

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

*Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller.* Zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinem Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern. (Edited by J. Schubert and U. Schneider) Leipzig, O. Harrassowitz, 1954. xix+902 pp., 4to.

This magnificent volume of imposing size and beautiful print, dedicated to Professor Weller on his sixty-fifth birthday, will be greatly welcomed as an important contribution to oriental learning. The title "Asiatica" is significant. Though India, as one would expect, takes the lion's share with about half of the contributions, the field covered extends in fact over the whole of Asia. In this way this volume is a very fitting tribute to Professor Weller, whose own work, as is evident from the carefully prepared bibliography (pp. xi-xix), ranges over an almost equally wide field.

In view of both the size of the volume and the scope of the studies included, it will be readily understood that not only would it be impossible to offer anything like a "review" of the fifty-five contributions (arranged in the Jubilee volume in alphabetical order of the names of the contributors) but it would appear that even a list of all the titles would seem of doubtful value as a mere repetition of the Table of Contents. Since articles on Indian subjects are likely to be reported upon in some detail in journals specializing in Indology, I limit myself here to listing the names of the twenty-five scholars whose contributions cover this field, viz. L. Alsdorf, H. W. Bailey, D. R. Shackleton Bailey, T. Burrow, F. Edgerton, E. Frauwallner, H. v. Glasenapp, R. Hauschild, J. W. de Jong, W. Kirfel, J. F. Kohl, E. Lamotte, R. F. G. Müller, W. Rau, C. Régamey, L. Renou, G. Roth, W. Ruben, H. Scharfe, U. Schneider, W. Schubring, P. Thieme, †F. W. Thomas, J. P. Vogel, and E. Waldschmidt. The name of S. Morenz, whose paper is on "Ägyptische Ewigkeit des Individuums und Indische Seelenwanderung", may perhaps be appended here. The remaining articles are contributions: (1) to *Iranian and Tokharian Studies*, viz., E. Benveniste, "Notes Avestiques", W. Couvreur, "Kutschische Vinaya- und Prätimokṣa-Fragmente aus der Sammlung Hoernle", W. Henning, "Ein unbeachtetes Wort im Awesta", H. Lommel, "Anahita-Sarasvati", and W. Thomas, "Die Infinitive im Tocharischen"; (2) to *Tibetology*, viz., J. A. Durr, "Wie übersetze ich Tibetisch?", J. Filliozat, "Un chapitre du Rgyud-bzi sur les bases de la santé et des maladies", J. Schubert, "Das Reis-Manḍala", and G. Tucci, "Ratnākaraśānti on Āśraya-parāvṛti"; (3) to *Turcology and Mongolian Studies*, viz., A. v. Gabain, "Buddhistische Türkmission", E. Haenisch, "Kapitel XVII von Jalavāhana aus dem kalmükischen Text des Altan Gerel", L. Ligeti, "Notes sur le colophon du «Yitihän Sudur»", P. Poucha, "Zum Stammbaum des Tschingis Chan", and P. Ratchnevsky, "Die mongolischen Grosskhane und die buddhistische Kirche"; (4) to *Sinology*, viz., E. Erkes, "Das Schaf im alten China", K. Finsterbusch, "Shan-hai-ching, Buch 13: Das Buch vom Osten innerhalb des Meeres", H. Franke, "Zur Biographie des Pa-ta shan-jen", W. Franke, "Neuere chinesische Arbeiten zur Geschichte der frühen Ming-Zeit", W. Fuchs, "Eine buddhistische Tunhuang-Rolle vom Jahre 673", W. Gundert, "Die Nonne Liu bei We-schan", F. Jäger, "Eine Textdublette im 97. Kapitel des *Schü-gi*", G. Köhler, "Das Mündungsgebiet des Hwang Ho", J. Průšek, "Die *Chui-tsi-shu*, erzählende Volksgesänge aus Ho-nan", and U. Unger, "Die *Shi-king*-Zitate in *Shuo-wen* und *Han-shi wai-chuan*. Ein Materialbeitrag zur Textkritik des *Shi-king*"; and (5) to *Japanology*, viz., H. Hammitzsch, "Chinesisches im *Jikkinshō*, einer didaktischen Schrift

der Kamakura-Zeit", O. Karow, "Das *Daidōrujuhō*—'Klassifizierte Rezepte der Daidō-Periode und die Reformbestrebungen des Kaisers Heijō'", M. Ramming, "Eine neue Faksimileausgabe der Original-schriften aus dem Nachlass des Heiligen Nichiren", A. Wedemeyer, "Hitomaro's letzte Liebe", and G. Wenck, "Zum Problem der nasalierten Verschlusslaute im Japanischen". Beyond its immediate purpose of paying well-deserved tribute to an eminent Oriental scholar, this monumental work constitutes an interesting and significant cross-section of present-day Oriental scholarship as a whole.

