

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS

William H. Alkire, *Lamotrek Atoll and Inter-island Socioeconomic Ties* (Illinois Studies in Anthropology, 5), Urbana and London, 1965. 4 to. 180 pp.

It sometimes happens, as in the case of Gregory Bateson's *Naven*, that the importance of a monograph by a social anthropologist is at first not (or perhaps never) fully recognised because of its title. There is a risk that the work under review may suffer the same fate. Under a pedestrian title hides a first-class piece of field reporting.

The author spent fifteen months engaged in a study of Lamotrek, a remote speck of 154 acres of land, inhabited by some 200 people in the Western Carolines. The meagre natural resources of these atolls, their isolation and their exposure to frequent typhoons offer a formidable challenge to human courage, endurance and ingenuity. That this challenge is met, and met successfully, is shown in Dr. Alkire's monograph.

After a brief survey of ecology and habitat we are presented with a full and carefully reasoned and presented description of kinship and political organisation. Next come two chapters on religion and economic activities. A discussion of Lamotrek's communications with other atolls and of social and economic ties then follows.

There was a time when social anthropologists endeavoured to find a natural limit to the scope of their field-work by choosing for their study societies which for cultural or geographical reasons had few, or at any rate, non-significant, relations with their neighbours. Remote as the atolls of the Carolines are from one another, Alkire stresses by contrast how important their interrelationship must always have been, and still is, and the reasons why. First, a typhoon may devastate one atoll and leave the next practically unharmed. In order to survive each island population must be able to count on reciprocal aid in times of disaster. Secondly, natural resources and products differ in detail from one atoll to the next, and to maintain life and culture above bare subsistence level there must be a regular exchange of commodities. Thirdly, with small populations, disease and natural casualties, it is difficult to ensure the continued existence of matrilineal clans (both chiefly and non-chiefly) and sub-clans, and it is even more difficult to ensure that there is at all times a wide enough choice of marriage partners within the permitted degrees of rank and within the limitations imposed by exogamy. Moreover land resources are so small that any kind of imbalance must be redressed as soon as possible. If a kingroup has more land than it needs, or if it actually dies out, there must be a way of making that surplus land available to other kingroups which have more members than they can support.

As the Lamotrek clans are also represented on other atolls, adjustments can be made by the movement of individuals from one island to another, by adoption, by the transfer of rights in land (either temporarily or quasi-permanently) from one kingroup to another, or in other ways. The fact that both the islands and the clans are subordinated one to another in terms of relative rank and prestige leaves room for many other details of adjustment.

The division of Lamotrek into three districts for some purposes and two districts for others offers an interesting comparison with the geographical division of Tikopia described by Raymond Firth.

Within the scope of this review it is unfortunately not possible to discuss a number of suggestive arguments put forward by the author which may be of more than local relevance, such for example as the neat examples of ethno-anatomy and ethno-navigation on pages 124-127.

The only serious criticism is that after mentioning the instability of marriage (a subject of current interest among anthropologists) Alkire does not investigate the relationship between the causes of individual breakdowns of marriages and the social structure of Lamotrek with its emphasis on the matrilineal inheritance of rights to the use of land. It is to be hoped that this monograph will be followed up by other publications in which the author will have an opportunity of developing some of his theses at greater length.

G. B. MILNER

Amagai Kenzaburō 天海謙三郎, *Chūgoku tochi monjo no kenkyū* 中國土地文書の研究 pp. 4, 3, 13, 866, 6. Tokyo (Keisō shobō 勁草書房), 1966. Price ¥5400.

Amagai Kenzaburō, who died in 1962 at the age of 78, was one of the remarkable generation of scholar-administrators employed by the Japanese in Taiwan and Manchuria, to whom we owe such a great proportion of our knowledge of Chinese custom and social usage. For thirty years, from 1908 until 1938, he was employed in the Research Department of the South Manchuria Railway Company, and was engaged for almost all of this time as a specialist on land problems. He had a perfect command of Chinese, and was perhaps one of the most knowledgeable scholars in dealing with late Ch'ing official documents. His writings, almost all of which were published for limited consumption by the South Manchuria Railway, are not well known, but deserve to be consulted by any serious scholar of the modern Chinese land problem. This volume (pp. 859 ff.) contains a bibliography of his researches, almost all of which appeared either under the SMRC or in the Mitsubishi company's research reports (*Mitsubishi gōshingasha shiryō-ihō*) and are thus highly inaccessible. If these reports are of the same quality as the volume under review, it is to be hoped that some means will be found of reprinting them for a wider readership.

Western readers wishing to pursue the study of land tenure in nineteenth and twentieth-century China have recently had a whole new field of documentation opened up to them in the article by Prof. Yuji Muramatsu in a recent number of the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. This article, which is merely a *résumé* of a whole series of extremely detailed and well-documented Japanese studies, deals with the very important collections of landlord documents which have recently come to light in Japanese and American collections. These documents almost all come from the area around Su-chou, and are primarily concerned with the management of large-scale private landed investments, and their exploitation through "landlord bursaries" (*tsu-chan* 租棧). The present volume deals with an equally rich and varied documentation concerning the "official lands" (*kuan-ti* 官地) administered through agents called *ts'ui-t'ou* 催頭 on behalf of the Board of Rites. The lands to which this massive collection of documents refer are all in the environs of Peking. The author gives a meticulously detailed account of the various kinds of deeds issued to the occupiers and cultivators of the lands, the various types of registers listing the issue of land-certificates, registers of cultivators, lists of land under individual administering officers, and of a variety of documents ordering the investigation of titles, the registration of transfer of occupancy from one tenant to another, and applications for fresh registration.

This is followed by a general historical account of the official lands attached to the Board of Rites, which compares the documents from the Peking area with other historical materials relating to the Board of Rites' "official estates" (*kuan chuang* 官莊) in Manchuria. Such official lands were in theory granted to a cultivator who was given the right of cultivation, but was prohibited from selling or transferring the title of his lands. This right of cultivation was heritable, and subject to equal division among the heirs, as in the case of lands held as private property. The author shows that actual practice varied widely from this theoretical ideal. The right of cultivation was frequently transferred to unrelated parties, and equal inheritance was frequently not observed. There is a great deal of related material in the six volumes of the magnificent wartime field

survey of rural northern China (*Chūgoku nōson kankō chōsa* 中國農村慣行調査 6 vols., Tokyo, 1952-8).

There are almost 100 pages of photographs of the original documents, and any scholar wishing to gain a really detailed understanding of everyday official procedure connected with land tenure should be able to find a wealth of material collected here.

The last part of the book gives a brief historical background outlining the history of the colonization and bringing into cultivation of Manchuria during the late Ming and Ch'ing periods, and the gradual relaxation by the Ch'ing government of its traditional policy of prohibiting settlement by Chinese in southern Manchuria. The author shows how the varying circumstances under which colonization went on led by the nineteenth century to extremely diverse and complex systems of tenancy and ownership.

To round off the volume there is the record of a discussion of the subject matter of this book, and of the research programme of the SMRC, held in 1957 between the author and a group of scholars including the legal specialists Niida Noboru and Fukushima Masao, Ubukata Naokichi of the Chūgoku kenkyūjo, the historian Hatada Takashi, and several others. Such reports of discussions with eminent scholars have been popular in Japan since the tape-recorder made the preservation of trivial conversation fatally easy. This discussion, however, sticks to the point, and the interlocutors elicited not only a great deal of interesting reminiscence and information from Mr. Amagai, but also many interesting expressions of opinion which some future historian of the Japanese regime in Manchuria may find interesting and revealing.

D. C. TWITCHETT

Malaysia: Selected Historical Readings. Compiled by John Bastin and Robin W. Winks. xiv+484 pp. Maps, bibliography. Oxford University Press, 1966. £4 10s. 0d.

Malaysia and its Neighbours. By J. M. Gullick. xiii+194 pp. Map, appendixes, bibliography. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967. Hard cover 25s; paper covers 12s. 6d.

These two volumes concerning Malaysia have in common a number of characteristics. Both are essentially anthologies, collections of readings; both have been compiled by scholars well established in Malaysian studies; and both are intended primarily for school and university use.

Dr. Bastin and Professor Winks have constructed their book to cover the history of Malaysia (including Brunei and Singapore) from the founding of Malacca to the secession of Singapore; the greater weight of their attention falling on the modern period. To this end they have dipped liberally into the standard literature for more than one hundred extracts from sources as diverse as the *Sejarah Melayu*, the *Straits Times*, Sir Richard Winstedt's *History*, and the *Journal of the South Seas Society*. They have attempted to be comprehensive in their coverage and to impart to their book an "organic" unity; and, on the whole, they have been successful. By virtue of judicious selection and careful organization the volume does stand as a whole, in a form which will make it useful for teaching purposes. There is little about this beautifully produced volume, however, which serves to advance the study of Malaysian history: it constitutes an exceedingly able elaboration on the conventional mode of presenting Malaysian history to the student; but it makes no attempt to modify that framework in any original fashion.

Mr. Gullick's *Malaysia and its Neighbours* is the first volume in "The World Studies Series" edited by James Henderson, which is intended expressly for students in sixth forms, colleges of education and universities. It is a tightly organized collection of documents bearing upon a single theme which is somewhat more restricted than the title would indicate: the formation of Malaysia and attendant developments between 1961 and 1965. The documents are well chosen and representative of divergent positions;

and they are very ably illuminated by concise and lucid introductory and explanatory comment. Though the ending of "Confrontation" with Indonesia and more recent events have dulled its topical edge, students of contemporary South East Asian politics will find this a useful guide to a complex period.

DAVID K. WYATT

Alfred Bloom, *Shinran's Gospel of Pure Grace*. (The Association for Asian Studies, Monographs and Papers No. XX.) University of Arizona Press, Tucson, 1965, XIV, 97 pp. \$5.00

This admirable short monograph on Shinran's doctrine of grace is a welcome addition to the previous literature on the Amidist schools of Buddhism. It is particularly useful perhaps at a time when the whole Buddhist insight represented by the Amidist sects is apt to be neglected in favour of Zen and the other schools recommending stern self-effort towards enlightenment. Mr Bloom has given us here a lucid and concise account of the growth within the Mahayana tradition of the doctrine of the 'easy way' to salvation; the way of complete dependence on the saving grace of Amida Buddha to enable all sentient beings to be reborn in his Pure Land, where, amid idyllic surroundings, they may be assured of attaining final nirvana.

Mr Bloom starts by giving us the background of Pure Land thought in India and China: the content of the three Amidist sutras which provide the scriptural basis for the teaching, followed by an account of the doctrine as it developed under the seven Patriarchs. In the hands of these successive thinkers — Nagarjuna and Vasubandhu in India, T'an-luan, Tao-cho and Shan-tao in China, and Genshin and Hōnen in Japan — we see the gradual emergence of the 'other power' principle, at first sight so oddly contrary to the earlier "Buddhist optimism that man with resolve can accumulate merit to purify himself from passion and ignorance."

The teaching of the efficacy of self-effort was a natural outcome of the Mahayana doctrine of the Buddha nature — the perfect nature latent in all men but realisable through practice of the correct moral and meditative disciplines. The Pure Land teaching rests on the reverse premise: that man's nature is not originally and essentially good but on the contrary, owing to the ineluctable pressure towards depravity exerted by the Latter Days of the Law, hopelessly sinful and reprobate. It is incapable, therefore, of taking of its own volition any positive step towards liberation. The only sure path to salvation thus becomes the total surrender to the saving grace of Amida as expounded in the Muryōjūkyō or Greater Sukhāvativyūha Sutra.

Mr Bloom shows how the doctrine in the course of its development inclined more and more towards the complete acceptance of the 'other power' principle. Until Shinran (1173–1262) however, the founder of the Shin sect in Japan, there was always some admixture of self-effort in the doctrine, whether only the effort involved in the recitation of the sacred name of Amida, or the effort of inclining the will in the direction of faith. It is only with Shinran that the doctrine reaches its consummation in a categorical denial that man is in any way capable, through action, speech or thought, of acquiring merit which he can direct towards his own salvation. Such was the essential depravity of all finite natures that "whatever good deed he appeared to do on the finite level was still evil, because it was done with a calculation in mind and was ultimately intended to redound to his benefit."

For Mr Bloom therefore one of Shinran's most significant insights, "which certainly qualifies him for a place among the great religious thinkers of the world and clearly comparable to the Protestant Reformers, Luther and Calvin," is the contention that Faith itself is a gift of Amida.

In the previous Buddhist tradition faith had played a part comparable to that of a traveller in the directions of a trustworthy guide pointing out a way which he himself had already traversed. In Shinran's thought, however, faith is not an operation of the human will at all. It is not even roused and sustained by repetition of the sacred name, as it had been for Shinran's mentor Hōnen. "The name as conceived by Shinran",

writes Mr Bloom, "is that name, Amida, sounded forth by the Buddhas of the universe in accordance with the Seventeenth Vow. It is the true cause of salvation as it mysteriously arouses faith in sentient beings when they hear it and become aware that it embodies Amida Buddha's compassionate intention to save all beings. Conceived in this manner, the name of Amida is no longer the merely vocal element in the practice of recitation, but it is the mysterious activity of Amida Buddha within the minds of men."

It was Shinran's overriding concern for the miseries and helplessness of the common man, we are told, which prompted him to preach this easy path to salvation. But what, one naturally asks, becomes of those who by accident or contrary conviction never arrive at the required faith in Amida's grace, or even a single repetition of his name? Are they consigned to rebirth in the realms which previous Mahayana tradition had reserved for those who fell short — hell, the world of hungry ghosts, the world of beasts?

That Shinran's vision of salvation was a truly universal one can be seen in Mr Bloom's chapter 8. Here we learn that the worst that can become of any man, however reprobate or ignorant, is that he incurs an 'inferior birth' in a quarter of the Pure Land whence it will take him rather longer than the truly faithful to achieve final nirvana. Gone are the eschatological terrors of kalpas in the various hot or cold hells which rendered previous Buddhist doctrine so comfortless to the common man.

