tours—and their significance as spectacle, ritual, and intellectual as well as physical exercise. Third, it is a book that sheds new light on the unique personality of the Qianlong emperor. For all these reasons this book ought to be regarded as a truly significant contribution to the field of Qing history, whose impact will be felt broadly.

NICOLA DI COSMO
Institute for Advanced Study

The Analects of Confucius. Translated by Burton Watson. New York: Columbia Univesity Press, 2007. Pp. 162. $21.95.

Although D. C. Lau's translation of the *Analects* under the Penguin (first published in 1979) and Chinese University Press imprints continues to attract a wide readership, a number of other fine translations have appeared over the past decade or so. Those of Simon Leys (aka Pierre Ryckmans) (1997), E. Bruce Brooks and A. Taeko Brooks (1998), Roger T. Ames and Henry Rosemont Jr. (1998), and Edward Slingerland (2003) stand out in particular. Their ranks are now joined by Burton Watson.

Burton Watson's reputation as a leading translator of early Chinese texts was established already in the 1960s with translations of such fundamental texts as *Shiji, Xunzi, Mozi, Zhuangzi* and *Han Feizi.* Since then he has produced a vast *œuvre* of Chinese and Japanese literature in translation. Given the early date traditionally ascribed to the *Analects,* coupled with what we know about Confucius in his mature years from that briefest of autobiographies (*Analects* 2.4), it seems apt that Burton Watson chose to defer the challenge (and rewards) of translating the *Analects* until his eighth decade.

Each of the translations by the above-named translators has its own distinguishing features. Lau's interpretations are conservative and informed by a sound familiarity with the commentarial tradition. Leys attempts to recapture the "real" Confucius whose distant voice he discerns in the *Analects.* The Brookses advance a richly detailed, if controversial, hypothesis about the dating and structure of the text. Ames and Rosemont characterise their work as a "philosophical translation." Slingerland provides his reader with an extensive running commentary closely informed by influential interpretations drawn from the Chinese commentarial tradition.

Watson does not inform his reader about what distinguishes his translation other than to state that he has tried "as much as possible to follow the wording and word order of the Chinese" and to render it in "the colloquial English that would be used if these conversations took place today." The word order of Classical Chinese and modern English share several common features: subject precedes its predicate; modifier precedes what is

© 香港中文大學 The Chinese University of Hong Kong

modified; and verb precedes its object. Watson widely follows the Chinese word order in his translations, and generally to good effect. He is, of course, not unique in adopting this practice. Indeed, where there is little difficulty involved in following the word order of a Classical Chinese sentence or phrase in the *Analects,* most translators tend to do adopt the practice. For example:

> 2.11 子曰：「溫故而知新，可以為師矣。」
>
> Watson: The Master said, Be thoroughly versed in the old, and understand the new—then you can be a teacher.
>
> Leys: The Master said: "He who by revising the old knows the new, is fit to be a teacher."
>
> Ames and Rosemont: The Master said: "Reviewing the old as a means of realizing the new—such a person can be considered a teacher."

Although one might quibble about Watson's understanding of the function of the particle 而 in this passage, the advantage of following the Chinese word order here is obvious when we compare the convoluted (over-) translation by Lau:

> The Master said, "A man is worthy of being a teacher who gets to know what is new by keeping fresh in his mind what he is already familiar with."

Where Watson differs from most other translators is the extent to which he follows the Chinese word order, something which is evident right from the very first *zhang* 章:

> 子曰：「學而時習之，不亦說乎？有朋自遠方來，不亦樂乎？人不知而不慍，不亦君子乎？」
>
> The Master said, Studying, and from time to time going over what you've learned—that's enjoyable, isn't it? To have a friend come from a long way off—that's a pleasure, isn't it? Others don't understand him, but he doesn't resent it—that's the true gentleman, isn't it?

This particular translation also evidences what Watson means by attempting to provide a contemporary colloquial English translation. (This does, however, beg the question of "whose" colloquial English we are talking about—there are many.) Again, it is useful to contrast a couple of alternative translations, just to highlight the different affect achieved by Watson's translation:

> Lau: The Master said, "Is it not a pleasure, having learned something, to try

© 香港中文大學 The Chinese University of Hong Kong

> it out at due intervals? Is it not a joy to have friends come from afar? Is it not gentlemanly not to take offence when others fail to appreciate your qualities?"
>
> Brookses: The Master said, To learn and in due time rehearse it: is this not also pleasurable? To have friends coming from far places: is this not also delightful? If others do not recognize him but he is not disheartened, is he not also a gentleman?

