

NOTICES OF BOOKS

Roy Andrew Miller. *A Japanese Reader. Graded lessons in the modern language.*
(現代日本文読本) Rutland/Vermont, Tokyo. Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1962,
250 pp. (157-250 in Japanese script, numbered in reverse). £3.

Exercises and texts in Japanese script, divided into 75 lessons, take up 94 pages of this work; vocabularies and notes to the lessons take up 108 pages. Besides a general introduction and an index to linguistic points dealt with in the notes, there are also five appendixes, one of which gives the two prevailing schemes of periodization for Japanese history, and one consists of a long note on reading Japanese proper names.

The exercises and texts are in five parts, entitled: Introductory; Elementary; Intermediate; Advanced, fiction; and Advanced, non-fiction. The first 30 lessons, comprising the Introductory and Elementary parts, take the student only as far as fairly short "text-book" sentences and introduce him to no more than 350-odd Chinese characters, many used with only one reading (either *kun* or *on*). This seems an inadequate basis for the later work. From Lesson 31 onwards the material is from works written for mature Japanese readers, and, although in the Intermediate part the structure of the language is generally straightforward, the vocabulary is often rather specialized; in the Advanced parts, naturally enough, there are formidable difficulties of language structure. It seems to me uneconomical in the long run for a student to tackle texts such as those in the Intermediate part, let alone the two Advanced parts, before he has under all-round control (for two-way speech, reading, and writing) a basic nucleus of the language, capable of dealing, not too unidiomatically, with most non-technical subjects. Under the scheme of this book, many of the simplest and most essential words in their script form are met with for the first time in an Advanced text. The work, therefore, seems to me unsatisfactory as a complete graded course for teaching reading (or reading and writing).

On the other hand, as a source of reading material for properly prepared students, the Intermediate and Advanced texts are an excellent selection. They cover a very wide variety of styles and deal with suitable and interesting subjects.

The apparatus of exposition provided for these Intermediate and Advanced texts has shortcomings on the linguistic side, as will be shown below. But the notes on "background" are, so far as I can judge, generally accurate; they supply much useful information, some of which is likely to be new to any scholar. This is particularly true of the Intermediate part, for which the author has chosen extracts from works dealing chiefly, one imagines, with his own special interests, and some from works he has himself translated. The appendixes also are informative and useful.

Much labour must have gone into preparing the vocabularies and notes, and it may seem ungrateful to make as much as I am about to do of their shortcomings. But there seems to be a real danger that an independent student, or a class under an inexperienced teacher, may be led by this book, not only into some misapprehensions, but, what is more serious, into habits of rather superficial reading. The very excellence of some features of the work makes a warning the more necessary.

First, then, there are some careless statements of socio-linguistic facts. A footnote on p. 51 reads: "The word *Shina* (支那) for 'China' is not now in common use in Japan, though it was the only word for the country down to the end of World War II." The first statement is too sweeping, and the second untrue. Note 4 on p. 55, to the suffix *-chan*, reads: "a variant of *-san* used in addressing children or others younger than the speaker". The variant is in fact part of "baby talk", young children being taught to

use it of others just as much as they themselves are addressed by it. It is normally—apart from occasional nickname or pet-name uses—used to or of an adult, if at all, only when the user knew the person in question and/or his family intimately at the time this person was a young child. In n. 11, p. 67, *modan-boo* ("modern boy") is described as a Meiji era (1868–1912) term. Even if it originated so early, which I doubt, its heyday was surely the 1920's, and it was still in use in the 1930's. The description in n. 2 and n. 6, p. 116, of *otta* and *yūte oru* as "old-fashioned" is inappropriate. In the text in which they appear the Bishop of Ōsaka is using his local dialect, in which these are the normal forms, and this dialect is very much alive.

