

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS

Muhammad Abd-al-Rahman Barker, Hasan Jahangir Hamdani, and Khwaja Muhammad Shafi Dihlavi, *An Urdu Newspaper Word Count*, Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Montreal, 1969, pp. xli + 453. 43s.

This, as the Introduction tells us, "is the last of four works dealing with the Urdu language" to be produced by Professor Barker and his associates. Like its three predecessors, it is an attractively produced volume and, again like its predecessors, is a comprehensive, lucid, and thoroughly sound presentation of its subject matter. Some three-quarters of it comprises "Part One: Urdu-English Alphabetical List" and despite the authors' statement that the work is "not intended primarily as a dictionary" it is undoubtedly as a convenient, reliable dictionary of newspaper Urdu that it will, quite properly, be used. The Introduction and "Part Two: Frequency List" form, in effect, an appendix to the present work and to the *Urdu Newspaper Reader* which preceded it - a valuable one, but an appendix all the same. Those who are interested in the aims and techniques of word-counts in general and of this one in particular, will find these admirably explained and exemplified there.

RALPH RUSSELL

W. B. Henning Memorial Volume. Edited by Mary Boyce and Ilya Gershevitch. pp. xliii + 467 + 16 pl. + portrait frontispiece. Asia Major Library, Lund Humphries, 1970. 14 gns.

Virtually the whole range of Iranian studies, as well as subjects of related interest, is represented in this volume to which scholars of many countries have contributed. The articles, almost without exception, are of a consistently high quality and the book is thus likely to be of value to anyone interested in this field of study. Among the subjects treated are: the origin of the Old Persian writing system; textual criticism in the Avesta; Av. and OP etymology and exegesis; Zoroastrian law and religion; Pahlavi texts and linguistic matters; Manichaean texts; Sogdian, Khwarezmian and Khotanese vocabulary; Iranian art and archaeology; modern Iranian languages and dialects; and Middle and New Persian metrics. Outside the Iranian sphere there are articles on Aramaic, Sanskrit, Indo-European, Chinese, Tibetan and Armenian. All these subjects were of interest to the great scholar to whom the volume is dedicated, and to most of them he made outstanding contributions, as we are reminded in the eloquent "In Memoriam" by I. Gershevitch.

Separate discussion of each article would be presumptuous, even were it possible within the bounds of a review. However, mention should be made of two studies at least, which seem to be outstanding, before passing on to a few points of detail.

The first, by I. M. Diakonoff, discusses the origin of the OP writing system. As he himself emphasizes (p. 99) "the textual base [of OP] is more than meagre, and ingenuity in exegesis has its natural limits" (a fact amply borne out by the contents of Mayrhofer's Bibliography of writings on OP since 1964, on pp. 276-98). Rejecting as improbable the view that Darius was the inventor of the script, Diakonoff suggests new approaches to the problem. First, "a more rigorous analysis of the principles of the OP cuneiform script" (pp. 105-15); second, a "search for the sources of the orthographic principles underlying the OP writing system" - i.e. a comparison with the typological features of systems of writing contemporaneous with the invention of the OP script, which may be assumed to have taken place in the first half of the first millennium B.C. The comparison, which he presents in tabular form, seems to suggest that the main

typological prototype was the Phoenician-Aramaic system, not the Assyrian and Elamite branches of the Akkadian cuneiform writing system, albeit certain features appear to have been borrowed from the Late Babylonian and Urartian cuneiform. Thirdly, Diakonoff suggests that certain locutions in the OP inscriptions have prototypes in the annalistic and epigraphic traditions of neighbouring Near Eastern cultures, and he compares for example certain Urartian formulae (pp. 121-2) which resemble formulae found in OP. Naturally these suggestions, however sensible, are not by themselves conclusive, as the author himself takes care to point out, but they point the way to new and perhaps more fruitful lines of enquiry and provide stimulus for further research.

The second article deserving of special mention is also particularly remarkable for the new methodology it suggests. In it Karl Hoffmann propounds a special form of textual criticism suited to the peculiarities of the Avestan MS. tradition. Since the late-medieval and modern MSS. that provide our text of the Avesta show the effect of several centuries' change in pronunciation, and the gradual growth of liturgical and scholarly traditions as well as scribal change, part of the critic's task, according to Hoffmann, is to try to re-establish as closely as possible the text of the "Sasanian archetype". The setting up of a stemma codicum and the selection on that basis of a "best" reading is, in this situation, inapplicable, or at least insufficient. Linguistic and philological methods should be added to the purely textual evaluation of the MS. tradition. In other words, in each instance of a doubtful reading, one should ask what the expected form would be on philological and grammatical grounds, and then compare this postulate with the variant readings before one. As an example of the application of this composite method of textual criticism, Hoffmann proceeds to show that the genuine acc. pl. masc. forms of *auua-* and *daēuua-* should be *auū* (or *au*) and *daēuū* respectively, and that the variants actually support this contention.

It will be interesting to see how widely this method can be applied, and with what results. Certainly Hoffmann has shown that Avestan scholars cannot afford to rely implicitly on Geldner's edition (which Geldner himself described on p. i of his *Prolegomena*, as only "an improved reprint" of Westergaard's edition of 1854, and elsewhere as susceptible to much further improvement), nor can they henceforth afford to treat the MS. variants in the cavalier and indiscriminate fashion commonly adopted, and emend without considerable circumspection.

Here follow a few more particular remarks: page 40 note 16 on the form *daēvō* as acc. pl. the reader should be referred to Karl Hoffmann's article, mentioned above (pp. 194 ff.). Page 97 note, in connexion with RV *uśig*, Av. *uśig*- beside Hitt. *ḫuek-/ḫuk-* "to perform incantations, exorcise", *ḫukmai* "charm, incantation", H. W. Bailey's suggestion (*Prolexis* 149) of base *vaś-* "make noise", as opposed to previous explanations cited by Burrow in his article quoted in note 11. This would accord well with the common association of RV *uśig-* with *bhṛgu-* and *āngiras-*. Pages 134-5, I fail to see why the poet should have wished to describe either *Tiśtrya* or the *Fravaśis* as "quickly snorting", especially since their connexion with horses is no more marked than that of the other gods. Nor are the RV passages adduced in support of the meaning "snort" comparable with the Avestan usage. In the absence of an improved sense given by a base **fruθ-*, as in Av. *fraoθat:aspā-*, it would seem safer still to see in **fraoθman-* the base *fru-*, OInd *plávate*, with **fraoθman-*: **frut-* as (hu)śōiθman-:(hu)śit-. Pages 427 ff. This article would have benefited greatly from some of Henning's concision. Pages 447 ff. If W. P. Schmid (p. 377) is right in finding IE river names that correspond to OInd. *sīndhu-*, then Thieme's hypothesis of an original meaning "frontier, barrier" is seriously weakened. The contexts of *sīndhu-* in the RV often suggests what one might anyway expect, namely an original appellative (extended base *syand-* "flow" has already been plausibly suggested), in which case there would no longer be any cause to assume (with Szemerényi and others) an Iranian borrowing in Av. *hindu-*. Thieme is surely right in trying to avoid such an assumption and the hypothesis based on it by Szemerényi.

In conclusion, the printers and proof-readers of the volume are to be congratulated on the accuracy of the text. Among the thirty or so printing errors, none is likely to cause confusion (though in a book of such typographical complexity it is odd that

most of the mistakes that do occur could have been corrected by someone without any specialist knowledge). On page 82, note 5, the reference should be to Khotanese Texts VI, 358; page 136, line 13, read Y. IX, 5; page 193, lines 16 and 21 read *aōui* not *aoui*. To the bibliography of Henning's works may be added, on page xxxiii, s.v. 1963: (d) Apud W. Hinz, *Iranica Antiqua*, III, 1963, 171 seq. A finely produced book and worthy memorial, it bodes well for the Asia Major Library, a series which it inaugurates.

PETER KHOROCHE

A Tibetan Principality. The Political System of Sa Skya, by C. W. Cassinelli and Robert B. Ekvall. New York, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1969.

Tibet is usually regarded as a single entity, which indeed it is from the point of view of folkways, religion and all that may be termed "culture". But politically, as the authors of this book point out (p. 62), Tibet was until 1959 "pre-nationalistic". Not only did the central government not bother itself with exact definitions of the country's status and sovereignty, it also permitted, apparently fairly willingly, the existence within the realm of effectively independent states. One such was Sakya, which remained until the Chinese takeover of the 1950's the self-governing remnant of a polity which had once embraced all Tibet.

The book is a study of this polity, concentrating on Sakya proper rather than the many other detached portions of it. The approach is allegedly based on "systems theory", a term unfamiliar to me, but the book is in fact a straightforward and commendably thorough descriptive account of the workings of the government at all levels, with discussion of the political principles and issues which emerge. The information was collected from several members of the Sakya ruling family now in the United States, and since Sakya's population was only 16,000 it is not surprising that they knew about most of what went on in the principality. Information from other informants and sources tends to corroborate their picture.

Interviews were conducted in Tibetan, the book carries a useful English-Tibetan glossary, and Tibetan spellings are used almost throughout for Tibetan words. All this is commendable, although the system of transliteration is a very clumsy one (e.g. Sakya is spelt *Sa sKya* in the text) and will deter some readers. The syllables *btags* "attached" and *bdag(-po)* "owner" are, curiously, both wrongly spelt *bdags* - the former on page 48 and the latter on pages 239, 242, and 277. This results in the word *kha-btags* "offeringscarf" being spelt the same as *kha-bdag* "part-owner". *rdzong* is wrongly spelt *gdzong* on page 106 fn. The "literal" translations given after many Tibetan terms are often irritatingly over-literal and unilluminating. Thus the inference on page 122 that the syllable *drag* means "fierce" or "frightful" and hence "descriptive of a government official" is unjustified. *drag* means "strong, powerful, violent", sometimes "fierce", but hardly "frightful", and in any case there are no grounds for asserting that the other meaning "noble, of noble birth" is a later extension of the sense. *sku drag* simply means "noble", and the holders of the title are government officials because they are noble, not fierce because they are government officials. Then on page 216 we read, "The hereditary nobility . . . were called "brGyud Pai sKu Drag", which means "sKu Drag of the line". In fact *brgyud-pa'i sku-drag* simply means "hereditary nobility", *brgyud-pa* meaning "person belonging to a family or lineage". Similarly on page 155 the syllable *tshigs* surely here means "clause, article" rather than "order", and on page 305 *gong-ma* means "the superior" - that is, the *khri-chen* - rather than "polity". It must be an outlandish dialect (that of Sakya itself?) in which *brgyud* is pronounced "jed" as stated on page ix.

Apart from these few spelling mistakes and the more numerous ventures into etymology, the Tibetan language is very competently handled, and the book is a convincing example of what can be done by Tibetan refugee informants under the prompting of Tibetan-speaking Westerners. A few Tibetans have already demonstrated their ability as traditional scholars, and this work as well as that of P. Carrasco shows what a store of social, political, economic and doubtless more information others are able to

impart. The authors, though not very sympathetic towards the Chinese communists, are careful not to take all statements by these members of the ruling family at face value, and Ekvall's long experience of life in eastern Tibet is useful in placing the whole study in its context. The approach is at times dry and could do with more of the actual episodes, such as the story of the dispute between the wives of the two artisans and how it was settled. The discussion of political principles is likewise over-abstract in places - modern Western fictions such as legitimacy of and sanctions for government make little sense in Tibet where government is judged by its acts. Not surprising, then, that the informants "never quite understood questions about the right of the Sa sKya government to rule its people". Allegedly "Political power was measured by the amount of land and number of people under a government's control." - a statement which is both trite and a considerable over-simplification. As the rest of the book shows, "control" is not to be taken literally. The government possessed no effective army and a minimal police force, could not prevent its subjects from leaving the area, could not enforce its own schedules of taxation, and could not have withstood a revolt by a large section of its population. Nor did it practice any form of political indoctrination. Relations between government and governed were really based on a series of tacit mutual understandings.

Generally, however, the observations are pertinent and reveal a good deal of insight into the attitudes and reasoning of the people of Sakyas, who, despite their primitive economy and hard conditions of life, had a remarkably fair and just government. Some of the government's leniency can be explained by the fact, not sufficiently stressed by the authors, that the characteristically Tibetan lack of population pressure made the government keen to attract people to its land and wary of driving them away, but moral principles also entered into it - it was recognized that a man was entitled to feed himself and his family, by theft if all else failed, before he was obliged to pay tax and rent. The most barbaric practice of the government - the flogging of suspects - is discussed in the interesting chapter on legal principles and practices. The authors conclude that it was "an expression of the power and majesty of government, an indication of what happened to people who came under the jurisdiction of the Law Officials". The second part of this statement no doubt contains some truth, but the first attributes motives for which there is little evidence. The actual cases described would suggest that the main purpose of flogging was to ensure the co-operation of the suspect and to test his story in a society where it was often impossible to find out the truth by police investigations.

The authors attempt to work out the revenues and costs of the government and thereby the level of taxation and general standard of living. This is a worth-while and doubtless feasible task, but the analysis is presented in a most confusing way (Appendix D). It is not clear quite how the calculations are made, nor what is the precise definition of "government" - does the revenue include all payments made to nobles, palaces, and monasteries or not? The information required seems to be there, but needs to be re-worked on a more systematic basis and in a clearer form. We are told on one page that "The total income in cash and kind of the Government was 7,800 rDo TSHad" and on another that "Maintaining a governmental apparatus cost the people of Sa sKya proper about 17,100 rDo TSHad."

There is an impressive array of maps, photographs, footnotes and appendixes and a useful index. The photographs, all unattributed, include an interesting shot of the South Monastery which I have not seen before. Despite detailed criticisms, the book is a much-needed and solid contribution to Tibetan studies.

P. T. DENWOOD

Victoria Contag, *Chinese Masters of the 17th Century*, 53 pp., with an index; 83 half-tone plates. Translated by Michael Bullock. Lund Humphries, 1969. £6 6s.

Dr. Contag has shown herself elsewhere to be an admirer of the seventeenth-century painters of China who accepts as enthusiastically as many of them did the full literary import of the doctrine of scholar's style. Consequently her account of the

painters in this essay of forty-five pages gives a large place to quotations from poems, letters, inscriptions and various apophthegmata which in a traditional Chinese view are so essential in the art and to the European in quest of style so irrelevant. At the outset the author virtually renounces the intention of defining period style when she says that date plays a minor role in determining the characteristics of a painter's work. His individuality is expressed in the finesse of rendering models taken from his predecessors (Wölfflin's concept of the *vorform* is instanced), and the result can be as varied as the possible permutations of a personal gift conjugated through the range of traditional formulae. In view of the revolutionary changes produced in Chinese painting in the seventeenth century in composition and subject, which the author herself has done much to familiarize us with, these opinions can only be called eccentric. They do not attune with other modern trends of criticism, gaining ground in east and west, which no longer see scholar's style and the views of Tung Ch'i-ch'ang as an epitome of all that is valuable in the art and the critical tradition. The spectral intensity which Tung Ch'i-ch'ang bequeathed as a stylistic, not a doctrinaire, influence, and the nervous intensity in Wang Meng's work which stirred the imagination of later generations do not enter into her concept of style. She does not attempt to characterize stylistically the six groups into which she divides the painters, and it is clear that geography and mutual acquaintance are largely the basis of the classification. With that reserve, in which the failing is no greater than that of other writers on this difficult period, the book is wholly praiseworthy as a stimulating survey well designed to initiate readers into the interest of the subject.

The first division, the Southern School, shows the lasting influence of the values extolled by Tung Ch'i-ch'ang, and forms a foil to the account of the Individualists which follows, but the latter are introduced only as demonstrating "the various, very different possibilities of the brush stroke", their transformation of composition and emotional tone being accounted less significant. The section called *The Six Ch'ing Masters working in different styles* is the most suggestive, dealing with seventeenth-century treatments of specific past styles, but in four pages the problem can be barely sketched. Ch'en Hung-shou, a problematic figure even among the eccentrics of his age, is allotted the sixth and final chapter to himself, which perhaps gives him undeserved prominence.

We owe much to Dr. Contag's publications for acquainting us with a large number of paintings in private collections which are not otherwise accessible, and the present work is no exception in this respect. The plates are of unusually good quality. The clarity of the translation will be appreciated by readers familiar with the complexity of the author's German style.

WILLIAM WATSON

Shrine Shinto after World War II, by Wilhelmus H. M. Creemers. 194 pp., Biographical Notes, Glossary, Appendixes, Bibliography, Japanese Texts, Index. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1968, 41 guilders.

This book contains all the elements for understanding in general terms what has happened to Shinto since the war. The first of these, of course, is understanding what it was before the war. This is adequately dealt with in chapters I and II concerned, respectively, with definitions and the historical development up to the time of the Religious Organizations Law of 1939. The definitions are as diverse as the historical accretions. But by the time the war broke out there can be discerned two generally accepted main features of the Shinto cult: a primitive animism developed over the centuries into "a way of life" and the inclusion within that "way of life" of the monarchical institution and the national polity.

Virtually all the pundits of the American Occupation were convinced that the two latter inclusions were largely responsible for the development of the militarist nationalism of the "thirties" and therefore for the war itself, as is pointed out by Dr. Monnier.¹

¹ Claude Monnier, *Les Américaines et Sa Majesté L'Empereur, Etude du conflit culturel d'où naquit la Constitution japonaise de 1946*, Université de Genève, 1967.

Chapter II of the book under review gives a detailed account of what they did about it, first by Supreme Command directive and subsequently by influence on the Japanese authorities.

They found themselves faced with essentially the same problem, in reverse, as their pre-war Japanese predecessors, despite the diametrically opposed motives animating them, the problem of "freedom of religion". As Dr. Creemers points out when speaking of the pre-war situation: "As a result of the freedom of religion granted by the Constitution in 1889, the government could not very well foster a state religion by favoring State Shinto in preference to other religions. By eliminating some religious characteristics from the shrines, however, it managed to keep control of those institutions which would nurture the popular sentiments of loyalty to the Emperor and the nation" (p. 98). As to the American occupationaires, "freedom of religion" had been promised by the Potsdam Declaration before ever they arrived on the scene. But since at least a part of the Shinto cult, in their judgment, had served to launch the nation on a career of aggressive war, this cult could obviously not be left "free" to operate in the same way as before the defeat. They had, then, to make the same compromise in reverse as their predecessors who had eliminated some religious characteristics from the shrines in order to "keep control of the institutions which nurture popular sentiments of loyalty to the Emperor and the nation", namely, to *restore* some religious characteristics to the shrines so that they could be "free" to continue their existence when the political implications of the cult had been disposed of. The Shinto Directive of December 15, 1945 dealt pretty comprehensively with these implications not only by eliminating State responsibility for all shrines, but also by prohibiting the teaching of Shinto doctrine and mythology in State schools.

But one political implication of the Shinto cult was only marginally dealt with by this Directive, the position of the Emperor. Dr. Creemers points out that the Supreme Command was "very careful not to attempt any direct attack on the Emperor's position. It rather aimed at the destruction of the ideology on which the Emperor's supremacy had been based since Meiji" (p. 123). The decisive initiative in this matter was taken by His Majesty himself in the New Year's Day Rescript of 1946, in which he repudiated "the false conception that the Emperor is divine".

Dr. Creemers provides, in the text (pp. 129-32) and the appendixes, most of the available material on the origins of this initiative. He summarizes the record of Tamon Maeda, published in 1962, and a newspaper account in 1960 of the role played by Admiral Katsunoshin Yamanashi, quotes some remarks made in 1962 by Dr. R. H. Blyth, an Englishman, and gives in full the hitherto unpublished record of the American Professor Harold G. Henderson.² These accounts vary to some extent in detail as to who did what, when, how and why. So, I must add, did those communicated to me, later in 1946 and subsequently,³ by most of the participants, including the then Prime Minister, Kijuro Shidehara, the then Foreign Minister, Shigeru Yoshida, and officials of the Imperial Household Agency who were present at the various interviews with His Majesty. But all are agreed that the concrete suggestion of such a Rescript originated not with the Supreme Command as such, but with others outside Japanese official circles, that it was welcome there, particularly to his Majesty himself, and that the final draft was approved by the Cabinet and by General MacArthur to whom it came as "a welcome surprise" (p. 124). As Dr. Creemers puts it, "no compulsion was brought to bear upon the Japanese but suggestions were certainly made and willingly followed" (p. 131).

