REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS

A Tamil Prose Reader, by R. E. Asher and R. Radhakrishnan. x+237 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1971. £3·50.

A Tamil reader to meet the needs of the modern student of Tamil has for long been a desideratum. Since the reader compiled by Pope as part of his Tamil handbook no compilation of this nature has been prepared, and despite the excellence of Pope's work, there was a need for a reader representing the written Tamil language of the present time, as well as providing typical samples of current literature. For this reason the passages chosen by the authors of the present work are all chosen from publications of the last twenty-five years, and the object of the reader is to provide a typical cross-section of modern Tamil literature in its various styles. They have also been selected with a view to providing the student with a wide vocabulary, so that when he has read through the present selection, he will be in a position to tackle, with the help of a dictionary, any typical modern Tamil prose text. The texts in the reader represent the standard literary dialect, but in some of the passages consisting of short stories colloquial forms appear in the conversational pieces and these are fully explained in the notes.

The reader contains a complete vocabulary of the texts, and a useful series of notes which supplement the information given in the vocabulary. They also serve to draw attention to aspects of Tamil culture with which it is desirable that the student should become acquainted. The texts are to some extent graded according to their difficulty, as far as this is possible in view of their variety in style and subject matter. The main types of modern writing are represented with the exception of newspapers on the one hand and technical treatises on the other.

The compilation of the present reader was commenced when both authors were attached to the South Asia Language and Area Center of the University of Chicago in 1961–2, and was developed pursuant to a contract between the University of Chicago and the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It should prove to be of great service to students of Tamil both in this country and North America, and its appearance is to be warmly welcomed.

T. BURROW

Sad-Dharma-Puṇḍarīka-Sūtra. The Summary in Khotan Saka, by H. W. Bailey. 59 pp., (The Australian National University, Faculty of Asian Studies. Occasional Papers 10.) Canberra, 1971.

This is, as would be expected, an extremely fine and useful little book containing the summary (Khot. haṃbistä, rendering Buddh. Skrt. samāsa-, a rather difficult word by the way, cf. *Franklin Edgerton*, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit II, New Haven, 1953, p. 570) in Later Khotanese of the Mahāyāna Sad-dharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra in facsimile reproduction from *Khotanese Texts*, III, Cambridge, 1956, pp. 58–61 (reprinted in *Khotanese Texts*, I–III, Cambridge, 1969) and—another version of the introduction of the summary—from *Saka Documents*, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II, Vol. V, Text Volume, London, 1968, p. 23, together with translations, a concordance Khotanese Summary—Buddh. Skrt. Text, a brilliant commentary (pp. 8–43), an Iranian index to the commentary and a list of Buddhist loan-words. The manuscripts are P(elliot) 2782, 1–61 (where, KT III, p. 61, note 4, here p. 56, by mistake *ñūysdyi* of

the text itself has been written as *ñyūysdi*) and British Museum Or. 8212.162, 82–92 (=KT II, pp. 5–6), to which latter text Sir Harold Bailey gives some notes (on bārai śau, hagrratha-, pasvai biśa, pūra aurmaysdau māñadū, and dharma-pada rāṣ̄īda) in *Saka Documents* p. 31. In the facsimile reproduction of the same text the word *āśiri* (=ācarya, given in the translation) has been omitted, presumably for technical reasons. A photo of the original text of Or. 8212.162 is on plate XI of *Saka Documents*, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II, Plates, Portfolio I, London, 196 . The essence of this book is of course the commentary, the great value of which is furthermore added to by the many references to Bailey's giant work *Khotanese Texts*, VI (Prolexis to the Book of Zambasta, Cambridge, 1967), the articles of which supplement the commentary and in some cases are supplemented by it (*e.g. bisā-*, "house", p. 19, as compared with KT VI, p. 245, with bisīviraa-=Avestan vīsō.puϑra-, Parthian Turfan vispuhr, Ṣinā Dardic (loan-word) guš-pūr, Ossetic guppur etc.). A wealth of comparative material (Avestan, Old Persian, Zoroastrian Pahlavi, Sogdian, New Persian, Ossetic, Pamir languages, Old Indian, Greek, Latin, Armenian, Hittite etc.) highly increases the importance of the book for the student who wants to get a clear idea of the special position of Khotanese among the other Iranian languages. As an introduction to the commentary Bailey gives a number of excellent and concise remarks on orthography and grammar—an additional reference here to the *Grammatical Notes*, p. 404 ff. in *Mark J. Dresden*'s The Jātakastava or "Praise of the Buddha's Former Births", Transactions of the American Philosophical Society N.S., Vol. 45, Part 5, Philadelphia, 1955, deserves mentioning—and a list of pronouns, numerals, and indeclinable words occurring in the text. To point out a few items in a work like this, as always in the case of Professor Bailey, is a difficult task. But there are sound reasons for drawing the attention to, *e.g.*, Old Pers. *brazmaniya* (p. 14 f.) that still, after W. B. Henning and J. Duchesne-Guillemin, is much discussed (cf. *Manfred Mayrhofer*, Das Altyersische seit 1964, W. B. Henning Memorial Volume, London, 1970, p. 285), to the "ritualistic explanation of *aurga* (p. 15), *hauna* (p. 38) (and hereto *āhau*, KT VI, p. 24), *hauva* (p. 39) (cf. -on Iranian *vat-* also *H. S. Nyberg*, L'inscription pehlevie d'Istanbul, Byzantion T. XXXVIII, Bruxelles, 1968, p. 121 f.), and to the long article on *aliyä* (p. 40).

J. P. Asmussen

Chinese Connoisseurship, the *Ko Ku Yao Lun*, the Essential Criteria of Antiquities. A translation made and edited by Sir Percival David. London, Faber and Faber, 1971. £15·00.

The study of art has a long history in China. Its scope has contracted and expanded with the progress of time. In the Chou period art was known as *yi* 藝, covering *li* 禮 rituals, *yüeh* 樂 music, *she* 射 archery, *yü* 御 charioteering, *shu* 書 writing and *shu* 數 mathematics. They were the practising arts of the nobility. In the Han times the copying of books and recording of archaeological finds started a fashion for the collecting of ancient cultural relics, especially Shang and Chou bronzes. The study of art had its foundation in archaeology. In the Six dynasties when painting and calligraphy were in vogue art collections were formed and theories of art discussed and formulated. There appeared many catalogues and works on the subject, some of which have been classics ever since. In the T'ang times four distinct forms of art were recognized, namely, *shu* 書 calligraphy, *hua* 畫 painting, *chin* 金 bronzes and *shih* 石 stone carving, and it was a fashion to discuss various objects according to their quality. In this way a number of histories of these art forms were published and circulated for generations to come.

The Sung dynasty was a classical period of Chinese art and archaeology. Under the patronage of the emperors calligraphy and painting were popular and the study of bronze and stone became the backbone of Chinese archaeology. Apart from actual objects, pictures and ink-rubbings were circulated for systematic studies and scholars did not hesitate to specialize on a particular form of art, though mainly in epigraphy. As a result a large number of standard works on various topics were published and repeatedly reproduced later on. At this stage it was natural that the collecting of art objects became very popular and trading antiques soon developed into an established profession. The merchandise began to include all sorts of ancient relics and rare curios which have continued to be in great demand ever since. The tradition was admirably upheld in the following centuries.

In the Yuan dynasty there lived a Ts'ao family in Sung-chiang, southern Kiangsu. The father was a retired scholar deeply interested in antiquities and he filled his house with all sorts of ancient objects and books on the subject. Brought up in such a background one of his sons, Ts'ao Chao 曹昭, grew to appreciate and admire these objects. He had a habit of searching through all the books and illustrated catalogues in order to trace the origin, to evaluate the quality and to determine the authenticity of any specimens that came to his notice. Later on he selected a dozen types of the objects for discussion and published his notes in book form for those who are interested, mainly collectors and dealers. The notes were arranged in three *chüan* 卷 chapters: I—on ancient bronzes, calligraphy and paintings: II—on ancient zithers, inkstones, precious objects and metal works and III—on ancient porcelain, lacquer, silk and textiles and rare wood and stone works. As they were merely personal notes forming a little book this was given the title *Ko Ku Yao Lun* 格古要論, meaning literally "Important notes for the investigation of antiquities". It appeared first in 1388 in Nanking and as it proved quite popular, it had been revised, rearranged, enlarged, and sometimes abridged by later scholars. Consequently it has continued in circulation for almost 600 years.

In 1936 when the late Sir Percival David made a study of the Ju 汝 ware he found *Ko Ku Yao Lun* valuable and important as well as intriguing and tantalizing, and some of its trade gossip awry and amusing. He considered it "a unique work" which "should be introduced in its entirety to the western reader" (p. lx). After making a very scholarly critical and bibliographical study of all the existing material he decided to use the simple text of the 1388 first edition as the basis of his book and supplemented it with the 1462 enlarged edition by Wang Tso. The former in its original arrangement is referred to as "O copy" and the text of the latter, "A copy", added to the O text under the appropriate headings. The remaining chapters of Wang Tso's work which do not correspond to any part of the original copy "are grouped together after the close of the original *chüan* III". Hence the translation in the present volume "includes all the materials to be found in the first two editions" (p. vii). It is interesting to find that these ancient miscellaneous notes on Chinese art objects are glamorized as "The Essential Criteria of Antiquities" and finally crowned with a grandiloquent title *Chinese Connoisseurship*.

As the book is a translation the reviewer is obliged to take a closer look at the translation. This can easily be done because the translator has thoughtfully included a complete facsimile of the original text of the first edition at the end of the book.

Translation is, of course, a difficult task and it is especially so with *Ko Ku Yao Lun*. The book was written in the fourteenth century when the Chinese language and writing were both in a process of transition. As a living language the ancient Chinese began to change in the Sung times. Writing in the vernacular or oral style, known as *yü-lu* 語錄, and the use of abbreviated characters of *shu-tzu* 俗字 came gradually into fashion. The Chinese language in its modern form was established in the Yuan period. Written at this time the text of *Ko Ku Yao Lun* is neither classical nor vernacular and being mere notes its style tends to be sketchy and laconic. Besides, many vernacular terms which were current in those days are now obsolete, and without punctuation the text can easily be misread. Hence it would be too optimistic to expect the translation to be accurate and perfect beyond reproach.

Being a great connoisseur of Chinese porcelain himself the translator believes that "Ts'ao's description of porcelain (is) of great importance" (p. lix). So it may be worth while to go over a couple of the translations of the porcelain notes carefully to see how faithful the translations are to the original texts.

A. Section XI—Text:

古建器

建碗盞多是㽓口色黑而滋潤有黃兔毫斑滴珠大者眞但體極厚俗甚少見薄者 (p. 305)

Translation:

> Fu-chien Ware.
>
> Most Chien bowls and cups have a flaring mouth. They are black in colour and are unctuous, with spots like the yellow fur of a hare. Genuine specimens have large "pearl drops" (*ti-chu*) on them. Those with thick body are common. Thin pieces are seldom seen. (p. 142)

The translation is clearly not very accurate. A few notes are needed before the translation can be improved. They are—

1. 古 The first character is *ku* not *fu* 福.

2. 撇口 In the first sentence *pieh-k'ou* is a term denoting a type of drinking vessel. It was a common term appearing in Sung and Ming writings as *pieh* 撇 *pieh-k'ou* 撇口 or *pieh-tzu* 撇子—*tzu* is a suffix showing that the word is a noun. Although the pronunciation of the character has not been given in Sung and Ming dictionaries, the term had continued to be used until the eighteenth century. By the nineteenth it was taken to denote another type of vessel. Hence *Giles* gives the pronunciation as "pieh" and the meaning "a wine-bottle with a large belly and long neck".

