benefited in the long run. Frequently, the author notes that some Wuhan-era measures became models for China and Taiwan later, thus explaining part of his book's subtitle, *The Making of Modern China.*

In the event a paperback edition is planned, a few minor inaccuracies in the volume should be addressed. Ding Wenjiang was a geologist rather than a mathematician, Zuo Shunsheng was a Chinese Youth Party leader and not editor of the Nationalist Socialist Party's *Zaisheng*, and Xu Zhimo was a poet, not a novelist. The title of the journal *Zaisheng* is usually translated as "National Renaissance," not "Born Again." Jiang Baili traveled to Europe with Liang Qichao in late 1918, not 1920. To describe *Red Star over China* as lacking "ideological bias" seems overstated. MacKinnon seems to concede Snow's unbalanced treatment of Mao and the Communists when he writes that "as if to balance his portrait of the Communists," Snow declared Chiang Kai-shek was the "right leader for China at the time." "Even Edgar Snow," MacKinnon adds, "praised Chiang Kai-shek." MacKinnon also could have noted the effect of the Soviet-Japanese clash at Changkuofeng on the Korean-Soviet border, which delayed the fall of Wuhan by several weeks.

MacKinnon's book is a model of scholarship. It includes maps; tables analyzing the refugees; a chronology of wartime Wuhan; complete and helpful notes; a glossary of Chinese characters for people, places, and terms; a comprehensive bibliography; and an excellent index. The photographs are especially evocative of time and place. In an era when copyediting can be spotty, the text is free from typos.

MacKinnon has enjoyed an impressive career. Author of books on Yuan Shikai, American reportage on China in the 1930s and 1940s, and a wonderful study of American radical Agnes Smedley (done with his wife), he now has published this little gem of a history. In the works since the early 1990s, this study demonstrates a masterly grasp of the most up-to-date Chinese sources. It is a book for which the wait has been worthwhile.

Roger B. Jeans

Roger B. Jeans is a professor emeritus of modern Chinese and Japanese history at Washington and Lee University.

Konrad Meisig, editor. *Translating Buddhist Chinese: Problems and Prospects.* East Asian Intercultural Studies 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010. vii, 166 pp. Paperback €36, ISBN 978-3-447-06267-1.

The present volume collects papers of a workshop held in July 2008 at the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz. A few additional contributions have also been included. The workshop focused on Chinese Buddhist philosophy, linguistics, history of redactions, and history of literature. It is presented in a collective volume on translating Buddhist Chinese. However, the book rather reads like an issue of a journal, with contributions that are sometimes only loosely connected. In this sense, it is not surprising that the articles have been arranged alphabetically.

Despite the rather loose connections, some articles still discuss similar phenomena. This case is particularly true for two papers studying the *āgama*s (Discourses) in the sense that they each approach the Chinese Buddhist Discourses from a totally different viewpoint, leading to what at first might be conflicting hypotheses, but which, in fact, might just be two compatible outcomes of the same (translation) process. The first article is a study of Bhikkhu Anālayo on the influence of commentarial exegesis on the transmission of *āgama* literature (pp. 1–20). The second article is a contribution by Bhikkhu Pāsādika on the Chinese *Ekottarāgama* and its Indic source text (pp. 87–96). Bhikkhu Anālayo studies a number of Chinese *āgama* passages that differ from their Pāli parallels. Such differences often gave rise to discussion on the nature of the original Indic texts. Are these differences the result of a translation process, or are they due to the existence of several Indian *āgama* versions? In other words, did the translator alter or interpret the original text by adding comments and ideas, or did he just faithfully translate the original text at his disposal? Relying on an extensive philological reading of *sūtra* literature, Bhikkhu Anālayo compares a relevant number of Chinese *āgama* passages to the Pāli (and, when available, Sanskrit) commentarial tradition, and aptly shows how ideas of the ancient Indian commentarial tradition influenced the Indic original texts and introduced changes to the *āgama*s, which could have occurred during their oral transmission. Anālayo's study also shows that this function of early commentarial notes is, in fact, not limited to the Chinese *āgama*s, but can also be found in, for instance, Tibetan texts, in *jātaka* literature, or even in the Pāli Discourses themselves. Thus, Anālayo's article underscores that, in all probability, discourses and commentary were transmitted together, even at the very early times of the Buddhist tradition. This hypothesis, which conflicts with K. R. Norman's former suggestion of a separate transmission of discourse and commentary (*A Philological Approach to Buddhism, the Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai Lectures 1994*, The Buddhist Forum 5 [London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1997]), offers original and very useful insight into how commentarial remarks could influence a basic discourse. Still, as acknowledged by Bhikkhu Anālayo, while early commentarial exegesis had a distinct influence on the wording of Indic *āgama* literature, not all differences can be attributed to early Indian exegesis, and translators certainly can have had some significant influence.[1] Bhikkhu Pāsādika focuses particularly upon this latter aspect.

