

NOTICES OF BOOKS

Günther Wenck, *Japanische Phonetik*. (Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.) Band I, Band II: 1954, pp. 373 and 328; Band III: 1957, pp. 411; Band IV: 1959, pp. 496.

Despite its title, Professor Wenck's work is likely to be of more interest to the philologist than to the phonetician in the usual sense of the term. It is divided into three parts, the first dealing with the phonetics of modern Japanese (including dialects), the second with the history of "sound-consciousness" and of the study of Japanese sounds in Japan, and the third with the history of the Japanese sound-system. It is noteworthy, however, that the first two parts and the first section (concerning the sources for the study of the Japanese sound-system) of Part III are all contained in the first volume. Each of the three other sections of Part III occupies a bulky volume of its own, entitled respectively "The phonetics of *man-yoogana*", "The phonetics of Sino-Japanese", and "Phenomena and problems of phonetic change in Japanese". Thus the main emphasis in the work is laid on the historical aspects of Japanese phonetics. Moreover, even its description of the phonetics of modern Japanese is not primarily based on practical investigation and experiment by the author, but is a condensation of material from a number of sources—though perhaps all the more useful for that, since almost all the sources are Japanese. At the time when he began working on the field of Japanese phonetics (originally for a thesis), in occupied Germany after the war, Professor Wenck had no opportunity of dealing in any other way with modern Japanese. But in fact his procedure here is consonant with his general approach throughout the work. He sees the task of the Japanologist as very largely that of a critical intermediary between Japanese scholars and Western scholars. By surveying the great body of Japanese work in the field of phonetics (in a wide sense), he wishes to help lay the solid philological foundation which Japanology, unlike older disciplines, lacks. One cannot but agree with him that the European scholar cannot hope to rival his Japanese counterpart in the breadth and depth of his researches into the various aspects of Japanese culture; and of all those aspects, that of the ancient language is perhaps the least accessible. I do not believe, as I understand Professor Wenck believes, that the Japanese necessarily have much real advantage over the foreigner in research into modern Japanese phonetics, but there is no question that in almost all else that Professor Wenck's work covers they do, and the foreign researcher must lean heavily on them. Professor Wenck has therefore rendered an incomparable service to Western students of Japanese by bringing together so much of the results of Japanese work. Despite its comprehensiveness, his work is extraordinarily detailed and thorough. Indeed, in endeavouring to avoid mere dogmatic statements and to present evidence in full, with clear distinctions made between facts, theories, hypotheses, assumptions (and his own views), he has, as he himself admits, reached the limits of readability. To compensate for this, he has made his references less full than they might have been. But it would be churlish to cavil at this; rather, I would stress what a prodigious amount of labour must have gone into the preparation of the work as it stands.

This is true not only in the sense that the author has obviously worked through the mass of relevant secondary sources extremely thoroughly and conscientiously, taking into consideration work produced in Japan as late as 1958, but also in the sense that he never shirks the discussion of a subject in the minutest detail. The second volume, for instance, consists of a systematic examination of each of the Chinese characters used as *man-yoogana*, in an attempt to discover how far the use of numerous

variants was capricious and how far it is possible to establish norms, *i.e.* what Chinese sounds were felt to be the best possible equivalents of Japanese sounds (note that he is aiming not at a reconstruction of the actual sound-value of the *man-yoogana*, but only at an arrangement of them according to Chinese sound-categories). According to Professor Wenck, his examination reveals that *man-yoogana* norms use *pre*-Middle-Chinese sound-distinctions; this fact, since the beginnings of *man-yoogana* cannot be placed as far back as the time when the Chinese language was at this stage of its development, can be best explained, he feels, by assuming that *man-yoogana* were based not directly on Chinese but on Sino-Japanese, and that the Sino-Japanese of, say, the second half of the seventh century reflects a stage of Chinese at least a century older.