This personal pronouncement by the Emperor facilitated the task of the new Constitution makers of 1946 and also in many ways the implementation of the Shinto

² Respectively, in 1945-6, Minister of Education, President of the Peers School, teacher at the Peers School and tutor to the Crown Prince, and Special Adviser to the Civil Information and Education Section of the Supreme Command.

³ The reviewer, Sir Vere Redman, was Counsellor at the United Kingdom Liaison Mission (after 1952 The British Embassy), Tokyo, from February 1946 to July 1961.

Directive. But there were still problems. As Dr. Creemers points out, the American view was that "The problems remaining after the implementation of the basic measure—the separation of religion and state . . . were to be resolved by the Japanese themselves" (p. 144). Most of these problems were concerned with the status and functions of the leading shrines.

The most important of these from this point of view are Ise and Yasukuni and the author devotes the whole of chapter VII to their modern status and the arguments for its modification. As matters now stand, both are recognized as private and purely religious organizations. But the supporters of both, for slightly different reasons, are endeavouring to secure for them some kind of "national" status. The Ise problem is complicated by the fact that traditionally the shrine must be completely rebuilt every twenty years and this involves expenditure beyond the means of a private body. A more important complication is the fact that the shrine is unquestionably "imperial" and has long been the custodian of the Sacred Mirror, the most important of the insignia of office handed down from Emperor to Emperor on accession. Under its pre-war status this raised no difficulty, but there is an obvious incongruity in a private religious organization having custody of, and being responsible for, an object which clearly does not belong to it, and, indeed, belongs to the reigning Emperor only during his reign. There is also the related problem in connexion with the pre-war custom of the Emperor, Prime Ministers and other eminent State officials "reporting" accession to office, or outstanding national events, to the Ise Shrine.

The Yasukuni Shrine problem has proved slightly less difficult to handle. The Shrine "cannot claim a long historical tradition nor a close relationship to the Imperial House" (p. 160). Its claim to be considered "national" lies in the "fact that it enshrines those who gave their lives for the sake of the country" (p. 160). Various attempts were made, then, by both the Shrine authorities and others to get it recognized as a national memorial to war dead, certainly not sectarian, or, for that matter, particularly religious in character, similar to such memorials in other countries. But these received a setback by the construction in 1959 with public funds of a non-denominational monument to the unknown soldier on a site not far from Yasukuni (p. 84).

There are several shrines in other parts of the country which have much the same characteristics as Ise and Yasukuni, respectively. Redefinition of the status of these two, then, would set a pattern which could be followed in the case of the others. But the Japanese have at least this in common with the British, a combination of ambivalence and of reluctance for change in matters of this kind. Consequently, decision still hangs fire and it seems to emerge from Dr. Creemers's study that some of the problems of the more famous of the Shinto shrines will remain without categorical solution for many years to come, perhaps, indeed, for ever.

It is with such "problems", of course, that Dr. Creemers's book is mainly concerned. He speaks of the vast body of shrines, registered under the post-war Religious Corporations Ordinance and members of the Association of Shinto Shrines established in 1946, and says that they have mostly "succeeded in making themselves self-supporting and serving their supporters as centers of religious activity" (p. 176), but he gives little indication as to what that "religious activity" consists of, although he censures the Association, justifiably no doubt, for having "tended more and more to give the non-religious or national aspects of Shrine Shinto its chief attention" (p. 177). In the concluding sentence of the book, he says that "Shrine Shinto . . . has more to gain from an effort to deepen and clarify the faith of its believers than by trying to regain what was lost and actually existed for only a relatively short period of time." The trouble is, of course, that this inherent dichotomy goes deep, as Dr. Creemers's study reveals, since Shrine Shinto as a whole has been pervaded since Meiji by State Shinto and the tail has wagged the dog a little too long for the animal to get accustomed to walking confidently without it. But those who, in good times and bad, have come to appreciate the values, ethical and aesthetic, which this cult has vouchsafed to the Japanese people are not without hope that these can survive, however muddled their doctrine and organization, as an aid to living even to the Japan of the consumers' society.

Günther Debon and Chou Chün-shan, *Lob der Naturtreue*, a translation, with introduction and commentary, of the *Hsiao-shan hua-p'u* (the painting manual of Mount Hsiao) by Tsou I-kuei (1686-1772), 177 pp., with index and bibliography; 4 colour plates. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1969.

Tsou I-kuei, high official and painter at the court of Ch'ien Lung,¹ was a specialist in flowers. His treatise on painting, of which only brief excerpts had been translated before the appearance of the present work, was notorious chiefly for its dismissal of all European painting as mere journeyman stuff, obsessed with realism. But Tsou was a realist in his own terms: he puts vraisemblance as a first principle, stating unequivocally that in his view to rank Hsieh Ho's *ch'i yüen* as the first desideratum is to speak as a connoisseur and not as a creative artist, that the apotheosis of the "gentleman painter" (*shih-ta-fu*) by Su Tung-p'o and of the "scholar painter" by Tung Ch'i-ch'ang amounts to literary camouflage in different periods of the same acceptance of sheer artistic incompetence. In his excellent introduction the author takes the theme of the distinction between the *shih-ta-fu* painters and the *wen-jen* painters to a point not reached in previous western writing, and attempted in the east only by Nakamura Shigeo in his recent *Chügoku-garom no tenkai*. The difference is between a style in which the graphic element is emphasized and one in which literary and historical influences are cultivated to the point of stylistic allegory; but the difference is also, as Tsou I-kuei rather fearlessly recognizes, a mere social one, the *shih-ta-fu* being a very high official in office, the *wen-jen* only a scholar, and often a mere unemployed junior official. Herein lies the point of the association of the former with the *li* script in the famous dialogue between Ch'ien Hsüan and Chao Meng-fu. In effect Tsou I-kuei is presented as rejoining a tradition of Chinese criticism which was obfuscated by Tung Ch'i-ch'ang's unhistorical and tendentious formulation of the scholars' style. In doing this Dr. Debon perhaps sharpens up a little too eagerly the outlines of the Ch'ing critic's philosophy of painting, for in the *Hua-p'u* are to be found some inconsistencies and contradictions: for example, having once castigated Su Tung-p'o, Tsou I-kuei goes on to rank him with artists who excelled in the criticism of painting and in the handling of the brush.

One element of consistency in Tsou I-kuei's manual is, however, very striking, and witnesses to unusual insight in assessing the theories and motives of earlier and influential critics. His professional adherence to a literal reading of the forms of nature as the only means of capturing the essential reality lying behind the forms, logically entailed the rejection of "hsieh i", the painting of the idea, and the demotion and simultaneous reformulation of the principle of *ch'i yüen*. In a gratifyingly concise and objective treatment of this question Dr. Debon defines Tsou's interpretation as the response to the living reality of the subject in the mind of the beholder (a view reinforced by the substitution of *yün* "transference" for *yün* "echo" etc. in the text of the *Hua-p'u*), and independently comes to conclusions resembling those of Wen Fong in his recent article on *The First Principle of Hsieh Ho*.

The translation, where the contribution of Frau Dr. Chou Chün-shan chiefly lies, cannot be faulted, and is fully annotated. It follows the text edited in 1937 by Yü An-lan, omitting only the plant catalogue in the first book and the supplement to the first book. The pungency of Tsou's writing provokes reflexion on the seriousness of the flower-painting tradition as still practised in recent times, and invites comparison with the discriminating originality of Ch'ing scholarship in other fields.

WILLIAM WATSON

John DeFrancis, *Index Volume: Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced Texts in Spoken and Written Chinese*, xvii+422 pp. New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1970, Paper 62s, cloth 113s.

The main body of this book is an index, arranged according to the *Pinyin* transcription, of all the vocabulary contained in the text and notes of the nine text-books of modern Chinese published by Professor DeFrancis. At first sight such a volume might seem superfluous, since the text-books themselves each contained separate indexes. However, since most terms occur in more uses than the ones illustrated in the separate

volumes, this book offers a convenient way of checking on all the uses of any word or construction throughout the series. It should be particularly useful for the teacher.

There are four separate indexes of characters at the end: (1) arranged according to *Pinyin* giving stroke and radical numbers; (2) according to stroke number; (3) according to radicals; and (4) an index of variant forms.

GEORGE WEYS

Werner Eichhorn, *Heldensagen aus dem Unteren Yangtse-tal (Wu-Yüeh Ch'un-ch'iu)*, (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Band XXXVIII, 2.) Wiesbaden, Kommissionsverlag Fr. Steiner, 1969, 153 pp.

This book is a complete translation of the *Wu-Yüeh ch'un-ch'iu*, a text which describes events in the feudal state of Wu between 585 and 473 B.C. and in the state of Yüeh between 492 to 470 B.C. The text, in its present form extant since the end of the thirteenth century A.D. seems to be a compilation of different materials, some of which may even be as old as the fourth century B.C. A book of this title seems to have existed from the second century A.D. on.

Professor Eichhorn is not interested in these problems of authenticity, nor does he attempt to present us with a philological translation of the book. In fact, his translation is almost without footnotes and Eichhorn admits that he may not have understood some of the difficult passages. He wants to give us a readable translation which preserves the style of Chinese story-telling (p. 6). He regards this book not as an historical source, but as a collection of heroic tales from the lower Yang-tse valley, in some ways, as a precursor of the famous *wu-hsia* 武俠 novels of later and recent times. It certainly is not a "ch'un-ch'iu" in the usual sense, though it can be compared with such works as *Yen-tse ch'un-ch'iu* and perhaps even the *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu*. On the other hand, the book has similarities in style with the *Chan-kuo ts'ê*, a book which recently also has been described as a story-book rather than an historical source. The main heroes in the *Wu-Yüeh ch'un-ch'iu* are some kings and their clever ministers, mainly Wu Tse-hsü, who first served Wu, then fled to Yüeh and instigated Yüeh to make war against Wu in order to take revenge for the murder of his family by the ruler of Wu. Already M. Granet has interpreted the story of Wu Tse-hsü as well as other stories in this book as legends and myths; some of the long discussions between kings and ministers can be regarded as lectures in statecraft, some even as moralistic lectures. In some sections one of the disputants presents the viewpoint of Confucian ethics, while the other presents the *wu-hsia* code. Usually, the representative of the *wu-hsia* code turns out to be the better politician, the more successful man. The king of Yüeh had to surrender to Wu and was kept a prisoner, together with his wife, in Wu for many years. The Confucianist prime minister of Wu proposes an amnesty. Such an act of generosity would raise the prestige of Wu in all of China. Wu Tse-hsü, the heroic minister, recommends the execution of the prisoner: when a country is annihilated, its ruler has to be killed in order to avoid any possibility of a revenge in the future. The king does not listen to Wu Tse-hsü and finally loses his state to the king of Yüeh whose only thought always had been revenge and who had not been impressed at all by the act of clemency shown by his enemy, the king of Wu. Passages like these show already the basic element of the heroic morality: revenge is a superior moral concept. Any act, including betrayal and deceit, is justifiable if it serves to achieve the ultimate aim. Modern novels of this type do not hesitate to let even a Buddha tell lies, if this serves to punish a man who has committed a crime against Buddhists. The book also contains another typical figure of *wu-hsia* novels: an heroic girl (chapter 9) who excels in the art of war and teaches it to a man. Many modern *wu-hsia* novels and films are built completely around the heroic girl who defeats many manly heroes and finally marries a rather weak scholar.

I think that Eichhorn's understanding of the book is correct. It may now be time to bring together the different existing studies on the concept of heroism in China, on the history of heroic fiction, and on legends and myths of Central China. This may on the one side give new insights into Chinese psychology, on the other side insights into

the pseudo-historical fiction of China. It might also give new insights into the character of the *Kuo-yü* and *Chan-huo ts'ê*. I would have liked to see some of this done in the "Introduction", but perhaps Eichhorn wants to do this in a special book.

WOLFRAM EBERHARD

Verrier Elwin (ed.), *The Nagas in the Nineteenth Century*, xii+650 pp. Bombay, Oxford University Press, 1969.

The late Dr. Elwin's new anthology, following upon the success of his *India's North-East Frontier in the Nineteenth Century*, is a treasury of first-hand observations and a testimony to the remarkable men and women whose scattered writings on the Naga he has brought together in this handsome volume.

The book is made up of excerpts from the publications of surveyors, soldiers, and administrators between the years 1827 and 1896. After a brief introduction the chapters deal successively with the following topics and peoples: the country of the Nagas; a general view of the Nagas, some aspects of Naga history; early tours among the Nagas; the Angami; the Ao; the Lhota; the Rengma; the Sema; the northeastern Nagas; the Nagas of Cachar; the Nagas of Manipur; Naga religion; some Naga customs and traditions; head-hunting and war; development; and miscellaneous notes. Each chapter is prefaced with general comments by the editor on the topic and on the writers of the pieces chosen. There is an excellent bibliography of works in English on the Naga, based on a Bibliography of the Ethnology of Assam, by J. P. Mills, amplified by Mrs. E. von Furer-Haimendorf's *Anthropological Bibliography of South Asia*, and supplemented by the late J. H. Hutton. The work is illustrated with contemporary line drawings in text, fifteen photographs and sketches, and a reproduction of Mackenzie's 1884 map of the North-East Frontier. There is a quite serviceable index.

The typescript of the anthology was almost ready for publication at the time of Elwin's death in 1964. The editing was completed by Mr. N. K. Rustomji, of the Indian Civil Service, who had been Adviser to the Governor of Assam and has had extensive experience in the tribal areas of the northeastern frontier of India. It is a matter for gratitude that so well qualified a collaborator should have assumed the laborious responsibility of seeing Elwin's large compilation through the press, and that the eventual work should be so eminently satisfactory. The result is certainly a book of much value which every library of Indian studies or anthropology and every student of the area will need to possess. Most of the original sources have long been out of print and scarce, often dispersed in the proceedings of learned societies and in other places which are practically inaccessible to most readers, so that the convenience of having so large and careful a selection of passages in one place is very great.

One hundred and fifteen excerpts, covering such a wide territory and variety of matters over a period of 69 years, do not lend themselves to an over-all report or assessment. They are judiciously selected and well ordered, and taken individually are exceedingly interesting; but the real unity of the book lies most, perhaps, in the moral impression created by the character of the authors. Doubtless they had their defects and limitations, and the imperial cause that they served was not in every way commendable, yet they can stir up a wonderful admiration. Their stance of utter and unreflecting superiority may appear insufferable today (though it must be said that some of the over-bearing and deprecatious Naga whom they encountered could have had little to complain of on this score), but it was bound up with a fortitude which can only abash a modern spectator. Far isolated from any of their own kind, they faced constant dangers from the peoples into whose lands they made their bold incursions and from the huge and little explored environment. They would have done well simply to survive and to carry out their official duties, but that would not have been enough for them. Wherever they went, they zealously took notes on natural history, habitations, topography, traditions, manners and customs, and anything else that caught their alert gaze. Their intelligent curiosity, and their diligence in making records of what they discovered, were astonishing. Though none of the writers represented here was a professional anthropologist, some of them, as Elwin remarks with a touch of understandable asperity,

"wrote better anthropology than many of the supposedly 'trained' young men of the present day". Whatever the sources of their confident energies and enterprise, they were indomitable people.

The world has quite changed since their time, and the challenges they mastered no longer present themselves. To be shot around space in a hermetic container is a technical marvel, but cannot make a moral comparison with the steady courage, drawn out over wearying years, of Capt. John Butler, for one, in the hazards and exploits that he and his colleagues so calmly report. It is with a sense even of privilege, therefore, that one is brought retrospectively, just through the pages of an anthology, into the collective presence of such a sterling company. For anyone who has drawn upon the literature from which Elwin made his selections, it is a special pleasure to re-encounter, and to find all together within these covers, such memorable personalities as Johnstone, Woodthorpe, Godwin-Austen, and Mrs. Grimwood, to catch glimpses of Tulloch, Vincent, and Needham. Probably the last of their kind, in the Naga Hills, was the late J. P. Mills, a scholarly, brave, and good man to whom – as to those predecessors commemorated by Dr. Elwin – the Naga themselves owed much.

A more circumstantial merit of this book, finally, is the appeal that it will make to the recollections of any one who have themselves been in the Naga Hills. Many will have found the country "all very wild and beautiful", just as Mrs. Grimwood did; those who took part in the battle of Kohima in 1944, relieving the siege set by the Japanese army, will find a piquant interest in the accounts by Johnstone and by Mrs. Cawley of the siege and relief of Kohima in 1879; and, far outweighing everything else, any reader who has marched through the hills and has depended upon the Naga, especially the Angami, for hospitality, guidance, and support, will respond time and again, through these veridical accounts from the last century, to the enduring qualities of the Naga peoples.

RODNEY NEEDHAM

R. E. Emmerick, *The Khotanese Śārangamasādhisūtra* (London Oriental Series, Vol. 23), xxiii + 133 pp. + 20 pl. London, Oxford University Press, 1970. £5.

A rather large portion of the Khotanese Ś[ūra]n[g]a[s]amādhisūtra has been preserved. The remaining folios belong to three groups which were identified by Dr. Emmerick, E. Leumann and H. W. Bailey. They correspond to the following sections of Lamotte's translation of Kumārajīva's Chinese version: §§ 3-4, 125-52. Dr. Emmerick gives a literal translation of the Tibetan version wherever the Khotanese is missing. The passages translated from the Khotanese are in italics. The Tibetan text is critically edited on the basis of the four following editions: Derge, Lhasa, Narthang, and Peking. A Tibetan index discusses a few words of special interest. All Khotanese words are listed in the glossary. It gives all references for all words and, where possible, the Tibetan equivalent for each Khotanese form. The translation is followed by a detailed commentary. The introduction deals with such matters as the date of the Khotanese manuscript and of the Khotanese translation, the title of the Śgs., Khotanese fragments with Śgs. associations, archaic orthography, the two manuscripts to which the folios and fragments belong, and with the Tibetan translation.

It must be left to specialists to discuss the new readings and interpretations of the Khotanese text proposed by Dr. Emmerick. The interest of this publication is not limited to the field of Khotanese studies. The Khotanese version of the Śgs. is also important from the point of view of the history of the Śgs. The Chinese translation dates from the beginning of the fifth century, the Tibetan one from the ninth century. Dr. Emmerick remarks in his introduction that the Śgs. may have been translated into Khotanese before the earliest extant Chinese translation, that made by Kumārajīva c. A.D. 400. Dr. Emmerick has indicated in the commentary where the Khotanese agrees with the Chinese against the Tibetan. The comparison of the Khotanese and Chinese versions is hampered by the fact that both versions do not attain the same degree of literalness as shown by the Tibetan version. When comparing the Khotanese

version with the two others, we must bear in mind the following four possibilities: the Khotanese version agrees (1) with the Chinese, (2) with the Tibetan, (3) with both, and (4) with neither of them. In quite a few cases the Khotanese agrees with the Chinese, but in others it agrees with the Tibetan. This may suggest that the Khotanese version has to be placed somewhere between the Chinese and Tibetan versions, perhaps closer to the first than to the second. If the Khotanese version of the Śgs. is one of the oldest Khotanese translations, as may be suggested by the archaic features of the orthography (cf. Intr. pp. xix-xxi), it would mean that the existing manuscripts are not much younger than the translations themselves and that both manuscripts and translations would have to be put in the second half of the first millennium A.D. Of course, a comparative study of other Khotanese versions and corresponding Chinese and Tibetan versions is necessary in order to corroborate this hypothesis.