3. 斑 This character means "streaks" not "spots".

4. 俗 Meaning "common", "ordinary", etc., this character is the first character in the last sentence, not the last one of the preceding sentence.

With these notes in view, Section XI may be better translated as follows:—

> Ancient Chien Ware.
>
> Most Chien bowls and cups are of the *pieh-k'ou* type. They are black in colour and are unctuous with streaks like the yellow fur of a hare. Those [with the glaze] dripped in large drops like pearls are genuine but the body is very thick. Ordinarily thin ones are very seldom seen.

B. Section XVI—Text:

古無器皿

古人喫茶湯俱用撇取其易乾不留津飲酒用醆未嘗把醆故無勸盤今所見定勸盤乃古之洗古人用湯瓶酒注不用胡瓶及有觜折盂茶鍾臺盤此皆胡人所用者中國始於元朝沽定官窯俱無此器 (p. 304)

Translation:

> Wares Unknown in Ancient Days.
>
> The ancients used pottery for tea or soup, for liquid becomes dry more quickly in pottery ware and does not leave dregs in it. They used bowls for drinking wine, for there were no cups. There were no separate plates either. What we see today are made at Ting-chou and were in fact ancient finger-bowls. The ancients had soup bottles and wine ewers, but not the *hu-p'ing* (barbarian bottles). The everted-rim cups, tea-cups, and salvers were all designs of the barbarians introduced into the Middle Kingdom during the Yüan Dynasty. Hence such forms are not to be found in [ancient] Ting and Kuan wares (p. 144).

In this section there are many more words which are now obsolete and they need some explanation before a proper translation can be made.

1. 喫 This character which means "to eat", "to drink" or "to swallow" has not been translated. Here it should mean "to drink". It may be pointed out that for "drinking tea" *ch'ih-ch'a* 喫茶 is used in Amoy (*chiàh-tê*); *yin-ch'a* 飲茶 in Cantonese (*yem-ch'a*) and (*ho-ch'a*) 喝茶 in modern Chinese. The term used here is probably the oldest of the three expressions.

2. 茶湯 This is an ancient word denoting tea in its fluid form. Freshly prepared it is hot, hence *ch'a-t'ang*, signifying that it is hot. Tea drinking was introduced in the Sung times into Japan and there the ancient word was translated as 茶の湯 (*cha-no-yu*) "hot drink of tea" and it has been preserved in modern Japanese to denote the "tea ceremony". Another ancient word for tea is *ch'a-shui* 茶水, literally "water of tea" and this is still used in Amoy (tê-chúi).

3. 撇 This is an ancient term denoting a type of cup used in drinking tea mentioned above. Here it is written without the suffix.

4. 乾 This character is used here as a special term in drinking, meaning "to empty". In modern Chinese *kan-pei* 乾杯 means "to empty the cup in drinking"—"bottoms up" in English so to speak.

5. 醆 An ancient word for a cup; now used more often as "a lamp".

6. 把醆 Another type of drinking vessel, a cup with a handle.

7. 勸盤 The first character in this word means "to persuade", "to urge", "to encourage", etc. This word meaning literally "a presenting tray" is also an ancient term for such a vessel. It was also made with coconut shell (p. 156, 299). The vessel was known since the T'ang times as *ch'a-t'o-tzu* 茶托子. According to Li Kuang-yi's 李匡乂 *Tze-hsia-chi* 資暇集, a T'ang work, the vessel was invented by the daughter of Prime Minister Ch'ui Ning 崔寧 in 780–3, who introduced first a ring of wax in the tray in order to steady the cup of tea at presentation. Later on it was replaced with a ring in lacquer. The Prime Minister gave it the name *ch'a-t'o-tzu*. This type of vessel was known in the Sung times as *t'ai-p'an* 台盤, meaning literally "a tray with a platform". The vessel was designed later on in many forms with many different names such as *ch'a-t'o* 茶托, *ch'a-t'ai* 茶台, *ch'a-p'an* 茶盤, *t'o-tzu* 托子, *ch'a-chou* 茶舟, *ch'a-ch'uan* 茶船, and so forth.

8. 觜折盂 This word denotes a type of tea bowl with bent mouth-rim. The bend was devised to take a cover so that tea can be prepared in the bowl. The bowl is usually placed on a *chou* 舟, saucer, forming a set of three pieces. The first character is an abbreviated form for 嘴. Without the *k'ou* 口 radical it means the 21st Chinese zodiacal constellation.

9. 茶鍾臺盤 This forms a set of two pieces, a tea bowl and a platformed tray or stand. Without a cover for the bowl the tea has to be prepared in a tea ewer or pot.

10. 沽 This character is unknown in Chinese dictionaries. The translator believes that it "should properly be 'ku', 'ancient'" (p. xlvii). In this context it would be better to read it as *ku* 故, meaning "therefore" or "consequently".

Basing on the above comments this section may better be translated as follows—

> Wares Unknown in Ancient Days.
>
> All ancients used *pieh* bowls in drinking tea because they are easily emptied, without leaving any residue. In drinking wine, [they] used [ordinary] *chan* cups, never with a handled *chan*, hence there was no *ch'uan-p'an* presenting tray. The presenting tray which we see today from Ting[-chou] are *hsi* shallow bowls of the ancient times. The ancients used tea *p'ing* pots and wine *chu* ewers but not the *hu-p'ing* bottles of the northern nomads. As to the *yü* bowl with bent mouth-rim and the tea *chung* bowl with *t'ai-p'an* platformed tray, they are all utensils of the northern nomads which were first introduced into the Middle Kingdom during the Yuan Dynasty. Consequently, all these vessels are not to be found in Ting and Kuan wares.

To attribute all these vessels which had long been in use in the T'ang and Sung times to Yuan shows clearly that Ts'ao Chao did not do his homework thoroughly. This has already been pointed out by a later commentator who left a MS note after this section in the O copy (p. 144).

Students of Chinese art will be impressed by the effort of the translator in presenting this little ancient enchiridion of Chinese art and archaeology in such a superlative volume. They will also appreciate his pointing out that—

> Apart from being informative, the *Ko Ku Yao Lun* shows a customary lack of judgement on the part of both Ts'ao Chao and Wang Tso, particularly Wang Tso, who, conditioned by his time and environment, was often unable to distinguish between facts and fancies. (p. lx)

The book has indeed included a number of trade gossip which are evidently not the result of careful research as the author has claimed.

It remains to be mentioned that the book under review also reproduces a small collection of Chinese "works of art which might have been known to and appreciated by the original authors" and three useful indexes.

Cheng Te-k'un

Zum Untergang zweier Reiche: Berichte von Augenzeugen aus den Jahren 1232–33 und 1368–70. Aus dem chinesischen übersetzt von Erich Haenisch. Durchgesehen und mit Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Peter Olbricht. x+55 pp.+10 pp. Chinese text. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Band xxxviii, 4. Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft. Kommissionsverlag Franz Steiner GmbH, Wiesbaden 1969.

Amongst the many translations of Chinese and, apparently, also Mongol texts which the late Professor Erich Haenisch left behind him unpublished at his death in 1966 are the two which make up this little volume, and which date back some forty years. The fair copy had been prepared before Haenisch died, and the publication agreed with Professor Peter Olbricht who was to act as editor, but Haenisch did not have time to review the manuscript or to write the preface. In accordance with his wishes, alterations were made in the translation only where absolutely necessary, but the editor took it upon himself to give a fuller annotation than Haenisch had planned, and, indeed, rightly, for otherwise the narrative might have suffered in intelligibility.

Haenisch's book consists, then, of annotated translations of personal accounts of the collapse of the Chin and of the Yüan empires by witnesses who were closely involved in the events of the time. Liu Ch'i's "Record of events in Ta-Liang" 錄大梁事 describes the siege of the southern capital of the Sung, Pien-liang or K'ai-feng, and its fall, in the years 1232–3. The "private record of the move to the north" 北巡私記. is ascribed to one Liu Chi who may, judging from a text reference, have been named, alternatively, Chang Chi. This account is a diary of events during the flight of the last emperor of the Yüan from Peking.

Both texts are valuable human documents to supplement what is known about the collapse of the dynasties. They differ considerably in character. The events in K'ai feng are described in a vivid manner, with all manner of anecdotes and reflections to give a feeling of immediacy to the tale of impending catastrophe. The "Private record" is a drier, terser, account, which contrasts sharply with the legends surrounding the flight of the last Yüan emperor which are told by the Mongol chronicles.

The book consists of a short preface by the editor and an introduction by the translator preceding the translations, indices of proper names, place names, official titles and book titles, a bibliography, and facsimile Chinese texts.

C. R. Bawden

Union Catalogue of Asian Publications, 1965–1970. Edited by David E. Hall. 4 vols, 35×26 cm. London, Mansell, 1971. £140.

This Union Catalogue was compiled under the auspices of the Orientalists' Group, Standing Conference of National and University Libraries, and was sponsored by and edited at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. It was established in 1965 in response to recommendations made in the report of the Hayter Subcommittee on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies, 1961. The constituent materials were provided by the Department of Oriental Printed Books and Manuscripts, British Museum, the India Office Library, and the University Libraries of Cambridge and of Durham, and many others. Altogether 65 reporting libraries in England, Scotland and Wales are listed, but these do not include the School of Oriental and African Studies, which published its own First Supplement to the Library Catalogue covering the period 1963–8; nor the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Each of the four volumes contains about 600 pages with between 20 and 30 entries to a page, reproduced photographically from the original typed cards supplied by the libraries, but with certain editorial modifications. The entries appear at slightly over half the size of the originals, and a good standard of clarity has been achieved. The catalogue contains approximately 66,000 entries, which are given in order of authors. Arrangements have been made for the issue of annual supplements for the next five years.

The appearance of this catalogue brings to fruition a most important project of vital interest to orientalist librarians everywhere. Subject to certain qualifications which are partly the planned result of the policy of the organizing committee, and are partly due to the difficulty of fully implementing such an all-embracing scheme, what has been presented is a conspectus of the Asian materials acquired throughout the country from 1965 onwards.

The editor, Mr. David Hall, is to be much congratulated for the way he has handled this vast mountain of data. The problems arise partly from the variety of Asian languages represented by the individual entries, and partly because of the large number of contributing libraries, each with its own style of catalogue entry, and in particular different ways of handling the elements of oriental names in the author headings, and variations in transcription. The editor has tackled this problem by adding where necessary a standardized form of the author's name at the head of the entry to determine the filing order, followed by the name in full as presented by the contributing library, together with a black box at the head of each name-section listing variations, and appropriate general cross-references where needed. A sample of this exercise can be studied in Vol. 1, pp. 200–8, where all the variant spellings of the name BANERJI are brought together in one series.

Apart from the standardization of author headings, the main editorial processing for each entry has been the excision of individual libraries' press marks, and the exclusion (except where it occurs in the body of the description) of any statement of the language of the item. Each entry has been given a serial number giving its order in the present catalogue, and a list of locations, signalled by an identifying code. Numerous cross-references have been introduced, which help both to bring the materials from so many sources into a more consistent relationship with one another, and also go some way to compensate for the lack of title and subject indexes.