In Vol. III, he investigates in equally patient detail, the phonetics of Sino-Japanese. Here he is concerned not with Japanese proper, but with Chinese sounds, and what happened to them when Chinese words were taken over by the Japanese. He does not hesitate to plunge deep into preliminary discussions of points in the reconstruction of ancient Chinese itself. This volume is divided into four main sections, dealing respectively with the equivalents in Sino-Japanese of the Chinese initials, medial vowels, syllable-final consonants (a particularly interesting section, comprising syllable-final nasals and the "entering-tone" sounds, which were the origin of what is now called *sokuon*) and finals. Of these sections, that on finals is the most extensive and has as its main feature a series of tables modelled on the *inkyoo*, in which are presented, in addition to reconstructed Chinese forms, series of characters arranged according to the different (Chinese) types of initial, together with their modern *on* readings, such *on* readings of them as occur in *kana* in old Japanese annotations of Buddhist and other Chinese texts, and their Sino-Korean readings. Professor Wenck does not, of course, pretend that it is possible in the present state of knowledge to arrive at definitive conclusions about the development of Sino-Japanese, or that, if it were, it would be legitimate to draw any direct conclusions therefrom about the actual sounds of ancient Japanese proper. He maintains, however, that a study of known differences in the Sino-Japanese of various later periods can at least show in what phonetic contexts problems arose and thus indirectly contribute to the history of the Japanese sound-system itself.

In these two volumes Professor Wenck goes far beyond the role of critical intermediary, and makes considerable contributions of his own. Indeed, he himself considers his study of the *man-yoogana* in their relationship with Sino-Japanese and Sino-Japanese sound-categories to be the scientific "centre of gravity" of the whole work. For me, however, the most interesting volume is the last, in which he passes to a consideration of important points in the development of the sound-system of Japanese proper. This is a volume of the highest value for Western students of the history of the Japanese language, containing extremely full discussions of the following matters: for the Nara period, the *tokusyu-kanazukai*, the nasalization of vowels, vowel harmony, the avoidance of hiatus (dealing, *e.g.* with elision), the ancient Japanese /p/ and its history, and the ancient Japanese sibilants; for the Heian period, /-i/ and /-u/ *onbin*, the contraction of vowel-combinations, the nasalization of initial /u/, the disappearance of distinctive semi-vocalic syllable-initials, the phonetic development of voiced stops, syllable-final nasals in Japanese proper, the sound-shift in the Heian period, and the Japonicizing of Sino-Japanese; for the feudal period, the phenomenon known in Japanese as *renzyoo* (*e.g.* the gemination of consonants, as in the word *tennoo*, "Emperor") in Japanese proper, palatalization and "assibilization", the disappearance of Sino-Japanese labial *yoo-on*, the full nasalization of medial /g/, and the development of *akusento*. (I quote the titles of these sub-sections in full, since they are not listed together anywhere in the work. Very inconveniently, no table of contents appears except in Vol. I, and that, while giving full details of the subdivisions of that volume, has only the general titles of the other three volumes, presumably because they were at that time not completed.) Once again, I cannot over-emphasize the meticulous care with which these problems are discussed, evidence sifted and all possible explanations and hypotheses considered. Moreover, Professor Wenck is no destructive critic, and in many places (*e.g.* the sections on ancient Japanese /p/, or /s/ and /z/) makes original

points and advances theories of his own. He has a definite contribution to make, for example, on the /i/ *onbin*, believing it to be bound up with the difference in ancient Japanese between the two types of /i/ syllable. He recognizes, however, that this idea, while helping the understanding of some aspects of *onbin*, also raises new problems. His own ideas are examined with no less rigour than those of others.

The aspect of the development of the Japanese sound-system which strikes me perhaps most forcibly on reading this volume is the importance of nasalization, whose influence appears to have been far-reaching in the extreme and may well explain a number of phenomena otherwise difficult to interpret. I should like also to mention the two interesting general points which Professor Wenck makes in connection with "the sound-shift in the Heian period", a period when so many changes were taking place that it might be called, he says, "the period of the Japanese sound-shift". As basic factors in this process, he sees two things, first, the influence on each other of Japanese and Sino-Japanese, and second, the instability of the vowel-system caused by the decay of the ancient vowel-distinctions.