The Khotanese version often helps us greatly in restoring the original Sanskrit text. In § 3 the Khotanese contains the names Mahāratnaketu and Prabhāketu. In both names *ketu* corresponds exactly to Tibetan *tog*, whereas the Chinese version has *hsiang* 嚮 rendered by Lamotte as *lakṣaṇa*. In this case it is obvious that the Sanskrit text must have had *ketu* and not *lakṣaṇa*. In the same section the name Sāgaragūṇaratnavyūhamati is reconstructed by the editor on the basis of Sāgaragūṇara- in the Khotanese manuscript and the corresponding versions. Lamotte reconstructs this name as Gūṇaratnavyūhasamudramati (cf. Tib. yon-tan rin-po-che bkod-pa rgya-mtsho'i blo-gros). However, the Chinese text has 海德寶嚴淨意 which corresponds exactly to Sāgaragūṇaratnavyūhamati. In § 133 Lamotte translates *fu-t'ien* 福田 with *punyaḥkṣetra* but the Khotanese version has *dakṣiṇīya* which agrees with Tibetan *shyin-pa'i gñas* (see also Leumann, *Buddhistische Literatur, nordarisch und deutsch*, I. Teil: Nebenstücke, Leipzig, 1920, p. 100). In § 138 Khotanese Sarvaratnapra- has enabled Dr. Emmerick to reconstruct Sarvaratnapratyupā as the name of the buddhakṣetra. Here Lamotte has Sarvaratnaracati. According to the Khotanese version the name of the bodhisattva in §§ 136-8 is Saśivimalagarbha (cf. Daśabhūmika, p. 2.7) and not Vimalacandragarbha as given by Lamotte.

On page 11 Dr. Emmerick translates Tibetan *bdud dan phyir rgo!-ba bcom-pa* with "they have conquered Māra and the adversaries", cf. also Lamotte, p. 227: "vainqueurs de Māra et des adversaires (*nihatamārapratyarthika*)". I believe that Ensink's translation of this expression is to be preferred: "having destroyed Māra, the adversary" (*The Question of Rāstrapāla*, Zwolle, 1952, p. 1). The same expression occurs in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka (Bibl. Buddh. p. 430.1), the Karuṇapūṇḍarīka (ed. I. Yamada, p. 78.7) and the Lalitavistara (ed. S. Lefmann, p. 8.16-17: *nihatamārapratyarthikarya*, read *nihatamāra*). The text of the following passage is almost entirely missing in the Khotanese manuscripts. Dr. Emmerick suggests that the Khotanese may have read "well-closed for them the paths to the Apāyas" (cf. p. 63). Lamotte translates Chinese 斷諸業 as "libérés des destinées mauvaises (*ksīṇāpāya*)". According to Dr. Emmerick Tibetan has *ltui-ba bcad-pa* "they have cut off Apāya". I believe that both renderings are open to objections. Chin. *tuan* 斷 does not correspond to *ksīṇa*, and the expression *ksīṇāpāya* is not attested elsewhere. Tibetan *ltui-ba* renders *āpatti*, *patana*, etc. but never *apāya*. Dr. Emmerick quotes Suvarṇabhāṣottama 62.1: *pīṭhitāni me trīṇy apāyapathāni*. Chinese *tuan* 斷 and Tibetan *bcad-pa* both probably correspond to *pīṭhita* (cf. Lalitavistara, p. 46.7 *pīṭhitum apāyapatha*; Tibetan *nan-son nams-kyi lam gcod-cin*). If Tibetan *ltui-ba* is an error for *nan-son*, both the Chinese and Tibetan versions correspond to *pīṭhitāny apāyāni*. I have not been able to find this expression in the texts which seem to expand this expression. For instance Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra, ch. 12: *de-dag-gis nan-son thams-cad ni bcad* which Lamotte translates as follows: "ceux-ci barreront toutes les mauvaises destinées (*ḍurgati*)". Hsüan-tsang seems to have read *apāyapathāni* (cf. Lamotte, *l'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti*, Louvain, 1962 p. 371). However, Kumārajīva's translation agrees with the Tibetan. In other places, *dvāra*, *patha* or *mārga* is added after *apāya*, cf. Divyāvadāna, p. 554.26 *pīṭhitāny apāyadvārāni*, p. 554.28 *pīṭhitāḥ sughoro hy apāyamārgo*. Lalitavistara p. 46.7, p. 117.9 *apāyapātha*. Elsewhere both *sarva* and *dvāra* are added, cf. Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā ed. N. Dutt, p. 75.15 *sarvāny apāyadvārāni pīṭhitāni*. This example shows that a

well-known cliché can occur in many different forms. This is of importance for the reconstruction of defective passages. In the Khotanese passage only *-ndā* remains. Both Leumann and Bailey have read *sāndā*. According to Dr. Emmerick *sāndā* "earth" does not seem required here. However, the expression *apāyabhūmi* is not unknown, cf. Suvarṇabhāṣottama, p. 23.11; Lalitavistara, p. 178.7, 9. In this case, the presence of a well-known cliché is not of great help in reconstructing the Khotanese text. The many variants of this cliché make it impossible to reconstruct the original Sanskrit text and, consequently, the Khotanese text.

Another cliché is to be found on the same page (p. 11; 2.4 v 3-4). Dr. Emmerick remarks that the Chinese has here the cliché: *śrutevādhimokṣyanti udgrahīṣyanti dhārayīṣyanti vācayīṣyanti paryavāṣyanti adhimucya deśayīṣyanti upadekṣyanti parebhya uddeḥṣyanti bhāvanākāreṇa prayokṣyanti* (p. 64; cf. Lamotte, p. 227). The same cliché occurs in § 11 of the Śgs. where we find: *adhimucya, udgrhṇāti, dhārayati vācayati, parebhyaḥ samprakāśayati, bhāvanāyogena prayunakti* (Lamotte, p. 126). This reconstruction follows closely Kumārajīva's Chinese version (630 b 11-12). In § 129 Kumārajīva's translation is almost the same (641 a 15) and it is difficult to understand why the Sanskrit text here would be much more expanded. In both cases the cliché ends with the following passage: 如說修行 "in accordance to what has been preached he applies himself to it". According to Lamotte this corresponds to Sanskrit *bhāvanākāreṇa prayunakti*. On page 126, note 28 he refers to his translation of the Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra, page 368, note 16, where references are given to several texts in which this cliché is to be found. The Tibetan translation has here: *sgom-pa'i rnal-'byor-la rjes-su sbyor-ba rñams* (same translation in ch. XII.2, Lamotte, p. 371). This does not correspond to *bhāvanākāreṇa prayunakti*. In only one of the passages, referred to by Lamotte, is this expression found: Daśabhūmika, p. 98.23 *bhāvanākāreṇa prayokṣyante*, but, according to Rahder's Glossary, the Tibetan translation corresponds exactly to the Sanskrit text. The Sanskrit equivalent of the Tibetan expression, quoted above, is to be found in Lamotte's reconstruction of the Sanskrit text of § 175 of the Śgs., cf. Lamotte p. 273, *bhāvanāyogam anuyuktaḥ*. In § 129 of the Śgs. the Tibetan translation has only *mos-pa*. In such cases it is difficult to know whether the original text is abridged or the translation. In any case, Kumārajīva's Chinese translation does not warrant the reconstructions given by Lamotte (p. 227) and by Dr. Emmerick (p. 64). Dr. Emmerick supplies *ays[mū]na* [byāta yanda] "remembers it with his mind". This reminds us of one of the variants of the cliché, not listed by Lamotte, in which the word *manasikarīṣyanti* is to be found: Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra p. 478.7. (cf. also *id.*, p. 226.5 *anusmaret*).

In some places the Khotanese translation seems to have misunderstood the text. Page 11 (2.4 r 5) *avāḥkālta-usā[v]ā* "of indestructible endurance". Both Tibetan and Chinese have read *ksānta* and *utsāha* seems here out of place. Page 41 (3.11 r 4) *duḥkarūṇa amāṇḍāna salōva* "extraordinary, unprecedented words". The use of *duḥkarūṇa* "difficult" (cf. glossary) is strange. Tibetan has *no-mtshar* which usually corresponds to *āścarya*. On page 29 (3.5 r 4) Dr. Emmerick translates *jsei'nu vātā* as "quickly" (I have quickly expounded the merits of Nirvāṇa), referring to KT 6.92. Here *jsei'na* is rendered as "small (fine, short)". Would it not be possible to interpret *jsei'nu vātā* as "in detail"?

In the Tibetan index Dr. Emmerick discusses the meaning of Tibetan *bla-dvags* in *tshig bla-dvags*. He quotes Chos-grags' explanation *miñ-gi tha-sñad btags-pa* "to etymologize a word". I do not believe that this translation is correct. It is of course difficult to know exactly what is meant by *miñ-gi tha-sñad*, but it does not seem to mean something different from *miñ* alone, cf. Chos-grags: *tha-sñad btags-pa - miñ-du btags-pa*. Another Tibetan dictionary (*Dag-yig thon-mi'i dgon-s-rgyan*, Vol. 2, Mtsho-sñon, 1957, p. 237) explains *bla-dvags* as follows: *bla-dvags ni - phral-du sbyar-ba'i miñ-ste chog-pa'am ruñ-bar btags-pa zes Glen-'bum brda-bkrol-du bsād* "a word which is immediately attached as being suitable or fit; this is the explanation given in the Glen-'bum." Finally, one must point out that *tshig bla-dvags* regularly translates *adhivacana* a term which occurs quite often in Prajñāpāramitā texts (cf. Edward Conze, *Materials for a Dictionary of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, Tokyo, 1967, p. 16: *adhivacana - tshig bla-dvags - synonym*). One has to correct here *dvags* in *dags*. Usually this word is

written *dvags* in which case the *va-zur* serves to distinguish in writing *dags* and *dgas*. Edgerton renders *adhivacana* as "designation, appellation, name, term".

May we conclude by expressing the wish that Dr. Emmerick will edit and translate in the same way other Khotanese versions of Buddhist texts. Khotanese Buddhist texts are not only important to the few specialists in Khotanese studies but to all those who are interested in the history of the transmission of Buddhist texts.

Additional note. H. W. Bailey points out that *jseina-* 'small' refers to size. There is no case so far found where reference to time is certain.

Khotanese Texts III 60, l. 35 *ttu sūtri birāṣamī jsiṃṃā* '(as to) this sūtra, we will expound it in *jseina-* fashion' – 'briefly' or 'in detail' or 'in its small points'.

Ibid. l. 43 *tye sūtri vira vistāri dā ṣṭi u miri haṃbistā hvīṃde* 'in this sūtra the dharma is vast and here it is taught in compact form'.

Ibid. l. 57 *ṣṭi buri hve śāstārā haṃbistāna sūtrā* 'this so great a teacher taught in compact form the sūtra'.

J. W. DE JONG

Martin Gimm, *Das "Yüeh-fu tsa-lu" des Tuan An-chieh*, Wiesbaden, 1966, 631 pp.

This book is a most important contribution to the study of the music and performing arts of the T'ang period. It is an exhaustive study of the *Yüeh-fu tsa-lu*, a short text on music compiled in the 890's by Tuan An-chieh. After a detailed discussion of the author and his family, and a lengthy account of the various editions of the text with translations of many critical accounts of it by later Chinese authors, the body of the book comprises a most copiously annotated integral translation of the whole text. The translation is accurate and takes account of all important variants. The annotation not only includes many lengthy essays on various technical points, but also incorporates much material from the somewhat earlier works *chiaofang chi* 教坊記 and *Chieh-ku lu* 羯鼓錄, together with a great deal of parallel material from T'ang literary sources, particularly from ninth-century poetry. The book has an excellent index of proper names and a glossary of technical terms, so that it will be of great value as a reference work. The author has also taken into account most of the modern secondary literature on T'ang music. I noted only one important omission, the important critical study of *Chiao-fang chi* by Jen Pan-t'ang 任半塘, *Chiao-fang chi chien-ting* 教坊記箋訂 (Shanghai 1962), an edition almost as profuse in its commentary as is Professor Gimm himself. It is to be hoped that *Chiao-fang chi* and *Chieh-ku lu* will also be presented in a Western language translation. This work, although it may well be criticized on points of technical detail, sets a high standard for future work of its kind, and helps prepare the ground for really thorough study of what we know of T'ang music.

D. C. TWITCHETT

Helmuth von Glasenapp, *Buddhism – a non-theistic religion* (translated by I. Schloegel. London, George Allen & Unwin, 1970.

Is Buddhism atheistic? – That controversy over this question should still persist among students of Buddhism is no doubt a reflection on two facts: (a) the vagueness of the concept "god", whose existence is denied by atheism; and (b) the formidable complexity and diversity of attitudes, views and interpretations that make up the teachings of Buddhism. The book under review makes out the case for the claim that Buddhism is atheistic. This claim is further related to another contemporaneous controversy: the adequacy or otherwise of the conventionally adopted definition of religion. For the author's ultimate concern is to prove that though atheistic, Buddhism is a religion. He has subsequently restated his main conclusion in his article "Buddhism and comparative religion" (*Fest. Liebenthal, Sino-Indian Studies*, Vol. V, parts 3-4, Santiniketan 1957): "So there can be no doubt whatever about the fact that Buddhism has been atheistic for at least two thousand years."

Von Glasenapp's position is predetermined by the restrictive procedures adopted by him in his book. As the decisive principle in defining theism he takes the Judeo-Christian variety of a monotheistic Creator. He then proceeds to argue out his thesis by analysing a vast corpus of supporting quotations, which, however, are largely philosophical, as distinct from theological, in character. These he chooses to regard as belonging to basic and original Buddhism, even though historically they may very well have constituted subsequent rationalizations. Incidentally, a curious omission in his analysis is that of *Īśvarakartṛtvaṇirāṅkti*, "Refutation of the idea of God as Creator", an essay attributed to Nāgārjuna, first published by F. W. Thomas in *JRAS*, 1903.

Contrary evidence, pointing to the Buddha or Buddhahood being accredited with divine characteristics is not entirely excluded by the author from his study, but its weight and relevance are suppressed. It is brought up by him only to be dismissed as a secondary, late and less typical development, and above all as not wholly conforming to the decisive Christian model of a Creator God.

The vulnerability of the author's methods may easily be exposed by referring to some of his own casual observations. Thus he aptly remarks that "we must consider all forms of religious expression, and not just those with which we happen to be personally familiar. A zoologist, too, does not limit himself to the European fauna only, but he must take into consideration that of other continents as well" (pp. 56-7). Elsewhere in the book the author invokes the analogy of the botanist, for whom the fully developed form of a tree should be of far greater significance than the originating seed. In another interesting observation, which similarly militates against his own approach, he points out that "ancient writers called the Christians 'atheists' because they did not believe in the gods of the state" (p. 16). The reader cannot help wondering: Could it not be the case that the present characterization of Buddhism as atheistic by Western Christian scholars is similarly due to failure to comprehend the entirely different nature of divine being involved in the Buddhist creed?

Von Glasenapp's study marks a watershed in the history of the controversy over Buddhist atheism. In its original German edition, entitled *Buddhismus und Gottesidee*, it was first published in 1954. It was then the culmination of earlier and similarly oriented studies, such as de La Vallée Poussin's article in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of religion and ethics* (s.v. "atheism : Buddhist"). But only one year later, in 1955, it was superseded by T. R. V. Murti's *The central philosophy of Buddhism* (also published by George Allen & Unwin). In the latter a fundamental Buddhist theology was systematically unfolded. By wider and deeper study of source-materials – particularly those relating to the Mādhyamika school – and by operating with the wider concept of Godhead, a corrective was achieved in it which greatly helped to redress the balance in the controversy over Buddhist atheism. Murti's functional comparisons are illuminating: "The *Tathāgata* as the Perfect Man (*uttama puriṣa parama puriṣo*, *Sam. N.*, IV, p. 380) is the ultimate essence of the universe. His position is analogous to that of God of Rational Theology (*ens realissimum*)"; "The *Tathāgata* . . . is the principle of mediation between the Absolute that is transcendent to thought (*tūnya*) and phenomenal beings. The need for a mediator is felt in all absolutism; Vedānta has recourse to *Īśvara*, apart from *Brahman*, to account for the revelation of truth; in the Mādhyamika and Vijñānavāda that function is performed by the *Tathāgata*" (*ibid.*, p. 40; p. 297).

Despite the lack of balance in its main thesis, the book under review is a study done with creditable acumen and a fair amount of documentation. It has much to commend itself to the student of Buddhism on account of the vast erudition involved in the argument, and to the student of comparative religion on account of the stimulating parallels from both other Indian and non-Indian religions adduced at the end of each chapter. As in other writings of this exceptionally prolific scholar, the style is forceful and very readable. The latter characteristic is occasionally, though not often, coupled with sweeping generalizations. The following statement is an illustration: ". . . since the *Upaniṣads* the Indians with their philosophical minds arrived at the logical view that something that has a beginning must inevitably also have an end" (p. 33). Evidently this overlooks the Indian logicians *par excellence*, i.e. the Navya-naiyāyikas, who explicitly propounded *dhvaṃsa*, "destruction, posterior absence",

as a positive entity which has a beginning but does not apply to itself, *i.e.* has no end. Their view, which is ontological as well as logical, may be illustrated by the following example. As soon as a pitcher is destroyed, the pitcher's absence is produced by the very destruction of the pitcher; and this absence, which is a character of the external world (*vastu-dharma*), cannot in turn be destroyed, *i.e.* it has no end.

The value of the book under review is greatly enhanced by an appended selection of extracts from Indian Buddhist scriptures referred to by the author. This has been very competently done by H. Bechert. Schloegel's English translation of the book reads fairly well; but it is regrettably not free from inaccuracies where technical terms are involved. Among the numerous misprints the lack of distinction between the neuter *brahma* and the masculine *brahmā* (pp. 114, 119) is particularly apt to confuse in view of the subject-matter. The title of the book in its present edition, which has "non-theistic" instead of "atheistic", does neither so much reflect the nature of Buddhism nor the thesis of the book as it reflects the readership at which the present edition seems to aim, namely the "spiritual refugee" in the West seeking a substitute for his pivotal concept of God.

T. GELBLUM

Richard T. Hallock, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications, Vol. XCII), Chicago, 1969.

Elamite studies owe a great deal to the many years of patient labour devoted to them by Professor Hallock. With this volume the world of scholarship now has an invaluable tool for further research into the various ramifications which will emerge; Elamite language studies, historical and geographical studies, onomastics, and the study of Old Persian loanwords into Elamite, to mention only the most obvious fields. All these studies will be based solidly upon the careful foundation laid by Professor Hallock, who rightly "put the chief emphasis on the achievement of accurate transliteration" and who regards his transliterations (but not his translations and comments) as "almost definitive" (p. 4).

The core of the book, chapters iii and iv, is the transliteration and translation of 2,087 Elamite tablets – a substantial corpus of material, carefully arranged and analysed. The texts are followed by what amounts to a dictionary of Elamite (pp. 663–776): chapter v "Glossary of Achaemenid Elamite". It covers "not only the fortification texts but also the treasury texts and the royal inscriptions". (The treasury texts were published in the same series in 1948 and have unfortunately been unobtainable for many years: George G. Cameron, *Persepolis Treasury Tablets*.) For many words complete references are given. Philological information is provided for every word even if no more can be said at present than "PN" (=personal name), which is in itself useful information.

The 2,087 texts are arranged according to various categories referred to by letters, A–W, and sometimes subdivided by numbers, *e.g.* C 1–6. Such categories are established as: transportation of commodities, delivery of commodities, accounting balances, exchanges, receipts by officials, rations for individuals with religious functions, mothers' rations, travel rations, special rations for animals, letters, journals. There is some cross-referencing between these categories but not within them. Such conclusions as Hallock has been able to draw from a comparative study of the texts on the basis of content, are to be found in his detailed discussion of the different categories in chapter i (pp. 13–69).

Chapter ii provides information on "transliteration, translation, and other features". It includes a list of the cuneiform signs found in Achaemenid Elamite together with their phonetic value or values. Only one representative form of each sign is given.

The Introduction contains information on a number of subjects including the language. Hallock has previously in a number of articles dealt with various aspects of the language, especially its morphology (references p. 8, n. 14). A useful survey of the language is now available in the *Handbuch der Orientalistik* (Abt. I, Band 2, Abschnitt 1–2, Lief. 2): E. Reiner, *The Elamite language*, Leiden/Köln, 1969. She promises there

(p. 110) an "edition of Old and Middle Elamite texts", which will complement the work of Hallock on the later form of the language, usually known as Royal Achaemenid Elamite. It is the language of the royal inscriptions which remains the best known and understood. This is due mainly to the fact that it is possible to compare the Elamite versions with texts in better-known languages, but it is also due in part to the presence of numerous loanwords from Old Persian into the Elamite of this period. Hallock was able to include many suggested identifications of such loanwords in this book as a result mainly of his correspondence with Dr. I. Gershevitch. Many more words will be identified as Iranian now that the material is available in this form.

