NOTICES OF BOOKS

Chou China, by Chêng Tê-k'un. "Archæology in China, Volume Three." W Heffer & Sons Ltd., Cambridge. 1963.

Archæology is a science that has come to the fore in China only in recent years. The Chinese have always been archæologists—in Former Han times the excavation of an ancient bronze is noted as making quite a stir in the court. Beginning about 1920, especially during and since the world war, Chinese archæology has come into its own. Instead of depending upon grave robbers, as did Bishop W. C. White (p. 103 f.), Chinese governmental expeditions have made their own diggings, thereby avoiding disputes with the owners of the land. The many reports of discoveries have been published in various Chinese journals. The best European methods have been employed and very large amounts of Chou materials have been discovered. Excavation is still going on, so that we can be extremely grateful to Professor Cheng, for bringing together these reports and condensing them into his book. He supplies four maps, 43 text-figures, 44 plates, and 41 pp. of Chinese characters for sites and names. There is a detailed index in 33 pages.

Everything seems to have been covered: architectural remains, burials, altar sites, city walls, jade carving, ceramics, bronze vessels, mirrors, weapons, tools, coins, chariot fittings, lacquer, writing, etc., etc. This book is indispensable to anyone interested in archaic China.

Oxford University. HOMER H. DUBS

Wing-tsit Chan, *Instructions for Practical Living and Other Neo-Confucian Writings by Wang Yang-ming*. Columbia University Press, 1965, xli, 358 pp.

Wang Yang-ming (1472–1529) was the last of the great Confucians in the middle ages. An idealist, he founded one of the two great Confucian schools that dominated Chinese thought until the modern period. His philosophy has been summarized in histories of Chinese philosophy but has never before been recounted in English *in extenso*.

Professor Chan makes a new and careful translation of Wang's *Ch'uan-hsi Lu* (*Instructions for Practical Living*, 267 pp.), together with a few short works that supplement it. He points out sarcastically that previous translations "contain too many mistakes to be of any use". This translation he supplements by Wang's "Inquiry on the *Great Learning*" and seven of his memorials and proclamations. (Almost every Chinese philosophical term is used here.) He also provides a list of Chinese works about Wang, eight pages of Japanese works bearing upon this philosophy, together with an English and Chinese glossary, 26 pp. of names and titles, and an index to this book.

Here is a careful translation and a well-worked out study concerning one of the two greatest medieval Chinese philosophies. They have dominated Chinese and Japanese thought from the sixteenth century until almost the present time. Chu Hsi stressed metaphysics. He taught that one must promote the good and remove evil. But selfish human desires overcame this teaching, while his requirement of a clear

understanding was replaced by memorization, recitation, philosophy, and textual studies. So he failed morally to influence the imperial court. Wang Yang-ming restored Confucian moral idealism to its central moral emphasis on purpose and action, although he too failed to influence the imperial court until half a century had passed after his death.

Curiously enough, Prof. Chan has failed to face the metaphysical problem concerning the ontological status of philosophical entities. Wang is sometimes presented as an objective idealist, since he emphasized that things are what they do and that "the extension of knowledge" consists in realizing "the innate knowledge of the mind", *i.e.*, moral principles. In this respect, Wang Yang-ming was like Spinoza, who likewise held that things are what they do. But Spinoza worked with two realities, mind and matter, while Wang Yang-ming did not separate them. "The original substance of the mind is characterized by the highest good. . . . Doing good is to rectify what is incorrect in the mind and return to the original state of correctness. . . . The concrete starting point of the effort to make the will sincere lies in the investigation of things" (pp. 248–9). Spinoza was a metaphysical idealist, while Wang Yang-Ming was a moral idealist. By "the investigation of things" he means an experimental search into the moral effect of a teaching.

