

Out of the Cloister: Literati Perspectives on Buddhism in Sung China, 960–1279. By Mark Halperin. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006. Pp. vi + 364. \$49.95/£32.95.

Western knowledge of Sung Buddhism has been much enriched since the last two decades during which the non-doctrinal aspects of Buddhism were given much attention.¹ Halperin's book on the literati perspectives on Buddhism reflects the continuing growth of interest in Sung Buddhism and represents a large stride that students in the field have made.

Few students of pre-modern Chinese Buddhism will fail to notice the prodigious amount of Buddhism-related literary compositions in scholars' collected works and in local gazetteers. While students of Buddhism have been using this innumerable amount of sources, which include poems, prefaces, epitaphs, stele inscriptions, and letters, none has made an analytical use of any of them to present an overall Sung literati's views and perceptions of Buddhism until Halperin. Halperin's selection of this topic is in itself a testimony of the author's penetrating insight. The abundantly rich sources cited in footnotes that amount to a fifth of the book indicate the long and arduous task the author undertook to complete this seminal study. Reading the literati's commemorations alone is a daunting task, not to mention providing a critical analysis and classification of them. It is doubtless an ambitious project, but the author has completed it skillfully and magistrally.

Using Huang T'ing-chien's 黃庭堅 (1045–1105) oft-quoted temple commemoration as an example,² the author ushers his readers into the entangled and complex world of Sung intellectuals, whose attitudes towards Buddhism and Buddhist monasteries ranged from unconditional patronage to outright denunciation. He informs us that a temple commemoration could incur the wrath of officials in power and caused its writer, Huang T'ing-chien, to be purged and sent into exile. Although this kind of liability on the part of the commemoration writer never became a norm in the Sung, Huang T'ing-chien's case suggests that every writer had his purpose in his representation of Buddhism when he decided to furnish a commemorative text to a monastery. The fact that Huang T'ing-chien availed himself of the opportunity to question the rationale for the classicists' mistreatment of Buddhists tells us only one of multifaceted purposes and representations embedded in the large corpus of Sung commemorative texts provided for Buddhist monasteries. They differed from their counterparts in the T'ang and this difference illustrates the diversity of

¹ See, for instance, John Kieschnick's books, both *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003) and *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997); and his article on "blood writing." See also various articles in *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 1993), edited by Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Peter N. Gregory, and in *Buddhism in the Sung* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999), edited by Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr.

² For the romanization of Chinese names in this review, I follow Halperin's use of the Wade-Giles system instead of the more commonly used pinyin system.

the intellectuals' perspectives of Buddhism in the T'ang-Sung transition, the Northern Sung, and the Southern Sung.

Thus the author discusses literati's views of Buddhism as represented by their representation of T'ang temples in chapter one of his book. Focusing on seven T'ang literati and their favourable commemorations for Buddhist monasteries, the author characterizes those texts as showing "intense piety" in keeping with the clergy's purpose of propagating the faith. These seven T'ang literati were Liang Su 梁肅 (753–793), Pai Chü-i 白居易 (768–846), Tuan Ch'eng-shih 段成式 (c. 800–863), Li Chao 李肇 (fl. 820), Wei Kao 韋臯 (d. 805), and Ku K'uang 顧況 (c. 725–c. 814), and the foremost Liu Tsung-yüan 柳宗元 (773–819). Their patronage of Buddhism and the widespread piety in Buddhism, in the author's view, resulted from the vigorous role that Buddhism and the Buddhists played in literate community. The general tenor of their commemorations bespoke that the "protecting the dharma," or *hu-fa* 護法, was the norm which some Sung literati would abide by. The ways they extolled Buddhism and endorsed the newly constructed or refurbished monasteries in their commemorative texts form the central theme of the second chapter.

Taking note of those Sung literati who engaged in "protecting the dharma" amidst their debate over the validity of Ch'an subitism when Ch'an became flourished in the Sung, the author discusses their commemorative texts in detail in chapter two. He points out that while there were literati, such as Hou P'u 侯溥 (1032–?), Yü Ching 余靖 (1000–1064), and Chang Shang-ying 張商英 (1043–1121), and Li Chao-ch'i 李昭玘 (fl. 1110), who favoured Ch'an subitism, there were also bickering voices of those who defended skillful means and gradual Ch'an, the foremost of them being Su Shih 蘇軾 (1037–1101), Shen Kua 沈括 (1031–1095), and Teng Su 鄧肅 (1091–1132). Some individuals in these two camps were, however, quick to show their apologetic sentiment in their commemorations. This sentiment also found its expression in the commemorations provided by Lu Yu 陸游 (1135–1210), Lu Hui-chih 陸徽之, Tseng Chao 曾肇 (1047–1107), and Lü Pen-chung 呂本中 (1084–1145). They adopted a conciliatory stance in their texts, proposing to reconcile the differences between Buddhism and Confucianism and seek common ground for both teachings to thrive. The author also suggests that the Northern Sung sense of a commitment to defending Buddhism somehow disappeared in the Southern Sung because, among other things, Ch'an circles no longer had any brilliant leader like Ta-hui Tsung-kaio 大慧宗杲 (1089–1163) and the lay society no longer produced such eminent scholars and patrons as Yang I 楊億 (974–1020), Su Shih, Chang Shang-ying, and Ch'en Kuan 陳瓘 (1157–1124). This diminution of commitment, along with the influence of the *tao-hsüeh* movement, contributed to the shift of focus and change of purpose explicit in the Southern Sung commemorations.

Chapters three, "Imperial Shrines," elaborates on this new trend by arguing that the literati were poised to strengthen the close tie existent between church and state by impelling the church to serve the state. In their commemorative texts, they urged the clergy to keep serving their multifaceted political functions, including replenishing their partnership with the state as well as with the imperial household, particularly when the state was suffering from political setback because of the Jurchen invasion and occupation of north China. They expected monasteries to continue serving as sacred spaces where the

remains of the war dead, the portraits of deceased emperors, and imperial calligraphy were enshrined. These monasteries, which became sanctified through such enshrinement, also received the honour of holding ceremonies for imperial birthdays and deathdays. Despite the paucity of the monasteries that carried out these functions, the author stresses that they “assumed a significance far out of proportion to their number” as their T’ang counterparts (p. 114). At these venues and through the texts they wrote, the literati “carried out a constant exchange of protection and submission” (p. 114).

