

## REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS

Olov Bertil Anderson, *A companion volume to R. H. Mathews' Chinese-English dictionary*. 210 pp. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 1972.

The compilation of this volume was prompted by a realization that a considerable number of entries in Mathews' dictionary were given a wrong pronunciation. The first and larger part of this book is a table of the numbers and pronunciations of all single entries in *M* (Mathews), juxtaposed with the page reference and pronunciation given in *H* (漢語詞典) and *T* (辭彙). The pronunciation is given according to the author's *Simplified Wade* system. The second part is an analysis of the differences between the three dictionaries. It shows that only 5,406 entries in *M*, that is less than 60%, are corroborated by both *H* and *T*, while 1,399 entries conflict with both *H* and *T*. There are further groups where *M* is supported by *H* but not by *T*, and vice versa, and a surprisingly large group of 867 which are not included in either. The last 32 pages are a presentation of the material in the form of the numbers from *M* arranged according to the groups to which they belong.

GEORGE WEYS

Anne-Marie Blondeau, *Matériaux pour l'Etude de l'Hippologie et de l'Hippiatrie Tibétaines*, 427 pp. Geneva, Librairie Droz, 1972.

The literature surveyed by Mme. Blondeau in this volume falls into two groups: the eleven known Tibetan texts on the veterinary diagnosis and treatment of horses (*hippiatrie*); and a further three Tibetan texts on the description and typology of the horse (*hippologie*).

Of the former group, one is the Tibetan translation of Śālihotra's *Asvāyurveda* in the Tanjur (which actually contains much that is properly "hippologie"); another is a blockprint fragment, referred to as the "Xylographe Bacot", whose background was totally unknown to Mme. Blondeau at the time of writing. In fact there is a complete copy of the work in the British Museum (Pressmark 19999 f. 46) – it was based on a manuscript from Sikkim and published by Tharchin at Kalimpong in 1934. (This is not the only recent case of a Tibetan work lying undetected in the British Museum. A proper catalogue is badly needed.) The French fragment is here reproduced and translated in full. The other nine texts in the first group are all documents from Tun-huang, of which the five kept in Paris are given in facsimile form, mostly readable with or without the aid of a magnifying glass.

Of the latter group of texts, one is from Tun-huang, another was written by *Sum-pa mkhan-po*, and the last is part of a manuscript of unknown author and date in the British Museum.

Mme. Blondeau's aim has been to classify these texts and to discuss their possible Indian origins, rather than to make a close study of the contents for their own sake. P. Cordier had written that the Tibetan *Asvāyurveda* in the Tanjur is very close to the Sanskrit version of Vahāda (Vāgbhaṭa) and to that ascribed to Śālihotra and preserved in the India Office Library. Mme. Blondeau shows clearly that this is not so. Although it is certain that the Tibetan text is a translation, this was made from a now lost Sanskrit original, given by Mme. Blondeau a date earlier than any other known Sanskrit work on the subject and, she implies, a classic treatise comparable to those of Caraka and Suśruta in the Ayurvedic tradition. Her suggested date for this classic text seems to be between 400 and 700 A.D. She places other accessible texts, ascribed to

Vahāda, Śālihotra, Nakula, Bhoja and Jayadatta, in that order at various later dates down to 1300. Thus the Tibetan *Asvāyurveda* should be of fundamental importance in any study of Indian horse-medicine, and of great interest to students of Indian medicine in general.

I can find nothing which would contradict this theory that the Tibetan *Asvāyurveda* represents a classic early text, but Mme. Blondeau's evidence for it is slender. It amounts to no more than that the Tibetan text, firstly, has a set of nine chapters not found in the Sanskrit works examined; and secondly, treats *puṣpa* or horse markings under a different heading from theirs. Other discussion of the dates of texts seems to me weak and inconclusive; for instance, although the Indians could hardly have coined the term *tājika* (Persian horse) before the Arab invasion of Persia in the eighth century, it does not logically follow that any texts not mentioning *tājika* must be earlier than that date.

Nevertheless, Mme. Blondeau's chart on p. 48 shows a perfectly possible and plausible succession of texts. At any rate, the Tibetan text comes squarely in the Indian tradition. Such is not the case with the Tun-huang texts on "hippiatrie". These have the form of concise, matter-of-fact manuals for the practical use of horsemen who, Mme. Blondeau suggests, might have learned them by heart (though if this was the case one might have expected them to be in verse). Historical preambles, considerations of medical theory, and elements of religion and magic, so characteristic of Sanskrit treatises in general and veterinary ones in particular, are virtually absent.

The Bacot blockprint, though it has some Buddhist accretions and generally recommends different medicaments, is cast in a similar mould to these Tun-huang texts and may even be a lineal descendant of them, representing with them the tradition of what Tibetans actually did to their sick horses as distinct from what Sanskrit traditions said they ought to do.

The three texts on "hippologie" are different again, and quite different from each other. They seem to be more in the nature of literary compositions than practical treatises.

Many of the translations of technical terms given by Mme. Blondeau are open to doubt – though to be fair it is not part of her aim to provide definitive translations. For instance, she gives "sel ammoniac" for both *rgya-tsha* and *rgya-mtsha*, but these are listed separately in many Tibetan medical works (e.g. Lokesh Chandra (ed.), *An Illustrated Tibeto-Mongolian Materia Medica of Ayurveda*, New Delhi, 1971, folio 64), while *rgya-mtsha/rgyam-tsha* is sometimes used to translate Sanskrit *saindhava* "rock salt (from Sindh)" (e.g. H. W. Bailey, *Khotanese Texts*, I, p. 19).

It is to be hoped that Mme. Blondeau or some other scholar will profit from this very welcome pioneering survey and go on to a detailed study of the texts themselves.

PHILIP DENWOOD

*Giuseppe Castiglione: A Jesuit painter at the court of the Chinese emperors*. By Cécile and Michel Beurdeley; translated by Michael Bullock. Lund Humphries. £10.50.

Castiglione was the most famous and the most successful of the many painters from Europe who worked at the imperial court of China in the eighteenth century. So much so that it is his name, transcribed as Lang Shih-ning, which has subsequently been appropriated by hopeful dealers to apply to any painting which seems to show western influence and which could be believed to be at least a hundred years old! In fact Castiglione never learnt to write the characters of his Chinese name; so that there can be no question of finding an autograph signature. However, since he painted in Chinese style only for the court, there is a secure basis for stylistic assessment in the painting in the imperial collection which must be accepted as authentic. This criterion is recognized by the Beurdeleys in the catalogue of his *œuvre* in which those listed in the *Shih-ch'u pao-chi* occupy the first fifty-three places. Of these items Nos. 1–22 are listed in

the first part of this imperial catalogue and must therefore be not later than the year 1744 in which it was composed. In fact, of these *The Hundred Horses* is dated in the sixth year of Yung Chêng (1728) and the ten album leaves of horses (18-22) were completed early in 1743. Apparently, however, the earliest of the surviving dated paintings (No. 28) of 1723 was included only in the second section of the catalogue. The other dated works by Lang Shih-ning in this section range between 1751 and 1765, the year before his death. In section three are paintings dated 1751 and 1758. These lists were however not complete: Ferguson found five more paintings by Lang Shih-ning in the palace collections (Nos. 54-8); two of these are dated respectively 1724 and 1745. Finally in 1936 the Palace published a catalogue of his work in their collections under the title *Lang Shih-ning hua-chi*, which included paintings not listed in either of the previous works (Nos. 57-79), of which one is dated as late as 1763 (No. 73). This is a portrait of the emperor Ch'ien-lung and, like a second portrait (No. 70), this is not signed but carries an inscription by Ch'ien-lung ascribing it to Lang Shih-ning. On the other hand the hand-scroll painting in the Musée Guimet of Kazaks presenting tribute horses to the emperor in 1757 is fully signed; but the inscriptions on this and several other hand-scrolls are not included in the reproductions. This is undoubtedly the most important work by Castiglione in the Western world and it is good to have three good colour plates of it. It might be thought on the other hand that it would have been more illuminating to have been able to follow the development of Castiglione's style by a chronological arrangement of the catalogue or at least of the plates.

For it does seem that Castiglione learnt more and more from a study of the practice of the artists at the court, and adopted a more and more thoroughly Chinese technique without ever losing his own personal vision which remained that of a Western-trained artist. It is pertinent, therefore, that the reader is then offered a survey of the preceding interest in European art at the Chinese court under the K'ang-hsi and Yung-chêng emperors. K'ang-hsi showed considerable personal interest in Western art and some of his court painters experimented in the rendering of perspective and even in modified chiaroscuro. Chiao Ping-chên, who reinterpreted for the emperor in 1696 the traditional subjects of rice and silk culture, had learnt scientific method in the Imperial Observatory whose instruments were redesigned by Father Verbiest in 1670 (not in the Ming dynasty, as indicated in the caption on p. 21), after the Yüan originals were found to be defective.

Chiao ventures rather timidly into realistic landscape. Later in the reign, a favourite genre painter was Lêng Mei, who excelled also in figure painting in a style equally indebted to T'ang Yin and to contemporary Western models. A Neopolitan secular priest, Father Matteo Ripa, was active in the employment of the emperor at the time of Castiglione's arrival in Peking in 1715, engraving views of the imperial summer palaces at Jehol in Manchuria (1713), and in his greatest accomplishment (not mentioned), the etching on fifty plates of the map of China and Tartary after the Jesuit survey of the empire, between 1713 and 1719. The important articles by Professor W. Fuchs on this map are not included in M. Beurdeley's bibliography.

No work executed by Castiglione for K'ang-hsi survives, but we know that he and Fr. Ripa were instructed in 1716 to try their hands at painting in enamels on metal for the court; but both managed to do so poorly in this as to be relieved of the drudgery of what they evidently regarded as mere craftsmanship. But Yung-chêng, on his accession in 1723, compelled Castiglione to resume experiments in enamel painting, in spite of the failure meanwhile of another Christian craftsman, Brother J. B. Graveureau, who was in Peking from 1719 to 1722. Once more Castiglione was unsuccessful; it was not until 1730 that the Chinese had learnt sufficient of this technique from Western examples as to achieve results which satisfied the court. By that date Castiglione was evidently working only on silk and paper in the Chinese technique which he had acquired.

Our authors assume that because of Castiglione's close relationship with former viceroy Nien Hsi-yao in preparing a translation into Chinese before 1729 of the *Perspectiva pictorum et architectorum* by Andrea Pozzo, he would have supplied designs for enamelling on porcelain in the Palace factory and would even have painted some of these pieces himself. But for this there is no evidence. They evidently base themselves

on Lady David's introduction to the illustrated catalogue of the Ch'ing enamelled wares in the Percival David Foundation (1958) p. xii, where the *floruit* of the Ku Yüeh enamelled porcelain is given as the years 1727-54. Sir Harry Garner has shown that enamelling on copper, including the use of the new rose colour, was introduced only between 1722 and 1730; but he does not attribute any of the enamelled porcelain in this new colouring to the period before about 1740, and he is sceptical about the tradition that enamelling of blank porcelain from Ching-tê-chên was ever carried out in the Peking palace. The authors note that Yang Hsiao-ku, the author of *Ku yüeh-hsüan tz'u-kuo* on this famous group of glass and porcelain enamelled in a westernized style, believed that all these designs were carried out by Castiglione; but they rightly treat this attribution with reserve. Since Nien Hsi-yao ceased to be concerned with the porcelain factory in 1736, the one piece of circumstantial evidence which might connect Castiglione with the decoration of porcelain could not be valid for the period in question, after 1740, to which this type must be attributed. In fact the elegant miniature style in which both the glass and the porcelain in the Ku-yüeh style is decorated does not agree with that of the authentic paintings on silk by Lang Shih-ning; and, of course, no piece bears his name. The class seems evidently to have been decorated by Chinese attempting to work in Western style, rather than by a Westerner using Chinese technique.

Let us look more closely at the style of Lang Shih-ning as evidenced in the paintings in the Imperial collections. The most important for the early period under Yung Chêng is *The Hundred Horses*; and this still shows considerable chiaroscuro and the horses are heavily outlined. In contrast, the scroll-painting in the Musée Guimet of the *Presentation of Tribute Horses from the Kazaks of 1757*, nearly thirty years later, is much lighter in tone and the horses are painted without any hard outline; while the rocks and vegetation are touched in with controlled flicks of the brush. Even the faces of the emperor and his courtiers, though modelled, are without hard outlines, whereas the drapery folds are rendered in calligraphic line as in native work. So far had Lang Shih-ning succeeded in conforming to the wishes of Ch'ien Lung. He was rewarded with the rank of Mandarin of the Third Class. Of course, as George Loehr, to whose fundamental research the authors express their special indebtedness, has emphasized, Castiglione did not attempt either the style or the subject matter of the *Wên-jên* painters; but mastered the *kung-pi*, realistic style of the professional recorder of subjects made to imperial order. Many of his paintings bear appreciatory remarks composed by the emperor, with his Seals of Commendation, and poems composed by leading courtiers and scholars. Lang Shih-ning was even invited to collaborate with some of the court painters by depicting the buildings in their landscapes: or, he was responsible for figures of men, animals and birds, as in a landscape shared with T'ang Tai (1630-1749), a scroll dated 1744 which passed from the Jehol palace collection to the Yurinkan in Kyoto, reproduced on pp. 58-9; another courtier Ch'ien Tsai (1708-93) even allowed that *shen* (spirit) was present in the Lang Shih-ning painting of *Tribute Horses* already referred to.

A great merit of this book is the inclusion of excellent, large-scale reproductions of many of the paintings now in Taiwan, in Japan, or in Europe; as well as the small record photographs which accompany each of the entries in the catalogue of his works which closes the book. On the other hand it is a matter for complaint that very few of the inscriptions on the paintings are included in either category of reproduction. Even the colour plate of the *Moon Horse* which appears on the jacket with full titles in Chinese, Manchu, Mongolian and Persian has been cropped in the body of the book. Moreover, very few of the inscriptions are translated, and those that are, not in full. For instance the symbolism of the painting of "two-eared grain and double lotus flowers" arranged in a vase, the earliest surviving work, of 1723, is lost by the omission of the conclusion "if two men can have the same heart, what a good thing it is". Unfortunately too the painting of another flower arrangement (p. 128) is reproduced in reverse, as well as losing its imperial seal. More serious are some omissions from the text of the useful series of short biographies of "some European persons referred to in the text". It is surprising to find William Alexander mentioned without his dates, 1767-1816, or any

reference to his eight years' service as Keeper in the British Museum; and Giovanni Gherardini, 1654-1723, though both have full entries in the Thieme/Becker Künstler-Lexikon. The two important commissions to Matteo Ripa mentioned above do not figure; while van Braam Houckgeest is given an impossible association with Lord Macartney's mission, although George Loehr's special article about him is cited in the Bibliography. Finally it must be said that very little of the loot of the Yuan Ming Yuan by the Anglo-French expedition of 1860 found its way into the hands of Queen Victoria or the Emperor Napoleon III, but on the contrary was divided out on the spot among the troops, more or less in accordance with their rank. The greater part was sold by them in China or Hong-Kong and never reached Europe. What did, was not for the most part put on the market for one or two generations: so that this event cannot be held to have had much influence on taste in Europe. It was in fact a wholly deplorable event in which the Jesuit buildings were destroyed with two of Lang Shih ning's major works.

The authors express reserve about some of the paintings attributed to Lang Shih-ning in the palace collection in Taiwan but not recorded in the Ch'ien-lung catalogues; but they include in their own list several works which would not appear to conform with his style. They note the existence of copies of several of the paintings, but do not suggest when these copies can have been made. Dr. Michael Sullivan is responsible for the inclusion in the canon of the very large night scene of a market at Canton. It is said to have been painted on a visit to Canton in 1735 (see *Apollo*, November 1968), but it is quite unlike his other known work.

