Even more problematic is Hoxby's treatment of the concept of the sublime. He relies exclusively on the Kantian notion of the "tragic sublime," in terms of the antinomy between freedom and necessity. The use of this modern notion of the sublime to explore some facets of early modern tragedy (e.g., Jesuit tragedy, 250–52) is contrary to his own historicizing methodology. But more importantly, the author ignores completely the early modern reception of *Peri Hypsous* by Longinus, which could have supported his general argument very well. As Marc Fumaroli rightly remarks, the reception of Longinus in this period can be considered as a "shadow text" of Aristotle's *Poetics*. What is more, from Robertello to Boileau, discussions on poetics and the sublime have often been intertwined. The sublime also played a crucial role in early modern discussions on the effect of tragedy. Whether it was Heinsius's *De Constitutione Tragoedia*, Corneille's reflections on the aim and effect of tragedy, the reception of his tragedies by Boileau, Bouhours, and Saint-Evremond, or even Menestrier's ideas on musical spectacles: the vehement and transporting emotions that tragedy could elicit were often described in terms of the (Longinian) sublime.

Apart from those lacunae, this book remains a rich and eye-opening study, differentiating early modern concepts of tragedy from later modern and idealist interpretations. The very impressive reconstruction of early modern poetics succeeds in demonstrating how tragedy was much more than a conflict between human freedom and necessity. Hoxby makes us rediscover a "world that we have lost" in which the tragic was pathetic and vice versa and that combined different genres such as opera and Christian drama. For years to come, Hoxby's explorations will remain a point of reference for students of early modern poetics, for literary and theater scholars, as well as for philosophers.

Bram van Oostveldt

Xiaoqian Fu-Hébert, *L'Architecture chinoise dans la pensée des Jésuites du XVIIIe siècle: Représentation de l'architecture chinoise en France par les premiers sinologues.* Saarbrücken: Éditions Universitaires Européennes, 2016. Pp. 490. €71.90.

In spite of the millennial flowering of architecture in China, Chinese scholars traditionally considered architecture as a part of the domain of workmanship. It was deemed inferior to arts grafted onto literature, such as painting, calligraphy, bronze and stone inscription, and even the tea ceremony. With few exceptions, builders handed down their knowledge orally. A Chinese equivalent for the word "architecture," as it is understood in the West, therefore did not exist until relatively recently. The word often used

This content downloaded from 131.211.104.035 on January 19, 2018 03:17:15 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

instead, *yingzao*, literally means "construction" or "building." *Jianzhu*, the equivalent of "architecture" in modern Mandarin, was a calque of a Japanese translation of the Western term in the late nineteenth century.

Unsurprisingly, the academic study of Chinese architecture, before being introduced at universities in China, was first undertaken by westerners around 1900. Their illustrious names include Alexandra von Herder Grantham from Germany, Dom Adelbert Gresnigt from Holland, the Swede Osvald Sirén, and Englishwoman Evangeline Edwards. In their wake, among the first Chinese practitioners of the discipline were the Confucian thinker Yue Jiazao and politician Zhu Qiqian. Most influential of all, however, was undoubtedly Liang Sicheng, the Chinese architect trained in the United States, who was the first to recognize the long-standing quality of Sino-Japanese architecture—as a match, if not superior, to that of ancient Rome.

The prehistory of these scholars' pioneering work is the subject of the book under review by Xiaoqian Fu-Hébert. Although she privileges Western accounts of architecture above the Chinese ones, her temporal focus is innovative, drawing the time line back to the seventeenth century. She focuses on the detailed, often illustrated accounts of European visitors, in particular Jesuit missionaries—the only westerners who had access to the Forbidden City.

No full-fledged treatises on Chinese architecture by these Europeans survive, and Fu-Hébert has been unable to locate the manuscript, devoted to the topic by Père Bourgeois, that is listed in the archives. She has therefore gleaned remarks on buildings, cities, and gardens from travelogues and letters about China, most of them written by missionaries. She examines the statements' claimed and actual veracity and to what extent they reflected contemporary Western taste. Fu-Hébert differentiates three periods in the European appreciation of Chinese architecture, marked by, consecutively, incomprehension, acceptance, and analysis.

The first phase does not begin with a Jesuit but with Johan Nieuhof, an artist who in 1655 joined a trade embassy of the Dutch East India Company to Beijing. He wrote a travelogue outfitted with 150 illustrations purportedly done "after life." Translated into German, English, Latin, and French, it became the most influential book on China since Marco Polo. Fu-Hébert contends that its description of the monumental Porcelain Pagoda of Nanjing inspired Louis XIV to outfit Versailles with the Trianon de Porcelaine, a tile-clad, opulently decorated, one-story retreat (which was demolished after a decade). Around the same time, in 1685, the French king sent six "Royal Mathematicians" to Beijing to remedy the Italian and Portuguese dominance of the Jesuit mission. Soon afterward, large books on China appeared by Louis le Comte (*Nouveaux mémoires sur l'état present de la Chine*, 1696) and Jean-Baptiste du Halde (*Description de l'Empire de Chine*, 1735). Both authors described Chinese cities, palaces, houses, and gardens but

This content downloaded from 131.211.104.035 on January 19, 2018 03:17:15 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

made no effort to understand architectural principles, disparaging Chinese works in comparison with the West. This tendency began to change when the import of prints and illustrated books depicting Chinese scenes inspired a fashion for chinoiserie decorations in European architecture. In 1749 Jean-Denis Attiret, an artist based at the court of the Qianlong emperor, expressed his admiration for the Yuanmingyuan (Old Summer Palace) in Beijing.