Mr Bloom is obviously well versed in Christian theology and it would have been interesting to have had from him a chapter or appendix comparing Shinran's doctrine of grace with that of St Augustine. From the same basic premises — the essential sinfulness of man and his consequent complete dependence on divine grace for salvation — the Christian and Buddhist paths diverge widely. From Mr Bloom's study it is not difficult to see that the more compassionate and merciful of the two was the Buddhist.

Shinran's religion of Pure Grace is perhaps difficult to comprehend properly by anyone who is not a naturally devotional type. Mr Bloom's study will make his thought more accessible to the others. It should be welcomed by all concerned with Buddhism and with Japanese religious history.

CARMEN BLACKER

Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, Howard L. Boorman (Ed.), Richard Howard (Associate Ed.) [et alii]: Vol. 1 (AI-CH'Ü), xv, 479 pp. (with a map and an Index of Biographical Reference Works). New York and London, Columbia University Press, 1967.

The publication of this first of five volumes is a major event in modern Chinese studies. When the work is complete, it will provide biographies of some 600 prominent Chinese of the "republican" period (1911–49) and will surely become as important and indispensable a work of reference as its distinguished model and predecessor, Arthur Hummel's *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*. Like Hummel's work this one will owe a great deal to its editor who conceived the project, persuaded the Ford Foundation to finance it, has supervised and directed it at Columbia since 1955 and has not only edited it but apparently rewritten each of its entries.

It is clear from the volume under review that the work relies to some extent on unpublished material—on what might be termed live sources. In his introduction the editor reveals that some of his contributors knew the subject of their biography quite well and often incorporated in their articles personal information and experience. It is partly for this reason that the articles remain anonymous. One assumes that the contributors and the editor sought other such source material for the biographies of persons still known—either intimately or at some remove—to a large number of people, some of whom were active participants in the events described and have now retired and were thus able to talk and write without the pressure and ensuing bias of day-to-day events. It is in the apposite use that has been made of these sources and in the sifting

and balancing of the information they provided, that authors and editors have put us particularly in their debt. Readers familiar with the *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period* will miss the important bibliographical notes at the end of each article. The editor promises a detailed bibliography of this kind which will comprise the last volume of the dictionary. It is to be hoped that some reference will be made there to unpublished as well as published sources. Modern recording techniques—both oral and visual—have given the contemporary chronicler access to an almost embarrassing and as yet somewhat underexploited wealth of new material. This book is an important example of the use that can be made of such material to give a largely factual and non-committal account of events in living memory.

Although the present volume covers only AI-CH'Ü, it offers an interesting and exciting sample of the work as a whole. There is, for instance, a twenty-page major article on Chiang Kai-shek—we are promised others on Mao Tse-tung, Sun Yat-sen Yuan Shih-k'ai and the Soong family. The article contains a wealth of factual information and a profusion of names with cross-references. Those of us who had to learn much of our Ch'ing history from the pages of Hummel's work will expect to find in this article and its many associated biographies an outline of the growth and development of the Kuomintang. We shall not be disappointed. For many of the associated biographies we shall, of course, have to await later volumes. Meanwhile it may be some indication of the coverage and extent of this work that we find a four-page biography of the warlord Chang Tsung-ch'ang, also known picturesquely as the "Dogmeat General". The main events and personalities in Chiang's life are set out clearly enough. Unfortunately no very clear picture of Chiang Kai-shek the man or the leader emerges, nor is there any attempt at an assessment of his role in the broader framework of the Chinese revolution. It is not very clear either just what sort of a man is Chiang Ching-kuo, his son, though here there may not have been as much information to draw upon.

Chou En-lai, on the other hand, comes through much more clearly as a politician of great skill and pertinacity, the architect presumably of communist China's foreign policy and certainly the master administrator that even the cultural revolution has found him to be. It is true that his biography is less overlaid with events, concentrating as it does on foreign affairs. It may also have been easier to form some judgement of him because he was eminently accessible in his Chungking days during the last war and—if to a lesser extent—in his later travels, notably through his participation in the Geneva and Bandung conferences.

For the early history of the communist party we have interesting portraits of Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai and Chang Kuo-t'ao together with a number of associated biographies. For much of the later history of the party we shall have to await other volumes, notably the one which will contain a major article on Mao Tse-tung. Chu Te, Ch'en Yi and Ch'en Po-ta, however, are here, although the files on this volume were closed in July 1966, just too early to include a reference to the latter's key role in the cultural revolution. It will be interesting to see to what extent the editor will find it possible in later volumes to notice the quite extraordinary events of this revolution. Chiang Ch'ing is not included since she was not prominent during the main period under examination. Chang Po-chün is included and we are offered an all too brief account of the anti-rightist campaign of 1957-8.

Although we shall have to wait for a biography of Wang Ching-wei, the story of the puppet government of 1940-5 is told briefly and not without sympathy in the biographies of Chou Fo-hai, Ch'en Kung-po, Ch'u Min-i and Ch'en Pi-chün, the remarkable wife of Wang Ching-wei. To a limited extent the story of Taiwan, though it falls outside the period of discussion, is told in the biographies of Chiang Kai-shek, Ch'en Ch'eng and that other Ch'en Yi, the first post-war governor of Taiwan.

In the field of literature there is an interesting and quite detailed article on Lu Hsün as well as biographies of Chu Tzu-ch'ing, Chou Tso-jen, Ai Ch'ing and Ch'i Ju-shan and a number of other writers like Chu Hsiang and Ch'en Pai-ch'en. Among the academics one finds, as one might expect, Cheng Chen-to, Ch'ien Mu, Y. R. Chao, Ch'ien Hsüan-r'ung, and Sophia H. Chen Zen, China's first woman professor, but also the demographer Ch'en Ta, Ch'ien San-ch'iang, the nuclear scientist, and Coching

Chu, the meteorologist. Among the painters there are biographies of both Ch'i Pai-shih and Chang Ta-ch'ien though it is somewhat puzzling to see the latter referred to as a dilettante. Banking and economics are represented amongst others by Chang Kai-ngau, for a long time director and governor of the Bank of China, K. P. Ch'en—founder in 1915 of the Shanghai Commercial and Savings Bank and later of its successor, the Shanghai Commercial Bank—, Chou Tso-min, director of the Kincheng Banking Corporation, and Chi Ch'ao-ting, who was influential both as an academic and as a practical economist. But it did not prove possible in these biographies to give more than a very sketchy account of China's main economic and banking problems during the period. Nor do we learn a great deal about Chinese films from the biography of the playwright and film director Chang Chün-hsiang.

A sustained effort appears to have been made to establish the educational background both in China and abroad of the persons described. Whilst this may appear to throw an occasional article somewhat out of balance, the cumulative effect is interesting, for these were people who grew up in a period of transition—nowhere more apparent than in the field of education. Many of them began their education in traditional schools and then made considerable efforts to obtain a modern schooling first in China and then abroad. In this period in particular, China's indebtedness to Japan for further education both civil and military is very apparent. One might argue that inclusion in the biographies which comprise this work is a mark that the subject belongs to a Chinese establishment, and a detailed analysis of the educational background of its members should prove to be most revealing. It is interesting to note how closely interwoven are the stories of many of the subjects of the biographies. Cross references take the reader with ease from one biography to another, often irrespective of political affiliations. It is remarkable, too, as far as one can judge from this first volume, how few are the gaps left by the editor's choice of a mere 600 persons.

One could wish, however, that the cross references were a little more regular. In the absence of an index of names—presumably a part of the final volume—it is often not possible to tell whether a given name has been included or not. It is a source of some regret, too, that no Chinese characters are given in the body of an article, only the characters for the subject's names. For titles of books and periodicals the English translation of their romanization generally identifies which characters are intended, but this is not possible for the names of persons, and for institutions and organizations a translation together with a romanization is not always altogether adequate. It may prove possible in the final volume to add a character index of all such names. One would also hope that future volumes will identify by date and courtesy name any person mentioned who does not have a biography. In the volume under consideration this is done for some but by no means all the persons referred to in the text. The editor tells us that the names included in the dictionary were selected from broad subject categories. It would be most helpful if this were to be made explicit by providing an index of names under subject headings.

In a large work of this kind with some 79 contributors in addition to an editorial staff of 16 it is inevitable that there should be some unevenness in the contributions, although the rewriting of contributions by the editor have given the work a strong sense of unity. Generally speaking, the portraits of communist subjects appear to be more vivid, more cohesive and less inhibited than those of nationalists. This is perhaps not unnatural. Communist China's isolation makes one view her leaders from a distance and gives the writer a certain sense of detachment. The nationalist subject or his relatives, on the other hand, may live in the United States or may appear there at almost any time. This must to some extent have inhibited the biographers.

Mr. Boorman's labours and those of his staff over the last twelve years have been very much worth while. Any one with an interest in modern China will be deeply indebted to them.

H. F. SIMON

Victoria Contag and Wang Chi-ch'ien, *Seals of Chinese Painters and Collectors of the Ming and Ch'ing Periods*. Reproduced in facsimile size and deciphered. Revised edition with Supplement. Introduction by James Cahill. Hong Kong University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 1966. pp. 726+lxviii.

The republication of this work, which since its first appearance in 1940 has proved indispensable to students as well as collectors, will be warmly welcomed by all. While the main section of this new edition is reproduced by the offset process from pages of the original edition, a supplement is added of seals from 'Ming and Ch'ing paintings in American public and private collections'. Among these may also be found the seals of a number of Sung and Yüan painters, though in the main section, following the original edition, Sung and Yüan seals are listed separately from those of Ming and Ch'ing. The resulting arrangement is awkward, and the numbering of the painters at times confusing. But a thorough revision of the original edition would have confronted Dr. Contag and Mr. Wang with insurmountable difficulties, a large number of the paintings from which the seals were taken being no longer accessible to them nor indeed the whereabouts of the pictures always known. And students are glad to put up with the small inconvenience for the sake of the additional seals.

The primary use of the book will, of course, be for the identification and authentication of seals on paintings. Careful and prolonged study of its contents – the seals of 476 persons under the categories of painters' seals and collectors' seals – should, however, lead the student beyond mere verification to an appreciation of the art of the seal itself. For such a purpose, a further category ought to be kept in mind: seal-carvers' seals. Among painters who carved their own seals were: Ch'ien Hsüan, Chao Meng-fu, Wu Chen, Wang Mien, T'ang Yin, Wen Cheng-ming, Chin Nung, Cheng Hsieh, Chao Chih-ch'ien, and Wu Chün-ch'ing. Others, less celebrated as painters, were outstanding in seal-carving, as, for example, Wen P'eng, Kao Feng-han, Ting Ching, Huang I, Wu Hsi-tsai, Chao Chih-ch'ien, and Wu Ta-cheng. The student's first concern must be the seals of all these men, who, it may be presumed, allowed only their own best specimens to appear on pictures and seal-albums. It is against their seals that those of others should be measured; for the inferior seal is invariably suspect, but the unrecorded one need not be so.

The earlier seals in this book, of Yüan and the earlier Ming, are marked by a certain uniformity of style; the later seals, from the end of Ming onwards, show far greater diversity. In his essay on 'Seals and Authentication', Mr. Wang dates this change of style to the Wan-li period, 1573–1619, when 'seals with the same characters were made to differ from each other considerably in design' (xiv). The view finds some support in the seals themselves. Thus in the fifteen examples from Wen P'eng (1498–1573) (Nos. 16; 16a), the first important innovator in artists' seals, from whom all later styles are said to have been derived, seals with the same characters are still essentially similar in design. And in the thirty-three seals of his younger brother Wen Chia (1501–1583) (Nos. 18; 18a), who was more bound by tradition, there is yet greater uniformity. But of the four seals of the seventeenth century carver Ch'eng Sui (No. 318), another long-lived innovator, the three with his name are quite different in style. And in the work of such later masters as Kao Feng-han (1683–1743) (No. 217) and Ting Ching (1695–1765) (No. 3), variety seems to be the rule both in the shape of characters and in the design.

Similarly, among the seventy-four seals of so fastidious a collector as Hsiang Yüan-pien (1525–1590) (Nos. LIII; 324a), the names Tzu-ching and Mo-lin, under which he was also known, recur in much the same form. But the thirty-five seals of the later collector Tan Chung-kuang (1623–1692) (Nos. 267; 267a) show greater variety: the six with the name Chiang-shang-wai-shih are in different styles. And the collector Chou Liang-kung (1612–1672) (No. XXII), a pre-eminent connoisseur in seals, used twelve seals with his various names in a variety of designs. But the whole question of stylistic change and development still awaits further investigation.

The introductory essays by Dr. Contag and Mr. Wang embody the results of some thirty years of study on the subject. Mr. Wang's position as outlined in his essay

in English and his Chinese Preface remains the same as that in his article in *Ta-lu tsu-chih*, Vol. 15 (1957), pp. 45–7. Apart from the rather large question of style already mentioned, certain other topics require detailed discussion, e.g., the relative importance of seals on pictures and seals in colophons, or the numerous similar seals of Shen Chou. It is to be hoped that Mr. Wang himself will find time to elucidate these in further articles now that he and Dr. Contag have made available to all again the material for such discussion in this enlarged edition of their book.

H. C. CHANG

Gerhard Doerfer, *Türkische Lehnwörter im Tadschikischen (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XXXVII, 3)*, 101 pp. Wiesbaden, 1967. 20 DM.

