

Further Adventures on the Journey to the West. By Master of Silent Whistle Studio. Translated by Qiancheng Li and Robert E. Hegel. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2020. Pp. xxxvii + 239. \$99.00 hardcover, \$30.00 paperback.

This new translation of *Xiyou bu* 西遊補 will be a boon to both scholarship and teaching. The translators' scholarly preface and postface, copious notes, and full bibliography mean that it brings this elusive novel closer to the point at which readers of today can understand it as seventeenth-century readers might have done. A helpful Chinese character glossary is also supplied. That this novel should need such a full apparatus to become legible to today's readers is the result of several factors: its full immersion in Buddhist and Daoist religion, its frequent invocations of the parent novel *Xiyou ji* 西遊記, and the distance between its assumed time of completion, 1641, and the present day. These obstacles are explained and then surmounted by the apparatus that is supplied. The book also includes materials that were published with the first edition, including a preface, the original illustrations, and a question and answer sequence. All three enhancements further the goal of leading today's readers back in time. The combination of supplements means that the translation can satisfy more than one kind of reader. Those who simply want a good read will benefit from the story proper, while those who want to learn more about subtle or arcane points in the narration can check the notes as they go along. As a result, important features of this novel, especially its use of dreams and its take on desire and on Buddhism, come through with greater clarity than before. A third group of readers will be interested in the question of how the novel was put together as a composition. These readers will learn from the comments in the original Chongzhen 崇禎 edition or those from the Kongqingshi 空青室 edition of the mid-nineteenth century. These are published in italics amidst the text, so the reader can follow them with ease. The book stops short of trying to answer every single question that arises. Some aspects of the text remain obscure even after this careful probing, as the translators are careful to state when they run into insoluble problems. Their caution enhances confidence in the enterprise as a whole.

Besides simply translating, the Li and Hegel team raises questions about the novel that will interest specialists in the field of traditional Chinese fiction.

Why do they prefer to call the putative author, 董說 (1620–1686), “Dong Tuo” instead of “Dong Yue,” which he has been called for years in English language scholarship? On pages xxvii–xxviii we learn that the *tuo* in Dong Tuo is the antonym of the *zhang* in Dong Sizhang 董斯張 (1587–1628), the name of Tuo’s father. *Tuo* means relaxed and *zhang* means taut. Ironically, Dong Tuo had the more high-strung personality of the two, we are told. And why do the translators strongly suspect that that the true author of the book is not Dong Tuo himself but his father Dong Sizhang? This question is more complicated than the matter of *yue* vs *tuo*. It turns out that the date ascribed to this book, 1641, does not make a lot of sense if the son is the author. This would have made him only twenty when he wrote it, and *Xiyou bu* appears to be too mature a work for a twenty-year-old to have written. The two translators conclude that it is much more likely that the father wrote the novel and that the son merely supplemented his father’s work, perhaps by finishing the final chapter, an interpretation that is reasonably consistent with the son’s own words on how the text came into being. Additionally, the translators have scoured Dong Sizhang’s other writings for signs of interests or lines of argument that coincide with those in the novel. It is on this level that their interpretation is most convincing. Examples include chapter 1 note 32 (on the relationship between form and emptiness), chapter 4 note 10 (on a stone mirror), and chapter 12 note 27 (on the palaces of Yao 堯 and Shun 舜). They all refer the reader to the elder Dong’s *Guang bowu zhi* 廣博物志 (An expanded account of wide-ranging things) and introduce parallels between it and the novel. However, the translators do not ask whether the date 1641 could have been pushed back to deter censors. This is not impossible, given the fraught politics of the early Qing.

Other thoughtful propositions are raised in the preface, postface and notes. One of the most important, as far as this branch of Chinese fiction studies is concerned, is whether *Xiyou bu* can be thought of as “high” literature. In other words, because it is a vernacular novel it could be treated as a genre of lesser seriousness or one designed for lesser readers. Like the “parent novel” *Xiyou ji* itself, might the “sequel” have been intended for readers who merely sought amusement, not engagement with higher realms of philosophical and aesthetic discourse? In the seriousness and complexity of this novel’s investigation of dreams, desire, and Buddhist theology more generally, the translators argue,

particularly when those same themes emerge in Dong Sizhang's other work, a claim to "high literature" can be made. Part of the issue lies in general efforts by scholars to reopen the question of whether the masterworks of Chinese vernacular fiction, too, should be treated as less serious than other genres. Another line of argument advanced here is that even if certain works of vernacular fiction may not be as serious or as well written as others (examples might include some of the other sequels to *Xiyou ji*), *Xiyou bu* stands apart from these other efforts, having so much to say about life and death, or desire and abstinence, that it cannot be dismissed as popular. It is also unusually well written.

A second question concerns the ways in which Dong Sizhang (or Dong Tuo) have used the sequel form. The plot of *Xiyou bu* is set between chapters 59 and 61 of *Xiyou ji*, not at the end or almost the end of the parent novel, as is more normal with sequels. The translators skilfully establish that this take-off point, with its flaming mountains, provides an easy entrée into the issue of sexual desire that the novel sets out to explore. The novel's playful spirit may have been another factor in its decision to take Sun Wukong 孫悟空, a character everyone knows well, and turn him to new and surprisingly serious ends.