Wang Yang-ming passed the government examinations in 1499, and was then given small governmental duties, such as conducting the provincial examinations in Shantung. But he absolutely refused to lower his moral standards. When, in 1506, a eunuch usurped the imperial power, Wang Yang-ming was banished to Kweichow. But in 1510 he was promoted to the imperial capital. When there was a serious rebellion in the country, he was often sent to suppress it, which he did more than once in a brief time. But the envy of the court eunuchs prevented him from securing his proper reward. Wherever he was, several hundred pupils attended his lectures. In 1527 there was a serious rebellion in Kwangsi. He was ill, but was sent to suppress it, which he did successfully. He however died on his way home in 1529. His privileges were then all taken away. Not until forty years later was he posthumously ennobled and entered into the Confucian temple.

Wang Yang-ming opposed Chu Hsi at almost every point. The latter placed the investigation of things ahead of the sincerity of the will. Wang Yang-ming, however, held that the will is the foundation of everything. Wang thought of moral principles chiefly and said that things are merely the functioning of the will—even by "things" he meant moral qualities. Knowledge is action, *i.e.*, unless moral principles are shown in action, they do not in such a case exist! He may have been short in logical acumen, but he was certainly long in moral insight.

HOMER H. DUBS

Les Lettres de 1289 et 1305 des ilkhan Arγun et Öljeitu à Philippe le Bel (=Scripta Mongolica, Monograph Series I). Par Antoine Mostaert et Francis Woodman Cleaves. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1962, pp. vii, 104+12 plates.

Ten years ago the initiative of Professor F. W. Cleaves and the Reverend A. Mostaert was responsible for the inauguration, with the co-operation of the Harvard University Press, of the series Scripta Mongolica, which was to be devoted to the reproduction of rare Mongol texts. Three such works have appeared since then. The present Monograph Series, of which the volume under review is the first to appear, is to contain Mongol texts with translation and commentary. Thus it continues in a handy form the excellent series of texts edited by Professor Cleaves and Father Mostaert which appeared hitherto in the Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, and this first volume conforms in the manner of its presentation to the now familar plan. The new series is a most welcome addition to the range of publications concerned with the scholarly study of Mongolistics and sets an impressively high standard of learning and of elegance of production for its successors. At a time when so much academic work is

couched in turgid jargon it is a pleasure to welcome the graceful clarity of Father Mostaert's essay.

The two letters from the Ilkhans Aryun and Öljeitü to King Philippe le Bel of France were discovered in the French National Archives by Abel-Rémusat and first published by him in 1824 in lithographic reproduction with a transcription into modern Mongol writing, a partial translation and a commentary. Since then a number of scholars have turned their attention to these letters, though unfortunately the faulty copies published by Abel-Rémusat formed the basis of nineteenth century research whose success was thereby vitiated. Even after the appearance in 1895 of Roland Bonaparte's photographic reproductions the earlier copies still received attention. Kotwicz was the first, in 1925, to turn Bonaparte's texts to account, while over thirty years later some of Abel-Rémusat's lithographs were given a new lease of life in Ts. Damdinsuren's summary of Mongol literature (*Mongolyn uran zoxiolyn toim*, Ulan Bator 1957). Father Mostaert traces in considerable detail the history of the study of these documents, referring also, most usefully, to isolated studies devoted to certain aspects of them published in recent years by Professor Cleaves and himself.

The book consists first of all of an introduction summarizing the state of research into the two letters, and situating them in their historical context. There follow preliminary remarks on the appearance of the documents, their punctuation and orthography, and their technical organization. Then each document appears in transcription, with a translation subjoined, and an extensive commentary on practically every word. Reference is facilitated by the Index Verborum, and an excellent bibliography is provided. The final pages contain photographic reproductions of the two texts. The commentaries take account where necessary of work by previous scholars, comparing and criticizing their readings and versions, and likewise of previous work by the two editors themselves, so that reference to their earlier publications is not necessary. The work is meticulously exact, though the effect of the distance between editors and printers, the book having been printed in this country, is shown in the persistence of a number of misprints. Of these one may mention as significant line 24 of the transcription on page 17, where *yayan* should read *yayun*, as in the plates and the commentary.