The treatment of some matters of pronunciation may mislead. On p. 26, after an explanation that *dzu*, still sometimes seen in certain romanized words, is a transliteration of what in traditional *kana* writing is a "modified *tsu*" as distinct from a "modified *su*", it is said: "These *dzu* spellings correspond to provincial dialect pronunciations of these words, but not to anything in the modern standard language". Now, it is true that in the standard language (and most other dialects) the sounds represented by "modified *tsu*" and "modified *su*" have long since coalesced. But, according to my observations, many standard speakers normally use a dental approach to this sound (irrespective of its origin), and the *d* element is surely all but universal following a "final *n*" in the same word or run, this "final *n*" being then a true *n* and not a nasalized vowel. In n. 24, p. 98, the forms *sorashiya shinai* and *dashiya shinai* (for the—in conversation—rather stilted *sorashi* (*dashi*) *wa shinai*) are unnatural if not impossible; the writing in the text undoubtedly implies the normal contractions, *sorasha* (*dasha*) *shinai*. In the index, *chya* [sic], occurring "in foreign words", is differentiated from *cha*, surely without any factual basis.

In the introduction (p. 15) it is said: "The English equivalents given in the Vocabularies are not complete dictionary entries; . . . [they] concentrate by and large on the meaning in the particular passage being explained." On occasions, however, the English equivalent given does not fit the context. On p. 52, "deep" is given for *fukai*, but the two occurrences of the word in the relevant passage are in *fukai tsunagari* and *kankei no fukai*; and, applied to words such as "connexion" or "relationship", "deep" is hardly acceptable English. On p. 101, *ichiō* is given as "more or less". The context is *o-taku-san no te de ichiō o-shirabe ni naru ni koshita koto wa nai*, and translations for part of this are suggested in n. 23, p. 103, using "if you were to conduct your own investigation (of him)". It seems impossible to fit "more or less" into this so as to give the right sense. Perhaps "if you were to make some (or 'some sort of') investigation yourselves" would do as a rendering, and the student might be told that *ichiō* is largely a lubricant, the amount of "sense" which it carries being very slight. Another such discrepancy occurs in n. 3, p. 122, where for *ittai* the student is offered "in the world, for goodness sake", the context being: *Watakushi wa saikin no Nippon no kodomotachi ga ittai kokka o utau kihai ga aru darō ka to utagau*. This seems to be adequately and naturally rendered by ". . . whether . . . have any opportunity whatever of singing . . ." It might possibly be claimed that "any opportunity in the world of singing" renders the sense, but that is scarcely natural English; and "for goodness sake" seems quite inapplicable.

Definite errors in the vocabularies and reading notes are relatively few, but not entirely absent. One venial slip occurs on p. 54 where, against *koharubiyori*, "Indian-summer day" should be "Indian-summer weather". On p. 101, *taikoban o osu* would be more accurately explained as "vouch (unreservedly) for someone" than as "give someone the highest possible recommendation". On p. 121, *ryōryō taru* is said to be "light, tripping", obviously because the character used in the text (撥) has been taken at its face value. But in the text the expression is used of the Japanese national anthem, played, it is true, by a brass band, but even that could hardly have made anything light or tripping out of *Kimigayo*. The character must be an *ate-ji*; the "correct" character seems to be 曉. However, the expression has become a stock epithet for music and is now (for all that it is literary rather than colloquial) more of an "ear word" than an "eye word". In popular use at least, the sense seems to have become rather vague and less important than the feeling of approval associated with the expression; so that

one might hesitate between rendering *ryōryō taru* "*Kimigayo*" as "the resonant strains of *Kimigayo*" or "the glorious strains . . .". In n. 2, p. 122, the explanation of *Nanika kaigi to yū to* (*sugu kai'in kiritsu shite . . .*) as "at the mere mention of a meeting" is off the mark. *Nanika*, in the usual construction, "requires" *mono* after the descriptive phrase (here *kaigi to yū*), and its absence shows the usage to be anomalous or idiomatic. It would probably give most help to a student to say that the clause is elliptical for *Nanika kaigi to yū mono ga aru to*, supplying a rendering on the lines of "Anything in the nature of a conference, and (at once . . .)" or "At anything in the nature of a conference (the first thing delegates do is get to their feet and . . .)"