So far the principal object of the attention of Iranists has been the vast number of personal names of apparently Iranian origin. See already É. Benveniste, *Titres et noms propres en iranien ancien*, Paris, 1966, 75–99; I. Gershevitch, "Amber at Persepolis", 167–251, in *Studia classica et orientalia Antonino Pagliaro oblata*, ii, Rome, 1969; "Island-Bay and the lion". *BSOAS*, xxxiii.1, 1970, 82–91 (Sir Harold W. Bailey volume); M. Mayrhofer, "Zu den neuen Iranier-Namen aus Persepolis", 107–17, in *Pagliaro*, volume iii, Rome, 1969.

Of much greater importance than the names, however, are the ordinary Iranian loanwords, providing evidence as they do for the forms of Old Iranian words at the earliest date of any of our attested material. The best known so far are the numerals, which have already been discussed by I. Gershevitch, *JNES*, xxiv.3, 1965, 182–6 and by K. Hoffmann, *KZ*, 79.3–4, 1965, 247–54, 300. A few unidentified loanwords will be immediately evident to Iranists. Such are *baraš* "shipment" and *hatika* "wild water bird" (see *JRAS*, 1969, 61). Among these small birds on PF 1943²⁸ *hakataš* is presumably the "cock", Avestan *kahrkatāt*. The *zarakka* fowls of PF 1940^{14–15} may be partridges: Khotanese *ysara-*, Paštó *zarika* (*EVP* 103), etc.

Some loanwords must be admitted from Indian. Thus, *šēšabat* was convincingly shown by Gershevitch to be from Old Indian *śiṃśapā-* (*BSOAS*, xix.2, 1957, 317–20; xxi.1, 1958, 174). It should be considered whether *madukka* is not OInd. *madhūka* "liquorice plant", *zali* "a kind of grain" is reminiscent of OInd. *śāli-* "id."

Some words, as has been indicated, are from Semitic: see on *maškam* and *dudda*. Perhaps *kupšu* "ewe" betrays Semitic *kbs* (so Arabic and Aramaic).

The glossary lacks Harrima for OP Haraiva, Avestan Harōiva. There is no explanation given for Parrubaraesana, the counterpart in the Elamite version to OP Gadāra. It was explained by J. Marquart: see the summary by I. Gershevitch, *The Avestan hymn to Mithra*, 174 n.

From the point of view of history and geography, the most important feature of this corpus of texts is the large number of place names attested. Hallock designates as place names about 440 items in the glossary, of which only about a little more than one sixth can be regarded as having been identified, mainly those occurring in the bilingual royal inscriptions. It is likely that with effort quite a few of those remaining could be identified. It would in fact be profitable to study as a group those tablets mentioning a particular place. Thus, in the case of Kurra it is interesting to note all the building activity going on there in Darius' 22nd year (500 B.C.). Is this then the Khurra said to have had a great fire-temple founded by Darius? See the tenth-century geography *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam*, tr. V. Minorsky, p. 129. Such a study would bring together such texts as PF 873 and 935, whose first paragraphs differ only in certain interesting particulars: flour/grain; Sardian men, blacksmiths/workers; eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth months/twelfth month. Ištīmanka was the supplier of rations for workers at Kaupirriš during the same period (see, *e.g.*, PF 927, 928).

An interesting place name is Hatukurransana, apparently a hybrid form with Elamite *hatu* "within" replacing OP *antar* "inside" plus Iranian Kurransana "Chorasān", NP Xurāsān (containing a nominal form of **ā-san-*, a verb which may be found in Avestan *ās(ə)naoiti*).

If Batrakataš (Bašrakada) is in fact Pasargadae as suggested by Hallock, it is already considerably developed from either of the currently competing etymological reconstructions (see the full discussion by H. Treidler in Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. Bd. 9, 777 ff.): **Pārsa-garda-* following

Stephanus of Byzantium (so recently Brandenstein and Mayrhofer, *Handbuch des Altperersischen*, Wiesbaden, 1964, p. 2; R. Schmitt, *ZDMG*, 117.1, 1967, 137 n. 157) and **pas-Arakadri-* (so J. Marquart, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Iran*, Leipzig, 1905, ii, 154; accepted by W. Hinz, *ZDMG*, 115, 1965, 393).

Some of the place names have recognizably Iranian second elements. A few have OP *didā-* "fortress" (Avestan *daēza-*): Ankatizza, Dadatizan, Išdatizzarn, Miyarnatizzan. The type is Kang-diz (Avestan *Kanha*). More common is the element **rakka(n)*, presumably *rāy* "plain" as in Sogdian and New Persian: Ankarakkan, Battirakkan, Dazzarakka, Hadarakkaš, Hinturakka, Kunturrukkan, Kurarakka, Mišarakkaš, Šaurakkaš, Tikrakkaš, Udarakka, Ukbarakka. Those with **dānu-* "river" as the second element may indicate a town situated on a river of that name: Hapidanuš, Mannandanuš, Šišudanuš, Turratannuš. All the above could be explained as Iranian without difficulty, but it remains to identify them. Unless this further step is taken, the proposed identifications would remain as much in the air as are those of the personal names.

Our appetite is whetted by this splendid work for the "nearly 1,300 additional fortification texts" (p. v) read by Hallock since the volume went to press.

Since the above review was sent to print, I have received through the authors' kindness the following articles concerning the Iranian elements: I. Gershevitch, "Iranian nouns and names in Elamite garb", *TPS*, 1969 [appeared October 1970], 165-200; W. Hinz, "Neue Wege im Altperersischen", *Privat-Vorabdruck aus der Festschrift für Wolfgang Lentz*, Göttingen, 1970; R. Schmitt, "Kritische Bemerkungen zur Deutung iranischer Namen im Elamischen", *KZ*, 84.1, 1970, 11-26. A review of Hallock's book by W. Hinz has appeared in *Orientalia*, 39.3, 1970, 421-440.

R. E. EMMERICK

T. R. H. Havens, *Nishi Amane and Modern Japanese Thought* (Princeton, N.J., U.P., 1970, 8vo, 253 pp. 80s.

Nishi Amane was one of those important, but relatively little known contributors to the modernization of Japan in the Meiji period, whose function in the process is only now beginning to be studied in detail: as a man of affairs, a bureaucrat, rather than a statesman; as an intellectual, a transmitter of European systems of thought, rather than an original thinker. He came from a family of samurai doctors and at an early age committed himself, first to "Dutch", then to "Western" studies. This led him to take service with the Tokugawa Bakufu, which sent him to study at Leiden from 1863 to 1865, whence he returned to pursue a career as an adviser on Western law and institutions to the Tokugawa, later as an official in the Meiji government's war ministry, fulfilling not dissimilar duties in both capacities. In addition to this he was an educator (simultaneously with being a bureaucrat), who played a large part in introducing to Japan the positivism of Comte and the utilitarianism of John Stuart Mill; while as a founder member of the Meirokusha he engaged actively in the debate about Westernization in all its aspects.

Clearly, he is a good subject for biography. And, fortunately, he has a good biographer. Mr. Havens writes lucidly and well; has an efficient command of a wide range of Japanese materials; and knows his Meiji history. In consequence, he is able to bring out the issues which are posed by Nishi's career and make them intelligible to a Western reader. There is, perhaps, a trace of the common biographer's fault, that of making more of his subject than it deserves and defending it a little beyond what is entirely just; but this is much outweighed by the importance of what the book has to say. Specifically, one can find here a great deal of insight into one of the cardinal intellectual problems of modern Japan: how a traditional Confucian ethic was reconciled with a commitment to a world which Western values dominated. In addition, there is much incidental light on the relationship between nationalism and Westernization, as well as on the development of army codes of behaviour. In other words, this is a very worth-while addition to the growing literature on the history of ideas in late nineteenth-century Japan.

W. G. BEASLEY

Yves Hervouet, *Bibliographie des travaux en langues occidentales sur les Song parus de 1946 à 1965* (Collection sinologique de l'université de Bordeaux. Vol. 1), Bordeaux, Société bordelaise de diffusion de travaux des lettres et sciences humaines, 1969, xxi + 139 + 28 pp.

This bibliography of works in European languages on the Sung period published during the twenty years after the last war complements to some extent the bibliographies published by the Tōyō Bunko entitled *Sōdai kenkyū bunken mokuroku* (1957) and *Sōdai kenkyū bunken teiyō* (1961). The arrangement, as in the Japanese works, broadly follows that of the *Tōyōgaku kenkyū bunken ruimoku* published by the Jimbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo, with some minor variations such as grouping sections on articles and books together under each subject, a sensible departure. Most entries are followed by brief notes on the nature and content of the work and references to published reviews. Appended is a bibliography of Soviet publications on the Sung period between 1945 and 1967, by L. A. Kuvshinnikova.

GEORGE WEYS

Modern Japanese: A Basic Reader, by Howard Hibbett and Gen Itasaka, 2 vols. Harvard University Press; London, Oxford University Press.

The first edition of *Modern Japanese: A Basic Reader*, appeared in 1965, and the second edition, reviewed here, in 1967. The main difference between the two editions was the addition of an index of vocabulary items, in Vol. I, the lack of which in the first edition had caused some difficulty to students who only had minimal teacher guidance available. The work appeared at a time when there was taking place in this country an expansion in Japanese studies at the undergraduate level and elementary readers were sorely needed.

Modern Japanese is divided into two volumes. Vol. I contains an introduction, vocabularies and notes, and an index to all vocabulary entries; Vol. II has the text passages (the first twenty-five are supplemented by "practice passages"), and reference materials (*kanji* lists, etc.). This volume starts with an introductory lesson presenting all *hiragana* and their standard combinations. There then follow fifteen text passages all using a conversational style of Japanese. From Lesson 16 onwards what is called "the impersonal style" (modern written Japanese), is used in most passages. Up to Lesson 19 the passages have been specially composed by the authors, but from there until the last lesson (Lesson 60) the passages are from identified sources, either straight quotations or reworded adaptations. Where the original work is of some importance in the context of Japanese history, literature or culture, explanatory notes, sometimes tantalizingly brief, are appended to the vocabulary lists. Selections are made from authors as diverse as Natsume Sōseki, Maruyama Masao and Yoshikawa Kōjirō. There is a slight preponderance of passages by literary men but these are by no means all directly concerned with literature, and it is perhaps an appropriate reflection of the important place the literary intellectual has had in Japanese history over the past one hundred years. The content of the passages is adult and has been welcomed by students. It is unfortunate that the paucity of material in Western languages concerning some aspects of Japanese culture has sometimes left their curiosity unsatisfied. Their final treat in Lesson 60 is an initiation into the order of the *radankai*, from which they will never find release, as long as their lives are concerned with Japan.

The introduction of *kanji* is based on surveys carried out by the Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyū-jo, which listed the most frequently occurring *kanji* in a large sample of quality magazines. This is an admirable principle on which to base an elementary reader, and has obvious advantages over the more usual method of introducing *kanji* in the order, either exact or approximate, in which they are introduced to Japanese school children. The compilers of the Kyōiku Kanji and Tōyō Kanji lists saw fit to include many characters and readings which may only be met once or twice in a lifetime of reading Japanese. For practical purposes it seems clearly preferable to base readers on character

frequency tables. Frequency tables change, however, and if the principle is to be observed, the necessity of revision must always be kept in mind.

Modern Japanese has many excellent features, but one point must be made about it which constitutes adverse criticism, particularly in the context of the teaching of Japanese at British universities. It is not suitable for use immediately after a course in colloquial Japanese such as Jordan and Chaplin, *Beginning Japanese*. The first lesson of *Modern Japanese*, which is very long, contains a number of lengthy and complicated sentences, and even some verb forms (for instance, *korareta* as an honorific) which do not occur in the Jordan and Chaplin course. Considerable teaching help is needed by students reading *Modern Japanese* and in small departments it may not be available. This could perhaps be remedied by reducing some of the complexities which mar the early lessons. *Modern Japanese* must inevitably be compared now with the later reader by Chaplin and Martin, *A Manual of Japanese Writing*. This latter course is based on different principles and has many faults, but it commends itself for its emphasis on self-study. It is perhaps significant that in one British university *Modern Japanese* is studied after *A Manual of Japanese Writing*, and in another has been replaced by it, because the time available for the teaching of elementary Japanese is severely restricted.

But this is simply a criticism of which the authors are well aware. The introduction states that "this tentative edition of the reader will eventually be revised to link it to a text-book of spoken Japanese in romanization". The interminable pattern sentences of *A Manual of Japanese Reading* have caused some students to regard this course as an unpleasant exercise accepted only because of the insistence of their teachers that it is a necessary one. A further revised *Modern Japanese* organically linked with a new, or existing, colloquial course, could solve the problem of teaching mature students an elementary language, when the last time they had to go through this was seven or eight years previously in their first year at secondary school.

BRIAN POWELL

Li Ch'ing-chao, by Hu Pin-ch'ing (Twayne's World Authors series), New York, Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1966, pp. 128. 36s.

The author begins by tracing the rise of the genre in Chinese poetry called *tz'u*. It is necessarily short, but it is an aid to the general reader. She also provides a short chapter on the life of the poetess, Li Ch'ing-chao, which is sufficient to put one in the picture as regards the important events in her life and those sad latter days.

All her *tz'u* now extant are translated by the author and are further explained and analysed. This would indeed help the reader to appreciate the subtlety and nuances of this genre and the distinctive qualities of this poetess which the author of this book promises to discuss critically from various angles: semantic, auditory, grammatical, and conceptual. Unfortunately in a number of poems the author has not made a clear enough translation, so that it is somewhat disappointing after one's hopes have been raised by the promise (on the dust cover) of a translation which combines elegance with accuracy.

A few examples will suffice to illustrate this point.

(1) (pp. 30-1)

Modeled on Magnolia
From a strolling peddler
I bought a branch of spring blossoms
Whose rosy cheeks
Are still loaded with tears of dew drops.

translates lines which mean "from a strolling peddler's loads I purchased a branch of spring blossoms which are about to bloom, with tear drops lightly smoothed out (mixed) with the traces of rouge, left there still by the pink clouds and morning dew." The author considers that "the comparison of spring blossoms loaded with dew drops to rosy cheeks stained with tears is ingenious". Actually this is a common imagery in Chinese poetry. What is new and "not hackneyed" is the idea of smoothing away the tears

slightly till they mix well with the rouge left (on the flowers) by the pink clouds of dawn and morning dew.

(2) (p. 31)

Modeled on A Bouquet of Plum Flowers.

1.1

autumn is on the jade mat.

Jade mat is unclear to a general reader. Perhaps "jade-adorned mat" will serve the purpose.

(3) (p. 31)

1.7

Alone the flowers fade, alone the water flows.

would be clearer if rendered as: "by itself flower fades, by itself the water flows on (each going its own way)".

1.8-9

(4) (p. 31)

One kind of longing

Idle worries in two places.

"Idle worries" does not bring out the state of mind of the user of the phrase. This phrase conveys the idea that the poetess and her husband have the same feeling of love and longing; and sad thoughts, which arise for no particular reason, are similarly felt in both places.

However, it is true that "Li Ch'ing-chao emerges through this appreciation of her writings as a vibrant human being" and we are grateful for a volume which introduces her to a wider public than heretofore.

K. P. K. WHITAKER

Yao Hsin-nung, *The malice of empire*. Translated, with an introduction, by Jeremy Ingalls, 160 pp. London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1970. 35s.

Despite a long introduction Mr. Ingalls does not give any publication details of the text he has rendered into English. The edition I have is a 1947 reprint published by the World Book Company of Shanghai, with which Yao Hsin-nung was associated; it contains a notice claiming copyright and some opening remarks of the author dated 1943. I therefore assume it to be authentic. Mr. Ingalls' English version is no more a translation of this text than "malice of empire" is a translation of the Chinese title *Ch'ing-kung yüan*. It is impossible to tell if he is abridging, adapting, or misunderstanding. So I have no way of reviewing it.

D. E. POLLARD

W. J. F. Jenner, *Modern Chinese stories* (Oxford Paperbacks 222), xiii+271 pp. Oxford University Press, 1970. 12s.

This collection of stories is divided roughly equally between the Republican and Communist periods. Most of the earlier stories are by well-known left-wing writers, the three of Lu Hsün being in Gladys Yang's translation. Four altogether are storyteller's tales. Of the other authors, only Chao Shu-li is much known outside China.

According to his introduction Mr. Jenner made the choice of stories on personal grounds, but apparently also with the general intention of illustrating aspects of Chinese life and showing what the Chinese revolution has meant to people. Since he has left out of account the question of literary quality, it would not be fitting for the reviewer either to introduce it. One does indeed agree with him that particularly with more recent fiction Western standards do not apply. Regrettably, though, he does not propose any alternative criteria, so there is nothing left to discuss, except the rendering into English, which, judging by the stories I have checked, is quite competent.

D. E. POLLARD

Book Pirating in Taiwan, by David Kaser. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1969.

Pirating in Taiwan has a familiar ring about it, recalling the days of Coxinga and pirate junks in the South China seas. This book is concerned with piracy of a different kind: the unauthorized reprinting and clandestine exporting of English-language books on the island of Taiwan. Literary piracy of this sort is rare today, thanks to the wide acceptance of international copyright protection. But among those few nations which give no such protection and which have not signed either the Berne agreement or the Universal Copyright Convention, there is still scope and profit in book-buccaneering. And there are sometimes sound domestic reasons to explain, if not to condone it. Taiwan provides a prime example of this.

For the past fifteen years and more Taiwan has earned notoriety in America and Britain for this enterprising, lucrative but unethical trade. Western publishers have viewed with dismay not merely the wholesale undercutting of their trade in the Republic of China but, more serious still, declining sales on university campuses at home as smuggled books at temptingly low prices poured in from Taiwan. This latter tide has now been stemmed, thanks to firm action by the Chinese authorities, but the basic problem of illicit reprinting in Taiwan itself remains. As the author of this stimulating book remarks in his preface: "solutions can only come through extended good-faith negotiations between Western publishers and Chinese booksellers and the enlightened self-interest of both groups".

For the problem is, and was, nothing like so simple as it seemed. There was another side to the coin, not always appreciated by indignant publishers in the West. A large demand existed in Taiwan, as in many other parts of Asia, for cheap editions of Western books - especially text-books for students. But how could a student at National Taiwan University, subsisting on the equivalent of only 56 U.S. dollars a year, possibly hope to buy his essential text-books at American prices, or even at the 60% reduction offered for special Far East editions produced in Japan? And how could he resist the appeal of the same texts reprinted in Taiwan at a mere fraction of the original price? A bargain is a bargain the world over, and the ordinary book buyer could not fail to see good value in a reprinted set of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, normally priced in the West at \$350, offered at no more than \$45? The hapless Taiwan authorities had somehow to reconcile two opposing interests here: to recognize, on the one hand, the plight of the Taiwan student and the enormous gulf between living costs in Taiwan and in the West, and to take action to satisfy the increasingly insistent demands of American and British publishers that the unauthorized reprinting of their books be brought to a speedy end. Genuine efforts were indeed made by the Republican Government to stop the exporting of counterfeit editions and to enable Western publishers to register their books in Taiwan, thus making pirated editions illegal. But loopholes remained, and progress towards a final solution has been slow and halting.

The whole absorbing story is told for the first time, and very well told, in this new book by David Kaser. In it the author has pieced together with patient skill all the isolated facts he has managed to dig out from conversations with booksellers and publishers and from official sources in Taiwan and the U.S.A. The style is clear and readable, and the narrative moves forward at a fast pace, covering an amazing amount of well-documented ground in less than 150 pages. As an American and an historian of publishing, Mr. Kaser is well aware of his own country's none-too-scrupulous record in the protection of literary property in the past, and he is careful to give a fair hearing to both sides in this case. Mr. Kaser's book stands as an excellent impartial record of this episode of literary buccaneering, marked by misunderstandings, commercial greed and misplaced self-righteousness, which has engendered so much heat on both sides of the Pacific.

K. B. GARDNER

The Manyōshū, the Nippon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai translation of One Thousand Poems, with a Foreword by Donald Keene, lxxxii + 362 pp. 8 × 5½ in., paper covers. New York and London, Columbia University Press, 1969. £2 5s.