W. SIMON

R. H. Van Gulik, *T'ang Yin Pi Shih: Parallel Cases from under the Pear-tree*, Translated by R. H. G. (Sinica Leidensia, Vol. X), Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1956, 8vo, 27 guilders.

Dr. Van Gulik has given sinologues and general readers much of interest and value in his previous works, but it is safe to say that none will appeal to so wide a circle as the present work. Written in the thirteenth century A.D. by a distinguished official who assembled famous cases of the remote past and paralleled them with others of later date, the book is a manual of Chinese jurisprudence as well as a vivid commentary on the social life of legal China.

The pear-tree of the title is that under which the prince of Shao halted to give judgment (see the *Shih Ching*, Karlgren, No. 16). In later times *t'ang-yin* became a metaphor for wise judgment or upright official, and the 144 cases in the present work are allegedly outstanding from some one legal standpoint. However slight (or even tricky) some of them may seem to the Western reader, there is no disputing the fact that for centuries the original has been a *vade-mecum* for Chinese, Korean and Japanese magistrates. That it should now be available to Western readers in a trustworthy translation is a major event in sinology.

The original text chosen (mainly for its general availability) by the author is not easy to understand; it has many lacunae and, here and there, is faulty. The lacunae have been supplied from other versions by the learned author and, where the *ssü-pu-ts'ung-k'an* text is corrupt or otherwise unintelligible, the translator has used another text, often printing this in full in his footnotes. A three-fold introduction of some 70 pages discusses the origin of the work, two parallel collections of legal cases (the *I-yü-chi* and the *Chê-yü-kuei-chien*) and their various editions, and court procedure in ancient China. Although it is a great pity that prohibitive printing costs prevented the translator from carrying out his original intention of publishing the fine edition of Yamamoto Hokuzan face to face with his translation, the student will find that most of his textual questions have been anticipated in the valuable commentary to the various cases.

NEVILLE WHYMANT

W. G. Aston, *Nihongi: Chronicles of Japan from the Earliest Times to A.D. 697*. Translated from the original Chinese and Japanese. Reprinted and published by George Allen & Unwin, London, 1956, two parts in one volume, xx, 407, 443 pp. (Reproduced by photo-lithography from the original edition, which was published as a supplement to *The Transactions and Proceedings of the Japan Society*, London, by Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1896, 2 vols.)

Since the first appearance of Aston's *magnum opus* sixty years ago, there has been a steady intensification of Japanese studies in the west. At the same time, the adoption by the Japanese of western scholastic methods has meant that the traditional commentaries on and studies of the *Nihongi* have, since Aston's day, been supplemented and in part replaced by a great body of modern critical writing. The publication of this reprint, therefore, presents an opportunity to reassess this pioneer work in changed conditions, and to consider how well it now meets requirements so different from those which called it forth.

Nearly all western students of an ancient Japanese or Chinese text would confess that a translation, even a bad one, frequently gives welcome comfort and relief. If in no other sense, then, Aston's *Nihongi*, the sole English version and an admirable one, would remain an essential aid in any study of ancient Japanese history undertaken by an English-speaking student. The translation is generally so careful, faithful, accurate and clear that there can be no suggestion of its supersession or replacement. In fact, the claim of the publishers of the present reprint that the translation is "authoritative" will hardly be disputed. This is the more remarkable not only in view of the translation's early date, which made the task even more arduous than it would be today, but also in view of Aston's inclination towards a certain impetuosity in conjecture and incaution in statement. This inclination is revealed in the notes, to which the results of its operation are generally confined, while the translation itself is kept nearly free of unorthodox or tendentious renderings. For example, in pt. II, p. 274, Aston rightly translates 兩制 as "discharged the functions of government", and records in a footnote his own odd notion that the phrase meant "announced the mourning for the Empress". Seldom, in fact, in the course of much use of the work, has the reviewer come upon a rendering which could not be defended by reference to at least one Japanese commentator. There are, however, inevitably certain renderings which in the light of modern criticism are dubious or controversial and which would now, therefore, at least be annotated as such. For example, in pt. II, p. 350, Aston renders 記定帝紀及上古諸事 as "commit to writing a chronicle of the Emperors, and also matters of high antiquity". The implication in Aston's phrasing, that these things were to be written down for the first time, clearly cannot be read into the original text. The rendering simply reflects the contemporary accepted view of the matter. Had Aston been working today, when this point has become highly controversial, he would almost certainly have avoided so misleading a phrase. The expression 帝紀, here rendered "chronicle of the Emperors", is also now at the centre of a controversy and requires appropriate annotation. The passage of time and increased critical activity reveal other such occasional flaws. Nevertheless, major errors of translation are few, while a number of minor ones are to be found corrected in the *Errata et Addenda* at the end of pt. II.