Tajik, the official language of the Soviet Republic of Tajikistan, like Persian, the official language of Persia, is a lineal descendant of Classical Persian, which was the official written language of an area which, when the mediaeval Persian Empire was at its greatest extent, included several provinces far to the north and east of the boundaries of modern Persia. It was, however, the native spoken language of a rather smaller area. This spoken language, "Modern Persian" (as opposed to the Middle Persian of the Sassanian Empire, not in the sense of contemporary Persian) was no doubt made up of several dialects, but the differences between them were small and until the Arab invasion from the south in the 7th century A.D. they did not contain many foreign vocabulary elements. The Arab invasion brought a number of Arabic words into the language, particularly the technical terms of Islam and of government administration, and the invasions from the east by Turks of various kinds from the 7th century onwards added further foreign elements. As a result of these invasions too the Tajik speakers of what is now Tajikistan and northern Afghanistan were cut off by a solid belt of Turkish speakers from their kinsmen in Persia, and since then the two languages, Tajik and Persian, have pursued rather different courses. In particular the language of the Tajiks has suffered a mass invasion from the language of their Turkish speaking neighbours, the Uzbeks, and of course in recent years from Russian.

For a number of years Dr. Doerfer, the author of the book under review, has devoted himself to the study of the Turkish and Mongolian elements in the Classical Persian of a wide selection of texts written between about A.D. 1000 and 1700. The results of these researches are now appearing in his *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen* of which three volumes have now appeared: I. *Mongolische Elemente*, 1963; II. *Türkische Elemente, atif bis tā*, 1965; III. *Türkische Elemente, ġim bis kāf*, 1967. The fourth and final volume is promised for 1968. The work, which is destined to remain for many years the main authority on this subject, is on a grand scale. The first three volumes contain nearly 2,000 pages and list just over 1,700 loan words. By comparison the present work is a much more modest affair and more highly concentrated, just over 40 pages containing 527 loan words, about 30 pages of discussion and 20 of index.

It is, in fact, Dr. Doerfer's second venture in the field of Tajik philology. In his article, *Zur Verwandtschaft der Altaischen Sprachen*, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, Band 71, Heft 1/2, 1966, he included a brief but penetrating study of the influence of Uzbek on the phonetics, morphology, syntax and vocabulary of Tajik and in particular the northern dialects, and pointed out that this influence had been so profound that if we did not know the past history of the two languages and that they were completely unconnected genetically, it would be difficult to resist the conclusion that they must be fairly distant members of the same family. This study was primarily intended as a cautionary tale for those scholars who use similar arguments to support the theory that the Turkish, Mongolian and Tungus languages are genetically related. In the present volume the relationship between the two languages is studied on a broader scale for its own sake, and not as a contribution to the Altaic controversy, but the lesson is still the same. It is primarily a study of certain north Tajik dialects, based mainly on the works of the Soviet scholar V. S. Rastorgueva, not of the official written Tajik language, the latest dictionary of which contains some 40,000 words. Spoken dialects are notoriously

poorer than written languages, and Rastorgueva's studies relate only to about 2,000 words, of which about 500, or 25%, are supposedly Uzbek loan words. In the official dictionary there are only about 700 such words, but the proportion, less than 2%, would of course be a good deal bigger if the Russian loan words were left out of account.

Obviously in a language with as long and complicated a history as Tajik, loan words must have entered the language at different dates, and Dr. Doerfer identifies four "layers":

- (1) loan words which go back to the period when an ancestor of Tajik was in contact with a pre-Uzbek Turkish language, conventionally called Chagatay;
- (2) loan words taken from the next Turkish layer, archaic Uzbek;
- (3) loan words taken from a later Uzbek language containing words borrowed from more westerly dialects, Kipchak and the like;
- (4) words taken from an Uzbek layer containing Mongolian loanwords.

There is a great deal of knowledge and expertise behind this classification, but it seems to rest on the unstated assumption that all the foreign relations between Tajik and other languages were conducted through Turkish dialects. This assumption seems to me to be unjustified. The ancestors of the Tajiks were in direct contact with speakers of several other languages besides the Turkish ones, and Tajikistan today, although it is largely enveloped by Uzbekistan, has a long common frontier with Afghanistan, where Turkish dialects are spoken only by a minority of the population, and most people talk Iranian (but not specifically Persian) dialects of one sort or another. On this subject see Gunnar Jarring, *On the Distribution of Turk tribes in Afghanistan*, Lund 1939. In these circumstances it seems only reasonable to suppose that a good many non-Turkish loan words reached Tajikistan direct from across the Afghan border, without any Uzbek intervention. For example it seems to me certain that No. 176 *kičiri*, which has the same meaning as the English (loan) word *kedgerie* and, like it, is derived from Hindustani *khichri*, came direct from Afghanistan and not via speakers of Uzbek, in which admittedly the word also occurs. Similarly No. 204 *mučči* "kiss", with its initial *m*- and no nasal later in the word, cannot possibly be Turkish by origin and almost certainly came over the border from Afghanistan.

It also seems to me improbable that Russian words with a Turkish suffix like No. 191 *magazinči* and 200 *māšmāči* were borrowed ready made from Uzbek. The suffix must have been a Turkish element incorporated in Tajik for a very long time, and there is no reason for supposing that the words were not home-made.

The main bulk of non-Turkish loan words in the list is Mongolian and here rather different considerations arise. When the Mongols moved west, their vocabulary penetrated every language with which they came into contact. For example, so far as Chagatay is concerned, in the *Sanglakh.*, the best dictionary of the language, out of about 5,200 words listed and translated not less than 350 are Mongolian loan words, which had become so firmly imbedded in the language that the 18th-century Persian author, a capable philologist, did not identify more than about 100 as Mongolian loan words. There was an equally massive penetration of Persian; Dr. Doerfer's major work lists over 400 such loan words. It seems to me more reasonable to suppose that words like No. 394 *čol* "desert, steppe" (which incidentally Dr. Doerfer did not spot as being Mongolian by origin) reached Tajik via Classical Persian than that it came through Uzbek.

Thus it seems fairly certain that the figure of 527 Turkish loan words, representing 25% of the vocabulary studied, is too high, but it is not very much too high and the general thesis is valid and important.

GERARD CLAUSON

John de Francis, *Beginning Chinese Reader*. xxxii, 1004 pp., 2 vols. New Haven and London; Yale University Press, 1966. \$2.75; 18s 6d each volume.

Since the publication of Professor de Francis' *Beginning Chinese* and *Intermediate Chinese* they have quickly established themselves as the best available text-books for the teaching of spoken Chinese and are now widely used also in universities in this

country. The character texts of these books, though adequate for an introduction to the script, were not, however, ideal for this purpose on their own, since the material was organized to give the student fluency in speaking, which demands different priorities.

The new series of Readers, of which this is the first to appear, looks like supplying just what is wanted. It begins sensibly by introducing some of the more common radicals during the first few lessons. New characters are accompanied by compounds in which they figure, a most important factor in the ability to read with fluency. The new words are drilled systematically, an exercise which must have required great ingenuity to devise. It is quite a feat to have produced a text-book of a thousand pages to drill the use of only four-hundred characters. Some students may find the exercises more than abundant, but the author has organized the material so cleverly that certain parts can safely be skipped by those with different needs. The student is from the beginning familiarized with both the written and printed forms of the characters and there are supplementary lessons on simplified forms. There are charts on stroke order, for the comparison of Sung and Ming type-faces, regular and simplified characters, and variant forms. The only extra help that might usefully have been given is a list of the radicals and their meanings, and to have introduced various characters with identical phonetics at the same time at the earlier stages, as the beginner can more easily learn characters like 實, 讀, and 續 than three unrelated graphs.

This very carefully thought-out text-book, published at a most reasonable price, will earn the gratitude of students of Chinese who will now be waiting impatiently for the Intermediate and Advanced Chinese Readers.

G. Weys

Clifford Geertz, *The Social History of an Indonesian Town*, 217 pp. Index. M.I.T. Press, 1965. 57s.

As set out in the Introduction, this work represents an attempt "to trace the social history of a single Javanese town from about the middle of the nineteenth century, when it was founded, to the middle of the twentieth", when during 1952-4 a team of American sociologists settled down there for a detailed research project. The town selected for this purpose was Modjokuto, the regional capital of a district and subdistrict of that name, situated about a hundred miles southwest of Surabaya. It is, in fact, a "mini-history", limited to a provincial town during only one century. The obvious advantage of such limitations is that it enables the author to arrive at an extremely detailed account from which it is possible to study the interaction between the different factors determining the growth of the settlement. On the other hand, it must be admitted that such a limited study carries little weight by itself. It may become interesting for the student of Asian history and politics only if there is reason to believe that the recent history of Modjokuto is somehow significant, for instance because it reflects wider issues or because it is characteristic of developments in a wider area. The author gives us no indication that this is indeed the case.

In view of the great importance attached to ecological factors it is surprising that no detailed map of the region is provided. The geographical indications lack precision, and few among the readers will have detailed regional maps at their disposal from which they may get an impression of the situation of the town in relation to mountains and rivers, as well as the road system connecting it with other settlements. A land-use map is mentioned (p. 15) but not reproduced. Also photographs, in particular aerial views, which could have given some idea of the kind of country in which the town is situated, are strangely lacking.

The book is very vague about the early history of the town. It is stated that Modjokuto was founded in the middle of the nineteenth century, presumably as a consequence of "large-scale migration of central Javanese from the island's heartland eastward", due to the Java war and the Culture System. One would like to know on what kind of evidence this statement is based. As a matter of fact, the area under discussion belongs to the Brantas valley, parts of which were brought under cultivation

(with elaborate irrigation works) in the beginning of the eighth century A.D., if not earlier. The town itself may be new but the area in which it is situated has been for more than a thousand years under cultivation. It is therefore likely that most of the population consists of families which have been in this area for many generations. It is quite possible that there has been some migration from central Java, but there is no reason to assume that this should have taken place on a large scale. The author has apparently relied on local hearsay without trying to check these opinions with the help of the Dutch documents or the Javanese *Babads*. In this connexion it is worth noting that the author seems unaware of the numerous publications on this area in languages other than English, notably those in Dutch (with the exception of the *Encyclopaedia* and the census reports). As a consequence, the historical part of this work is disappointing in spite of a few interesting observations. The main merits of this study lie in the vivid and often keenly observed descriptions of the contemporary scene, in particular the detailed account of a village election (pp. 153–202). Only future developments may show whether the author is right in concluding that the town "seemed well on its way to becoming the sort of social miscreation the world is likely to see many more of in the years ahead – a 'permanently transitional' society."

J. G. DE CASPARIS

Chauncey Goodrich, *A Pocket Dictionary, Chinese-English, and Pekingese Syllabary*. xiv, 252, 70 pp., Hong Kong, Hong Kong University Press, 1965. H.K. \$20.

This re-issue of the well-known *Pocket Dictionary* by Ch. Goodrich (1836–1925) is certain to be welcomed not only by the many students of Chinese who, like the present reviewer, for years carried an earlier slimmer edition of it literally in their pockets, but also by the later generation whom they have taught. It was a good idea to replace the page references to Wells Williams's dictionary by abbreviated characters, but it may seem regrettable that the distinction between characters used primarily in either literary, or semi-literary, or colloquial styles, marked by adding a semicolon in the second, and a comma in the third case, after the page references, should have fallen a victim to this innovation. A debt of gratitude is owed to both Professor L. Carrington Goodrich, who also contributed a biographical notice, and to Mr. Henri Vetch for making this book available again, adding a few useful Tables at the same time.

W. SIMON

Qad-un Ündüsün-ü Erdeni-yin Tobčiya, Eine Pekingische Palasthandschrift (Asiatische Forschungen. Band 14). Herausgegeben von Erich Haenisch. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1966. 4to, viii + 596 pp.

Seven years ago Professor Haenisch published a facsimile edition of the Peking Palace-print of the Mongol chronicle *Erdeni-yin Tobči*. In reviewing it for this journal (viii, 1960) the present reviewer suggested that it was unlikely that any new texts, except perhaps for the manuscript on which the print was based and of which Haenisch also possessed a copy, would appear in the foreseeable future. However, in 1961 the Mongolian Academy of Sciences issued a critical edition of the chronicle, taking as its main text that already published by Haenisch as the "Urga Handschrift" and adding variants from three other copies. With the present Palace-manuscript we now have, therefore, four more texts than were available when Haenisch's last publication appeared in 1959 – surely an *embarras de richesse*. At the time the reviewer put forward the opinion that the improbability of new texts being published freed any scholar undertaking the preparation of a final edition of *Erdeni-yin Tobči* from the inhibiting possibility of vitally different texts turning up during the course of his work. The four texts which have been published in the meantime serve merely to emphasize the essential unity of the tradition of the text and suggest that however many texts may

appear in the future, it is unlikely that we shall be able to improve on what we have got. The time has probably now come when obstinately obscure passages, where they are not so merely because of the inadequate knowledge of the reader, may be considered definitely corrupt, and textual emendation is probably now permissible, which was certainly not the case less than twenty years ago when Schmidt's good, but by no means perfect, text was a *unicum*.

The Palace-manuscript is so similar to the print which was made from it that it is difficult to review it without repeating the ideas expressed in the review of the Palace-print. Briefly, these were two, first that the subordination of the Manchu and Chinese versions to the Mongol print cannot be assumed unconditionally, since the former can be shown by comparison with the Urga manuscript to have preserved here and there what is certainly a better reading than that of the latter, and secondly that, on the whole, however, the Manchu and Chinese versions are definitely secondary and derivative. One would expect that an edition prepared for the Emperor would *ipso facto* have been immaculate, a perfect version of the best text available, but this is not so. What seems to have happened is that the editors did their best to make a nice bibliographical specimen from the manuscript, the so-called Cenggünjab manuscript, submitted to them, rather than produce a scholarly text. Hence both palace editions contain errors. The Print even has printing mistakes: to the one noted by Haenisch, p. viii, we may add an even more gross one. *Köke möngke tngri*, IV, iiv, 3 of the manuscript has been cut in the print so that the first word appears as *böke*. But neither does the manuscript itself always present an intelligible text. We may take as an example what has always been an irritating crux, a passage of verse at the bottom of pages 144 and 145 of Schmidt's edition:

qorumqan neretü balyad bariqu bolba:
quuya alqal sirüi ökiqu bolba:
ajai taiji-yi qayan ergükü bolba:
aruytai köbegün-i tayisi bolyaqu bolba.