Surely also there is a certain naivety in the reference: "Curiously the catalogue of the imperial collection does not mention any portrait of a woman" as by Lang Shih-ning. It is a pity that the following delightful story cited by Dr. George Loehr is not included here: (from the *Kao-tsu-Hsün Huang-ti Shih-lu*, translated in 1856 by Feuillet de Conches): "Ch'ien Lung summoned Lang Shih-ning into the imperial presence when he was surrounded by about fifty of his women. On the following day the emperor in the midst of eight favourite concubines again sent for the artist. 'Let's see, Shih-ning, which one do you consider the most beautiful?' Without turning his head, the reply came, 'The women-folk of the Son-of-Heaven are all equally beautiful.' 'Look, look; you must do the portrait of the one you prefer.' 'Who would dare to choose after the Emperor has made his choice?' 'What', exclaimed Ch'ien Lung, 'did you perhaps see some yesterday which you found more to your liking?' 'I did not look at them.' 'Then what were you doing when you directed your glance aside?' 'I was counting the pieces of porcelain in His Majesty's palace.' 'Well then, how many are there?' When the number was given, the emperor, on having them counted by some eunuchs, found that the number corresponded exactly." What can we say, in the light of this story, of the scroll-painting reproduced from the Cleveland Museum of Art depicting eleven of the imperial concubines in 1737 at the beginning of the reign? It might be held that the personal observation which these portraits show is minimal.

These criticisms concern the scholar: to the wider public to whom it is addressed, this beautifully produced and lavishly illustrated volume will give a vivid picture of the work of Castiglione at the court of Peking. We are left admiring both the skill and the versatility of the missionary artist, but above all the extraordinary patience with which he accepted for over fifty years the exacting demands of these autocratic rulers who all three considered themselves qualified judges of art. Only the discipline of the Society could have made this feat possible.

BASIL GRAY

*Ballad of the Hidden Dragon* (Liu Chih-yüan chu-kung-tiao). Translated with an Introduction by M. Doleželová-Velingerová and J. I. Crump. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1971.

The *chu-kung-tiao* ballad played a very important part in the rise of China's first mature form of drama and in the popularization of the form of poetic composition known as *qu*. For this reason and all the more so since they constitute a powerful genre in their own right, the three or four whole and fragmentary examples of the *chu-kung-tiao*

which survive have long been crying out for translation. Much less than half of the *Ballad of the Hidden Dragon* is extant, but this is sufficient to convey the essence of the rumbustious, rough-humoured, red-blooded, and sometimes highly moving story. Some of the vigour, humour and pathos comes through in this translation. It is not a literal one and the demands of versification and rhyme and other factors not infrequently take it away from the original. The use of rhyme in the codas is courageous in this day and age, and, I think, an aim to be applauded if a translation is trying to recreate poetic flavour, but often I feel more wholesale reorganization and more daring departure from the original line-sequence would be needed with this particular text. The twenty-eight page introduction contains some useful and thought-provoking material as well as some dashing generalizations. The bibliography is helpful. It is not complete, but makes no claim to be. The book is pleasingly and very readably printed, and as a whole serves to remind those who are not already aware of it what a wealth of varied and lively Chinese literature still remains to be translated.

A. W. E. DOLBY

*Chinese Village Plays*, edited by Sidney D. Gamble, 762 pp. + Introduction of 29 pp. Amsterdam, Philo Press, 1970.

There is far too little of the rich store of Chinese drama available in translation, and a collection of *yang-ke* plays is certainly a good idea. The forty-eight plays in this collection have been translated by Chi-tzung Hsiao, Vidya Tay, T. T. Liang, and H. C. Chung and derive from Chinese originals collected in and around Ting-hsien in Hopei province in the late twenties of this century. The introduction views them primarily from their sociological aspects and the little that is said concerning the nature of the performances and the traditions behind the plays tantalizingly whets the appetite for a considerably more elaborate exposition of such aspects. The plays themselves abound in uproarious wit and robust farce with occasionally fine poetry, though the translations are generally rigid, short of conjunctions, and otherwise troubled by bowdlerizations (intentional and otherwise). The layout is convenient, the illustrations are agreeable, and the brief notes to each play are useful. The translations are at least adequate to inspire the reader's further interest.

A. W. E. DOLBY

Dr. Baymirza Hayit, *Turkestan zwischen Russland und China*. xiv + 415 pp., 3 plates, 5 maps. Amsterdam, Philo Press, 1971.

The author of this book is an Uzbek who was born at Namangan in eastern Uzbekistan in 1917, finished a course in history at Tashkent in 1938 and was conscripted into the Soviet army in the same year. He was captured by the Germans in 1941. From March 1942 until May 1945 he was in the Turkestan Legion, later renamed the National Turkestan Army, a unit of the Wehrmacht, and worked in the National Turkestan Unity Committee in Berlin. He got away from Berlin in time, continued his historical studies in Western Germany and became a Ph.D. in 1950. The book under review is something in the nature of an *apologia pro vita sua*.

It is no part of the function of a reviewer in *Asia Major* to express an opinion on the validity of the arguments used and conclusions reached in what is essentially a political tract. As a history of the relations between the Russian and Chinese Governments on the one hand and Turkestan (as defined by the author) on the other in the eighteenth to twentieth centuries, the book seems to be well constructed, with a very extensive bibliography covering 26 pages and copious references to the books contained in it in the footnotes. There are useful indices and five skeleton maps at the end, the first showing the empire of Tamerlane, the last the present political divisions of the area. The book is commendably free from misprints.

It is, however, written on the assumption that the whole area is, and always has been almost exclusively inhabited by Turks. The fact that the Tajiks of Tajikistan are Iranians is barely mentioned although they are said in one of the oldest Turkish inscriptions of the first quarter of the eighth century A.D. to have been one of the local tribes which, for a short period, acknowledged Turkish suzerainty. In the two brief introductory chapters, the author expressly disclaims any intention to go into the distant past of Turkestan and starts his history with the overthrow of the fourth (but only second Turkish) dynasty of the Khwarazmshahs by the Mongols at the beginning of the thirteenth century. The first sentence of the book states: "it is generally known that Turkestan with its great past as the cradle of the Turks has always played a special role in world history". This is directly contrary to the facts. The cradle of the Turkish race was what are now the Mongolian steppes. It was there that they first appeared in history, and from there that some Turks migrated to the Volga basin, probably among the hordes of Attila, in the fourth century A.D. From there too, other Turks in collaboration with the Sasanians attacked the Hephthalites in Sogdiana in the middle of the sixth century. But the Uygur did not occupy Chinese Turkestan until the middle of the ninth century, and there are no grounds for supposing that any Turks actually settled in Russian Turkestan before some of them were converted to Islam in the first half of the tenth century.

GERARD CLAUSON

Soame Jenyns, *Later Chinese Porcelain*, 111 pp., 120 half-tone pls., 8 colour pls. Faber and Faber. £5.

The best commendation of this original and stimulating item in Faber and Faber's ceramic series is that it should now appear in its fourth edition, 20 years after it was first issued, with text and illustration unchanged (but the colour plates increased by two). In a new introduction to this printing Sir Harry Garner, a recent president of the Oriental Ceramic Society and himself a leading authority on Ch'ing art, endorses the lasting validity of Mr. Jenyns' account of this involved and unusually well documented piece of ceramic history. There is an unprecedented duality: porcelains made in normal Chinese style for the home market, some of it designed to satisfy the most fastidious native taste; and a large and miscellaneous group of wares manufactured expressly for export. The latter rarely adopted European features, but made use of a selection of Chinese shapes and ornament known to appeal to the West. The European connexion, embracing such literary sources as the letters of D'Entrecolles, also contributes to novel accuracy in dating certain innovations. Thus the question of the earliest use in China of the pink enamel, the basis of *famille rose* porcelain, is limited to a choice of dates between 1715 and 1723. Mr. Jenyns accepts the earlier figure and thus authenticates some pieces bearing the *nien hao* of the K'ang Hsi emperor, whereas Sir Harry Garner has argued for the later date and thereby places these pieces under suspicion of retrospective marking. The possibility of developing the narrative around the names of successive imperial commissioners appointed to the Ching-tê-chên potteries is exploited fully, adding a realism to the account which is perforce lacking from earlier periods; while the variety of animal and floral ornament, its Western links and contrasts, introduces themes which Mr. Jenyns treats with zest and confidence exceeding even what is found elsewhere in his forthright writings. In an earlier preface, W. W. Winkworth rather wordily deplores that the study of Ch'ing porcelains makes little progress, owing to the growth of academic as against collectors' interest, and the increasing specialization of museum departments. It is only right to add that modern interest goes more to essential qualities of Chinese art seen in intelligible contexts, and that by any token much of the exported porcelain was dull stuff. In any case its problems are only to be elucidated by co-operation with the experts of European ceramics. It is regrettable but understandable that Mr. Jenyns has resigned this branch of the subject.

WILLIAM WATSON

G. Kara, *Chants d'un harde mongol*, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica* XII, 352 pp. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1970.

Dr. Kara's detailed study of the epic and lyric songs in the repertoire of the leading Jarut story-teller (*qiyurči*) Pajai is beyond doubt the most outstanding contribution to Mongolian dialectology to appear after the classical works of the late Fr. Antoine Mostaert, C.I.C.M., on the Ordos dialect.

Kara had the unusual, in fact quite unique, opportunity for a European scholar to collect and record his material directly from the mouth of Pajai during a brief visit to Kukukhoto (Huhehot) in the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China in winter 1959.

The main body of Kara's book consists of the texts of Pajai's songs in transcription, the translation of the texts, and an extensive commentary. The texts are preceded by two introductory chapters on the history and territory of the Jarut, and on the life and art of Pajai. To complete his work, Kara has added a chapter on the little-known Jarut dialect and a glossary.

In the first chapter (pp. 13-26) Kara traces the history of the Jarut (pr. *jarūd*) back to the first half of the sixteenth century. From the beginning of the seventeenth century the semi-nomadic Jarut living in the north-eastern corner of Jehol became tributaries of the Manchus. After 1911 they became subjects of the Republic of China and, except for a 12-year spell under the Manchukuo régime, they have remained under Chinese administration since. Their present territory is within the Jirim (Cherim) League of the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region.

In dealing with the early relations between the Jarut and the Manchus, Kara translates (pp. 16-22) a number of important Chinese and Manchu sources. The bibliographical reference to the *I-t'ung-chih* is, however, incomplete; the passage translated by Kara (pp. 16-17) is found in the *Chia-ch'ing ch'ung-hsiu I-t'ung-chih* 嘉慶重修一統志 (*Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an*, *hsü-pien* ed.) 536 (*ts'ü* 195), pp. 1a-b of the section "Chalu-t'ê 扎魯特". Kara's translation is, on several points, at variance with the original; moreover, he has not translated the opening phrases of the original and part of the final section, giving the impression that he has taken over the text he is translating from an inferior secondary source.

The life and career of Pajai *qiyurči* are outlined by Kara (pp. 27-44) on the basis of information collected mainly from the biography of Pajai by the contemporary writer Na. Asaraltu. As one would expect, the treatment of this biography lays stress upon various political and ideological commitments; it does, however, mention two facts worth noting, namely, that Pajai owed his life to the intervention of an old Mongol princess when, at the age of 17, he had been condemned for insubordination by a lay tribunal, and that his subsequent career as a true *qiyurči* was largely due to the patronage he received from the "feudal lords" and the high-ranking lamas.

After the biographical *excursus*, Kara adds (pp. 46-52) some relevant, and most interesting, remarks on the *qiyurči*'s art and his use of the small Chinese four-string fiddle (*ssü-hu* 四胡; a type of *hu-ch'in* 胡琴, in Jarut called *hór* = Mo. *qiyur*, from which the word *qiyurči*, lit. "fiddler").

The texts of the 29 songs (pp. 55-102), some of which are sung and others recited without musical accompaniment, are accurately recorded in transcription. In several instances both versions, i.e. the sung and the recited, are given. The themes of these songs vary greatly and so does their length. Five songs are from the Geser cycle (Nos. 1-5), two from the story of the Brave Hunter (6-7), and two are inspired by the Chinese *Romance of the Three Kingdoms* (*San-kuo-chih yen-i* 三國志演義). There are also four love songs (17-20), three songs for social occasions (21-3), one political song (24; on the People's Communes and Progress), and 12 on various subjects (10-16, 25-9), including a delightful one on the flea (26). The shortest text contains eight verses (14), the longest over 250 (5). The French translation (pp. 103-68) is excellent, and amply endowed with footnotes. Further explanations, comparisons with other texts, musical notations, and illuminating sections on genres, versification, phraseology, the use of literary vernacular, and foreign thematic elements in Pajai's songs are found

in the "Commentaire des chants" (pp. 169-223) which follows the translation. This chapter is very informative indeed and of special interest to the folklorist. In his discussion of Mongol epic traditions, Kara (pp. 206-09) mentions *inter alia* the important role played by the Geser cycle, highlighting in particular the Peking printed version of 1716. The problem of the origin of this version has interested several scholars in the past. According to Poppe, "Geserica", *AM* 3 (1926), 192-3, the oral text which served as basis for the Peking edition originated in Inner Mongolia. By adducing further linguistic evidence, Kara (pp. 208-09) has performed the considerable service of narrowing this vast area down to the territory between the Ordos and the Üjümüün.<sup>1</sup> (In footnote 378 on p. 208 "n° 161" should be amended to "n° 159".)

The Jarut dialect is described by Kara (pp. 227-84) on the basis of the material found in Pajai's songs. It is, however, compared with other Mongolian dialects and placed in historical perspective (see the reviews of A. Róna-Tas in *Acta Or. Hung.* 24 [1971], 253-5; and G. Doerfer in *UAF* 43 [1971], 241-3). This is another important contribution, further enhanced by a glossary (pp. 285-338) of about 1,500 words in which the Jarut entries are accompanied, wherever possible, by the corresponding forms in other dialects and in Written Mongolian. The Bibliography (pp. 339-49) is comprehensive and lists several items published in China and in the M.P.R. which are either little known, or not accessible to Western Mongolists. To sum up, Kara's book has all the qualities to become the definitive work on the subject. The only suggestion one can make to improve it is to have, in a future edition, a complete index of names and terms, which the wealth of information contained in the book renders indispensable.

I. DE RACHEWILTZ

- (1) Die Kaiserliche Ku-wen-Anthologie von 1685/6 *Ku-Wen Yuan-Chien* in mandjurischer Übersetzung. Hrs. von Martin Gimm. Bd. 1 Kap. 1-24 (Chou bis Chin-Dynastie). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1969. lxiii+748 pp.
- (2) Die Chinesische Anthologie *Wen-Hsüan* in mandjurischer Teilübersetzung einer Leningrader und einer Kölner Handschrift. Hrs. von Martin Gimm. (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 11.) Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner, 1968. 222 pp., 4 Abbild.

(1) The first of these two important contributions to Manchu studies owes its origin to the present well-known scarcity of Manchu prints and manuscripts, most of which are available only in oriental libraries or in the private collections of the few scholars specializing in this field. Reprints (in transcription) have been done in both Germany and Japan, the German reprints starting as early as 1864 with Hans Conon von der Gabelentz's *Sse-schu*, *Schu-king*, *Schi-king* (to which he added his Manchu-German dictionary). The present reprint has been made from typescript and is preceded by a neatly set out printed Table of Contents in (transcribed) Manchu and in Chinese. Apart from the notes which have been left out throughout the work, also the extracts from the *Tso-chuan*, *Kung-yang chuan*, and *Ku-liang-chuan* of the Anthology have been omitted, as they would have duplicated their appearance (though with certain textual differences) in Professor W. Bauer's transcription of the *Ch'un-ch'ü* and its three commentaries, which was published 10 years earlier by the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, xxxiii, 1, 1959). The Table of Contents (pp. I-XL) is followed by an Introduction (previously published in *Oriens Extremus*) which deals very competently with the many bio-bibliographical problems raised by the Chinese original of the Anthology.