It is also claimed that the translation is "readable", and this claim too must, on the whole, be conceded. It is true that in the interest of a kind of linguistic accuracy the translator seems deliberately to have retained some un-English angularities (e.g., in the rendering of causatives); and, in any case, a work like the *Nihongi*, replete with exotic names and elaborate titles, can never provide easy reading in any language. (It has never been easy to read even in the original, since the time it was written.) But we can be grateful for the austerity of the translation, which might well, at the end of the nineteenth century, have been full of fustian and over-elaboration. Whatever the relative merits of Chamberlain and Aston as scholars, the latter seems to have had the clearer view of the possibilities and limitations of translation. Aston is content to render *sumera mikoto* or *tennō* 天皇 as "Emperor", but Chamberlain belabours the reader with the expression "Heavenly Sovereign" in his translation of the *Kojiki*, while he meticulously renders the honorific epithet for imperial persons or things by "august" (child, heart, lute, etc.), which Aston tends to suppress without loss of meaning. Aston's language, then, is still generally inoffensive to the modern reader and is superior, in this respect, to certain more recent examples of translations from ancient Japanese and Chinese.

It is, of course, in the notes that time has most conspicuously left its mark. Some of these are quite obsolete and could not (or should not) appear in a work written today, while Aston would probably have been restrained from some of his more rash suggestions had he had access to some of the works of reference, both Japanese and Chinese, which have since become available. He must also have been handicapped by the lack of an index to the *Nihongi*: this lack persists, though mitigated by the index to the *Nihon Shoki Tsūshaku*. A further reason for what many western students would now feel to be inadequacy in the annotation must be "the class of readers for whom the present work is intended", to which Aston refers in his introduction (p. xviii). He states at the beginning of the preface (p. v), "The chief object of preparing this

translation... was to make accessible to European scholars the very considerable store of material for the study of mythology, folk-lore, early civilization, and manners and customs which it contains". He was thus most concerned with readers who would never consult the original and scarcely at all concerned to assist the narrower specialist (who hardly yet existed) by discussing the minutiae of textual criticism and interpretation. This means, among other things, that we are not kept more than intermittently informed either of Aston's departures from his chosen text, that of the *Shoki Shūge*, or, more important, of the *Shūge's* arbitrary departures from all other texts of the *Nihongi*. The monumental *Shūge* was and is an indispensable commentary, but it seems unfortunate that Aston did not base his work on a conventional text. And further, there is, in general, a distinct touch of the antiquarian rather than of the historian or textual critic, in much of the annotation; though this is to be expected, especially in the mythological portions, as a reflection of the interests of the translator and putative readers, it is to be regretted in the historical portions.

Some of the notes are so misleading and apparently continue so to mislead some readers, that it may be worth mentioning one or two, that the reader may beware of others. In pt. I, p. 109, n. 1, Aston refers to "the Southern Wa mentioned in 'Shan hai king', a very ancient Chinese book, as being, along with the Northern Wa, subject to the kingdom of Yen". This interpretation of the reference to Japan in the *Shan-hai-ching* is based on erroneous punctuation of the relevant passage; the mistake seems to have been first made in the seventeenth century in the *Ishō Nihon Den* by Matsushita Kenrin and then perpetuated by Japanese and foreign scholars until the present century. The error has now died in Japan but lingers on in the work of some western scholars, misled, perhaps, by this very note.

In pt. I, p. 232, n. 2, we read, "Corea at one time was divided into three kingdoms called Ma-han, Sin-han, and Pyōn-han, corresponding respectively to Pëkché, Silla and Koryō. But there is some doubt on the subject". There is indeed doubt on various aspects of the subject, but there can never have been any justification for thus identifying Pyōn-han as the precursor of Koryō. It is hard to see how Aston could have made such a mistake.

Again, it is hard to attach much meaning to the statement in pt. II, p. 137, n. 1, that the Japanese have never called their country by the name, *Wa*. The character *wa* 倭, to which they eventually took exception, is found, read *Yamato* but meaning Japan, in frequent use in the *Nihongi* and in the *Kojiki*; it is used to this day in the name of the legendary priestess, Yamato-hime; and no reason has been shown for doubting the veracity of the Chinese records which allege that at one time Japanese rulers signed their communications to the Chinese court, King of Wa 倭國王. As for the sound, *wa*, the character 和 is, of course, still in constant use so pronounced and meaning "Japan".

