

of exchanges between Chinese, Spanish, and indigenous practices through the Manila Galleon Trade, would have made a conversation between Duan's account of silk and Priyadarshini's book on porcelain in transpacific settings particularly fruitful.

In *Objects of Seduction*, Duan presents an ecologically aware study of sericulture, silk, and fashion in a global context that contributes to the Pacific turn. Both its interdisciplinary approach and its transcultural focus make it a perfect fit for the book series "Empires and Entanglements in the Early Modern World" and a highly useful addition to the rapidly growing literature on the material worlds of the early modern period in a global context.

Zhu Xi: Basic Teachings

Translated by Daniel K. Gardner. New York: Columbia University Press, 2022. 184 pp. \$30.00 (paper).

Reviewed by Sukhee Lee*

Rutgers University

*Corresponding author. Email: sukhlee@history.rutgers.edu

doi:10.1017/jch.2023.6

Zhu Xi: Basic Teachings (hereafter *Basic Teachings*) offers a selected translation of the first thirteen chapters of the *Classified Conversations of Master Zhu* (Zhuzi yulei) along with selections from Zhu Xi's other writings. Ever since the publication of *Chu Hsi and the "Ta Hsueh": Neo-Confucian Reflection on the Confucian Canon* in 1986, Daniel Gardner has continued to publish important works on Zhu Xi, arguably the most influential thinker in Chinese history after Confucius, in highly readable English including a selected translation of chapters seven through thirteen of the *Classified Conversations of Master Zhu (Learning to Be A Sage*, University of California Press, 1990). Indeed, there could be few people better qualified to translate Zhu's works than Gardner in the English-speaking world.

If we exclude its bibliography, *Basic Teachings* is composed of 142 pages, with an additional eighteen pages for the Introduction and the translator's note in which Gardner offers a brief survey of Zhu's life, the historical and intellectual background and significance of Zhu's teachings, and characteristics of the *Classified Conversations*. The main body of *Basic Teachings* consists of five chapters: "Foundations of the Universe" (1–31), "Human Beings" (33–61), "Learning" (63–85), "A Theory of Reading" (87–110), and "Moral Self-Cultivation" (111–128). Throughout the book, Gardner's translation is not only accurate in most cases but also reads extremely well. His pithy annotation also provides necessary intellectual and historical background of given phrases or figures. For example, one of the difficulties of tackling texts written in classical Chinese is that authors, in the case of the *Classified Conversations* "speakers," freely quote classic texts without clarifying the sources. Gardner takes pains to identify each of important classic texts quoted (30). I believe one can assign this book in undergraduate classes on Chinese thought or intellectual history. As a reviewer of this superbly translated work, however, I am still compelled to raise questions, no matter how trivial they

might be, about Gardner's choices of translation and annotations, as well as about his general depiction of Zhu Xi's ideas.

When he writes, for instance, "But as severe as he found some the ills of government to be, the cure for them, he was convinced, remained simple (and very much in accord with traditional Confucian belief): the ruler merely had to rectify himself" (xi), he flattens, albeit inadvertently, the complexity in Zhu's social programs. This is regrettable given the rich scholarship on them such as Robert Hymes and Conrad Schirokauer, eds., *Ordering the World* (1993) and Peter Bol, *Neo-Confucianism in History* (2010).

His annotation also could have been a bit more informative. On page 39, for instance, he identifies the locus classicus of a phrase "[human] heads are round in the image of heaven and their feet are square in the image of earth" as the *Huainanzi*, but he does not specify which part of that extremely voluminous text. As Gardner writes in his "Notes on the Texts and Translation," he identifies the questioner or other person "only when he is a person of some note" (xxii). Yet Xie Shilong and Zheng Jingwang on page 17 remain unannotated, whereas a certain Qiyuan on page 66 is annotated as Cao Shuyuan, who was Chen Fuliang's student. The former two are Xie Jixuan 薛季宣 (1134–1173) and Zheng Boxiong 鄭伯熊 (*jinsshi* 1145), both of whom were important institutional thinkers from Yongjia prefecture. Granted, neither Xie nor Zheng was the questioner. But he identifies Yushu as Lü Dalin 呂大臨, who was not a questioner either (37). On page 137, Lu Zishou is annotated as older brother of Lu Jiuyuan, which is correct. However, Zishou was his style name. It would have been better if Gardner had provided his given name, Jiuling 九齡.