In his contribution, Bhikkhu Pāsādikā launches an appeal for the translation of the Chinese *Ekottarāgama*. He mainly argues that the text is important for the study of school affiliation and that it can provide interesting information on the formative phase of the history of Chinese Buddhism. In addition, he shows how the *Ekottarāgama* can be identified as the unknown source drawn upon by the author(s) of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, one of the most popular *sūtra*s of East Asian Buddhism. On the school affiliation of the *Ekottarāgama*, Bhikkhu Pāsādikā points out how, through a comparison with Pāli *sutta* literature, the general claim that the *Ekottarāgama* belongs to the Māhāsāṃghika tradition can be substantiated. However, more interesting in the framework of the present book, is Bhikkhu Pāsādika's discussion on what can be learned about the cultural and religious history of China from the *Ekottarāgama*. He particularly shows how, through the translation process, Indian notions have been adapted to serve Chinese purposes, either by reinterpretation or by deliberate textual insertions. Like Bhikkhu Anālayo, Bhikkhu Pāsādika compares Chinese *āgama* passages with their Pāli parallels. Thus, he points out how some passages clearly seem to have been adapted by a translator in order to bring them into line with the Confucian hierarchical system of ethics. This goal is realized, for instance, by inserting a reference to the six—traditionally Chinese—kinds of domestic animals, or by adding a complaint on moral and social degeneration, which can be interpreted as a subtle criticism on a powerful ruler in early medieval China. Still, in the light of Bhikkhu Anālayo's findings on early Indian commentarial exegesis, it should not be excluded that differences noticed between the Chinese *Ekottarāgama* and its Pāli variants are due to differences in the original Indic texts. On the other hand, a reference such as the one to the six domestic animals clearly points to an influence exerted by a Chinese translator.

Still one more article can be linked to the two discussions on *āgama* literature. In his contribution (pp. 45–52), Roderick S. Bucknell discusses how a contemporary researcher engaged in translating a Chinese text (*in casu* the *Madhyamāgama*, T. 26) takes into account the Indic source text. Although the source text of the *Madhyamāgama* is lost, there are relatively close Pāli parallels and occasionally some manuscript fragments in other Indic languages that can be used for a comparative study. Bucknell argues that familiarity with the contents of such parallels greatly facilitates comprehension of the Chinese version. It thus provides an extra tool for a more appropriate translation. He shows that, in some passages, it is even possible to correct mistakes of the Chinese translator. In addition, Bucknell's examples clearly show how a comparison of parallel passages can greatly benefit the making of a glossary relevant to the translation of a particular text, a topic that in the present volume will be discussed by Marcus Bingenheimer. Nonetheless, one question remains: Is any information available on how a Chinese reader of the *Madhyamāgama*, unaware of the misinterpretations of the Chinese translator, grasped the content of the Discourse? If knowledge of the Indic

background language is that important to the correct understanding of the Chinese text, then how did readers with no knowledge of this background deal with the translated text?

The issue of the making of a relevant glossary for the translation of Chinese Buddhist texts is also discussed by Marcus Bingenheimer (pp. 21–43). He does so by focusing on the way digital texts have changed—and are still changing—research practices in the field of buddhology. He hereby tries to clarify the role of digital media in two important issues at stake in the translation process: the role of repetition in Buddhist texts and the history of collaboration in larger translation projects. As is well known, repetitive sentences frequently appear in Buddhist texts as one of the mnemotechnic devices used at the time of oral transmission. Quite often, however, these sentences have been shortened or even deleted during early transmission and translation processes. According to Bingenheimer, one of the main reasons was that they were very much disliked by scribes and translators alike. Other media, such as printing and digital devices can, however, offer new tools to handle repetition. Thus, Bingenheimer tries to paint a picture of what new media have to offer to the translation process. Unfortunately, in the case of his exposition on repetition, what influence modern media might actually have remains unclear. Much more interesting, in my opinion, is the second part of his contribution. Here Bingenheimer presents a case study on a collaborative translation project of the *Madhyamāgama* (T. 26). After presenting an overview of the historic development of translation teams, Bingenheimer shows how digital media influence the translation process, and particularly the compilation of a specialized glossary, which offers a most interesting tool for all translators participating in the process.

In the cited contributions, the difficulty of grasping the meaning and content of Chinese Buddhist texts has been highlighted. This focus is also the case in the contribution of Konrad Meisig (pp. 65–74), who defines Buddhist Chinese as a particular metalanguage, a "relegiolect," to be understood only by insiders—believers or specialists. Relying on examples taken from the *Dīrghāgama*, Konrad Meisig shows how numerous specialized Buddhist terms, either transcribed or translated, figure in Buddhist Chinese, a language of translation. Doing so, Konrad Meisig seems to address a readership with a good knowledge of Chinese, but with a relatively new interest in Buddhist Chinese, aptly pointing his readers to the main difficulties of the so-called religiolect. Konrad Meisig also points out that translators frequently borrowed from the Confucian and Daoist traditions, using a metaphorical language, which involves the risk of a different or even erroneous interpretation by Chinese readers.