The long *addendum* note on the *Kuji Hongi* (pt. II, p. 431), though containing the useful and unconventional idea that the *Kuji Hongi* deserved re-examination, also contains some important errors of fact, one of which, at least, has been reiterated by subsequent western scholars. One of these mis-statements involves that carelessness which mars so many of the notes but seems to be absent from the translation. Aston says of the relationship between part of the *Kuji Hongi* and the *Nihongi*, "so far as the former goes it is identical word for word with the latter"; and yet in the introduction (p. x) he had more correctly said, "almost word for word". The difference between the two statements happens to be of great importance in this field.

The above are a sample of the more flagrantly mistaken notes, the shortcomings of which cannot be said to be altogether due to the unadvanced state of these studies in Aston's time. Such notes as these together with the somewhat aimless antiquarianism of much of the annotation perhaps suggest that, while the translation itself may and should stand unchanged, as one of the greatest western contributions in this field, a supplementary volume of notes, referring to the existing translation and notes, would be a valuable addition. But it is one thing to criticize and quite another to make the positive contribution which Aston's great work now deserves; and the task may never be done.

Finally, though we must be grateful to the present publishers for making this scarce work once more available, it is a little annoying to find that they have unnecessarily departed from the original in certain small ways. Is there an inflexible rule that, when a two-volume work is reissued in one volume (to reduce binding costs?), the original volumes must be called "parts"? After all, abundant cross-references to "vol. I" and "vol. II" inevitably appear in this photo-lithographic reproduction. But even if the volumes had to be retitled, there was no justification, when printing new tables of contents for them, for removing the superscript vowel lengtheners from these tables. This and the repagination (not, surely, unavoidable) of the prefatory and introductory pages are the only departures from the original edition.

G. W. ROBINSON

*Ihara Saikaku, Kosyoku Seisuiiki* (Edited by O. Mori and K. Noma). Ōsaka (Ōsaka Bungei Konwakai) 1953, 229 pp. (In Japanese).

This is a photographic reproduction of the only surviving copy of this book, which is block-printed, dated 1688 and now in the Ōsaka Prefectural Library. In this edition the paper is better and the size of the page somewhat larger than in the reproduction published in the *Koten-bunko* in 1948. Each page of the original is accompanied by a transcription into printed forms of Sino-Japanese characters and *kana*, and this will be very helpful for those desirous of giving themselves practice in reading cursive Japanese. The editors claim that their transcription is an improvement on that of Huzimura-Saku in volume 2 of the collection of Saikaku's works in the *Nihon-kotenzensyo*. A quick check on two pages of the book under review showed that in two instances there was in fact an improvement. On p. 102, line 3, we find 兵四郎, where Huzimura has, mistakenly I think, 兵四頁, and on p. 103, line 1, the *hurigana* to 世帯 is given as しよたい as against Huzimura's せたい. Here again, I think, Huzimura is wrong, though one cannot be quite certain owing to bad printing at this point. However, in the same line, the text under review adds a *nigori* mark to the *hurigana* to 親仁 へ せ ち ぢ, whereas Huzimura puts no such mark. There is no mark to be seen in the reproduction, so that here Huzimura seems to be right. Thus it appears that the editors have not quite managed to produce the definitive edition that they claim, but nevertheless their work is to be welcomed as demonstrating the increasing accuracy of literary studies of the Tokugawa period.

C. J. DUNN

Edwin O. Reischauer, translator. *Ennin's diary, the Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law*. The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1955. xviii + 454 pp., 8½ × 6½ in.

Edwin O. Reischauer. *Ennin's travels in T'ang China*. The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1955. xi + 341 pp., 8½ × 6½ in.

These two volumes are an outstanding achievement of Western scholarship in the field of Far Eastern studies. The first is an annotated translation of *Nittō guhō junrei gyōki* by Ennin (793-864) who is sometimes also known by his posthumous name of Jikaku Daishi: the second is a synthesis, from the scattered references in the diary, of a continuous record of Ennin's stay in China and, much more important still, a reconstruction, by the same means, of a strikingly clear picture of affairs in China in the middle of the ninth century.

Marco Polo's description of China written over four centuries later has long been world-famous for its account of contemporary Chinese life as it appeared to a foreigner. As Professor Reischauer points out, it is very strange that Ennin's diary, which is so much earlier and gives what is in many respects a superior account of Chinese life, has been allowed to remain in obscurity for so long. The value of the diary in this connection has been overlooked by Japanese scholars, and the few of them who have made use

of it at all have done so merely as a source for obtaining some comparatively unimportant details of political history, without recognizing its overall significance as a rich mine of information about everyday life and affairs in T'ang China. Great credit belongs to Professor Demiéville for having originally suggested the subject to Professor Reischauer, as well as to Dr. Arthur Waley for having recognized the value of the diary in *The Real Tripitaka and other pieces* (London, 1952), pp. 133-68, and to Professor Reischauer himself for having been the first to translate the complete diary into any modern language and for having presented such an eminently readable reconstruction of life in T'ang China on the basis of the contents of the diary.