Some explanations are inadequate rather than definitely wrong. Thus, in the vocabulary on p. 100, *kenson suru* is equated with "be modest and retiring"; the context, to which no note is provided, is: *Sempō wa kenson shite Makioka-san to watashi to de wa mibun-chigai de mo ari . . . to itte iru*. A student who thinks that this would be adequately rendered by "The other party [or 'He'] is modest and retiring, and says . . .", or even by "Being modest and retiring, he says . . .", is unlikely to have grasped the implication of *kenson shite*. It is inserted by the speaker before reporting what "the other party" says as a warning that this is to be interpreted in the light of the rules of Japanese etiquette, which prescribe a deliberate under-rating of oneself in the sort of situation in question (negotiating for a wife). The student needs a clue to this. Note 10, p. 102, reads: "*sorekiri* 'from then on'". [It further suggests a comparison of this word with *marukiri*, though a semantic connexion is far from obvious and an etymological one very doubtful.] Though "from then on" might serve in a running literary translation, it seems unwise to suggest to a student that *sorekiri* is a mere variant of *sore kara*. He needs to be referred to the uses of *kiri* as a particle and told that English lacks a simple equivalent for *sorekiri* in contexts like the present, so that one must choose in translating between making rather too much of it (e.g. "That seemed to be that, and (for a time I had no word)") or more or less ignoring it. Another example is n. 17, p. 103, reading: ". . . *ni kite itadakeru* 'receive (someone's) hand in marriage' ". This fails to bring out the implication in *kite* (not to be adopted into her family) and omits the "potential" sense of *itadakeru*. Note 28 on the same page suggests that *omowareru* is no different from *omou*, making no mention of the compulsion or inevitability implied by this use of the "passive" ("can only think, cannot help thinking"—or in the actual context, after *dō ka to*, "could not help wondering"). Here, as in some other notes to extracts from novels, a quotation is given from an English translation of the novel by a generally reliable translator. This practice has its dangers; the literary translator's main object is to make a total impression on his reader which shall be as nearly as possible the same as that made on a reader of the original work and to that end may legitimately sacrifice some points of detail. But a learner of the language needs to be helped to understand all the details.

I may have given a disproportionate amount of space to positive infelicities in this work and so given an exaggerated impression of their number and importance. They may do less harm than what seem to me to be gaps in the annotation. The notes to some of the Advanced texts—and particularly to the dialogue in novels—are not adequate, in my opinion, to enable an average student to follow the text with full understanding, even with all available dictionary help. To take only the first two sentences from *Sasameyuki* in Lesson 57, there is a difficult use of *tokoro* at the end of a clause; a somewhat unusual use of *hajimete* (to mean something like "reviving the matter" instead of the common "for the first time"); a bit of structure in *go-soodan o shinai de warukatta* which is likely to worry some students (who might be helped by pointing out the near-parallel in "it was wrong of me not consulting you"); and the ellipsis in *yoi en o nigashite wa to omotta*, where *ikenai* or something similar has to be "understood" after *wa* (at least, that is the explanation I should give of this construction; others may be possible). No note is given to any of these points except the last, and the note to this, "(concerned) if (one) miss, lest (we) miss", scarcely explains the construction. Or, to take an example from a non-fiction text, the first sentence in Lesson 66 reads: *Denwa no juyō wa mezamashii mono ga arimasu*. An ordinary enough newspaper-style sentence no doubt! But should not a student be told something about

the *ga*? If space could not be found for annotating all the texts in more detail, it seems to me that it would have been better policy to leave some of them without any annotation at all. Explaining some things in a text but not others of at least equal difficulty—and some of the points which are explained in the Advanced texts are rather elementary—is likely to suggest to a student that what is unexplained is unimportant. He may then come to think that the Japanese themselves do not mean anything particular by the things which seem a bit odd, and that all one can hope for in reading Japanese is to get a somewhat vague idea of the general sense.