With a truly monumental work such as this, it would be idle for a reviewer to quibble about one or two slight misreadings, or about minor points on which he disagrees. I cannot, however, forgo a comment on the format of the work. In the first place, it is not made any easier to read by being reproduced from typescript, though the author cannot of course be blamed for that. My real complaint, however, is against the complete lack, not only, as I have said, of any detailed tables of contents for Vols. II, III and IV, but of anything, such as running heads, which would enable one to find more easily where the individual sections of the books begin and end, particularly the latter, since the notes are grouped together at the end of each section. Another simple thing which would for me have made the text easier to read, would have been the underlining of names of works appearing in the text, rather than the use of inverted commas as at present.

Let me not finish, though, on this note of trivial criticism, but instead emphasize that this work is a remarkable achievement, and a major contribution to European knowledge of the development of the Japanese language.

D. E. MILLS

D. L. Snellgrove, *The Hevajra Tantra*, Part I, Introduction and Translation; Part II, *Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts*. London Oriental Series, Vol. 6, Oxford University Press, London, 1950, XV, 149 and XI, 188 pages, 2 plates.

The reviewer must say first that he has hesitated to write the review since his ignorance of Sanskrit makes it impossible for him to do full justice to the author's work. But having some experience of Tibetan he may at least say how important is Mr. S's contribution since the *Hevajra Tantra* is so frequently quoted in purely Tibetan texts and has been one of the authoritative sources of development of Tibetan tantrism.

The present work consists of two parts. First (Vol. II) the critical edition of the Sanskrit text based on three MSS, with the Tibetan translation juxtaposed page by page, followed by a Sanskrit commentary, the *Yogaratanmālā* of Kāṇha compared in footnotes with its Tibetan translation; and finally a most useful Tibetan-Sanskrit-English vocabulary, with references to the text, and a Sanskrit-Tibetan glossary. Second (Vol. I) the translation with many learned notes, preceded by a very well written and instructive introduction, and followed by a résumé of contents provided with cross-references, eight diagrams and tables of classifications, an analytical and detailed glossary of special Sanskrit terms and an index of names and subjects.

The usefulness of the work need hardly be stressed. Such a handy and reliable edition of an important text will always remain an indispensable source of information. The philologist will find new words or a new and precise definition of already known ones, as well as a list of metaphors of the secret "language of the *ḍākinis*". The student of iconography will have the description of the divinities and their arrangements, the historian of philosophy and religion a deep insight in the most essential aspects of tantrism.

Such a book should not and will certainly not be read only by the few specialists of Buddhist Sanskrit and Tibetan. Other scholars will benefit from the translation and introduction. But in this respect the reviewer would be inclined to express regrets as to the method of translation. As he says in the "apologetic" part of his introduction, the author has felt necessary to apologize for the "unpleasant practices" of the tantras and to expunge "short passages here and there, in which nothing of value is lost".

The reviewer cannot agree to this. The general reader may find shocking detailed descriptions of sexual practices, but the scholar will view them with the same objective detachment and unconcern as the yogins did themselves. Certainly, as the author says, the commentaries insist above all on the symbolical meaning and the internal process, but this is primarily in order to warn against those who would only see the external practice and would thus be reborn in hell. But though the practice was certainly considered dangerous to handle (like a poison as medicine) by the ordinary man, it was surely also viewed as a necessary technique and must be studied as such. The new approach is precisely to liberate from passions through the handling of them. If the authors of the tantras had wanted to minimize the actual practice or the sexual symbolism, they would have expunged the text themselves. It is interesting indeed to see that when Hevajra is teaching Nairātmyā philosophy or ritual (and the reader of the expunged text could imagine them sitting sagely on chairs in a classroom well behaved) the tantra feels necessary not only to mention briefly that they have intercourse, but to describe it in most exuberant details. It will be necessary to consider this very fact, whatever may be the explanation. It is remarkable too that the Chinese translation has also expunged all such passages. Were it not for the Tibetan and Sanskrit texts our knowledge of the tantra would have been incomplete.

Dr. S's translation is from the Sanskrit, the Tibetan version having only been a help. It is thus difficult for the reviewer to judge, but in some cases it may be interesting to note that, at least for a Tibetan unacquainted with Sanskrit, a different meaning may be suggested. The Tibetan version must often have remained unintelligible to a Tibetan, and still more the Chinese version to a Chinese, the language of the translations adhering very closely to the Sanskrit, too closely often to make sense in the new language. One can imagine that an oral, colloquial teaching was necessary for them. Some observations may therefore be ventured.