The three remaining contributions are more loosely connected to the theme of translation or transmission, but still offer some interesting and useful thoughts for readers of Buddhist Chinese. Choong Mun-keat (pp. 53–64) focuses on the

structure of the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama* (T. 99), including its Pāli counterpart, and launches an appeal for more research based on the findings of the Taiwanese scholar monk Yinshun 印順 (1906–2005). These findings, according to Choong Mun-keat, have until now been largely overlooked by European and American scholars. Marion Meisig (pp. 75–86) focuses on the legend of Mingcheng 名稱, which is part of the **Avadānaśataka* (T. 200), a *sūtra* collection of one hundred legends, all dealing with pious persons and animals whose past and present deeds will be rewarded in the future. She shows how ethical Hindu Vedic principles underlie the story and have been transferred by the Buddhist author(s) into the realm of the laity. At the same time, she offers a translation of the story and compares it with a Sanskrit parallel. This Sanskrit version is, in all probability, not the Indic source-text of the Chinese **Avadānaśataka*, but a version similar to an earlier Middle Indian Prākrit text. Still, the comparison between the Chinese and the Sanskrit versions gives a good terminological basis for further translations of the **Avadānaśataka.* In addition, in an appendix to the present volume, Marion Meisig presents a translation of the story of Prince Sudhana, a pious legend that is part of the Chinese **Ṣaṃpāramitā-saṃgraha-sūtra* (T. 152). She adds some biographical notes on the Chinese translator Kang Senghui 康僧會 (third century) and discusses his role as interpreter. Still, again in the light of Bhikkhu Anālayo's earlier contribution, I would like to call for caution and research into the actual role of Kang Senghui. Is it not possible that at least some of the interpretations attributed to Kang Senghui were actually already present in the original source-text? Still, Marion Meisig's focus on Kang Senghui as a didactic Buddhist teacher brings to the fore interesting questions on the role of bilingual translator-masters.

Finally, in the last contribution (pp. 97–111), Karl-Heinz Pohl discusses the role of laughter in Buddhism. He attracts our attention to a notable change from smiling,[2] represented in the Indian tradition, to laughter, which started to develop in the course of Buddhism reaching China. Referring to representations in art, Karl-Heinz Pohl illustrates his hypothesis with a few well-chosen topics, including a story on the monk Huiyuan 慧遠 (334–416), a laughing depiction of the Buddhist poet Hanshan 寒山 (Tang dynasty, 618–907), and the figure of the well-known laughing Buddha, prominently present in Chinese, Korean, and Japanese Mahāyāna traditions. In addition, he discusses laughter as represented in a book by the American author Mark Salzman (*The Laughing Sutra*, [New York: Knopf Publishing, 1992]), a novel modeled along the Chinese classical story *Journey to the West.*

In conclusion, the present volume offers diverse contributions, all discussing Chinese Buddhist topics. The book has both strong and weak points. The topic of "translating Buddhist Chinese" is interpreted in a very broad sense, but even then the link between some contributions and the issue of translation or transmission is sometimes not easy to find. On the other hand, the diverse points of view make

one think about aspects not previously considered, enriching our view on Chinese Buddhism. While some contributions aim at relatively experienced readers of Buddhist Chinese, others are directed at students with a good knowledge of Chinese, but with a relatively new interest in Buddhist Chinese. Some contributions present results of long-term research, while others launch an appeal for more research into a particular topic. Some contributions focus on the translation process itself, while others reflect on the translated texts, and say relatively little on the transmission process. In short, the present book certainly offers interesting and useful ideas and comments, but seems to lack uniformity.

Ann Heirman

Ann Heirman (Ghent University, Belgium) is a professor of classical and Buddhist Chinese specializing in studies on Buddhist disciplinary texts.

NOTES

1. Bhikkhu Anālayo (note 46) refers to the Chinese version of the *Samantapāsādikā*, which contains a passage that reads (T. 1462, p. 706b18): "The Dharma teacher says: 'I do not understand the meaning of this.'" According to Anālayo, this comment might have been added to the translation. Still, as already indicated by Anālayo through the use of quotation marks for the term "translation," the status of the Chinese *Samantapāsādikā* itself remains relatively unclear. In my opinion, the "dharma master" does, in fact, not need to be a translator, but could as well have been a master, even an Indian master, who gave a lecture on the textual tradition known as *Samantapāsādikā* (a master who might even have included references to his own teacher). As studied in detail by Funayama Toru (*Asia Mayor* 19, no. 1/2 [2006]: 39–55), lectures delivered to a Chinese audience by Indian monks can easily be confused with translations.

2. In this context, I would like to draw attention to a recent article by Shayne Clarke on the role of humor in Indian disciplinary texts *(vinaya)*: "Locating Humour in Indian Buddhist Monastic Law Codes: A Comparative Approach," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 37, no. 4: 311–330.

Serge Michel and Michel Beuret. *China Safari: On the Trail of Beijing's Expansion in Africa.* Translated by Raymond Valley. Photographs by Paolo Woods. New York: Nation Books, 2009. 306 pp. Hardcover $27.50, ISBN 978-1-56858-426-3.

Imagine yourself, a tourist walking along a street in an African city and being greeted by friendly little children with "*Ni hao, ni hao*!" For a whole generation of