgoku* (China)

1. “Chūgoku bukkyō to zen [Chinese Buddhism and Chan]”, by Okabe Kazuo. This chapter would seem to be more concerned with studies on Chinese Buddhism than with Chan; however, it still provides a fair outline of the directions that research in this field have taken over the past two or three decades.
2. “Tonkō no zen seki [The Chan Material from Dunhuang]”, by Tanaka Ryōshō. This chapter is packed with information, and provides a mine of information. Naturally, the work of Yanagida Seizan is given special attention. However, a substantial part of it has appeared in the author's, “A Historical Outline of Japanese Research on the Chinese Chan Writings from Dunhuang” (*SCEAR*, Vol. 2 (1989), pp. 141–69). Here Tanaka also gives credit to most of the fairly abundant Western scholarship in the field. In addition it appears that this chapter was written more than ten years ago, as it fails to include much recent research done by Western scholars.
3. “Tō-Godai no zen [Chan during the Tang and Five Dynasties Periods]”, by Suzuki Tetsuo. Since Suzuki is an expert on the history of Chan in the Late Tang and Five Dynasties periods, no one would be better suited for the task of writing this chapter. The formation of the schools of Chan, its institutions and organizations, lines of transmission, and regional developments are all dealt with here. However, all references to the large body of significant Western studies are missing. Fortunately the author has not been too self-denying and gives due credit to his own highly important contributions to the field.
4. “Sōdai no zen [Chan during the Song Dynasty]”, by Ishii Shudō. Being one of the leading authorities on Chan during the Song, Ishii has an impressive command of the field, which unfortunately does not include studies by Western scholars. A major section deals with studies on the dichotomy between Caodong and Linji Chan, i.e. “Silent Illumination”, and the use of the *huatou*. The chapter is concluded by a discussion of studies pertaining to the ideological confrontation and interchange between Chan and Neo-

Confucianism.

5. “En-Myōdai no zen [Chan during the Yuan and Ming Dynasties]”, by Nagai Masashi. This in my opinion constitutes one of the most interesting chapters in the book, as it deals with those periods in the history of Chinese Buddhism about which comparatively little has been written. Studies on several of the important figures in Chan Buddhism are given special treatment.

- Part II. *Chibetto no zen* [Chan in Tibet], by Okimoto Katsumi. This short chapter provides some information on the study of early Buddhism in Tibet and is devoted to research on the presence of Chan in Tibet during the eighth century in connection with the so-called “bSam-yas Debate”. The author appears reasonably well informed about the relevant Western research, most of which is included here.
- Part III. *Kankoku no zen* [Korean Sōn], by Chōng Sōngbon. This chapter is organized differently from the other chapters in the book in so much as it features a historical approach to the topic under presentation. After a general and very superficial introduction to general studies on the history of Korean Buddhism, the author meticulously follows the development of Korean Sōn from the Unified Silla dynasty (668–935) through the Koryō (918–1392) and the Chosōn (1392–1910), up into the modern era. In the course of this essentially historical survey of Korean Sōn, he introduces what he sees as the most important studies, most of which are by Korean scholars. It appears that he presumes Korean Buddhism to be relatively unknown in Japan, and makes this his reason for presenting the material in this dual way. However, I am not so sure that this is the case. There are quite a number of reasonably sober studies in Japan on Korean Sōn of which mention could have been made. Lastly the author of this chapter has Chosōn Buddhism end in 1896, and what he refers to as “modern” Buddhism start the following year. What a strange thing to do! The Chosōn dynasty ended in 1910 with the Japanese annexation of the Korean Kingdom, and it would be more meaningful—if not more correct—to let “modern” Korean Buddhism start from that date. In any case traditional Korean practices have prevailed long into the twentieth century, and the impact of Japanese modernization on Korean Buddhism was not felt until after the annexation.
- Part IV. *Nihon* [Japan]
  - 1. “Nihōn bukkyō to zen [Japanese Buddhism and Zen]”, by Ishikawa Rikizan. As indicated by the title, this chapter provides a discussion of studies which contextualize *zen* in Japanese Buddhism. Somehow I miss information on studies that deal with the

assimilation of esoteric and Shinto practices by the schools of Zen Buddhism.

2. “Sōtō shū 1 [The Sōtō School—1]”, by Itō Shūken. This chapter deals foremostly with Dōgen studies, including the formation of the early Sōtō School. It is rather obvious that it focuses on studies done by people from Komazawa.

3. Sōtō shū 2 [The Sōtō School—2]”, by Ōtani Tetsuo. This section deals with the history and doctrinal development of the Sōtō tradition after Dōgen. Again studies done by people from Komazawa dominate the account.