P. 47. The tantra opens, like all sūtras, with the classical formula: at that time the Buddha was at such a place. The author translates: "the Lord dwelt in bliss with the Vajrayoginī". But the Tibetan clearly means: "dwelt in the womb (or sex) of the Lady", using the word *bha-ga* which, in Tibetan, has only that meaning (like p. 73 where *bhaga* is translated "triangle of origination", a term, *chos-byuñ*, which only occurs later in verse 3). For the student of comparative religion, it is important to have the literal meaning even if it is only a metaphor (*idem* on p. 92, verse 38, 41).

P. 51, "make an image of a snake", but all versions have: "of Ananta". Yellow colour made of "green lac" is startling. Tib. *ldon-ros* is Chin. *hsiuung-huang*, "orpiment". The Skr. has *haritalakta* (cf. Monier-Williams: *haritālaka*, "yellow orpiment"). Note 4: "nāga-subduing juice". Chin. has *lung-hua shu chih*, "juice of *puspa-nāga* tree".

P. 52, "cloud-rendering ritual" (*sprin dral-ba*). According to Chin., that means to stop rain. Note 4, *kūṣṭhārachinna*; Chin. does not translate just *ts'ao*, grass, but *ts'ao-t'ie* *ts'ao*, iron-cutting grass.

P. 53, v. 23: "together with *śukra*". The text has: "with *Akṣobhya*". This is of course the same, but the reader should be told which term is actually used in each case.

P. 54, "(sun and moon) stand still so that sun and moon will be indistinguishable day and night". Tib. and Chin. suggest: so that there will be no distinction between day and night.

P. 57, "one should first imagine a corpse which represents the whole of existence". Something must be wrong with the text which has (Skr., Tib. and Chin.): "which represents *dharmadhātu*". The Tib. *ro*, corpse, here corresponds to Skr. *mṛtaka*, but the *Taishō* edition notes: *amṛtaka* (= *ro*, flavour).