Most readers are likely to start with the volume *Ennin's travels in T'ang China*. Its scope can be judged from its chapter-headings

- |                                    |                                |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Ennin's diary                   | 6. Popular Buddhism            |
| 2. Ennin: pilgrim and patriarch    | 7. The persecution of Buddhism |
| 3. The embassy to China            | 8. The Koreans in China        |
| 4. Ennin and the Chinese officials | 9. Homeward bound              |
| 5. Life in T'ang China             |                                |

The material is almost all taken from the diary, and consists of the numerous fragments of often trivial information about each of these subjects which are to be found in different places in it carefully pieced together to form a continuous narrative. This volume is, in a way, even more valuable than the translation of the diary itself, because it offers a complete and consistent account of many aspects of T'ang China which could not otherwise be known. A debt is indeed due to Professor Reischauer, who after completing the translation of the diary itself might well have felt that he had done enough, for having gone on to undertake this complementary volume which ensures that the important information which lies scattered haphazardly through the diary is thus fully brought to attention. If he had not written this volume, much of the significance of this information would doubtless have been missed. The writing is masterly and fluent. Although intended for the general reader as much as for the specialist, the book is not vague or sketchy, but is on the contrary full of precise details and well-arranged facts, and reads as excitingly as any modern travel story. It may be remarked that anyone who imagines that red tape and bureaucracy are the invention of the twentieth century will be surprised to find that they flourished in China over a thousand years ago.

The whole book is so well executed that few valid criticisms can be raised. There are, however, several passages in the first chapter where some loose and over-generalized statements occur. Thus on p. 5 it seems a little strong to claim that "Ennin stands out as one of the last great individuals of this phase of history in East Asia", and there appears to be inconsistency in the following successive opinions about the general development of the T'ang dynasty:

1. "When Ennin was in China the T'ang dynasty was decaying politically." (p. 6)
2. "Despite the downward swing of the dynastic cycle, the ninth century was in a more fundamental sense a period of significant political growth in China." (p. 7)
3. "The China which Ennin saw and described . . . was a China in the midst of one of its greatest periods of development and growth." (p. 9)

After this first chapter the book turns to a detailed assembly of facts, and impresses by its reliability. It may, however, be mentioned that the general reader could perhaps be misled by a passage in p. 46 which says that the embassy to China of 838 was "the last to go to T'ang and for that matter the last mission to be dispatched abroad by the Imperial court of Japan until the nineteenth century". This is, of course, true as far as concerns the Imperial court, but there were later missions from the shogunate which for practical purposes took the place of the court.

There is one further subject upon which Professor Reischauer might have touched with profit in this volume, and that is the significance of Ennin's diary as one of the earliest surviving full-scale personal diaries to have survived in Japanese literature, and perhaps even in world literature.

The translation of the diary, in the other volume, is a major work of impressive

accuracy. The text of the Tōji manuscript, of which a photographic reproduction is available in Tōyō bunko ronsō, vol. 7 (1926), is in a difficult hand, and the printed versions in the *Zoku zoku gunsho ruijū*, *Dainihon bukkyō zensho* and *Kokuyaku issaikyō* which are based upon this manuscript were only superficially edited. Apart from a modern Japanese translation of about one-eighth of the text, and two or three articles in periodicals dealing with a few points in the text, Professor Reischauer had no Japanese translations or commentaries to which to refer in the solution of the numerous problems of every kind that confronted him in this by no means easy text, but he has presented a translation and notes which inspire deep confidence. Even the general reader, once his appetite has been whetted by the companion volume, is likely to find the translation to be full of interest and attractive to read.

E. B. CEADEL

Hugh Borton, *Japan's Modern Century*. The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1955, vii + 524 pp., 9½ × 6 in. U.S. \$7.00.

The centenary of the opening of Japan in 1853-4 has produced both inside and outside Japan a number of books surveying the vast changes in Japan's history that have taken place in these hundred years. In Japan, the Kaikoku hyakunen kinen bunka jigyōkai has been issuing the fourteen-volume *Meiji bunka shi* and the six-volume *Nichibei bunka kōshō shi*, both of which throw much light on this period. In America, Professor Hugh Borton has produced *Japan's Modern Century* as a full-scale general and interpretative history of the years 1853-1955.