4. “Rinzai shū—Ōbaku shū [The Rinzai School—Ōbaku School]”, by Takenuki Genshō. Since the doctrinal and practical aspects of the Ōbaku School are still little known in the West, this chapter provides a highly useful introduction to classical works and secondary material in Japanese that are otherwise hard to come by. No doubt in order to avoid sectarian squabbles, the editor has wisely let Rinzai scholars from Hanazono and Daikoku Universities write this chapter.

- Part V. *Genten dokukai no tame no kiso chishiki* [Reference Works and Dictionaries]
  1. Chūgoku no genten dokukai [Chinese Reference Works], by Ogawa Takashi.
  2. “Nihon no genten dokukai [Japanese Reference Works]”, by Takahashi Shū’ei.

One of the greatest drawbacks of the present publication is the fact that it was already outmoded by the time it was published. With the possible exception of the part on reference works, the book generally fails to mention much of the research in the field—both Japanese and Western studies—that has appeared since 1985. This is somewhat absurd since the book is meant as a guide and introduction to Zen/Chan studies for a Japanese-reading audience.

Another serious flaw, in fact something which is linked to the above point of criticism, is the generally poor knowledge of Western scholarship which is apparent throughout the book, with the possible exception of Tanaka’s essay on Chan Buddhism in Dunhuang. Although it may be that Japanese scholars often do not consider Western studies on East Asian Buddhism to be of a very high standard, it does reflect a considerable lack of insight in what is going on in the rest of the world. In Western Chan studies I miss the significant contributions to the history of early Chan by Bernard Faure, Peter N. Gregory’s study on Zongmi (780–841), as well as Morten Schhütter’s ground-breaking study of the *Platform Scripture*. In the field of Korean Sōn the author of this chapter displays a total lack of knowledge of any study in Western languages, and even fails to mention Robert E. Buswell’s several important studies on Chinul (1158–1210) and on the *Vajrasamādhisūtra*, as

well as his more recent work on Sōn monasticism in contemporary Korea. Needless to say, the entire part on Japanese Zen does not refer to a single work in a Western language despite the fact that several fine studies have appeared during the last two decades, including James Sanford's work on Ikkyū; Carl Bielefeldt's study on the practice of Zen meditation in Dōgen; and Martin Collcutt's book on the Gozan system in medieval Japan, just to mention a few.

Despite its obvious shortcomings, *Zengaku kenkyū nyūmon* is a useful reference tool, and as a quick entry to studies on Zen/Chan/Sōn in the Japanese language it is probably the best available publication on the market. In addition to this, with its ¥6000 price tag it is a reasonable buy (indeed a rarity for Japanese books), and hence it must be considered a worthwhile investment for the concerned scholar.

(HHS)

*Other Selves: Autobiography and Biography in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Ed. by Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara. Oakville (Buffalo): Mosaic Press, 1994. pp. 243 + 17 unpaginated pages.

In recent years there has been a certain fascination among scholars of the humanities for concepts relating to "self" and identity in its various expressions. This fad has also spread into the field of Asia studies, where autobiographies, diaries, travelogues, and other literary genres containing the direct formulations of the "self" have captured the attention of scholars. The present publication is an attempt at exploring this specific phenomenon in relation to the historian of religions, namely that of the self-understanding of the religious as expressed in the literary genres of autobiography and biography. To this end Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara of McMaster University in Canada have once again joined forces, and the outcome is the series of articles contained in the present book. As *SCEAR* (and the reviewer himself) is devoted to the study of Central and East Asian religions only, I shall here refrain from commenting critically on the articles in the book that do not fall within this frame of reference. In addition to a useful list of Chinese characters and an index, *Other Selves* contains the following articles.

Ronald L. Grimes, "The Presentation of Self in Native American Life History". This article attempts to set up a general methodological framework for the purpose of understanding the perception and presentation of self as found in autobiographical accounts by Native American Indians. In the course of his fairly short presentation the author reveals some instances of fictionalization of these accounts by outsiders. Annotation is all but non-existent here.

Phyllis Granoff, "Life as Ritual Process: Rememberance of Past Births in Jain Religious Narratives". The previous life-accounts in the Jain tradition

are here discussed on the basis of the *Ācārāṅga-sūtra*, an important early source. As might be expected, morality plays a major role in the Jain understanding of rebirth, and much of Granoff's discourse is devoted to an unravelling of the structural elements in these didactic stories. The author is clearly very knowledgeable in the various aspects of the field of Jainism; however, the accompanying annotation appears surprisingly weak.