The tone of this jingle is clearly a mocking one, since it is uttered in reply to a query by a slave gathering dung about what was decided at a meeting of the nobility. The last two lines present little difficulty. They may be translated: "They're to raise Ajai taiji to be emperor, they're to make the boy Aruytai a taishi". Precise interpretation of the first two lines is not so easy.

Schmidt seems to have been rather wide of the mark. He has: "It was decided to rebuild the city of Qorumqan, to level and consolidate the building site." Krueger's version (*Poetical Passages in the Erdeni-yin Tobči*, pp. 158–9) based on that offered by Zamcarano (*The Mongol Chronicles of the Seventeenth Century*, p. 11) is more acceptable, but still not to the point. He notes a possible pun between *qorumqan* meaning "moment" and so referring to an ephemeral city, and a possible allusion to the city of Qaraqorum and translates: "They are going to build the city called Qorumqan; they are going to beat (= slaughter?) a white-flanked bull." Now there seems little doubt that the text of the Urga MS., followed by all three of Mostaert's texts, is the more correct one, and the text of Schmidt, together with that of the two palace editions, is wrong, and the likelihood is that the latter tradition is nonsense based on a miscopying at some time of the text. The Urga manuscript reads for *alqal sirüi*, *alay sar-i*, and for *quuya*, itself a rare word attested once elsewhere in *Erdeni-yin Tobči*, p. 170, *quuqa*. The reviewer would suggest that the sense here is not quite what Zamcarano made of it, but is rather: "They are going to slaughter the motley, chestnut bull." The point would be that all four lines of the jingle express some paradox or improbability, and that as is common in Mongol poetic parallelism, the two latter lines refer to the real situation under consideration while the two former lines are a fantastic commentary to them. A bull, in fact, cannot be motley and chestnut at the same time.

Thus, like the Palace-print, this new text will have to be considered in the preparation of any new edition of *Erdeni-yin Tobči* but it is unlikely to be of decisive importance. The Urga manuscript will still be the obvious basis of any such edition, and the main interest of the Palace-manuscript will probably lie in a detailed study of the relationship it bears to Schmidt's printed edition. For this comparison to be drawn

successfully one would need access to Zamcarano's manuscript B, the Čenggünjab manuscript presented to the Emperor Ch'ien-lung.

Professor Haenisch's life as a scholar ended in 1966, as it had begun in 1904, with a publication devoted to what had always been a favourite text. One cannot speak with regret or sadness of the passing of a colleague who reached such ripe years, but only with gratitude that to the end of a long life he was able to write with clarity and from full learning.

C. R. BAWDEN

Hamaguchi Shigekuni, *Shin-Kan Zui-Tō shi no kenkyū* 漢口電國：華漢隋唐史の研究. 2 vols., pp. 4, 5, 681; 5, 685-1008, 88. Tokyo (Tokyo Daigaku shuppankai), 1966. Y. 4800, 2800.

Professor Hamaguchi who recently retired as Professor of Far-Eastern history at Yamanashi University, one of the smallest in Japan, was in the formative years of the Tokyo school of Chinese Economic and Institutional History before the war one of its most productive and promising members. In 1941 he became Assistant Professor at Tokyo University, but towards the end of the Pacific War he became a member of the Research Bureau of the South Manchurian Railway. After his return to Japan and since his transfer in 1950 to the new University at Yamanashi, he has channelled all his energies into a series of extremely detailed and important studies of slavery and servitude during the T'ang period, which have recently been collected and are due for publication as a separate volume. Meanwhile, a number of his former colleagues and pupils at Tokyo University conceived the idea of re-issuing his pre-war articles as a book to celebrate his retirement. The two volumes which are the result include all his articles written between 1929 and 1944, which first appeared in a variety of journals. Every scholar of Chinese institutions between the Ch'in and the T'ang will find them an invaluable source both of solid factual scholarship and of germinal ideas on such important topics as military service, corvée and labour service, local administration, and the tax and transportation systems. In spite of the fact that this is one of the best worked fields of Chinese history, surprisingly little in these two solid volumes has been made obsolete, although the earliest item was published 38 years ago. They constitute a fitting tribute to a fine but sadly underestimated scholar.

D. C. TWITCHETT

Karl Lo, *A Guide to the Ssu pu ts'ung k'an* (The University of Kansas Publications, Library Series Number 23). ix + 82 pp. Lawrence, University of Kansas Libraries, 1965. \$1.50.

This little book consists of three parts: a list of titles in the collection, arranged according to the *Chung-kuo ts'ung-shu tsung-lu*, with indications of authorship, the text used and the number of volumes; a subject index according to the Ssu-k'u system; and a very useful romanized author and title index including variations of titles. As not all scholars own either the *Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an shu-mu* or the *Chung-kuo ts'ung-shu tsung-lu* they will find this book a convenient tool of reference.

G. WEYS

Mao Han-kuang 毛漢光, *Liang Chin Nan-pei ch'ao shih-tsu cheng-chih chih yen-chiu*, 兩晉南北朝士族政治之研究 2 vols., pp. 22, 730, Taipei 1966.

One of the crucial changes which took place in Chinese society during the latter part of the T'ang dynasty was the disappearance of the caste-like aristocracy of immensely powerful noble families who had held a stranglehold on high office in pre-T'ang times. This change was already recognized by Shen Kua in the twelfth century,

but has come into prominence in recent years firstly by the important place which the replacement of aristocracy by a ruling elite of professional bureaucrats is given in the analysis of China's medieval history by such scholars as Ch'en Yin-k'o and Naitō Torajirō, and secondly by the wave of interest in the application of sociological methods to earlier periods of history among younger Chinese scholars, which began with Ch'ü T'ung-tsu's study of law and society, and is to be seen for example in the recent book of Hsü Cho-yun, *Ancient China in transition* (Stanford 1965).

There have been a number of recent studies of this problem both from Chinese and from Japanese scholars, the centre of interest recently having lain in the T'ang period and the decline of the aristocracy, and in the various lists of eminent clans discovered among the Tunhuang MSS. There remained, however, room for a good survey of the aristocracy in the pre-Sui era, and Mr. Mao's new book will be extremely useful to anyone working in this period, since for the first time the careers and social origins of a very broad sample of persons (virtually every person having the fifth rank or above whose biography is included in the standard histories, some 4,000 cases in all) are analysed statistically. This material is all presented in detail, in some 77 tables and a number of charts.

The most interesting part of the book, however, is the author's lengthy discussion of the methods by which the aristocratic classes sustained their political power and social prestige, and restricted the power of people from the non-aristocratic (*han-su* 寒素) families. There is also some discussion of the style of life adopted by the aristocratic families, the economic basis of their social power, and their system of endogamy within their own closed group.

This is a good and intelligent little book. It is a great pity, however, that the author does not seem to be acquainted with the Japanese literature on the subject, apart from Miyazaki Ichisada's *Kyūshin-kanjin hō no kenkyū* 九品官人法の研究 (1956), which remains the standard work on the recruitment of officials during his period. For example the late Moriya Mitsuo's 守屋美都雄 study of the T'ai-yüan Wang clan (*Rikuchō mombatsu no ichi kenkyū* 六朝門閥の一研究 Tokyo 1951) suggests what further depth can still be added to the overall picture by detailed studies of individual clans over a long period. The important study of Miyakawa Hisayuki 宮川尚志 *Rikuchōshi kenkyū* (*seiji shakai hen* 六朝史研究：政治社會篇) (Tokyo, 1956) gives some useful general relevance to the whole discussion. There is also a long series of articles by Ochi Shigeaki 越智重明, the Kyūshū University historian, which stress the vulnerability of the southern aristocratic clans in the face of powerful emperors under the Liu Sung. These articles are largely summarized in his recent book *Gi Shin Nan-chō no seiji to shakai* 魏晉南朝の政治と社會 (Tokyo, 1963). Another very important contribution to this whole problem has been made in a series of studies by Yano Chikara 矢野主税 who has suggested among other things that the origins of the great aristocratic clans cannot in fact be placed in Han times, as most scholars have claimed, but rather in the very end of the Hou Han period and in the Three Kingdoms. Yano has also recently published, unfortunately in a very small mimeographed edition, a book devoted to the whole problem of the pre-T'ang aristocracy (Yano Chikara, *Mombatsu shakai shi*, 門閥社會史, pp. 240 Nagasaki (Nagasaki Daigaku Shigakai), 1965). There is an excellent long review of this by Saitō Aiko 齋藤愛子, in *Shigaku Zasshi* 75, viii (1966) pp. 79-84, which may interest readers to whom the scarce original is unavailable.

Another shortcoming, for which an author working in Taiwan can hardly be blamed, is that no notice is taken of recent work published in mainland China. For example, no scholar writing on this topic can afford to neglect the very important studies included in T'ang Chang-ju's 唐長孺 *Wei Chin Nan-pei ch'ao shih lun-ts'ung* 魏晉南北朝史論叢 (Peking, 1955), and in the *Hsü-pien* 續編 (Peking 1959) to this work. T'ang Chang-ju has also in his *San chih liu shih-chi* *Ching-nan ta-t'u-ti suo-yu-chih ti fa-chan* 三至六世紀江南大土地所有制的發展 (Shanghai 1957), given a very interesting account of the economic activities of the southern aristocracy. Another Chinese study of considerable use to the student of the ruling class of the "barbarian" northern dynasties is Yao Wei-yüan 姚薇元 *Pei-ch'ao hu-hsing k'ao* 北朝胡姓考

(Peking 1958), which deals with the non-Chinese lineages which played such an important part in affairs.

Another recent work from Taiwan on the subject of the aristocratic clans also deserves notice. This (by Chin Fa-ken 金發根 *Yung-chia-luan hou Pei-fang ti hao-tsu*, 永寡亂後北方的豪族 pp. 191, Taipei 1964), discusses in detail the means by which the great families of northern China survived the fall of the Western Chin and the extinction of Chinese political power in northern China. It is particularly useful in that the author differentiates developments in the different regions of northern China.

D. C. TWITCHETT

K. P. S. Menon, *Many Worlds, An Autobiography* (Oxford University Press, 1965), viii + 324 pp. and 10 illustrations. 28s.

In the view of an orthodox Indologist, Mr. K. P. S. Menon's *Many Worlds* may be considered to be of greater interest to a politician, diplomatist or student of international affairs than to a scholar pursuing the history and progress of Indian culture; but any such sceptic will soon be satisfied that the volume is a considerable repository of information about contemporary India. In his book, which is an autobiography of an eminent Indian, the author takes us in a completely uninhibited manner on a tour through his experiences of childhood and adolescence in the surroundings of a well-to-do family, his school and college days in and outside India, his career, at first, as a member of the I.C.S., and later as national and international diplomat. In a pleasant and easy flow of language he finds ample opportunity to converse, factually and critically, about practically everything that concerns India: her traditional lore, her literature, family life, educational systems, sexual life, politics, judiciary, economy, religious and social structure, the internal conflicts within the realm of India and the complexity of attitudes of various circles of population towards the British before independence and towards the world after 1947. Of special interest is also the description of the turbulent events in Kerala where he was born and to which he returned after his official retirement from service. By the example of his own diplomatic activities, the reader is partially introduced into India's external relations and her participation in, and influence upon, events in Asia and beyond it. There is little need to remind those who knew K. P. S. Menon or who followed his diplomatic activities, that nobody could more ably and with greater vigour represent India's cause abroad.

It was this reviewer's pleasure to meet Mr. K. P. S. Menon first in India in 1948 during the period which he describes in his book between pp. 261 and 276. It was also my privilege to visit his home and meet some members of his family. After this experience I have felt almost nostalgic reading the frequent tender references in the book to "Anujee" (Mrs. K. P. S. Menon), a lady of elegance and distinction, and a Sanskrit scholar in her own right. I also saw Mr. Menon in Europe when he was ambassador to the Soviet Union, Poland, and Hungary.

Those who may be inclined to detect a self-congratulatory note in the occasional assertions of his own achievements would immediately be disabused of any such notions when confronted with a person, full of wit and simplicity, intelligence and humour, lavish with praises and recognition of achievements of others, and aware of the virtues and shortcomings of heart and brain, his own as well as his fellow creatures.

During the writing of this review I reminisced about Mr. K. P. S. Menon with Dr. Victor Hoo, the present Commissioner for Technical Assistance at the United Nations, who as the then U.N. Assistant Secretary General accompanied him in Korea in 1947/8 (see pp. 256 and 258). Dr. Hoo was particularly impressed by Mr. Menon's lively facial expressiveness. He remembered the dark sorrow obfuscating his features when the news of the death of Gandhi, to whom Mr. Menon was deeply devoted (see p. 260), reached him in Korea. Mr. Menon's sociability and genuine liking for people, at which he himself frequently hints in the book, were, as it were, confirmed by his vivid expression of joy when an invitation came his way to join pleasant company. The ups

and downs of the Committee's proceedings, says Dr. Hoo, were reflected in the gamut of Mr. Menon's expressions showing the sentiments of occasional satisfaction, frustration and disappointment, scepticism and indignation, sympathy and concern. These observations offered by the author's and reviewer's mutual friend might serve as an outsider's footnote to some points of character and temperament, on which an autobiographer could not comment himself.

There is little doubt that among the crowd of autobiographies filling the book-markets, Mr. Menon's is one that is highly readable and informative. In relating his diplomatic activities and adventures he is never pompous; more often than not we can watch him tackle things with a twinkle in his eye. He applies his diplomatic skill and experience with all the seriousness necessitated by a serious occasion, and his wit and sense of humour in situations where seriousness would be ridiculous. In a number of incidents related in the book the reader can sense the sharpness of an old hand in diplomacy, who can grasp at once what matters in the game and what does not, and make out at a glance who is play-acting and who means business (note, for instance, his quite amusing and somewhat bitter observations on the Indian Delegation in the United Nations in 1945).

