

secular lineage, Buddhist canonical texts, and the exchanges with Korea and Japan. Unfortunately, many interesting theses were not developed and chapters were fundamentally restructured during the process of transforming the dissertation into a book. My comments in this review are solely based on the book format of his research and I highly recommend that interested readers consult his dissertation for additional information on Buddhism in this period.

JIANG WU
University of Arizona

© 2017 Jiang Wu
DOI 10.1080/0737769X.2017.1299432

STEPHEN ESKILDSEN, *Daoism, Meditation, and the Wonders of Serenity: From the Latter Han Dynasty (25–220) to the Tang Dynasty (618–907)*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2015. viii, 387 pages. US\$85.00 (hb). ISBN 978-1-4384-5823-6

Daoism, Meditation, and the Wonders of Serenity continues Eskildsen's solid scholarship on the Daoist tradition, expressed in his earlier works *Asceticism in Early Taoist Religion* (1998) and *The Teachings and Practices of the Early Quanzhen Taoist Masters* (2004), both also published by SUNY Press. The present book is a historical and textual study of Daoist meditation from the second to eighth centuries CE.

We may begin by recognizing that there are at least five major types of Daoist meditation, with each emerging during a specific period of Daoist history and often associated with particular Daoist movements. They include apophatic or quietistic meditation, ingestion (*fuqi* 服氣), visualization (*cunxiang* 存想), inner observation (*neiguan* 內觀), and internal alchemy (*neidan* 內丹). "Apophatic meditation" approximates a variety of Daoist technical terms, including *jingzuo* 靜坐 (quiet sitting), *shouyi* 守一 (guarding the One), *xinzhai* 心齋 (fasting the heart-mind), and *zuowang* 坐忘 (sitting-in-forgetfulness). Associated with the inner cultivation lineages of classical Daoism, that is, the earliest Daoist religious community during the Warring States period (480–222 BCE) to the Early Han dynasty (202 BCE–9 CE), apophatic meditation emphasizes emptying and stilling the heart-mind and attaining mystical union with the Dao. It is primarily contentless, non-conceptual, and non-dualistic. Ingestion and visualization practices first appeared in the context of early and early medieval Daoism, from the Later Han dynasty (25–220 CE) to the Period of Disunion (220–589 CE). Ingestion generally involves bringing various energies (*qi* 氣), such as solar, lunar, and astral effulgences (*jing* 景), into the body. Visualization involves imagining (actualizing?) the body in multiple ways, such as the five *yin*-organs (*zang* 臟) as orbs of light or residences of deities. These practices are particularly associated with the Shangqing 上清 (Highest Clarity) movement, although there are earlier precedents such as in the Taiqing 太清 (Great Clarity) movement and *Huangting jing* 黃庭經 (Scripture on the Yellow Court; DZ 331; DZ 332). Inner observation is a Daoist adaptation of Buddhist "insight meditation" (Pali: *vipassanā*; Skt.: *vipāśyanā*), which generally involves

maintaining non-discriminating awareness of all phenomena. This practice became especially prominent in the Tang-dynasty (618–907 CE) integrated Daoist monastic and ordination system. Finally, internal alchemy emerged in fully systematized expressions in the later Tang and early Song dynasty (960–1279 CE). From that point forward, it became the primary form of Daoist meditation, although apophatic meditation remained foundational and central. Internal alchemy utilizes complex, often sequential stage-based techniques with the goal of complete psychosomatic transformation, or “immortality” in Daoist terms. It is especially associated with the so-called Nanzong 南宗 (Southern School) and Quanzhen 全真 (Complete Perfection) movements, including their various lineages.