P. 59, "there is sun and moon"; text has: "moon-āli and sun-kāli", with interesting inversion of attributes.

- P. 66, "the (right) *yogin* and *yogini*"; Skr. and Tib. have: "brother and sister", terms which may seem interesting to some readers.
- P. 67, v. 5: "if he indicates the earth, one should indicate the mouth". Chin. too has "earth", but Tib. has *so*, teeth, and not *sa*, "earth", the former being more appropriate in the context.
- P. 71, v. 21. One may note that the Chinese version has expunged this passage on eating human flesh and slaying.
- P. 74, v. 8, the word "embryo" for *piṇḍa*=*gōn-bu* is perhaps too precise; rather a lump or globular mass.
- P. 79, "for the yogin all these (form and so on) appear in their purified condition, for of Buddha-nature is this world". The Tibetans have understood: "and in this way this world becomes Buddha".
- P. 81, v. 5-7, "a *yogini* is resorted to . . . , one binds the face of the *prajñā*". The text has twice: *mudrā*; why not keep the same term? As for the commentary (n. 6), one is astonished to hear that: "in order to teach foolish worldlings the way of passion one should place in the *maṇḍala* a girl . . .". It is clear that the girl is put there for the use of the yogin and for her own initiation. Perhaps the more common meaning of *byis-pa* would help: "a plain young man [or girl] not initiated or married", as S. Ch. Das puts it. That is also what is implied by the Chin. *t'ung-tzū* in the text, a young boy or girl, mature but still pure. The whole practice is indeed an elaborate instruction in sexual behaviour and could well be compared with similar institutions in China or with aboriginal tribes of Asia. In these civilisations sexual instruction of young people before marriage (and its use after marriage) as well as links with religious initiation are well known. Against such a background the tantric rites do not appear as shocking or unusual. The sentence may then mean: "in order to instruct the youngsters in the ways of passion", that is precisely to get liberated of passion through passion, or to learn, as the text has it, "a mingling of passion and absence of passion". The difficult path of such a tantrist is precisely, not to be free from passion by staying aloof from temptation, but to be so even while he raises and even stirs up to the highest degree the physical experience of sexual passion.
- P. 82, v. 19, "it suddenly appears as sleep with no distinction between sleep and the waking state". The Tib. has: "appears as dream", which fits better. This is probably what the Tibetans call "luminous (conscious) dream", '*od-gsal rmi-lam*."
- P. 97, v. 29, one may note that the desire of "purifying" the text has led the Chinese version to say the contrary of the original: "you should *not* kill living beings and should protect them as yourself".
- V. 30. "To vow to save (*bsgral*) all men is interpreted as lying-speech". The Tibetans would certainly take the sentence '*ḥig-rten bsgral-ba ḥes-bya-ba* ("this is called saving the world") to be connected with the preceding sentence: "to take life". In many Tibetan texts, the verb *sgrol*, to save, is used as synonym for to kill.
- P. 98, v. 46-48. Just as the Chinese version, the author has chosen not to "burden" the reader with the list of unpleasant ingredients. For one of them, *svayambhukusuma*, we have the Tib. definition (n. 2), the English being found only in the vocabulary under *rañ-byun me-tog*, menstruation-blood. The comparatist ignorant of Tibetan, the sinologist for instance, would have needed at least a Latin definition and a translation of the literal meaning "self-born flower". Other terms, not listed in our dictionaries, lack definition even in the vocabulary. What is *bu-btsas-skyes*?
- V. 49, "he adorns himself with clay-markings of different colours". Tib. has: "with ashes of burnt corpses", an interesting item since Jäschke translates *thal-chen* by: (1) ashes of the dead; (2) also a sort of grey earth used for daubing the face in masquerade.
- P. 105, v. 47, a sentence is missing in the translation: *me-loñ ye-ḥes (ādarasajñāna)*=*lhan-ḥig skyes-pa* (innate).
- P. 104, v. 40, "the lower cakra" is "the cakra of the navel" in Tib. and Chin., whereas p. 105, v. 52, "situated at the navel" corresponds to *yomi*=*skye-gnas* in the text. This fits better than "navel" with the following "place where the birth of all beings come about". Also in v. 56-57, the "navel" is called *evamkāra*, the heart *dharmacakra*, etc. Why not give the actual terms of the text? Once more, p. 106, v. 61 "the monastery is

the womb (*lto-ba*=belly) . . . one is in the womb (*skye-gnas*=*yoni*)". But v. 63, "in the lower cakra" (text: *yoni*). There is then a hesitation between navel and *yoni*, which the reader should be enabled to discover.

P. 108, n. 3. Would it not have been worth while to tell the reader that the abiding of Hevajra in the *evam* (= *yoni*) is here qualified by the term "to remain in equanimity" (*samāpatti*=*sñoms-jug*)? The Chin. has here *san-ma-ti* (*samādhi*) instead of *san-ma-yueh* (*samāpatti*) and the goddesses issue out of different seed-syllables related to different *san-ma-ti*.

P. 113, v. 63, "then at the second stage he should cause the pupil to enter". The Tib. (*thun-tshod gñis-pa la*) rather means: "at the second watch". The Chin. translates: "at midnight".

These are only small details. The text repeats itself and is confused. Dr. S. has given an excellent systematic exposition of its teaching in his introduction, résumé and glossary. He has a very good chapter on the origins and history of the tantras and a clear explanation of the philosophy and the psycho-physiological process. One can hardly find a clearer account, for instance, of the mental creation or "process of emanation" (*bskyed-rim*=*utpattikrama*). This is very well explained as an experimental act repeating the very process of phenomenal existence. It is a reply to a question one may well ask, that is why there are so many different gods, *sādhana*s, *maṇḍala*s and so on. They must of course be as many and variegated as phenomenal existence itself. As for the reverse mental operation, the "realization" (*rdzogs-rim*=*utpanna-* or *sampanna-krama*), it is less fully treated, but this is because the tantra itself does not do so either. To judge from Tibetan texts where the latter is so often referred to, this process is not purely spiritual, but leads to the immortal "rain-bow body". Other tantras, like the *Guhyasamāja*, or Tibetan works like Tsoñkha's *ḥNags-rim* will have to be translated.