Father Mostaert's transcriptions are superior in several instances to those of his predecessors, and appear to have reached as near perfection as possible as far as the actual readings are concerned. Thus the latest version of these letters to appear, that in Professor Ligeti's *Preklasszikus Emlékek I, XIII–XIV század*, Budapest 1963, differs hardly at all from Father Mostaert's. Ligeti does not adopt the reading *ngdüni* for the problematical first word in the fifth line of Argun's letter, and he prefers *aman* to *nemen* in line 25. Other variations of substance are of minor significance. However, the general question does arise whether the transcription as a whole is exact enough, in that it does not distinguish the use of pointed and unpointed n and that of the various forms of t and d, and so on. The question was examined in some detail by Professor Ligeti in *Acta Orientalia XIV*, 3, 1962, pp. 318–320 in relation to *Qutuytu Pañcarakṣā*, and need not be discussed again. Whether or not such punctiliousness is demanded when the texts are appended in facsimile is open to discussion. But it is instructive to compare the appearance of the otherwise almost identical transcriptions in these two recent editions.

One or two detailed remarks may be made. On pp. 26–27, discussing the phrase *öčijü ilerün*, Father Mostaert refers to paragraph 275 of the Secret History for a further occurrence of this locution. However, from the text of the Secret History recently published by Pankratov it appears that both occurrences of *öčijü* in this paragraph are followed by forms of the verb *ire-* rather than *ile-*. Though Haenisch reads *ociju irerun* and *ociju ileju'ui*, the original clearly supposes an r in the second syllable on each occasion and glosses with 來 rather than the usual 去. Thus though the Secret History shows many examples of *ile-* following verbs of saying, as for example *ke'eju ile'esu* (177) and *ke'eju ilebe* (178), this particular context seems irrelevant.

To the discussion of the word *tangsuy* on pp. 44–45 may be added the following notes. *Erdeni-yin Erike*, in the contexts quoted by Father Mostaert, appears to suppose a different word, *i.e.*, *dangšuy*, which is evidently intended, whether anachronistically or no. *Dangšuy, dangsiy*, is derived by Damdinsuren (*Mongol xelend orson tövd ügs*, Studia Mongolia II, 1–16, page 74) from Tibetan *brtan-bžugs*, explained by him as "strengthening" (Russian *упрочение*). For this see also *Tsang-wen tz'u-tien* 藏文辭典, Peking 1957, p. 359, s.v. brtan-bžugs, with its explanation *brtan-par bžugs-pa ḷta-bu*, 堅住, 如請久住, "dwell firmly" as, asking for "long existence". This appears to be the word intended by *Erdeni-yin Erike*. I do not have Pozdneev's edition available, and my typed extracts from it show only *tangsuy* for the passages quoted. However, the recently published edition of *Erdeni-yin Erike* in Monumenta Historica III, 1, Ulan Bator 1960, p. 93a, reads *tangšuy* or *dangšuy* for the first quotation and *ḏangšuy* for the second. (Here *ḏ* transcribes "Uighur" d used in an unusual position). This unusual spelling is not decisive evidence, since elsewhere an initial d of a foreign word, *e.g.*, p. 110b, *Dondubdorji*, is spelled, regularly, with "Uighur" t. However, it does point to some peculiarity to be observed in the reading of the word, and in the corresponding Chinese text in *Meng-ku i-shih* 蒙古逸史 p. 40, which transcribes the word without translating it, the character used as *tan* 丹 and not a character *t'an*. Similarly the second syllable is definitely read as *šuy*, and not *suy*, the characters employed being *shu k'e* 書克. Thus the text employed must also have read *dangšuy* instead of *tangsuy* or this must have been the understanding of the informant who read out the text for Ch'en Lu 陳籙 the editor. We may refer also to the biography of the Jebtsundamba Qutuytu (*Asiatische Forschungen*, Vol. 9, paragraphs 38v and 39 r) for the compounds *mandal dangsuy* and *dangsuy mandal*, and to Pozdneev's brief reference in *Mongoliya i Mongolii*, p. 81, to the presentation of *dangsiy* (in his writing даньшик) to the Bogdo Gegen of Urga as one of the four annual ceremonies taking place in the Urga Chogchen.

C. R. Bawden