interested in the Kyoto School, Continental philosophy, and/or intercultural dialogue.

Zen Buddhist Rhetoric in China, Korea, and Japan. Edited by Christoph Anderl. Volume 3 of the series Conceptual History and Chinese Linguistics. Leiden: Brill, 2012. xvi + 474 pages. Hardcover $166.

LIN PEI-YING

This book of collected essays is definitely a welcome volume for scholars of Chan studies. Here leading specialists in Buddhist studies and East Asian linguistics analyze the interplay of language and doctrine in Chan/Sŏn/Zen literature. It especially includes pre-Chan Buddhist literary developments in India and China, so as to trace continuities and changes in the application of rhetorical strategies in the overall framework of Buddhist literature. The keynote of this volume is explicitly expressed in its introduction: "The division between 'China,' 'Korea,' and 'Japan' is to a certain degree artificial, and especially in the early stages of Chinese Chan and Korean Sŏn, these regional divisions only make limited sense" (p. 1). Christoph Anderl's ninety-four-page introduction staggeringly sets out all the aspects of current rhetorical studies of Chan/Sŏn/Zen texts in an attempt to develop a linguistic methodology. Anderl's effort is to be highly esteemed, for such a task demands a high level of integrity and a comprehensive understanding of Buddhist language as well as thought; otherwise one might risk a fallacy of applying methods dedicated to analyzing the *form* of Buddhist terminology to explaining the *content* of the ideas. Fulfilling its pan-Buddhist scope, admirably, there are three articles on India, two on Japan, four on Korea, and four on China. Through this diachronic and comparative approach, the work aims to illustrate the great complexity and the multifaceted features of Chan literature in the respective sociopolitical and socio-religious contexts. Despite regional, temporal, and vernacular varieties, all of the authors focus their discussions on linguistic devices and "rhetorical modes" that have been used in the texts in question.

Starting from the Indian side, Jens Braarvig selects some important Mahayana Buddhist literature, including the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvacaryānirdeśa*, to illustrate their contradictory characteristics: these Mahayana sutras may have a logical form but still are strongly characterized by the "rhetoric of emptiness," which expresses an anti-rhetorical and anti-logic

attitude. Next comes Bart Dessein's essay on the Sarvāstivāda texts. He addresses the appearance of new rhetorical devices, which he labels "inter-textual" and "intra-textual." He then provides ample evidence to illustrate the rhetorical strategies to attract external audiences in the context of the sectarian development of the Sarvāstivāda School. Likewise, Christoph Harbsmeier's study on the *One Hundred Parables Sūtra* shows how its entertaining narratives attracted less-educated people. Furthermore, in proving the correlation between the references of *avadāna* in Chan texts and the revival of the literary genre of *jātaka* stories during the Chinese Tang and Song dynasties, he argues that some rhetorical features in later Chan texts have their origin in this kind of Buddhist literature.

Drawing the readers' attention to China, in the essay on the poetry of Wang Wei (701?–761?), Halvor Eifring proves how famous Tang poets were retrospectively linked up with Chan Buddhism. For example, Wang Wei's expressions were reinterpreted as "subtle enlightenment" because they create an impression of an unrestrained and liberated mind, which became very appealing to the Ming (1368–1644) literati. This is followed by Christian Wittern's study of the rhetorical structures of the *Jingde chuandeng lu*. She compares the rhetorical strategies in twenty answers to a selected "public case" (*gong'an*), and finds that most of them are incomprehensible answers and some use body language or poetical language, arguing that the disparate use of rhetorical devices in this text displays its performative characteristic.

Then the stage turns to Japan. William Bodiford's article titled "The Rhetoric of Chinese Language in Japanese Zen" contributes work that lays an essential foundation for the study of Zen and Chan texts of the fourteenth century. In directing us to explore the bibliographies of Chan-related texts outside the Five Mountain literature, Bodiford provides a valuable analysis of new Zen literary categories. Meanwhile, he reminds us to be aware that the inferior presentation of the works of Eisai (1141–1215) and his followers had been corrected and edited in the hands of seventeenth-century editors and publishers in Japan. Next comes Steven Heine's essay on the approach of Dōgen (1200–1253) to texts and language. Because Dōgen's works do not feature any consistency concerning his attitude towards cited masters, Heine argues that Dōgen often imposed his own interpretation of his Chinese masters' sayings as a means to establish his own integrity and sectarian identity. Heine calls this approach "transgressing as transmitting."