The monasteries and their major functions summarized in the inscriptional texts can be outlined as follows:

1. Comforting the war dead: Wang Yü-ch’eng 王禹偁 (954–1001), wrote for Chien-lung ssu 建隆寺 in Yang-chou 揚州; Liu Pin 劉邠 (1023–1089), wrote for Tzu-sheng ch’an-yüan 資聖禪院 in T’ai-yüan 太原; Yeh Meng-te 葉夢得 (1077–1148), wrote for various monasteries in Chien-k’ang 建康; Wang Hsi-lü 王希呂 (fl. 1172), wrote for P’u-hsiang yüan 普向院 in Lin-an 臨安; Yüan Fu 袁甫 (fl. 1220), wrote for Kuang-hsiao ssu 光孝寺 in Ch’ü-chou 衢州.
2. Praying for royal birthdays and deathdays: Li Chih-i 李之儀 (fl. 1100), wrote for Ch’ung-ning Wan-shou ssu 崇寧萬壽寺 in Ying-ch’ang fu 穎昌府 (Honan); Lu Yu, wrote for Ta Neng-jen ssu 大能仁寺 in Shao-hsing 紹興; Lin Hsi-i 林希逸 (fl. 1235), wrote for K’ai-yüan ssu 開元寺 in Ch’ao-chou 潮州 (Kuangtung).
3. Preservation of imperial calligraphy: Sung Ch’i 宋祁 (998–1061), wrote for Ch’ien-ming ch’an-yüan 乾明禪院 in Fu-chou 復州 (Hupei); Han Yüan-chi 韓元吉 (1118–1187), wrote for P’u-hui ssu 普惠寺 in Yin-ching-shan 隱靜山 (Anhui); Lu Yu, wrote for A-yü-wang ssu 阿育王寺 in Ming-chou 明州 (Chekiang).
4. Enshrining imperial portraits: Hsia Sung 夏竦 (985–1051), wrote for Tz’u-hsiao ssu 慈孝寺 in K’ai-feng 開封 (Honan), Ssu-ma Kuang 司馬光 (1019–1086), wrote about Shou-hsing kuang 壽星觀 in Kai-feng;³ Lou Chi 樓機 (1133–1211), Ch’eng Kung-hsü 程公許 (?–1251), Chou Fang 周方 (*chin-shih*, 1256), and Chao Meng-chien 趙孟堅 (1199–1295) wrote for Hsing-sheng ssu 興聖寺 in Chia-hsing 嘉興 (Chekiang).

Using these literati’s commemorations as examples, the author highlights how Buddhist cloisters consecrate objects associated with imperial household, sometimes at the risk of *lèse-majesté*, and stresses that this was the church that the literati, with a few exceptions, preferred to see.

A similar sentiment became evident in the commemorations discussed in chapter four, “Deplorable Displays and Edifying Exempla.” In this chapter, the author calls attention to writers’ different attitudes towards Buddhism and identifies three major strands of voices in the literati’s account of the monasteries. One of the voices was particularly aimed to further impose patriotism on Buddhism. This was in part because the tone of the

³ This was actually Ssu-ma Kuang’s memorial, which was attempted to address to the placement of imperial images in a Taoist temple. However, he did mention the impropriety of worshipping imperial portraits in both Buddhist and Taoist temples.

literati's discourse on Buddhism was largely set by the high-minded Northern Sung Confucian literati led by Ou-yang Hsiu in their critical analysis of the reasons behind Buddhism's success. Later literati mulled over their views in admiration or in doubt and echoed, reinforced, or questioned their predecessors' disparaging views of Buddhism and their denouncement of new Buddhist establishments. The author suggests that these writers "used commemorations for Buddhist establishments as forums for the critical discussion of social ills" (p. 160), which in their views could be either cured if Buddhist monasteries took their social responsibilities as the government expected or could be worsened if they did not. These three contrasting types of voices, their responsible literati, and the monasteries to which they addressed in their commemorations can be outlined as follows:

1. Contentious voices: primarily the anti-Buddhist diatribe exemplified by Su Shun-ch'in's 蘇舜欽 (1008–1048) criticism of the monastery's profligacy indicative in its the construction of Pao-hsiang ch'an-yüan 寶相禪院 in K'ai-feng 開封, as well as the following accusations made by what the author perceives as "militant Confucians" in their polemic commemorations.
 - (a) Buddhists as economic parasites: Tseng Kung 曾鞏 (1019–1083), addressed to O-hu yüan 鵝湖院 in Hsin-chou 信州 (Kiangsi) and Tou-shuai yüan 兜率院 in Fen-ning 分寧 (Kiangsi); Lu Chün 陸垓, addressed to Ch'ung-fu ssu 崇福寺 in Ch'ung-te 崇德 (Chekiang).
 - (b) Buddhists caused cultural decay: Liu Tsai 劉宰 (1167–1240), addressed to Tz'u-yün ssu 慈雲寺 (Kiangsu); Hu Yin 胡寅 (1098–1156), addressed to Chih-tu yüan 智度院 in Feng-ch'eng 豐城 (Kiangsi); Chen Te-hsiu 真德秀 (1178–1235), addressed to Ching-shan [shou-sheng] ssu 徑山壽聖寺 in Hangchou; Huang Chen 黃震 (1213–1280), addressed to [Ching-shan] shou-sheng ssu; Li Mi-hsün 李彌遜 (1090–1153), addressed to Ch'ien-yüan ssu 乾元寺 in Fu-chou 福州 (Fukien); Chang Nieh 張嶠 (1096–1148), addressed to Chi-fu chiao-yüan 集福教院 in Ch'u-chou 處州.
2. Virtuous models: Essentially the praise of Buddhists' moral rectitude demonstrated in the construction of monasteries as a way to encourage good deed, as pointed out by Yü Ching in his account of Lo-han yüan 羅漢院 in Nan-hai 南海 (Kuang-chou) and in similar accounts provided by both pro-Buddhist and anti-Buddhist scholars.
 - (a) Promoting magnanimity: Ou-yang Hsiu, wrote for Yao-shih yüan 藥師院 in Hsiang-t'an 湘潭 (Hunan); Chang Fang-p'ing 張方平 (1007–1091), wrote for T'ien-mu ssu 天目寺 in Shu-chou 蜀州 (Szechuan); Li Kou 李覲 (1009–1059), wrote for Hsin-ch'eng yüan 新成院 in Fu-chou 撫州 (Kiangsi); Tsou Hao 鄒浩 (1060–1111), wrote for Fa-hua ssu 法華寺 in Yung-chou 永州; Chou Fu 周孚 (1135–1179), wrote for P'u-chi ch'an-yüan 普寂禪院 in Chiao-shan (Szechuan).
 - (b) Filial devotion: Wang Ying-lin 王應麟 (1223–1296), wrote for Kuang-en ch'ung-fu ssu 廣恩崇福寺 in Lin-an; Shih Hao 史浩 (1106–1194), wrote for Kuang-shou hui-yün ch'an-ssu 廣壽慧雲禪寺 in Lin-an; Li Shih 李石 (1108–

- c. 1181), wrote for An-le yüan 安樂院 in Chien-chou 簡州 (Szechuan); Yü Ching, wrote for Shan-hua yüan 善化院 in Shao-chou 韶州 (Kuang-tung); Lu Yu, wrote for Ling-mi yüan 靈秘院 in Kui-chi 會稽 (Chekiang).
3. Embarrassing successes: A collective revelation of Buddhists' unflagging effort to conserve and expand monasteries as a way to safeguard the tradition of Buddhist faith. The success achieved by dint of the clergy's diligent and effective construction of monasteries was highly praised to shame Confucians who looked down upon monks and their faith.