The introductory material consists of a "List of Reporting Libraries with Identifying Codes and Indications of Facilities offered", which is repeated inside the front cover of each volume, and gives conditions of access, lending and photographic facilities; a foreword by Mr. J. D. Pearson, Chairman of the Orientalists' Group, SCONUL, and the Editor's Preface and Introductory Notes. In his preface, Mr. Hall has given some indication of inclusions and exclusions of categories of materials, and in his notes, considerations of general cataloguing policy, as well as specific treatment of oriental names in the author headings according to the regions and languages concerned. The term "Asian Publications" is referred to works published in all languages in Asia outside the Soviet Union, and to those published in non-European scripts in North and North-East Africa, and except for year books and special editions, periodicals are excluded, as are works of science. Examination of these aims, and of their interpretation as evidenced in the body of the work, would make it possible to define more closely what has been included and excluded. For instance English writers whose works have been published partly in England and partly in India, will have the former excluded and the latter included; and a critical edition of an Arabic text published in Europe will also be excluded. Again, contributing libraries have their own policies of inclusion and exclusion at the time of acquisition, so that the material presented in the Union Catalogue has been subjected to a double process of selection. The result will provide some important evidence as to the character of holdings of Oriental materials in the country, but it would not necessarily provide guidance as to what libraries ought to have.

The period covered by the catalogue, 1965–70 represents not dates of publication, acquisition or cataloguing, but the reporting of material to the editor, who has incorporated it up to as recent a date as has been possible. The actual dates of publication of individual items vary because different libraries acquire and catalogue the same materials at different times. An approximate bracket of dates for new works reported by different libraries can be ascertained, but the over-all character of the catalogue is complicated by the inclusion of retrospective acquisitions. Though it is useful to know that individual libraries have recently acquired important old materials, this category is patchy, reflecting as it does attempts to overtake old gaps when the chance occurs, casual acquisitions through donations, or even the reporting of re-

catalogued material, where only the new entry, and not the original date of acquisition falls within the 1965–70 period. I note for example that in the case of North Indian books in the British Museum, the greater number of entries by date of publication span the years 1962 to 1967, while in the same category, the India Office Library holdings reported are within a different span, and in the case of the British Museum Chinese materials there are many retrospective entries.

Something needs to be said about omissions from the catalogue. First of all there are books which have been reported, and which appear to be proper candidates for admission, but have not been included. There may be a variety of reasons for this due to problems of control, at both the contributing and receiving ends. Similarly there are cases where the indications of locations are incomplete. Instances have come to my notice of books reported by the India Office Library and included in the catalogue, but without the additional note that they have also been reported by the British Museum. The most serious deficiency, however, is the omission of an explicit statement of the language of each entry. It is perfectly possible for a book with an Arabic-sounding title, published in Karachi to be in Sindhi, Urdu, Persian or Arabic, and the user of the catalogue would have no certain clue as to which it was. There are many more instances where the librarian can infer the answer, but only with some inconvenience. This is a matter which ought seriously to be re-assessed by the controlling committee.

The Union Catalogue of Asian Publications is a pioneer work of greatest importance, not only in its conception, but also in the way it has been brought into being by the industry and understanding of its editor. It is clear that there are some serious problems which have not yet been overcome, but fortunately, with the plan to publish yearly supplements, some of these can be successfully tackled. It is much to be desired that the controlling committee will assess the work as it now appears, and their own policy, to ensure that the first supplement shall be more than a continuation in time of the work in its original form. Clearly the editor needs and deserves the support of additional staff. In addition to new material, omissions of materials already reported need to be overtaken; likewise omissions of additional locations, as well as new additional locations, which may well necessitate the repetition of some of the original entries; and the statement of the language of each entry should be included.

It would also seem desirable that new introductory matter should be included, perhaps to supersede that of the first volumes. A much fuller and more specific statement of cataloguing policy, and of inclusions and exclusions would be helpful. So too would a short statement from each contributing library of the character and status of its own holdings so far as they are included in the Union Catalogue, particularly with regard to the span of publication dates of new acquisitions, and to special features of retrospective additions. In addition to this a list of each library's catalogues already published, both those covering the period of the Union Catalogue and those before it, would greatly enhance the value of the Union Catalogue as a bibliographical tool. We shall wait with great expectations to see the result in the First Supplement when it appears.

G. E. MARRISON

Franklin E. Huffman, *Cambodian system of writing and beginning reader with drills and glossary* and *Modern spoken Cambodian*. Yale Linguistic Series, Yale University Press, 1970.

These two additions to the Yale Linguistic Series are intended to be used in conjunction with each other, the latter being begun a few weeks before the former. They are clearly the result of a well-directed operation, in the course of which Mr. Huffman has used to the full the talents and knowledge of his assistants. The attractive handwriting of Mr. Im Proum gives an easy, pleasant appearance to the pages of the reader; his voice (which the writer has not had the opportunity to hear) is recorded on the tapes. Mrs. Chhom-Rak Thong Lambert prepared most successful reading passages for the reader while Mr. Charan Promchan provided the material for the extremely lively and realistic dialogue in the course book.

Cambodian system of writing and beginning reader is a fully comprehensive guide to the orthography of the language. It is divided into four parts: presentation of the orthographic symbols, shown in relation to the pronunciation of the author's transcription; reading exercises; passages for reading practice; Cambodian-English glossary. Part One has been prepared with extreme thoroughness and is presented with admirable clarity so as to minimize the overawing impression which the complexity of the Cambodian system of initial consonants and its variety of vowels and diphthongs makes on the beginner. The consonant-symbols are particularly clearly presented with an immediate introduction to their different realizations in the positions of simple initial consonant, first in a complex or final consonant. The independent vowel-symbols are well illustrated, the less common realizations being introduced straight away. It is in fact a characteristic of Mr. Huffman's approach to teaching Cambodian that he does not hesitate to give irregular or complicated material at an early stage. Part Two consists of well-prepared exercises on the material given in Part One, with instructions concerning their use which no student could fail to understand! Part Three is an admirable collection of graded reading passages with a wide variety of style and subject-matter, for each of which all the new vocabulary is given on the relevant page. This section, together with the *Lectures cambodgiennes* of Madame Lewitz, has made a great deal of difference to the early progress of the student. Part Four contains all the vocabulary which occurs in the book. Inevitably one or two slips have been made. There are a few misleading statements, such as that the dental surd symbol is always pronounced /d/ when written subscript. In one or two words, *e.g.* /ptal/ "bowl", it is pronounced /t/. Not all editions of all volumes of the *Recueil des contes et légendes cambodgiens* have standing script; later editions even of volumes I and II are printed with slanted script. In discussing the spelling of disyllables with the shape /CVm-/ Mr. Huffman fails to perceive that the Buddhist Institute has a system in its choice of spelling, though admittedly there are exceptions to its rules. It recommends spelling with anusvara where /CVm/ is prefixed and spelling with the conjunct consonant where /v/ is infixed between the two initial consonants of the base. However, no major criticism is to be levelled at this carefully thought-out manual. Even the lack of an index is compensated for by the very full list of contents.

Modern spoken Cambodian aims to give the student a command of conversational Cambodian in normal situations. The course is based on audio-oral methods and is written entirely in transcription. There are thirty-one lessons, each divided into: A. Dialogue (with vocabulary and translation); B. Grammar and drills; C. Comprehension (*i.e.* a further dialogue with no help given in English); D. Conversation. The book concludes with a Cambodian–English and English–Cambodian glossary. Care has been taken to use and reuse the vocabulary, idioms and grammar relevant to each lesson. A. and C. are similar in style and subject-matter. D. consists of hints in English to stimulate a conversation in which the material acquired in A., B. and C. is used. The grammar and drills sections call for some comment. One's first impression is surprise at the number of small points of grammar which seem to be packed into every lesson. In effect this method reproduces for the classroom student the experience he would have if learning his grammar from direct contact with speakers in real situations. One sympathizes with the author's need to treat small sections of grammar here and there; many of the syntactic forms found in Cambodian seem strange to students, especially in comparison with the English translation and with the grammar of the English. They thus seem like idioms, requiring *ad hoc* learning by heart rather than like grammatical patterns which will be repeated with other components. On occasion Mr. Huffman does treat a subject at length. Sometimes he summarizes various grammatical uses of one word-form, which have been met, thus giving a useful *résumé* to aid the student's memory rather than an exegesis of one point of grammar. In other cases, for example that of affixes, he takes one section of formal grammar and presents it once and for all, as a complete entity. Grammatical terms, such as "modal verb", "pre-verbal auxiliary" are introduced without definition or reference to English. However, this is not intended to be a formal grammar and one must not look for the kind of exposition which the author gave in his doctor's thesis. One thing, however, one would have liked Mr. Huff-

man to have supplied: a really comprehensive index! There are students, as Mr. Huffman himself says in his introduction, who desire to analyse and label what they are doing. There are those who forget what they have learned and wish to refer back to it. The index is not sufficient for these needs; a student might well expect to find a reference to "negation" or "subject" or "object" in the index.

Both books are characterized by a most energetic thoroughness. There has been no sparing of effort with regard to the provision of illustrative material. For every point in the *Cambodian system of writing and beginning reader* there is an example with translation; for instance, every consonant which can occur as a final consonant in spelling is given with an example. Similarly, in *Modern spoken Cambodian* alternative pronunciations, such as /sɔpbaay, səpbaay, səbaay/ are patiently supplied while pairs of actual words have been sought out for practising the pronunciation of minimal pairs. A generous amount of material is provided for the substitution and transformation drills. The two books together form a course which is planned to take 300 hours of study; ideally a class of several students would take the course with a Cambodian drill-master. There is no doubt that such students would come into contact, as nearly as is possible through the printed word, with the living language of Cambodia.

J. M. JACOB

Lu Hsün: Three Stories, Chinese text with introduction and notes by Paul Kratochvíl. lv+26 pp., Cambridge University Press, 1970, £1·25.

Chao Shu-li: The tale of Li Youcai's rhymes, Chinese text with introduction and notes by Susan S. H. Macdonald. lxviii+67 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1970, £1·60.

These are the first two volumes in a series of modern Chinese readers instigated by Dr. Kratochvíl, and as such they should be assessed in terms of what they do rather than what they are. It would for instance be injudicious for a reviewer to remark on the very occasional wrong accent or character missed in proof reading, thorough though the preparation has evidently been, or even to dwell on the introductions, since the two editors follow their own bent and presumably the same will be true for succeeding volumes. It would be far more appropriate to appraise—and as it turns out, welcome—these volumes as providing an aid to struggling students (comparatively few people fall outside that category) who want to read some examples of good modern literature.

Nowadays most teachers make vocabularies for their classes, and this is essentially what the editor's notes consist of, but they are of a superior kind. Apart from giving that extra thought to finding English equivalents that naturally would go into a work intended for publication, Dr. Kratochvíl and Mrs. Macdonald have applied a scheme of language classification that distinguishes classical from colloquial, obviously, but also between the orders of early *pai-hua*, literary and non-literary Modern Standard Chinese, dialectal and idiomatic expressions, technical terms and alien loans. Border-line cases inevitably arise where ascription is slightly arbitrary, but I have found their judgment to be sound, and there is no doubt that such advice will enhance the reader's appreciation of the literary flavour of the texts. The base line for the vocabularies is what "accessible Chinese-English dictionaries" do not provide. They do not, as a matter of policy, seek to explain lexical items or grammatical usages beyond the context in which they occur. One can understand the practical reasons for this; nevertheless one could have wished, since it clearly lies within their competence, that the editors had taken the opportunity to offer more general explanations more frequently, to assist in further reading. Pehaps, too, they should have envisaged the possibility of their readership including some students able and willing to consult works of reference in Chinese, in which case they might have drawn attention to certain specialized vocabularies pertinent to the work in hand, such as Jen Ming's *Pei-fang t'u-yü ts'u-tien* with regard to Chao Shu-li's writing. There can be very few complaints, however, that they have not carried out thoroughly and efficiently the practical job they set out to do.