In the Table of Contents I noticed (apart from the misprint 手 for 子 in the

<sup>1</sup> On this problem see also Kara's article "Une version ancienne du récit sur Geser changé en éne" in *Mongolian Studies* ed. by L. Ligeti, Budapest, 1970, pp. 213 ff., and Ts. B. Tsyendambaev, "On the Language of the Mongol and Buriat Versions of the Geser Epic", *ibid.*, pp. 565-79.

Chinese title of No. 99) the use of a *spiritus asper* instead of the apostrophe to which we have been used since H. C. von der Gabelentz. Professor Gimm, who has retained Gabelentz's *sse* for Chinese 四 and its many homonyms against Hauer's and Haenisch's 5 (the underlining of 5 was unfortunately omitted in the Table on p. 25 of Haenisch's grammar) has added the *spiritus asper* also to transcribe Chinese 五 as *ss'e* (see No. 310, pp. XXI). In accordance with Hauer's dictionary one would expect *æ'e* which stands for Wade's *ts'ê* and *ts'ü* but could easily be further distinguished by underlining the initial *æ* in the case of *ts'ü*.

Evidently much labour has been spent by Professor Gimm and his collaborators on this work which, it is to be hoped, may be brought to its conclusion in the not too distant future.

(2) The existence of a Manchu translation of an earlier anthology, the *Wen hsüan*, has long puzzled students of Manchu. We are greatly indebted to Professor Gimm for having made available (again in transcription) the fragment of a manuscript translation which is in fact no other than the one figuring as No. 113 in P. G. von Möllendorff's *Essay on Manchu literature (Journal of the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, N. S. XXIV (1889/90), pp. 1-45)*, and now listed as No. 132 in M. P. Volkova's *Opisanié Mancžurskich rukopisei Instituta Narodov Azii* of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow, 1965, p. 70). The translation covers only the section *fu* of the *Wen hsüan*, and the editor leaves it open whether more than this first part has ever been attempted by the translator, whom a careful inspection of the manuscript has identified as an official of the eighteenth century, Ha Shan 哈山 (Manchu: Hasan, 1632/3-1719). A detailed introduction again precedes the transcribed text. Six further pieces of translation have been appended which were included in a manuscript belonging to Professor Walter Fuchs.

W. SIMON

- (1) L. Ligeti, *Histoire secrète des Mongols, Monumenta linguae Mongolicae collecta I*, 268 pp. Akadémiai kiadó (Budapest, 1971).
- (2) L. Ligeti, *Monuments préclassiques 1: XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles, Indices verborum linguae Mongolicae monumentis traditorum I*, 169 pp. Akadémiai kiadó (Budapest, 1970).

(1) In 1955 the eminent Hungarian Mongolist Lajos Ligeti undertook a project of great importance for Mongolian studies, namely the collection, editing, and publication of all extant monuments of ancient or pre-classical Mongolian. These texts were to be published in Latin script, transcribed directly from the originals or from photocopies of the originals. For this purpose, Professor Ligeti and his collaborators devised a new system of transcription which, by means of appropriate diacritical signs, could reproduce all the orthographic peculiarities of the old Uigur-Mongolian script. Hence the need to re-edit the numerous Mongol documents published by other scholars in the past. Professor Ligeti's *Corpus* of old Mongolian literature was also to include important pre-classical works, such as the Mongolian version of the *Subhāṣitaratnamidhi* of Sa skya Paṇḍita,<sup>1</sup> which, although handed down in later recensions, still preserve most of the characteristics of the pre-classical language. The series in which these early Mongol texts were to be published was called *Mongol Nyelvemléktár (Mongol Language Monuments)*; however, this was intended as a provisional edition only, circulation being restricted to scholars in Hungary and a few specialists outside Hungary. It was to be superseded later by a revised edition for general distribution.

The first volume of *Mongol Nyelvemléktár*, devoted to the lesser literary monuments of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, appeared in 1963. It was followed in

<sup>1</sup> An excellent translation of this work (with text in transcription and critical notes) has recently been published by J. E. Bosson in *A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels: The Subhāṣitaratnamidhi of Sa Skya Paṇḍita in Tibetan and Mongolian, Uralic and Altaic Series Vol. 92*, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1969.

1964 by an important volume of Mongolian texts in 'Phags-pa script, in an improved transcription also devised by Ligeti, and by the edition of the *Secret History of the Mongols*, which appeared in the same year.<sup>2</sup> Other volumes came out in quick succession in the following years, among them further collections of epigraphical material and various Buddhist texts. The series, comprising altogether 15 volumes, is now being revised and re-issued under the title of *Monumenta linguae Mongolicae collecta* (hereafter *MLMC*). It is accompanied by a parallel series of *Indices verborum linguae Mongolicae monumentis traditorum*.

The first volume of *MLMC* is, appropriately, Professor Ligeti's edition of the *Secret History* text. It is a revised version of the 1964 edition which represented already a great advance over Pelliot's posthumously published edition of 1949<sup>3</sup> and the earlier, pioneering work of Haenisch.<sup>4</sup> Pelliot's edition, besides leaving unresolved many ambiguous readings, was unfortunately marred by numerous typographical errors. Ligeti's early edition presented a more accurate and reliable text in an improved and sophisticated transcription. It contained, however, not a few errors of its own, mainly due to faulty checking and typing. The new edition is preceded by a preface in French (pp. 7-21) — a translation of the original preface in Hungarian — in which Ligeti discusses the problems of reconstruction of the Mongol text from the Chinese phonetic transcription and the parallel passages in the *Altan tobči nova*, and critically reviews the system of transcription used by previous investigators. Some of his remarks, concerning the reconstruction of three proper names, had already appeared in *Collectanea Mongolica. Festschrift für Professor Dr. Rintchen zum 60. Geburtstag, Asiatische Forschungen* B.17, Wiesbaden, 1966, pp. 124-36. It is regrettable that in this otherwise valuable preface Ligeti does not touch on such important problems as the basis for the introduction, in his system of transcription, of the letters *k* and *g*, and his adoption of questionable readings like *oyun* (§66 [46a]) for *oyin* (cf. A. Mostaert in *HJAS* 13 [1950], 357), and *bü, büi*, and *büyyü* for *bu, bui* and *buyu* (see below). Presumably these questions will be dealt with in the "appareil critique" which Ligeti, as stated in the preface (p. 11), intends to publish elsewhere. Incidentally, in the preface the letter "Y" refers to Yeh Te-hui's edition of the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*.

Of far greater relevance is the extent to which the revision of the earlier edition of the text has been carried out. Some of the errors have been duly corrected, but a close examination reveals that most of them have been carried over into the new edition. Moreover, new errors have crept in.

The following are points which, in the present reviewer's opinion, need rectifying: §7 [4b]: for *irgen-tür read irgen-dür*; §19 [12a]: after *ququlun add yadaba*; §35 [21b]: for *taqar-un read tuqar-un*; §54 [34a]: for *Merkid-ür read Merkid-ün, for Oloqunu'ut read Olqunu'ut*; §57 [39a]: for *Qoorqonaq-un read Qorqonaq-un*; §63 [43b]: for *atqum read atqun, for Jewüdün-iyen read Jewüdün-niyen*; §80 [15b]: for *ide'er read ide'en*; §87: delete [25a]; §89 [27a]: for *neyisüldüjü read neyileldüjü*; §92 [33b]: for *olja-yü read olja-ü, for Naqu-bayyan-u read Naqu-bayyan-u (idem §93 [34b])*; §93 [35a]: for *acırabā read a[bi]čiraba*; §99 [43b]: for *Bo'urču read Bo'orču*; §105 [4a]: for *nikente read nikenten*, [5a]: after *Uduyit add Uwas*; §107 [9b]: for *ke'en read kelen*; §110 [15b]: for *je'esü read ije'esü*; §116 [26a]: for *anqa read angqa*; §118 [31b]: for *gödölekse'er read gödölükse'er*; §120 [34a]: for *irebe read irebei*; §121 [39a]: for *nidür-tü read nidün-tür*; §124 [46a]: for *Dögei-čerbi read Dödei-čerbi*; §134 [16a]: after *bayasču add ičuba*; §143 [35b]: for *ta'alaqadaba read ta'alaqdaba*; §145 [41a]: for *amduriqarun read amduriqdarun*, [41b]: for *kebten read gebten*, [43b]: for *amin-iyen read amin-niyen*; §146 [45b]: for *de'eren read de'ere*; §151 [11b]: for *Taqa-ba'atur read Taqai-ba'atur*;

<sup>2</sup> Professor Ligeti's Hungarian translation of the *Secret History, A mongolok titkos története*, was published in Budapest in 1962.

<sup>3</sup> P. Pelliot, *Histoire secrète des Mongols. Restitution du texte mongol et traduction française des chapitres i à vi*, Paris, 1949.

<sup>4</sup> E. Haenisch, *Manghol un miuca tobca'an (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi). Die geheime Geschichte der Mongolen, aus der chinesischen Transkription (Ausgabe Ye Têh-hui) im mongolischen Wortlaut wiederhergestellt*, Leipzig, 1935; rep. Wiesbaden, 1962.

§155 [22b]: after *güregen add güregelen*, [23b]: for *tuta'aju'ui read tuta'aju'u*; §163 [34b]: for *barqsan read baraqsan*, for *qari'uluqu-yi read qari'ulqu-yi*; §174 [17a]: insert *je between ügülerün and teyin*; §176 [19b]: for *Ongirat read Onggirat*; §177 [21a]: for *qatas read aqtas*, [31a]: for *orqa-ban read orqo-ban, insert aburaju between ilčü and öktebe*; §180 [38b]: for *yabuya read yabuyu*; §181 [39b]: insert *je betweenaju'u and ničügün, delete je after je*, [41b]: for *baru'ulju read bari'ulju*; §183 [46a]: after *sonos-dabai add hot*; §188 [7b]: insert *bi between irebe and ke'en*, [8a]: for *itekdegü read itegektegü*; §193 [22a]: for *Jun-u read Jun-nu*, [22b]: for *tede read tende*, [23b]: after *ger-teče add ese*; §195 [37b]: for *asa[ql]la read asa[q]ba*, [38b]: for *görolgü read gürölgü*; §196 [43a]: for *ülüldüjü'ui read üküldüjü'ui*, [44a]: for *Sajj'ut read Salji'ut*; §197 [47a]: for *ügüle'e read ügülele'e*; §199 [7a]: for *güyicęjü read güyicęgü*, [10a]: for *ayala'urun read ayala'ulurun*; §200 [12a]: for *tede read tende*, [15a]: for *Qalalqaljıt read Qalalqaljıt*; §201 [20a]: for *hüldekdebe read hulekdebe*; §202 [25a]: for *Göcü read Gücü*; §203 [27b]: for *edö'e read ede*, [28a]: after *ügüle'esü add Sigi-qutuqu ügülerün*, for [31] read [31b]; §204 [33b]: for *aju'u tere readaju'u je tere*; §205 [37b]: for *qonqor-i read qonqor-i*; §208 [45b]: for *alaldaqui read alalduqui*; §214 [11a]: after *kö'üčilen add asaraju*, [17a]: for *ese read esen*; §224 [33a]: for *mingan read mingän*, [34b]: for *ülü bolqu read ülü bolqun, for nidün-e read nidün-ü*; §229 [48b]: for *gü'ün read gü'ün-i*; §234 [9b]: eleven words omitted between *ke'ebe and bürin*; §242 [22b]: for *kö'üt read kö'üt-te*; §244 [29a]: for *qanču read qančut*; §245 [33a, 34b]: for *Teb-tengeri read Teb-tenggeri*, [36a]: for *donqodu'ai read dongqodu'ai, after üjin add oron*, [38a]: for *te'üntü read te'ün-tür*; §247 [1a]: for *qonini read qonin*; §248 [4a]: for *duratqarun read duratqarun*, [4b]: after *edö'e add bida*, [5a]: for *nököčen read nököčekün*; §251 [12b]: for *bayyiladuju read bayyildüju*; §252 [17a]: for *qoyar read qoyar-i*; §254 [26a]: for *ho'ojital read ho'ojitala*; §255 [28b]: for *ačilasu read ači'asu, for üge-tür read üge'er*, [30a]: for *büret read müret*, [32b]: after *jerge-deče add üli*; §257 [37b]: for *te'en-ü read te'ün-ü*, [38b]: for *bayyildaju read bayyildüju*; §261 [49a]: for *Dörben-döqšin-i read Dörbei-döqšin-i*; §263 [50b]: for *taruqas-lu'a read daruqas-lu'a, for Ürünggeči read Ürünggeči*; §264: for [53a] read [52a], [53a=52a]: after *qariju add Hindus-un*, for [53b] read [52b], [53b=52b]: after *Erdis add Jasaqu, for tün-e read tün-ne*; §269 [13b]: for *Yisüngge read Yisünger*; §270 [17b]: for *aqala'ulumu read ayala'ulumu*; §272 [22a]: for *u'ju read u'aju, after irgen-ü add qajar, delete irgen-ü after qa(n)t*, [24b]: for *üge-ber read üge-ben*; §276 [32a]: for *ha'utala read ha'u[č]tala, for abari'uluyu read abari'uluya*; §277 [35a]: for *Orusu[č] read Orusut, for edege-yin read ešige-yin*, [35b]: after *Janggi-tan add -a*; §278 [37b]: for *bayyituqi read bayyituqai*, [39a]: for *yabuyun read yabupun*, [40a]: for *nuntuqčin read nuntu'učin*, [41a]: for *Qori-qača read Qori-qačar*, [44b]: for *qujin read qučin*; §279 [49a]: for *elčün-e read elčün-i*; §281 [56b]: for *kesesüleğü read kegesüleğü*.

To the above we must add those cases, fortunately rare, where a poetical passage is not treated as such (e.g. the last two lines of §126), and the same proper name is written differently in a different passage (e.g. *Qada'an Daidurqan* in §120, but *Qada'andaldurqan* in §124). But perhaps the most distressing shortcoming of the new edition is the all too frequent omission and misplacing of hyphens, diacritical signs, and apostrophes, and the inconsistent use of lower case and upper case. This, combined with the uneven typeface, with letters and words constantly falling out of alignment, and the generally poor quality of the printing, results in a text which is in almost all respects inferior to that of the first edition.<sup>5</sup> In its present form the new edition is not reliable and should not be used without referring in each case to the earlier one; something, however, which is impossible for the majority of readers, since the first edition is now a bibliographical rarity. It is to be hoped, therefore, that Professor Ligeti and his colleagues will issue before long a new, and thoroughly revised, edition of this important work.