Thanks to his erudition, and particular talent in picking the essential out of the multitude of accumulated knowledge, Mr. Menon's book will no doubt be considered as a supplement to current history of developments which he not only eye-witnessed but to which he himself contributed. Events which he was able to observe from close quarters such as the transition from the epoch of Stalin to that of Khrushchev, the complexities of the birth of the Chinese People's Republic against the background of China of Chiang Kai-Shek and Sun Yat-Sen, the role in China of the United States and the involvement of its then leading personalities in the moulding of these events, can benefit an historian who can judge events only from documentation. Mr. Menon has also a good deal to say about the happenings in Eastern Europe before and after 1965. Many may not share his views and fault may be found with his interpretation of some of the facts, but his facts will undoubtedly help those who will seek to formulate some conclusive interpretations. To enter into the analysis of Mr. Menon's political interpretations of national and international conflicts and events would be out of place here. The reader of ASIA MAJOR might, however, find, that in addition to the information on the developments in China, Japan, and Korea, a first-hand account of events and personalities in the North-West Frontier (pp. 89-99) is of fascinating historical value because of the author's apparent intimate interest in that part of the country.

Mr. Menon is obviously a man of the world, indeed of many worlds. But he is foremost an Indian and likes to present himself as such. Occasionally, he brings his "Indianism" to the forefront consciously, and occasionally it comes out by itself sub-consciously, in his pronouncements on some of the affairs with which he was confronted during his diplomatic career. A case in point is his mission to Africa. True, he was sent by the Government to East Africa in 1934 "to inquire into the conditions of Indians in Zanzibar, Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika". Yet, judging by the standards of his often penetrating remarks about conditions in other countries, his observations about Africans, amidst the sorry affairs of East Africa of that period, are somewhat superficial; his real concern is the position of the Indian immigrants. A more thorough approach in the forties might have allayed the present precarious situation of the Indian in East Africa which stems from the understandable but misguided policies of seeking a more privileged status for Indians among the unprivileged Africans.

Mr. Menon rejects (pp. 298-9) a comment made in a review on his *The Flying Troika* (published in 1963) accusing him of "strong prejudices". He is surprised at the imputation; had the reviewer said prejudice instead of prejudices, he says, he would have been on firm ground. Mr. Menon confesses to just one prejudice, "amounting to allergy", against John Foster Dulles. This is a pity; the reader may wish that the author of *Many Worlds* had more of them. Lack of prejudices, or, shall we say, of a strong ideological foundation, is perhaps the only weakness of the book. The book is brilliant, witty, judicious, well informed and informative, but coping, as it does, with a host of ideas, countries and situations it only seldom juxtaposes personal ideology

implying definite approval or disapproval. All the author's views are founded on his impeccable honesty; his approach is almost invariably objective. Yet, subtle shadings in the objectivity can be discovered in proportion to the strength of his personal concern with the problem at hand. Objectivity is supposed to be a great virtue, and so is passionate belief in a cause. Mr. Menon has chosen the former as his Weltanschauung; he was an outstanding I.C.S. member and a diplomat of the highest calibre; he took the training for both these activities seriously. As he himself cites (on p. 131) the I.C.S.'s credo,

For forms of government let fools contest;
Whate'er is best administered is best.

In the best of Oxford traditions, Mr. Menon has on many occasions chosen an attractive device for, as it were, vicarious confessions of ideology by way of interspersing the text with a selection of poems composed by himself, some unknown Indian poets, a Japanese statesman, his favourite Anatole France, Sarojini Naidu, W. B. Yeats, among others. Let, however, this Freudian subterfuge be discreetly glossed over, but duly counted in the recognition of the author's serious contribution to autobiographical literature.

It remains to the reviewer to express the hope that Mr. K. P. S. Menon, now in his "busman's retirement" in Kerala, will continue to delight readers with further reminiscences and more stories about his versatile and full life.

ARNOLD KUNST

Ivan Morris, *Dictionary of selected forms in classical Japanese literature*, xviii + 135 pp. Columbia University Press, 1966. 56s.

The limited objectives of this work are made clear at the beginning of the introduction: "The purpose of this dictionary is to help students to read and translate classical Japanese literature; it is not intended to be a definitive or systematic treatment of *bungo* or an original grammatical study." Anything which makes some 1,200 years of Japanese literature more accessible to foreign students is to be welcomed, and this book could certainly be of help to them at a certain stage of their studies. This stage will be a passing, intermediate one. The book does not of course aim to do any teaching of classical Japanese, so that students must still first learn or be taught at least the rudiments of the grammar; so few of the entries and examples come from post-Heian literature that the book is, for practical purposes, a glossary of Nara and especially Heian languages; and since the entries, although carefully and fully analysed within the chosen field, are necessarily only a small selection from the total literary-style vocabulary, some other dictionary of the old language will still be needed in order to read a text. This book will therefore be of use to students after they have had an introduction to *bungo* and until they gain sufficient experience and confidence to rely solely on the standard dictionaries.

The work has tried to be as helpful as possible within its limited field, and users who are in the early stages of reading the classical language will probably appreciate most the listing and breakdown of combinations of verbal suffixes such as *-teba*, *-taredo(mo)* and *-zarikeri*. If the work was consciously aimed at the still groping student, however, there are a number of ways in which it could be made safer for him to use.

The author says that "Several examples have been taken from Japanese grammars and works of reference and could not be studied in their full context; their translations are therefore tentative." This is understandable and perfectly acceptable in a reference work such as this, provided that the basic meaning can be clearly shown and that a true contextual translation would require little more than, say, a change in personal pronouns which were unexpressed in the original text. Classical Japanese being what it is, however, this is a dangerous procedure even with innocent-looking quotations, and it must be said that some of the examples in the book cannot bear the interpretations that Professor Morris gives them, even on grammatical grounds. For example, the quotation *Awaji no shima no a wa to mishi tsuki* (p. 3), taken from *Genji monogatari* to illustrate

the use of a "that (place), yonder", is translated as "the moonlight by which one can see yon Awaji island"; but *Awaji no shima no a wa* cannot mean "yon Awaji island". Having returned to the capital from exile, Genji is in fact comparing the bright moon which now seems to close with "the moon which I saw as [being] yonder from Awaji island" or, more freely, "the moon which seemed so far away, beyond Awaji island". Similarly, *nani semu ni ka ima mata kaeritamaubeki* (p. 62) means not "he will soon come back again for some reason (or to do something or other)", but "for what purpose should he now come back again?"; and *omoiwakarenu koso yokere* (p. 15) not "they praised it" but "it is well that we cannot tell". (This last quotation, incidentally, is misplaced in the book: at the level of analysis being followed, the *e* in the first word cannot be explained as a form of the *shimoidan* verb *u*, but only as part of the *mizenkei* of the *shimoidan* verb *[omoi]wakaru*.)

Such cases are few, however, and constitute much less of a hazard than difficult examples and over-free translations which obscure the construction of the original Japanese. In *etsugaseta mau azaramu mono kara* (p. 58), for example, the first word is so complicated grammatically that it makes the quotation quite unsuitable as an illustration of the conjunctive use of *mono kara*, quite apart from there being no following clause to complete the framework for such a use; and such entries as *nao kore hitori bakari wa* (p. 45), which has no verb but is translated as "at least let me in, if no one else", and *ki to kite wa* (p. 123), which means something like "coming on and on" but is translated as "going ahead rapidly", could cause many a furrowed brow. The tenses used in the translations of quotations are also likely to puzzle. Non-past tenses are regularly used in Japanese to describe past events, like the historic present in English, but it would have seemed advisable to keep to a strict and obvious equivalence in a work like the present one. The author freely uses past tenses in the translations, however, when there is no apparent reason for them in the Japanese (e.g. *kimi yuku to kikaba* "if I had heard that you were going", p. 122), and occasionally – and confusingly – does the opposite: . . . *koso saiwai nakarikeru* "it is indeed unfortunate" (p. 66).

These free translations and the apparently cavalier attitude to tenses no doubt stem from literary translations of passages in which they are perfectly justified; but they will be sure to prove unkind to the people who need this book most, and this is a pity, for the author's idea of using his wide reading to lead others into the field was a good one.

P. G. O'NEILL

Nishijima Sadao 西嶋定生, *Chūgoku keizaishi kenkyū* 中國經濟史研究, pp. 15; 912, 22, plates 46 pp., Tokyo (Tokyo Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū hōkō) 1966 no price.

Nishijima Sadao, Professor of Far Eastern History in Tokyo University, has received some notice from Western scholars through his part of a symposium volume on the periodization of Chinese history published a decade ago (Suzuki Shun and Nishijima Sadao, eds., *Chūgoku-shi no jidai-kubun* 中國史の時代区分, Tokyo, 1957), and for his detailed study of the 20 grades of noble-rank and their use by the Han emperors as a means of defining and settling the social order in the first centralized bureaucratic empire (Nishijima Sadao, *Chūgoku kodai teikoku no keisei to hōzō* 中國古代帝國の形成と構造, pp. 587, Tokyo, 1961), a summary of which was presented as a paper to the International Congress of Historical Science in Vienna in 1965. The bulk of his research, however, has been in the field of socio-economic history, in which he has continued the tradition of Katō Shigeru and Hamaguchi Shigekuni, who were among his teachers.

The volume falls into three sections. The first comprises a number of sections dealing with various problems in agricultural technique in pre-Sung times. A very lucid general account of the problems outstanding in this field of study is followed by discussions of the level of agricultural technique displayed in three works of Ch'in

or Han time, the "T'u-yung lun" section of *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu*, the fragments of the *Fan Sheng chih shu* 汜勝之書 and those of the *Ssu-min yüeh-ling* 四民月令. Readers with a particular interest in the last of these texts will find very useful the new edition by Shih Sheng-han 石聲漢 (*Ssu-min yüeh-ling chiao-chu* 四民月令校注, pp. 2, 6, 2, 120, Peking (Chung-hua shu-chü), 1965) which appeared while this book was in the press. There is next a very detailed discussion of two terms referring to techniques of culture which have aroused much controversy, *tai-t'ien* 代田 and *huo-keng shui-nou* 火耕水耨. Professor Nishijima had already published a lengthy study of *tai-t'ien* in the *Festschrift* for Prof. Nomura entitled *Hökensei to Shihonseï* in 1956, but the 120-page study included in this volume is far fuller, and deals with the considerable literature published on the subject since the earlier article, in particular with the study of Yoneda Kenjiro 米田賢次郎 which appeared in *Shisen* 27/28 (1963). The discussion of *huo-keng shui-nou* includes a very close discussion of the early evidence on the techniques used in raising wet rice, and the differences between the methods used in the north and in the Huai-Yangtse area. This section of the book ends with a very original article on the introduction of water-mills, the demand for wheaten flour, and the system of rotation by which three crops were grown on the same land in two years during pre-T'ang and T'ang times. This article, too, has added to it an important appendix dealing with criticisms of its original version published by Yoneda in *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 17, 4 (1959).

The second major section of the book is a set of studies of the medieval land systems of China. A very lucid introduction summarizes the problems in this very closely studied field. This is followed by an excellent account of the *T'un-t'ien* 屯田 system of the Wei dynasty, a study of the Land Statute 田令 promulgated in 564 by the Northern Ch'i, and a revised version of the author's magisterial study of the Turfan land documents connected with the actual operation of the *chun-t'ien* land allotments in the early eighth century. The new version, besides some revisions, also corrects the readings of a large number of the fragmentary documents on which it is based, and should be preferred to the earlier version in *Tonkō Torohan shakai-keizai shiryō* I (Kyoto, 1959). This article is chiefly concerned with demonstrating in great detail just how the *chun-t'ien* system was kept in force even under the extremely unusual conditions of Turfan. Besides being perhaps the most important single study of the medieval land allocation policy, this is also a very revealing study of the routine functioning of the low-level bureaucratic machinery in T'ang times.

The last section of the book reprints a number of articles on rural handicraft industry in the Ming and Ch'ing, dealing in particular with the cotton industry. These are very early articles deriving from the author's graduation thesis written in 1942, but they remain solid, well-documented contributions. The author has added an appendix listing more recent research which has been done in this field, and also some account of the criticisms which have been levelled at these articles.

The book is provided with an adequate index, and illustrated with excellent photographs. It is essential reading for any scholar seriously engaged in the study of Chinese economic or agrarian history.

D. C. TWITCHETT

P. G. O'Neill, *A Programmed Course on Respect Language in Modern Japanese*, ix+142 pp. The English Universities Press Limited for the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1966. (A 540-frame linear programme, supplemented by four pages of practice material.) 25s.

Teachers have reason to be grateful to a colleague with the enterprise and industry to programme a course in their subject. Their own teaching load will be lightened if they can adopt the course. Even if not, they will probably learn something about the teaching problem from seeing, as it were in slow motion, how someone else tackles it, and, if the subject-matter is at all complex, they are almost certain to have their views on some details sharpened, whether or not they agree with the programmer's treatment

of them. As regards language teaching, moreover, the parts of it for which a programmed course is most suited will only become clear if such courses are written.

Dr. O'Neill has been a pioneer in applying programming to aspects of Japanese. Besides the work under review, he has programmed a course to teach the *kana* syllabaries (now published by Kodansha International Ltd.) and one to teach an outline of the grammar of Classical Literary style (*bungotai*). Last year I gave the then unpublished *kana* course to a number of students, and the result was very satisfactory.