D. E. POLLARD

Jessie Gregory Lutz, *China and the Christian Colleges, 1850–1950*. xiii+575 pp., Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 1971. £7·60.

An objective history of the Christian Colleges in China is to be welcomed; and Professor Lutz, of Rutgers University, has written a scholarly, very well-documented and satisfactorily indexed account of this rather surprising international contact. Much painstaking research has been undertaken to trace the history of the twenty or so colleges, founded by Protestant missions, from their beginnings until, after amalgamation, there were thirteen of them, all *ta-hsüeh*, when eventually they ceased to be independent institutions. This is a valuable work of reference for all who are interested in the development of education in China during the last hundred years, in the changing attitude of the Chinese towards western (particularly American) culture, and in the participation of Chinese students in the social and political life of their country. The reader is presumed to possess fairly detailed knowledge of recent Chinese history.

In the beginning the colleges were thought of solely as a means of evangelization; and were despised by the Chinese because of their neglect, and indeed ignorance, of Chinese culture. Then came a time when they were regarded with favour because of their English teaching, especially for the growing number of Chinese who wished to go abroad for further study. Moreover the incorporation of the colleges under western institutions, such as the Board of Regents of New York State University, not only ensured raised academic standards, but also made it easier for graduates to undertake advanced work in America. A new wave of disfavour followed later when the colleges came to be regarded as agents of colonialism and imperialism.

It was realized that more was required of the colleges than to be mere adjuncts of missionary work. The policies laid down by the trustees in America, which were designed for Christian Liberal Arts Colleges, were modified; also, after altering their constitutions, the colleges obtained recognition by the Chinese government, which then supplemented funds which previously has come almost exclusively from abroad.

During a renewed period of popularity the colleges were seen as mediators of western civilization and participants in a continuing and growing Chinese revolution; then the fear again gained ground that their students were being denationalized, although the colleges themselves had in fact become largely sinified and secularized. It was never entirely forgotten that they were established by foreigners as agents of an alien faith, which, partly because it was not possible to separate it from western culture, was disruptive of Chinese tradition. "The colleges originated out of the need of Westerners, not as a result of Chinese demand. They . . . became more important as contributors to the disintegration of the Chinese heritage than as agents of Christian evangelism" (p. 491). Their final destiny was to be taken over by the People's Government, by which time, largely as a result of increased student pressure, they had become "a function of national events, not of the actions of Christian educators" (p. 397).

One contribution of the colleges to China was in initiating the formal education of women. They also helped to create an understanding and appreciation of medicine as a profession. They pioneered in library science as well as in journalism, but perhaps their most notable contribution was in agricultural education and research. The work of the University of Nanking on crop improvement, soil science and rural reconstruction in general, owed much to the support given by Cornell University. The research and publications of J. Lossing Buck and others are well known. A number of American universities had similar links with the colleges in China: Harvard with Yenching, Princeton also with Yenching, the Pennsylvania State College with Lingnan. Missouri gave help to the School of Journalism at Yenching, their first teachers included Edgar Snow of the *New York Sun* and the late H. J. Timperley of the *Manchester Guardian*. More might have been said about the *Lignan Science Journal*; and among the contributions to knowledge, no mention is made of the reports published by the West China Border Research Society. Well-known graduates are listed: many made their mark in government and public life. A number are now in Taiwan, and also in People's China, in government, administrative or publishing work.

The reviewer, who himself spent 25 years in one of the colleges (West China),

a year at Lingnan, and for a short time was secretary of a British committee connected with them all, regrets that more recognition is not given to the British share. Perhaps this criticism is unfair as the book is frankly described as treating the colleges as "a central element in the Sino-American relationship". Some British contacts are mentioned, and it is true that they were relatively few, yet they did modify policy to some extent. The reviewer went to China partly through the influence of Sir Michael Sadler, who was associated with education in India and China, and was vice-chairman of the Governors of West China Union University. He never considered that a college should exist for any other purpose than education in its broadest sense. Unlike their American colleagues, with notable exceptions, the British staff, also with some exceptions, maintained that the purpose was to serve the interests of truth, and not to be regarded as means of indoctrination or conversion.

The last few chapters of the book deal with recent events: the war with Japan, the student trek to the interior, the eventual disagreements with the Kuomintang and the influence of communism. The wealth of detail which is given requires more time for a thorough assessment, which might well come from a Chinese rather than a Westerner or westernized Chinese.

Few would disagree with the author's final words: "The main purpose of the missionaries in coming to China was the conversion of the Chinese to Christianity. In this they failed. The number of Christians . . . never reached more than 1 per cent of the total population . . . Christianity remained a foreign religion and the church a foreign institution . . . Moreover Christianity had not been accepted as essential to Chinese nationalism and the building of a new China . . . The rural reconstruction projects were a contribution to China, but not to Chinese Christianity. The same might be said of the Christian colleges. Their contribution to China was of lasting importance; their contribution to Christianizing China or Sinifying Christianity was marginal. The colleges aided the Chinese in defining themselves and in defining the West. The colleges helped make change necessary and possible, and they stimulated the growth of Chinese nationalism. That nationalism had and continues to have a strong anti-Western bias."

WILLIAM SEWELL

Modern Drama from Communist China, edited by Walter J. Meserve and Ruth I. Meserve. New York, New York University Press; London, University of London Press Ltd, 1970.

A collection of plays from contemporary China is unlikely to be engrossing reading. What is needed to justify such a work is a subtle analysis of the highly significant political position the drama has held in China since 1949 and some explanation of the stylistic changes in the Chinese theatre as some of the traditional forms are modified or discarded. Sadly there is little of this here. In a short and confused introduction, which contains several inaccuracies, the editors do not probe much deeper than saying that the theatre is subservient to the political demands of "Red Communism". They do not appear to distinguish clearly between the various kinds of drama they are discussing, which range from straight Western style plays to the revolutionary Peking operas. Apart from the introduction their only contribution is a brief appendage to a note on p. 327 about strategic hamlets in a play on the Vietnam war, which reads "Communist China does not recognize two Vietnamese republics".

The editors have been limited in their choice of plays by the number of available translations. All the plays selected are, in fact, translations from the Peking Foreign Languages Press and both the texts and notes have been reprinted in full without comment apart from the note mentioned above. It is useful to have this collection although in most cases the original translations are readily available in specialist libraries. The choice of Yuan drama and also a short piece by Lu Hsün, which was almost certainly never performed, would seem a little out of place, but the rest form a reasonable collection of what is available. It would have been considerably improved had it been possible to include some more controversial plays, such as the historical dramas which provoked so much fury in the early sixties, but none of these had been translated—with the possible example of T'ien Han's "Kuan Han-ch'ing"—at the time of publication.

D. RIMMINGTON

Gabriella Molè, *The T'u-yü-hun From the Northern Wei to the Time of the Five Dynasties*. xxxi+286 pp., Roma Instituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1970 (=Serie Orientale Roma Vol. XLI).

The T'u-yü-hun tribe (or rather tribal federation) has played a prominent role on China's northwestern borders from the third to the tenth century. The information on this ethnic group is therefore scattered over the dynastic histories from the *Chin-shu* and *Wei-shu* to the *Wu-tai shih* and the *Liao-shih*. The *Chin-shu* monograph on the T'u-yü-hun had been ably translated and annotated by Th. D. Carroll (*Account of the T'u-yü-hun in the History of the Chin Dynasty*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1953). Dr. Molè has now presented us with a translation of the T'u-yü-hun monographs from the later dynastic histories: *Wei-shu/Pei-shih*, *Chou-shu/Pei-shih*, *Sung-shu*, *Nan-Ch'i-shu*, *Liang-shu/Nan-shih*, *Sui-shu*, the two *T'ang-shu* and finally the *Wu-tai shih*. Together with Carroll's translation we have thus a complete collection of data on the T'u-yü-hun available. The author has stated that it has been her aim to provide scholars with all the material to be found in the Chinese histories. The present volume begins with a survey of T'u-yü-hun history (pp. xii–xxv) and a short survey of their culture (pp. xxvi–xxxi). The translations themselves occupy 65 pages, whereas the bulk of the book is taken up by copious annotation. The author has not only carefully compared the existing *variae lectiones* and relevant data from the other parts of the individual histories, but also digested a huge mass of secondary literature in her notes. Perhaps the greatest crux in all accounts of Central Asian peoples are the geographical names and their identification. Dr. Molè has devoted great care and patience to their elucidation, although some of the results, as she admits herself, are only tentative. Another problem is that of foreign names in Chinese orthography. The more or less accepted view of the linguistic affinity of the Hsien-pi and the T'u-yü-hun seems to be that they were "proto-Mongol". Apart from the fact that the Mongol language itself cannot be traced back earlier than the beginning of the thirteenth century, there are some flaws in this hypothesis. Most authors, including Pelliot, have based their opinions on titles and names, but these are just the linguistic elements that are apt to migrate most freely (for a recent discussion of the problem of the Hsien-pi language, see also *Zentralasiatische Studien* (Bonn) Vol. 3 (1969) pp. 13–17). Dr. Molè has, in most cases, commendably refrained from adding new theories to the unsatisfactory older ones.

The translations, as far as occasional comparisons with the Chinese text have shown, are accurate. On p. 65 I would prefer for the terms *sheng* and *shu* rather "uncivilized" and "civilized, acculturated" than "unknown" and "known". It might also be mentioned that the *Wu-tai hui-yao* has a brief treatise on the T'u-hun/T'u-yü-hun in ch. 28 (ed. Basic Sinological Series, pp. 343–5) which gives a few details not contained in the parallel passage of *Wu-tai shih*. A very useful feature of Dr. Molè's work is the detailed index (pp. 227–86) listing not only names and titles but also indicating topical information (culture, government, religion etc.) concerning the T'u-yü-hun. There can be no doubt that her book is an excellent contribution to Central Asian studies; it is sober, reliable, and well presented. This reviewer also holds the opinion that progress in Central Asian history can be made only if all available information on individual ethnic groups is collected, instead of the piecemeal use of sources which one encounters so frequently. Dr. Molè has through her scholarly work set an example which should be followed for other Central Asian tribes and nations.

HERBERT FRANKE

Kotoku Shusui: Portrait of a Japanese Radical, by F. G. Notehelfer. x+227 pp. Cambridge, University Press, 1971. £5.

It is surprising that Kōtoku Shūsui has not found a foreign biographer before. As the police's arch-villain of the plot to assassinate the Meiji Emperor in 1910, as a pioneer socialist and anarchist in Japan, and as a man who refused to conform or compromise in his personal as much as his political life, he ranks as one of the most striking individuals in modern Japanese history. Even the most routine biography of Kōtoku would possess considerable human interest, therefore, but Dr. Notehelfer has in fact produced a lucid and thoughtful study which gives as much weight to his subject's ideas as to his career, and shows the relevance of Kōtoku's concerns to the Meiji political and intellectual atmosphere without attempting to minimize the factors of personal psychology which seem to have exercised a dominant influence on Kōtoku's attitudes. The picture which emerges is that of a man born in Tosa soon enough after the Meiji Restoration to have inherited a deep feeling for samurai tradition, and especially for the dramatic gestures of the loyalist *shishi*, who failed to find a role which satisfied his ambition and who, in an almost continual mood of dissatisfaction, moved from the people's rights movement to socialism and finally to anarchism in his pursuit of an ideal to which he could dedicate himself. His career poses in an acute form the problem of those Japanese intellectuals who were concerned about the increasing materialism which had entered Japanese life as a result of the effort to match Western power and whose nationalism was essentially concentrated on the domestic problem of constructing a society where morality prevailed—but in alliance with individualism and not as a result of official indoctrination. As Dr. Notehelfer suggests, it was this, rather than the doctrines he espoused, which gave Kōtoku's career a wide significance and made him a symbol for Japanese of widely different persuasions. This biography therefore throws light on one of the most fascinating aspects of modern Japanese history and, with the single slight reservation that the author tends to assert Kōtoku's adherence to the values of the past without showing exactly how he conceived of them in his writings, should be warmly welcomed as a valuable addition to the short list of studies of Japanese historical personalities.