Koichi Shinohara, "Zhiyuan's Autobiographical Essay: The Master and the Mean". The topic of this long article is the eleventh century Tiantai monk, Zhiyuan (976–1022), and his *Zhongyong zizhuan* [Biography of a Gentleman of the Mean; note that my translation of the title of the work in question differs that of Shinohara]. The spiritual backdrop of Zhiyuan and his essay are the doctrinal polemics between the Shanjia and the Shanwai factions within Tiantai Buddhism of the early Song, and Shinohara gives a solid historical presentation of the time and the persons involved, and thereby shows his wide knowledge of Chinese Buddhist history and that of the Tiantai in particular. He provides a highly detailed analysis of Zhiyuan's significant autobiographical essay—both in terms of contents and in terms of its literary genre—including a translation of its major parts. The article also includes an appendix, extensive annotation and a long bibliography.

K. I. Koppedrayar, "Gandhi and Autobiography". This article consists of an analysis of Gandhi's *An Autobiography, or the Story of My Experiments With Truth*, and through this study one gains an interesting insight into the mind of this peculiarly fastidious individual. Much of the information on which this article was written deals with Gandhi's years in South Africa. Copious notes and an extensive bibliography accompany this article.

Luis Gómez, "Presentations of Self: Personal Dimensions of Ritualized Speech". In this presentation the author focuses on two confessional texts, the *Deśanāstava* [Eulogy of Confession], and the better known *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, written by the Indian Buddhist sages Candragomin and Śāntideva respectively. Since both texts are written in the first person, the author treats them in the light of self-disclosure, i.e. as narrative identity. However, Gómez goes one step further, as he also includes the concept of autobiographic projection, i.e. imagined selves, in his presentation. As might be expected, the article evolves around a tightly structured methodological argument incorporating comparative analysis.

Koichi Shinohara, "Passages and Transmission in Tianhuang Daowu's Biographies". The focus of this article is on the biographical account of the Chan monk Daowu (c.748–807) as found in two inscriptions contained in the *Quan Tangwen* [Complete Tang Texts] with special emphasis on spiritual development and transmission. This information is then corroborated with information taken from various Chan histories including the *Chodang chip* and the *Jingde chuandeng lu* as well as the *Song gaoseng zhuan*. The author is mainly interested in understanding the various strategies used by medieval Chinese writers to compose biographies, or rather hagiographies

of famous monks. Much of the article consists of translations. As for his deconstructive analysis Shinohara could have benefitted from a reading of Bernard Faure's significant study of Chan Buddhist self-understanding, the *Rhetoric of Immediacy* (Princeton, 1991).

Phyllis Granoff, "Ritual and Biography: The Case of Bappabhaṭṭisūri". This article, with its over fifty pages, is the most extensive in the present publication. It deals with the biography of the Jain saint Bappabhaṭṭisūri (fl. 8th cent.), and most of the article consists of translations taken from the *Prabandhakośa*, dated to AD 1349, and the *Ākhyanakamaṇikośa*, dated to the late eleventh century. Textual analysis takes up the last ten pages. Again the annotation is weak, especially when seen in the light of the length of the paper.

Ronald L. Grimes, "Ritual and Autobiography in Frank Hamilton Cushing's *My Adventures in Zuni*". A short but detailed study of a pioneer ethnologist's life and experiences with the Zuni Indians. This study appears somehow on the fringes of the theme of the book, as it deals more with the question of cultural than with religious identity from the point of view of self-perception.

Volney Gay, "Religious Autobiography, Psychoanalysis and Suicide". Various analytical models are in produced in relation to the issues referred to in the article's title. However, the author's approach to religious autobiography is derived mainly from the point of view of psychoanalysis. Towards the end Gay discusses some of the issues raised in the other articles found in this book.

It goes without saying that the the six contributions by the two editors and Ronald L. Grimes dominate the volume, which to a considerable extent is organized around the concerns they address. This is not meant as a criticism, but should more be seen as an acknowledgement of the areas and cultures focused upon here. Generally I find thematic compilations of articles—such as those found in the present publication—interesting and refreshing, not only because they deal with a fixed topic seen from various perspectives, but also because they may offer a useful comparative and methodological background across a fairly wide cultural spectrum. Despite the fact that such experiments often result in futile exercises in methodology, they are nevertheless necessary because they can sometimes force us to look at our own special areas with new eyes. Although I do not count myself competent in most of the areas presented here, I found the topic and the general idea behind the book highly stimulating, and I hope that the editors in the future will continue to initiate such cross-cultural "experiments".

As was the case with the previous book edited by Shinohara and Granoff at the Mosaic Press, the lay-out of the publication is perfectly awful, and typographical mistakes are abundant.

(HHS)