Professor Borton is known for his *Peasant uprisings in Japan of the Tokugawa period* (Tokyo, 1938), and *Japan since 1931, its political and social development* (New York, 1940), for editing *Japan* (New York, 1951), and for his share in compiling *A selected list of books and articles on Japan in English, French and German* (revised edition, Cambridge, Mass., 1954), and *The Far East, 1942-1946* (London, 1955).

*Japan's Modern Century* is an extremely useful work in that it brings together into one volume and in fairly full detail information which hitherto could only be sought from a variety of sources. In consequence the book is likely to be used as a work of reference for a number of years to come, and it is in the hope that they will be of use when a new edition is called for that the various comments and corrections listed below are offered.

No radical new interpretations or theories of a major nature are put forward, but some interesting viewpoints are advanced. The long-term repercussions of the tripartite intervention by France, Germany and Russia after the Treaty of Shimonoseki in 1895 are stressed (p. 211). The important fact that the main trends of the Constitution of 1889 were already virtually decided by 1881 before Itō Hirobumi was sent abroad to study foreign constitutions is clearly established (p. 129). The story of Fukuzawa Yukichi meeting a farmer on horseback (p. 172) is a very apt illustration of the problems resulting from the abandonment of feudal customs.

From the use of descriptions such as "Shintō, the indigenous religion" (p. 72) and "Shintōism, an indigenous polytheistic animism and ancestor worship" (p. 181) it becomes apparent that the general reader as well as the specialist is being catered for. This being so, a statement such as that on p. 117 that the price of rice rose "from 4.60 yen in 1877 to 8.79 yen in 1879" requires to be amplified by indicating the measure of rice involved. (Incidentally the figure of 4.60 yen does not tally with the figure of 5.15 yen given on p. 153 as the cost of rice in 1877.)

The book is divided into five Parts, namely, the Opening of Japan, 1850-1868; Formation of a Centralized Monarchy, 1868-1890; Establishment of the Japanese Empire, 1889-1915; Leadership in Greater East Asia, 1915-1941; Japan Survives War and Defeat, 1941-1955. The four appendices contain the Potsdam Proclamation, the Instrument of Surrender, the Imperial Rescript, September 2, 1945, and the text of Japan's two Constitutions, 1889 and 1946. The index is fairly complete.

The proportionate amount of space allocated to each of the five Parts seems

reasonable, and it is fortunate that the period of the war and occupation is not allowed to take undue prominence since it is too recent for a historian to be able either to have access to all relevant source material or to survey it in proper perspective. It may be noticed, however, that the author consciously or unconsciously narrows down the scope of his work as it proceeds. Thus, although Parts II and III both contain whole chapters giving full details of the economic position of Japan in the periods in question, the economic factors are dealt with very summarily in the latter half of the book. This is particularly unfortunate, since the effects upon Japan of the world economic depression of 1930-1 were extremely severe, justifying more than the three pages (pp. 322-4) in which it is briefly described. Similarly although Part II has a long chapter (pp. 170-91) on "the social and cultural scene", there is no attempt to give similar material in later sections of the book. It would seem that the author found himself running out of space and that he in consequence felt himself obliged to restrict himself almost entirely to political history.

If so, it must be regretted that the space available in the book (over 500 pages of fairly small, close print) was not better organized, for there is an almost incredible amount of plain repetition. This repetition is difficult to explain. It may be that the chapters are based, without much change, upon lectures delivered in Columbia University (*cf.* Preface, p. vi), but the repetitions that are permissible and even desirable in a course of lectures which are spaced out over a period of time are unsuitable in a book. Or it may be that the author expects his work to be used only as a reference book by readers who wish to study only one section of it at a time and therefore tried to make each section as complete as possible regardless of repetition; but such completeness could much better have been afforded by cross-references in brackets and footnotes.

Anyone, however, who reads straight through the book will certainly be baffled when statements are repeated, often in almost the same words, time and time again, being presented on each occasion just as if they were being related as completely new information. Thus:

1. (a) "The dictatorship expired with only a minimum of struggle and upheaval." (p. 63),
- (b) "Fortunately for the new Emperor and the new volunteer army placed at his disposal by the western feudal barons, the resistance of the Tokugawa forces was at a minimum." (p. 64),
- (c) "Fortunately for the Imperial Army, there had been a minimum of military resistance by the supporters of the Tokugawa cause." (p. 73),
- (d) "The military campaigns between the Imperial and Tokugawa forces in the first two years of the Restoration were not extensive operations." (p. 85),
2. (a) "A new school was established where lectures on foreign books were given to the most talented clan warriors and where English, French and German were taught." (p. 41),
- (b) "Schools . . . were started in Edo where the young warriors concentrated on foreign languages." (p. 51),
3. (a) "Matsukata Masayoshi . . . became Finance Minister in 1881 and a policy of currency reduction was inaugurated." (p. 117),
- (b) "In 1881 . . . the new Finance Minister, Matsukata, inaugurated a retrenchment policy." (p. 119),
- (c) "Matsukata became the new Finance Minister in 1881 and immediately began a deflationary program." (p. 135),
- (d) "When Matsukata Masayoshi became Minister of Finance in 1881 . . . [he] adopted radical steps to place the country on a solid financial basis." (p. 153),
4. (a) "When the issues . . . were all under discussion, the Japanese Army was well entrenched from Vladivostok to Harbin to Chita to Baikal." (p. 287),
- (b) "Japan was in a strong position to press at the peace conference . . . The Army was rapidly spreading westward in Siberia to Lake Baikal." (p. 288),
5. (a) "He [*i.e.*, Hamaguchi] ordered a return to the gold standard . . . Unfortunately . . . this policy could not have come at a worse time." (p. 314),

(b) "Hamaguchi insisted on a return to the gold standard . . . Unfortunately . . . the Hamaguchi government could not have chosen a worse time." (p. 322).

These examples are a few out of the hundreds of repetitions which much detract from the readability of the book. Each of the twenty-two chapters is concluded by about a page of summarization of the contents of the chapter, and is introduced by about a page of summarization of the background (usually consisting largely of the material of the previous chapter). The reader must therefore be prepared sometimes to be told a fact in a chapter, then have it included in the summary at the end of the chapter and again in the introduction to the next!

There are many places where it would appear that the author is making use of lecture notes or other previously prepared material, rather than attempting to set out his narrative continuously and clearly. Thus on p. 135 it is stated "the parties disappeared in 1884", but on p. 196 we find that in 1889 "the party leaders placed great hopes in the power they would be able to exert through Parliament". The reader is left in ignorance of how the parties which disappeared in 1884 had reappeared by 1889, and his ignorance is only dispelled if he notices on p. 198 a reference to a footnote (No. 3) on p. 212. Similarly on p. 334 the reader is suddenly introduced to two factions in the army, the "Imperial Way Faction" and the "Control Faction": what these factions were and how they came about are not mentioned in the main text, and the answers to these questions can only be found in the middle of a long footnote on p. 345. In this and numerous other contexts the information given in the footnotes should have been included in the main text.

In a work of this size, replete with so much information, it may seem churlish to complain that some aspects are insufficiently covered. But several subjects call for fuller treatment and explanation. Much more needs to be said about the motives of the four western clans, and later of the remaining clans, in surrendering their fiefs to the Emperor in 1869 (p. 77). Something, also, should be said about the mutual relationships between Ōkubo, Itō, Iwakura, Kido, etc., and the way in which they reached decisions on policy matters in the earliest years of the Meiji period: something is said about these relationships in 1873 and onwards, but nothing about them in the important formative period 1868-73. Further explanation is required for Hara's change of mind too briefly described on p. 299 as follows: "he presented a bill to Parliament which would have permitted universal manhood suffrage. Before it came to a vote, however, he had dissolved the Diet and explained that an extension of the franchise would not contribute to the healthy development of constitutional government".

There are many instances of unexplained inconsistency of the author's viewpoint. On p. 205 it is stated that in 1894 "opposition to Itō and his Cabinet vanished instantaneously with the outbreak of war", and on p. 234 it is stated that in 1904 "the endemic political crises had little effect on the international policies which they [the Japanese government] formulated". On p. 215, however, we find that in 1898 "they were in an even more precarious political position. Faced with these internal weaknesses, Japan adopted a generally conciliatory and co-operative policy . . . it concentrated on negotiations, treaties, and alliances to bolster its international position". If it is true that in 1894 and 1904 the Japanese government could rely on external crises to bring an end to internal political crises, some fuller explanation should be given why the opposite should apply in 1898. Again, on p. 176 the author quotes with apparent approval a recommendation from an American educational adviser urging instruction in schools and universities in Japanese rather than in foreign languages: yet on the following page there is apparent disapproval in the passage "most vestiges of liberalism in education disappeared . . . After 1882, university courses in which the instructor lectured in a foreign language were dropped". In summarizing the Sino-Japanese war, the author writes on p. 207, "Japan had conclusively defeated one of the strongest nations in the Orient", a description of China which gives a somewhat different effect from that on only the previous page, "China was weak and disorganized. The Imperial court was still living in a blissful isolation. Its army was practically as outmoded as that of Japan thirty years earlier".