To sum up, as the basis of a complete course this work cannot be recommended; it attempts to teach people to run before they can walk. But the selection of texts in the Intermediate and Advanced parts could hardly be bettered as a source of reading material for students with the necessary basic knowledge. However, for some of the texts at least, most students will need more help than is provided in the notes, which, moreover, are not always to be trusted. A student who uses the apparatus of exposition provided without having it amplified and amended by a competent teacher will not only be left with a few misapprehensions about details, but may be led into a habit of mind which is inimical to further progress in understanding the finer points of the language.

It remains to add that the book is admirably produced, in the printing of the Japanese texts and all other respects. I have noticed only two misprints, the omission of the *i* of "idol" against *gūzō* on p. 79, and 無 for 舞 in Lesson 54, column 18 (p. 215). [I should explain that I have romanized quotations from the texts to save printing costs.]

F. J. DANIELS

Don C. Bailey. *A Glossary of Japanese Neologisms*. Pp. xii, 172. Tucson, Arizona Press 1962.

This glossary is an extraordinary hotch-potch of the useful, the interesting but only marginally relevant, and the totally unnecessary.

It is unquestionably a valuable and most welcome source of information about genuinely new words or expressions, both those of foreign or partly foreign origin and those whose elements are wholly Japanese (particularly such words as *kaminari-zoku*, "the thunderers"), [the Japanese equivalent of the English "ton-up boys"], where the meaning is not obvious even though the individual constituent parts of the word are not new in Japanese). The compiler says he anticipates some criticism of his omission or inclusion of individual items, but I for one find no grave sins of omission in his choice of head-words. On the other hand, I do feel that there is all too much which he would have done better to leave out.

He himself admits that his title is inaccurate. His original plan was "to collect in one place a list of useful new words and phrases not found in Japanese-English dictionaries, specifically, words not found in Kenkyūsha's *New Japanese-English Dictionary*, 1954 edition". But he has deviated from this plan in several ways, notably in including a number of "useful words somehow overlooked in the Kenkyūsha dictionary" even though they do not qualify as neologisms, with the result that he feels constrained to say that a more nearly accurate description of his book would be something like "a list of words in current use but not found in Kenkyūsha's *New Japanese-English Dictionary*". Not only is this still inaccurate, however (for, to take a couple of examples at random, can the Nara period *sakimori*, "frontier guard", and the Tokugawa period *fudasashi*, "a usurer who preyed on shogunal retainers", legitimately be called terms in current use?), but this general procedure turns the book into a veritable ragbag.

One feature of this glossary is its inclusion of many proper nouns. In this, it seems, the compiler is following the recommendation of a conference on lexicography held in 1960, and indeed there may be some point in noting phrases like *Peruche-kōka*, "the Peltier effect", or the names of commissions, institutions, etc. But why include such names as *Koti*, "Coty" (the French cosmetic company), or *Kanchenjungga*, "Kangchenjungga"? In the latter case, moreover, a mere identification is deemed

insufficient and we are quite gratuitously given the information that this peak was first scaled by Charles Evans party [*sic*] in May, 1955! In one place, the glossary almost seems to be advertising as well as identifying a product; *Ararudaito* (Araldite) is said to be the "trade name of a resinoid plastic possessing superior mechanical, electrical, and chemical properties", and to be "also valuable because easily bound (welded) with metals, ceramics, etc."

In pointing to these remarkable examples, I am not suggesting that the definitions should never have exceeded a few words. So long as they concern Japan, and particularly post-war Japan, the detailed explanations of terms are often of interest, even if a little long for a book of this kind. But what need was there to explain in detail technical terms having no special relevance to the Japanese context, such as the musical term *kanon*, "canon"? Why is the definition of *jiko-kin'yū* as "working capital" followed by seven lines of definition of the term "working capital" itself? True, in this case the Japanese term is not a word-for-word equivalent of the English. But the same cannot be said of *fuka-kachi-kōsei*, "added values make-up (structure)", or *hakkōsha-ri-mawari*, "issuer's yield", each defined in six lines.