R. L. Sims

I. de Rachewiltz, *Papal Envoys to the Great Khans* (Great Travellers). 230 pp., London, Faber and Faber, 1971.

If, as the dust-jacket blurb on the book under review confesses in an access of vicarious humility, "few of us know of the medieval friars . . . who explored the remote regions of Asia as papal envoys and missionaries", this is hardly the fault of Dr. de Rachewiltz's many learned predecessors in this field, and perhaps no more than an admission that blurb-writers are ignorant of the bibliography given in the very work that they are advertising. English readers in particular have been well served in the past, with books such as *The Mongol Mission*, edited by Christopher Dawson in 1955, or Leonardo Olschki's comprehensive guide-book, *Marco Polo's Asia*, published in 1960, not to speak of Sir Henry Yule's magnificent volumes from an earlier age.

However that may be, Dr. de Rachewiltz's book is most welcome. He sketches for us the historical background against which it was felt necessary, in the mid-thirteenth century, to send successive missions to the Mongols, with the dual intention of gaining their alliance against Islam and perhaps even of gaining converts, and he also traces the growth of the confused ideas of Prester John and a Christian kingdom in Asia which were current at the time.

The first papal envoy into Asia, sent to Prester John, seems to have been a certain Master Philip, the personal physician of Pope Alexander III, who set out from Venice in 1177, and of whom nothing more is known. Dr. de Rachewiltz deals with all the missions subsequently despatched, and especially fully with the most significant of

them, those of John of Pian di Carpine (John of Plano Carpini), William of Rubruck, John of Montecorvino who became Archbishop in Khanbaliq or Peking, and John of Marignolli who travelled to China in response to an appeal from the Christian Alans of Khanbaliq for a pontifical legate to be sent there. He sets his narrative against a competent survey of contemporary history.

The earlier envoys went on "fact-finding missions", to discover who the feared Tatars really were, and John of Pian di Carpine gives a good account of himself as a military expert as well as a general observer. But by the time of John of Marignolli the boot was on the other foot. The Mongols were no longer a threatening, unknown quantity, likely at any moment to descend on Europe from an Asia inhabited by dog-headed peoples and other monsters. Their power had declined, and the last emperor, Togon Temür, seems to have welcomed John of Marignolli's arrival as likely to please the military class on whom his security depended, in the face of rising discontent among the Chinese people.

In their main objectives the missions may be said to have failed. No military alliance against Islam was ever brought about, nor were there conversions of the native peoples of Asia to Christianity in any significant numbers. But the papal envoys performed another valuable and lasting service. Their written reports were the main source of factual information for their contemporaries on life in Asia, and helped to dispel rumour and myth. At the same time, they were very accurate in their observations, and for us, who live seven centuries or so later, their reports are source-books of inestimable worth. Dr. de Rachewiltz deserves our thanks for once again bringing these pages of history to our notice, and one hopes that his attractive work of popularization will reach the wide public it deserves.

C. R. Bawden

Paul Thieme. Kleine Schriften, edited by Georg Buddruss. 2 vols., xv+412, 413–815 pp., Glasenapp-Stiftung Band 5. Franz Steiner Verlag, 1971. DM.72.00.

This is the fifth in the Glasenapp-Stiftung series of 'Kleine Schriften'. As can be seen from the bibliography of Thieme's writings, which also serves as index to the two volumes, almost all the author's published articles as well as his more important reviews are included. With one exception (a victim of Indian printing), which has had to be entirely reset, all the articles have been photomechanically reproduced from the various journals in which they first appeared. If a few have shrunk uncomfortably in the process, this can be the only reserve in one's praise of the skill and enterprise of the Franz Steiner Verlag.

Paul Thieme is known chiefly for his work on Vedic and the Indian grammarians. Broadly speaking, volume one is devoted to the former, volume two to the latter subject. But such classification belies the essential quality manifest in each article: a wide-ranging mastery of the whole ancient Indian field. This is best seen in two major studies: one on the institution of marriage and its Sanskrit terminology with Greek and Latin parallels, the other on an Iranian loan-word, *bandī*, in Sanskrit.

Among the reviews, those of Lüders' '*Varuṇa*', Renou's '*Terminologie grammaticale du Sanskrit*', and Wackernagel-Debrunner's '*Altindische Grammatik II,2*' are themselves replete with information and insight. The two books are completed by a list of Corrigenda, a selective index of words treated and passages cited, and Addenda, in which the author adds to and corrects some of the points made in articles that span forty years.

Apart from the obvious convenience of having these widely scattered writings collected and easily accessible, it gives one an opportunity to appraise the qualities and peculiarities of a mind as it tackles a diversity of problems. If some of the more daring speculations will not be acceptable to all readers, few will grudge admiration for the great erudition and extraordinary subtlety of this scholar.

Peter Khoroche

D. C. Twitchett, *Financial Administration Under the T'ang Dynasty*. 2nd edn., 386 pp. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1970. £2·75.

This is the second edition of a work completed in 1959 and first published in 1963. Since its original publication, Professor Twitchett's *Financial Administration Under the T'ang Dynasty* has been the standard work on T'ang economic history. In this new edition, the text and notes are basically unaltered, but the author has corrected some minor errors from the first edition and has added a twelve-page supplementary bibliography which lists, with brief annotations, significant work relating to T'ang economic history published since 1958. The price of the work has been halved, but the paper is not as good as that of the first edition.

It is welcome to have available at a more reasonable price this valuable book. For to all serious students of the T'ang, and indeed of pre-modern Chinese history, Professor Twitchett's work is basic reading, describing subjects of significance and complexity with great skill. The author is over-modest about the scope of the book, remarking in the preface that he has deliberately restricted himself to "considerations of state financial policy, to the exclusion of any discussion of the economic history of the period in the broadest sense". Although it is too early to write a full and comprehensive account of the economic history of the T'ang, Professor Twitchett nearly always succeeds in discussing the formulation of policy in terms of its historical context. Of course the materials available are often normative rather than descriptive and are usually written from the vantage point of the capital. But Professor Twitchett has exploited the available evidence expertly and thoroughly.

The main text is divided into six chapters: (1) Land Tenure; (2) Direct Taxation; (3) State Monopolies and Taxes on Trade; (4) Currency and Credit; (5) The Transportation System; (6) The Financial Administration. In the appendixes there are translations of important documents, including: The statutory legislation—administrative and penal—covering land tenure under the *chün-t'ien* ("equal field") system; extant fragments of the *Taxation Statutes* and their supplementary legislation; documents dealing with the *liang-shui* tax quota system; texts concerning indirect taxation, specifically, the salt monopoly; data dealing with production of coin; descriptions of the great canal systems, by which grain and textiles were transported. The text is 123 pages, the appendixes another 70. There are nearly 150 pages of notes, a great many of which are in themselves interesting short essays on related subjects. There is a glossary-index (with Chinese characters) and a subject-index.

I shall not attempt to summarize the contents of the book which is in any case so concisely and cogently written as to make summary difficult. I should like to raise one or two points of substance, but first it might be useful to call attention to some of the areas in which Professor Twitchett has, in articles written since the publication of *Financial Administration Under the T'ang Dynasty*, extended the book's discussion and revised certain of its statements. Some of these recent articles are listed in his supplementary bibliographical essay (pp. 194–205). Two articles quite closely related in subject are "The T'ang Market System", *Asia Major* (n.s.), XII, 2 (1966), pp. 202–48 and "Merchant, Trade and Government", *Asia Major* (n.s.), XIV, 1 (1968), pp. 63–95. The first of these describes the attempts of the state to intervene in and control trade and discusses the gradual breakdown of the system of control as trade increased during the dynasty, particularly during the period of political decentralization in late T'ang. The second article considers the traditional, very circumscribed, role of the merchant in society and describes the government's attempts to control his activity through economic, legal, and sumptuary restrictions. It then goes on to discuss the gradual softening of attitudes toward the merchant as his role in society became more important, the result of a series of related developments, including increasing urbanization and a growing network of rural markets, a more firmly-based money economy, and the necessity of his co-operation in government financial policies based on taxes on trade. In "Provincial Autonomy and Central Finance in Late T'ang", *Asia Major* (n.s.) XI, 2 (1965), pp. 211–32, which seems to me to be an article of particular importance, Professor Twitchett describes very clearly the great difficulties faced by the central government after the rebellion of An Lu-shan, when the areas of China most productive of grain, salt, and metals were largely lost to central control. Professor Twitchett describes the repercussions of the greatly altered geo-political situation. Specifically, he shows that the burning of the government storehouses of silk and the loss of Hopei and Shantung, which before the An Lu-shan Rebellion had been contributing two-thirds of the government's revenues in silk cloth, had a major impact on the keeping of government accounts; at this time the basis changed from silk cloth to copper cash, a development which stimulated the growth of a money economy. This analysis goes well beyond certain of the statements still retained in the second edition of the book, for example the view expressed on p. 78 that the growth of a metallic currency at the expense of cloth as a medium of exchange was the result of the natural development of society and was not linked with the destruction of the government stocks of cloth during the rebellion. This is not to say that metallic currency was not in any event gaining in importance before the rebellion, but only that it was significantly stimulated by the An Lu-shan rebellion. "Provincial Autonomy and Central Finance in Late T'ang" is an exceptionally important and suggestive article, one which synthesizes a great deal of earlier work and establishes a perspective from which we can understand more deeply many of the great issues of late T'ang history.

Finally, I would mention another recent article (not included in the supplementary bibliography) by Professor Twitchett, "Local Financial Administration in Early T'ang Times", *Asia Major* (n.s.), XV, Part 1 (1969), pp. 82–114. This article greatly expands the discussion of the duties of the local magistrates as found on pp. 11 and 229–30 (note 101) in this book. On the basis of the documentary evidence available from Tun-huang, he shows that in that region at least "the massive preponderance of the official matters ... came from the two financial services", while the judicial duties of the local magistrate were of very minor importance ("Local Financial Administration", p. 89). This is a significant revision of his earlier judgement (still expressed in *Financial Administration Under the T'ang Dynasty*, pp. 229–30, note 101) that the largest part of the local magistrate's duties was concerned with judicial duties, financial administration being second in importance. One would of course have to consider the fact that there is a particular regional character to all of the Tun-huang evidence. This is a very important matter, concerning as it does the extent to which the central government intervened in local affairs. This article also contains a very interesting account of the collection and expenditure of revenues at the local level, and describes the means by which local officials carried out their duties (these included employees hired on a permanent basis, from which we see that Wang An-shih's Hired Servant System was by no means an unprecedented reform).

I have tried to indicate here some of the areas in which Professor Twitchett has developed the analysis and coverage of the book. I hope this suggests adequately the desirability of reading this book in conjunction with some of the author's recent work. For the most part, however, the findings in the book are likely to stand for quite some time.