Tseng Kung, wrote for Ts'ai-yüan yüan 菜園院 in Fu-chou 撫州 (Kiangsi); Han yüan-chi, wrote for Ch'ung-fan ch'an-ssu 崇梵禪寺 in Chien-an 建安 (Fukien); Lu Yu, wrote for Kuang-shou ch'an-yüan 廣壽禪院 in Fu-chou 撫州 (Kiangsi) and Tsun-sheng yüan 尊勝院 in Chien-ning 建寧 (Fukien); Sun Ying-shih 孫應時 (1154–1206), wrote for Ming-hsi ch'an-yüan 明禧禪院 in T'ai-chou 泰州 (Huai-nan), Fu-ch'ang yüan 福昌院 and Fa-hsing ssu 法性寺 in Yü-yao 餘姚 (Chekiang); Li Hsin-ch'uan 李心傳 (1177–1244), wrote for Nan-lin Pao-kuo ssu 南林報國寺 in Wu-ch'eng 烏程 (Chekiang).

Clearly, these assessments of the merits and demerits of Buddhist monks and their construction of monasteries were tied in with the interaction between Buddhist institutions and lay society. Some writers were quick to praise a lay Buddhist who offered generous charity support for the monasteries but not for Confucian institutions such as schools. However, despite a laudatory account of the clergy and the monastery or an endorsement of a lay Buddhist's good deed, the writer, in the author's words, "left resembling a bystander, distanced from the larger society, perceptive but ineffectual" (p. 202). This bystander's role is further discussed in chapter five in which the commemorations were attempted to highlight the monastery in the writer's personal or family life. Discussed in the introduction of this chapter is Lou Yao 樓鑰 (1137–1213) and his commemoration for P'u-chao yüan 普照院 in Lu-shan 廬山. While this cloister brought fond memory to the writer because of the spectacular landscape that had captivated the writer when he was young, other cloisters brought to mind the writers' past experiences with them and gave the writers opportunities to reaffirm the worth of Buddhism. The writers and the commemorations for them can be outlined as follows:

1. Faith and filial piety: personal account of the monastery that was closely connected with family faith and filial piety towards ancestors, as seen in the commemoration that Hu Su 胡宿 (985–1067) wrote for Hsing-hua ssu 興化寺 in Ch'ang-chou 常州 (Kiangsu). Other examples include Chou Hsing-chi 周行己 (*chin-shih*, 1091) and his commemoration for Hsien-hsin p'u-an ch'an-ssu 閒心普安禪寺 in Wen-chou 溫州 (Chekiang); Liu K'o-chuang 劉克莊 (1187–1296) and his commemoration for Chien-fu yüan 薦福院, which was once the ancestral temple of the celebrated Fang family in P'u-t'ien 莆田; Hou P'u and his commemoration for Sheng-shou ssu ling-kan kuan-yin yüan 聖壽寺靈感觀音院 in Ling-chou 陵州 (Szechuan); Ts'ui Tun-li 崔敦禮 (d. 1181) and the commemorative text he furnished for a set of transformation tableaux in memory of his grandfather's piety.

2. Monastic memoirs and literati identities: account of personal reflection on and reminiscence of the construction of a Buddhist building. Examples include Lo Shih 羅適 (1029–1101) and his commemorations for Yung-le yüan 永樂院 in Ch'ien-t'ang 錢塘 (Chekiang) and Miao-sheng yüan 妙勝院 in Ming-chou, the first of which reminded him of his monk teachers from whom he learned Confucian teachings and the second denounced the religious practice that dismissed scriptural study and discipline; Yang-shih 楊時 (1053–1135) and his commemoration for the monk Ch'ing-chen 慶真 of Han-yün ssu 含雲寺 in Kiangsi and another commemoration for Tzu-sheng yüan 資聖院 in Fukien to which the care of his ancestors' graves and images were entrusted; Lu Yu and his commemoration for Lo-han t'ang 羅漢堂 in Ch'ing-chou 青州 (Shang-tung); Yeh Shih 葉適 (1150–1223) and his commemoration for Su-chüeh an 宿覺庵, which he built as his retirement cottage below the mountains where the eminent T'ang monk Yung-chia Hsüan-chüeh 永嘉玄覺 (665–713) had taken up his abode.

Along with these accounts, the author offers his interpretation of the reasons behind the literati's attention to these memorable cloisters. He suggests that the emergence of literati's introspective accounts owed much to the ever increasing intersection of the worlds of literatus and cleric, among other things.

In the conclusion of this book, the author reiterates the multifarious quality of the lay response to new and rebuilt temple structures during the Sung. He stresses that writers' different responses should not be taken for granted because evidence shows that individual writers, regardless of their attitudes towards Buddhism, would admire and deplore church on different occasions at different times, and that their increasing acquaintance and familiarity with the Buddhist church enabled them to speak of Buddhist constructions from various personal perspectives. Furthermore, it was the secularization of the *sangha* and the sacralization of literati's community that brought the two groups closer and the relationship between the two groups much more fluid. This new relationship demanded scholars to see Buddhist institution as an integral part of Sung culture and society and prompted them to engage in the appraisal of Buddhist establishments in the commemorations they were asked to write.

Overall, this book is marked by the following merits: (1) efficient use of a substantial amount of stele inscriptions as primary sources; (2) solid research on important issues raised by scholars in their commemorations, which are discussed thoroughly and coherently in separate chapters; (3) successful exploration of the uncharted areas of Sung society and culture that was enlivened by the interaction between the clergy and the literati; (4) effective analysis and classification of the multifaceted views and sentiments that the literati revealed in their commemorative texts; and (5) keenly perceptive of the shifting focus of the commemorations written in Northern Sung and those written in the Southern Sung.

The goal of this book, as the author proclaims, is to “examine how Sung literati represented monasteries, a central feature of Buddhism” (p. 4). Given the sumptuous monasteries and their excessive display of Buddhist images, which can be found in scholar-officials' commemorative inscriptions that often highlight their material splendor

(pp. 4–5), a conscientious student of Sung Buddhism simply cannot ignore this important genre of Sung historical source. As such, the author presents his book as a study of “commemorations [or commemorative inscriptions] as a literary form” (p. 14) and has to delve deeply into the sea of these sources. The overwhelming details and strikingly dense analysis support the author’s presentation of “a web book, not a line book.... [I]t will present a Sung landscape, with Buddhist temples at its center, and map out the different contexts and vantage points from which literati writers represented temples” (p. 26).