I am tempted to say that such terms as *fuka-kachi-kōsei* scarcely merit inclusion at all, since the meaning of the whole is easily deducible from that of the parts. (This is even more true of such phrases as *Nō-no-ryūha*, "Nō schools", and *Nō-no-shite*, "a Nō protagonist", whose inclusion here is utterly incomprehensible.) However that may be, the space taken up by the definition of definitions could certainly have been put to better use. More might have been done, for instance, to indicate the extent to which terms of foreign origin listed have gained real currency in Japan. Clearly a phrase like *kaunti-karejī*, "county college (England)" can only have been found in a highly-specialized type of context. Such words are therefore only reproductions, not viable borrowings, of foreign words. It is of course difficult to determine at what stage a word can really be said to have acquired the status of a loan-word, but I suspect that not a few of the foreign terms listed in this book have not yet passed that stage. It would be asking too much to demand an assessment of what proportion of the Japanese public might understand them or use them. But it would have been helpful in some cases if their use could have been demonstrated by example.

D. E. MILLS

In Memoriam Eduard Erkes 1891-1958. Mit einem Vorwort von Johannes Schubert, Leipzig 1903, Fol. X, 239 pp.

This Memorial Volume was originally planned as an Anniversary Volume for the 65th birthday of Eduard Erkes and in fact the typescript in a special portfolio was handed over to Professor Erkes on his birthday (23rd July 1956) but there were difficulties in putting the work into print before as well as after his untimely death in April 1958. Most of the articles then appeared in the "Gesellschafts-und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe der Wissenschaftlichen Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx Universität, Leipzig". That accounts most probably for the numerous printing and other errors.

As usual with Anniversary Volumes this one contains a few good articles besides a number from friends who only wanted to pay their respects to a dear old friend. As an old friend of Erkes myself I wish to pay tribute personally to the deceased by drawing attention to this volume. As there were only 200 copies printed it may also prove useful to enumerate the titles of those articles which deal with Far Eastern subjects. They are given in alphabetical order of the authors:

Arland, Anton/Enzmann, Josef: Pflanzenbauer reisen nach China (9-13);

Behrsing, Siegfried: "Po-lin min-pao" (Ein Dokument des proletarischen Internationalismus aus der Ihot'uan-Zeit (14-22);

Böttger, Walter: War die Jagd der Chou-Zeit ein soziales Vorrecht? (23-27);

Chao Jui-hung: Über die Hauptströmungen der modernen chinesischen Literatur (28-43);

Chen Yuvoon: Zum chinesischen Ehegesetz von 1950 (44-49);

- Damm, Hans: Dis javanischen und balinesischen Gunungan oder Kajon im Museum für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig (50-53);
- Eichhorn, Werner: Das Fei-yen wai-chuan (54-63);
- Franke, Herbert: Eine umgangssprachliche Erzählung und ihre schriftsprachliche Vorlage (64-70);
- Gabelentz, Hanns-Conon von der: Geistige Voraussetzungen der Kunst (71-84);
- Haenisch, Erich: Liu Tsung-yüan's Inschrift über den Flusstransport von Hing-chou (85-89);
- Heidenreich, Robert: Ein Pferd aus der T'ang-Zeit (90-92);
- Hübner, Franz: Einige medizinisch interessante Stellen bei dem chinesischen Philosophen Chuang-tze (93-94);
- Kahlo, Gerhard: Der zweite Erdkreis der Alten (95-136);
- Köhler, Günther: Binnenschifffahrt und Häfen in China (137-139);
- Lanciotti, Lionello: Nota sulla sepoltura prona nell'antica Cina (144-145);
- Piasek, Martin: Ist das Vorbild der lateinischen Grammatik für die grammatische Darstellung der chinesischen Sprache überholt? (161-173);
- Průšek, Jaroslav: Two Documents relating to the Life of P'u Sung-ling (174-177);
- Ruben, Walter: Der Terrorist Sandip in R. Tagores "Das Heim und die Welt", das Porträt eines indischen Materialisten (Cārvāka) (178-189);
- Schubert, Johannes: Das I-ching und seine Probleme (190-197);
- Steininger, Hans: Das Bezugssystem der Wu-hing (五行) in seiner "Allgemeingültigkeit" und "Notwendigkeit" für Regierung und Philosophie im Alten China (198-204);
- Sung, Hung-cheh: Temporale und lokale Bestimmungen im Chinesischen nach der Anschauung zeitgenössischer einheimischer Grammatiker (205-207);
- v. Takáts, Zoltán: Abhangs Motives in the Art of Ajanta and Wu Tao-tzu (208-215);
- T'ang Lan: Über die Wichtigkeit der Paläographie als Spezialwissenschaft und über die Stellung der chinesischen Paläographie in dieser Spezialwissenschaft (216-218);
- Taube, Manfred: Das Kelen-ü cimeg des Nag-dbari-bstan-dar (219-227);
- Tseng, Shi-yü: Ost und West nähern sich (228-229);
- Tucci, Giuseppe: A Tibetan History of Buddhism in China (230);
- Wang Hsien-t'ang: Die drei Entwicklungsstufen des Münzgusses im Staate Ch'i im China der Chou-Zeit (231-239).