(2) The first volume of the *Indices verborum linguae Mongolicae monumentis traditorum* should, in theory, have appeared after *Monuments préclassiques 1: XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles* (in the *MLMC* series) of which this is the companion volume, but being

<sup>5</sup> The 1971 edition has the advantage over the earlier edition of giving the poetical passages in verse form.

ready first it was published first. It is a most useful tool, listing all the words in each text, with exact references and quoting the expressions in which they occur, thus making it virtually a concordance. The following nine texts have been indexed: (1) the so-called "Stone of Chinghis-khan", traditionally dated 1224 or 1225 (in the reviewer's opinion, almost certainly erected later, after the event which it commemorates); (2) the Mongol postscript of the edict of Töregene in Chinese of 1240 (cf. F. W. Cleaves in *HJAS* 23 [1960-1], 62-73); (3) the legend on the seal of Güyüg apposed to his letter to Pope Innocent IV of 1246. The "1245" in the "Table des matières" on p. 169 is a *lapsus*. (Cf. A. Mostaert and F. W. Cleaves in *HJAS* 15 [1952], 485-95); (4) the inscription in honour of Möngke of 1257 (cf. N. Poppe, Kun Chang and Leon Hurvitz in *CAJ* 6 [1961], 14-23); (5) the inscription of Qara-qorum of 1346 (cf. F. W. Cleaves in *HJAS* 15 [1952], 1-123); (6) the Turfan fragment of Cosgi Odsir's *Bodistw-a čari-a avatar-un tayilbur* of 1312 (cf. F. W. Cleaves in *HJAS* 17 [1954], 1-129); (7) the inscription for Chang Ying-jui of 1335 (cf. F. W. Cleaves in *HJAS* 13 [1950], 1-131); (8) the inscription for Jigüntei of 1338 (cf. F. W. Cleaves in *HJAS* 14 [1951], 1-104); and (9) the inscription of Aruy of 1340 (cf. F. W. Cleaves in *HJAS* 25 [1964-5], 31-79, and G. Kara in *AO Hung.* 17 [1964], 145-68). The explanation of the system of transcription used by Ligeti, which is not given in this Index, will be found in the introduction to the volume containing the texts. As stated earlier, the system reproduces faithfully all the orthographic peculiarities of the original documents in Uigur-Mongolian script and is the best that could be devised for a work of this kind. The Index itself is clear and accurate, only occasionally does the underscoring of words interfere with the diacritical signs placed below the letters. Nevertheless it seems regrettable that alternative readings were not included in cases where the given reading is uncertain. For instance, the reading "eregü [?]" in the second line of the Mongol text of Töregene's edict (p. 9) is extremely doubtful. Another, perhaps better, reading is *erke*, which Ligeti himself had already proposed in 1963 (see *Mongol Nyelvelméletár I: Preklasszikus Emlékek 1. XIII-XIV. század*, p. 17). In this case the reading *erke* could have been added within the square brackets. *Bui*, *buyu*, and the interrogative *buyuyu*, are registered under *bü-*, indicating that Ligeti regards them as forms of the defective verb *bü-* (cf. *büi* and *büyü* in his edition of the *Secret History*). If so, should not *bui* and *buyu* have been transcribed as *büi* and *büyü* to conform with his system? But, then, what about *buyuyu*? For, whereas the ambiguous nature of both the Chinese phonetic transcription of the *Secret History* and the pre-classical script may not permit a clear distinction between front and back vocalism in words like *bui* and *buyu*, the interrogative form *buyuyu*, which appears in line 13 of the inscription for Jigüntei, shows that *buyu* must be read with back vocalism, and not as *büyü*. A few points of detail such as these may still need clarification; however, the above comments should not be taken as detracting in any way from the value of this excellent work of reference.

I. DE RACHEWILTZ

Hafeez Malik, ed., *Iqbal: poet-philosopher of Pakistan*, xviii + 441 pp. New York and London, Columbia University Press, 1971. £6.00.

This bulky volume consists of 17 *pièces d'occasion* of an international symposium with Soviet, Czech, German, Indian, Pakistani, and American participants. Some of the personal reminiscences of the poet are interesting.

SIMON DIGBY

Franz Michael and Chung-li Chang, *The Taiping Rebellion: History and Documents*. 3 vols., pp. 243, 726, 1815. University of Washington Press. 1966.

This work is certain to be, for many years, if not permanently, the authoritative source and history for the Taiping rebellion in a Western language. The first of the three volumes gives the narrative history of the origin, rise, achievement, and fall of the Taiping kingdom; the second and third are a collection, so far unique, and most

comprehensive, of all the documents relative to the régime and issued by it, which have survived. These include the decrees of the T'ien Wang, the Heavenly King, ruler of the Taipings, and also the confessions written by the chief leaders who were captured at, or shortly after, the fall of the rebel government. There is thus a wealth of source material which no future student of the rebellion can do without, and which will greatly influence all consideration of its meaning, purpose, and scope. At a time when the Taiping rebellion is of great interest to Chinese writers in China, an interpretation and a wealth of source material has an added value for Western scholars working in the same field.

The cause and character of the great rebellion which ravaged central China in the mid-nineteenth century, but was finally wholly crushed and eliminated by the Manchu Government, has been a subject of controversy and speculation. The early view paid great attention to its religious aspect, the adoption of a form of Christianity by its leaders and the claim of the Heavenly King himself, Hung Hsiu-ch'uan, to be a younger brother of Jesus Christ. The missionary world of the time was torn between its eagerness to welcome a great Christian movement and its reluctance to admit the validity of such a claim. The reluctance triumphed, as it must, over the eagerness: moreover the lay Western observers in China, consuls, naval officers and others, were not so convinced of Taiping merits, and soon perceived that there were elements of weakness in the rebel régime which would work against its political and military prospects. Professor Michael examines this aspect with care; he shows that the main failing of the Taiping leadership was an inability to organize a coherent and well-functioning state even after the régime had been established in the important city of Nanking, southern capital of the Chinese Empire.

Professor Michael, in this rather departing from much recent assessment of the Taipings, does lay great stress on their religious origins and beliefs, and shows how these characteristics made it impossible for the Confucian gentry of China, themselves not always convinced supporters of the alien Manchu dynasty, to back a movement which openly aimed at the overthrow of the existing social order and its basic philosophy, Confucianism, which was their own power base and speciality. The Taipings could not win the scholar gentry, and it was from this class that their most effective antagonists were drawn. The dynasty was forced to rely on Chinese armies raised, commanded, and financed by Chinese gentry leaders to defeat the Taipings. The consequences of this reliance was the fatal undermining of the prestige and power of the Manchu dynasty; the precursor of the Chinese revolution of our own times.

Communist writers have stressed the social revolutionary content of Taiping policy - the common treasury, the common ownership of land, the new equality given to women, as evidence of a revolutionary spirit differing widely from the incoherent aspirations of many great peasant rebellions of earlier times. They do not attribute the source of these ideas to the religious teachings of the Taipings, whereas Professor Michael sees, and demonstrates, a very real link. Other writers, neither strongly influenced by Christian views nor by Communist beliefs, have put stress upon the popular and peasant character of the rebellion, considering the Taiping "hard core" religious group as of secondary and waning importance after the capture of Nanking. Opponents of the rebellion, both Chinese, Manchu, and also Western, saw it as a vast uprising of banditry on a very large scale, deriding its religious aspect, and discounting its social revolutionary content. And yet no one denies its importance; it marked the turning point in the fortunes of the Manchu dynasty, and as it was to prove, of the ancient institution of Chinese monarchy itself. It cannot be denied that the peculiar semi-Christian doctrines preached by the Heavenly King and his followers were inspired by imperfect knowledge of the Christian (Protestant) translations of the Scriptures. The influence of foreign contact in a major Chinese political movement is thus apparent, and for the first time.

Professor Michael agrees with many other writers, both contemporary and earlier that had the Taipings captured Peking, although they might thus have driven out the Manchus, they would not necessarily have inherited their empire. They were too revolutionary for the mass of the Chinese of their age; other aspirants, more acceptable,

would certainly have arisen who would have contested the vacant throne, probably with partial or total success. China would have been ravaged for several decades by wars between pretenders, as had happened at the fall of many previous dynasties. This fear and prospect was what induced the foreign governments concerned gradually to retreat from the position of neutrality which they at first assumed and ultimately to permit their own officers, as for example the later General Gordon, to take command of and organize armed forces on behalf of the imperialists. Even more important was the system which gave the Court the revenues of the Customs at Shanghai, without regard to who controlled the regions where goods originated or found a market. The strange paradox is, that while the rebellion yet seemed on a wave of success, the Western nations, Britain and France, were actually at war with the Manchu Empire from 1858 to 1860 and in those campaigns ended by capturing Peking itself – which the Taipings could never achieve. But no attempt was made to co-operate with the rebels against a common enemy. The Western powers wanted to extract trade and diplomatic concessions from the Manchus, not to dethrone them. They also had doubts about the pliability of the younger brother of Jesus Christ if he became the recognized sovereign of the Chinese Empire.

In the last stage of the rebellion, from 1860 onwards, the Taipings threw up a new leader, Hung Jen-kan, a cousin of the Heavenly King, and a convert to Protestant Christianity, regularly baptised and instructed. Hung Jen-kan endeavoured to modify the extravagances of the Taiping claims – at least as presented to foreigners – and to introduce reforms and policies which would make the Taiping state a normally efficient administration. He also planned military campaigns on a co-ordinated basis in contrast to the forays of leading Taiping generals, which were made at their own initiative and for the needs of their own forces. Hung Jen-kan was by far the most intelligent and educated member of the Taiping hierarchy; his views sound singularly modern, and Professor Michael is right to call him “perhaps the first Chinese Nationalist”. But he could not prevail against the selfish ambitions of the various “kings” who commanded the armies, and who, since the violent feuds which had decimated the leadership in 1856, had lacked any decisive control from a sovereign, the Heavenly King, who seems to have suffered from increasing mental disorder of the paranoid type. Military and strategic errors, redeemed fleetingly by brilliant tactical victories, could not finally postpone the siege of Nanking and the end of the régime.

Once destroyed, the Taiping movement sank without trace. There were soon no Taipings in China, where only a few years before the following had been numbered, nominally at least, in millions. The Chinese are not given to supporting lost causes: what is down is also “out”. But the effect remained in the increasing weakness of the Manchu dynasty and the memory, perhaps, that a new doctrine of foreign inspiration had proved dynamic if incoherent, and had shaken the old system to its foundations.

C. P. FITZGERALD

Tsugio Mikami, *The art of Japanese ceramics (The Heibonsha survey of Japanese art)*, 185 pp., 200 illus., 1 map. New York and Tokyo, 1972.

Professor Mikami's work in archaeology is well known to students of archaeology and art history, but to the general reader, at least in Europe and America, his is virtually a new name. It is rather unfortunate therefore, that this survey of Japanese ceramics for the general reader should suffer so severely at the hands of a translator whose ignorance of ceramics is apparent on almost every page, and who appears totally ignorant of the fact that pottery is conterminous with ceramics, and that it is therefore nonsense to speak of the three coloured lead glazed wares of the Nara period as being “the first true ceramics produced in Japan”, when Jōmon, Yayoi, and Sueki have already gone before. Having thus made it clear that the author is not to blame for the schoolboy howlers, what of the real meat of the survey? It is fair to say that to expect any author to compress the long and complex history of Japanese ceramics into what is

virtually less than one hundred pages is to ask the impossible. For all this there is much of interest because the author has related the material in the first three chapters, which are a bird's-eye view, to the social and economic development; he has drawn attention to both these aspects and in addition makes the point that there was never the kind of supersession of wares that is found in other cultural traditions. This means that there is in Japan a cumulative diversity of wares with a tendency for them to co-exist without influencing each other to any great extent. The later chapters take the story chronologically and here the many disadvantages of so compressed a treatment come home to the reader, with Bizen, Tamba, Seto, Shigaraki, and Echizen, and later Mino and Shino jostling each other in disorder, and all too often remote from the illustration. A more carefully organized arrangement of the illustrations would have done much to redeem this disorder. For English readers, another great difficulty in using a direct translation of a Japanese work is the relating of period names to dates, since the former have as little meaning as Carolingian or Jacobean would have to a Japanese reader; this is an editorial matter. The errors of fact that come out in translation should be corrected – the list is too long to justify inclusion here, but one glaring example is enough to show the situation for what it is; on page 116 we are informed, incredibly, that reduction firing of iron oxide glazes produced amber and brown, and oxidizing produced green, which is the reverse of the truth. It is depressing to find the work of so respected an authority being introduced to an English reading public in such an unfair guise and so badly treated. Fortunately nothing can diminish the quite superlative quality of the illustrations both coloured and black-and-white; these are a real joy.

MARGARET MEDLEY

Miyoko Nakano, *A Phonological Study in the 'Phags-pa Script and the Meng-ku Tzu-yün*, 172 pp. Faculty of Asian Studies, in association with Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1971. \$6 Aus.

The purpose of this book, as the title indicates, is to establish the phonetic values of the hP'ags-pa (in future hP.) letters used in the *Mêng-ku tzu-yün* (in future *MKTY*), a rhyme dictionary of the conventional Chinese type, compiled by Chu Tsung-wên in A.D. 1304, and so to place the language of the dictionary (in future *MKTY* Chinese) on the complicated map of Chinese dialects, ancient and modern.

The hP. alphabet was designated by imperial decree in A.D. 1269 as the official alphabet of the Mongolian (Yüan) Empire to be used for writing Mongolian, Chinese, and other languages. It originally contained 41 letters; nearly all of these are used in Mongolian hP. texts and their phonetic values are therefore certain; the phonetic values of nearly all the rest can be inferred from the phonetic values of the Tibetan letters on which they were modelled. According to a Chinese monograph written probably in the late Yüan period, of which two or three versions, all more or less imperfect, have survived, four additional letters were later added. It is believed that these additions were made by the Chu Tsung-wên mentioned above. To these Miss Nakano has added another two. All these additional letters are modified forms of standard letters. The crux of the matter is why these additional letters were invented.

The simplest explanation is that they were invented to represent sounds which were similar to, but slightly different from, the sounds represented by the standard letters of which they were modified forms. This is the explanation which has been adopted by Miss Nakano. With enormous industry and a profusion of references to a number of modern dialects she has reached the conclusion that *MKTY* Chinese had many elements of the Wu dialects with a certain Mandarin element. She suggests therefore that it was a southern variety of Chinese, the language in use in Pien-ching (Kaifeng) when it was the Southern Sung capital, later transferred to Lin-an when the capital was moved to that city. She finds support for this theory in the fact that the compiler, Chu Tsung-wên, was himself a southerner born in Chekiang province.

But it is surely obvious that the *MKTY*, although it provides a great deal of



material which can be used as a basis for conjecture, cannot by itself provide a solution of the problem. Happily there is an invaluable body of evidence to which no reference is made in this book, which provides an independent cross-check of these conclusions. It comprises the Chinese characters used to transcribe the Mongolian text of the "Secret History" (*Mongyolun Niuca Tobca'an* or *Yüan ch'ao pi-shih*; in future SH). Although the original Mongolian text is lost, it is known that it was written in a language indistinguishable from that of the Mongolian hP. texts and it is almost certain that the text actually transcribed was in the hP. alphabet. As I shall show below, when the transcriber had to represent a Mongolian syllable beginning with *h-*, *š-*, *y-* or a smooth vocalic ingress he used Chinese characters which in the hP. transcription of the MKTY begin, or if they were listed would begin, with modified as well as standard letters and in the last case with three different letters. It is therefore extremely unlikely that the modified letters were invented to represent different sounds from the standard letters and some other explanation for their invention must be found.