Interpreting the effect or impact of a historical event can be difficult, particularly when individuals involved in the event were prominent political adversaries. However, singling out one of the individuals to introduce the conflict of interest among political adversaries can be sensational. When the author introduces his topic with a reference to Huang T’ing-chien’s dedicatory inscription, the image of Huang T’ing-chien as a victim of political purge immediately catches the reader’s attention. One cannot agree more with the point made by the author when he questions why Huang “[went] out of his way on this apparently apolitical occasion to criticize the government” (p. 3). Since Huang should have known that his adversary Chao T’ing-chih 趙挺之 (1040–1107) would not tolerate his repeated defiance against his policy, he would run the risk of undermining his official career by offending Chao T’ing-chih. There is little reason to assume that Huang was so naïve about the outcome of criticizing policy makers, which was apparently a political act, on an “apolitical” occasion as he might thought he was. He would know that his deliberate public offense was likely to give Chao T’ing-chih an excuse to remove him from office, because, once again, Chao T’ing-chih felt Huang had ridden roughshod over him when Huang’s commemoration was brought to his attention. To those readers who are familiar with Huang’s contemptuous attitudes toward Chao, Huang’s exile seems to have been a predictable outcome of his commemorative text. Thus while Huang T’ing-chien’s case can exemplify the trend of literati’s composition of commemorations, using his case to begin the discussion of literati’s perspectives on Buddhism could suggest the existence of a special type of commemoration of which Huang T’ing-chien was the precursor. Given the atypical nature of Huang’s case, this suggestion of a special type of commemoration with its political implication seems questionable.

To students of Sung Buddhism and culture, Su Ch’e 蘇轍 (1039–1112) is best known for his role as a *wai-hu* 外護 of Buddhism, or one who protects the dharma. This explains why the author uses him as the foremost example to explicate the complexity of Ch’an debate in the Sung. Su Ch’e furnished at least four separate commemorations for four different cloisters. His praise of the collaboration between the clergy and regional prefect and lay Buddhist, under whose auspice two separate monastic constructions were completed, is a recurrent theme in Sung commemorative texts.⁴ They could have been used to bolster the author’s argument about the *wai-hu* quality of some literati’s commemorations. A commemorative text of this nature is what a Sung monk expected from the writer who granted him a commemoration for his accomplishments of which cloister building was but

⁴ See “Kuang-chou k’ai-yüan ch’ung-hsiu ta-tien chi” and “Yün-chou sheng-shou yüan fa-t’ang chi” in his *Luan-ch’eng chi* 欒城集 (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1987), pp. 501–4.

one. Su Ch'e's favourable texts encouraged monks to seek like-minded scholars to amplify their merits. They helped boost the growing demand of commemorative inscriptions, providing impetus for the practice to become unprecedentedly common during the Sung. It is puzzling to see the absence of Su Ch'e's commemorations among those discussed in the book.

This said, we should be reminded that one compelling reason for Sung literati to feel imperative about joining and leading the discourse on Buddhism or Ch'an in different forms of compositions including commemorative inscriptions is their erudition in both Confucian and Buddhist literature and canons. With their intellectual breadth and depth, coupled with their brilliant skills in prose writing, they prided themselves on their mastery of Buddhist teachings and would wittingly or unwittingly presume to judge the clergy and their faith. The Southern Sung Neo-Confucian Hu Yin claimed that he had studied various Mahayana scriptures and Ch'an texts, i.e., lamp histories, handed down by different Ch'an lineages. Only after he *ch'ung-chien chih-kui* 窮見指歸 (explored thoroughly their purports) did he decide to write a book to refute the absurd and preposterous aspects of their teachings.⁵ Also because of his conversance with Buddhist scriptures and history, he was able to compose critical commemorations and unleash his discontent onto Buddhists, and Confucians, who abnegated their purposes and learning.

Hu Yin was certainly not alone in furnishing favourable commemorative texts to monks as an anti-Buddhist. He had every good reason to do it, as he once pointed out the upsurge of commemorations and admitted that Confucian writers were obliged to write them because Buddhism offered good advice and warning.⁶ Earlier, the Northern Sung scholar Tseng Kung had pronounced that praising those who studied Buddhism was to encourage Confucian scholars, and his view was repeatedly quoted by Southern Sung scholars such as Wang Ying-lin.⁷ In these literati's views, Confucians did fall short of their effort to carry out their Confucian Way and appeared lethargic in the face of Buddhist discipline and austerity.⁸ Singing praise of the clergy in commemorative texts thus evoked the sense of shame among their Confucian colleagues. It served as a mirror for the unscrupulous Confucians to self-reflect. Hu Yin and many other literati produced a significant amount of such texts. The author aptly calls attention to some of these texts, which, if thoroughly studied, can further attest to the increased Confucian affinity toward Buddhist clergy.

⁵ Hu Yin, "Wang-shih Chang-shih mu-chih-ming," in his *Ch'ung-cheng pien/Fei-jan chi* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1993), pp. 570-71. The book was later known as *Ts'ung-cheng pien* 崇正辨, which the author also discusses briefly (p. 170).

⁶ Ibid, "Feng-ch'eng hsien hsin-hsiu Chih-tu yüan chi," p. 406.

⁷ See Wang Ying-lin, "Kuang-en ch'ung-fu ssu chi," in Yüan Cheü 袁桷, *Yen-yü Ssu-ming chih* 延祐四明志 (*Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu* edition), *chüan* 17, pp. 22a-23b.

⁸ Tseng Kung, "Ts'ai-yüan yüan fo-tien chi," in his *Yüan-feng lei-kao* 元豐類稿 (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1984), pp. 280-81.

Sung literati did not write for the burgeoning Ch'an cloisters exclusively. Nor did they necessarily privilege and favour Ch'an monasteries over temples associated with other Buddhist schools. To them, many Ch'an masters were by no means solipsistic. They could be experts of Ch'an, T'ien-t'ai, Hua-yen, Pure Land, and Vinaya teachings at the same time, being equally well versed in Ch'an, *chiao* 教 (doctrines), and *lü* 律 (vinaya). Likewise, abbots and monks of other Buddhist schools could have the same caliber and would for this reason command the scholar's respect and admiration. Their surpassing learning and managerial skills more often than not contributed to the success of their construction projects. The literati did not always provide commemorations at the monk's request and would sometimes volunteer their work. Ch'en Kuan, a devout Buddhist and an unscrupulous remonstrance official whose name the author mentions in passing (p. 84), composed a commemoration of his own accord for the newly constructed Pure Land halls in the prominent Yen-ch'ing ssu 延慶寺 in Ming-chou.⁹ In his text, Ch'en Kuan not only furnished a statement extolling the *wang-sheng* 往生 (rebirth in the Pure Land) and *pu-t'ui-chuan* 不退轉 (non-retrogression) concept but also lauded Bikshu Chieh-jan 比丘介然 (fl. 1078–1130) for his ability to mobilize lay followers to help complete the seven-year project.¹⁰ Ch'en Kuan stressed that Chieh-jan's selfless dedication to the project was the reason for his winning of the whole-hearted support of Pure Land practitioners.¹¹ Other than endorsing Chieh-jan's construction of sixteen meditation halls along with images of the Buddha Amitabha and the Pure Land Triad, Ch'en Kuan made no attempt to embarrass his Buddhist friends and Confucian colleagues. He expressed his views with his personal Pure Land conviction.