Eskildsen’s study technically focuses on the first type, which he refers to as “passive meditation” (pp. 2, 19, 27, 160, 277, 285–86, *passim*), although, as discussed below, some of his categorizations are debatable. This form of Daoist meditation is especially associated with classical Daoism and became foundational in the larger Daoist tradition; the practice is particularly related to the cultivation of “clarity and stillness” (*qingjing* 清靜), referred to as “clarity and calmness” by Eskildsen. The book consists of eight chapters, including an introduction, the six main chapters, and a conclusion. The titles of the six principal chapters, which focus on fourteen primary texts, are as follows: (chapter 2) The Earliest-Known Daoist Religious Movements (Taiping 太平 Group Texts, *Laozi xiang'er zhu* 老子想爾注); (chapter 3) Dramatic Physical and Sensory Effects (*Xiandao jing* 顯道經, *Rushi si chizi fa* 入室思赤子法, *Taishang Hunyuan zhenlu* 太上混元真錄); (chapter 4) Integrating Buddhism: Earlier Phase (*Xisheng jing* 西昇經, *Xuwu ziran benqi jing* 虛無自然本起經); (chapter 5) Integrating Buddhism: Emptiness and the Twofold Mystery (*Benji jing* 本際經, *Wuchu jing* 五廚經, *Qingjing jing* 清靜經); (chapter 6) Serenity and the Reaffirmation of Physical Transformation (*Zuowang lun* 坐忘論, *Dingguan jing* 定觀經); and (chapter 7) Serenity, Primal *Qi*, and Embryonic Breathing (*Cunshen lianqi ming* 存神煉氣銘, *Taixi jing zhu* 胎息經註) (I use Eskildsen’s translations of the titles in the present review). Some of these texts are fairly well known in the field of Daoist Studies. Stephen Bokenkamp published a study and annotated translation of the possibly early third-century CE *Laozi xiang'er zhu* (DH 56; S. 6825) in his *Early Daoist Scriptures* (University of California Press, 1997), with *xiang'er* untranslated by Eskildsen, but rendered as “thinking of you” by Bokenkamp and as “thinking through” by Russell Kirkland. Livia Kohn has published studies and annotated translations of the seventh-century *Cunshen lianqi ming* (Inscription on the Preservation of the Spirit and the Refining of *Qi*; DZ 834), the eighth-century *Dingguan jing* (Scripture on Stability and Observation; DZ 400), sixth-century *Xisheng jing* (Scripture of the Western Ascension; DZ 666), and eighth-century *Zuowang lun* (Treatise on Sitting and Forgetting; DZ 1036). Here her *Seven Steps to the Tao* (Steiner Verlag, 1987), revised and updated as *Sitting in Oblivion* (Three Pines Press, 2010), is particularly relevant. Eskildsen’s selection of texts is somewhat random, given his interest in “the wonders of serenity,” and the study at times lacks the necessary contextualization. Part of this is due to the anonymous and unclear provenance of many Daoist texts. While Eskildsen does discuss issues of dating, one would have appreciated more attention to *specific* Daoist sub-traditions, movements, and lineages. For example, the *Xisheng jing* is associated with Louguan 樓觀 (Lookout Tower Monastery in Zhouzhi 周至, Shaanxi), and it could be connected to the more

encompassing monastic system, specifically ethical commitments and monastic requirements such as celibacy and sobriety. As the chapter titles indicate, Eskildsen's organizational framework is primarily historical and secondarily thematic, and some of the texts seem to have little affiliation with each other beyond the apparent concern for stillness-based meditation.

In addition to detailed discussion and close reading of various Daoist texts, an interesting and noteworthy feature of Eskildsen's account focuses on the "five stages (*wushi* 五時) and seven phases (*qihou* 七候)" (pp. 215, 230–31, 250–51, 300), and the "nine rooms" (*jiushi* 九室) (pp. 46–47, 130, 135–36, 140, 162). The five stages refer to stages or moments in meditation, specifically the movement from "major motion" (*taidong* 太動) to "major calmness" (*taijing* 太靜), although *dong* may also be understood in the technical sense of "agitation." The seven phases refer to psychosomatic benefits, effects, and transformations that emerge after the state of major stillness has been attained. They include complete health, rejuvenation, longevity, refinement, divinization, pervasion, and immortality. Finally, the nine rooms refer to a series of meditation techniques undertaken in ordered progression in isolation in a meditation room. Eskildsen's work thus provides important details about the technical specifics of Daoist meditation.