I would now like to turn to one chapter of the book which seems to me to contain a number of puzzling problems. This is the fourth chapter, on "Currency and Credit" (pp. 66–83). In this section, Professor Twitchett has tried to show some of the problems encountered by the government in its efforts to establish and maintain a metallic currency adequate to the needs of a growing and increasingly diversified economy. He suggests that the administration tried, but never really succeeded, in supplying the demand for a stable and sufficient currency. The system of coinage production, under provincial mints, was wasteful and inefficient; it sometimes cost more to mint a coin than the coin was worth. In addition, the government never succeeded in putting and keeping in circulation a coin of higher denomination. Finally, counterfeiting was common, and counterfeit coins tended to drive good coins out of circulation; counterfeiting was easy because the coins were of very simple design, being produced by corvée labourers rather than by professional artisans.

A series of questions are immediately suggested by the above data. Why, in the first place, if it was government policy to restrict and control trade, which was viewed as

disruptive of society, was the government so concerned with putting more coin into circulation? One can see that later in the dynasty, when taxes on trade, collected through the salt monopoly, became important, the government would want to keep a large amount of small denomination metallic currency in circulation. But early in the dynasty, when taxes were collected in grain and silk cloth, when the dynasty's officials were paid in grain, when taxes on trade were not used, why would the dynasty have been so concerned about metallic currency? In "The T'ang Market System" and in "Merchant, Trade and Government in Late T'ang" (cited above), Professor Twitchett seems to accept the view that the government was interested in nothing as much as controlling and restricting, rather than encouraging, trade. Furthermore, he seems to treat the problem of the metallic currency as quite separate from that of the other, and apparently more important currency: silk cloth. In this book he states that silk cloth was, during the first half of the dynasty, used in large-scale transactions (It was gradually replaced by precious metals, particularly silver, later in the dynasty). In "Provincial Autonomy and Central Finance in Late T'ang" (p. 228) Professor Twitchett stresses the fact that during the first half of the dynasty silk was the principal form of currency, held by the government in huge quantities since it was collected as tax from every peasant. Government financial policy and accounting procedures were based on the fact that silk cloth was the standard of value, and the government was able to stabilize prices by controlling the amount of silk in circulation. In view of this, it seems to me that one cannot treat the problem of metallic currency without considering it in relation to the principal form of currency and without explaining why the government was apparently so eager to encourage trade. And if it is correct to regard silk cloth as the basic form of currency, then perhaps the *tiao* tax and the *yung* corvée exemption tax, both of which were paid in the form of cloth, should be regarded as money taxes, rather than as taxes in kind. Is there a difference in principle between the collection of taxes in silk cloth as against metallic currency of high intrinsic value? It would of course be a different matter if the government had succeeded in circulating a fiat currency, but apparently it never did. This is a matter of great importance, since the introduction of money taxes is often regarded as a major innovation in government financial policy.

It would also be interesting to speculate on the reasons for the difficulty of the government either to produce enough coins or to put into circulation the larger denomination coin. It is curious that a government which could build a great capital and carry out complex engineering projects could not, in a country where metallurgical techniques had developed early, produce a sufficient quantity of coin in a design not easily duplicated. Is there evidence that there was large-scale peculation by local officials at the provincial mints? It is also curious that coins containing only a non-precious metal like copper would be hoarded; was the copper in the coins actually of greater worth than the face-value of the coins? May we assume that hoarding of this non-precious metal would have been likely only in times of extreme inflation? And one wonders why the government apparently lacked the power to put the larger denomination coin into circulation. This suggests a surprising lack of confidence in the currency it circulated. Why didn't it pay its own officials with large denomination coins?

Beyond this, it would be interesting to try to establish a general picture of the situation in regard to metallic currency during the early part of the dynasty, and to tie this in with what is known of government monetary policy. Who was most concerned and why? The government itself imposed no direct taxes in the form of metallic currency, except for the household tax, which was only a minor, supplementary levy. The indirect tax on commerce (actually on production) established through the salt monopoly did not come until about 758, and the government did not tax trade until the imposition of a tea tax in 793. The merchants would have benefited from the stimulus to trade that would have resulted from an increase in the amount of metallic currency in circulation, but we may assume that government policy was not designed to benefit the merchants. For the peasants, who paid their taxes in grain and silk which they produced themselves, the problem of a metallic coinage could not have been a major concern. The peasants could quite literally produce their own money—*i.e.* cloth—in small quantities, for whatever they had to buy. Professor Twitchett shows (*Fin. Ad.*, pp. 74–5) that between 665 and 683 the price of grain in terms of metal currency rose 4,000–8,000 per cent. But this inflation, though quite dramatic, might have had little effect on the peasantry; the household levy, fixed in cash terms, would have actually been lighter. Of course, later in the dynasty, when under the *liang-shui* quota system, taxes were calculated in terms of the metallic currency though paid in terms of cloth and grain, the problem would have been, and was, presented to the peasants in acute form: Tax quotas were fixed in 780, a time of inflation; this was followed by a long period of currency deflation, which meant that the actual tax burden on the peasants greatly increased, producing a real financial crisis for the people. I hope Professor Twitchett will, at some future time, speculate on some of these problems.

It seems to me that this book represents the coming-of-age of scholarship on the economic and institutional history of pre-modern China. It was not very many years ago that Étienne Balazs chided (and, it will be admitted, caricatured) Western scholars for their interest in topics of peripheral importance: "disquisitions on philological trifles, expensive trips in abstruse provinces, bickering about the restitutions of the names of unknown persons and other delightfully antiquated occupations." He remarked sardonically that Western Sinologists, "Fully occupied with philological hair-splitting . . . never found the interest or the time to investigate such frivolous things as the economic foundations and the social structure of a great society." Certainly this is the kind of study that Balazs was encouraging, and he was himself one of the pioneer Western scholars in this field.

By the time Professor Twitchett's early work was published, a large number of scholars, mainly in China and Japan, had, in the author's words, "transformed out of all recognition the picture of medieval Chinese society currently accepted thirty years ago". He adds that "if this volume does no more than introduce to the Western reader some of the results of their researches, it will have fulfilled a very useful purpose". This purpose has been served, for Professor Twitchett has fully incorporated the scholarship of a host of Chinese and Japanese historians, many of whom produced work of great importance and distinction. But it is obvious that this book is the author's own, for throughout one finds the lean prose and incisive, well-organized analysis, the thorough familiarity with primary documentation and keen instinct for significant historical problems that characterize all of Denis Twitchett's writings.

ROBERT SOMERS

Heide Wehlert, *Imagawa Ryōshun und sein "Nigenshō": ein Beitrag zur waka-Poetik der Muromachi-Zeit.* Studien sur Japanologie, Band 11, pp. 106. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1969.

From the mid-thirteenth century on there was much dissension among the descendants of Fujiwara Teika through his son Tameie over the inheritance not only of property, but also of the family tradition in matters of poetry. The attitude of the Nijō branch of the family was wholly conservative; they were obsessed with the sanctity of the traditional practice in all aspects of poetry, and as a result they wrote the kind of imitative and unimaginative verse that has caused the late classical period to be regarded as a time of steady decline. Two other branches of the family, however, the Kyōgoku and the Reizei, claimed to be honouring the true spirit of their great predecessors Shunzei and Teika by blending a respect for tradition with a willingness to be original, and as Brower and Miner have shown, they produced much good poetry. The subject of the book under review, Imagawa Ryōshun (1325–1420), though not a Fujiwara, was a leading proponent of the Reizei school of poetry. His *Nigenshō* is a report made to the Bureau of Poetry, giving advice on certain controversial matters, namely the distinction to be drawn between two categories of words, those which were "poetic" (*utagoto*) and those which were "ordinary" (*tadagoto*). Ryōshun stresses that, when used by a master, even everyday words used for the first time in poetry can become acceptable poetic diction, and also argues that if a poem has originality or is unusual (*mezurashi*) in its conception, it will automatically take on a "Wortmelodie, die etwas Interessantes bringt, das einen hellwach werden lässt" (*mezametaru ikkyō no kakari*).

After a brief account of Ryōshun's life and character, including notes on each of his works, the author devotes some forty pages to a discussion of poetics: Fujiwara Teika and his intellectual legacy, Ryōshun's development as a poet, and the systematization and extension of Reizei poetics as set out in the *Nigenshō* and other writings of Ryōshun. Competent though the exposition of these matters is (though one notes with surprise the translation of the term *okashi* as "spasshaft interessant" and the consistent misreading of *fuzei* as *fūzei*), one could not help feeling that it was all somewhat theoretical; the actual poems quoted could be counted on the fingers of one hand. There was some consolation, however, in the thought that there was still the kernel of the book to come, the translation of Ryōshun's treatise, with the over fifty poems which a glance ahead showed it to contain (not, incidentally, poems of his own). But what a disappointment lay in store!

Part of the disappointment was that the translation left something to be desired. In the first place, the poems are translated line for line, with a slavish adherence to the Japanese word-order which may have demanded considerable ingenuity but which hardly seems justifiable, in view of the clumsy and forced translation that it can on occasion produce, as in "Über die man Leinwand / zum Trocknen hängt, die groben / Stangen als Stütze / umrankend, ist sie erblüht, / des Flaschenkürbis Blüte" (poem 24, p. 72), or "Der arme Bauer, / den Reisbeetzaun zum Schutze / stellt er flechtend auf -/ hat in das Keimbeet heute / er wohl das Saatgut gesät?" (poem 2, p. 63). On the whole I have little quarrel with the interpretation of most of the poems, though there is one bad mistake on p. 93, where *tare ga nokiba yori / yuki harauramu* is translated as "Wer ist's, der vom Traufenrand / wohl den Schnee fortstreifte?"; *ga* here must be a genitive, not a nominative, particle, the subject of *harauramu* being surely the *arashi* of the first line of the poem. On the other hand, the prose part of Ryōshun's treatise is marred by several serious (and a few smaller) mistranslations. For instance, "Auch ein Wort wie shiroshi als schlecht zu verbieten ist nicht angängig" (p. 62) is a misinterpretation of the original *shiroshi to iu kotoba mo, waroki nite imashimeraretaru nite wa yomo sōrawaji*, which means "the word shiroshi can hardly have been prohibited because it was bad". On p. 89, we read ". . . (meint man), dass es auch unter diesen Gedichten, was auch immer den 'erhabenen Wuchs' ausmache, mangelhafte gäbe; wie wohl konnte man so ein Urteil fällen?" How indeed could the author make such a judgement on this sentence? The Japanese says " . . . since these poems (of Tamesuke) do seem to include a few in the 'lofty' style (Stil des erhabenen Wuchses), how could anyone claim that such poems were lacking (or: that there was a deficiency in his work in this respect)?" On p. 91 the author has been led by a Japanese full stop into misplacing the beginning of a quotation. She has translated ". . . somit dürfte sich nun unser Weg auf die Vorsehung der beiden Gottheiten stützen. Die Unterweisung lautete, dass es nicht angehe . . ." But the first of these two sentences belongs with the second; both constitute the "Unterweisung" imparted by Tamehide.