Another writer, Ch'en Shih-chü 陳時舉 of Yü-yao 餘姚, wrote a commemoration in 1132 for a Vinaya temple called Hua-yen lü-yüan 華嚴律院. Like Ch'en Kuan, all he tried to do in his text was revealing the managerial skill of the abbot Tsung-wei 宗暉, who was recommended to head the temple because none of his predecessors was capable of restoring it after they had been selected from *shih-fang* 十方 (ten directions) to preside over the temple. Ch'en Shih-chü recounted the story of Tsung-wei's success, stressing Tsung-wei's sincere devotion to the construction, which he believed was the sole reason for the efficacy of the abbot's prayer. To Ch'en, although the completion of the ten-year project owed much to communal support and even to good timing, it was "in fact a result of human efforts. If it were without Master Wei's profound sincerity in Vinaya Discipline that had moved people, how would it be possible to accomplish such feat?"¹² Ch'en was delighted in writing the commemoration at Tsung-wei's request largely because Tsung-wei had been a fellow villager and friend he knew all too well.

⁹ The temple, whose abbot was Ming-chih Chung-li 明智中立 at the time, had been presided over by Chung-li's grand master Fa-chih Chih-li 法智知禮, one of the most eminent T'ien-t'ai masters in the early Sung.

¹⁰ Chieh-jan was Fa-chih Chih-li's second generation heir and Ming-chih Chung-li's dharma brother.

¹¹ See Ch'en Kuan, "Yen-ch'ing ssu ching-t'u yüan chi," in Chang Chin 張津 et al., *Ch'ien-tao Ssu-ming t'u-ching* 乾道四明圖經 (*Hsü-hsiu Ssu-k'u chüan-shu* edition), *chüan* 10, pp. 5a–7a.

¹² See Ch'en Shih-chü, "Hua-yen lü-yüan chi," in *Yen-yu Ssu-ming chih*, *chüan* 18, pp. 4a–5b.

Wang T'ing-hsiu 王庭秀, a certain Legal Researcher of the Censorate 御史臺檢法官 in Emperor Kao-tsung's reign, composed a commemoration in 1127 not in response to the monk's request but to his friend's. Hearing from his friend Miao-kao chü-shih 妙高居士 relay to him the success story of the P'u-ming lü-ssu 普明律寺, he was moved to provide a commemoration for the temple.¹³ In the text, he brought to light the resolve and enthusiasm of the abbot, Tao-cheng 道證, and the collective effort made by the fellow temple monks led by Tao-shu 道殊 and Fa-ting 法定. He attributed the swift completion of the imposing abbot's hall to the abbot's remarkable character.

Clearly, the supposedly difficult process in the construction of these non-Ch'an temples was nonetheless efficiently carried out mainly because of the abbots' charisma and resolve. All three approbatory commemorations were among those that were attempted voluntarily or semi-voluntarily without the monk's repeated imploration. Other than applause and personal admiration, what edification would the writers of them consider conveying to the responsible party of the monastic construction? Compared with such anti-Buddhist scholars as Ssu-ma Kuang, Li Kou, and Hu Yin, these writers simply felt urge to honour their trusted monks and their ability to accomplish amazing feats of institutional expansion.

Many Ch'an masters were honoured for such ability as well. Although the development of Ch'an in the Southern Sung remains an area yet to be explored, suffice it to say that the rise of the so-called *Wu-shan shih-ch'a* 五山十刹 owed much to some outstanding Ch'an masters and their extraordinary capability to exert some gravitational pull on lay followers. This is why Yeh Meng-te, whose *pi-chi* 筆記 the author quotes a few times, remarked that "the rise and fall of the monastery relies on timing, whereas donations it received is up to the effort of the donor."¹⁴ Only a charismatic Ch'an master could draw large funds from donors. Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗杲 was certainly among one of these highly-regarded Ch'an masters, but he was by no means the most influential as the author suggests. Although one could argue that after his death, "no monk for the rest of the dynasty, either outside or inside the Ch'an tradition, emerged with remotely the same degree of brilliance or influence" (p. 109), one should be wary of the distinction between "brilliance" and "influence," and Ta-hui's towering image shaped by modern scholars. For one thing, his contemporaneous Ch'an master Hung-chih Cheng-chüeh 宏智正覺 might be equally brilliant, but he exerted less direct influence on the expansion of Ts'ao-tung 曹洞 teaching than his second generation heir T'ien-t'ung 天童如淨 did inside and outside China. Ju-ching's renown made him the abbot of Mt. T'ien-t'ung, whose growing prominence under Ju-ching's management drew such exceptional foreign monk as Dōgen 道元 from Japan. Ta-hui's direct influence on the expansion of Lin-chi 臨濟 teachings, if measured against the larger backdrop of East Asian Ch'an development,

¹³ Miao-kao chü-shih was Yü Kuan-neng 俞觀能, a native of Hsiang-shan 象山, Ming-chou, who wrote a commemoration for the newly refurbished Buddha Hall in local T'ai-p'ing ch'an-ssu 太平禪寺 of his accord because his grandfather had donated funds to construct the hall. See *Yen-yu Ssu-ming chih, chüan* 18, pp. 22a-25a.

¹⁴ See in the end of his "Pao-ning ssu lun tzang chi."

was as limited as Hung-chih. A number of later generation Lin-chi masters, including but not limited to Wu-chun Shih-fan 無準師範 and Hsü-t'ang Chih-yü 虛堂智愚 (1185–1269) whose name the author also mentions in passing, exerted wider influence inside and outside China. As second or third generation heirs of Hu-ch'iu Shao-lung 虎丘紹隆 (1077–1136), a dharma brother of Ta-hui, they had greater, direct influences on Ch'an's continuing prominence and dissemination in the entire East Asia. When considering influence, one should not lose sight of the fact that Ch'an after Ta-hui was no longer a cultural phenomenon in China, but instead in the entire East Asia.