The image of Confucius conveyed by these two translations is that of an exceptionally stilted, even "schoolmarmly" individual. And although the Brookses' translation also follows the Chinese word order (as do most of the other translators listed above), the choice of linguistic register provides a stark contrast in how Confucius' personality is portrayed.

We can, however, also find examples where pithy translations by other translators produce even more effective results.

> 6.18 子曰：「質勝文則野，文勝質則史。文質彬彬，然後君子。」
>
> Watson: The Master said, Where solid qualities outweigh refinement, you have rusticity. Where refinement outweighs solid qualities, you have the clerkly style. Refinement and solid qualities beautifully balanced—then you have the gentleman.

When we compare this with Lau's somewhat bloated translation, the benefits of the more pared-down approach are again self-evident:

> Lau: The Master said, "When there is a preponderance of native substance over the acquired refinement, the result will be churlishness. When there is a preponderance of acquired refinement over native substance, the results will be pedantry. Only a well-balanced admixture of these two will result in gentlemanliness."

On this occasion, however, even Watson is no match for Leys when it comes to pithiness and directness:

> Leys: The Master said: "When nature prevails over culture, you get a savage; when culture prevails over nature, you get a pedant. When nature and culture are in balance, you get a gentleman."

Indeed, Leys frequently gives Waley a good run for his money in the pithiness stakes. I cite just one more example to illustrate the point and also to show that adhering to the Chinese word order does not necessarily lead to a more concise rendering:

> 8.2 子曰：「恭而無禮則勞，慎而無禮則葸，勇而無禮則亂，直而無禮則絞。君子篤於親，則民興於仁；故舊不遺，則民不偷。」

© 香港中文大學 The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Watson: The Master said, Courtesy without ritual becomes labored; caution without ritual becomes timidity; daring without ritual becomes riotousness; directness without ritual becomes obtrusiveness. If the gentleman treats those close to him with generosity, the common people will be moved to humaneness. If he does not forget his old associates, the common people will shun cold-heartedness.

Leys: The Master said: "Without ritual, courtesy is tiresome; without ritual, prudence is timid; without ritual, bravery is quarrelsome; without ritual, frankness is hurtful. When gentlemen treat their kin generously, common people are attracted to goodness; when old ties are not forgotten, common people are not fickle."

It might also be noted in passing that on a number of occasions it seems that Watson has in fact drawn upon Leys's translations of particular terms and phrases to good effect.

Following the Chinese word order can also lead to unnatural expression. Consider Watson's following translations:

1.2 有子曰：「其為人也孝弟，而好犯上者，鮮矣；……」

Master You said, A man filial to his parents, a good brother, yet apt to go against his superiors—few are like that!

8.12 子曰：「三年學，不至於穀，不易得也。」

The Master said, Someone who can study for three years without thinking about an official salary—not easy to find!

9.20 子謂顏淵，曰：「惜乎！吾見其進也，未見其止也。」

The Master said, Someone I could talk to and he never got tired—that was Hui, wasn't it?

By adhering somewhat mechanically to the topic-comment syntax, these translations all bear a distinctive "Chinglish" quality.

On a number of other occasions, it is not syntax that is of concern but the translator's interpretation of particular terms and phrases (an area where there will always be differences of opinion). A few examples include: "fair-minded" 周 (2.14); "Humaneness is the beauty of the community" 里仁為美 (4.1); "the petty man has his mind fixed on bounty" 小人懷惠 (4.11); "cultural and emblematic matters" 文章 (5.13); "it flows on like this—does it not" 逝者如斯夫 (9.17); "of those who ruled through inaction" 無為而治者 (15.5); and "a man of station" 士 (throughout). Other grounds for nit-picking might be certain idiomatic choices (such as "smart-alecky people" [11.25] or "to govern is to put to rights" [12.17]); inconsistencies in translation (such as *yiguan* 一貫 of 15.3 and 4.15); the decision not to translate particular lines (12.10); or mistransliteration (*gu* 古 as "ku" [pp. 13, 50]).