Three studies on medieval Korea follow. Robert Buswell's article deals with Pojo Chinul (1158–1210)—the most important figure in the history of Korean Kanhwa Sŏn Buddhism—and his response to the new type of Sŏn received from China. Chinul's doctrine of "moderate subitism" differs

from that which was normative in the Chinese Linji tradition and can be regarded as reconciling the language of moderate and radical subitism. Buswell views it as Chinul's negotiation with the scholastic argot of Zongmi (780–841) and the iconoclastic use of language by Linji (n.d.–867?). Correspondingly, Jörg Plassen's article examines the apologetics of an extremely interesting treatise, the *Chodong owi yohae* by Sŏlcham (1435–1493). This treatise equates Sŏn Buddhist and Neo-Confucian thought in a most radical fashion: it provides a bold integration of the Chan/Sŏn dialectical scheme of the Five Positions and Chinese Neo-Confucianism. Plassen concludes that the "Great Buddho-Confucian debate" found resolution in Sŏlcham's work. Similarly, Jongmyung Kim's study on the *Sŏn'ga kwigam* by Hyujŏng (1520–1604) focuses on its soteriological strategies responding to the historical setting of sixteenth-century China and Korea. Hyujŏng's thought in this text expresses a syncretic tendency for combining "doctrine" and "meditation," which seemed incompatible to many Sŏn Buddhists of his time, as well as for combining meditation and the recitation of the Buddha's name. Kim further argues that this tendency shows Hyujŏng's soteriological strategy to attract people of inferior spiritual faculty.

Finally, the book turns to two representative figures of Buddhism in early modern East Asia. As stated by Vladimir Tikhonov, the *Pulgyo Taejŏn* by Manhae Han Yongun (1879–1944) exhibits an attempt at producing an all-inclusive modern Buddhist compendium to compete against Christian and Confucian rivals. Through an examination of the principles Han employed to compose the compendium's structure, Tikhonov argues that Han Yongun reinterpreted Mahayana sutras as suitable for a modern and civilized society and as giving a messianic promise for a better future. In similar fashion, Therese Ollien's study on the sermons by Chinese Master Xu Yun (1840–1959) argues that this well-known master is not representative of change, but rather of the continuation and preservation of tradition, for he quotes Tang and Song patriarchs verbatim, instead of paraphrasing or reinterpreting them.

Indeed the linguistic features of Chan literature have plenty of significant aspects for researchers to discover, and the authors of this volume have done a tremendous job in presenting the multifaceted significance of Chan rhetoric. The work leads us to cardinal questions concerning the problematic status of language in Chan literature: How do we approach Chan literature? How do we deal with contrasting features of "eloquence" and "silence" in Chan literature? The authors of this volume have, in general, dealt with their complicated sources linguistically, historically, and rhetorically. This kind of

emphasis on the rhetorical structure has led to Anderl's argument that texts such as the *Recorded Sayings* concern persuasion mainly in order to defeat the opponent and to establish the general superiority of a specific master. He argues that the appearance of *gong'an* literature in the Song dynasty pushed the dialogic nature of this literary genre further to become like a court trial, where the power rests ultimately at the hands of the judges (pp. 4–5). All these resemble devices for persuasion in the author's eyes. Though convincingly presented, a potentially undermining factor is the risk of a reductionist tendency to read *gong'an* only for their "public" and "persuasive" nature disregarding their religious sense. As linguists are well aware, consideration of only the linguistic relevance of similar words in the fragmentary passages cited without a broader analysis of doctrines can hardly confer a thorough understanding of the writers' attitudes or intentions. Granted the challenge in maintaining a balance between one's capacity to narrowly consider details of language on the one hand and the possibility of drawing broad conclusions on the other, the rhetorical approach applied in this volume and the undeniable merits it brings to the field of Chan/Sŏn/Zen should be regarded highly.