No matter how far the Ch'an master could disseminate his teaching, he had to succumb to the Sung state domination of his monastery. There is no question that the state used the church for its own purposes, but this imposition had to be in keeping with the literati's expectation of ritualistic propriety according to their Confucian conviction. Thus even though the monasteries wanted to voluntarily express their favour and support for the state by enshrining imperial portraits, the literati, regardless of their attitudes toward Buddhism, did not always find their intended sanctification of imperial portrait appropriate. This, of course, does not rule out the fact that some monks were able to enjoy the honour that the Sung emperors bestowed upon them. To say that no cleric was able to enjoy lavish imperial favour as Ch'eng-kuang, Hui-neng, and Subhakarasiṃha had enjoyed in the T'ang (p. 158) is to be oblivious of the individual Chan master's charisma. In fact, Ta-chüeh Huai-lien 大覺懷璉 (1009–1090) in the Northern Sung, Wu-tsun Shih-fan, Fo-chao Te-kuang 佛照德光 (1121–1203), and a few other Ch'an masters in the Southern Sung did enjoy comparable imperial patronage.¹⁵

Also, despite the state dominance, the literati's commemorations written in the Northern Sung, as the author suggests, tended to underscore the kindness of Sung rulers. As the time went by, it became clear that this was not much of the concern of the commemorations composed in the Southern Sung. Writers during this period tended to give weight to the munificence of devout donors and the efficacy brought about by the new or refurbished construction they supported. The apolitical texts produced in this celebratory vein, however, may not be seen as a national norm but rather an expression of regional diversity on top of personal preference, which the author may also need to take into account. In other words, without a thorough study of all available commemorations and their authors' mindsets within their geographical contexts, one cannot claim the overall prevalence of such sharply contrasting writing trends between the Northern Sung and Southern Sung. After all, the scholar-officials' attitude toward and engagement with Buddhism varied widely, and they "adopted a highly nuanced view of Buddhism" (p. 4), the classification of which must be conducted with extra caution.

¹⁵ See my article, "Ts'an-fang ming-shih: Nan-Sung ch'iu-fa jih-seng yü Chiang-tse fo-chiao ts'ung-lin 參訪名師：南宋求法日僧與江浙佛教叢林" (Searching for Inspiring Masters: Japanese Pilgrims and Buddhist Monasteries in the Jiang-Zhe Region during the Southern Song Dynasty), *Fo-hsüeh yen-chiu chung-hsin hsüeh-pao* 佛學研究中心學報 (Journal of the Center for Buddhist Studies), 10 (summer 2005), pp. 185–234.

Similarly, the prevalence and impact of Buddhism and rituals associated with it may need to be reconsidered. Saying that the popular acceptance of Buddhist ritual rendered Confucian classical ritual nearly invisible is as troubling as “[s]eeing Sung family ties as necessarily ‘Confucian’” (p. 205). Apparently misled by Patricia Ebrey’s oversimplified portrayal of pious wives in the upper rung of Sung society, the author says that “[t]he few women who preferred classical to Buddhist rituals were treated by militant classicists as noteworthy paragons” (p. 205). While it is true that women adhering to Confucian rites were highly praised, the number of them is by no means as small as the author suggests. A quick perusal of epitaphs or other forms of biographies of upper class women in the Sung proves that despite the dramatic increase of upper class Buddhist women, their number remains lower than women who rejected Buddhism.¹⁶ Thus the notion that “the few women” would prefer Confucian rituals is untenable.

A similar misrepresentation of Sung society is the author’s view of the fewness of ancestral halls. Following Beverly Bossler’s argument, the author, after stressing the diminution of Confucian influence and the increasing impact of Buddhist rituals as a result of economic and social changes, concludes that “few men in the Sung actually composed genealogies, built ancestral halls (without clerical stewardship), endowed corporate property, or saw to it that kin were buried together” (p. 205). Despite the parenthetical qualification, the seemingly logical statement cannot withstand the testimony of historical evidence, which shows a wide array of accounts of Sung literati’s references to ancestral halls and interment practice. They tell of the building, refurbishing, and relocation of ancestral halls and the collective burial of family members that apparently were not the products of the “few men” that the author speculates.

There are some unclear or confusing points one may also quibble about. For instance, the author’s statement regarding Confucian shrines’ being “nestled within Buddhist monasteries, where monks tended their cults” (p. 25) creates an image of the collapse of Confucian institutions and is not given any proof. When Seng-ch’ieh 僧伽 (628–710) is mentioned, the citation of the sources is minimal (p. 241).¹⁷

Regarding *chi* 記 as a literary genre used to write a commemorative inscription for a Buddhist structure, the author is not clear about his point. First, he says that it “began to appear in quantity during the late eighth and ninth centuries,” but he then quotes Yeh Shih 葉適 as saying that the genre “truly came into its own during the mid-eleventh century, with the works of Ou-yang Hsiu, Tseng Kung (1019–83), Wang An-shih [王安石 (1021–1086)], and Su Shih” (p. 14). This is confusing because it is unclear what exactly the mid-eleventh century writers had done to make the genre prevailingly significant. Is it simply because Yeh Shih praised the works of these “ancient prose” 古文 writers and gave them the credit for promoting the genre? Hardly so! All Yeh Shih said in the quoted

¹⁶ This point is adumbrated at greater length in my long article on Sung upper class women and Buddhism (forthcoming).

¹⁷ For a comprehensive study of the Seng-ch’ieh cult, see Chi-chiang Huang, “Seng-ch’ieh ch’uan-ch’i hsin-lun,” *Journal of the Center for Buddhist Studies* 9 (summer 2004), pp. 177–220.

passage is the writers' promotion of the ancient prose. Contrary to the author's suggestion, Yeh Shih never clearly indicated that they had made the genre celebrating.

Saying that Hu Yin's "Lo-han ko chi" 羅漢閣記 represents a "commemoration saturated with religious devotion" (p. 251, n. 115) is a misreading of Hu Yin's text. Hu Yin was a very consistent anti-Buddhist and a "militant" Confucian as the author identifies him. His composition of this commemorative text would not make him anywhere near a sympathizer of Buddhism. In fact, a highly suspicious overtone embedded in this commemoration indicates that he totally disagreed with the monk Chih-ching 智京, the requester of the commemoration, on the construction of the grand structure which, to him, would only incur Bodhidharma's ridicule as Liang Wu-ti 梁武帝 (464-549) had long ago.¹⁸

This misreading of the original inscriptional texts is among a plethora of misreadings and mistranslations randomly selected for discussion below. To some extent, the book is replete with many excellent translations of well chosen commemorations, but it is marred by these unfortunate errors.

The author begins his discussion by calling attention to the death of Huang T'ing-chien and his commemorative writing that caused him troubles. In the translation of the beginning paragraph of the commemoration, he fails to note Huang T'ing-chien's reference to the influence of Seng-ch'ieh, thus using the phrase "The Transformation of the Way" to translate the Chinese text 其道化, which really refers to the influence of Seng-ch'ieh's way or what Seng-ch'ieh stood for. The beginning of the second paragraph that reads "[c]lassicists always discuss the costs of Buddhist monasteries ..." is a misreading of the original, 一佛寺之費, which really means "the cost of building a single monastery."

The end of the last paragraph on the same page that reads "... unite and expel [the Buddhists]" is a misreading of the Chinese phrase 合而軋之, which actually means "expel [the Buddhists] *en masse*."