The subject of the present course is in marked contrast to *kana*. The scope of the *kana* course—teaching some hundred written forms, their one-to-one relationships to known sounds, and a few rules and exceptions—is clear-cut; whereas respect language can hardly be precisely delimited. Learning the use of the *kana* entails little more than rote memory; whereas, with respect language, although the learning of forms is part of the task, the main difficulty lies in getting a grasp of the functions of unfamiliar categories, which have, moreover, intricate interrelations.

Dr. O'Neill, who has done me the honour of dedicating this course to me, says in his preface that he knows I would not necessarily agree with all aspects of his analysis. I did in fact question one or two details in an earlier version which he gave me, though I did not properly consider the course as a whole.

Information about the course in its published form is given in a preface and a specification. It is for "students at college or university level" who have "the appropriate previous knowledge". What this is is indicated by a reference to the first twenty-nine chapters of *Teach Yourself Japanese* (Dunn and Yanada). This can be interpreted as a working knowledge of a selected general-purpose vocabulary operated, within the limits of the chief common grammatical structures, at the *masu* level, but without other respect-language features except for a few honorific (or, in Dr. O'Neill's terminology, "respectful") nouns. There is a reference in the specification (in connexion with the "post-test", mentioned below) to students without previous experience of respect language, but I assume that this is not to be taken quite literally and that the reference is to students with a previous knowledge only of such respect-language features as are included in the first twenty-nine chapters of *Teach Yourself Japanese*.

The specification, under "Objectives of course", says: "The course is intended to enable students with the appropriate previous knowledge to state the significance of respect forms, both in isolated sentences, and connected text, by identifying

- (i) the type of respect form used (e.g. honorific verb).
- (ii) the person to whom respect is being shown.
- (iii) the equivalent form in the colloquial language at the ordinary *masu* level of politeness."

That this is not the only aim of the course seems clear from the preface. It speaks, not only of enabling forms to be identified, but also of providing "an understanding of how respect language works" and, further, of "the main basic and 'correct' forms which the student should master for his own use", and which the course "teaches primarily", in contradistinction to some "current variants from these" which it "also aims to describe". On the other hand, that the "specific" aim is to teach students to identify respect-language forms under the three heads in the specification seems to be emphasized by providing a "post-test" with 25 such forms to be identified in this way. There is no test of any other ability.

The course itself gives few signs of having been written exclusively, or even chiefly, with this "specific" aim in view. Much of it deals with the sociological situations in which one of the categories or an actual form is appropriate; and the frames to be answered in Japanese (over 330 of the 540) more often than not require the production of a respect-language form to fit a situation. The proportion of the teaching directed specifically towards enabling forms to be identified under one of the three heads can scarcely exceed 10%, though much more of it no doubt contributes indirectly to that end.

It might be argued that to teach nothing but how to identify forms would be jejune and unprofitable, that only by teaching "how respect language works" does the subject come alive; and, further, that since a student will eventually have to use some at least

of the forms himself some teaching of this is all to the good. On the other hand, it might be argued that the ability to identify the forms is a basic necessity which an introductory course must teach, and that to do this efficiently it should not distract the student by attempting other things at the same time. In my opinion, whatever force there may be in the arguments against being too narrow, the scope of the present course is too wide for its "specific" aim.

Here it becomes relevant to look at the post-test. Each of the 25 typical forms has to be identified under the three heads, one mark being scored for a correct answer under any head, so that the maximum score is 75. A score of 56 ("approximately 75%") is said to be "satisfactory for students without previous experience of respect language". Now, scoring 56 does not mean that 75% of the 25 forms, *i.e.*, 18, must have been correctly identified under all three heads; the number may be as high as 18 or as low as 6,¹ and will probably lie somewhere between. Can it really be satisfactory for a student to fail to identify (fully) 7, let alone 19, out of 25 typical forms at the end of a course whose "specific" aim is to teach him to identify such forms? One wonders whether the arithmetical implications of the method of scoring were, perhaps, not realized.

Would students be likely in fact to do much better than this pass mark of 56 suggests? A clue is available in the specification, where it is reported that certain students took this post-test and made an average score of 88%. This means that the average number of forms they correctly identified (fully) was in the range 16 to 22 both inclusive; the actual average was, then, probably about 19. In other words, the average number of forms not correctly identified (fully) was probably about 6. These students must have had some previous knowledge of respect language, since the report says that they scored an average of 12% in a "pre-test", the nature of which is not disclosed.² The inference, for what it is worth, is clearly that students with no previous knowledge of respect language are rather unlikely to be able at the end of the course to identify correctly (and fully) as many as 19 of the 25 typical forms.

This evidence goes to support my opinion that the course is too wide in scope for the efficient teaching of its "specific" aim. I take it that a course with this aim ought to achieve it with a majority of (qualified) students; that is to say, impart to them the ability to identify the forms with virtually 100% accuracy. This does not seem an unreasonable view. After all, identifying is a more or less straightforward process of applying what has been taught about a certain number of structures and of special forms, a number which, though fairly large, is not unlimited. The ability to do this does not depend on cultivating that sense of the social situation which is involved in applying respect-language categories and in appreciating all the nuances of their implications.

As we have seen, the course has in fact wider aims than the specification and post-test would suggest. What can be said of it as a general account of respect language for teaching purposes? It certainly covers one aspect very thoroughly: the sociological situations in which various categories are appropriate. I doubt whether some of the more abstract explanations of the situations in the first section (64 frames) would be easily grasped by all students, but for some at least this part of the course may be valuable. My own opinion is that the course as a whole, even if one does not regard the ability to identify forms accurately as a basic requirement, contains too much to be an efficient introduction for the average student. Most students would, I believe, be left with a good deal of "half knowledge"; they would need to go over some of the ground again because of having forgotten things and need some remedial teaching because of having confused things. Only a small proportion of particularly gifted students, using

¹ 18 if there are only two right answers, in all, about all the other 7 forms; 6 if there are right answers under two heads about each of the other 19 forms.

² If the pre-test was in fact the same as the post-test, these students may have known more about respect language before starting the course than the average 12% score suggests. They can hardly have been familiar with Dr. O'Neill's systematization and may have lost marks by putting some forms into categories according to a different system.

the course as an introduction, would probably be able to digest it. To more advanced students, it will no doubt be useful, for filling gaps in their knowledge and focusing their attention on aspects they may not have fully appreciated before.

Some points in Dr. O'Neill's exposition which I am inclined to question may be due to our preferring different standards rather than to making different analyses. Throughout most of its history respect language has no doubt varied by sex, social class, hereditary occupation, etc., as well as regionally, some regional dialects being virtually without any. Under present-day conditions, especially in the "melting-pot" of Tokyo, there are not only competing standards, but there must be, even among persons of education, some whose early upbringing did not give them a standard of their own to which they can appeal with confidence. As Dr. O'Neill says, "Respect language in Japanese is today in a somewhat chaotic state". So, though I would myself put some of Dr. O'Neill's "deferential verbs" into the "depreciatory" category and *vice versa*, distinguishing also more sharply than he seems to do between the two categories, and would explain the implications of "honorific" and "depreciatory" somewhat differently, there is probably evidence on most of these points to support both our views.

In part at least this may well be true of the uses of *moosu* and *mooshiageru* (as main verbs). Dr. O'Neill classes them both as depreciatory, whereas I am used to so regarding only *mooshiageru*, taking *moosu* to be—in my use of the term—deferential. I am reluctant therefore to approve frame 300. The student is given to understand that in *Daijin ni soo surujitatsu tsumori wa nai to mooshimashita ga* (required as the rendering of "I told the Minister I had no intention of doing so, but . . .") the speaker depreciates himself by using *mooshimashita* (as by using *itasu* rather than *suru*) and by so doing shows respect to the Minister. I would feel that *mooshimashita* showed deference to the person addressed, and that *mooshiagemashita* would be needed to give the *daijin* his due (and I would not feel altogether certain "against" whom the self-depreciation of *itasu* was directed). Again, post-test question A.7, reading *Ano kata ni soo mooshitan' desu kara daijobu deshoo*, is to me a solecism; for congruity with *kata* I want *mooshiageta*.³ It is certain, however, that some people do use *moosu* as a depreciatory, and I concede that my objection to this use may be out of date, and possibly may even never have been justified by a consideration of all the facts. So far, the issue depends on a choice of standards. But there is also a question concerning *moosu* which may have to do with the analysis. When I call *moosu* deferential, I mean in part that it does not necessarily depreciate the person or persons referred to by its (possibly unexpressed) grammatical subject, whereas in Dr. O'Neill's system it always does so. I am inclined to think that this is a flaw in his system, but the question may after all boil down to a choice of standards.

One point on which we are not quite agreed I suspect to be due to some extent to Dr. O'Neill's misinterpreting his own evidence. He speaks of "a modification of the standard *o+base+ni naru* honorific construction" which "consists of reducing the *ni naru*⁺ to the neutral *suru*⁺ and using the resulting *o+base+suru* construction as a kind of informal honorific". The first of his two examples (frame 273), however, does not show this happening. A mother says to her small son *O-suwari shite (o-)nomi nasai* (Sit down and drink it); but *o-suwari* here is not *o+(verb) base*, but *o+noun*, the *o-* being a "converted" honorific prefix, as in *o-jigi* or *o-mairi*, not attributing "honour" to a person, but conferring a residual trace of it on the referent of the noun itself. There is no doubt that the use of *o+base+suru* as (in the user's intention) an honorific instead of a depreciatory does occur,⁴ though I suspect that Dr. O'Neill has somewhat overestimated its prevalence. But this departure from tradition, even if fairly common,

³ I take it that the speaker is speaking of himself. If it was somebody else who "spoke in that sense", *soo mooshita* would be correct by my standard provided that deferential language was being used; but then *deshoo* (at least) would be incongruous and should be *de gozaimashoo*.

⁴ Mr. Iwabuchi-Etsutaroo (Director of the National Language Research Institute) castigates the "error", giving examples of it from newspapers etc., in his *Akubun* [Bad Language] (1960), Nihon Hyooron Shinsha, pp. 209-13.

must, I think, be put down to ignorance or to carelessness. In advising students not to adopt it themselves, Dr. O'Neill says that this structure "is *not yet* [my italics] universally accepted as a legitimate honorific". But the probable consequences of universal acceptance can hardly have been clearly envisaged. Such acceptance would threaten the category of "depreciatory form of the verb", for the structure would most likely go out of use if it had contradictory implications (honorific and depreciatory); and there is no obvious replacement to enable the category to survive. I think it should have been said bluntly that the use is a wrong one. Categories are tough, and to brand as an error an innovation which, if generally accepted, would put a category in peril is, I submit, not pedantry, but common sense—refusing to back a likely loser.⁵

A minor point on which Dr. O'Neill cannot be quite accurate is in stating, in connexion with frames 240-3 and 299 (cf. also 359 ff.) that *morau* differs from *uketoru* in implying receipt from a superior. That it necessarily implies this is disproved by, for example, its common use by a customer in a shop (*Kore o moraimashoo*, "I'll take this"). I suggest that *morau*, unlike *uketoru*, draws attention to the fact that someone (the donor) parts with what is received, bringing him as it were into the picture, and that any effect of a status difference between recipient and donor is an indirect consequence of this distinction. In speaking to a superior of something he received from oneself, tact normally calls for self-effacement, and so for the use of *uketoru*. When the donor is the superior of the recipient, the latter may be flattered by the use of *morau*, or may resent it; here the would-be tactful speaker is put on his mettle. When the speaker knows nothing about the donor—as with the example in frame 240 (a statement by a hotel employee that a guest received a letter yesterday)—*uketoru* is the word, but its use here implies nothing about the recipient's status *vis-à-vis* the (unknown) donor. Incidentally, if I am right about the distinction between these two words and its effect, we have here a good illustration of the difficulty of delimiting respect language with precision.

It seems misleading to say (frame 425; cf. also post-test question A.10) that the deferential *de orimasu* is for "da (with animate subjects only)". Surely it is for *de iru*, the distinction between that and *da* lying outside the province of respect language. I am puzzled by *de irasshai* (section VIII, Imperative Forms), which is said to be equivalent to "be!" (with animate subjects only). Can it ever occur?

Dr. O'Neill uses diagrams to illustrate various sociological situations in which different respect-language categories, single or combined, are appropriate (relative status between 1st, 2nd, and 3rd persons, whether 2nd or 3rd person is associated with the speaker or not, and so on). The fact that the first section of the work contains twenty of these diagrams—and there are a few more in later sections—is indicative of the complexity of the subject; though it is true that only eight "standard situation diagrams" appear in the summary, in appendix 1. I confess that I find it difficult to get a clear idea of situations described in this abstract way. This may be a personal disability; but, even so, it seems likely that some students would share it. I have a feeling that Dr. O'Neill's treatment has in general a slight tendency to overemphasize the degree in which status relations determine the use of respect language at the present day, but this is very much a matter of opinion.

"Mechanical" blemishes in the course are very few. The latter part of frame 287 reads in part: "can reasonably be used to either the 2nd or 3rd person"; no doubt "show respect to" has dropped out after "used to". In frame 521 it seems unwise to have relied on the hyphen before *-otsuke* to keep a student from mistaking it for an independent word. The only misprints noted are: frame 209, *ikagu* for *ikaga*; frame 394, *tomodacho* for *tomodachi*; appendix 1, p. 132, "last or 2nd persons" for 1st or 2nd persons".

⁵ My impression is that the *o*+base+*suru* construction (in a depreciatory sense) is now more widely used, in conversation at least, than before the war. This may possibly be in part the result (*via* the schools and the mass-communication media) of the approval given to it in *Kore kara no keigo* (1952), a widely disseminated publication sponsored by the Ministry of Education. The vogue, if that is what it is, may help to explain the recent crop of misuses.