The Volume also includes a controversial article by Franz Altheim and Ruth Stiehl about the Wall Inscriptions (Middle Persian) of the frescoes in the Synagogue of Dura-Europos (on the Euphrates) which B. Geiger discussed in the Final Report VIII, Part I of "The Excavations at Dura-Europos" (New Haven 1956), pp. 283-317.

A Bibliography of the Writings of Eduard Erkes ("Verzeichnis der Arbeiten Eduard Erkes") completes the Memorial Volume.

Special thanks are due to the editor, Professor Johannes Schubert, who overcame all difficulties and published the Volume after all.

B. SCHINDLER

Erich Haenisch: *Manghol un Niuca Tobca'an (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi) Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen. Aus der chinesischen Transkription (Ausgabe Ye Tê-hui) im mongolischen Wortlaut wiederhergestellt.* Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1962, xi plus 142 pp.

Erich Haenisch: *Wörterbuch zu Manghol un Niuca Tobca'an (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi) Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen.* Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1962, 192 pp.

Nothing is more difficult for a reviewer than the task of saying something of value about a facsimile reproduction of a work from a previous generation which, even if it

never achieved a proper distribution, has nevertheless been constantly in use among the few scholars to whom it is of significance. The various imperfections of Haenisch's studies have been discussed in far greater detail than a review allows by other scholars, the transcription system principally by the late M. Lewicki and the translation in particular by the Reverend Antoine Mostaert, though mention of the latter's monumental *Sur quelques passages de l'histoire secrète des mongols* is strictly speaking irrelevant here, where the translation volume of Haenisch's work is not under review.

The history of the study of the Mongol text of the Secret History was outlined, up to the year 1931, by Haenisch himself in his *Untersuchungen über das Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi* and is an interesting record of disappointment and frustration. Nor is the subsequent history much different. The inhibiting knowledge that the master of sinological studies, the late Paul Pelliot, was planning a complete study of the text was in itself a discouragement to the efforts of others, and his assurance as early as 1920 that he had already made a full restoration of the text, followed by his announcement in T'oung Pao in 1936 that he had prepared a complete edition with translation and commentary did not escape Haenisch's attention. However, those few scholars who are interested in what to the small world of Mongolists is a chronicle of supreme importance have without exception had reason to be grateful to Professor Haenisch for persisting, in spite of the suspicion that his work was being duplicated elsewhere, and publishing a "premature" work which has held the field for between twenty and thirty years. The first volume, containing the text, seems to have attracted only five reviews between Pelliot's in 1936 and von Gabain's in 1943, and of these, two appeared in war-time Germany. The dictionary volume and the translation which followed in 1939 and 1941 fell on evil times. The war limited their distribution and an air attack destroyed the stocks in 1943. Thus though the translation was reprinted in 1948 and has always been easily available, the two earlier volumes, with their slight general appeal, have been bibliographical rarities almost ever since their appearance. Pelliot's posthumous work appeared in 1949 and contained much less than might have been expected from his announcements, and the Japanese edition of Shiratori, also published during the war years, was the only other significant contribution to these studies during the 1940's, Kozin's Russian edition being more or less unobtainable even today. More recently much comment and correction of previous work has appeared. Haenisch himself notes studies by Cleaves and Poppe, as well as Mostaert, and the work of Waley (*BSOAS*, vol. xxiii, part 3), Doerfer (*C.A.J.* I.4) and Street (an interesting essay in descriptive linguistics) should also be mentioned. But the long-awaited edition prepared by Professor F. W. Cleaves has still not appeared, and in these circumstances the reprinting of what Pelliot described in 1936 as "cette édition provisoire" is most welcome. The two volumes are unchanged in substance, though new prefaces have been added.