Translation of the first paragraph of Tseng Kung's commemoration (p. 164) has a rather confusing ending. The statement that reads "[b]ut they say, 'This law, which can bring people good and ill fortune, takes its substance from the ineffable [Way] of the sage'" does not accurately convey the meaning of the Chinese text that reads 質之於聖人，無有也, although the author's explanation of the parasitic nature of Buddhists does conform to the general purport of the paragraph. The problem is that the author reads *chih* 質 as "substance," which actually means "to question, to inquire" instead. And the sentence that begins with *Juo-fu* 若夫 and ends with *tse* 者 should be much more accurate when translated as "Such kind of people [who cannot do ...], yet still claim that they have ways to deal with fortune and misfortune, have never existed, [even] the sage would said so if he was inquired about."

The end of the first paragraph of Lu Chün's commemoration (p. 166) is mistranslated as "tasting that [dish] and assessing this one? Or will they only seek to eat what is sufficient?" The Chinese text reads 亦嘗量彼而忖己乎？抑止求其饜足而已也 should be translated as "Did they ever measure [how difficult it was for] that single person to feed

¹⁸ Hu Yin, *Ch'ung-cheng pien/Fei-jan chi*, pp. 455-56.

them and reflect on [how easy it was for] themselves to live [comfortably]? Or all they want is to enjoy being sufficiently fed and that is all?”

The sentence “[h]ow can this be explained” in the paragraph that follows is a misreading of a longer Chinese text 則將若之何勤修 ..., which should be translated as “Then [they should think about] how to diligently cultivate ...”

Translation of Liu Tsai’s commemoration (p. 168) violates the structural rule of the prose. The reading of Liu Tsai’s interpretation of the reason for Buddhism’s spread in China misses points suggested in a series of formulaic and parallel sentences that were attempted to show two contrasting and adverse behaviour patterns: While people want to eat delectable food, Buddhism tell them to stop killing; while people want to unite with their companions and live together, Buddhism wants to do away with human ethics; while people might be wanting in their memorial service when the sad things befall them, Buddhism wants them to give offerings for seven times over seven weeks and to conclude the mourning period in one hundred days; while people are unable to support their parents when they are living or unable to repay their parents after their deaths, Buddhism says that blessing can be prayed to have and sins can be repented.

Translation of Hu Yin’s commemoration (p. 170) is a misreading of 或至棄寺而居, which actually means “They even went so far as to abandon their monasteries to live elsewhere” rather than “In some cases they reside in neglected monasteries.”

Translation of Chang Fang-p’ing’s commemoration (p. 178) does not convey the intended meaning of the Chinese text that reads 佛言人命在呼吸間，一息不屬，雖至親愛，莫相為救，何嗟及矣. In stead of rendering it as “[a]s for the Buddha’s words and human life, we do not heed them during our lives [even for] the space of a single sigh. Even if [the distressed] are our dearest loved ones, none will act to save them,” the sentence should be translated as “the Buddha says that the life of a person lies in one’s breath. Once the breath discontinues for a moment, even if his/her dearest loved ones are incapable of acting to save him/her, and that will be too late for him/her to sigh.”

The Chinese text in Shih Hao’s commemoration (p. 183) that reads 矧或不競，求售他人，一再過而為墟者有之 is wrongly translated as “Yet in some cases, they do not seek to sell the property to others. One passes them once or twice, and they have become vacant lots.” An accurate translation should read “Moreover, once they are unable to fare well and seek to sell [their properties] to others, repeated changes in ownership may turn their places into waste lots. There are cases as such.” The Chinese text that follows should read 固不若……為長且久也 rather than 有之固不若……；推己所有……為長且久也, as indicated in the author’s translation that begins another paragraph “Owning them cannot match ... ” and ends in “to extend and lengthen [the family patrimony].”

Translation of Lu Yu’s commemoration for Ling-mi yüan (p. 187) misses the writer’s interrogative tones. The Chinese text that reads 有能家世相繼支久不壞如若之為父子者乎 and the parallel sentence that follows are rhetorical questions meant to single out the family ties that the monks of the temple have established *vis-à-vis* other neighbouring temples that have failed the job, despite their ability to receive favours from officials and obtain benefits from merchants.

In Lu Yu’s commemoration for Kuang-shou ch’an-yüan (p. 193), the Chinese text

that reads 今顧能不動聲氣，於期歲之間成此奇偉壯麗百年累世之迹，予切怪 ... is mistranslated as “Now to look on it, how can I not say something? Within the forecasted time I especially censure” An accurate translation should read something like “Now thinking that you were able to act without making any noises but complete, within a year, this extraordinarily grand and magnificent work, which will last many generations, I really want to censure”¹⁹

Translation of the Chinese text that reads 要之日葺月增，規隨後先，實民固圉 in Sun Ying-shih's commemoration (p. 196) garbles the writer's intended points. The phrase *shih-min ku-yü* 實民固圉, in particular, does not mean “to realize the [goal of] holding fast to the people's territory,” but rather “to enrich people and strengthen boarder security.” The last sentence in the translation, “Isn't this to swindle heaven?” is confusing because there is no corresponding text in Chinese. The ensuing discussion fails to note Sun Ying-shih's point that “the classicists cannot win people because [they have lost their Way], whereas Buddhists are able to win people. Who should take blame [for this] then?” 儒者不能以道得民，而佛氏得之，將誰責歟？²⁰

The statement about Ts'ui Tun-li “presented himself in a variety of personae” (p. 213), might be right, but the author confuses Ts'ui Tun-li's words with his father's. It should be noted that Ts'ui Tun-li started out his text by recounting what his father had said to him and concluded his summary by saying “after hearing what my father had relayed to me, I always sighed deeply and shed tears for it.” The translation that reads “[w]hen I told my father this, he always sighed deeply and shed tears” does not make sense, because Ts'ui's retelling of his father's words is misconstrued as Ts'ui's own “confession.”

Lo Shih's commemoration for Yung-le yüan is misread in many ways. “Each had considerable command of the two schools of Confucianism and Buddhism. I, who was humble, thus could associate with the two masters” (p. 216), is a mistranslation of the Chinese text 以儒釋二家自負，不少下人. The author clearly misreads it as 以儒釋二家，自負不少，下人余. The subsequent sentence 日浸淫開發，聞此達彼 is also mistranslated as “[...] our friendship grew daily. To develop my knowledge [...].” An approximate translation would be “I steeped myself in those books to explore their purports and was able to hear this and understand that”

Yang Shih's text that reads 始恨不得相從復如昔日也 should be translated as “then I began to regret not being able to associate with him again like we had been together in the old days” rather than “In the beginning, I regretted ... and restore the old days” (p. 219). The subsequent sentence 今其已矣 should be translated as “Now he is gone” instead of “Now [my hopes] are finished.”