A reviewer can scarcely avoid giving more space to doubts and disagreements than to enumerating what he approves, and I may have given an unbalanced idea of the systematization and its exposition for this reason. I hasten to add that most of what Dr. O'Neill says is sound and enlightening. I have myself learned a number of things from his explanations, particularly about the working of depreciatory verbs. The useful little tip about *o tanonde* (frame 386) is not, as far as I know, to be found elsewhere. This is certainly the most detailed attempt at describing in a European language the respect language of modern Japanese, and almost certainly a more detailed treatment of it than anything in Japanese.

It is a pioneer work in a double sense: in attempting what is in some ways an original systematization, and in presenting this systematization in a programmed form. This combination has a drawback. A programmed course, because of the diffuse style in which it is necessarily written, is not very convenient for reference. (The index in the present work and the summaries in its four appendixes mitigate, but do not altogether obviate, the inconvenience.) But, when the systematization is not what a teacher is used to, he is specially likely to want to refresh his memory of points of detail in it, since he will want to know during his later teaching just what his students have been taught by the course.

What general conclusions can be drawn about the teaching of respect language and the desirability of programming this teaching? For students new to the subject, it seems to me that something with approximately the same aim as the "specific" aim of the present work is certainly needed—or rather, perhaps, with the slightly narrower aim of teaching how to identify only the forms covered by a selection of "essential" structures and special forms. (Which to select as essential is admittedly a problem awaiting solution.) It would concentrate on achieving its aim, and any mention of situations and the application of categories to them would be the minimum necessary for purposes of illustration. I see no particular reason why this comparatively short introductory course should not be programmed. I am not convinced, however, that this is necessarily the best way of presenting a subject-matter of this kind. Ideally, perhaps, the same information should be made available in both a programmed and a non-programmed form, students being free to choose one course or the other. Ideally, too, it may well be that a part, or parts, of either course should be divided, different branches being taken by students of different sex, since some of the conspicuous differences between men's and women's usages are at quite an elementary level.

But a more schematized treatment is also required, of wider coverage than the present course. It seems fairly certain that programming would not be useful for this exposition, because convenience of reference should be a primary consideration. A programmed course is essentially dispensable after use. But respect language is surely too complex for all its details to be taken in by going once through any more or less complete treatment of it. Even an advanced scholar would almost certainly want from time to time to refer to items in the exposition.

F. J. DANIELS

Eberhardt Richter, *Tibetisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*. 444 pp., Leipzig, VEB Verlag Enzyklopadie, 1966.

Dr. Richter, well known through his *Grundlagen der Phonetik des Lhasa-Dialektes* (Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1964), presents us here with another contribution to the study of Modern Tibetan. In the former study he based himself on recordings of Tibetan elementary lessons, placed at his disposal by Professor J. Schubert (who had them made in China), and gave a detailed phonetic analysis of his text, which he transcribed in the I.P.A. system. In the present dictionary he has confined himself to a transliteration of his (about 9,000) entries, which are printed in, and arranged according to, the Tibetan alphabet. There may be more than merely economic reasons which will have induced Dr. R. (and before him the authors of the *Kratkiy Tibetsko-russkiy Slovar'* [Messrs. Semichov, Parfonovitch and Dandaron], Moscow, 1963), to make this decision, regrettable as it may appear to users of the dictionary, who will have to

turn, apart from Dr. R.'s former book, to vocabularies like those appended to G. N. Roerich's *Text-book of colloquial Tibetan*, 1957, on which the author has drawn, or to K'un Chang and B. Shefts's *Manual of Spoken Tibetan*, Seattle, 1964, which he is likely to have seen only when his dictionary was ready for print, to get an idea of the Tibetan spoken word. Though it will be readily admitted that to add a phonetic transcription to his entries would have been a considerable task, hardly possible to accomplish without the help of qualified indigenous speakers of the Lhasa dialect, the notation of the pronunciation in the standard (Lhasa) dialect, including pitch, tone- and stress-marks, of the Tibetan single words and compounds will remain a so far unfulfilled desideratum of dictionaries of modern Tibetan.

As far as the lexical items are concerned, they constitute an interesting selection based both on the above mentioned Tibetan-Russian dictionary and a number of Chinese collections, to which most recently Dr. J. Kolmaš (Archiv Orientalní, 1961) has drawn our attention. The latter consist almost exclusively of newly coined terms, not all of which are likely to survive. The latest publication of this kind, the *Hanzang tsyrhuey 汉藏詞匯 (rGya-Bod san-sbyar-gyi ts'ig-mdzod)* of 1964 would have provided further material and further proof, if such proof were necessary, that the period of coining neologisms has not yet reached its final phase.

There are a great number of hybrid compounds among these coinages, and care has been taken by Dr. R. to indicate them by adding, e.g., "Tibetan and Chinese" after these. It would have facilitated further the task of analysing such compounds had the non-Tibetan element been italicized. Further help could have been derived from using a hyphen between parts of a compound, and a hyphen might also regularly have indicated affixes like *ba*, *pa*, *mo*, *po*, etc. as such. Further desiderata in this field would be the indication of diminutives and the coverage by cross-reference of alternative coinages — there are as many as three for "atom".

A study of the modern language cannot, of course, be attempted without referring to the dictionaries of the older language, of which, in the opinion of the reviewer, A. H. Jäschke's would still be the best. Any user of the present dictionary, should, however, be able to analyse the compounds and illustrative examples given in it without recurring to other dictionaries. A test of the dictionary from this point of view has proved rather disappointing. One finds, e.g., the compound *dril-sgrags* "propaganda" and the phrase *dril-brda gtor-ba* "to ring a bell", but the entry *dril* "bell" as such is not given. In the same way, verbs often appear in conjunction with their (preceding) object without an entry of their own (e.g., *dug-log gon* "to put on clothes", without an entry *gon*). Various forms of one and the same verb do not seem to have been included (there is, e.g., no reference from *btun-ja* "tea" to *ht'un-ba* "to drink"). In fact, the author might consider for a later edition the inclusion of a table of verb forms, as given in the Tibetan-Russian and some of the Chinese-Tibetan dictionaries.

There seems thus to be an imbalance between entries of compounds and those of single words which reflects the origin of the work, going back in the first instance to collections of newly coined compounds. I noticed in fact the omission of common single words, like *glo-ba* "lung", *sbal-pa* "frog", *sdig-pa* "sin", to name only a few. A check from this point of view against Sir Charles Bell's *English-Tibetan Vocabulary* (not included among his sources) might, in spite of its comparatively early date of publication (1905), induce the author to enlarge considerably the amount of single words which still form part and parcel of the living language.

The printing is very accurate (correct, however, *dpun-pa* "shoulder" to *dpun-pa*) and even lavish in so far as the use of a *tilde* to indicate repetition has apparently been excluded in principle both in the Tibetan script and in the transliteration.

The main merit of the dictionary, then, is the collection and translation of a very considerable number of newly coined compounds, giving clear evidence of the author's competence in both the Chinese and Tibetan fields. In spite of the strictures voiced above with regard to certain other aspects of the work, it constitutes, no doubt, a very welcome addition to the rather sparse material available for the study of modern Tibetan.

W. SIMON

Tibet. A Political History, by Tsepon W. D. Shakabpa. xiii + 369 pp., 8 pp. illustrations. New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1967. 72s.

History in Tibet was almost exclusively the domain of learned monks who subordinated political matters to the greater glory of religion. The present work by a scholarly lay official adopts, for the first time, something of the Western approach and provides a continuous picture of political events in his country. No Tibetan is better qualified for the task than Mr. Shakabpa whose wide interest in Tibetan history and knowledge of its records were first known to me some thirty years ago. His position in the Tibetan Government gave him access to official documents and he had more experience of the outside world than most of his fellow countrymen.

The bibliography includes several Western works as well as some 71 Tibetan books and documents; and the author has drawn also on his own memory and on the fund of national and family traditions which is still fresh in the minds of a small closely knit community which, although deeply literate, lacked the luxury of cheap printing.

The result is welcome as a pioneer work, it is valuable in presenting material new to Western students and it is also tantalizing in the questions it raises and what it leaves unsaid. It would have been of immense value to the student to have had exact references to the texts and also extracts in Tibetan from some of the rarer works; and it would have given guidance to the general reader if the relative value of the sources had been indicated; even the dates of some of them are not given, and we are left in doubt which works are actually in the author's possession and for which he relies on notes taken in Tibet.

Such questions affect the treatment of later history less than that of the earlier periods. Especially valuable is the account of events after 1792 when Tibet became a closed country—a period well within the range of vivid family memories which bring the "Strong Men of the Nineteenth Century" clearly before our eyes (ch. 11). Another excellent chapter sorts out the confused period of the Phagmogrupa and after; and contains a lively story based on the rLangs Po ti bSe ru. It is interesting to find in the rare autobiography of sLe-Lung rJe-drung the source of a description, known to many Tibetan nobles, of the appearance of the VIth Dalai Lama as a handsome youth with long hair, wearing blue silk robes, adorned with jewels and carrying a bow and arrows (p. 130). There are many such fresh and colourful touches.

Surprisingly, one gets at times the impression of a Tibetan writer, so determined to give politics their due place that he plays down the political effects of religion. In particular, in the account of Pandit Atisha, the rise of the great monastic schools, and even in that of the appearance of Tsongkhapa, no very clear pattern emerges of the impact of these great events on Tibetan society as a whole. There is also a general tendency to string together a chain of events without explaining causes and effects—for example there is no real attempt to enquire why Tibet was important to the Mongols, to the Manchus, or to the British. In dealing with recent events, such as the Rating troubles of 1947, the author is understandably cautious, but he gives us a new and fascinating story of the crisis after the death of the thirteenth Dalai Lama. It is valuable also to have his confirmation of matters already discussed by Western writers such as the ransoming of the fourteenth Dalai Lama from Ma Pu-feng and the relations between the Tibetan Government and the Chinese mission at Lhasa after 1934. On one point within my personal experience I wish to take issue. Sir Basil Gould did not ask the Tibetan Government for rights to establish a British mission at Lhasa in 1936–7 (p. 281); he simply left a representative to continue discussions he had initiated and without further question this developed into a quasi-permanent mission. A few dates also seem to be out. The U.S. aircraft crashed in Tibet in 1943 not 1944; and the English school under Mr. Parker was established in 1944 not 1945 (p. 289).

In comparison with the handling of later periods the chapter on the Early Kings (ch. 2) is less felicitous and the use of source material not very discriminating. Traditions and legends from the works of writers some five centuries and more after the event are interwoven with references to original documents of the eighth and ninth centuries most of which have only recently come to light and which Tibetans are only now learn-

ing to study critically. I found at Lhasa a general lack of interest in the earliest records. A shining exception was the author of the Deb Kar to which Mr. Shakabpa makes frequent reference; but there are pitfalls for the unwary there in a lack of precision about sources; and some similar problems appear in Mr. Shakabpa's chapter: e.g. p. 50, in what language was the copy of the treaty of 821-2 "from the Chinese pillar" and was it in fact taken from a (now unknown) pillar or was it one of the "book versions" referred to in Bushell's article in JRAS 1880? Incidentally, in the photograph after p. 178 the "Shol-do-ring" is wrongly described as the pillar of the treaty; it bears, in fact, earlier inscriptions one of which the author quotes on pp. 40-1. Neither here nor for the "Chongyas" inscription cited at p. 45 does the author specify the origin of his text. His notes suggest that the former is derived from Tsuglag Trengwa; but it is not there, and the source is perhaps this reviewer's edition in JRAS Prize Publication Vol. XIII. For the latter the only surviving text seems to be that of a famous Lama of the eighteenth century edited in JRAS 1964. If this is also the author's source, his interpretation of the inscription as addressed to the king is not easy to accept. Like others of the period it seems to be a straightforward narrative.

In the same chapter (p. 32) it would be helpful to know which Tibetan sources mention the appeal of the Chinese princess for asylum in a foreign country - which Chavannes' Chinese documents show to have been Kashmir.

Here and there the accuracy of the translations seem in doubt. At p. 1 a passage in Deb Sngon is said to show that the name "Bod" originated from the name "Pugyal". The text (Ka 18 b) simply says it came later (phyis). And on p. 83 what appears to be a translation from Tsuglag Trengwa is seen, on comparison with the Tibetan, to be an abbreviated adaptation.

The foregoing points are made in the hope that the author, having cleared the ground, may some day provide fuller details of his source material. Many students of Tibetan history would be eager to know more of such books as 'Brug gi rgyal rabs and sLe lung rje drung, also the family records and official documents he cites. For the present the author has done what he set out to do; he has given a continuous lucid account of Tibetan history leading to the conclusion that Tibet controlled its own affairs both externally and internally; and he has provided a valuable basis for further study of Tibetan history.

The book is well produced; the illustrations are of historical value; and there are maps, although several places mentioned in the text are not to be found there. The expert hand of Professor Wylie shows in the arrangement and in the careful index in which a not very attractive form of phonetic rendering is clarified by correct transliteration. It should certainly be read with advantage by anyone with a serious interest in the history of Tibet.

H. RICHARDSON

Walter A. Staehelin, *The Book of Porcelain*. Translated from the German by Michael Bullock. 87 pp.+34 colour plates. London, Lund Humphries, 1966. £5 5s.

Chinese albums illustrating daily life and technical processes of one kind or another have for long held an irresistible fascination for casual inquirer and earnest student alike. The present volume is no exception. The thirty-four illustrations of ceramic processes and commercial transactions in progress are each reproduced with a facing page of explanation conflated from such source materials as those of Du Haide, Père d'Entrecolles and Nieuhof, as well as material from the *T'ao-shuo*, *T'ao-lu* and *fang-chih's*. The collection is preceded by a short general introduction that serves to set the scene and to date approximately, in the first half of the 18th century, this valuable series of illustrations of a perennially interesting subject. Of the artistic merit of these drawings, little need be said; they are what one might expect of a somewhat unskilled artist, who suffers the natural disadvantage of unfamiliarity with the technique of drawing "from the life". Apart from this the drawings have a certain charm and often a liveliness that is pleasing and sometimes amusing.