R. A. STEIN

Der Kienlung-Druck des Mongolischen Geschichtswerkes Erdeni yin Tobci von Saḡang Secen (= Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission. Band XIII.) Von Erich Haenisch. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1959, 4to, viii+271 pp.

Nearly sixty years ago Professor Haenisch drew the attention of scholars to the Chinese version, *Meng-ku yüan-liu*, of the Mongol chronicle *Erdeni-yin tobči*. At that time the existence and survival of a possibly intermediate Manchu version was unsuspected, nor was anything known of the Mongol manuscript or print which must ultimately have served as the basis for the Chinese translation. In more recent years Professor Haenisch has brought to light much more material which is indispensable to a proper re-editing of the chronicle. In 1933 he published a transcription of the Manchu-language palace print from Peking, and in 1955 the so-called Urga manuscript, the oldest and most valuable Mongol text of *ET*. His most recent publication, now under review, is a facsimile reproduction of the late eighteenth century palace print in the Mongol language. To this print there also belongs a manuscript which served as "copy" for it, and a page of this manuscript was published by Haenisch in an article in *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*, II, 3, 1954. It is unlikely that this manuscript, the last unpublished text in the western world, is in any way significantly different from the block print which was made from it. Unfortunately, the rich materials in the libraries of Leningrad, Ulan Bator and China (especially Kōke Qota, where a dozen manuscripts, including the originals of those recently published by the Reverend A. Mostaert are said to be kept) remain as inaccessible as ever. However, the complete material for a definitive edition and re-translation of this important chronicle is at hand, and the editor will not have to put up with the inhibiting possibility that new and vitally different texts may turn up during the course of his work.

This publication adds little of positive value to the study of the Mongol text of *ET*. The text of the palace print is very similar to that printed by I. J. Schmidt, and it appears that Žamčarano may well have been right in hinting that the manuscript used

by Schmidt was also used, earlier, in the preparation of the Chinese (and by implication, of the Mongol) palace prints. The two printed versions, Schmidt's made in St. Petersburg in movable type, and the Peking block print made independently probably more than fifty years before, are naturally not identical. Schmidt seems to have incorporated alterations in his text, perhaps based on the explanations of his informant. The colophon especially has been tampered with, as was pointed out by the Reverend A. Mostaert in *Scripta Mongolica II*. Occasionally, as on page 46, line 11, Schmidt seems to have faked his chronology, for the sake of apparent consistency or perhaps so as to accord with another source (here *Badhimör*). The palace print has its infelicities too, often due to errors on the part of the block-cutters. But such errors, for instance the reading *eke ökin* for *eke-yügen* (III, 4a, 1) can usually be corrected quite easily. However, the question of the interrelationship of Schmidt's manuscript, the so-called Cenggünjab manuscript (if these are in fact not one and the same) and the Mongol and hence Manchu and Chinese palace prints, should not at present be taken too far, as it soon becomes necessary to explain how the Manchu and Chinese versions can have occasionally retained a reading which appears from the Urga manuscript to be correct and original, while both Schmidt and the Mongol palace print are corrupt. Two examples illustrate this. In line 21 of folio 25r of the Urga MS we read: *jarim mayui sedkil-tü irgen yenggügen ügüleju*: "some nasty-minded people spoke slanderously of her". The corresponding Manchu text (Haenisch, p. 33, line 16) runs: *ememu ehe gūmin-i urse ehecume gisurehengge*, which may be translated in the same way, and the Chinese text has a similar meaning. Now both Schmidt and the palace print are corrupt here, omitting the word *yenggūren*, to which correspond Manchu *ehecume* and Chinese 讚. The former reads: *jarim mayui sedkil-tü irgen eyin ügülerün*: "some nasty-minded people spoke thus" (p. 58), and the latter, less intelligibly: *jarim mayui sedkil-tü irgen egün ügüleju* (III, 3b, 6). Second, the passage in the palace print (III, 20b, 3) *yeke ejen-iyen egeretü bayun ger-te kürčü ireküi-e*, Schmidt (p. 76) *yeke ejen inu egeretü bayun ger-te-ben kürčü ireküi-e* (Schmidt tr. "worauf er den Rückweg zur Heimath antrat. Als der Herrscher nicht mehr ferne von den Seinen war . . ." "whereupon he betook himself homewards. When the Ruler was no longer far from his own people . . .") can be shown by comparison with the Urga MS (31r) to be corrupt. *Ejen* should be read *ayan*, "hunt, campaign", and the passage translated: "he recalled his great campaign, and as he was about to reach his tents . . ." Now the correct tradition of this passage is retained in the Manchu (p. 40) *amba cooha be gocifi*, "recalling his great army" and in the Chinese 遼撤大兵. Thus the immediate source for the Manchu version must have read *ayan*, and not *ejen* as in both Schmidt and the Mongol palace print. It is thus clear that the Mongol palace print cannot be used unconditionally to correct the Manchu and Chinese versions, as might be the case were no other Mongol versions at hand.