¹⁹ The phrase *chi-sui* 期歲 denotes “one year” or “anniversary.” The commemoration indicates that the construction of the canon hall began in December, winter 1179, and was completed in November, winter 1180. The entire process took as short as a full year with little fanfare.

²⁰ Sun Ying-shih, “Fu-ch'ang yüan tsang-tien chi,” in *Chu-hu chi* (*Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu* edition), *chüan* 9, pp. 17a–18b.

The translation that reads “[t]he infants of the Central Plain” (p. 127) is a literal translation of 中原赤子, which would sound better if translated as “the innocent people of the Central Plain.”

The citation “[A] literatus donated 1,100 *mu* of his land to a prominent Chekiang monastery” (p. 135) would be more informative if the author also mentioned that the land, whose donor was Hsüeh Ch’un-i 薛純一 of Shan-yin 山陰 district, could yield an average of some 1,300 *tan* (piculs)²¹ of rice annually, which would give the temple purchase power to hold celebration of the birthdays of Kao-tsung’s two empresses.

Hu Su’s reference to his nephew is expressed in the phrase *chih-tzu* Ko 姊子格 in Chinese. The author apparently reads the phrase as *mei-tzu* Ko 妹子格, hence the translation reads “[m]y younger sister Ko” (p. 207).

Despite its high quality, the book is also fraught with many reference and editorial errors. The following are some examples:

Ching-shan 徑山 monastery, ranked first among the so-called Five Mountains in the Southern Sung, is “in Chekiang” not “in Kiangsu” (p. 171).

The personal name Le-cheng Tzu-ch’un 樂正子春 in Li Shih’s commemoration is mistaken as “Lo Cheng’s son Ch’un” (p. 184).

The full title of Zhao Bian’s 趙抃 *T’a-yüan chi* 塔院記 should begin with Lung-yu hsien rather than Lung-hu hsien and the author of the *Ling-yang chi* 陵陽集 is Mou Yen 牟巖 rather than Niu Yen (p. 251).

Reference on page 314, note 94 should be the same as note 93, “Su-chüeh an chi” instead of “T’i Chang chün so-shu fo-shu.”

Yü-t’ai (p. 2) should read Hsü-i (盱眙), which was a district in Ssu-chou 泗州 Anhui in Sung times and has since remained a district in Ssu-chou throughout history until 1955, when it was moved to the jurisdiction of Kiangsu after land rezoning.

Chen Kuan (p. 84) should read Ch’en Kuan.

A superfluous “the” is found in “did not the match the grandeur [...]” (p. 121).

Han Yüan-chi’s collected works should read *Nan-chien chia-i chi* 南澗甲乙集, instead of *Nan-jün chia-i chi* (pp. 288–89 and p. 328).

Lu Yu’s collected work should read *Lu Fang-weng ch’üan-chi* instead of *Lu Fang-wen ch’üan-chi* (p. 289).

Hsia Su (p. 154) should read Hsia Sung 夏竦, and Lu Chun (p. 165) should read Lu Chün.

Many editorial errors appear in the bibliography. Most of them are typos of Chinese characters. Here are some examples: Chen Te-hsiu 真德修 (p. 320) should read 真德秀; *Ch’üan Shu i-wen chih* 全屬藝文志 (p. 321) should read 全蜀藝文志; *Han Ch’ang-li shih hsi-nien chi-shih* 韓昌黎系年集詩 (p. 327) should read 韓昌黎詩繫年集釋; *Kung-k’ui chi* 功愧集 (p. 335) should read 攻媿集; *Ou-yang Hsiu tzu-liao hui-pien* 歐陽修資料會編 (p. 337) should read 歐陽修資料彙編; P’ei Hsiu 裴修 (p. 338) should read 裴休; *Shao-hsi yün-chien chih* 紹西雲間志 (p. 339) should read 紹熙雲間志; *Shih-men cheng-t’ung*

²¹ A picul is between 132 and 140 lbs.

釋門正通 (p. 340) should read 釋門正統; *Su Shih tzu-liao hui-pien* 蘇軾資料會編 (p. 342) should read 蘇軾資料彙編; *Ch'ih-hsiu Pai-chang ch'ing-kui* 敕修百丈清規 (p. 343) should read 敕修百丈清規; *Tseng-i A-han ching* 曾一阿含經 (p. 344) should read 增一阿含經; *Sheng-shui yen-t'an lu* 澗水燕談錄 (p. 345) should read *Min-shui yen-t'an lu*; *Yen-hsia fang-yen* 巖下放談 (p. 348) should read 巖下放言; Yen Keng-wang 嚴庚望 should read 嚴耕望; Yen Shang-wen 嚴尚文 (p. 348) should read 顏尚文; *Yen-yu Ssu-ming chih* 延佑四明志 (p. 349) should read 延祐四明志; *Hi Shū ten* 裴修傳 (p. 349) should read 裴休傳; Yü Ching 俞靖 (p. 349) should read 余靖; Yü Ying-shih 余應時 (p. 349) should read 余英時; Yüan Chen 元鎮 (p. 349) should read 元稹; Imamura Yoshio 今村與志 (p. 349) should read 今村與志雄。

To sum up, Halperin presents to his readers a significant amount of information on Sung literati's views on Buddhism as expressed in temple commemorations. His analysis and interpretation are sound, and his arguments well grounded. Despite the errors in translation and in references, the reader will find the book challenging and inspiring. The publisher, however, would do the readers of the book a great service if it attended to the aforementioned editing flaws.

CHI-CHIANG HUANG
Hobart and William Smith Colleges

Mediasphere Shanghai: The Aesthetics of Cultural Production. By Alexander Des Forges. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007. Pp. xi + 278. \$55.00.

There seems to be no end in sight to the ongoing stream of writings on how the image of Republican Shanghai as the hybridized city of speed, modernity, and sensuous abandon was produced and recycled. This is not to be lamented and Alexander Des Forges's highly readable book, *Mediasphere Shanghai*, is a welcome addition to this field in which the author presents a new perspective on this interesting topic. Whereas other scholars of Shanghai literature and culture tend to read the literature from the city based on the assumption that it reflects its historical and socioeconomic status, Des Forges argues for the primacy of the text in shaping people's relations with the place. Des Forges's argument is that literature about Shanghai, originating with the instalment fiction from the late Qing period, constituted and framed people's expectations and experiences of the city. Fiction set in Shanghai created a narrative of Western development and influence and established a fixed set of conceptions about the city which in turn led people to seek out pleasures and experiences that conformed with their expectations. This included taking carriage rides, strolling leisurely in Yuyuan 豫園, and visiting the tea houses or brothels. Writings about Shanghai and the representation of the city thus ultimately played a key role in cultivating and giving shape to long-time residents' identity as *Szahaenin*, i.e. Shanghai people.

Des Forges bases this argument on a wide range of sources from fiction to guide books, photographs, and film. These different media constitute the "mediasphere" of the