These very fine translations were first published by Iwanami Shoten thirty years ago, and were reissued by Columbia University Press in 1965, with *romaji* texts, which are not contained in the present book. The final credit for the high literary quality of these versions must go to the English poet, Ralph Hodgson, to whom all the paraphrases, produced by the Special Manyōshū Committee, were submitted; while the list of scholars who served on this committee and on the Japanese Classics Translation Committee is a guarantee that the interpretations are as accurate and scholarly as was possible in the state of *Manyōshū* studies at the end of the 1930's. Subsequent progress in these studies has, as Professor Keene points out in his Foreword, invalidated a number of interpretations and readings, but the main purpose of the book, to provide the general reader of English with a good notion of the riches of this anthology, has not been thwarted, more than one fifth of the total number of poems being here translated. The poems are arranged so far as possible in approximate chronological order of their true or alleged authors (with the odd exception of the four poems traditionally but absurdly attributed to Nintoku's empress). They are numbered serially, and the *Kokka Taikan* number is also provided. The footnotes, sometimes including the original notes, are generally useful and adequate. I have only one general regret: the too frequent omission of the conventional epithets (*makura-kotoba*), an unfortunately common practice on the part of *Manyōshū* translators. It is true that there are some which, as the Introduction has it, "invoke images extraneous and incongruous, confusing to the general reader", and others of quite uncertain meaning. But there remain many, of established or nearly established meaning, appropriate to their contexts, which are often, though not consistently, omitted from these otherwise splendid versions.

If the passage of time has done almost nothing to tarnish the translations, the same cannot be said of the Introduction, which, out of surely misplaced piety, has been retained from the original edition. Some passages now seem little short of grotesque, written as they were in a fervent spirit of nationalistic propaganda. Much of the purely informative part is of course still good and valuable; this could all have been retained in a new introduction, and the opportunity could have been taken to indicate, more fully than Professor Keene may have felt free to do in his Foreword, the nature and scope of recent progress in *Manyōshū* studies. At least it is fortunate that the choice of poems corresponds hardly, if at all, to what the tendentiousness of the Introduction might lead one to expect. The choice is beautifully representative of the *Manyōshū*'s fine multifariousness.

There are three appendixes. Appendix I provides biographical information about the authors of the poems, in the same order as that in which the poems are arranged in this book. It is hardly surprising that even such a dubious attribution as that of the first poem to the emperor Yūryaku is not questioned. Appendix II is a chronological table of significant events in Japan from (except for the death of Yūryaku in 479) about the end of the sixth century to the end of the Nara period in 794; reign or era years and dates A.D. are given. Appendix III is a finding list, giving *Kokka Taikan* numbering against the numbers of these translations. Finally, there is a satisfactory index.

G. W. ROBINSON

M. D. Kennedy, *The Estrangement of Great Britain and Japan, 1917-35*. Manchester University Press, 1969. 55s.

This is a somewhat old-fashioned book, which could have appeared in much the same form 20 years ago. Although its title carries the promise of a study of Anglo-Japanese relations in an important transitional period, it is, in essence, a general account of Japan's foreign relations between the two wars, based mainly on the author's

diaries and memories. As such it does contain a considerable number of contemporary observations on Anglo-Japanese relations, some by persons of high standing, but these, interesting as they sometimes are, give little idea of the process of policy formulation, either in Britain or Japan. Moreover, as a Japanophile with many friendships in Japan dating back to his service there as assistant military attaché during the First World War, Captain Kennedy's viewpoint is a rather special one. He tends to see international affairs from a predominantly Far Eastern, not to say Japanese, viewpoint, and it is hardly surprising, therefore, that Western governments and statesmen are liberally apportioned blame for their failure to treat Japan realistically. If British policy-makers come off fairly lightly, this is largely because the author regards them as short-sighted men who were forced to choose between Japan and America by American leaders who were exclusively concerned with prestige and who themselves were swayed by the cunning propaganda of wily Chinese politicians. This basically pro-Japanese approach has its advantages, in that Japan's case has, in the past, frequently gone by default, but the author's bitter criticism of America and extreme lack of sympathy for China may well prove objectionable to some readers and may even prevent his argument from being taken seriously. This would be unfortunate, for Captain Kennedy was in contact with Japanese soldiers and diplomats for well over a decade, and though he may occasionally have been tempted to give too much credence to their statements, he was undoubtedly in a good position to gauge their feelings and attitudes. He gives a good impression of the differences among Japanese policy-makers, and some of the conversations he records make one wish that he had quoted more fully from his diaries. Moreover, as an ex-soldier, he makes some useful observations on Japan's military position after the First World War and during the Manchurian Incident, even though he unaccountably has nothing to say about factionalism within the Japanese army. Nevertheless, an objective, scholarly study of Anglo-Japanese relations based on British and Japanese governmental records and taking the general international situation fully into account still needs to be written.

R. L. SIMS

Lives of Eminent Korean Monks: The Haedong Kosŭng Chŏn. Translated, introduced and annotated by Peter H. Lee (Harvard-Yenching Institute Studies XXV), Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1969, xiii + 116 pages. 66s.

In one respect *Haedong Kosŭng Chŏn* is not untypical of works of old Korean literature: when the studies which have led to our present state of knowledge of the history of that literature began at the turn of the century, *Haedong Kosŭng Chŏn* was lying neglected in one defective manuscript copy. It is, however, an extreme case, having been composed in 1215, quoted in 1285, and then not heard of again for 600 years. It is therefore perhaps right that Dr. Lee should have singled out this work, which is of such specialist interest in its contents, for such thorough and sympathetic treatment. One result of his choice is that we have in the introduction one of the very few studies in English of the nature of civilized Korean society before the Yi dynasty.

W.E.S.

Chao Lun. The Treatises of Seng-chao. Translated into English with Bibliography, Introduction, Notes and Appendices by Walter Liebenthal, Hong Kong University Press, 1968, xli + 152 pp. 88s net.

The Chao-lun is a collection of essays written by Seng-chao (374-414) in the last decade of his life. Seng-chao was a pupil of Kumārajīva, but like many Buddhist scholars of that period he was very well read in Taoist literature. Dr. Liebenthal points out that he knew the writings of Wang Pi (226-49). Fukunaga Kōji has studied the relations between Seng-chao and Kuo Hsiang (died 312), the author of an important

commentary on Chuang-tzu.¹ Written in a terminology partly Buddhist, partly Taoist, and dealing with abstruse metaphysical problems, Seng-chao's treatises are extremely difficult to interpret. Dr. Liebenthal first translated Seng-chao's work in 1935 and revised his translation several times before publishing it in 1948. As a pioneer undertaking this work had the great merit of examining carefully the philosophical ideas of Seng-chao. From a philological point of view the translation is not free from imperfections, such as wrong interpretations, too free renderings and the use of many different terms to translate the key concepts of Seng-chao. Since 1948 much progress has been made with regard to the study of the Chao-lun. In 1953 appeared Derk Bodde's translation of Fung Yu-lan's *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, Vol. II, which contains a chapter on Seng-chao (pp. 258-70). A carefully annotated translation, made by a group of Japanese scholars, was published in 1955: *Jōron kenkyū*. The same volume contains seven studies relating to the Chao-lun. Of great importance is Paul Demiéville's review of this work (*T'oung Pao*, XLV, 1957, pp. 221-35).² Recently Richard H. Robinson published a translation of the first three treatises of the Chao-lun together with an analysis (*Early Mādhyamika in India and China*, 1967, pp. 212-32; pp. 124-35; pp. 140-54). In preparing the second edition of his work Dr. Liebenthal has not been able to use the Japanese translation. Robinson's book came too late to be used by him.

Dr. Liebenthal has carefully revised his translation. Several mistakes have been corrected.³ In many places the revised translation adheres much closer to the original text. It is still freer than the interpretations given by the Japanese scholars and by Robinson who has been able to derive much profit from the Japanese translation. Robinson has thoroughly studied the logical aspects of Seng-chao's work, whereas Dr. Liebenthal is more interested in its metaphysical aspects. By comparing the translations (including the first edition of Dr. Liebenthal's work), which are now at our disposal, a better understanding of Seng-chao will become possible. A true understanding of the text and its philosophical ideas, however, will only be reached when the terminology of Seng-chao and its antecedents have been thoroughly studied, as has been justly remarked by Demiéville (*op. cit.*, p. 228).

J. W. DE JONG

Samuel E. Martin, Young-Sook C. Lee, *Beginning Korean*, xxix + 575 pages. New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1969. 79s.

Beginning Korean consists of 30 lessons in spoken Korean, preceded by an introduction on "The Sounds of Korean", and followed by Korean-English and English-Korean vocabularies of the words occurring in the lessons. Every fifth lesson is a review lesson, divided into sections reviewing vocabulary and points of grammar, and sections giving guidance for further practice of the material. The remaining 24 lessons present, first, basic sentences (30 to 35 in most cases, up to 50 occasionally), followed by a supplementary vocabulary list, then grammar notes, and finally various exercises and suggestions for further practice. The Korean-English vocabulary contains probably about 2,500 entries, the English-Korean apparently less than 2,000. All the material is presented in transliteration.

¹ *Jōron kenkyū* (Kyōto, 1955), pp. 252-71 (cf. Demiéville, *T'oung Pao*, XLV, pp. 233-4).

² Demiéville's review is wrongly listed in Dr. Liebenthal's bibliography at the bottom of p. xiv.

³ The revision is not always an improvement, e.g. the following quotation from a sūtra: 聖心無所知, 無所不知. The first edition translated freely: "The Mind of the Sage contains no object and no object is excluded" (p. 71), but the revised edition has: "The Mind of the Sage cognizes nothing (and therefore) nothing is cognized (by him)" (p. 67), cf. *Jōron kenkyū*, p. 24: "Shōshin ni wa shirareru mono mo naku, shirarenai mono mo nai"; likewise, Robinson, p. 213: "In the Holy Mind, there is nothing that is known and nothing that is not known."

It is a massive beginning in Korean. Each lesson would fill a good ten hours in class, and time would have to be found separately for the written language. It would probably not achieve its object unless it were used intensively, since the book gives a great deal of detail which it would be difficult to retain without constant practice.

I have found myself completely unable to evaluate the work fairly. In the first place, by its nature it gives thousands of facts, with no unifying theme or main thesis. The facts are the facts of the Korean spoken language, a selection of the utterances themselves, and a description of those utterances. Most people can speak their own language fairly well, and Mrs. Lee does not seem to be so illiterate or insensitive as to allow the Korean presented here if it were grossly incorrect. Most foreign students of Korean get a reasonably correct understanding of the language after a few years' study, and Professor Martin is far from being inept at language study. The facts must therefore be largely correct. If this is true, then the overwhelming impression with which I am left after sampling this course, of some very odd conversations for Korean and of inadequacies in the description, must be due to some bias in my own approach to this book. In the second place, the work as a whole is a scheme for teaching, and any scheme for teaching works or fails to work according to whether it succeeds or fails in inspiring in the teacher an enthusiasm which he can pass on to his students. I am sorry to have to say that I found *Beginning Korean* stifling.

However, I must not stifle any enthusiasm which this course might arouse in other teachers. Although it seems to me to be inferior to several of the courses which are used in language schools in Korea, and although it is not suitable as it stands to replace the adaptation of Lukoff's *Spoken Korean* of 25 years ago which serves my own teaching purposes adequately, it is probably the most comprehensive course in Korean at present available in published form. If there is someone at present about to start teaching Korean, full of his own enthusiasm, but without a course, he must certainly look at this course and make up his own mind whether it will suit him. Others who have courses in use which they find adequate to their purposes will at least find this book handy as a work of reference for themselves and perhaps their students also, and they may find that the course can be adopted as a whole to their and their students' advantage. In spite of my own reaction, I hope that they will, since one cannot but admire Professor Martin for his persistence with Korean, and thank him for at least trying so hard to make easier the tasks of the teacher of Korean.

W. E. SKILLEND

Helen Craig McCullough, *Tales of Ise, Lyrical episodes from tenth-century Japan*, pp. 277. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1968; London, Oxford University Press. 71s 6d

This new translation of an important work is more suitable for the general reader than the 1957 version by Vos, but both will have to be read by the serious student. Mrs. Helen McCullough's has a substantial introduction, with an interesting section on the interrelation of Chinese and Japanese poetry. The translation introduces the romanized text of the included poems, always useful even if the reader has no knowledge of the language. There are appendixes giving text and translations of *Kokinshū* poems by the Six Poetical Geniuses, a study of the texts of *Ise Monogatari*, and meticulous notes. There are also a bibliography and two indexes. This is a most valuable addition to the list of good translations from the Japanese.

C. J. DUNN

Earl Miner, *An introduction to Japanese court poetry*, pp. xv + 173. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1968; London, Oxford University Press. 57s (boards); 19s (paper covers).

This, the latest of the books on Japanese poetry bearing the name of Earl Miner, is as welcome as the others. It gives a very useful and satisfying first account of the subject that will serve as an introduction not only to Japanese poetry, but also to the

great *Japanese Court Poetry* which Miner wrote with Robert Brower, but which for the ordinary comparative literature student was rather too technical. Now it is possible to approach the matter in stages. It should be noted, however, that, by dealing with poets up to 1500, this work goes beyond *Japanese Court Poetry*, and it includes second thoughts and a revision of some aspects of the earlier book. Both books are therefore required reading for every student of Japanese or international poetry.

C. J. DUNN

Nittō-guhō-junrei-kōki no kenkyū 入唐求法巡禮行記の研究, by Ono Katsutoshi 小野勝年, 4 vols., Tokyo 1964-9. Vol. 1: p. 520, 1964; Vol. 2: p. 480, 1966; Vol. 3: p. 499, 1967; Vol. 4: p. 637, 63, 1969.

Ennin's diary of his journeys in China is well known to Western readers since the publication in 1955 of Professor Reischauer's English translation and accompanying volume of commentary, as one of the most important sources for the social and religious history of the early ninth century, doubly important as the only extensive "outsider's" account of China from such an early period. Those who wish to go more deeply into the text are now provided with an extremely detailed commentary and annotation, as well as a critical text considerably easier on the eye than the crabbed hand of the Tōji MS., the facsimile of which is the most reliable text generally available. The fourth volume contains a series of somewhat disjointed general essays covering such subjects as the organization of the Japanese mission with which Ennin entered China; his relationships with Korean residents; his travels and dealings with T'ang officialdom; the monastic communities which he describes, the organization of the Buddhist clergy, and the practice of Buddhism, popular faith and the Buddhism as practised at Wu-t'ai shan, what he observed concerning the various schools of Buddhism; his study of esoteric Buddhism, and what he relates of the Hui-ch'ang suppression. The author also appends Ennin's catalogue of the various scriptures and other non-Buddhist works which he brought back to Japan entitled *Nittō shingū shōgyō mokuroku* 入唐新求聖教目錄 which is a most important source for our understanding both of Ennin's later teachings and also of the knowledge of Chinese literature in mid-ninth-century Japan.

Readers will find additional materials on many of these and a host of other problems in a massive symposium of studies on Ennin, *Jikaku Daishi Kenkyū* 慈覺大師研究 (p. 794, 15; Tokyo 1964) edited by Fukui Kōjun 福井廣順 which was published by the Tendai Gakkai to celebrate the 1100th anniversary of Ennin's death. This volume contains, in addition to many items of purely Buddhological interest, articles by Naba Toshisada, Kubō Noritada and Fukui Shigemasa on the *Diary* as historical source material, by Kasuga Reiichi and Nagashima Takeshi on Buddhism in Ch'ang-an, by Ogasawara Senshū on Buddhism in P'u-chou, by Mori Katsumi on Ennin's dealings with Koreans, by Sogabe Shizuo on the tax position of the Buddhist clergy, by Ushiba Shingen on T'ang colloquialisms in the *Diary*, by Hori Ichirō on folklore preserved in the *Diary*, and by Kanda Kiichirō and Makita Taiyō on the list of books brought to Japan by Ennin on his return.

D. C. TWICHELLT

Peasant Rebellions of the Late Ming Dynasty, by James Bunyan Parsons, 292 pp., Published for the Association for Asian Studies by the University of Arizona Press, 1970. \$7.50.

The peasant rebels who toppled the Ming dynasty in 1644 were so rapidly eclipsed by the invading Manchus that they have hitherto received scant attention from Western scholars (though rather more from Chinese historians, some of whom see the rebellions as the first manifestation of nationalist resistance to a foreign conqueror). Professor Parsons thus performs a useful service in bringing the subject to our attention and in attempting, from his assessment of the nature and course of the rebellions, to

answer the question why none of their leaders was able to emulate the feat of Chu Yüan-chang three hundred years earlier and found a new dynasty. He charts in considerable detail the chaotic course of the revolts, from their sporadic beginnings in Shensi in the late 1620's to the final defeat of Chang Hsien-chung early in 1647. From this it emerges clearly that the principal reason for their failure was not simply the superior strength of the Manchus and their Chinese allies, but their own lack of capable leadership and organizing ability. In particular the rebel commanders, tearing like a hurricane back and forth across China, neglected to build up a secure base area from which to launch concerted campaigns, and were unable, partly for this very reason, to win the vital support of the officials and gentry in the areas through which they passed. In short, neither Li Tzu-ch'eng nor Chang Hsien-chung had the political genius of a Chu Yüan-chang, though it must be admitted that even if they had, they might still have failed to ward off the Manchus.

More important and more interesting than all the military alarms and excursions, however (particularly in view of the disputed theory of dynastic cycles), is to determine why the major revolts broke out when and where they did; how far they were the product of particular local conditions in the depressed north-west of China and how far they resulted in addition from general administrative corruption and decline and the repeated tax increases with which the ailing dynasty attempted to bolster its finances. Ray Huang in his essay on Ming fiscal administration (in Hucker, ed., *Chinese Government in Ming Times*, pp. 73-128) has argued that the tax surcharges, from which distressed areas were in theory exempted, were not in themselves of crucial importance, and that it would have been well within the capacity of the population to pay them, had it not been for widespread local abuses which the government was unable to curb. This may well have been true of the more prosperous south-east but was possibly not the case with economically depressed and notoriously badly administered provinces like Shensi. Li Wen-chih in his able full length study of the rebellions, *Wan-Ming min-pien* (Shanghai, 1948), has tried to show (pp. 20-4) that the initial surcharges, which were applicable to the whole country, did in fact intensify existing popular distress in Shensi and may well have contributed to the steady worsening of conditions there. This and other related problems are obviously of considerable importance and it is most unfortunate that Parsons has chosen virtually to ignore them. He devotes only three pages to the entire background of the rebellions and gives merely a bare list of the factors known to have been significant, without really attempting to assess their relative weight. He also ignores the numerous serf and tenant risings of the Yangtse valley and south east, which have been so ably documented by scholars like Fu I-ling. These, though not as spectacular as the northern revolts, did accelerate improvements in the status of tenants and were perhaps of greater long-term consequence to Chinese society.

Parsons does come to grips with some of the important features of the subject in his final chapter "Specialized Aspects of the Rebellions" which analyses such matters as rebel organization, their general lack of religious or other ideological motivation, their leadership, and their relations with the gentry, etc. On many of these topics, particularly the last, there is not a great deal of hard evidence, and it is disappointing that more has not emerged from the collection of documents *Ming-mo nung-min ch'i-i shih-tiao* published in Peking in 1952. It might well have been possible to glean a great deal of relevant information by using a wider variety of source material, especially local gazetteers, which Parsons does not seem to have considered at all. For example, the 1827 edition of the gazetteer of T'ung-ch'eng, Anhwei, has an interesting and quite detailed account of the rebellions as they affected the area, the dramatic siege of the city by Chang Hsien-chung in 1642, and the measures taken by the local gentry and officials to organize defence. (T'ung-ch'eng was not "captured" by Chang, as Parsons says on p. 210; the rebels left on the arrival of a relief force under Huang Te-kung. *T'ung-ch'eng hsien-chih* (1827) 23/20a.) It was from T'ung-ch'eng incidentally that Chang Hsien-chung obtained his most important gentry adherent, Wang Chao-ling 汪兆麟, about whom Parsons regrets that so little is known (p. 210). Wang does not seem to be mentioned at all in the T'ung-ch'eng gazetteer, but the genealogy of his clan is still extant and while he himself would doubtless not qualify for a biography in it,

it is quite possible that something could be discovered from it about his immediate antecedents.