However, the value of the text of the palace print is precisely the critical insight it permits us into the essential unity of the versions of *ET*, in spite of the minor variations between the two groups of texts, on the one hand the Urga MS and the MSS published by Mostaert, and on the other hand Schmidt's edition and the palace print. It is possible now to modify the opinion expressed in Haenisch's original article, before so much material was available, that Schmidt's text and the Chinese translation represent two different redactions. Speaking literally, of course, this is undeniably so—the Manchu and Chinese versions are often quite different from the tradition of Schmidt. But where they differ radically from all the extant Mongol versions, including the palace print, their putative parent, we must suspect either errors and misunderstandings on the one hand, or, on the other, a preference in the poetical passages for a properly alliterated piece of verse at the expense of the original sense if both objects could not be attained. There is now no real reason to suppose a different Mongol tradition upon which the variant Manchu and Chinese texts have been based, and the publication of the Mongol palace print has done us the very valuable, if negative, service, of demonstrating how carefully the Manchu and Chinese texts must be handled if they are adduced in explanation of the Mongol text. One such passage has been briefly discussed by the present reviewer in a review of the Urga MS. (*Erasmus*, Vol. 12, No. 19-20, p. 599a.)

Others are not difficult to find. Thus in Schmidt, (p. 142) we read: *bayiji oron-du qangya ügei bolum gele kemen*. Schmidt translates: "Diese war aber damit noch nicht zufrieden" ("But she was still not satisfied with this") and the phrase *qangya ügei* has been incorporated, with this passage as reference, into Kowalewski's dictionary with the meaning "mécontent de"—a translation which by itself would not be impossible. Similarly, and independently, the Manchu reads: *bayiji kemuni elerakü seme* (p. 64) and the Chinese 拜濟尙不愜意, both repeating the idea of continuing dissatisfaction. However, the Mongol text, which appears in the Urga MS (5rv) and the palace print (V, 8a, 4) in the same form as in Schmidt, evidently reproduces a proverb, with the characteristic closing phrase *gele kemen*: "saying, 'It is said . . .'" *Qangya* is probably the word listed in Ramstedt's Kalmuck dictionary as meaning "Holzklötz" ("block of wood") and in Luvsandendev as "rasporiki" ("stretchers, distance-pieces"). *Oron-du*, omitted in all the versions, I take to mean "in the bed". The context of the passage is that the Bayiji, or princess, is in pleasurable revenge licking the blood from the place where the Khan's finger has just been shot off, and the proverb seems to be a playful allusion to the mutilated hand: "It is said: 'There is a stretcher missing from the bed' ". The point need not be laboured that the Manchu and Chinese texts must from now on be considered secondary and inferior, unless they can specifically be shown to be better than the Mongol palace print, for instance through comparison with the Urga MS.

Towards the end the text of the palace print has undergone revision in a small but perhaps significant way. The rebel general Li Tzu-ch'eng is referred to in Schmidt and in the Urga manuscript by the title conferred upon him by his followers, Ch'uang wang, while the palace print has rejected this in favour of the original name.

The book is preceded by a short introduction from Professor Haenisch's pen. The Mongol text is clearly and legibly reproduced, which is especially gratifying since the printing had to be done from a blue-print copy made in China twenty-five years ago. As the editor says, this version of the chronicle may have its faults, but it cannot be overlooked in the preparation of a definitive European edition of *ET*.

C. R. BAWDEN