From a more critical perspective, one deficiency of the book, although more "orthodox" Sinologists will see this differently, involves Eskildsen's use of a conventional view of Daoism, specifically an assumed disjuncture between classical Daoism (so-called "philosophical Daoism") and organized Daoism (so-called "religious Daoism"), with only the latter being Daoism ("Daoist religion") as such. This is evident in the book's reference to the "earliest known Daoist religious movements" (ch. 2); that is, while Eskildsen accepts some connection between earlier sources (e.g., *Laozi*, *Zhuangzi*) and early organized Daoism, such as the Taiping 太平 (Great Peace) and Tianshi 天師 (Celestial Masters) movements, he implicitly suggests that historical sources only support the latter as the "beginning of Daoism" as a social movement. This position makes the cover image (Laozi riding his water buffalo) somewhat strange, although Eskildsen perhaps means to draw attention to various texts attributed to revelations from Laojun 老君 (Lord Lao), the deified Laozi. In contrast, the work of Harold Roth and others suggests that the inner cultivation lineages of classical Daoism—which created, preserved, and transmitted the type of meditation that forms the centerpiece of Eskildsen's study—was an earlier religious movement comprised of loosely-related master-disciple lineages. These had a specific and shared anthropology (view of self), cosmology (view of the universe), psychology (view of mind), soteriology (view of the ultimate purpose of human existence), theology (view of the sacred), and so forth. To use Ninian Smart's "seven dimensions" of religion, they employed and advocated specific doctrines, ethics, experiences, material culture, narratives, practices, and social organization. Eskildsen is somewhat more sophisticated than the standard "bifurcated" or "Leggean view" and the early revisionist "truncated" or "Strickmannean view," views explored and critiqued in my *The Daoist Tradition* (Bloomsbury Academic, 2013). Eskildsen does address some of the texts of classical Daoism in the introduction, but a separate chapter on classical Daoist apophatic meditation would have added an important and necessary foundation for the book. Interested readers may consult Harold Roth's *Original Tao* (Columbia

University Press, 1999), although that work is by no means uncontroversial or universally accepted.

A few other dimensions of the book deserve more critical reflection. First, some of Eskildsen's categorizations are problematic. While addressing or related to meditation, many of the texts clearly are not "meditation manuals." For example, the *Xuwu ziran benqi jing* 虛無自然本起經 (Scripture on the Original Arising from the Naturalness of Empty Nothingness; DZ 1438) is more cosmological, while the *Xisheng jing* is more mystical. This is not to suggest that these are unrelated or mutually exclusive, but rather to raise the issue of relevance, appropriate engagement, and sophisticated interpretation. Similarly, while Eskildsen effectively demonstrates the centrality of serenity in the selected texts, some of the works are more complex. For example, the *Dingguan jing* and *Zuowang lun*, connected to the eighth-century *Neiguan jing* 內觀經 (Scripture on Inner Observation; DZ 641), are clearly influenced by Buddhist insight meditation and might be better categorized as "inner observation" works. This is not to suggest that the texts do not have "quietistic dimensions," but rather to raise the question of appropriate typology. That is, although contemporaneous Chinese Buddhist works emphasize the complex relationship between *zhi* 止 (Skt.: *śamathā*) and *guan* 觀 (Skt.: *vipāśyanā*), Daoist emptiness- and stillness-based meditation pre-dates the introduction of Buddhism to China; "inner observation" is, in turn, adapted from the insight component. Along these lines, one wonders about the centrality of visionary experience in some of the texts (pp. 75–141), which seems to problematize the emphasis on clarity and calmness. Eskildsen acknowledges the complexity of categorization in various places, specifically when he draws attention to accompanying visualization techniques (pp. 43–45, 48, 75–76, 156–57, 277–79, 286). He also anticipates the subsequent integration and systematization of various methods in later periods of Daoist history (pp. 3, 73, 130–31, 172–73, 253, 274–75, 298, 303).