One further point which ought to be made is that Parsons' bibliography of secondary works is curiously selective and can hardly comprise the sum total of his reading on the subject. He omits for instance all but a few works by mainland Chinese authors and also all Japanese research. Particularly conspicuous by their absence are Shimizu Taiji's "*Mindai no ryūmin to ryūzoku*" (Shigaku Zasshi, 46 (1935), 192-230, 348-84) and Tasaka Kōdō's *Li Tzu-ch'eng wa fuikyōto ka* (Tōhō Gakuhō XII, pt. 2 (Tokyo, 1941), 91-110), both of which discuss at some length the interesting question whether Li Tzu-ch'eng may have been a Mohammedan. Parsons does not once allude to this possibility and it is to be hoped that he is not unaware of it.

Finally, the index of the book leaves much to be desired. It omits, among other things, many names of places affected by the rebellions and also some personal names; examples are Grand Secretary Hsüeh Kuo-kuan, and his kinsman who became adviser for a time to Chang Hsien-chung (p. 62). The serious reader will do well to compile his own supplementary index, as this reviewer has.

H. J. BEATTIE

Jaroslav Průšek, *Three sketches of Chinese literature*. Dissertations Orientales, Vol. 20. Prague, Academia, 1969. 149 pp.

I realize now the disadvantage of being English - the inability to look with anything but a cold and fishy eye on sentimental effusions. Whether due to personal or national character, Professor Průšek evidently does not suffer from this kind of atrophy, for he is able to write on the early prose works of Yü Ta-fu and Kuo Mo-jo, two of his three subjects, at great length and from express enjoyment. Both these writers conformed to recognizable romantic patterns, portraying either "studious youths crippled by a vast emptiness of spirit", to borrow a phrase from Jacques Barzun, who tend to veer between moods of exhilaration and despair, but most often despair, or men and women who accept "passion in its own right", to draw this time on Stendhal. But their "romanticism" came late in the day, and after all as Chinese they had a different background from the European romantics, so Průšek quite rightly dwells on their individual characteristics while at the same time taking into account their Chinese literary heritage. What he does not consider very much is the quality of their minds, on which the interestingness of their work depends, and the extent to which their descriptions of moods and experiences rely on literary borrowing; even the best of their pieces are marred by false flourishes. This Průšek does not seem to mind. He does pay a great deal of attention on the other hand to their literary technique.

The move in these studies away from concentration on character and plot, till now normal in Western criticism of modern Chinese fiction, towards questions of organization and diction would be welcome on grounds of sophistication alone, but in that it brings under scrutiny things less affected by non-literary values, it also gives scope for discussion across ideological gaps. It is regrettable that in this particular case Průšek has not done the job very well. Factually his summaries of the stories of Yü and Kuo are inexact in some details. In itself this is not important, and it would be a waste of space to list the inaccuracies here. But this haziness of recollection does take on importance when he begins to misrepresent and embroider on the stories. For instance, it does not matter very much that in Yü Ta-fu's "Huan hsiang chi" ("Going home") the narrator does not "weave" his "dream-story of his meeting in his youth with a lovely girl" etc. "on the margin of the Hang-chou lake" (p. 53) but on emerging from the railway station; it does matter that it is not a "dream-story" at all, but an extended simile to describe his feelings on returning to the haunts of his youth. That story, incidentally, does not dramatize "personal experiences" so much as private fantasies, often of a prurient nature. Again, "follows a lovely description of an approaching sandstorm" (p. 49) in the same author's "Shih-i yüeh ch'u-san" ("November the third") refers to only one line of text; the line may indeed be lovely, but the reader has been prepared to

expect something more elaborate. This kind of imperfection may come from working from notes rather than the text, but when Průšek does get down to direct study of the text he is not markedly more scrupulous. For example, in order to illustrate his point that the tone of "Yen-ying" ("The shadow of smoke") is more matter-of-fact than usual, which is true on the whole, he quotes on page 77 a passage about the dangers of the civil war which is quite flatly stated – but omits from the middle of it some romantic hyperbole which would seriously weaken his case. Similarly I feel he overstates his case with regard to the complex structure of Yü Ta-fu's sentences in the same story. He says that the opening sentence shows "a remarkable number of facts incorporated in a single semantic and syntactic whole" (p. 76), and goes on to discover aesthetic virtues in the fact. Yet he knows that such sentences, though typical of the author's style, were not invented by him: the Chinese "sentence" is often like that. In the same way he suggests (p. 106) that Kuo Mo-jo's use of reduplicated adjectives gives his writing the stamp of high art, when such terms are very common in belles-lettres; they may just as much be in the stamp of bad style as of good. He also fails to convince me that Kuo's use of parallelism, which it is hard for even a modern writer to avoid, "heightens the impression of rhetorical pathos" (p. 108). In all three cases I feel that Průšek is bringing a powerful critical apparatus to bear on very slight examples of the writer's craft. The same applies when he gets out his instruments to measure angles of vision and planes of experience. Yü's story "I-ko jen tsai t'u-shang" ("A lonely man on a journey") is, to be sure, well put together, but to list ten "levels" in terms of time and feelings among the items of recall is making much ado about nothing; inevitably memories all relate to different times and are of different emotional intensity.

Where Průšek's intellectual powers find more suitable application is in more general discussion of his subjects' aims and characteristics. It is easier to talk sympathetically (since that appears to be his intent) of Yü Ta-fu and Kuo Mo-jo as literary phenomena than to extol their skills. Ma, the subject of his third study, is in no need of such patronage, and offers more to grapple with. His approach to literature also seems more really congenial to Průšek's point of view. As a result I found this section more relevant and penetrating. I do not say more interesting, for the whole book is interesting; it is just that much of the work he discusses is not as good as he would like it to be.

D. E. POLLARD

Edward H. Schafer, *The Vermilion Bird, T'ang images of the South*, pp. 8, 380. Berkeley, 1967.

Following up his earlier work *The Golden Peaches of Samarkand*, which dealt with the influences of Central Asia and the Steppe on T'ang life and thought, Professor Schafer has now turned his attention to the role played by the Far South, Ling-nam and Vietnam, both as an actual factor in T'ang history and as a potent exotic image in the literary imagination of the time.

It was time that some account of southern China at this period was put together, for during T'ang and Sung times this region rather than the north-west was the expanding frontier of the Chinese world. And paradoxically, although Chinese sedentary culture was more or less debarred from ever spreading far beyond the arid north-west frontier, T'ang culture found far less difficulty in accepting the nomads of the North-west and adopting many aspects of their culture and customs than in adapting themselves to the totally alien and exotic world of the Far South, an area which in time the Chinese were to colonize entirely. If nothing else these two books underline the essential northern-ness of the T'ang ruling class. The "south" which was in T'ang times becoming more and more important both politically and as a centre of population and accepted as an integrated part of China Proper, was essentially the Yangtze valley and Chekiang. The old image of this region as a languorous exotic romantic region was only slowly transferred to regions farther south. Fukien, Ling-nam and the south-west remained remote colonial dependencies and tiny outposts of Chinese officials and

soldiers living in the midst of an alien population, whose speech they could not understand, in an environment which they felt as essentially hostile and danger-ridden. Professor Schafer illustrates very clearly how this attitude remained until the very end of T'ang times, when in such writers as Li Hsün and Ou-yang Chiung the far south began to play a role in the imagination, a romantic exotic role rather like that which the Yangtze region as reflected through the *Ch'u-tz'u* had played in earlier times.

Like all the author's writing this is a highly readable book, based on an acquaintance with a vast range of literature, packed with strange erudition and full imaginative insights. Even more than the north-west, the T'ang writings on the tropical south seem to have fired his imagination, and this book will send many readers back to reread the T'ang poets with many newly sharpened insights, in particular to Liu Ts'ung-yuan and Liu Yü-hsi, whose poems are cited again and again.

In connexion with Liu Yü-hsi the author makes one error, in ascribing the set of poems entitled "Chu-chih tz'u" 竹枝詞, which were set to local folk tunes, to Liu Yü-hsi's early period of exile in Lang-chou (Hunan). These poems were in fact written later in his career when he was Prefect of K'uei-chou, probably in 822-3, and the local customs which they so vividly evoke are those of the region of the Yangtze gorges in eastern Szechuan, although the slash and burn farmer aborigines which they mention are probably distant kin of the Mo-Yao 莫 (the author's "Mak") who are encountered in T'ang times from Kwangsi through northern Kwangtung and western Hunan.

This brings out a very important point made by the author: the great extent to which, in late T'ang times and even during the Sung, aboriginal peoples still populated not only the far south but also parts of China (particularly the uplands) which we tend to consider as rather completely sinicized. Hunan and Kiangsi, for example, had very sparse Chinese settlements in the valley lowlands, and were only extensively colonized by Chinese settlers in late T'ang and Sung times.

May we express the hope that the author will now turn his attention to the south-west, and attempt to give us an equally penetrating picture of Nan-chao and its surrounding tribes? There is an abundance of descriptive material, even though producing a coherent picture from it is a nightmare task.

D. C. TWITCHETT

A First Course in Literary Chinese, by Harold Shadick with the collaboration of Ch'iao Chien, 3 vols., Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1968, US \$15 (English agents: IBEG Ltd.) £5 14s.

This course in literary Chinese by Professor Shadick, which has developed over twenty years from an "Introduction to Classical Chinese" at Cornell University, is the first text-book of its kind and, as such, is an important contribution to the teaching of literary Chinese which is recognized by everyone who has engaged in it as a most formidable task. This new work will certainly, in some ways, make that task a little easier and for this the authors deserve our gratitude.

The work is elaborate in conception. Volume I consists of 34 selected texts, translation exercises from literary Chinese into English related to texts 1-22, 14 additional texts for translation, and finally translation exercises from English to literary Chinese, again related to texts 1-22. Volume II consists of vocabularies of the selected texts, preceded by a glossary of terms and symbols used in Vols. II and III. Volume III consists of commentaries on the selected texts and an Outline of Grammar. There is a character index in Vol. I and an Index to Function Words in Vol. III.

The 34 texts fall into two main groups, 1-22 and 23-34. The first six texts of the first group were specially written or adapted to illustrate the most basic syntactic patterns. The other texts of the first group "are unchanged from their original form. They are mostly from what may be called 'classical' works of the late Chou period." Of the second main group, "texts 23-7 include at least one piece from each major dynastic period from T'ang to Ch'ing. Texts 29-34 are from writings of modern reformers and revolutionaries" (p. 3). Thus, in the small compass of a set of 34 texts, literary Chinese

from the late Chou period to Hu Shih is covered. This seems to me to be a defect common to most anthologies designed for the teaching of literary Chinese. It is too ambitious to teach literary Chinese spanning more than two thousand years in a course meant for beginners, and behind such attempts is the mistaken assumption – rarely explicitly stated – that literary Chinese is one single homogeneous language.

The first six lessons are also of doubtful soundness. The first four, we are told, are taken from a primary school text-book published in the 30th year of Kuang Hsü, but these have been rewritten. The aim of such text-books was to teach Chinese children simple literary Chinese, and for such an aim it was sensible to make use of the spoken Chinese the children already knew and to teach them to read and write a kind of literary Chinese that is a straight translation from spoken Chinese. But this method is ill-adapted to the purpose of teaching foreigners beginning literary Chinese, as they may not have any knowledge of spoken Chinese at all and even if they have they are unlikely to know Chinese in the way Chinese children know it. At best, this would be a wasteful method, as at some later stage the student who has learned this kind of simplified literary Chinese will have to unlearn a great deal of it. In the present case, the matter is made much worse by the rewriting. What was originally simple literary Chinese has become excessively verbose and at times downright incorrect. (I have, unfortunately, no access to the Kuang Hsü text-book, but all four lessons are included in Brandt's *Introduction to Literary Chinese* (Peking, 1936). There is no reason to think that the text in Brandt has been rewritten. In any case, the Brandt version is exactly the kind of thing that one would expect of a primary text-book of that particular period.) Here are some examples. In text 4 is the sentence,

今非獨畫深水亦淺 (p. 11).

It is no more possible to say such a thing in Chinese than to say "Not only is the pitcher deep, the water, too, is shallow" in English, because of the polarity of *shen* and *ch'ien*.

In text 3 we find

人爲之說牆上所書之義 (p. 9).

This is supposed to mean "people explained to him 'the meaning of what was written on the wall,'" (p. 513), but *ch'iang shang so shu chih yi* can only mean "the *yi* that was written on the wall". More will be said about this when we discuss *so*.

On the Outline of Grammar, I do not intend to offer any comments except that as the sentence is the basis of analysis, it is somewhat surprising that the only definition of a sentence offered is that it is "a form that is not in construction with any other form" (Gr 1.3, p. 688). It is further said that "not being in construction with another form means that a sentence is bounded by pauses" (Gr 10, p. 827). On the basis of this definition, predicates that share a common subject are treated as independent predicate sentences, "because they are separated by full pauses and not joined by conjunction or by symmetry" (p. 830). As the pause serves a variety of purposes, one would like to know how a "full pause" can be distinguished from other kinds of pauses. At any rate, the sharing of a common subject by a number of predicates surely is the most basic way in which a complex Chinese sentence (whether literary or spoken) is constructed with the minimum use of connectives.

There are two procedures used in the explanation of constructions which cannot be left without comment. First, there is the notion of a transform (Gr 8.412), which is explained in the *List of Grammatical Terms* as "a form derived by transformation, especially a nominal phrase derived from an S-P form" (p. 209). This results in the treatment of an expression as a transform where it is either impossible to say what it is that it is a transform of, or where it is only possible to do so by explaining the expression in the most extraordinary manner. The expression 長者 is said to be a transform (p. 807), but we are not told what kernel form it is a transform of. Again, 馮護者 is said to be a transform and it is only possible to say that it is a transform of 此人馮護也 by first equating it in meaning to "something like 馮護之此人" (p. 813), which is quite impossible in Chinese.

The second procedure is the use of square brackets to fill out expressions that are supposed to be elliptical. This proves to be disastrous. The resultant expression in full form turns out to be, in nine cases out of ten, impossible Chinese. For example,

下[於]山 (suggested on p. 535), 角[以]力 (p. 649), 無有[之]也 (p. 665), 江東地方[以]千里 (p. 583), 乃入[以]見 (p. 593), 仰[以]視 (p. 817), are all quite impossible. The most astonishing examples are those involving 所[於] (p. 529, 606, 673, 675). The explanation given for 所[於]居 is that "since 居 is an IV [intransitive verb] we assume that 所 is equivalent to 所於" (p. 529). Similarly, because 之 is an intransitive verb, presumably by the criterion that its object cannot be replaced by 之, we find 之[於]薛 (p. 560). Now it is possible for A 之 B to mean "A goes to B", but A 之於 B can only mean "A is to B . . ."

There are cases where the use of square brackets is simply the result of a failure to understand the original sentence.

採藥[而]去 (p. 633) would mean "left after collecting herbs", whereas the original sentence means "gone to collect herbs".

授[以]軍機大臣: "He was invested with the title . . ." (p. 644). By the insertion of *yi* the expression is changed from the passive to the active.

以五十步[之故]笑百步則何如: "[If these latter] on account of [only] running fifty paces laugh at . . ." (p. 547). The original sentence literally means "If, as a fifty-pacer, he were to laugh at . . ." The addition of the words in square brackets has changed the meaning.

不亦[爲]君子乎: "Is not [such a person] indeed a gentleman?" (p. 596). This shows a failure to appreciate that *chün tzu* is used as a stative verb here and that this usage is quite common in the *Analecals of Confucius*.

在邦無[人]怨[之]: ". . . there will be none [who] resent [you]" (p. 598). Surely it is obvious that *wu yüan* is a straightforward verb-object construction.

友[之]朋: "a group 朋 of friends – various friends" (p. 676). The expression has been misconstrued. *Yu p'eng* is a co-ordinate construction made up of two near synonyms.

The treatment of function words is not always satisfactory. For instance, the note on *yeh* 耶 says, "Final Particle (interrogative) similar to 乎, but favoured for disjunctive questions" (p. 429). In Gr 10.6151, this is said of 歟(興), "This final particle is mostly employed with rhetorical questions" (p. 851), and in Gr 10.6152, 耶, 耶 are said to be "synonymous with 歟(興) and are also used primarily in rhetorical questions" (p. 852). Can any grammarian writing after Mullie and Graham afford to treat these interrogative particles in quite such a cavalier manner? Graham, for instance, has said quite explicitly both that "In the *Analecals* and *Mencius* the functions of 興 *yu* in interrogative sentences are those of 也 *yeh* in indicative sentences", and that "the same is true of the functions of 耶 *ye* in the appendices of the *Book of Changes*".²

On p. 522 the word *fei* 非 is explained as "a fusion of 不 and 惟 which latter was an equational verb of the early Chou period (and presumably not unrelated to the late Chou 爲 . . .)". On p. 236, it is again said that "in early Chou *wei* was an equational verb 'is'. While they are phonologically different, it seems most likely that 惟 and 爲 are variants of the same word." In spite of the admission that 爲 is phonologically different from 非 and the lack of any positive evidence, the author is tempted, in one place, to state quite categorically that 非 is "equivalent to 不 爲 . . . The opposite of 非 in this sense is 爲" (p. 236). This is simply not true: 非 is indispensable in negative equational sentences, but not only is 爲 not indispensable in positive equational sentences, its occurrence is in fact exceptional in pre-Han texts. Again, it is said that "the equational verb 非 can only be used to negate an equational nominal predicate" (p. 522). This is not so. 非 is used in non-equational sentences with verbal predicates, e.g., 城非不高也 (*Mencius*, II. B.1). The function of *fei* in such sentences is quite different from that in equational sentences. This is clear even from the way these sentences have to be translated. The *Mencius* sentence can only be translated "It is not

¹ Apart from two instances of 所於 in ch. 15 of the *Chuang tzu*, I know of no other. That these do not figure in the parallel passage in ch. 1 of the *Huai nan tzu* suggests that the *Chuang tzu* text is possibly corrupt.

² A. C. Graham, "The relation between the final particles *yu* 與 and *yeh* 也", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 1957, xix/1, p. 123.

that the city walls are not high." This shows that the function of *fei* is to negate the whole sentence rather than the relation between subject and predicate.

We have already seen something of the difficulty the author has with *so* 所 in insisting that *so* before an intransitive verb is really "short for 所於". But his difficulty does not end there. Although he says that 所 transforms an S-P construction "into a nominal phrase 'that which is . . .'" (p. 745), he generally prefers to use the formula "what is . . .", e.g., "所悟 'what was realized', 所書 'what is written'" (p. 529), and it is this second formula that has misled him into the mistake we have noted above: "所書之義: 'the meaning of what was written,'" not realizing that "所 y 之 x" should be understood to mean "the x that is y-ed" where x replaces only the "that" in "that which". Hence 所書之義 can only mean "the yi that was written".

The explanation of constructions involving *ho* 何 is also unsatisfactory. First, 何也 is said to be equivalent to 何故也 or 以何故也 (pp. 546, 549, 591, 624). Take the text 寡人之民不加少, 何也 (10.5). It is possible to say "寡人之民不加少, 其故何也", or "寡人之民何故不加少", but it is not possible to say "寡人之民不加少, 何[故]也". Second, 何 is expanded to 何以 which is said to be the full form (p. 750). Here are some examples: 何[以]患乎無君 (p. 540), 何[以]足以言此 (p. 676), 亦何[以]足取 (p. 679). To say that 何以 is the full form of 何 and that the meaning is "why" or "how" is to ignore the difference between the two. All the above examples with 何 are rhetorical questions, and these are changed into genuine questions by the insertion of *yi*.

Again, the treatment of *hu* 乎 is unsatisfactory. It is simply said to be a variant of 於 as a coverb, and in the example 何患乎無君, it is said that 患 is an intransitive verb "with coverbal complement 乎無君" (p. 540). But this is to ignore the difference between 乎 and 於: "於 x" is a unit, but "乎 x" (e.g. 乎無君 above) is not. Moreover you can begin a sentence with 於, as in 於斯三者何先 (21 (11), p. 44), but you cannot replace *yü* by *hu*. As a result of this misunderstanding, the explanation of 惡乎 is equally unsatisfactory. On p. 271 惡 is said to be equivalent to 何於 which (as distinct from 於何) is impossible. Again, on p. 751 it is said "Or possibly they [i.e., 安 and 惡] are interrogative pronouns with coverbs implied. This would explain the occasional occurrence of 惡乎 'whereat?' (乎 being a variant of 於)." There are two things wrong with this statement. 乎 is not a variant of 於 in the expression 惡乎 as 惡於 is impossible. Second, 惡乎 does not simply occur occasionally, but is a regular construction, and, by and large, the distinction between 惡乎 and 惡 is very clear. (For instance, it is always 惡 in rhetorical questions.) Instead of it being the case that 惡, like 焉 and 安, is possibly an interrogative pronoun with a coverb implied and that the occurrence of 惡乎 is somehow anomalous, the opposite seems to be the case: the regular occurrence of 惡乎, but not of 焉乎 or 安乎, shows that 惡 is different from 焉 or 安 and does not imply a coverb.