The obvious explanation is that they were invented by Chu Tsung-wên so that he might be able to transcribe with different hP. letters the initial sounds of Chinese characters which in earlier times had begun with different sounds. By his time these differences had disappeared but their memory lingered on in the arrangement of rhyme dictionaries. The first step in arranging such dictionaries was to divide each word into an initial or *tzü mu* (in future *mu*) and a final or rhyme. The words were then arranged in groups, each group containing all the words with the same rhyme, and then the words in each group were arranged in the traditional order of the *mus*. The introduction to the MKTY contains a table of *mus* in this traditional order accompanied by corresponding hP. letters. The history of the *mu* tables is long and complicated; all that need be said here is that some centuries before the MKTY was written a table of 36 *mus* was standardized, and that not very long before the thirteenth century three of the 36 *mus* were split into two each, the original *mu* and another representing a different sound. This later development is reflected in the MKTY table. A single hP. letter is written over 33 of the characters representing the *mus*, but in the case of the three split *mus* one letter is written above and another below the character. It would be entirely in accordance with the meticulous standards of Chinese scholarship that each *mu* should be represented by a different hP. letter, and as there were not enough hP. letters to go round after eliminating those which represented medial *y* and *w* and final vowels and the like, new ones had to be invented. In the following sentences the relevant *mus* are represented by their pronunciation in early Middle Chinese as reconstructed by Karlgren, followed by their modern pronunciation according to the Wade system with one or two minor changes. The hP. letter (in Miss Nakano's order) No. 27 (43 modified) is written over *šjəm—shên* and No. 43 (š) over *šjəm—shan*. No. 29 (h) is written over *xiéu—hsiao*, No. 36 (x, not, as Miss Nakano transcribes it, *γ*) over *γap—hsia*, and No. 44 (29 modified) under it. No. 23 is written over *ying—ying* and No. 45 (y) below it, No. 30 over *ju—yü* and No. 24 (45 modified) under it. It should be noted: (1) that in Mongolian hP. texts the difference between Nos. 23 and 30 is purely orthographic, there is no glottal stop in Mongolian; No. 30 is used only as an initial to represent *a-*, with the appropriate vowel subscripts *ö-* and *ü-*; No. 23 is never used as an initial; within a syllable it represents an inter-vocalic hiatus. In Chinese hP. texts No. 23 sometimes occurs as an initial but there is no evidence that either it or No. 30 represented a glottal stop; (2) that in the table on pp. 43-46 the standard and modified forms of *š* and *y* are reversed. In the SH transcriptions initial *š-* is represented both by characters falling under *shên* and those falling under *shan*, *h-* both by characters falling under *hsiao* and those falling under *hsia*, and *y-* both by characters falling under *ying* and those falling under *yü*, while syllables with a smooth vocalic ingress are represented by some characters falling under *ying*, some falling under *yü* and some falling under *ngü—i*. This seems to prove that the differences between the standard and modified forms of *h*, *š*, and *y* were not phonetic. As *f* is not a Mongolian sound the SH throws no light on the differences between the standard and one, or two, modified forms of No. 37. Structurally the standard letter is a crasis of *h-* and *-w-* and in Chinese hP. texts it represents both words beginning with *hw-* (*hu-*) and those beginning with *f-*.

There is no reason to suppose that the difference between the two (or three) letters was phonetic. The modified form of *n* referred to on p. 65 is merely a simpler way of writing the standard form, a sort of "grass character". Similarly the difference between the two forms of *o* referred to on the same page is purely orthographic; the simpler form is used at the end of syllables, the more complicated in the middle to attach the final consonant to the rest.

I should add that the SH throws valuable light on the vexed question of plosive initials in MKTY Chinese. It has often been remarked that the hP. transcriptions of the unaspirated plosives are reversed: *kien—kien* by *g*, *k'iei—k'i* by *k'*, and *g'juan—k'ün* by *k* and so on. In the Mongolian hP. texts *k-* and *t-* are spelt *k'-* and *t'-* (there is no *p'-* or even *p-* in Mongolian) and in the SH transcriptions these sounds are represented by characters falling under *k'i* and *t'ou*. But there is quite a different position regarding the voiced plosives. Syllables beginning, for example, with *b-* are represented by nearly as many characters falling under *b'jeng—ping* as by those falling under *pwang—ping*. In other words in MKTY Chinese there were only two kinds of plosive initials, aspirated unvoiced and unaspirated voiced.

To sum up, in the light of the SH transcriptions Professor Ligeti was quite right in describing the language of his edition of the hP. text of the *Po chia hsing*, which is identical with MKTY Chinese, as Old Mandarin. And indeed it is incredible that Chu Tsung-wên, whatever his place of birth, when ordered to produce a rhyme dictionary with hP. transcriptions, should have ventured to represent in them anything but the language of the imperial capital, Peking. It is sad that Miss Nakano, who devoted so much industry and ingenuity to demonstrating that it was something quite different, should have been proved wrong. It may be some consolation to her to realize that she has at any rate proved that the Wu dialects are much closer to early Middle Chinese than the rest.

She is much less at home when dealing with Mongolian phonetics and history. For instance the "stone of Činggis Qan" referred to in the footnote on p. 14 can be closely dated by its contents to the spring of A.D. 1225 and the letter to Philippe le Bel, who came to the throne in A.D. 1285, referred to in the same footnote, was from the Ilkhan Öljeitü, not Chinggis Khan, who died in 1227.

It would not be right to conclude this review without commending very highly the admirable skill with which a most complicated piece of typesetting has been achieved and the text almost completely cleared of misprints.

GERARD CLAUSON

Robert van Niel, *A Survey of Historical Source Materials in Java and Manila*, 255 pp. *Asian Studies at Hawaii*, No. 5. University of Hawaii Press, 1970.

The University of Hawaii has flourishing departments concerned with East, South-east and South Asian studies which stimulate research on these areas. One of the factors that limit, however, the possibilities for research is the absence of precise information on the availability of source materials in different parts of South-east Asia. The present work is, as stated at the beginning, "conceived of as an introduction to some of the written materials which are in existence" in Java and Manila. It provides a clear description of the principal archives and also explains how prospective scholars could utilize their contents. The archives in Java are, on the whole, in a lamentable condition, although there are some very favourable exceptions. This work also includes a detailed description of the private collection of papers of the late Professor Muhammad Yamin. Professor van Niel's survey is accurate and gives just the right amount of detail; it will therefore prove a great help for future research especially in determining what kind of topics are promising in the light of the available sources. It is hoped that the present survey may be supplemented by a similar account of the materials in Indonesia outside Java.

J. G. DE CASPARIS

Shumpei Okamoto, *The Japanese oligarchy and the Russo-Japanese War*. Columbia University Press, 1971.

It has long been clear that the early part of the twentieth century saw a significant change of emphasis in Japanese foreign policy and Japanese public attitudes concerning it. Caution, induced by a recognition of Western military and economic superiority, gradually gave way to a greater self-assertiveness as the effects of Meiji policies became apparent in the country's growing strength. A changing international situation gave greater opportunities for that self-assertion to be manifested in action. Imperialism emerged as a concomitant of nationalism and modernization. The Russo-Japanese War, as Dr. Okamoto's study shows, marked an important stage in this process. Equally, the manner in which the Japanese government took the decisions to begin and end it, as well as the nature of the public response to those decisions within Japan, foreshadowed some of the difficulties that were to bedevil the making of foreign policy for the following 40 years.

This was a time when power was shifting from one generation to another. The men who had shaped Meiji policies in the consciousness of the Western threat, that is, the Genro, were giving way to a new group, which was less cohesive, less cautious, both less able and less willing to observe the restraints which their predecessors had thought necessary in dealing with the outside world. Rivalries within the country's leadership made it more difficult for the oligarchy now to resist public pressures for a "strong" foreign policy. An authoritarian inheritance made the Government unwilling either to accept or to manipulate those pressures. As a result, there was a growing divorce between the government's criteria for deciding the aims of its own secret diplomacy and those which the press and a predominantly literate public applied in judging its results. The riots which greeted the Treaty of Portsmouth were in large part a consequence of this.

It is principally with these matters – the making of policy, political intrigue, press comment, the attempts at moulding opinion by irresponsible (but not revolutionary) activists – that this book deals. Within those limits it is admirable. It is fully documented, and often includes some valuable pieces of translation. It is lavishly footnoted (though some of the more interesting information in the notes might well have been included in the text). It is sober in judgment. As a contribution to our knowledge of both Japanese nationalism and Japanese politics it is of considerable importance. This said, however, one must also note its relatively narrow view of the topic it considers. Given the immense importance of Japan's trade with the neighbouring mainland, the space here devoted to economic factors and to the views of business circles seems less than the subject merits. Indeed, what is said on the matter is largely routine. Similarly, to dismiss Marxist interpretations of the social significance of the 1905 riots as "a gross mistake" may well be right; but to do so without fuller discussion of the social tensions resulting from modernization is to underemphasize one of the author's own conclusions about the rioting, namely, that the "public protest against the peace treaty, the original objective of the demonstration, was practically forgotten in the process" (p. 222). In other words, for all its virtues Dr. Okamoto's book leaves some major questions still to be answered.

W. G. BEASLEY

P. G. O'Neill, *Japanese Names: A Comprehensive Index by Characters and Readings*. xvi+359 pp. John Weatherhill, Inc., New York and Tokyo, 1972.

In this book, Professor O'Neill has made as valuable a contribution to Japanese studies in the West as has been made for many years. His book supersedes all previous compilations both in comprehensiveness and in practicality. The only comparable work in English is Koop and Inada's *Japanese Names and How to Read Them*. This, however, though still a useful work, particularly for specialists in certain areas, such as art collectors, is badly outdated, and above all irritatingly inconvenient to use.

The O'Neill Index is divided into two parts, each containing 36,000-odd names of the following kinds: 13,500 surnames, 11,000 personal names, 6,800 literary, historical and artistic names (not only of people but also of works), 4,400 place-names and 300 Japanese era names. The first part of the book indexes these names from characters to readings (the total number of characters being approximately 3,050), and the second from readings to characters. The arrangement has all the systematic thoroughness of which Professor O'Neill has given such ample evidence in his programmed courses, and it is clear that an immense amount of labour has gone into the book. He has even attempted to arrange in descending order of frequency not only the different name-readings of individual characters but also alternative readings of names or different ways of writing them in Chinese characters.

A feature of the book to be noted (though this reviewer does not greatly welcome it) is its complete avoidance in the main part of the index of the traditional system of arranging characters. Those who are accustomed to the traditional system will, however, find at the end of the book a list in which the name characters are arranged according to the familiar radicals, with numbers giving references to the appropriate places in the main list. The purpose of O'Neill's system, which is a development of that used by Rose-Innes and is similar to that followed by Koop and Inada, is said to be "to make it easier for the index to be used by people without formal Japanese language training". How far it was really necessary to cater for non-specialists, and whether yet another new system of character arrangement was called for, seems open to question. It is true that the O'Neill system is not very difficult to master. But this specialist, at least, found it all too easy to slip back into his old ways and, for instance, to count 𠄎 and 𠄎 as having six and three strokes respectively, instead of the O'Neill eight and four.

However, these are minor matters, since the unrepentant traditionalist can always have recourse to the radical index. Much more important is the question how far this book, which is extremely comprehensive in terms of areas covered, goes towards the unattainable goal of answering all the user's questions. Any reviewer will inevitably be able to pick some holes in it and find a number of individual random points to criticize. Why, for example, does it include works with such easily-read titles as *Shitakusa* when it excludes the much more troublesome *Honchō tsūgan*, the work by Hayashi Razan and Hayashi Shunsai whose title will be read by the uninitiated as *Honchō tsūgan*? Again, one wonders why 孝雄 is given only as Takao when it is well-known as Yoshio in the name of the distinguished scholar of Japanese literature, Professor Yamada. Why, when the titles of some famous *otogi zōshi* are included, was "Urashima Tarō" omitted? Why is the name of the Nara priest widely known as Gyōgi listed only as Gyōki, for which there may be warrant, but which is, to say the least, unusual? Why is there no Benkei, or Benten?

The discussion of such random points, of course, may give a very false impression of a book like this. Clearly, the proof of the pudding will be in the eating. The usefulness of a dictionary is not easy to assess quickly. It may therefore be not without interest to report on two extended and fairly searching tests to which the reviewer recently had occasion to subject the book. In the first of these the Index was used to try to establish the readings of the names of a number of scholars listed in a bibliography in the introduction to an edition of a standard classic in the Iwanami *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* series; they were all contemporary or at least twentieth-century authors of books or articles on, or editions of, the classic in question. Of the approximately 80 personal names, some 35 could not be found, but perhaps one-third to one-half of these would not present the specialist with much difficulty, the reading being deducible by analogy, since in each case a similar name appeared in the Index, sometimes with both characters, sometimes with only one different. Only one name contained a character not found in the Index. Of the surnames, only five were not to be found. The second, and far stiffer test was a table of some hundred instances of *kataki-uchi* or revenge-killing which took place between 1600 and 1868; the list comprised the names of those killed, of the avengers and of the places where the revenge was carried out. In the case of this table it would not be fair to attempt any statistical assessment of the success or otherwise of the dictionary, since some of the names are

neither still in use nor famous enough to merit inclusion as historical figures of note. But it can be said without hesitation that even in this context of pre-modern names Professor O'Neill's book was extremely helpful. Where a given combination of characters as a place-name had more than one reading, of course, it was occasionally difficult to decide which reading to take; but one can hardly ask of a work like this that it should serve as a gazetteer, with indications of latitude and longitude, like that of Stanley Gerrit!

As Professor O'Neill acknowledges in the opening sentence of his preface, there is no final and complete solution to the problems of reading Japanese names written in Chinese characters. But, at least on the basis of the above tests, he can be said to have succeeded triumphantly in his aim "to help with the problem of Japanese names within the limits of what is feasible". Certainly no one could have done a better job than he, and we shall all have reason to be grateful to him for many years to come.

D. E. MILLS

*Proceedings of the First Japan-United States Conference on Libraries and Information Science in Higher Education* (University and Research Libraries in Japan and the United States). Edited by Thomas R. Buckman, Yukihiisa Suzuki, and Warren M. Tsuneishi. American Library Association, Chicago, 1972. \$13.50.

In recent years, Japanese specialist librarians in Britain have increasingly looked towards the United States for information and experience in the all-important problems of obtaining Japanese language materials from Japan, and, therefore, the holding of the First Japan-United States Conference on Libraries and Information Science in Higher Education (Tokyo, May 15-19, 1969) was an event of special interest. The 47 papers published in this volume as the proceedings of that conference will probably be of greatest interest to the general academic librarian in this country, not least as an example of what can be and has been achieved by Japan and the United States in the field of international library co-operation. However, there are several contributions of value for the Japanese specialist also, mostly in terms of information rather than interpretation of library problems which apply equally here and in the United States.

Not surprisingly, the most usefully informative papers came from Japanese members discussing the administration and activities of their own organizations. Particularly to be recommended in this respect are Yasushi Sakai's paper on the "Availability of Government Publications in Japan", Seisuke Kanōzawa's paper on the "Activities of the Japan Library Association", and Takahisa Sawamoto's paper on the "Exchanges of Academic Librarians Between the United States and Japan". However, probably the most relevant paper of all, because it deals with problems which bedevil Japanese specialists in Britain, is "Hobbledehoy: Japanese Collections in American Libraries" by James William Morley.

As practical steps towards the solution of these problems, Professor Morley suggests enlarged Government-sponsored materials exchange; the establishment of a "Hibaihin" Service Centre and documentation centres; librarian exchange; acquisitions guides; and a duplicate purchasing scheme whereby in certain fields libraries send a copy of each book they purchase to corresponding libraries in the other country. These suggestions are not revolutionary, but they are an indication of trends in the United States which Japanese specialist librarians in Britain would do well to consider, though perhaps on a less ambitious scale than Professor Morley suggests.

This volume is a welcome addition to the growing number of materials on international library co-operation and there is a great deal to be learned from it, particularly in the field of librarian exchange in the Japanese field in which this country sadly lags behind the United States.

DAVID G. CHIBBETT

Jaroslav Průšek, *Chinese History and Literature*, 586 pp. Prague, Academia, 1970. Kcs. 150.