Below I will touch on the translation. As classical Chinese and archaic vernacular Chinese usually leave much room for different interpretations, I hope readers of this review take my alternative reading of these passages as one of the many possibilities in understanding and rendering the given texts.

Arguably three of the most important concepts in Zhu's metaphysical theory would be *li* 理, *qi* 氣, and *xin* 心, which Gardner translates as principle, psychophysical stuff, and mind-heart, respectively. Although alternative translations such as "pattern" or "coherence" have been suggested for *li*, principle seems to be a relatively unproblematic translation. I am not sure, however, whether Gardner had to adhere to a single translation for each use of *qi* and *xin*. I do believe that "psychophysical stuff" for *qi* and "mind-heart" for *xin* make more sense when they are used in describing human conditions. But I wonder if Gardner still had to translate "the primordial *qi* of heaven and earth" (天地一元之氣) as "the primordial psychophysical stuff" (9) and "*qi* of yin and yang" (陰陽之氣) as "yin and yang psychophysical stuff" (10), where the phrases are used to describe a process in which heaven and earth produce myriad things and they produce the earth, respectively. Likewise, did Gardner have to adhere to "psychophysical stuff" when *qi* is used to refer to raw elements in a coin (49)? Confusion may arise when the same character is used slightly differently in a single sentence or phrase. Take the following sentence, for an example. "The clear part of the psychophysical stuff becomes psychophysical stuff, the turbid part becomes solid matter [*zhi*]" (氣之清者為氣，濁者為質) (18). The latter *qi* here is clearly used in comparison to *zhi* (solid matter), so it would be better translated as "ether." Besides, does it make more sense to translate "mind of heaven and earth" (天地之心) as "mind-heart of heaven and earth" (8)? As Gardner notes, "*xin* is both the source of people's intellect and understanding and the center of their emotions" (8). But Gardner himself uses "the mind" as its translation elsewhere (111–112). These are just quibbles about

Gardner's consistent translations of extremely complex, almost untranslatable, concepts in Chinese thought. Below I list several occasions on which I have to differ from Gardner's choices of translation from a grammatical point of view.