There are a considerable number of explanations both in the notes and in the commentaries that are not quite correct. Here are some examples from the notes.

- (1) 讓王 does not mean "kings who abdicated" (p. 275) but the "abdication of the position of a king".
- (2) The distinction between 憂 and 悲 is certainly not that the first is a stronger emotion than the second (pp. 283, 300). 憂 is the persisting state of being worried while 悲 is a feeling, that of sadness.
- (3) 願為諸君快戰 (7 (10)). It is very unlikely that 快 here means "quickly" (p. 303). The meaning, as given in Chinese dictionaries, is 稱心. The text can, perhaps, be freely translated, "I should like to have a really good fight to show you that what I said was true."
- (4) 吾知公長者 (17 (10)) 長者 does not necessarily mean "one who is a senior", but it sometimes means "a good man, a kindly man, an avuncular man", and the present instance is a case in point. Here is a further example. When Han Hsin betrayed Chung-li Mo, the latter cursed him, saying, "公非長者" (*Shih chi*, Peking, 1959, p. 2627).
- (5) 參在參閱 does not mean "partly, in part, additionally" (p. 312), but is a verb meaning "to examine, to compare".

- (6) The meaning of 再 is given as "twice, a second time" as a numeral, but "again, further" as an adverb (p. 333). This is incorrect. In early Chinese, 再 could only mean "twice, a second time", while the word for "again" was 復, and the distinction between the two was strictly observed. (See Wan Li 王力, *Ku tai Han yü* 古代漢語, Peking, 1962, Vol. I, p. 138.)
- (7) The dates, 378-343 B.C., given for King Wei of Ch'i, are based on the *Shih-chi* and are in fact incorrect. They should be 357-320 B.C.
- (8) In 游削於不寸之質 (24 (19)), 削 is not a verb (p. 361), but a noun meaning "a knife, a graver," and object to 游. This is also clear from the *Han fei tzu* passage to which reference is made in the commentary (p. 614) where it is said, 必以削削之. The first 削 can only be a noun. The text in question should be taken to mean "to manoeuvre a knife on something less than an inch in size".
- (9) The word 機 in 軍機處 does not mean "strategic planning" (p. 399), but "confidential matters".
- (10) 招商[局] does not mean "[Bureau] for Attracting Trade" (p. 424), but "[Bureau] for inviting Merchant Participation". 商 by itself can only mean "merchant" not "trade".
- (11) 統籌 does not mean "putting together and calculating, to tot up, to sum up" (p. 425) but "overall planning".
- (12) The 王 in 殺王綽詰之學 does not refer to 王筠 (p. 45), but to 王引之. (and perhaps to his father 王念孫 as well). Elsewhere, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao uses the more explicit phrase 戴段二王 (*Ch'ing tai hsieh shu kai lun* 清代學術概論, Peking, 1954, p. 31).
- (13) 南海 is not the name of the city of Canton (p. 458), but the name of a hsien, though part of Canton was within the Nan Hai Hsien.

The following are examples of mistakes from the commentaries.

- (14) 衛使夷公之斯追之: "The emissary of Wei (who) was Yü-kung chih szu . . ." (p. 528). 使 is a verb and the sentence simply means "Wei sent Yü-kung chih szu . . ."
- (15) 宦者之為禍: "When eunuchs produce the disaster" (p. 618). 為 does not mean "to produce". The sentence means "the disaster of eunuchs is such that . . ."
- (16) 窮則變變則通: "[When the ordinary series of changes] is exhausted then a major alteration occurs; when a major alteration occurs it reaches everywhere" (p. 649). The translation does not seem to mean very much. 窮 and 通 are opposite terms. The quotation, for the purposes of the present context, can, perhaps, be rendered "When one reaches a dead end one should change one's approach, and when one has changed one's approach one gets through."
- (17) 汝自視乃如常兒乎: "When you look at yourself are [you] then only like an ordinary boy?" (p. 672). 視 does not mean "to look at", but "to look upon as". The sentence means "Do you then look upon yourself only as an ordinary boy?"
- (18) 此不亦畏之太甚而養之太過歟 (L (8)): "Is not this indeed to encourage their fears too much and to coddle them too excessively?" (p. 754). Presumably "them" and "their" refer to the people. But on p. 841 we get a different translation "to fear it too greatly and to nourish it too overmuch". Here it is not at all clear what the "it" refers to. From the context it seems that the 之 in 畏之 refers to "wars" and the 之 in 養之 refers to "the person". The sentence is somewhat obscure, but it occurs once before in a clearer context. Unfortunately the present extract has been abridged, and the earlier passage in which the sentence is found has been left out.

There are also some cases of wrong readings. For instance, 磨且 should be read T'ang Chü and not T'ang Ch'ieh (p. 484); 安釐 should be An Hsi and not An Li. In a different category is the reading of Tseng Shen for 曾參 (pp. 335, 491). This is, indeed, the reading usually followed but is, nevertheless, wrong. The correct reading is Ts'an, 參 being a loan for 驂, as can be seen from his *tzu* which is 子輿. (See Wang Yin-chih

王引之, *Ching yi shu wen* 經義述聞, Basic Sinological Series edn., p. 907; for further comments by other scholars see Chou Fa-kao 周法高, *Chou Ch'in ming tzu chieh ku hui chieh* 周秦名字解詁彙編, Taipei, 1958, pp. 113-14.)

何爲 is given as hó-wéi, and 奚爲 as hsi-wéi (p. 75) when they should be hó-wéi and hsi-wéi. This is also the case when a word is interposed between *ho* and *wei* as in 何渡爲 (17 (18)) where again we are told that 爲 is the coverb wèi.

從 is read ts'ung in 從之者如歸市, and the explanation is given that it means "to follow close after, to accompany, to attend to, to look after" and that it is read tsung as a noun meaning "a follower" (p. 259). First, the usual reading in this context is tsung. Second, the distinction implied here that it is ts'ung as a verb and tsung as a noun is certainly not correct. The distinction is somewhat obscure, but it seems to be, to begin with, a distinction between the literal meaning of "to follow behind" when it is read as tsung and the metaphorical meaning of "to follow" when it is read as ts'ung. For instance, in 從一而終 "[a woman] follows one husband to the end of her life", it is read as ts'ung. The distinction shifted subsequently and the word is read tsung when the meaning involves the idea of "an appendage, or an adjunct" and ts'ung for other senses. Again, 王者 should be wáng che instead of wáng che (p. 813).

The character 醒 has both a p'ing and a ts'e tone. In the line 夜飲東坡醒復醉 (27 (10)) it should be hsing and not hsing (p. 384).

In a number of cases, the explanation departs from the traditional. Whether this is justified or not, in a text-book for beginners the reason for such a departure ought to be given, but no reason is in fact given. In 延之以三簋 (13 (18)), 延 is explained as "to invest". There is no foundation for such a gloss. The usual gloss of "to invite" seems perfectly satisfactory. In 孟嘗君願謂馮諼 (14 (32)), 願 is explained as "to look at out of the corner of one's eyes" (p. 287). The graph 俱 is said to be "a loan for 具" (p. 304). In neither case is there any foundation for the explanation. In 爲之政以率其僚屬 (26 (23)), 率 is read as *li* and explained as "to set limits to; set a standard for; to regulate" (p. 269). This, again, is not the usual reading which is *shuai* "to lead, to encourage". In 己所不欲勿施於人 (21 (9)), 施 is read as *yi* and explained as "to extend". This is wrong. The usual reading *shih* is correct, as it means here to "practice on, to impose upon".

There are a considerable number of mistakes in the Chinese characters in the notes and commentaries. 老子 (p. 121) should be 莊子; 已而 (p. 123) should be 已而; 蒲 (p. 225) is wrongly written with an extra stroke; 蘇 (p. 275) should be 蘇; *chai* (p. 323) should be written 宅; *Nieh* (p. 394) should be written 巢; *pei* (p. 423) should be written 備; 嗚呼 (p. 428) should be 嗚呼; *mei* (p. 461) should be written 寐; 家 (p. 467) is a mistake for 豨; *li* (p. 489) should be written 慄; 所畫 (p. 529) should be 所書; there should be a 之 after 請而見 (p. 558); ... 核桃 ... (p. 613) should be ... 桃核 ...; ... 之悅 (p. 622) should be ... 之說; 見殊 (p. 624) should be 見黜; 雜 (white collar) (p. 631) is a mistake for 胥; 見被 (p. 672) should be 見背; ... 弟 (p. 674) should be ... 第; 下障 (p. 786) should be 下障; ... 傳語 (p. 797) should be 傳語; 爾相如 (p. 798) should be 爾相如.

I have dwelt on the mistakes of this book because it is a text-book for beginners and mistakes of any kind detract from its usefulness, and also in the hope that what is here pointed out will be of some use to the authors when the time comes for a revised edition.

D. C. LAU

Su Tung-p'ò, *Selections from a Sung Dynasty Poet*, translated by Burton Watson, pp. 139. New York and London, 1965. 28s.

In this little book Professor Burton Watson has succeeded in sharing with his readers the enjoyment of the personality and poetry of the great Sung poet, Su Tung-p'ò. Although the outline of the poet's life in the Introduction is but short, it forms an adequate and convenient frame-work for reference later on, as the translated poems are given in chronological order with occasional biographical notes. The selection of 86 poems, which includes the two famous prose poems on the Red Cliff, is

sufficient to provide a representative picture of the life and times of the poet and his art and distinctive appeal. "I have naturally chosen poems which I like and which I think go well into English" writes the author. Perhaps this is a wise maxim for a translator, as his sincere appreciation of the poems in the original tongue must come through in the translation. When reading over these poems one is aware that the translator sees the whole situation very clearly in each of them and does his best to convey it to his readers. For example, in No. 3, in the opening lines:

East wind stirs fine dust on the roads.

First chance for strollers to enjoy the new spring.

Slack season - just right for roadside drinking.

Grain still too short to be crushed by carriage wheels.

There is, however, the problem of straight translation or over-translation to make the idea clearer, as for instance, in the same poem, line 8, "Picnic baskets strew the fields where crows pick them over". The actual words say that "crows become tame", that is to say they are not afraid of people any more but dare to come near to pick the left-overs.

There are lines which appear not particularly clear in translation:

Poem 2, line 3, Songs and flutes upstairs - threads of sound, translates "the sound of songs and flutes upstairs quietly (floats through the air)".

Poem 4, 4th line from the bottom, How could I hope next year won't come? translates "Next year, could there be no year?" which could be explained as "Of course there is a next year". Same poem, last two lines

I work to hold on to the night

While I can still brag I'm young

translates the idea "tonight is all there is left for me to make an effort in, as I can still claim to be young (so long as the old year lasts)".

In Poem 6 there are two mistakes: the date in the original is the 14th, not the 24th; the poet "stopped for a bite and a drink" which lasted till the evening, not as Professor Watson translates "and reached there by evening".

In the first prose poem on the Red Cliff (No. 55), "He drank wine overlooking the river" translates "he poured libation on the water of the (Yangtse) River"; and "dipping gourds into the wine jar and pouring for each other" should perhaps be rendered as "lifting the gourd bottle and urging each other to drink" (p. 87).

But these are minor errors which detract but little from the excellent service Professor Watson has rendered, through his quick succession of publications, to students of Chinese.

K. P. K. WHITAKER

A. C. Soper, *Textual evidence for the Secular Arts of China in the period from Liu Sung through Sui (excluding treatises on painting)*, 71 pp. + 5 half-tone figures. *Artibus Asiae Supplementum XXIV*, 1967.

Professor Soper consigns in this volume material which forms a pendant to his *Literary Evidence for Early Buddhist Art in China*. The exclusion of works on painting is intelligible but drastic, in a period when painting seems to have been the only branch of art for which critical interest threw and for which a critical language was being forged. What remains over in surviving literature makes an anthology with a minor interest for art-history, and only a slightly greater one for Chinese literature. It is extremely well done. Comment on it must be as desultory as its contents. The social stance in art is of course as much in evidence as in later times: the gentleman may not strive too hard, even in calligraphy. A wide acquaintance with portrait painting is argued by the frequent appeal to portraiture in bestowing personal praise - "as pretty as a picture" is not (one would guess) a frequent remark in post T'ang literature. A rather nasty use made of a portrait is recorded in the Southern Ch'i history, when paintings of a dead prince and of his concubines were used to put his grieving wife out of love with him. The naïveté and banality of this reference is typical of the anecdotal material

grouped as evidence from prose sources. This section is followed, rather unfairly, by longish quotations from Chang Yen-yüan and T'ang Hou, called *Reminder*, evidently to recall that the Chinese were capable of better stuff on art.

The *Evidence from poetry* is predictably the most attractive and interesting portion of the anthology, less for any insights it affords into particulars of artistic theory and practice, than for its demonstration of the identity of verbal and pictorial image. Both are concrete, categorized and rhythmically related, an affinity which is at the bottom of the perennial Chinese concept of the common aim of literature and painting—a concept limited rather than extended by the poem-calligraphy-painting link insisted on by the tradition of *wen-jen hua*. The author's illustration of the texts by further reference and comparison with extant works of art is consigned to a separate final chapter of comments, of which the most amusing is the excursus on battle pictures, a statement by a tenth century poet that "in Six Dynasties painting combats are frequent" being in contradiction to surviving works and other evidence. The whole book and this section in particular are informed with the author's daunting erudition, perhaps surpassing any that has been so systematically applied to the history of Chinese art.

WILLIAM WATSON

Yen Chih-t'ui, *Yen-shih chia-hsün* (Family instructions for the Yen clan). An annotated translation with introduction by Teng Ssu-yü. (Monographies du T'oung Pao, Volume IV). Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1968. Gld. 68.

The *Yen shih chia hsün* occupies a very special place in Chinese literature. Its significance goes far beyond what one can expect of a work of this genre. This is because Yen Chih-t'ui was a man of many parts. He served four dynasties and rose to a position of some importance in his official career. He was a Confucian whose views were tempered by Buddhism. He was a considerable scholar and a talented writer. Above all he was an authority on phonology who was, to a large extent, responsible for the form the *Ch'ieh yüan* eventually took. This versatility accounts for the wide range of topics covered by the *Chia hsün*, which is a mine of information for students in a variety of fields. There has long been a need for a translation of this work which would make it accessible to the general reader. When a complete translation was announced, one had high hopes that, at long last, this need was going to be satisfied, but, in the event, such hopes have been badly shattered.

The task of translating the *Chia hsün* is by no means an easy one, as Yen Chih-t'ui possesses a style of considerable literary distinction. The translator must, to some extent at least, be able to do justice to this side of the work. On the other hand, there are compensations. As a work which is likely to have a wholesome effect on the young, the *Chia-hsün* has attracted the attention of a series of commentators. Chao Hsi-ming's commentary, together with the added notes by Lu Wen-ch'ao, has made the task of reading this at times difficult work much easier. In 1960, Professor Chou Fa-kaio put all students of this work deeply in his debt by publishing his *Yen shih chia hsün hui chu* 顏氏家訓彙注, which gathered together everything that had been written on the text up to that time. Since then, further commentaries have appeared, for instance, those by Mr. Ch'en P'an and Professor Wang Shu-min. Thus most soluble problems concerning difficult textual points have been solved for the translator, and he has little or no excuse for misinterpretation. Unfortunately for us, the present translation gets the worst of both worlds. The English is hardly intelligible, let alone adequate to convey the elegance of the original, and there are innumerable mistakes, many of which could have been avoided if the translator had paid more attention to the commentaries.

First, the crudity of the English. 文章 (title of Chapter IX) is rendered "On Essays" (p. 85) when the opening section mentions every conceivable genre of writing, including poetry. 東方曼倩滑稽不雅 is rendered "Tung-fang Man-ch'ien had an indecent sense of humour." (p. 86) 爲鬼所嫉 is rendered "is envied by devils." (p. 203) 釋憤 is rendered "relieve dizziness." (p. 208). Again, 後雖有臣僕之稱 is rendered "Later on, although there were such titles as minister or servant." (p. 29). Can the

reader be expected to see that this meant that "in subsequent periods, although there was the use of words like *ch'en* your subject or your slave and *p'u* your servant to refer to oneself (instead of the use of one's own given name)"?

The imperfections of the English are nothing compared to the lack of comprehension of the Chinese. These range from misunderstanding of single expressions and function words to total reduction to nonsense of entire passages. As these are so numerous, only a selection can be dealt with in a review.

Let us begin with misunderstanding of *single words and expressions*. In the opening section Yen Chih-t'ui says that the various writers since Wei Chin times have simply repeated what has been said before, just like 屋下架屋. This is rendered "making a room under a room." (p. 1) Surely, in that case all that happens is that one gets another room. There is no obvious reason that this should be superfluous. In fact, the word *wu* means, in this context, a roof, and a roof under another roof is, indeed, superfluous. The same mistake is found again on p. 17 where 寄人宅, 奴婢徹屋爲薪略盡 is rendered "Another time he rented a house to someone whose slaves and servants almost entirely demolished it for fuel." This ignores the distinction in the original between 宅 for house and 屋 for roof. Again, 寡妻 is rendered "widowed mother" (p. 1) when it means "consort, principal wife". 累德 is rendered "misconduct" (p. 21), and "their careers were impeded" (p. 93) when it means "a blot on one's moral character." 梁代謂之漢聖 is rendered "who was regarded as 'the Han sage' in the Liang period", (p. 164) when 漢聖 in this context, means "the greatest authority on the *Han shu*." 多饒積厚 is rendered "repetition of forgiveness and accumulation of kindness," (p. 174) when 饒, meaning "rich", is a near synonym of 多, while 厚 is to be understood in the sense of abundance. 準的 is rendered "a sure target", (p. 203) when 準 is used as a synonym of 的.

Function words and rhetorical questions seem to be a source of trouble. For instance, 比及數歲, 可省答罰 is rendered "For several years punishment with the bamboo rod should be avoided." (p. 3) This is to misunderstand both 比及 and 可. This should be "After a few years, the rod can be spared." Again, 五百年一覽, 猶比轉也 is rendered "a wise man appears but once in five hundred years, yet people should still try to compare with him shoulder to shoulder." (p. 46) The mistranslation is, at least in part, due to a misunderstanding of the word 猶. This should be "The appearance of one wise man in five hundred years should be considered to be as frequent as a line of wise men standing shoulder to shoulder." 假令有者 is rendered "Since all that they had . . ." (p. 117) when 假令 means "even if . . . were".

Here are examples of *rhetorical questions*. 亦何忍哉 is rendered "Who would tolerate this?" (p. 25) This should be "How can the father bear to stand by when this happens?" 安可悉廢之乎 is rendered "Why should all of them be discarded?" (p. 39) This should be "How can all these things be discarded?" 況 seems to offer special difficulty. For instance, 況凡庶乎 is rendered "Why can the common people not be so?" (p. 52) This should be "How much more so with the common people."