Students of Chinese early colloquial literature and modern fiction have long been aware of how much Jaroslav Průšek's studies have contributed, and go on contributing, to the knowledge of these fields and to the interpretation of their features, even to the point of his ideas being the basic currency in which discussion over large areas takes place. Younger sinologists have not always been bowled over by his theories, but even his critics have consistently recognized the extent of his learning (some have, on occasion, been sharply reminded of it) and the bold sweep of his vision. The publication of this volume of collected articles on Chinese literature and cultural history, spanning a period of 30 years from 1938 to 1968, is a fitting occasion for that respect to be voiced. The devoted reader of *Archiv Orientální* will know most of the articles already, but there are also included papers for conferences, festschrifts, and essays written originally as introductions to Průšek's own Czech translations from the Chinese; some of these will doubtless be new, and they will certainly reinforce that impression of breadth. Those only familiar with his work on colloquial fiction may be surprised to read here discussions of *Sun-tzu ping-fa*, *Liao-chai chih-i*, and even an essay entitled "History and Epics in China and the West". Out of this miscellaneous group the piece I personally found most valuable was that on the Honan folk-song, the *chui-tzu-shu* (pp. 170-98). The rest of the book, over 300 pp., is taken up with medieval popular literature. Modern literature is left over for another volume. We are told, too, to expect a book on the "principal historical theme" on which Průšek was engaged in his youth, before he was diverted into literature.

This collection is, then, far from being a final accounting, but as it reaches over so much of Průšek's career, what seems to be called for is not so much criticism of any part of it, but a view, incomplete and necessarily personal, of his style as man and scholar, even though in this respect he might prefer to be judged by his peers. Průšek pioneered the study of the Chinese popular narrative in Europe, and ever since the mantle of pioneer has hung about his shoulders. While in China he apparently mixed with the great, and in introducing Chinese literature to the Czech people and in founding and presiding over the Prague school of sinology he has himself on his own ground long been very much of the great man. It is noticeable that while he acknowledges his debt of gratitude to certain Chinese scholars, he has always asserted his independence from them, pursuing his own line of enquiry and making his own discoveries. One does not expect in his writings to run into the scaffolding of citations and references to the work of other sinologists which customarily festoons the scholarly article. What is conspicuous about them is the promotional aspect, the claim for value in the things he chooses to write about. If one sometimes feels he waxes too lyrical in this regard, he still does a necessary job in counteracting the blighting influence of other commentators on Chinese literature who talk slightly of it out of failure to adjust to it. Průšek is one person of whom one can truly say that his immodesty is becoming.

D. E. POLLARD

*Studies in the Social History of China and South-East Asia, Essays in Memory of Victor Purcell*, edited by Jerome Ch'en and Nicholas Tarling, 424 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1970. £4.50.

This festschrift volume for Victor Purcell (1896-1965) contains a wide variety of essays covering many different aspects of Chinese and South-east Asian history and society. The essays in Part I, China, are arranged by author as follows: P. Cavendish: "Anti-imperialism in the Kuomintang 1923-8", Jerome Ch'en: "The origin of the Boxers", Jack Grey: "The high tide of socialism in the Chinese countryside", Alistair Lamb: "The Sino-Indian and Sino-Russian borders: some comparisons and contrasts", Owen Lattimore: "Unpublished Report from Yen-an, 1937", James Macdonald: "The Use of Slogans and 'Uninterrupted revolution' in China in the early

part of 1964", Joseph Needham and Lu Gwei-djen: "The Optick Artists of Chiangu", Part II, South-east Asia, includes the following essays: W. E. Cheong: "Canton and Manila in the Eighteenth Century", Chiang Hai Ding: "Sino-British Mercantile Relations in Singapore's Entrepôt Trade 1870-1915", Graham W. Irwin: "The Dutch and the Tin Trade of Malaya in the Seventeenth Century", Anthony Reid: "Early Chinese Migration into North Sumatra", Kenneth Robinson: "Revolution in Education", Kernal Singh Sandhu: "Sikh Immigration into Malaya during the Period of British Rule", Nicholas Tarling: "The Entrepôt at Labuan and the Chinese", Wang Gungwu: "China and South-East Asia 1402-1424". The volume appropriately opens with a memoir of Victor Purcell (by Sybille Van Der Sprekel) and closes with a list of Purcell's main writings.

ENDYMION WILKINSON

Lawrence A. Reid (ed.), *Philippine Minor Languages: word lists and phonologies*, xii + 241 pp. University of Hawaii Press, 1971. \$3.50, Oceanic linguistics 8.

This book contains a collection of standardized data from some 43 lesser-known languages of the Philippines. The aim is explicitly stated as that of providing the material for beginning comparative studies of these languages and their classification and subclassification into historically related families (vii). The data provided for each language consist of: 1. The source and the worker responsible; 2. The consonant and vowel phonemes, together with stress and length phonemes, where these features have been analysed as distinctive; 3. The basic pronominal system; 4. The basic demonstrative system.

Additionally, and in a separate part of the book, the nearest translations of a set of 372 English glosses are given for each of the 43 languages. These lists are intended to provide a basic vocabulary for comparative purposes, and they are derived from the Swadesh list of 200 glosses, with such modifications and additions as the geography and cultures of the area seemed to require. Much of the phonological and grammatical data has been published already, though not very accessibly, but the lexical lists are for the most part published here for the first time.

The success of nineteenth century comparative-historical linguistics in Indo-European and in other contiguous families owed much to the data-collecting labours of eighteenth century and earlier workers. Comparative-historical work in the Philippines is much less advanced than in these more familiar fields; its progress will be greatly facilitated by the devoted preliminary service of making available the necessary data here undertaken by the authors and the editor.

R. H. ROBINS

Werner Rüdénberg, *Chinesisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Dritte erweiterte, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage von Hans O. H. Stange, xx + 821 pp. Hamburg, Cram, de Gruyter & Co., 1963. DM 160.

Hans O. H. Stange, *Deutscher Index zu Rüdénberg-Stange Chinesisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 742 pp. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1971. DM 120.

When the first edition of this dictionary appeared in 1924 it was welcomed as the first sizable Chinese-German dictionary and Pelliot himself acknowledged its usefulness to Western sinologues generally because it included modern terms, which were mostly lacking in dictionaries in other Western languages at the time. A second revised edition appeared in 1936 and has long been out of print. According to the preface to this third edition it was prompted by the great progress in Chinese lexicography during the three decades following the publication of the first edition. It is intended in the first place for beginners. The number of single-character entries has been increased from 6,400 to 9,239 and their arrangement altered to the extent that this new edition must be judged as a new work.

The romanization adopted in the first edition has been abandoned in favour of that used in O. Franke's *Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches*. This departure complicates the work of the student, for he will find words pronounced alike in National Language as: 江 and 將, 心 and 欣, 邪 and 鞋, 雪 and 血, 糾 and 訓 under *kiang* and *tsiang*, *sin* and *hin*, *sie* and *hie*, *sie* and *hüe*, *sin* and *hün*. The distinction could be of interest only to the student of the ancient pronunciation: the majority of users must find it time-wasting and irritating.

Still more tiresome is the arrangement of compounds according to meaning. One would think that a dictionary, especially one intended for beginners, was to be used mainly by people who do not know the meaning of words. Here they must plough through all the entries which are printed before the one they are actually looking for. As consolation they are told that they are going to learn a great deal from frequent and careful reading through whole sections of pages. Most readers would prefer to do their dictionary reading from choice, not as an imposed penance when looking for one term.

It is a pity that the pronunciation of the second character in compounds is not given as a matter of course, but only in cases where the second character has more than one pronunciation. Even in these cases it is not always indicated as in 暖 and 放假, 睡覺. There are also quite a number of characters which are given a wrong pronunciation as *kiang*<sup>3</sup> for 港, *t'scha*<sup>1</sup> instead of *t'scha*<sup>4</sup> in 差不多, *ti*<sup>1</sup> for 的, instead of *te*, *ti*<sup>2</sup> or *ti*<sup>4</sup> according to meaning.

The introduction fails to indicate according to what principles the vocabulary of the dictionary has been enlarged. It is clear, however, that many Buddhist terms have been added, as well as names of plants and animals. On the other hand there is little indication that the vocabulary has been brought up to date, and it reflects the language of even the fifties far less well than the first edition did that of the twenties. Some mistakes from the earlier editions are corrected but a great number of them are reproduced. In some cases there are new mistakes as 不得意 *Schwäche, Nachteil; ungeschickt, unerfahren*, which means *to be unsuccessful*; 辦 *verrichten, ausführen, erledigen, tun*, as well as the correct meaning *unterscheiden* from the first edition; 瞎說 *lügen*, where the first edition had *Unsinn reden*. For many expressions not all important meanings are given: 加油 *ölen*, but not *to accelerate, to put in more energy*; 拋錨 *Anker werfen*, but not *to break down (of a vehicle)*; 不錯 *ganz richtig, das stimmt; jawohl*; but not *not bad at all*; 實力 *sich verdingen*, but not *實力氣 to exert oneself*; 起發 *treu bleiben, seine Treue zeigen*, but not *to raise a righteous revolt*; 校書 *Singmädchen, Hure*, but not *to collate books*; 終身大事 *die grösste Tat (Hauptleistung) des Lebens*, refers to marriage; 不在乎 *nicht eingeschlossen; unwesentlich*, is used in the sense of *not to mind*. Many common expressions are missing altogether such as 欣賞, 廣播, 護士, 開玩笑, 滑冰.

The Classical Chinese entries are more reliable on the whole, yet there are curious omissions and mistakes on the particles which are so important for the beginner. 比 is not given as a conjunction; 已而 *lediglich nur, weiter nichts, und damit gut*, but not the more common *soon afterwards*; under 莫 we do not get the pronominal meaning *none*; under 而 no 而上, 而下; 所 *Relativpronomen: derjenige welcher, das was; was auch immer* obscures the important point that it stands for the patient, not the agent of the action; under 焉 the pronominal function of the character is not pointed out; the function of 曾 similar to 乃 is omitted; 某 is not given its use of referring to the speaker; 者 . . . *schliesst als Final-partikel Befehlssätze ab*; one would like to see some examples of this; 以仁存心 *durch Güte Herzen gewinnen*, 存心 cannot mean *to win hearts*; 以天下與人 *das Reich dem Volke übergeben*, 人 does not mean *the people* but *another or others*; these are both well known quotations from *Mencius*, translated over 50 years ago by Richard Wilhelm as *Er hegt Güte im Herzen und die Welt einem andern geben*. 以惡報惡 *Böses mit Gutem vergelten* means the opposite.

Altogether this dictionary once again demonstrates, and more clearly than most, that the attempt to produce a single Chinese dictionary covering the language of all periods is doomed to failure.

The *Index* is presumably meant to be used as a German-Chinese dictionary, but one wonders how the user, who is not likely to be an adept in Chinese, is supposed to

be able to choose between expressions coming from all sorts of styles and periods. Furthermore its use is extremely laborious. For example under *ruhig* we are referred to 55 entries spread all over the dictionary, and although the entry referring to 靖 and 靜 is underlined, the person looking for the term to use in speech or writing would probably be better served by compounds such as 安靜 or 寧靜. Under *Widerspruch* we are referred to 反對; 扞格不入; 異言, 異詞; 曲論; but not to 矛盾; under *Flüchtlinge* we find 敗寇, 流離, 逃人, 亡人, but not 難民; under *aufpassen* 闚, 覺察, 探伺, 狙伺, but not 留心 or 注意; under *operieren* 剗割 but not 動手術 or 開刀; *europäische Nahrung* 香菜 but not 西餐; *intelligent* 智 but not 聰明. These examples could be multiplied almost at random. They show that an index to a dictionary from one language to another is not a substitute for a dictionary in the opposite direction.

GEORGE WEYS

J. J. Saunders, *The History of the Mongol Conquests*. xix+275 pp. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1971. £3.15.

To write on the Mongol conquests in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is indeed an art requiring almost polyglot skills, for handling the original sources as well as secondary literature. During the last decades an enormous amount of detailed studies on individual problems and aspects has been published in Western languages alone, so that the previous general histories of the period (such as Grousset's *L'empire des steppes*) have been partly superseded. It is only a short time ago that an excellent English translation of Rashīd al-Dīn's history of the Mongol emperors has appeared in print (John Andrew Boyle, *The Successors of Genghis Khan*, Columbia University Press, New York and London, 1971). In view of this constant flow of publications it is a hard task to keep even the bibliography up to date, not to mention the even harder task of digesting the information. The author of the book under review, a historian teaching at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, has been fully aware of the difficulties inherent in writing on the period of Mongol conquests (p. 5), but, as he points out, the undertaking is well justified by the fact that there is hardly a modern comprehensive work available in English. He has, moreover, been assisted by such scholars as J. A. Boyle, I. de Rachewiltz, Sir Gerard Clauson, Ch. Bawden and O. Lattimore, who have read parts of his manuscript.

The result of Dr. Saunders' labours is an eminently readable book with enough scholarly annotation and bibliography to make it attractive also to specialists working in the field. One has to be grateful that the author also has a chapter on the "Turkish rehearsal for the Mongol conquests"; the importance of the Turkish heritage for the Mongols can hardly be overrated. The narrative is distributed evenly over the various geographical regions which fell successively to the Mongols. The concluding chapters ("The Mongol age in retrospect") tries to assess the impact of the Mongol conquests on world history and goes far beyond the usual truisms about *Pax Mongolica*; it is a judiciously balanced analysis of the changes brought about to the Eurasian world in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It is inevitable that in a book of such a wide scope a specialist will discover some passages where he is inclined to disagree, but it would be ungrateful to insist on such minor points if the result of the author's endeavours has been a book as useful and stimulating as the one under review. There are two Appendices, one on the *Secret History of the Mongols*, and one on the question if the Mongols did use guns in their campaigns. The author comes to the conclusion that they probably did not, and that there is no conclusive evidence that the use of cannons (or rather bombards) in fourteenth-century Europe was introduced by the Mongols. On p. 197 a slip should be noted: the Chin, and not the Khitans (whose empire in northern China had become already extinct by 1125) fought against the Mongols in 1232. Chinese metal-barrel cannons or bombards, some of them dated, have survived from the fourteenth century; the earliest dated specimen seems to be one of 1332 (see now Wang Jung, article on Yüan and Ming bombards (in Chinese), *Wen-wu*

1962, No. 3, p. 41-4). But it would certainly be wrong to regard them as an innovation which changed the character of warfare. These bombards were quite small, having a length of c. 15 inches, and cannot have been very effective, except perhaps in undermining the enemy's morale. We do not know of any military engagement in East Asia in the fourteenth and fifteenth century where firearms decided victory or defeat (for more details see also my forthcoming article "Siege and defense of towns in medieval China" to be published 1973 in a volume on Chinese Military History edited by John K. Fairbank for Harvard University Press).

H. FRANKE

R. A. Stein, *Tibetan Civilization*. Translated by J. E. S. Driver, illustrated by Lobsang Tenzin. 334 pp., 3 maps. Faber and Faber, London, 1972. £4.00.

This is a translation of Professor Stein's masterly account of Tibetan civilization originally published in French in 1964. Some small additions have been made, recent works are included in the bibliography, a simpler system of references has, mercifully, been devised, and an index has been supplied. The translation by Mr. Driver, himself a scholar of Tibetan, could hardly be better. Professor Stein, embarking on "rather a gamble" in attempting such a work in the incomplete state of our knowledge, has certainly hit the jackpot with an authoritative, comprehensive, and original survey so compact as to defy adequate review.

A kaleidoscopic look at the many differences in climatic environment and racial types united within a single civilization leads to a summary of Tibetan history from its legendary origins, through its factual beginning in the sixth century, up to the present day.

In an analysis of society Stein describes Tibetan ideas and practices in the family, their ways of life as herdsmen, farmers, town-dwellers, noblemen and serfs, culminating in the dominant group of the religious with its many shadings from powerful abbot, high monastic officers of government, religious teacher, ordinary monk educated or uneducated, magician, and so on. More might, perhaps, have been said about the working of the administration – a pragmatic balance between centralization and delegation of authority – and of the position of reincarnating lamas of whom there were many, both great and small, in each religious sect.