© 香港中文大學 The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Matters of greater import stem from Watson's negligible use of textual notes and almost complete lack of commentary (be it his own or that of traditional commentators). Traditional Chinese redactors certainly did not expect their readers to understand the *Analects* texts without commentary. As I have noted elsewhere with reference to traditional commentaries: "Unless a reader is provided with a commentarial 'context' in which flesh is added to the very spare bones of the text, [the *Analects*] frequently reads as a cryptic mixture of parochial injunctions and snatches of dry conversation. It is the commentaries which bring the text to life and lend it definition." Leys, Ames and Rosemont, Slingerland, and the Brookses all provide extensive commentary and notes. (Ames and Rosemont's work has the additional advantage of providing the Chinese text.)

What is the reader to make of passages such as 5.4 when no commentary or note is provided?

> Watson: Zigong asked, What would you say of me?
> The Master said, You are a vessel.
> What kind of vessel? Zigong asked.
> A fine sacrificial vessel, said the Master.

In his introduction Watson writes: "Where interpretations differ markedly and the differences are of significant interest, I have offered more than one translation of a passage." Despite the fact that every passage in the *Analects* is open to alternative interpretations—with some being the focus of fundamental differences of opinion for millennia—it would seem that Watson deems only a couple of passages to be of "significant interest" and ignores the rest, leaving the unsuspecting reader with the impression that there is little of controversy in the history of interpretation of the *Analects.* Watson also rather glibly claims that his "translation for the most part follows the interpretations that have been most commonly accepted over the centuries in China, the *Analects* as most readers in the past have known it." With a little more diligence in attending to significant alternative interpretations, including those accepted as standard for many centuries, Watson might well have provided his readers with a far richer translation by drawing on interpretations transmitted in texts such as Zheng Xuan's 鄭玄 (127–200) seminal commentary to the *Analects, Lunyu Zheng shi zhu* 論語鄭氏注.

Zheng Xuan's *Lunyu Zheng shi zhu* and He Yan 何晏 (*c.* 190–249) et al's *Lunyu jijie* 論語集解 were the two most influential *Analects* commentaries to the end of the Tang dynasty (618–907) and Zheng was arguably the single most influential commentator between the Han and the Tang. By the early Song (960–1279), however, *Lunyu Zheng shi zhu* suddenly ceased being transmitted and disappeared. In the twentieth century, a steady accumulation of Tang dynasty hand-written manuscripts of Zheng's commentary found at Dunhuang in Gansu and Astana near Turfan in Xinjiang has enabled scholars to reconstruct about half of this work. Today, Zheng's annotations are valuable because they provide us with new, yet also very old, interpretations of Analects passages; interpretations

© 香港中文大學 The Chinese University of Hong Kong

《中國文化研究所學報》 Journal of Chinese Studies No. 49 - 2009

which are both of "significant interest" and have been "commonly accepted over the centuries in China" (even if that was in the first rather than the second millennium).

Consider *Analects* 3.8:

> 子夏問曰：「『巧笑倩兮，美目盼兮，素以為絢兮。』何謂也？」子曰：「繪事後素。」曰：「禮後乎？」子曰：「起予者商也！始可與言詩已矣。」
>
> Zixia asked, saying,
>
> *Her artful smile engaging,*
> *lovely eyes in clear outline,*
> *colors on a white ground,*
>
> What do these lines mean?
>
> The Master said, The painting comes after the white background.
>
> Zixia said, So ritual comes afterward?
>
> The Masters said, Shang (Zixia) is the one who reads my meaning. At last I have someone to discuss the *Odes* with.

Watson's translation is based on an interpretation than can be traced to Bao Xian 包咸 (6 B.C.–A.D. 65), as cited in *Lunyu jijie:* "Confucius is saying, 'Zixia is able to bring forth and elucidate my meaning.' " For Bao Xian, Confucius is praising Zixia for his perspicacity in being able to intuit the teaching implicit in Confucius's obscure reply. For Bao Xian and the *Lunyu jijie* editors, this was a heuristic ploy on Confucius's part, one that challenged the disciple to make the connection himself.

Following Zheng Xuan's interpretation as recorded in *Lunyu Zheng shi zhu* (but not in *Lunyu jijie* where it has been "edited"), this *zhang* can alternatively be translated as follows:

> Zixia asked, "What about the lines:
>
> 'Her charming smile, dimpling
> Her beautiful eyes, darting!
> White completes the colourful patterning.'
>
> What do they mean?"
>
> The Master said, "That in the matter of painting, white is applied after the other colours."
>
> Zixia said, "Then ritual comes after?"
>
> The Master said, "It is you, Shang, who draws out my meaning! Now I can begin to discuss the *Odes* with you!"