Second, the book would have benefited from deeper engagement with theoretical work on "meditation" and "practice" and from more integration, especially in terms of recurring themes. This point relates to the necessity of Sinologists having more thorough training in Religious Studies. Eskildsen basically reduces meditation to the solitary practice of *techniques* and associated contemplative experiences, specifically through the *conceptual framework* of "serenity." However, there are other dimensions of meditation that deserve consideration; they include aesthetics, breathing, community, dietetics, ethics, material culture, place, posture, time, accompanying practices (e.g., celibacy, recitation, ritual), and so forth. Eskildsen does mention place (pp. 35, 131, 145), posture (pp. 81, 278), and timing (pp. 40, 83, 86–87, 99, 101–2, 105, 107–8, 132–35), but he does so in a haphazard manner. On a more minor note, the book would have benefited from at least some illustrations. In addition, the format is somewhat monotonous (text, date, translated passage, exegesis). The recurring right-margin mishyphenation of Pinyin also is a distraction, and the index is fairly rudimentary. For example, it lacks entries on "passive meditation," "proactive meditation," and *qingjing*, phrases that occur repeatedly and that are central to Eskildsen's study.

Nonetheless, the book makes a major contribution to our understanding of Daoist meditation, and it will assist individuals in understanding Daoist meditation in a more integrated and sophisticated manner. It does indeed document "the wonders of

serenity,” and we may look forward to Eskildsen’s proposed second installment and subsequent study on later Daoist meditation, including internal alchemy (pp. 3, 303).

LOUIS KOMJATHY
University of San Diego

© 2017 Louis Komjathy
DOI 10.1080/0737769X.2017.1299429

THOMAS JÜLCH, *Bodhisattva der Apologetik: die Mission des buddhistischen Tang-Mönchs Falin*. With an English Foreword by Bart Dessein. Munich: Herbert Utz Verlag, 2013. 3 vols., 1142 pp. €139 (hb). ISBN 978-3-8316-4237-3

It is well known that one of the strategies used by the Tang rulers to claim legitimacy of their rule was to trace their ancestry back to Laozi with whom they shared a common surname. In contrast to the Sui who had based their unifying rule on Buddhism, the Tang emperors therefore supported Daoism from the very moment they ascended the throne in 618 CE. Availing himself of this momentum of support and to secure the position of Daoism for the new dynasty, the Daoist scholar Fu Yi 傅奕 (554–639) who had been promoted to the influential position of Grand Astrologer under Gaozu 高祖 (r. 618–626), promptly submitted a memorial in 621 titled “Eleven Articles on Reducing Buddhist Monasteries and Pagodas and Diminishing Buddhist Monks and Nuns, to Profit the State and Benefit the People.” In 626, two of Fu Yi’s devotees, Li Zhongqing 李仲卿 and Liu Jinxi 劉進喜 handed in similar petitions to the throne.

The Buddhist monk Falin 法琳 (572–640), born two years before the great persecution of Buddhism under the former emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou had experienced the existential threat that Buddhism faced in the late sixth century. Blaming the Daoist Zhang Bin 張賓 for having instigated the Zhou emperor to suppress Buddhism (*Bianzheng lun* 辯正論, end of *juan* 3), he was well aware of the potential danger of the attack that these Daoist scholars had launched on Buddhism. Therefore, when emperor Gaozu officially asked for feedback on Fu Yi’s allegations, Falin immediately wrote a most detailed refutation titled *Treatise on the Destruction of Evil* (*Poxie lun* 破邪論) in 622 and an even more comprehensive work titled *Treatise on the Explanation of What is Correct* (*Bianzheng lun*) that he completed around 633.

Falin knew that the two earlier famous responses to Zhang Bin’s attack—the *Xiaodao lun* 笑道論 by Zhen Luan 甄鸞, which ridiculed the Daoist position, and the *Erjiao lun* 二教論 by Shi Daoan 釋道安, which did not even grant Daoism the status of a teaching (*jiao* 教)—had not been able to fend off the imperial persecution back in 574. He therefore decided to write refutations that were not just stating a counter-position in the first place, but reached out and addressed each single point of the Daoist allegations in a mode of scholarly argumentation. Assuming that references to Buddhist sources would not be convincing as counter-evidence to Confucian and Daoist arguments, he further decided to make ample use of Confucian and Daoist sources to support his own refutations. This strategy of refuting