In the section on Religion and Custom he uncovers the wealth of indigenous thought and practice underlying or, rather, woven into the surface manifestations of ubiquitous and all-pervading Buddhist faith. Reasonably accepting the name Lamaism for the Buddhism practised in Tibet, he outlines with lucid brevity the basic ideas of Mahāyāna Buddhism and, for good measure, adds a briskly practical account of the aims and methods of Lamaist meditation. Through the hazy spiritual frontier-ground of mediums, trances, and religious dances he moves to what he calls The Nameless Religion – traditional, pre-Buddhist but not all indigenous, elements. They are to be distinguished from Bon which is far from being, as is sometimes supposed, a comprehensive native counterpart of Buddhism. Most of them have been enveloped under the broad cloak of Lamaism and the villager who burns incense to a father deity on his roof top or dismounts and doffs his hat to some spirit residing in a red-painted stone at a roadside corner regards that as the duty of a *nang-pa*, one within the Buddhist fold.

Throughout the book the accent is on the indigenous; even the photographs of the Potala and the temple at Samye are chosen to show pre-Buddhist cairns and flags. And in literature Professor Stein takes his examples mainly from works where such elements predominate or their effects can be traced. His translations of eighth and ninth century songs, delightful in themselves, are a great advance in scholarly understanding on the pioneer efforts of Bacot and his colleagues. There is also an interesting account of the development of verse metres. In discussing later literature the huge corpus of religious works comprising exegesis, instruction, ritual, prayers, encyclopaedias, pantheons, etc. is dismissed rather too summarily in order to concentrate on

the native heritage of colourful epithet, veiled allusion, and pointed maxim which give so much life and charm to the hymns of often unorthodox and mystic holy men such as Milarepa. The picture is, therefore, unbalanced for the very mass of orthodox literature is a feature of Tibetan civilization and, though much is tedious, there is also valuable light on life and thought in encyclopaedias or in the biographies of lamas, often quite simple persons.

In painting and sculpture too, attention is focused on such things as individualized portraits and on the miniature marginalia in paintings of saints and deities, traces of originality submerged under the smooth conventional surface, technically skilful but static, of religious art.

In the Epilogue, Professor Stein draws an acceptable comparison between Tibetan civilization and those of Japan and of Europe between the tenth and sixteenth centuries in which he judiciously rejects a pejorative interpretation of "the medieval". The few strokes in which he summarizes Tibetan personality show his sympathetic understanding of it.

The search for what is characteristically Tibetan, pursued with insight and originality, is based on what Tibetans themselves have written, sometimes in rare or unpublished MSS, as well as on descriptions by Chinese and other visitors. Not everything, of course, can be accepted without question. Statements by later Tibetan writers about their early history, some of which are recounted by Professor Stein as though they were proven facts, are often contradicted by the earliest Tibetan and Chinese evidence: for example the tradition that Me Aktsom in his old age married a Chinese princess, destined for his son, and had by her the future king, Thrisong Detzen. Information from one person is not always a good basis for generalizations about local habits etc.: there is no improvised clowning at the solemn New Year dances at Lhasa (p. 277); I have seen Amdowas eating pork with relish! (p. 24); the swastika patterns on the pillar at Chonggye are clearly of a much later date than the inscription and are not evidence of an ancient practice (p. 201). Chinese transcriptions of Tibetan names may cause misunderstanding: rice can surely never have been grown at Gyamda (p. 25) at an elevation of nearly 11,000 feet in a valley whose sole product is described by Abbé Huc as a little black barley. Different deductions from and interpretations of obscure texts are possible: it seems unlikely that the words of an oath would have been inscribed on a tomb at a date which appears to be about A.D. 635 (p. 201); the transportation of a throne for peripatetic lamas need not have been any great matter (p. 119) for earth or stone constructions, on which cushions could be laid, marked the regular camping grounds of such personages; my reading of the passage cited in n. 2 at p. 137 is that the image of Songtsen Gampo was carried in a decorated carriage only after his death had been announced, not as a pretence that he was still alive.

The new and not entirely infallible reference system is sometimes rather like an intelligence test for advanced students. Only the initiate will know why Muruk never appears by name in sBa-bzhed to which one is referred in n. 1 on p. 101 for information about him, or will discover by considerable trial and error that the citation of Das's Dictionary, without a page reference, in n. 3 on p. 200 is misplaced; and even prolonged search fails to locate the Tibetan text apparently stated to be inscribed on a stele of 730 (p. 200, n. 4). But such matters will not concern the non-specialist educated reader for whom, in part, the book is intended (p. 16).

The production is good. I noticed only one misprint - "Songsten" for "Songtsen" on p. 99, and one inaccurate reference in the text - chapter III of the Tun-huang chronicle should read chapter IV (p. 133). The photographs and attractive drawings really do illustrate the subject matter; incidentally the figure in pl. 17 p. 128 is not one of the Dalai Lama's dancers but a personage called the Abaa who accompanies maids-of-honour on auspicious occasions.

How sad it is that this fine work is an epitaph and that the civilization to the understanding of which it is so important a contribution has in the past 20 years been violated and destroyed in the subjugation of Tibet by its Chinese communist conquerors.

H. E. RICHARDSON

Rashid al-Din Tabib, *The Successors of Genghis Khan*. Translated from the Persian by John Andrew Boyle. 372 pp. Columbia University Press, 1971. £6.

Since Europe ceased to dominate the world, closer attention has been given to the non-European cultures and what they have to say of their past. Among peoples with a respectable tradition of history-writing the Persians hold a high place, and their best work in this field was produced in the Mongol age. The two greatest Persian historians were Juvaini and Rashid al-Din. The former wrote a life of Genghis Khan, which remains one of our oldest and most valuable sources for the Conqueror's career, and the latter the first truly world history. Rashid was the subject of a World Empire that stretched from Korea to Poland; as a high-ranking official he had access to the Mongol archives, and the patronage of the Khans gave him opportunities of which he made full use. He compiled a vast survey of universal history which covered the history of China, India, the Arabs and Persians, the Franks and the Jews, as well as the Turks and Mongols with whom he was specially concerned. In view of the size of his book and of his tragic fate (he was executed on a trumped-up charge of treason in 1318) it is surprising that so many manuscripts of his have survived. Translations into European languages have proceeded in piecemeal fashion. The Russians have been most diligent; some parts of the history have appeared in French and German, but this is the first translation into English. It has been wisely entrusted to Professor Boyle of Manchester, whose admirable version of Juvaini, published in 1958 under the title of *The History of the World Conqueror*, sufficiently attested his skill as a translator from the Persian.

Rashid's account of Genghis being based largely on Juvaini, the section here translated is confined to the biographies of his successors, the result of his own original research. It treats of the reigns of four Great Khans (Ögetei, Güyük, Möngke and Qubilai), of three of Genghis's sons who never attained supreme power (Jochi, Chaghatai and Tolui), and breaks off in the reign of Qubilai's grandson and successor Temür, whose real authority did not extend beyond China. The period covered is thus the years 1227-1307, when the Mongol Empire was at the height of its power. It describes the Mongol drive into Europe in 1237-42, and Qubilai's conquest of Sung China, but not Hülegü's invasion of western Asia, which was included in the section on Mongol Persia.

Some years ago the late Vladimir Minorsky (to whom this book is dedicated) pointed out the contrast between the two great Persian historians. Juvaini was above all a pious Muslim, whose horizon was bounded by Islam and whose style was flowery and rhetorical. Rashid, who seems to have been a Jewish convert to Islam, had wider views; his manner is sober and restrained; instead of wringing his hands at Mongol excesses, he takes the common-sense position that, Mongol rule having established itself, a patriotic Persian bureaucrat must do his best to make it work, mollify these ferocious barbarians, instruct them in the traditional methods of government, and protect the people against the worst exploitation. He served the Mongols in the same spirit that Boethius served the Goths. He was impressed by the achievements of Mongol imperialism, which had brought so many nations under a single sway, and his history was inspired by a desire to find out how it had all come about. His merit lies in his industry and attention to detail and the care he took in compiling an accurate record. He had access to the Ilkhan archives and diplomatic correspondence, and the khans who employed him, Ghazan and Öljeitü, were themselves authorities on Mongol folklore and antiquities. What emerges is a striking picture of this great Eurasian Empire which confirms the reports of Polo and other contemporary travellers and missionaries from Latin Europe. We can now, so to speak, see this Mongol world from the inside. Professor Boyle's very readable translation is supplemented by a glossary, genealogical tables, and a table of years according to the 12-year animal cycle then in vogue throughout the greater part of Asia. It is well printed and free of errors; the only misprint I have noticed is "1258" given as the date of Möngke's death in Table I (elsewhere the correct date 1259 is given).

J. J. SAUNDERS

Ssu-yü Teng and Knight Biggerstaff (comp.), *An annotated bibliography of selected Chinese reference works. Third edition* (Harvard-Yenching Institute Studies, II). xi+250 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971. \$8.00. (Distributed in Great Britain by Oxford University Press. £3.75.)

This bibliography, which first appeared in Peking in 1936 and was reissued in a revised edition in 1950, was the only work of its nature in English. Although it became somewhat out of date with the compilation and reprinting of Chinese reference works in the Far East during the last two decades, it remained an indispensable tool for all students of China except those exclusively concerned with events since 1949.

This new edition will be even more useful, for it includes nearly 200 new titles and it gives details of where many of the old titles have been reprinted, thus making them available to scholars who may not have access to sinological libraries. Among the new titles are works published in Japan, which can be useful even to scholars who know no Japanese, most of them indexes and catalogues. The arrangement broadly follows that of the second edition, though there are new sections on minority peoples, South-east Asia and translations. There is a combined index and glossary.

The description and guidance for use of the works included is generally a model of clarity and brevity, though occasionally one feels that the difference in convenience between various editions has not been made explicit enough: one is told how to look up an expression under the rhyme of the last character in the *P'ei-wen yün-fu*, but not that one can save oneself the trouble by using an edition with an index. The information given is generally most reliable, an exception being the description of 藝文類聚 (6) "Facsimile of a Sung edition, with parts from a Ming edition." This in fact is not a facsimile but a newly set up punctuated edition.

The choice of what to include must have been difficult and on the whole it has been very well made. But one wonders why among the Jimbun kagaku kenkyūjo's *T'ang Reference Series* Professor Hiraoka's 唐代之詩人 and 唐代之散文作家 are listed while 唐代之詩篇, 唐代之散文作品, the calendar of the T'ang dynasty and the indexes to geographical works are excluded. 全上古三代秦漢三國六朝文篇名目錄及作者索引 published by Chung-hua shu-chū and reprinted by Daian in Tokyo in 1968 is missing. 中國叢書綜錄 was reprinted as 叢書總目類編 (appended to Yang Chia-lo's 叢書大辭典) and 叢書子目類編, excluding only the union list of ts'ung-shu holdings and pinyin-character finding lists, in Yang Chia-lo's *Chinese Bibliographical Dictionary Series* Nos. II, III, Taipei, 1967. Heibonsha's *Ajia rekishi chian*, 1966, could have been mentioned for its section on China among the historical atlases.

Points of detail such as these do not detract from the value of this book which every student of China will want to possess.

GEORGE WEYS

Frank N. Trager (Ed.), *Burma: Japanese Military Administration, Selected Documents, 1941-1945*, xviii+279 pp. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971. \$20.00.

Most of the 66 documents comprised in this volume have been selected from two Japanese publications: The Office of War History, Defence Training Institute, Defence Agency, *Military Operation for the Conquest of Burma*, Tokyo, 1967, and Ota Tsonezo, *An Historical Study of Japan's Military Administration of Burma*, Tokyo, 1967. They have been translated from the Japanese by Won Zoon Yoon assisted by Thomas T. Winant. They are organized into nine sections dealing with different aspects of the occupation. One, for instance, deals with the Burma Independence Army and its successor, the Burma Defence Army. Another is headed "The Independence of Burma" and includes such official documents as the Japan-Burma Secret Military Agreement of 1 August 1943, Dr. Ba Maw's declaration of independence and his Burma New Order Plan. The final section, dealing with the construction of the

Burma-Thailand railway, consists of two rather exiguous documents likely to evoke satirical comments from survivors of that enterprise.

The editor prefaces the work with some brief historical notes. The documents themselves present only the official version of Japanese administrative policy in Burma. They are, therefore, arid and completely divorced from reality in terms of human experience. They do, however, together with the appendices and bibliography, provide useful aids to a researcher.

D. G. E. HALL

Giuseppe Tucci (Ed.), *Deb T'er Dmar Po Gsar Ma: Tibetan Chronicles by bSod nams grags pa*, Vol. I, xiv+245 pp. Serie Orientale Roma Vol. XXIV. Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Rome, 1971.

*Deb t'er dmar po gsar ma* - "The New Red Annals" - an excellent photographic reproduction of which is provided by Professor Tucci, is a rare Tibetan historical work dated 1538. Like the now well-known and highly valued *Chos 'byung* of dPa bo gtsug lag phreng ba, it probably owes its rarity to criticism by the fifth Dalai Lama of statements by its author. Although I was able to locate the woodblocks of the former work and to arrange with the Tibetan Government for it to be brought back into circulation, no blocks of the *Deb t'er dmar po gsar ma* could be traced and I could consult, but not acquire, only one manuscript copy at Lhasa. The work does not appear to be recorded in Western libraries.

In the present edition Professor Tucci has listed a number of emendations to the text and has translated the greater part of it, omitting two short, legendary, accounts of the royal lineages of India and of Shambala. A few glosses have been omitted, without explanation, from the translation. An Appendix contains a transcription of the text of the royal genealogies of Tibet compiled by Grags pa rgyal mtshan and 'Phags pa Blo gros rgyal mtshan and contained in the Sa-skya gSung 'bum; these are the subject of an early article by Professor Tucci - *The Validity of Tibetan Historical Tradition*, in *India Antiqua*, 1947.

Although a few points of interest are mentioned in footnotes, Professor Tucci's full commentary on the many problems raised by the *Deb t'er dmar po gsar ma* is to appear in a second volume which will be a sort of extension of the invaluable account of the history of medieval Tibet contained in his classic work *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*.

In the meantime it can be seen that the *Deb t'er* has the unique importance of being composed by a Lama of the dGe lugs pa sect - though that is a description he never uses, preferring dGe ldan pa, Yellow Hat, or the Yellow - who wrote 40 years before the sect first got its foot on the ladder of political power through the patronage of the Mongol ruler, Altan Khan, when its hierarch, bSod nams rgya mtsho visited him in 1578 and was invested with the title "Dalai".

The account of the early history of Tibet has little to add to those of Bu ston, the *Deb t'er sngon po*, the *rGyal rabs gsal ba'i me long* and the *Tshal pa Deb dmar* which are among its sources; but in the chapters dealing with the descendants of the early kings, the Sa skya pa, the 13 myriarchies, and especially the long section on the Phag mo gru pa there is significant evidence of the relationship of the dGe ldan pa Church with the older religious establishments and their lay supporters into the midst of whose political rivalries it had recently been launched. The more important parts of the work have the great value of being clearly dated; but the writing is so succinct and allusive that many points can only be understood by reference to other works and much research will be needed to relate its contents to earlier and later histories such as the *rGya bod yig tshang* and the Chronicle of the fifth Dalai Lama. In his *Tibet* (1967) Tsipon W. D. Shakabpa has made a valuable start in clarifying the history of Tibet in the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries and Professor Tucci's second volume, which promises to be of the highest authority and importance for that obscure and complicated period, will be eagerly awaited.

Like all publications in Serie Orientale Roma, this book is well printed on good paper, and is a pleasure to read.