Fu-Hébert contends that in the second half of the eighteenth century, missionaries began to examine the built environment in a more profound fashion and in relation to their study of the Chinese historical annals. Yet her argument takes a somewhat surprising turn by focusing on gardens. The traditional Chinese hierarchy of the arts respected gardening (in contrast to building) as an activity grounded in literature.

One of the early French admirers of Chinese gardening was botanist and polymath Pierre-Martial Cibot, who contributed to the 16-volume *Mémoires concernant les arts, les moeurs, les usages etc. des Chinois* (1716–91). His interest in the topic, which he apparently studied with a Chinese man named "Lieou-tchou," reveals a biologist's keen eye for detail. Cibot distinguishes the imperial gardens from the private gardens of the *shidafu*, or literate officials, who wanted to enjoy nature without leaving their urban business (he fails to address, however, the gardens of Buddhist and Taoist monasteries). According to his estimation, Chinese gardens originated at the same time as those of the Babylonian king Nimrod. Comparing Western and Eastern regard for antiquity, Cibot privileges the Middle Kingdom. Its purportedly "immutable" people, isolated from the rest of the world, has preserved its antiquity better than the West and makes better use of the things it conserves (320). In a chronological overview of Chinese gardening, Cibot depends on a poem by the famous eleventh-century historian, Sima Guang, who upon retiring from active life asked for a position as *literatus* in Luoyang, to devote himself to his studies and build a garden. Cibot gives a paraphrase, rather than a literal translation, of his treatise on "The Garden of Solitary Joy."

Cibot also edited a 1773 "Essay on the Theory of Gardens in China" that explained in more detail how the Chinese saw the garden as a miniature cosmos, an idealized version of the whole of nature. Gardens were shaped after the earthly paradise: a mythical mountain in the middle of an ocean, where the elixir of immortality was to be found. With help of his Chinese friend, Cibot apparently studied classics such as the Daoist text *Liezi* (attributed to Lie Yukou, fifth century BCE). He writes that the Chinese surpass the Europeans in conceiving of their gardens as a *Gesamtkunstwerk* appealing to all senses, joining architecture, sculpture, painting, and the applied arts. He also recognizes the importance of geomancy in the gardens' layout. Most shockingly for a European audience, however, he concludes that the "great art of gardening is . . . to embellish them with the disorder of nature and to hide behind the veil of nature's irregularities"

This content downloaded from 131.211.104.035 on January 19, 2018 03:17:15 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

(341). Here there is no room for trees planted in symmetrical rows, geometrical flower beds, or water enclosed in basins and canals. Cibot's desire to depend on Chinese sources and evaluate Chinese garden art on its own terms is a strikingly early example of a European who relinquishes the Eurocentric perspective in the history of the humanities.

Fu-Hébert's book, despite being descriptive rather than analytic, is original and important. It would certainly have merited a more careful production. It is unfortunate that the Éditions Universitaires Européennes have treated the layout, and in particular the many images, in a positively amateurish fashion.

Thijs Weststeijn

Michel Espagne, Nora Lafi, and Pascale Rabault-Feuerhahn, eds., *Silvestre de Sacy: Le projet d'une science orientaliste*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf/Patrimoine, 2016. Pp. 355. €29.

In the history of Oriental studies in Europe, between the era of the crusades and the twentieth century, we can perceive at least two major shifts. The first was the relocation of the practicing of Oriental studies from Rome and the Catholic Church to the new northern European centers of learning, such as Paris, Leiden, and Cambridge, from the end of the sixteenth century onward. The second was the more gradual transition from scholarly discourses and visions, which were entwined with religion, toward a more secular attitude in which, in spite of clear religious disagreements, a certain measure of objectivity was strived for and a broader range of religious and nonreligious sources was collected, edited, and explored. These two shifts contributed to the formation of Oriental studies as an autonomous discipline in the course of the nineteenth century and, moreover, to the acceptance of Islam and non-European civilizations as separate fields of scholarly inquiry.

The first shift, from the domination of the church to secular institutions and universities, was related to the emergence of dissident and Protestant scholarly networks in northern Europe, in Germany, Switzerland, the Dutch Republic, and England, which expanded throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These networks no longer relied on Catholic institutions for their text material or on clerical patrons but built their own resources and relationships with each other and with informants and intermediaries abroad. Although the Protestant scholars explicitly countered "papist" discourses of Islam, this did not mean that Oriental studies were dissociated from religion. Protestant scholars, too, denounced Muhammad as a false prophet and even

This content downloaded from 131.211.104.035 on January 19, 2018 03:17:15 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).