Persuasive though much of this reasoning is, it still raises questions from time to time. The first is about what Dong Tuo might have added to his father's composition. In making their points they draw on earlier interpretations of the novel, especially those by the unnamed commentator to the Chongzhen edition (possibly one or the other Dong) and scholar Qian Peiming 錢培名, the lead commentator on the Kongqingshi edition of 1853. Sometimes these commentaries merely applaud the action, as when they interject words like "wonderful" and "marvellous," but if one plays close enough attention, they are also quite interested in how the composition as a whole is integrated. For example, the early chapters are shown to prefigure what happens later on, whereas the last three chapters (fourteen through sixteen) close down elements of the plot one by one as the novel reaches its end. Could this way of approaching the work have been Dong Tuo's contribution, one might wonder? This attention to form seems slightly different from the preoccupation with desire that is the most obvious link to Dong Sizhang's other writings. Furthermore, at one point the work of Jin Shengtan 金聖嘆 (1608–1661) is invoked directly, as we learn from chapter 10 (p. 116), when the term "snake in the grass or discontinuous chalk line" is used. This particular comment, from the Kongqingshi edition, does

not constitute an anachronism. The nineteenth-century commentators could easily have known of Jin's famous roster of literary techniques, which came out in 1641, the same year as *Xiyou bu*. However, many of the stylistic features Jin highlights come out indirectly in the commentaries to *Xiyou bu*, particularly the focus on foreshadowings and recapitulations, though Jin's exact critical term is used only once, in chapter 10. Is it possible, one wonders, that Jin's type of thinking could have influenced the novel more than would have been possible if the only author were Dong Sizhang?

A second question to consider is what prompted the author(s) of *Xiyou bu* to use the sequel form. It is rather striking to see that two better than average sequels came out at around the same time. One is Chen Chen's 陳忱 (1615–1670) *Shuihu houzhuan* 水滸後傳 of 1664. The other is Ding Yaokang's 丁耀亢 (1599–1669) *Xu Jin Ping Mei* 續金瓶梅 of around 1662. Was there something about the fall of the Ming, impending or actual, that led to the creation of sequels at this time? The case would not have affected Dong Sizhang, if he was author, since he died sixteen years before the Ming fell. But Chen Chen and Dong Tuo both came from Huzhou 湖州 in Zhejiang province, and both travelled in Ming loyalist circles for a time. *Shuihu houzhuan* deals with some of the same themes that one finds in *Xiyou bu*, especially the opposition between traitors and loyalists, such as that between Qin Hui 秦檜 (1091–1155) and Yue Fei 岳飛 (1103–1142), that is one of *Xiyou bu*'s major themes. Similarly, Ding Yaokang makes use of this theme in his sequel to *Jin Ping Mei*. However one chooses to connect these three novels, it is striking that all three came out so close in time to one another and so soon before or after the fall of the Ming. Each one elevates the novel form in general, as well as the sequel form in particular. This could simply mean that *Xiyou bu* inspired these two successors, or it could mean that the fall of the Ming somehow generated a void that sequels to the great novels sought to fill.

In its interpretation of *Xiyou bu*, this translation by Li and Hegel does not put much weight on the actual fall of the Ming. Its efforts to situate the novel in its late Ming setting focus largely on feeling (*qing* 情), with *Mudan ting* 牡丹亭 and other writings by Tang Xianzu 湯顯祖 (1550–1616) playing a leading role. If the novel is practically all Dong Sizhang's work this is a reasonable interpretation. If Dong Tuo's intervention is more than superficial, however, connections to these two other sequels might take on more significance.

Whatever way one may resolve such questions and issues, there can be no doubt that the partnership between Qiancheng Li and Robert Hegel has given rise to a valuable new version of *Xiyou bu* for English readers. Its thoroughness and care are such that it leaves room for alternative interpretations, even when it makes its strong case for authorship by Dong Sizhang. And its emphasis on dreams, desires, and feelings links it inextricably to late Ming currents, whether or not formal or thematic influences from after the death of Dong Sizhang might have played a role.

ELLEN WIDMER
Wellesley College

Whampoa and the Canton Trade: Life and Death in a Chinese Port, 1700–1842. By Paul A. Van Dyke. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2020. Pp. xxi + 304. \$67.00.

For almost a century, from 1757 to 1842, Chinese maritime trade was confined to a single port, Canton. Although the modalities of these exchanges had been extensively researched, Whampoa, an outer harbour located some twenty kilometres from Canton, downstream from the Pearl River, had not been the subject of a systematic study. Yet, this vast area included anchorages that could accommodate hundreds of foreign ships (more than 100 docked every year from the mid-1820s). Whampoa also comprised wharves and basins for careening and repairing ships, as well as barracks to house and care for the crews (more than 10,000 men from the 1830s onwards), away from the Chinese population. Whampoa was also a burial place for foreign sailors who died in China. Overshadowed by studies on Canton, this area has been little investigated. Paul Van Dyke, Professor of History at Sun Yat-sen University in Guangzhou, has come to fill this gap.

Whampoa and the Canton Trade also completes and renews the vision of trade in the Pearl River Delta in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that