There are some surprising mistakes which result from misunderstanding of the *syntax of an expression*. 目不邪視 is rendered "sly glances would not be seen," (p. 3) when this should be "the eyes did not glance sideways." 但重於詞怒, 傷其顏色; 不忍楚撻, 憐其肌膚耳 is rendered "they merely fear that heavy reprimands will cause loss of face and that unbearable beating will injure their bodies." (p. 4) This should be "the reason is merely this: they do not resort lightly to angry reprimand because they are pained by the expression on the child's face, and they cannot bear to beat him because they are distressed by the bodily pain he suffers." 視聽之所不曉 is rendered "see and hear what you cannot understand," (p. 22) when it should be "there are things you have never seen or heard." 禮緣人情, 恩由義斷 is rendered "Rites are based in human nature, and kindness springs from upright decisions," (p. 38) when the second part of the sentence should be "love should be regulated by what is morally right." 必能悲慘自居, 何限於深藏也 is rendered "If one really feels grieved and wishes to live in solitude by oneself, then why is it necessary to limit oneself to deep concealment?" (p. 39) The first part of the sentence should be "If one is able to remain in a state of sorrow." 求請身而無所得 is rendered "Forced to depend

upon themselves, they could do nothing." (p. 54) This should be "When they looked within themselves they found that they had gained nothing in learning." 忠孝無聞 is rendered "Of loyalty and filial piety they appear to have heard nothing." (p. 60) This should be "they are not at all known either as good subjects or as good sons." 同其遺屋 is rendered "when asking about building a house." (p. 60) This should be "ask them about the building of a house." 權轉爲詩儒道之, 始將發口, 懸見排聲 is rendered "Ts'ui reported this point to the other scholars. [One of the latter] was about to speak, but he suddenly felt disturbed. . . ." (p. 65) This should be "Ts'ui recounted what I said to the scholars, but no sooner had he opened his mouth than he was brushed aside." 至乃倦劇愁憤, 輒以講自釋 is rendered "until extreme fatigue and intolerable grief led him to give up his teaching." (p. 70) This should be "and whenever he was tired, sad, or enraged, he would get relief from lecturing." 每被課厲, 勤勞經史, 未知爲子可得安乎 is rendered "for you have faithfully taught and trained me by hardwork on the classics. If I prove ignorant of performing a son's duty, how can I feel at ease?" (p. 74) This should be "Every time you urge me to work hard at my study of the Classics and Histories, I wonder whether I, as a son, can be easy in my mind." 太史公記曰 is rendered "T'ai-shih-kung [Ssu-ma Ch'ien] says in his [Shih-] chi," and, again, 應劭風俗通云, 太史公記 is rendered "Ying Shao's *Feng-su t'ung* says, 'T'ai-shih-kung notes that . . .'" (p. 166) In both cases 太史公記 was simply one of the names by which the *Shih chi* was known. 調絃未通央 is rendered "the silk arrangement has not been done yet." (p. 174) Professor Teng is perhaps following the reading 調絃, but whatever the reading, the expression can only mean "tuning the strings" and so "to play on the lute." 河北此書, 宗藏一本, 遂無作李處者 is rendered "My family had a copy of this book made north of the Yellow River. But it was not attributed to Li Ch'ien." (p. 176) This should be "A copy of this work is to be found in every household to the north of the River, but none gives Li Ch'ien as the author."

There are cases of serious mistakes which make complete nonsense of the original.

(1) 人之事兄, 不可同於事父, 何怨愛弟不及愛子乎? 是反照而不明也。An elder brother should be treated in the same way as a father. Why, then, should love of a younger brother be less than love of a son? There is confusion and lack of clarity in such comparisons. (p. 10)

This should be

If a man fails to treat his elder brother as a father, then how can he complain that his elder brother fails to treat him as a son? To do so is to fail to see himself as he is when looking within.

(2) 案爾雅, 喪服經, 左傳, 姪名雖通男女, 並是對姑之稱。晉世已來, 始呼叔姪。

. . . nephews, which, according to the *Erh ya*, *Sang-fu ching*, and *Tso-chuan*, can be applied to both male and female children of a father's sister. Since the Chin dynasty the term uncle-nephew has begun to be used [in the sense of the son of your father's brother]. (p. 31)

Can a reader be expected to see the point from this muddled translation? What Yen is saying is that, although in the *Erh ya*, *Sang fu ching* and *Tso chuan* the term *chih* applied to both sexes, it was a term correlative with *ku* (father's sister) and it is only since Chin times that *shu* (father's younger brother) and *chih* are used together as correlative terms.

(3) 且賈甲爲兵, 昨筆爲吏, 身死名滅者如牛毛。角立傑出者如芝草; 擢紫披黃, 吟道詠德, 苦辛無益者如日蝕, 逸樂名利者如秋荼。豈可同年而語矣?

Moreover, mailed warriors and penholding officials, quite unknown after death, are as numerous as hair on a cow's hide; outstanding and eminent persons are as rare as the *chih* plant, while those who stick to plain (silk) and yellow (scrolls), who ponder morality and virtue, who work painstakingly without reward, are as unusual as a solar eclipse. Idle enjoyers of fame and gain are as numerous as autumn weeds. How can you find a common basis (lit. in the same year) on which to discuss such conditions? (p. 55-56)

The wayward way in which this passage has been punctuated has completely obscured the point. What Yen is saying is this. Of men who followed the career of a soldier or a functionary, those who died completely unknown were as numerous as hair on a cow's hide while those who distinguished themselves were as rare as the *chih* plant. On the other hand, of those who studied, those whose toil was in vain were as rare as eclipses of the sun while those who attained a life of ease, profit or reputation were as numerous as autumn weeds. How, then, can one mention the two, i.e., those who follow the career of a soldier or a functionary, on the one hand, and those who study on the other, in the same breath?

(4) 思魯等曠夫彭城劉靈, 嘗與吾坐, 諸子侍焉。吾問儒行敏行曰: "凡字與魯諸名同音者, 其數多少? 能盡識乎?"

Liu Ling of P'eng-ch'eng, the husband of Ssu-lu's aunt, once sat with me surrounded by other boys. I asked Ju-hsing and Min-hsing saying, "How many characters have the same sound as *tsu-i*. Do you know all of them?" (p. 83)

The *chu tsu* which has been translated as "other boys" should in fact be translated as "his sons". What Yen was asking the sons of Liu Ling was whether they knew all the homophones of the given name of the *tsu i*, i.e., their father, viz., the word "ling". This was so that they knew what to taboo. The question would be pointless if it were about homophones of the words *tsu* and *i*.

(5) 異物志云: "螭劍狀如蟹, 但一臂偏大爾。"

The *I-wu chih* says, "The *yung chien* [a certain kind of crab] looks like a crab, but the carapace is larger and flatter." (p. 103)

The final sentence means, "but the only difference is that one of its pincers is bigger than the other."

(6) 後漢書: 囚司徒崔烈以銀鑿鑿。鑿鑿, 大鑿也。世間多誤作金銀字。In the *Hou-Han shu*, Ts'ui Lieh, a minister of justice, was imprisoned with tinkling *lang-tang* chains, which means a great chain. Usually people miswrite it in the sense of a silver or gold fetter. (p. 104)

Yen's point is that very often people mistakenly write the character 銀 *yin* (as in 金銀) for 鑿 *lang*.

(7) 其五以縱有因緣, 如報善惡, 安能辛苦今日之甲, 利後世之乙乎? 爲異人也。

fifth, even though there is a causality which commands retribution, they wonder how the painful exertions of the man of today can benefit the man of a future generation; thus he is an atypical man. (p. 139)

The final sentence of the translation can only be described as astonishing. The passage should be translated "fifth, even if there were such a thing as causality, yet in the retribution of good and evil, how can suffering be inflicted on A of today in order to benefit B of a subsequent incarnation, as A and B are different persons?"

(7) 夫信謗之微, 有如影響。

. . . the actions of believing in and denouncing Buddhism follow each other like a reflection and an echo. (p. 144)

It is not belief and blasphemy which follow each other like reflection and echo. It is the certain effects, i.e., reward and punishment which follow belief and blasphemy like shadow following a form and echo following a sound.

(8) 元年, 制詔丞相斯, 去疾, 凌度量臺始皇帝爲之, 皆刻辭焉。今觀號而制辭不稱始皇帝, 其於久遠也, 如後嗣爲之者, 不稱成功盛德。

In the first year [of the Second Emperor of Ch'in] a decree instructed the minister [Li] Ssu and [Feng] Ch'ü-chi saying that "the laws and units of measurement were entirely made by the First Emperor and the statements were all inscribed. Now although I have inherited his title of "*Shih-huang-ti*", it should not appear on stone inscriptions for his (the First Emperor's) name will be long lasting. If my successors make inscriptions, they should not praise (personal) accomplishments and splendid virtue. . ." (p. 168)

It is surprising to be told that the Second Emperor inherited the title of "*Shih-huang-ti*". This is symptomatic of a failure to grasp the point of the passage which is this. All the standards of weights and measures were instituted by the First Emperor

and this was duly inscribed on the objects, but in the inscriptions, the First Emperor was referred to simply as *huang ti* "Emperor". Now that I, his son, had inherited the title of *huang-ti*, if the practice of simply using the term *huang ti* in the inscriptions were to be continued, then in the far distant future it would appear that the standards were instituted by a descendant of the First Emperor instead of by the First emperor himself. This would detract from the great achievements of the First Emperor.

(9) 賈誼傳云：「日中必莫」，注：「莫，暋也。」曾見人解云：「此是暴疾之意，正昔日中不須矣，卒然憊矣耳。」

Chia I's biography says, "In the middle of a day, it must be good to expose;" and the commentary explains that *wei* means to expose (pao). I have heard a gentleman explain this phrase saying, "The *pao* means a sudden illness, which attacks a man in the middle of a day, and soon after he dies." (p. 186)

The explanation suggested by the gentleman referred to may be mistaken but it is certainly not the patent nonsense the translator has made of it. What Yen has said is this: "I have heard someone explaining it in this way. '*Pao*' is to be taken in the sense of 'quickly' as in *pao chi* [*chi* being a near synonym of *pao*]. What is said is simply that 'the sun does not stay at the highest point for more than a moment. Abruptly it declines.'"

There are even cases of quotations from the classics being mistranslated. For instance, 求福不回, rendered "working for fortune without disappointment" (p. 60), is a quotation from Ode 239 and should be "seeking for blessing without swerving". Again, "to refuse to serve the wrongful ruler was the principle of I and Chi" (p. 92) is the translation of 何事非君, 伊棄之莠也, the first part of which is a quotation from *Mencius*, II.A.2 and should be translated as "willing to serve any prince."

In the chapter on Phonology, there are also a number of mistakes. "The southerners pronounce . . . **sjäk* 石 as **ds'ja* 射" (p. 190) Here **ds'ja* should be **ds'jäk*, as Yen is concerned, in this group of examples, only with wrong initials. The asterisk in "**ua* 哇" (p. 191) is misplaced, as *ua* is not the ancient pronunciation of the character. "In *Ch'i shan* 岐山, *ch'i* should be pronounced **kyjē* 奇, but south of the Yangtze it is read **g'jē*." (p. 193) **Kjijē* should be *g'jē*.

There are various oversights that suggest carelessness in the preparation of this work. There is a case where a phrase in the Chinese has been left untranslated. After the fifth line in the final paragraph on p. 32, the sentence 母屬者爲某姓族 has been left out. There are also cases where a text has been mistakenly taken as part of a quotation. On p. 97 we find ". . . *P'o-ching fu* which runs, "In ancient times, . . . would not enter" But this passage is not a quotation. Again, on p. 154 "Ti is a tree classified under the radical *mu* (wood)" is said to be from the *Shuo-wen*, when only "ti is a tree" (this rendering is questionable) is from the text of the *Shuo-wen*. There are inconsistencies in the translation. For instance, the expression 行路 is correctly translated on p. 91 (end of page) as "strangers" and on p. 10 as "outsiders", but on p. 4, 一言之是, 徧於行路, 終年譽之 is translated "A single well-chosen word, the father would praise for a whole year wherever he went," where 徧於行路 means "to all passers-by", i.e., to all and sundry. Again 所以讀書學問 is correctly translated on p. 59 as "the reason for reading and studying is primarily to . . .", but on p. 56 所以學者, 欲其多知明達耳 is wrongly translated as "Therefore study will increase one's knowledge and ability to understand." There are even discrepancies and errors in the quotation on p. xxix of a passage from p. 92.

Although it is stated in the Introduction that "the text used in this final translation is Chou Fa-kao's *Yen-shih chia-hsün hui-chu*," (p. xxxiv) there is at least one instance where departure from Chou's text resulted in error. On p. 82 we find

Let us try to consult the *Shuo-wen*, [note. This bird is described in *Shuo-wen chieh-tzu ku-lin*, pp. 1644-45] "The *fen* 鶉 sparrow is similar to the ho pheasant although blue; it comes from Chiang;" The *Yün chi* gives the pronunciation *fen* 分.

Now Chou's text reads 鶉 and 介 and he points out that 鶉 and 介 are mistakes. Furthermore, when one looks up the *Shuo-wen* reference given in the note, the bird described is also the 鶉.

There are some mistakes in Chinese characters as well as in romanization. 台灣 (p. xxvii) should be 台灣; 讓 (p. 27) should be 讓; 續 (p. 167) should be 續; I-yung (p. xxix) should be I Yin; Wei 嬌 (p. 100) should be Kuei; T'ao Chih (p. 145) should be Tao Chih; *yu ti chih t'u* (p. 154) should be *yu ti chih tu*; *kung* (p. 155) should be *chiung*; Fang (p. 162) should be Fan; Kuan (p. 167) should be Wan; Chien-ting (p. 176) should be Chen-ting; *chih-yu ts'an chün* should be *chih-yü ts'an-chün*; *D'uan-*Kam (p. 196) should be *D'uan-*Kan; 質 is twice given as Huo (p. 207) when it should be Ho. 郭璞 is romanized throughout as Kuo P'o when it should be Kuo P'u.

Finally, there are mistakes in the Bibliography. Chang Hsin-cheng (p. 213) should be Chang Hsin-ch'eng. In the entry Chao I, *Nien-erh-shih k'ao-i* it would appear that either the author or the title must be mistaken. In 証廣韻五十聲類 (p. 211), there should be a — after 五十. Wang Shu-ming 王叔鳴 (p. 226) should be Wang Shu-min 王叔岷.

It is, in fact, much to be regretted that this translation, on which the author has obviously lavished time and energy should prove to be of doubtful value to the general reader because of inaccuracies and oversights.

D. C. LAO

Tibet, Land of Snows, by Giuseppe Tucci, translated by J. E. Stapleton Driver, 216 pp., 80 plates in colour and black and white. London, Elek Books, 1967. 84s.

The publishers have done a very great service to the neglected cause of the now rapidly disappearing Tibetan civilization by producing this magnificent book by Professor Giuseppe Tucci. Professor Tucci may be justly acclaimed the greatest scholar in Tibetan culture, whether in east or west. Between the years 1927 and 1948 he made many expeditions into Tibet, and during three decades he has applied his vast erudition to the revealing of so many hidden treasures of Tibetan life, art and learning. His expeditions into Western Tibet in the 1930's revealed the existence of many ancient monasteries and temples, derelict and neglected, matters of indifference to the Tibetans themselves, yet containing magnificent frescoes and images, and representing the earliest surviving Tibetan religious art. These and other like discoveries are recorded in his *Indo-Tibetica*, 4 vols, Rome, 1932-41. But for his reporting, they would now be lost to posterity for ever. Apart from his important editions of Tibetan, Sanskrit and Chinese texts, often of MSS. which he himself has discovered, and his informative scholarly travelogues, one must note particularly his major work on the cultural history of Tibet, namely, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, Rome, 1949.

During the past ten years Professor Tucci has turned his attention to fresh fields, to archaeological work in Afghanistan and northern Pakistan, where overworking as always, he has made with his colleagues most brilliant discoveries. Thus we have reason to be glad that he has found the time to write a short readable book on Tibet in respectful memory of a culture to which he owes so much. He has produced it as a kind of "swan song" of Tibetan civilization, for he knows that the traditional life of Tibet, which he knew better than any other Westerner, has now disappeared for ever. The book is divided into general sections, namely, history, religion, art, daily life, family rites, literature, and administration.

The section on history provides a comprehensive survey, and treats in some detail of the post-war period and the Chinese Communist take-over. Despite all his personal concern for the Tibetans in their present trials, he analyses quite dispassionately the causes of weakness of the *ancien régime*. Because of the vastness and complexity of the subject the chapter on religion will probably prove the most difficult to the uninitiated reader, for in writing of Tibetan religion succinctly one needs to take for granted so much knowledge of Indian Buddhism and an appreciation of attitudes to life typical of our own Middle Ages, but even with our own past modern man seems to have lost all contact and feeling of sympathy. Inevitably he seems much closer to communist theory than to what he is likely to denounce as medieval obscurantism. For all its lighter parts, Tibetan religion is certainly dark, often horrific and certainly mysterious. It would have helped the clarity of the subject matter in the present case, if

sub-headings such as pre-Buddhist beliefs, deities, divine kings, yoga, monasteries, etc. had been introduced into the text.

The chapter on art is a masterly survey as one would expect from such an authority. The chapter on literature is very short for so large a subject. The main intention, certainly realized, was to give an impression of the more popular Tibetan literature by quoting translated extracts from selected works. Professor Tucci also draws attention to the Tibetan interest in history, something that separated them remarkably from their Indian teachers. It is noteworthy that the Tibetans have been good historians of their own traditions, and they may have developed this art from their early practice of writing royal annals. Small mention (p. 197) is made of scholastic literature, which probably accounts for over 90% of all Tibetan literary production. But again, any comprehensive account of it, would require a knowledge of Buddhist religion and philosophy, which one naturally hesitates to take too readily for granted in one's reader. The chapters on daily life, family rites and administration complete this over-all description of a world that has passed.

The illustrations, many of them in colour, are really magnificent. Mr. J. E. S. Driver deserves commendation for his good translation of the original Italian typescript. There are a few petty mistakes incurred through overhaste, e.g. the date of the coin reproduced on pages 134 and 135, or the reference on page 112 to the ancient Buddhist monastery of Odantapuri as being situated at present-day Paharpur (East Pakistan). The site of Odantapuri, known to be near Nālandā, remains unidentified, while at Paharpur was the once Jain and later Buddhist establishment of Sompura. But such small slips are hardly avoidable, and all in all this is a very fine book, of which even so great a scholar as Professor Tucci and certainly his publishers have every right to be proud.

DAVID L. SNELGROVE

Joseph Wolff, *A Mission to Bokhara*, edited and abridged with an introduction by Guy Wint. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Joseph Wolff was an eccentric Victorian traveller, whose principal expedition was made in 1843-5, when he went to Bokhara to ascertain the fate of Colonel Stoddart and Captain Conolly. Wolff's description of this "mission" was first published in 1845 and had reached its seventh edition by 1852. In this century he has been forgotten. His name is not even mentioned, for example, in the current *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Nevertheless, Guy Wint, the well-known journalist and writer on the East, who died in 1969, has performed a useful service in reviving his memory. For Wolff's journey took place shortly before the Russian advance swallowed up the independent khanates of Central Asia, and much of the atmosphere of the period can be perceived from his account. Wolff's own original narrative was full of repetitions and unnecessary discursions tiresome to a reader of the present day. Guy Wint has reduced the text to about half its original size without affecting the narrative. In a long introduction he has provided useful supplementary background material, and notes have been added at the back of the book giving further detail concerning people and events referred to in the text. These reveal the editor's wide reading of the contemporary sources and modern comments upon them. The result is a useful and readable book, which deserves to be a success.

R. E. EMMERICK

Lien-sheng Yang, *Excursions in Sinology*, xii+250 pp. Harvard University Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1969. 72s.

Included in this collection are, Professor Yang tells us in the Preface, "twelve research articles (mostly from the *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, one from *T'oung Pao* and two from books containing conference papers); a short account and discussion

of Chinese calligraphy; and the original English text of four lectures delivered in French at the Collège de France", all written, one may add, between 1947 and 1957. Between them these articles cover a wide variety of topics - from the concept of "free" and "bound" in Spoken Chinese to the ancient game of *liu po* - and practically the whole expanse of Chinese history - from the Yin to the end of Imperial China. There is, perhaps, no more fitting testimony than this volume to the catholicity of Professor Yang's interests and the breadth of his scholarship. It is difficult to imagine a student of Sinology who can come away from its pages without finding something to delight as well as instruct.

In an otherwise well-produced volume, it is a pity that the editor has missed the opportunity of correcting the occasional misprint which escaped notice when the articles were first published, e.g., *kuan k'an* (p. [102], n. 20) should be *kuan k'an*, *chao chih* (p. [127], l. 9 and p. [128], last paragraph) should be *chao shu*, and *lung mei* (p. [240], l. 5) should be *lung mai*, and it is somewhat surprising to find that on page 46 a comma has been inserted, and on page 118 a quotation mark deleted, by hand.

D. C. LAU