Perhaps the most startling example of a mistranslation occurs on p. 88, where we find "Da man sich bei der Wortmelodie der Gedichte des Rokujō diesen Stilthemen nicht zuwandte und nicht nach ihnen dichten mochte, fühlte man sich vermutlich nicht sonderlich von ihnen angesprochen . . .; das (aber) führte dahin, dass es zu einer Einengung des (Ideenreichtums) des ([*sic*] D.E.M.) Weges kommen musste". In the original, however, we have not an explanation of why something happened in the past but a statement of what happens or would happen should the "Wortmelodie" of the *Rokujō* (*i.e.* the *Kokin waka rokujō*) be used with themes other than those in the *Rokujō*. This is clear from the verb-forms used in the sentence "*yomi-sōrawazaran ni wa . . . konomi-eiji-sōrōmajiku sōro. Sa narade wa . . . michi sebaku ya narubeku sōrawanzuran*", and it is difficult to see how the author's version of this made sense to her. The fact that it did is perhaps a comment on the not too rigorous logical progression of the original argument. Indeed, the whole structure of the *Nigenshō* is distinctly unsatisfactory. For instance, the set of fifty-nine poems described by Ryōshun, though without explanation, as *mezurashi* ("unusual, exceptional, original") is preceded and followed by (but not in any way linked with) what strike me as utterly trivial lists of so-called "poetic words" (*utagoto*) presented without reference to poems and without any expla-

nation of why they are poetic; the second list is even said rather ingenuously to have been added as an afterthought "da es mir in den Sinn kommt".

All in all, the *Nigenshō* proves to be a disappointing text in itself. But the final disappointment for the reader is that the author of this book does not try to compensate for Ryōshun's avoidance of comment on his choice of poems. She explicitly disclaims any ability as a result of her study of his work to attempt a precise definition of the terms *tadagoto* and *utagoto*, and as far as appreciation of the poems is concerned (as distinct from explanatory annotation) she limits herself to the most generalized comments, eschewing any detailed examination of the poetic diction used. One cannot expect her to be able to make definitive statements on matters which, as she says, could only become clear after the study of many more sources. But if she considers the *Nigenshō* to be important, she must have formed some idea of the linguistic basis for Ryōshun's choice of poems. Yet on this she remains silent, and so she cannot blame the reader if, after studying her book on Ryōshun's approach to the language of poetry, he feels rather cheated.

D. E. MILLS

James W. White, *The Sōkagakkai and Mass Society*. Stanford University Press, 1970.

The first part of this book, comprising eight substantial chapters, provides a detailed account of the Sōkagakkai—a religious movement developing from Nichiren Buddhism—the growth of which has been one of the outstanding features of Japanese social and political history since 1950. It begins with an examination of some of the factors contributing to the emergence of the movement, which emphasizes in particular the post-war disruption of previously accepted values in Japan and the fact that some groups—in the cities, especially—did not share fully in the benefits of economic recovery and boom. Mr. White then considers in turn the beliefs, growth, membership, recruitment and indoctrination, organization and political activities of the Gakkai, making use for this purpose of the Gakkai's own publications, the results of several opinion polls, and much contemporary analysis in Japanese and Western languages.

From these chapters, any reader who possesses a modest knowledge of the vocabulary of the social sciences may secure a rounded and well-based account of an important social and political phenomenon (though rather less about the movement quâ religion). The rest of the book, however, is more difficult going, at least to this reviewer. Its argument starts from the fact that many observers, notably among Japanese intellectuals, have treated Sōkagakkai as being dangerously inclined, because of its composition and attitudes, towards an authoritarian and ultranationalist position. As a framework within which to consider this question, the author takes William Kornhauser's concept of "mass society": the proposition that "mass man" is *unattached* to his society's broader groupings and is *alienated* from himself, his fellows and the major systems of the society in which he lives. Each part of the proposition is then examined in turn, to determine how far it may apply to the Gakkai and those who join it. Broadly, the point is made that there are at least superficial grounds for asserting the applicability of the model. Members of Sōkagakkai often seek through their membership a social nexus which they do not otherwise find in Japanese life. They are commonly drawn from groups that are relatively deprived (chiefly the urban lower classes and small businessmen). Their activities are based on a critical approach to the existing manner of Japanese politics and imply some chauvinist or nationalist elements in their thinking. Nevertheless, Mr. White's conclusion—convincingly—is that the threat this poses to the character of Japanese politics is potential, not actual. The Gakkai, he says, "does not display any marked tendency toward deviant social behavior" (p. 274). Its members "are at present neither ultranationalist nor militarist" (p. 280). It is only if there were breakdown and a marked swing to the right in Japan that the movement might assume a central and dangerous role.

For the reader whose interest is primarily in studying Japan, these conclusions could presumably have been presented (as well as reached) without the use of a model

that has in the end to be rejected: "one surmises", the author states, "that the Gakkai member is closer to the average Japanese than to the average Japanese Communist or to the mass man model" (p. 214). Political scientists may well find the approach valuable. For most readers of this journal, however, it is probable that the result is to make a useful and worth-while book just that much more difficult to read. It will be a matter of some regret if it prevents them from reading it altogether.

W. G. BEASLEY

George Woodcock, *Into Tibet.* 276 pp., 10 illustrations, 2 maps. London, Faber and Faber, 1971. £2·75.

This account of the travels into Tibet of Warren Hastings's envoys George Bogle (1774) and Captain Samuel Turner (1783) and the independent adventure by Thomas Manning (1811) is drawn from the Journals of Bogle and Manning in the classic edition by Clements Markham (1876)—the source also of most of the biographical material including that of Turner—and from Turner's *Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama*, 1800.

Dr. Woodcock, using some lively extracts, weaves the stories into a whole with his own explanations.

The historical setting is sketched with a brevity that leads to inaccuracies. Van der Putte was not the only European layman in Tibet before Bogle; for the Capuchins mention a Frenchman from Patna in 1717 and, also, their own "laico", Paolo di Firenze. Criticism of Tibetan magical practices was not the principal reason why the Capuchins had to leave Lhasa, nor were they expelled; lack of funds combined with the prohibition against preaching (1741) made them leave in 1745, and resentment at their recent conversion of Tibetans—the first in over 30 years—prevented their return.

Coming to the main matter: almost half the book is devoted to Bogle of whom Dr. Woodcock takes a strangely ambivalent view, seeing beneath the "immaculate surface" of his "mannered" prose hidden idiosyncrasies, such as calculating self-centredness, callousness, and a constant self-dignifying, self-effacing wariness underlying an admirable outer appearance of warmth and frankness. That interpretation—forced in my opinion—does not gain strength from a sometimes biased choice of words—e.g. in describing as "adulation" Bogle's genuine admiration and reverence for the Panchen Lama. Nor is it realistic to compare Bogle's journal with Manning's diary—so intimate that one seems almost to pry upon its extravagant raptures, doubts and miseries. Bogle wrote, by command, for the critical eye of Hastings who wanted information about Tibet, not about Bogle's emotions. The style, so much easier and more revealing than the elegant correctness of Turner, is that of an educated bright young man of the day, touched with light self-mockery and badinage—Woodcock sees them as self-complacency and heavy irony—and, in view of the recipient, surprisingly gay and humorous.

Intent on secrets, Dr. Woodcock wonders fancifully whether Bogle was also concealing (with good motives this time) a serious attraction to Tibetan Buddhism. Certainly he attended many temple ceremonies and had friendly discussions with the Panchen Lama about religious generalities—Tibetans make no secret of such things; but he could never have had an inkling of esoteric doctrines requiring long probation and more Tibetan than the ability "to make it out" at a party.

Dr. Woodcock inclines to dismiss the tradition that Bogle married a Tibetan wife. He has interesting new information about a "Bebee Bogle" but there is no space here to examine the arguments, not all of which are entirely convincing. Incidentally, the female incarnation, Dorje Phagmo was the Panchen Lama's niece, not his "half-sister" (p. 169).

The two other travellers get much less space. Bogle's pioneer mission overshadowed Turner's which had no more political success and which lacked Bogle's advantages in personal contacts. Turner described it 17 years later, impressively but with studied detachment. Even in the account of his reception by the infant Panchen

Lama (the successor to Bogle's friend, who died in 1780), though it can stir emotion today, Turner admits only "attention" and "interest". Woodcock does not cite the one hint of feeling—at the magical sight of Tashilhunpo at dawn, nor is Turner's excellent map of the route mentioned.

Dr. Woodcock rightly sees Manning's private journey, though made after the official closing of Tibet to foreigners, as nearer in spirit to Bogle and Turner than to those who came after; but it is misleading to imply (p. 19) that after Manning there were, apart from Huc and Gabet, no European explorers in Tibet until 1904. A cloud of witnesses disproves that: Moorcroft, Henry Strachey, Prjevalski, Rockhill (from the U.S.A.), Dutreuil de Rhins, Annie Taylor, Sven Hedin, Bower, the Littledales, and more; and a significant distinction is, therefore, missed—that while later travellers, except for Sarat Chandra Das, could explore only the surface of the land, Bogle, Turner and Manning explored also the mind of the Tibetans.

An understandably haphazard rendering of Tibetan words produces some errors: Namling (p. 104) is not *gnam gling*, "Sky Garden"; but *rnam (grol) gling*, "Place of Perfect Deliverance". Dalai Lamas are *sku mdun*, "The Presence", not *kun ldan*, "All Possessing" (p. 106). A few other points: "Tus" is not "an archaic transliteration of the Tibetan word for sheep"! (p. 54); Bernier explains it as the word (perhaps Persian) for the soft wool of the shawl goat. Chinese attempts to incorporate Tibet began in 1908, well before the Republic (p. 108). The blade of the *phur-pa* dagger is not "customarily" made of meteoritic iron (p. 118); such are rare and specially venerated. The Regent at the time of Manning's visit was not the Tatsa (rTa-tshag) (p. 240) but the De-mo Rimpoche ("Ti-mu-fu"). "Jo-khong" for "Jo-khang" (p. 256) and "Dishalkar" or "Diskalkar" (p. 271) are apparently misprints.

Among the illustrations in this pleasantly produced book the portrait of Manning is far and away the most attractive. Pale reproductions of prints from Turner's book do not do justice to the originals.

Little space remains for the many felicities in Dr. Woodcock's easy presentation of a fascinating story; but the biographical note on Manning with quotations from Charles Lamb's letter deserves mention as does Dr. Woodcock's sound verdict that the Tibet of Bogle, Turner and Manning is nearer to the reality than is the land of magic and mystery envisaged by some later seekers.

H. E. RICHARDSON

A Tibetan Religious Geography of Nepal. By Turrell Wylie. Serie Orientale Roma XLII. 8vo, 66 pp., map. (Roma, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente), 1970.

This volume comprises a text and English translation of the Nepalese section of the *'Dzam-gling-rgyas-bshad*, of which the Tibetan section was published by the same author in 1962. The text, composed in about 1820, is taken from a corrected manuscript obtained by Dr. J. F. Rock. The author appends two further transliterated but untranslated texts; the *Bal-yul gnas-yig* and the *Bal-yul mchod-rten 'Phags-pa shing-kun dang de'i gnas gzhan rnams-kyi dkar-chag*; and a useful two-way glossary of Nepalese proper names in Tibetan and roman transcription.

Professor Wylie's translation is accurate and clear, and it is good to have these texts published. It cannot be said that this text tells us much that is new about Nepal in the early nineteenth century, though it does provide an additional source which may be used to check those already available. We can thus form an impression of the reliability of the Tibetan section of the same work. The author of the text, *Bla-ma Btsan-po*, proves to be generally accurate as regards topography, place names and major ethnic groups, but very vague on details and confused over history and legends.