Zheng Xuan comments:

© 香港中文大學 The Chinese University of Hong Kong

> This says that a beautiful woman such as this will be consummated through marriage in accordance with the purity of ritual. This is what the three lines of the ode say. In asking what the three lines meant, Zixia was criticizing the widespread dissolute behaviour of his times, in which most marriages were not conducted in accord with ritual propriety. In all cases, in the matter of painting, it is only after the various colours have been first painted that the white touches are applied. . . . [commentary incomplete here in the Bu Tianshou 卜天壽 manuscript.] The intention of this ode is to use the various colours as an analogy for the woman's countenance and the application of the white touches as an analogy for the ritual of marriage.

According to Zheng Xuan it was Zixia, not Confucius, who understood the use of white in painting as a metaphor about ritual. Zheng Xuan allowed Confucius to be portrayed as failing to make the important connection between this ode and the role of ritual, even though his disciple was able to do so. (According to Zheng, Zixia's question was rhetorical, his real purpose was to "criticize the widespread dissolute behaviour of his times.") This is entirely consistent with the all-too-human image of Confucius that Zheng sought to portray elsewhere in his commentary.

Another example of "significant interest" is 2.23:

> Zizhang questioned the Master, saying, Can we know how things will be ten generations from now?
>
> The Master said, Yin followed the rites of Xia, and we know in what ways it added to or subtracted from them. Zhou follows the rights of Yin, and we know in what ways it added to or subtracted from them. Whoever carries on from the Zhou, we can know how things will be even one hundred generations from now.

Unlike other early commentators who understood Confucius to be articulating one of the cyclical theories of dynastic change (and hence the claim that the ritual practices of future dynasties could be predicted on the basis of these theories), Zheng Xuan interpreted the passage from the perspective of someone in the future being able to learn about the ritual practices of the former dynasties. Commenting on how it would be possible to know what transformations the rituals had undergone over a period of one hundred dynasties, he wrote:

> "That which has been lost or added to can be known" means that such losses and additions could be checked against all those contemporary records still extant. After the Zhou, even one hundred dynasties later, its institutions could still be known. Such records could be used to trace to their full extent all the transformations, changes, losses, and additions that had occurred in the interim. Nor would it be excessive to trace as far back as the times of the three kings [i.e. the founders of the Xia, Shang and Zhou].

© 香港中文大學 The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Accordingly, a translation of 2.23 based on Zheng's interpretation would be:

> Zizhang asked, "Can the changes in ritual that occur over a period of ten dynasties be known?"
>
> The Master said, "The Yin built on the ritual of Xia. What was lost and added can be known. The Zhou built on the rites of the Yin. What has been lost and added can be known. Should there be successors to the Zhou, then even for a period of one hundred dynasties, these changes can be known."

The point to notice is the importance Zheng Xuan attached to the written word rather than to any of the Han theories about the patterns of dynastic succession. Thus rather than advancing some notion of ritual continuity being underpinned by a cyclical cosmological order, Zheng Xuan stressed the role played by human transmission, via the written record, in the continuity of ritual. Watson's translation seems to follow the interpretation favoured by Zhu Xi, but unfortunately Watson provides no hint of the existence of significant alternative interpretations of this important passage.

Many similar examples might be adduced from *Lunyu Zheng shi zhu*. It is not, however, only material found in archaeologically-recovered texts that affords us significant alternative interpretations, accepted as standard for many centuries. A similar exercise could equally be conducted with many of Zhu Xi's annotations on the *Analects*. The point, however, is that in not alerting his reader to significant alternative interpretations—standard or otherwise—Watson robs the *Analects* of the plurivocity it has garnered over time. In sum, Watson has presented us with a new, concise translation but provides little new insight into what the text might mean.

John Makeham
The Australian National University

Buddhism and Taoism Face to Face: Scripture, Ritual, and Iconographic Exchange in Medieval China. By Christine Mollier. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008. Pp. xi + 241. $55.00.

Christine Mollier's claim in the introduction to this volume, that the interaction of Buddhism with the other great religious tradition of China, Daoism, has been "neglected," is arguably false (p. 1). The problem is rather, I believe, the monumental difficulties confronting any scholar who would attempt to study *both* Buddhism *and* Daoism and then would be so bold as to attempt to plumb the historical relationships between them,

© 香港中文大學 The Chinese University of Hong Kong