C. R. BAWDEN

J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *La religion de l'Iran Ancien*, Paris, 1962, iv, 412 pp.

This book is the most comprehensive single work on Zoroastrianism published this century, and forms a valuable handbook both for the Iranist and for the general student. The author has covered methodically, clearly, and with a wealth of bibliographical detail, all major aspects of the religion: belief, ritual, ethics, history of the church, the priesthood, and the present-day community. He has also included a considerable amount of background material, as well as summaries of the more important Avestan and Pahlavi texts; and has discussed the influence of Zoroastrianism on Judaism, Christianity, Gnosticism, Manichaeism, Hellenistic thought and later Islam. Planned on this scale, the book necessarily consists largely of summaries of previous studies, either by the author himself or by other scholars; but here and there, within the general treatment, new material is contributed, as in comments on the significance of parts of the ritual (with some comparisons between Iranian and Indian practice).

A very great deal of matter is thus concisely contained in a medium-sized volume.

The well-devised arrangement makes it a handy work of reference, in which the different sections are clearly demarcated, and in the main self-contained. This applies also to the bibliographical material, to which no general index is given. Two sections are provided instead, namely *Bibliographie générale* (pp. 17-19), and *Histoire des études* (pp. 384-99), which overlap to some slight extent. No list of specialist abbreviations is given, which may be a small handicap for the general student. From this point of view one may also regret that, whereas in most matters the author is scrupulously careful to discuss different points of view, in some of the major fields of current controversy he does not allude to differences of opinion. Thus there is no mention of the considerable school of thought which attributes Zurvanism to the late Achaemenian period, and not to any earlier date; nor of that which rejects the attribution to Ahura Mazda of paternity of the Evil Spirit. Minor criticisms of Professor Dumézil's theory of the tripartite function are mentioned, but it is not indicated that scholars of standing in various Indo-European fields have radically criticised it as a whole. These omissions result in some loss of vigour in the study, and may be misleading for the general student, in view of the author's usual practice of giving a detailed and scrupulously objective account of controversial matters (as, e.g., the religion of the Achaemenians, p. 165 ff.), even to the point of summarising some books and articles which he himself indicates are of little worth.

The following are among the few minor points which have been noted: p. 15, it cannot justly be said that "Mahmūd le ghaznévide . . . chargea Firdousi de chanter le passé de l'Iran en un vaste poème épique". The first draft of the *Shāhmāme* was already finished before the work was presented to Mahmūd. p. 41, with reference to the *Kephalaia* passage on the Zoroastrian books, H. H. Schaeder's remarks deserve a mention, *Gnomon* 1933, 354. p. 64, the editions of the *Tansar Nāme* by M. Minovi (Tehran 1932) and A. Iqbal (as part of his *Tārikh i Tabaristān*, Tehran 1942) merit a reference. p. 68, under *Inscriptions sassanides* a detailed reference seems desirable to the plates of Sar-Mašhad and Naqš i Rostam published by W. B. Henning as part of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum* (mentioned generally, with one of the book's few misprints, p. 68 n.1).

To press minor omissions in a work of this scale would be both unjust and ungrateful. Professor Duchesne-Guillemin has produced a most useful work, the product of a great amount of careful and judicious compilation. Its clarity and thoroughness make it likely that it will be used for a long time as a guide to Zoroastrianism.

MARY BOYCE