Most of my points refer to footnotes, which are not always very illuminating:

p. xiii. Correct *'Dazam-gling-rgyas-bshab* to *'Dzam-gling-rgyas-bshad.*

p. 13. The Nepali word for Kathmandu may be transliterated from the devanagari

as *Kāṭhmāṇḍəw̃*, which according to T. W. Clark represents the vernacular pronunciation. Wylie's "Kāṭmaṇḍu" is therefore not much more accurate than the Tibetan *Ka-tha-māṇḍu*.

p. 18. The image of Tara in Bhatgaon did not prophesy that Milarepa "be invited as the King of Bhatgaon", but merely advised the King to honour Milarepa with gifts or to invite him to the city. Since Milarepa did not accept the invitation, the translation of *lung bstan* by "prophesy" is not apt. I would translate *kho khom rgyal por rje btsun mi la gdan drongs zhes lung bstan pa* (on which Wylie bases his footnote No. 31) as "the (image of Tara which gave advice to the King of Bhatgaon, saying 'Invite the reverend Mila!'". The story appears in the *mgur-'bum* of Milarepa—see for example *The Hundred Thousand Songs of Milarepa*, by G. C. C. Chang (New York, 1962), Vol. 1, pp. 287–95.

p. 26 (also footnotes 76 and 77). By giving an epithet of Śiva as a name to a series of images of Viṣṇu the Nepalese have caused some confusion. Wylie rightly points out this discrepancy. *Bla-ma Btsan-po* has picked up the story of a Nepalese King who was not able to see the images at Gosainthan and Budhā-Nīlakaṇṭha and so ordered the one to be made at Bāla-Nīlakaṇṭha. The Gurkha Kings were not allowed to visit the Budhā-Nīlakaṇṭha image. One Nepalese explanation of these things is that since both the Malla and Gurkha Kings were themselves incarnations of Viṣṇu, the idea of visiting themselves or seeing themselves would be nonsensical. Also the *Bal-yul gnas-yig* identifies the images as Viṣṇu. Apparently they were known to be Viṣṇu, but because of their names many people worshipped them as Śiva. *Bla-ma Btsan-po* seems to have caught an echo of this confusion since he goes to some lengths to identify the images and describe their background. He attempts to solve the problem by identifying them as Avalokiteśvara. Furthermore he has mixed up the different images. This is a good example of how careful we should be in using his information without a prior knowledge of what he is talking about.

p. 33. *Bla-ma Btsan-po* is quite justified in calling Bhimpedi the frontier of Nepal (*bal-po'i yul*). Whenever the Gurkha government began calling the whole of their territories "Nepal", at the time this text was written the term signified to most of their subjects (and the corresponding *bal-po'i yul* to the Tibetans) only the Kathmandu Valley (still often called the Nepal Valley). Even today the inhabitants of places only a few miles outside the Valley will ask the traveller if he has come from "Nepal", and there is still a checkpoint at every entry point into the Valley.

p. 34 (also footnote 48). Since the works of Lévi and Hamilton, quoted by Wylie, there have been at least two dealing with the Newar caste system: "Social Mobility in the Newar Caste System", by C. Rosser, in *Caste and Kin in Nepal, India & Ceylon*, ed. C. von Fürer-Haimendorf, Bombay 1966; and *The Newars*, by G. S. Nepali, Bombay 1965. The castes mentioned by *Bla-ma Btsan-po* may be set out in diagrammatic form as follows:

Hindu	*Buddhist*
(Deo Brahman)	
(Bhatta Brahman)	Gubhaju = *Go-bāl*
(Jha Brahman)	Bare or Banra = *Banṭa*
Shrestha = *Shrisṭha*	Udhas or Uray = *U-tā-si*

If *Dza-ya-si* refers to the Josi, this is a Shrestha surname. The Gubhajus are family priests, the Bares goldsmiths and silversmiths, the Shresthas traders, and the Udhas mainly traders who carried on commerce with Tibet and Bhutan.

p. 35. Although *Bla-ma Btsan-po* elsewhere uses *Gorṣa* to refer to the Ghurkha Kings, I suspect he is using the term here to refer to the Gorakhnath yogins, since they are grouped here with other classes of wandering yogin. It was this sect which gave the town of Gorkha its name in the first place.

Bla-ma Btsan-po classes Gurungs, Magars and Thakalis as *Mon-pa*, which is reasonable. It is interesting that the Gurungs and Thakalis were already known to be influenced by Tibetan Buddhism. However, something is wrong with the equation *Kha-si* = *Kla-klo*. if *Kha-si* means the people known in Nepali as "Khas" (*i.e.* those with Nepali as their mother tongue) then these were strictly Hindu at the time. If the Khas are included in the classification *Gorṣa*, which is possible, then these *Kha-si* must be some entirely different group. Their comparison to the *Kha-khra Klo-pa* suggests that *Kla-klo* does not mean "Muslim" but "of primitive tribal religion". *Bla-ma Btsan-po* may have some forest-dwelling group such as the Chepangs in mind.

P. T. Denwood

Philip B. Yampolsky, *The Zen Master Hakuin: Selected Writings* (Number LXXXVI of the Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies). xiv + 253 pp. New York and London, Columbia University Press, 1971.

Professor Yampolsky's translations of Hakuin's writings bring fresh air to the reading public of Zen Buddhism. Despite the indisputable position of Hakuin (1686–1769) as the reviver of Japanese Rinzai Zen, his writings have somehow escaped scholars' attention for careful study. After we have seen R. D. Shaw and W. Schiffer's translation of his well-known work, *Yasenkanna* (*Monumenta Nipponica*, XIII, Nos. 1–2), the present publication of translations of three pieces from his writings is welcomed as a great contribution for making his Zen spirit more accessible for modern public.

As for the translation, it is regretted that mistakes are found here and there and the translator sometimes allows himself free, unwarranted conjectures. One of the far-fetched interpretations is his allusion to *kappa* (water goblin) (p. 37, ll. 17–18, and n. 38), where the meaning is quite clear if translated literally, as "like a clam or a shrimp that has left water". It is a mistake to translate *shinka gyakujō* as "fire mounts to (or in) the heart" (p. 29, l. 13 and p. 32, l. 2), similarly *shinka takaburi agari* "as fire rises in the heart" (p. 31, l. 18). *Shinka*, "mind-fire", roughly refers to mental and emotional energy which is to be kept down in the lower part of the body; its rising upwards upsets the balance of mind and body. *Tokuriki*, "acquirement of power", *i.e.*, spiritual power of controlling oneself and one's world, is not properly translated (*e.g.*, p. 32, l. 8 and p. 33, ll. 11 and 16). *Endon no bosatu* is not a "perfect bodhisattva" (p. 34, l. 20), but a "bodhisattva who follows the perfect, abrupt teaching". *Hachija* (p. 34, n. 21) is erroneously explained as the eight incorrect views of the Madhaymika; it is the opposites of the eight noble paths. "Men who would scorch buds and cause seeds to rot" (p. 35, l. 13) is to be substituted by "men with scorched buds and rotten seeds (of Enlightenment)". The note on "Tathāgata" (p. 35, n. 22) is not correct; the use of this appellation is not restricted to "a Buddha in his manifestation in this world". I am not happy with the invariable translation of *igi* as "dignity" (explained in n. 30, p. 36). In referring to postures of a man, the term simply means four positions of the body, *i.e.*, walking, standing, sitting and lying. "Wisdom of the true reality of all things of the One Vehicle alone" (p. 36, ll. 14–15) for *shohōjissō yuiu-ichijō no chiken* is inadequate, if not a mistake; I would render this as "wisdom which sees through the true reality of all things and realizes the sole existence of the One Vehicle teaching (in all the Buddha lands)". This phrase should be explained in the footnote with an appropriate reference to the *Lotus Sūtra*. "The truths themselves are one" (p. 36, l. 26) for *santai-sokuichi* is a mistake for "the triple truths (of voidness, temporariness and middle path) are one". *Bukkokudo no innen* is not "cause for entrance to a Buddha land" (p. 169, ll. 12–13, etc.), but "causes and conditions for establishing a Buddha land", *i.e.*, a Bodhisattva's vows and practices.

By far the most important thing in translating Buddhist writings, especially those explaining deep spiritual experiences like Hakuin's, is to follow faithfully the course of spiritual progress expounded in them. If the reader has experience of concentrated meditation on the *Mu* koan, he will find a serious mistake in the following statement: "In the *Mu* koan . . . the practitioner is required to meditate . . . until he arrives at the state in which, in Hakuin's own words, 'within his heart there is not the slightest thought or emotion, only the single word *Mu*'." (p. 13, n. 22). It is not very long before the diligent practitioner reaches this state of oneness with the koan. Professor Yampolsky regards this state as the objective of the koan. In fact, it is only the threshold to the

realization of *satori*. It is only after the ensuing spiritual anguish and pain is overcome by the accelerated concentration of energy on the koan that it is dissolved with the complete annihilation of "self and the world". The entire course of Zen practice is long and painstaking. One has to, among other things, keep one's mind and body well balanced while pursuing the way. The word *kufū* frequently used by Hakuin refers to the spiritual struggle in seeking the balanced approach to the objective, with or without concentration on a koan. To translate it invariably as "intensive meditation on a koan" (p. 29, n. 4) is often misleading. In many cases, it can be rendered simply as "diligent practice or pursuit of the way."

In the translation there are a considerable number of passages which must be corrected and rewritten. "Initially emphasis . . . enlightenment experiences" (p. 32, l. 3 from bottom to p. 33, l. 1) should be changed to something like "while practising introspection diligently, first with the primary objective of spiritual nourishment, I have experienced, without my seeking them, how many times I don't know, unexpected awakenment and acquisition of power". I would suggest to change "power of ordinary understanding which he had seemingly attained" (p. 33, ll. 11–12) to "understanding and power which he had possessed at ordinary times". "Mediocre, talentless person" (p. 33, l. 13) is an inadequate translation for "after all inferior to one who has had no intention (to practise Zen) in the past". "Po-shan . . . on one's back" (p. 33, ll. 20–3) is to be corrected to "Po-shan has said that difficulty in achieving meditation in the midst of activity is like climbing up a mountain ridge as steep as a sheep's forehead with a hundred-and-twenty-pound load on one's back". "His great capacity . . . pride" (p. 39, ll. 4–5) to "great capacity which is, as Yün-men says, like the king of capacity (or dignity)". "For endless time . . . in error" (p. 39, ll. 14–15) to "for endless time he performs great donation of Dharma without ever becoming destitute of it". "He makes clear . . . influence" (p. 39, ll. 15–17) to "he unfolds thousands of (bodhisattva) practices which are like flowers in the sky and establishes the teaching-methods of salvation which are like echo (*i.e.*, proclaims all the methods of salvation which, viewed from the standpoint of voidness, are of temporary existence". ". . . Consider that . . . own nature" (p. 40, ll. 5–7) to ". . . perceiving their spirit (or basic consciousness) they think that they have seen their true nature". "But today's evil . . tomorrow"(p. 41, ll. 16–17) to "they commit evil karmas and produce evil causes today: they will engage themselves in the acts of killing living beings and plant seeds of pain tomorrow, too". "A person who . . . a person?" (p. 49, last five lines) to "anyone who concentrates . . . everyday life like the man who . . . seeking them will surely attain joy (in realizing Enlightenment)".

Finally, rather elementary mistakes such as the following may be pointed out: "swallowing" (p. 38, l. 23) for *tsuba* (spitting); "in the past" (p. 40, l. 24) for *saruhodoni* (in the meanwhile); "most people" and "they" (p. 49, ll. 22 and 23) to be changed to "he"; "who would envy me" (p. 77, ll. 16–17) to "whom should I feel bitter against" (mistake of *uramu* for *urayamu*).

The mistakes and inadequacies as pointed out above, however, do not outweigh the merit of the publication. The translator's labour in bringing people of today in closer contact with the great figure of Japanese Rinzai Zen of the eighteenth century will be long appreciated.

H. Inagaki