The text unfortunately does not always achieve the standards to which we are nowadays becoming accustomed on this subject. Particularly discouraging is the fact that the author states on the first page of the introduction that the writer of the *T'ao-shuo* was Pao T'ing-po, apparently relying on Sir Percival David's article "The T'ao-shuo and illustrations of pottery manufacture" in *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. 12, 1949. Luckily David affirms unequivocally that the book was written by Chu Yen and also states with similar clarity that the publisher was Pao T'ing-po. Fortunately, or unfortunately, the other errors are less glaring than this, but the dangers of dependence on secondary and indirect source materials are amply demonstrated in the succeeding pages. While there is perhaps some excuse for carrying over translation errors from the Chinese made by Bushell, whose work has influenced us for so long, there can be very little for mistranslation of Père d'Entrecolles' precise French, old fashioned though it may seem to be. These shortcomings inevitably do something to detract from the value of this interesting publication, as do the disconcerting errors in the translation of the characters that appear in the pictures. It is certainly surprising to find the name of one of the Door Gods being rendered "this house deals only in very fine wares"! Despite a copious allowance of mistakes in the text, the drawings are of some importance not only to people interested in ceramics, but to those concerned with aspects of ceramic production less immediately connected with the wares themselves, such as cooping and wicker-working. One striking point about the illustration, particularly noticeable on plate 5, is that the painting of prunus, roses, and grape-vines is so close to what is found in early *famille-rose* wares, as to suggest that the painter himself had in fact been engaged in this specifically decorative aspect of ceramic production. Technically of unusual interest is plate 10 with the boy hanging from a rope to operate a kick-wheel, a peculiar arrangement, and one certainly not extant when Brankston visited Ching-tê Chên in 1936, when the stick-wheel was normally in use. It would be a valuable contribution to our knowledge if other collections of this kind, especially the one at Lund, could be published so that the technical peculiarities in the different series could be studied in the light of our modern understanding of the one of the world's oldest crafts.

The lay-out of the volume is attractive and, although there must necessarily be some loss of brilliance in the rendering of the original colour, the reproduction of the illustrations, at I imagine their full size, would appear to be remarkably good. We must hope that if other sets of this kind are reproduced, they will at least reach this standard, and that the quality of the text will surpass the one with which we have been faced on this occasion.

MARGARET MEDLEY

Tai Yen-hui 戴炎輝 *T'ang-lü t'ung-lun*. 唐律通論. pp. 3, 2, 34, 1, 640, Taipei (Kuo-li pien-i kuan, Cheng-chung shu-chü), 1964.

Chuang Wei-ssu 莊爲斯 *T'ang-lü shu-i yin-te* 唐律疏議引得. pp. 2, 24, 945, Taipei (Wen-hai ch'u-pan she), 1965.

Nunome Chōfu 布目潮渥 *Tōritsu sakuin kō* 唐律索引稿. pp. 4, 117, Kyōto (Tōritsu ken'yū kai of the Jimbun kagaku kenkyūjo), 1959.

Nunome Chōfu, ed. *Tōritsu-sogi kōkan-hyō* 唐律疏議校勘表. pp. 13, 86, 4 plates, Kyoto (Tōritsu kenkyūkai), 1963.

Nunome Chōfu, ed. *Tōritsu-sogi kōkan-hyō ho-i* 唐律疏議校勘表補遺. pp. 20, Kyoto (Tōritsu kenkyūkai), 1964.

Niida Noboru 仁井田陞 *Tōryō shūi* 唐令拾遺. pp. 3, 4, 4, 1006, 2, 6 plates, 2nd edition, Tokyo (Tokyo daigaku shuppankai), 1965. Y.8000.

For the student of the law of the T'ang period, the last years have seen a number of most useful publications which will considerably ease his burdens. The most important of these advances is the completion of the publication of Professor Niida Noboru's four volumes of studies in Chinese Legal History, which are the subject of a separate article.

Although these studies range far and wide over the whole of Chinese history, they return continually – as any study of Chinese legal institution must – to the T'ang period, and to the evidence afforded by the Tunhuang documents.

The books here under review are all concerned with codified law in its narrowest sense, and above all with the T'ang Code (*T'ang-lü*) and its official commentary (*shu-i*). This field has for long been monopolized by Japanese scholars, and it is good to see, in Professor Tai's work, a significant contribution from a Chinese historian of law. Professor Tai is already well known for a matter-of-fact and businesslike little outline text-book of Chinese legal history (*Chung-kuo fa-chih shih kai-yao* 中國法制史概要, p. 22, 263, Taipei 1960) designed for college students, and an earlier volume on personal status in Chinese law, besides various articles in both Chinese and Japanese, including some interesting work on the administration of the earliest Ch'ing settlements in Taiwan. As a legal scholar he is very much in the Japanese scholarly tradition, and is heavily influenced by the ideas of Professors Nakada Kaoru, Niida Noboru, and Shiga Shūzō. The new study of the T'ang Code is in fact based upon his graduation thesis from Tokyo University, written under the direction of the last named.

The book is a clearly written, at times somewhat over-simplified, text-book style account of the principles of T'ang law as embodied in the *T'ang lü* 唐律, the penal code which was the essential central pillar of the whole system of codified law. He begins with a very sketchy account of the position of the T'ang Code in the general context of Chinese legal history, and of the origins of its "general provisions" (*Ming-li* 名例, the preliminary six chapters of the text). This is followed by a rough outline of its special characteristics, dealing with such questions as the embodiment of the principle of legality, interplay between law and morality and customary ethical practice, conflicting conceptions of the purpose of punishment, reformatory, deterrent and purely punitive, and the influence of ideas concerning the equivalence of offences and of offence and punishment similar to *talio*. All of these matters have been discussed at length, and with much more subtlety, by Niida (an English summary of whose views was presented as a paper at the XII^e Congrès International des Sciences Historiques and is published in the proceedings) and other Japanese writers.

The more substantial part of the book which follows falls into two sections. The first continues the author's interpretative work on the Code as a whole, taking up three major themes. The first is a discourse on the effects upon criminal liability and responsibility of personal status, family and status relationships, and official rank or office. This covers ground which has been explored in a much broader context, covering the whole of Chinese history, by Ch'ü T'ung-tsu 瞿同祖 in his *Chung-kuo fa-lü yü Chung-kuo she-hui* 中國法律與中國社會 (Shanghai, 1947. English translation and revision *Law and society in traditional China*, Paris, 1961. See *BSOAS* XXV, p. 394-5), a book whose title is never referred to by the author in his notes. Professor Tai's account, however, does define these relationships purely in terms of T'ang institutions, and this adds some precision to our picture. There follows an analysis of what constituted an offence, with notes on accessories, complicity, criminal responsibility, intention and negligence. This is a useful and straightforward account leaning heavily upon studies by Nakada Kaoru, Niida Noboru, and Shen Chia-pen. The analytical section of the book ends with a lengthy and detailed account of the whole system of legal sanctions embodied in the code, and incorporating an extremely acute and stimulating study of the system by which officials were able to atone for offences either by a setback in their career or temporary retirement (*tang-kuan* 當官) or by dismissal from public service (*ch'u mien* 除免) or by payment of a commutation fine. (The full version of this study appeared in *Hōseishi kenkyū* 13 (1962) pp. 53-92).

The second part of the book (from p. 181) is in effect a very detailed commentary upon each article in turn of the "general provisions" of the Code. This will be valuable to any scholar working through the Code in detail, since it provides many cross-references to articles elsewhere in the Code in which the various principles are exemplified. The general student, however, will certainly feel the urgent need of a good index to assist him, since he is likely to go to Professor Tai's account for guidance on some specific point.

One of the most urgent needs of any scholar who has embarked on the study of T'ang law has been a concordance or a reliable index to help him find his way through the five hundred articles, some of considerable complexity, and their lengthy commentaries and sub-commentaries, of the Code. Some years ago the Tōritsu kenkyūkai, a group of scholars at Kyoto University engaged on a corporate study of the T'ang Code published a draft index, arranged under the "four-corner system", with supplementary indices arranged by Japanese readings of the characters, and by their number of strokes. The index was made on the base of the "late Sung" (but it is in fact probably Yüan) edition of the *T'ang-lü shu-i* reprinted in the *Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an*, with the variants of the text in the *Tai-nan-ko ts'ung-shu* edition. It is excellent as far as it goes, but unfortunately indexes only the text of the Code itself (*lü*), not its official commentary (*shu-i*), which is the bulkiest and in many respects the most important part of the book for the historian.

The new concordance published in Taiwan by Chuang Wei-szu is far more ambitious in scope. Running to almost a thousand pages of extremely fine print, it lists every occurrence of every character in the Code itself (*lü*), its sub-commentary (*chu* 注), and commentary (*shu-i*). It is arranged according to the stroke order of each character, with a supplementary finding list arranged by radicals. It will be extremely useful although one could wish that the typography had been better – headings, key terms, and quotations are all printed in the same size and type-face. But the most important deficiency of the book is the text upon which it is based. This is the generally available text of the *Wan-yu wen-k'u*, reproduced in the *Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu*, and recently photographically reprinted in Taiwan. This edition was based upon the Japanese "Official print" (*Kampon* 官本) published by the Edo Bakufu in 1805. This text, which derived through a whole series of manuscript copies, the chief of which seems to have been the critical edition made by Bukkan 物觀 (Ogyū Sōshichi 荻生德七 younger brother of Ogyū Sorai) in 1727, contained a considerable number of wrong characters and omissions (although Sōshichi claimed in the memorial presenting his manuscript to the Bakufu to have corrected 3,142 wrong characters and many other errors in the transmitted texts of his time). The editors of the *Wan-yu wen-k'u* have reproduced most of these errors, though they have emended the text themselves here and there, and added a crop of misprints and errors of their own. In using Mr. Chuang's excellent concordance, then, it is essential to remember that his text is frequently incomplete or corrupt.

With this in mind it is doubly fortunate that Professor Nunome and the Kyoto research group should have published, almost at the same time, their collation tables of the principal editions of the *T'ang-lü shu-i*. These tables use the *Tai-nan-ko ts'ung-shu* edition as their basic text, and list all the significant textual variants (in both the *lü* and *shu-i*, but not in the much later *tsuan-li* 纂例 and *Shih-wen* 釋文 glossaries which are appended to most editions) contained in (1) the Yüan Chih-cheng edition (1351), from which the *Tai-nan-ko* text derives; (2) Shen Chia-pen's rather poor edition, which was based on the *Tai-nan-ko* text, but carelessly printed; (3) the very early Yüan edition formerly owned by P'an Tsu-yin reproduced in the *Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an* and generally referred to as the P'ang-hsi-chai text, which is the oldest surviving edition; and (4) the "Bukkan text" (Ogyū Sōshichi's critical edition), (5) the Japanese "Official Print" of 1805, and (6) the *Wan-yu wen-ku* edition. The fragments of the Yüan "large character" edition of 1332 preserved in the *Pei-ching T'u-shu-kuan* and in the Ōki bunko 大木文庫 collection of the Tōyō bunka kenkyūjo in Tokyo are also collated. The introduction to the first volume of collation notes gives a brief account of the various editions, by Professor Nunome, and the postface to the supplementary volume brings this into line with the recent studies of the early editions by Niida Noboru (*Chūgoku Hōseishi kenkyū IV*; – *Hō to kanshū; hō to dōtoku* 中國法制史研究: 法と慣習: 法と道德 Tokyo (1964) pp. 65-102) and Naitō Kenkichi 内藤乾吉 (*Chūgoku Hōseishi kōshō* 中國法制史考證 Osaka (1963), pp. 148-81). The next important step will be a careful collation of the several fragments of the Code recovered from Tunhuang, some of which represent recensions of the Code considerably earlier than that of 737 to which all our modern editions go back.

The last book under review is a reprint, with one or two new plates and some minor corrections, of one of the classics of Chinese legal studies, which has been out of print and extremely rare for many years. This extraordinary work, a reconstruction from innumerable fragmentary quotations in a wide variety of literature of the T'ang administrative statutes (*ling* 令) was published in 1933, when the author was still in his twenties, won him the Gakushiin Imperial Prize and instantly made his reputation. The reconstruction was not only an important step forward in the study of Chinese law, but also a major achievement in textual criticism, and the culmination of a line of work which goes back, through the studies of Professor Niida's master, Nakada Kaoru, to the legal scholars of Tokugawa times, when Matsushita Kenrin 松下見林 first attempted to reconstruct (in 1734) the *ling* in his manuscript Tōryō 唐令, now in the Seikadō bunko. A supplementary volume is in the course of publication, including new material from the Tunhuang manuscripts, and some corrections of detail. It is one of the most serious losses to T'ang legal studies that the manuscript of the author's parallel reconstruction of the surviving fragments of the other categories of centrally codified law, the Regulations (*ko* 格) and Ordinances (*shih* 式), was destroyed during an American air-raid in Tokyo toward the end of the war.

D. C. TWITCHETT

The Golden Khersonese: Studies in the Historical Geography of the Malay Peninsula Before A.D. 1500. By Paul Wheatley. xxxiii + 388 pp. Maps, figures, bibliography. Kuala Lumpur, University of Malaya Press, 1966. Distributed by Oxford University Press. Paper covers, 30s.

Professor Wheatley's *Golden Khersonese*, first published in 1961, is a superb book. With meticulous scholarship he has scrutinized a vast range of evidence bearing on the early history of the Malay Peninsula and constructed thereon a firm foundation for subsequent researches. This volume may be elaborated upon, as in the same author's more recent *Impressions of the Malay Peninsula in Ancient Times* (Singapore, Donald Moore, 1964); but it will not soon be superseded. A price of 30s. seems unexpectedly exorbitant for a paperback book; but for such a magistral and beautifully produced volume as this it most definitely is not excessive.

DAVID K. WYATT