- “Earth is the one especially prominent thing within heaven” (地特天中之一物爾) (11). I think *te* 特, translated as “especially prominent,” means “simply.”
- “This place tended to remain bright at night” (其地夜易曉) (12). This sentence would be better translated as “Dawn comes early in this area.” Otherwise, it would be redundant with the immediately succeeding sentence “the night did not get very dark”
- “Heavenly principle is incredibly vast and limitless, so if there weren't this psychophysical stuff, though this principle would exist, it would have nothing to which to attach itself” (天理固浩浩不窮, 然非是氣, 則雖有是理而無所湊泊) (39). Here *ran* 然 translated as “so” is used as an adversative conjunction, meaning “but.”
- “Having acknowledged the harm caused by the psychophysical endowment, we need to work hard to bring it under control, master it, and return it to a balanced state” (須知氣稟之害, 要力去用功克治, 裁其勝而歸於中乃可) (p. 41). *Sheng* 勝 in *cai qi sheng* 裁其勝 here means something excessive. Thus, “*cai qi sheng*” would be better understood as “control what is excessive.”
- “Zhu replied: It started with Zhang [Zai] and the Cheng [brothers]. I believe that utmost effort should be devoted to the teachings of the disciples of Confucius, supplemented by the teachings of later followers in the school” (曰, “此起於張程. 某以為極有功於聖門, 有補於後學) (41). The second sentence here rather significantly distorts the meaning of the original. It should be understood as “I believe that [Zhang Zai's and Cheng brothers' theory of “psychophysical material”] have made an extremely important contribution to the Confucian school and would be of help to later scholars.”
- “If the good overcomes it” 善反之 in the Zhang Zai quote (47) means “if one is good at restoring it [to its original state].”
- “The weakness in it, though, is the rare use of the word psychophysical stuff” 只是中間過接處少箇‘氣’字) (48). Here “*shao*” 少 means to “omit something,” which suggests that Han Yu did not understand the importance of the concept.
- “Still, to talk about the supreme ultimate is to talk about the supreme ultimate itself and to talk about *yin* and *yang* is to talk about *yin* and *yang*” (然至論太極自是太極; 陰陽自是陰陽) (52). This sentence comes right after Zhu stressed that the supreme ultimate is within *yin* and *yang*. Here Zhu complicated his explanation once again, saying that they are separable at least conceptually. Thus, I would rather translate this sentence as follows: “However, if we are to discuss, the supreme ultimate is just the supreme ultimate on its own; *yin* and *yang* are just *yin* and *yang* on their own.”
- “Human nature is merged with emotions in this way. It is simply principle and not some separate entity” (性只是合如此底, 只是理, 非有箇物事) (55). The first sentence blurs the meaning of the original. *He* 合 here means “should” or “ought to.” I would rather translate it as “Human nature simply means what it ought to be.”
- “The Six Classics do not have an iota of self-centeredness in them” (六經不作可也, 裏面著一點私意不得) (91). Here the first phrase is not understood clearly. Note that this sentence is part of what Zhu said of why ancient sages and worthies felt it necessary to write the classics. It was because by doing so they wanted to

clear away people's self-centeredness. I would rather translate this sentence as "It would be fine even if the Six Classics had not been written. One should not have an iota of self-centeredness in oneself."

- *Quanheng* 權衡 is translated as both "measuring stick" (97) and "scale" (114). The latter is correct.
- "In reading, you must set up curricular limits. *Manage it [the reading] as if it were farm work*" (讀書不可不先立程限。政如農功) (103). Here *zheng* 政 simply means "just" or "only."¹ Thus, a proper translation would be "It is just like farm work."
- "They were talking about the method of reading and Zhu said" (因言讀書法, 曰) (105). Here the subject who was talking about the method of reading was Zhu Xi, not his disciples. So, the sentence could be translated as "While talking about the method of reading, Zhu said."
- "Learning is really complicated and requires skill" (人之為學, 千頭萬緒, 豈可無本領) (118). *Benling* 本領, translated as "skill" here, means "an essential point." Therefore, I would rather translate the above sentence as "Although learning is really complicated, how can there be no essential point?"

Below are simple errors or mistakes.

- Nankang in Jiangxi, where Zhu Xi served as prefect, was a military prefecture (*jun* 軍) not a county (*xian* 縣) (ix).
- The Chinese character *ji* 集 is missing after *Zhu Xi ji* (xix).
- "Students today, when they have read a text it as if they had never read it" (102). "is" is missing between "it" and "as."
- No. 79 in "Mindful Reading" is presented as from chapter 11 and page 187 (107). It is from page 178.
- Yonglo edition (140, 146) is Yongle edition.

The Making and Unmaking of the Chinese Radical Right, 1918–1951

Nagatomi Hirayama. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022. xiv+296 pp. £75.00 (cloth)

Reviewed by Els van Dongen*

Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

*Corresponding author. Email: evandongen@ntu.edu.sg

doi:10.1017/jch.2023.4

Although absent from the title, *The Making and Unmaking of the Chinese Radical Right* is essentially a history of the formation and decline of the Chinese Youth Party (CYP, *Zhongguo qingniandang*), which was founded in Paris in December 1923 by a band of Chinese intellectuals and students. Chinese historiography of the CYP has not been

¹See Tanaka Kenji 田中謙二, *Shushi gorui gaininhen yakuchū* (Tokyo: Kyūko shoin, 1994), 170.