There is an over-easy use of catch-phrases and clichés. Thus "the war had

eliminated the menace of China to Japan" (p. 216) is a phrase more appropriate to a Japanese politician of 1895 than to a modern historian. It is ridiculous to suggest that the prostrate China of the period was or could be a menace to Japan. In addition, the historian should, of course, avoid the use of "labels" charged with emotion and of imprecise connotation. The reader who finds the phrase "propaganda of the Reds" in the Preface (p. vi) is forewarned, and will not be surprised to find the phrase "Tokugawa dictatorship" (admittedly a "tottering dictatorship", p. 55) peppered over the pages describing the years 1853-68. However appropriate the word "dictatorship" may have been to the shogunate at the beginning of the Tokugawa period, it gives a completely false impression when referring to its last fifteen years. The author himself in fact lets the cat out of the bag on p. 39: "As the actual operation of the government was largely in the hands of the Council of Elders, the *Rōjū*, it made little practical difference in terms of basic policy as to who was Shogun". The words "device" and "technique" applied on p. 98 to the actions of the government in making concessions to their critics imply that the actions were insincere and deliberate tricks. Such an implication deserves substantiation.

In a work of this size there are inevitably some points needing correction. The 3,750,000 bushels of rice which on p. 152 are given as the amount exported in the first half of the decade 1885 to 1894 are represented on p. 260 as being the average annual amount exported in these years. The phrase "the traditional anti-Christian attitude of the country and its people" (p. 181) is not a fair summary. The frequent practice of making direct quotations from books or speeches without giving references should be remedied in a future edition, especially when in such phrases as "As a leading scholar had predicted a half century earlier:" (p. 21), or "As a contemporary writer expressed it, . . ." (p. 211), or "As a contemporary described them . . ." (p. 24), the scholar or writer is left completely unidentified. The author's editorial methods could be improved. Why give the dates of Ozaki Yukio on p. 309 when he has been previously mentioned on p. 251 without dates? Why, when the abbreviation Satchō for Satsuma, Chōshū has been explained twice, on pp. 62 and 77 respectively, and used on pp. 119, 121, 132, etc., was it necessary for the explanation to be given again on p. 199?

The most serious errors occur in the romanization of Japanese. No one will object to Tokyo for Tōkyō, especially when a warning about this is given in the Preface (p. vi): less logical is the choice of Konoye for Konoe while Edo is preferred to Yedo. But whereas misprints in the English text are completely absent, the romanizations contain a high proportion of errors. Thus Aiiichi (p. 259, n. 11) should be Aichi, *Gaihō* (p. 189, n. 2) should be *Gahō*, *Keisai* (p. 129, n. 1) should be *Keizai*, Hensan Jō (p. 470) should be Hensanjo. There is frequent inconsistency between o and ō, and between u and ū. There is no excuse for such carelessness. Either the lengthened vowels should be regularly marked or else the lengthening bar should be regularly omitted. In this book we sometimes have Genrō, sometimes Genro (p. 205), and so on. It is irritating to see the same publishing firm as Kaizō Sha and again as Kaizosha within six lines on the same page (p. 473). But what is most surprising is that the author, a professor of Japanese, seems to think that the Japanese word for capitalism is shihon shūgi (pp. 479, 482, cf. *Nihon shūgi* on p. 211), and that the final vowel of personal names such as Sadao, Kumao, Shigeo, Takao is always long. Thus Araki Sadao always appears disguised as Sadaō, Harada Kumao as Kumaō (p. 344), Inobe Shigeo as Shigeō (p. 470, etc.); also we find Ōyama Iwao as Iwaō (p. 149, n. 3, p. 212, n. 2). Most unfortunate of all is the famous economist Tsuchiya Takao, who becomes Takeo on p. 129, n. 1, and p. 130, n. 6, and Takaō on pp. 470 and 473. Similarly we find Yanai-bara Tadaō on pp. 97, 110 and 470. The word for a treaty is given as joyaku twice on p. 474 and again on p. 475, and dōryoku is given instead of doryoku for "efforts" on p. 482. Ōuchi Hyōe who sometimes is correctly given also appears as Ōuchi Hyoe (p. 318, n. 13) and as Ouchi Hyōe (p. 482). This review, like the main text of the book itself, may conclude with a reference to a book by Ōuchi: the book, however, is not the meaningless "*Sengo Nihon Zaisei Ayanda Michi* (The Probable Direction of Postwar Japanese Finances)", (p. 482), but *Sengo Nihon zaisei no ayunda michi* which means "The direction which Japanese Finances have taken since the War". E. B. CEADEL