H. E. RICHARDSON

Charles Vaurie, *Tibet and its Birds*, xv+407 pp., map, 3 figures in text, 23 black-and-white photographs, 3 colour plates, gazetteer, bibliography, indices. London, H. F. & G. Witherby, 1972. £10.50.

This beautifully produced book, the first comprehensive monograph on the birds of Tibet and the country they inhabit, is a valuable contribution to Tibetan geography and ornithology.

Tibet, as described in Dr. Vaurie's first chapter, is a geographical concept without regard for ethnographic or political boundaries; but his map does largely coincide with the ethnographic Tibet of Sir Charles Bell's map in *Tibet Past and Present* though it extends further westward, up to the Karakoram range. The country falls into three natural regions: the largest, but poorest in number of species, is the Northern Plateau comprising the Chang Tang, Zaidam and Koko Nor; the Outer Plateau, subdivided into western, southern, and north-eastern Tibet; and the South-eastern Plateau. The great variety of altitude, climate and vegetation in these regions is excellently illustrated by photographs well chosen to show that the journalists' picture of the bleak "Roof of the World" is not typical of Tibet.

On the subject of fallacies: Dr. Vaurie repeats cautiously a Chinese report that in 1936 the rainfall at Lhasa was 5035.5 mm. — over ten times the total for other years. I was at Lhasa from August 1936 and am convinced that the figure is wildly wrong. A deluge of such proportions would have left its mark on crops, river levels, the mud-roofed houses, and the streets as well as on the minds of the Tibetans; but conditions then were no different from those I saw in eight other years there, and in records over an even longer period the highest rainfall in any one of the three rainy months was just over 7 inches in 1949. The informant's reliability is weakened for anyone who endured the frequent howling dust storms at Lhasa by the statement that the wind did not exceed 1.1 on the Beaufort scale — about 3 m.p.h.

In digesting the geographical observations of explorers in the different parts of Tibet, Dr. Vaurie naturally favours those best equipped for scientific work; and the names of Przhhevsky, Hedin, and Kingdon Ward figure prominently. But there are a few unexpected omissions, e.g. the Pundits of the Survey of India, some of whom kept meteorological records, W. W. Rockhill and, of recent travellers, David Snellgrove in whose *Buddhist Himalaya* there is information about Spiti, and good photographs. Incidentally, while Dr. Vaurie wisely avoids general speculation about the meaning of place names, I wonder in what language Spiti means "Middle Country" (p. 15).

In chapter 2 "History and Ornithological Exploration", the sketchy outline of Tibetan political history not surprisingly contains minor inaccuracies and, in supposing that William Moorcroft — rightly described as "colourful" — was the first to mention birds from Tibet, c. 1812 (p. 41), a few early steps in the ornithological story are omitted. The statement in a sixth-century Chinese history that birds and mice share burrows in the country near the Koko Nor is perhaps only an oddity though it does suggest the ground chough, which nests in the holes of the mousehare. But beginning with Francisco de Azevedo (1631), the Jesuit and Capuchin missionaries in Tibet wrote of sparrows, larks, ravens, falcons, and eagles there, as well as an abundance of geese and ducks one of which — a curious duck of golden velvety colour, revered by the Tibetans — described by Ippolito Desideri (1715-21), is clearly the Ruddy Shelduck. The British envoy in 1775, George Bogle, reports partridges as well as wildfowl; and he tells how he refrained from shooting to avoid offending his hosts — a restraint followed by British representatives who came after him. Samuel Turner, in 1783, saw kites and ravens as well as geese and ducks; and the eccentric Thomas Manning (1811) noted large flocks of duck which he found very tame, and described in well observed and lively detail the behaviour of the numerous ravens.

The extensive list of ornithological explorers after Moorcroft is illustrated by sketch maps of the routes of Przhhevsky, Kozlov, and Frank Ludlow to whom Dr. Vaurie clearly gives the highest place and whose photographs he includes. Ludlow, to whom the book is dedicated "in sympathy and with gratitude for much help" sadly died just before its publication.

Chapter 3, on "Distribution and Zoogeography", and chapter 4, on "Migration", become more technical but Dr. Vaurie's balanced opinions on the origin of the Tibetan avifauna and the zoogeographical status of the Sino-Himalayan region are stated with incisive clarity, and he presents in orderly form the little that is known about migrants in Tibet.

The kernel of the book — almost half of it — is a systematic list of Tibetan birds, supported by notes showing where the 16,200 specimens examined by Dr. Vaurie were collected. Most of the place names are not to be found in his maps but can be traced in a complete gazetteer referring to the International Map of the World. Of the 504 species listed there are less than 70 for which no specimens were available and in tracking down the number he was able to see, Dr. Vaurie, with remarkable determination, visited collections all over the world.

The total of 504 species represents a considerable increase on the number previously supposed to exist; 15 further species form a hypothetical list based on sight records only. To that might be added "a large grey bustard with black neck and tail" reported by Sir Richard Strachey near Lake Manasarowar in 1848 and a pied kingfisher (*Ceryle lugubris*) seen by me in the upper Chumbi valley in August 1938. Dr. Vaurie emphasizes that vast regions of Tibet remain unexplored or only superficially visited. More species and more information about distribution and migration may be expected to be discovered when the opportunity arises. Among likely regions for new discoveries are the upper reaches of rivers that rise in Tibet and pierce the Himalaya, such as the fertile Kyirong district of the upper Trisuli river. And on my last journey in Tibet in 1950, over 30 miles upstream of the gorge where the Lhobrak river, whose several branches rise far inside Tibet, flows through the mountains into Bhutan I found a stretch of deciduous woodland untypical in my experience and sheltering several birds I had seen only south of the Himalaya as well as others I could not identify.

Three bright colour plates by A. Singer show 11 species including pheasants, parakeets and finches. Their characteristic attitudes are well caught though, for me, Keulemans' more delicately coloured plate in Henderson and Hume's *Lahore to Yarkand* recalls better the gawky untidiness and querulously suspicious eye of the ground chough.

Apart from those plates and the wing measurements in the systematic list the mere bird watcher will find no description of the birds such as those in Oates and Stuart Baker's eight volumes on birds in the Zoological Survey of India — invaluable to me but not cited in Dr. Vaurie's bibliography. He will not learn the approximate number of birds of the several species to be found in the different types of country illustrated in the photographs, or their fearlessness and the ease with which they can be watched in the sparse cover of the plateaux and in the groves and thickets near Lhasa, where full leaf comes after most of the migrants have arrived. Nor will he get a hint of the never-failing excitement of being able to approach within some 15 yards of bar-headed geese and Pallas's fishing-eagle or the sight of great rafts of red-crested pochard, their heads gleaming against the blue of a Tibetan lake, or clouds of choughs wheeling over the dry plains, or hundreds of ravens streaming to roost in the groves near Lhasa and performing their spectacular courting flights in early spring. There is something of that in Walton's appendix to Landon's *Lhasa* and more in Chapman's *Lhasa, the Holy City* (neither in Dr. Vaurie's bibliography) and in Saïim Ali's *An ornithological pilgrimage to Lake Manasarowar and Mount Kailas*.

Dr. Vaurie himself did not enjoy that particular experience; and subjective disquisitions would, perhaps, be out of place in an exact work of this sort; but the fruit of so much enthusiasm and scientific precision will surely be prized as of first importance by the zoologists for whom it is chiefly intended and it will give pleasure and information to many with a more general interest in the terrain and wild life of Tibet.



Claus Vogel, *The Teachings of the Six Heretics*. According to the Pravrajyāvastu of the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, edited and rendered into English. With an appendix containing an English translation of the pertinent sections in the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Wiesbaden, Kommissionsverlag F. Steiner GMBH, 1970. 62 pp. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, hrsg. von der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Bd. XXXIX, 4.)

This excellent little monograph, dedicated to the memory of Johannes Nobel, offers a critical edition of the Tibetan text of the relevant section of the Vinaya, based on a careful collation of five Kanjur prints (Peking, Derge, Narthang, Chone, and Urga), the Berlin and London Kanjur manuscripts, and the Mongolian version of the Kanjur. The text is followed by a translation (including, in the Appendix, a translation of the Chinese version by I. Ching), by a bibliography, and a "select vocabulary". Apart from the special Buddhological interest which attaches to a version of the story of the Six Heretics as handed down by the Mūlasarvāstivādins, students of Tibetan will be grateful to the author for his remarks on the relations between the various Kanjur prints, and for his lexicological observations. As far as the latter are concerned, Tib. *gsaṅs-pa*, which Professor Vogel translates, in accordance with Sanskrit *nirveṣṭ* as "to unwind" (p. 38), adding (p. 32, n. 71) the remark "unattested so far", may be explained as belonging to *hḍsaṅs-pa* "spent". The corresponding Chinese version has in fact (轉) 盡。

W. SIMON

*Chinese Rhyme-Prose: Poems in the Fu Form from the Han and Six Dynasties Periods*. Translated and with an introduction by Burton Watson. Columbia University Press, 1971.

This elegant book is dedicated to the memory of Arthur Waley, a fitting tribute from a now famous translator to the old master. It contains translations of 13 *fu*, all but the last of which are to be found in the first 19 *chüan* of *Wen hsüan*. There are introductions, on average about 200 words apiece, to each of the translations, minimal but adequate footnotes to explain the allusions, two short appendices, one containing translated extracts of *fu* criticism, the other, translations of two of Hsün-tzu's five "riddle *fu*", a 6,000-word general introduction and a useful select bibliography of translations and studies.

Three of these *fu* have been translated into English before. There is an early prose translation of "The Wind" by Waley; Chia Yi's "Owl" has been translated by Robert Hightower; and there is a most interesting study/translation of Sun Ch'ò's "Wandering on Mt. T'ien-t'ai" by Richard Mather.<sup>1</sup> But most of the 13 are appearing in English for the first time. They will do much to correct an erroneous impression sometimes given by Chinese histories of literature and careless Occidental teachers that, with a few notable exceptions, nothing of much importance occurred in this genre after the fall of Han.

Throughout the eight centuries represented by this selection the *fu* was, in effect, the Chinese equivalent of the long poem. Neglect of the Six Dynasties *fu* has therefore given the verse literature of this period a somewhat thin, unbalanced look. For many readers the glimpse of riches this book provides will be a revelation. Who, for example, has heard of Mu Hua? Yet who, reading this book, will deny that his "Sea", however unlike that element as it appears to the shore-haunting Saxon or Celt, is nevertheless a most powerful and remarkable work of the imagination? And who would have suspected so much grandeur having read only the *shih* poems of Mu Hua's contemporaries?

<sup>1</sup> Neither Watson nor Mather, I believe, mentions the probability that this *fu* provided the inspiration for Li Po's famous poem "Wandering on Mt. T'ien-mu in a Dream".

As the type of long poem the *fu* throughout this period was to some extent subject to the same influences as the *shih*. When the *shih* became tone-conscious, so did the *fu*; when the *shih* became reflective, mystical, and philosophical, so did the *fu*; when the *shih* became allusive and opaque, the *fu* became even more congested with names and symbols. The high, allusive style which Yü Hsin affected in his *shih* may be observed in the densely allusive "Small Garden" *fu* translated in this book and the greater allusiveness fairly precisely gauged by the great multiplication of footnotes.

This is not to say that *fu* did not have its own separate traditions and distinctive conventions. By the beginning of the T'ang period these conventions had produced a style so mannered and frigid that the medium was effectively dead and exercises in it, even by such literary giants as Tu Fu and Li Po have about as much – or as little – relevance to contemporary developments in creative literature as the Latin poems of Milton. The "prose *fu*" of Su Tung-p'o is sometimes pointed to as a latter-day renewal but is really a red herring. Like "prose-poem", the very term "prose *fu*" is a contradiction, and the typologist must be allowed to query it as in any meaningful sense a development of the same genre.

I therefore believe that Burton Watson is right to end his selection with Yü Hsin. Yü Hsin stands at the end of a tradition. He is one of those great writers like Joyce beyond whom, along the particular line they have elected to pursue, there can be no further development.

But if it was right to conclude with Yü Hsin, I am less convinced that it was right to begin with the pseudo-Sung Yü, particularly when the inclusion, later on in the book, of Hsieh Hui-lien's "Snow" demonstrates with very great clarity just how these false attributions could come about. If Hsieh Hui-lien's authorship had been forgotten, "Snow" would quite certainly have been ascribed to Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju; and there can be very little doubt that "The Wind" has strayed from its true chronological position, even if we cannot state with any confidence precisely where that position should be.

With that single reservation I think the selection is an excellent one and that it will give the reader a very good idea of the characteristic contents of Han-Six Dynasties *fu* and of the characteristic way in which those contents were deployed and presented. If I take leave to doubt that he will get much idea from these or any other translations of what a *fu* is really like, I do not thereby mean to impugn the scholarship and skill with which they have been made or to deny the many beauties and felicities that they contain. I merely wish to record my belief that translation from a genre in which form is of such preponderant importance presents virtually insuperable problems if we are looking for an end product that will give some impression of the tension and density of the original.

Of course, no translation from the Chinese, whatever the genre, can be formally like the original. Five-stressed verses in sprung rhythm are no more like Chinese pentasyllabics than iambic pentameters or stanzas in common metre. A translator can only choose or invent a form in which he can best express to his own satisfaction the "feeling" that he is given by the original. The measure of his success has very little to do with the number of formal elements that the original and the translation have in common. The erroneous belief that it *has* is responsible for those pathetic attempts we sometimes see to "suggest" the form of a consistently rhyming Chinese text by slipping an occasional easy rhyme into an otherwise unrhymed translation, or by occasionally sinking into a limp pentameter when the minimal amount of thought and effort is required in order to achieve one.

That is not to say that he will not often find it expedient to use one or other of the *kinds* of formal element that the original contains. He may, for example, decide to dispense with rhyme but to employ alliteration, when the original contains both of these formal features. If he is a literate translator like Watson he will then tend naturally to fall into the established rhythms of English alliterative verse. He may in this way have hit upon a very satisfying *substitution* for the original form. But no-one must be deluded into thinking that this is the least little bit like the Chinese form just because alliteration is used in both.

Watson has, in fact, obtained some of his finest lines by doing precisely this:

Luminous, light-filled,  
Rich and resplendent,  
The bravest aspect that ritual can wear.

Or take these splendid lines from "The Snow":

See them darting, scattering, mingling, turning,  
Blanketing, blinding, dense and dark,  
Softly seething, bobbing, gliding,  
Faster and faster falling now . . .

Curiously enough the one single feature of *fu* style which all translators, good and bad alike, insist on retaining – I refer to the purely rhetorical employment of antithesis – is also the one whose retention produces some of the most disastrous effects in *fu* translation. Even so skilled and sensitive a translator as Watson is sometimes betrayed into writing lines that can only be described as hideous by his reluctance to jettison some trumpery bit of rhetoric a hundred times less important, formally speaking, than the rhymes and rhythms abandoned in their thousands without a regret. One of his most beautiful lines

She flames like the lotus flower topping the green wave

is followed by this grisly couplet:

In her a balance is struck between plump and frail,  
A measured accord between diminutive and tall . . .

(The second line doesn't even mean anything, as far as I can see). While lower down on the same page:

Red lips that shed their light abroad  
White teeth gleaming within

tells us less about the style of the *fu* than it does about the annihilating effect of the *fu* on the style of a good translator. If the purely rhetorical *nei/wai* antithesis is to be transplanted into the English translation at all, it must surely be in the form of an English antithesis: in/out, inside/outside, at home/abroad, within/without. If none of these will do, it is pointless to tinker with them, since the problem of translation is not in this case a semantic problem at all. The problem is what rhetorical or other formal device we are going to use in our English translation as an equivalent of the rhetorical device which we find employed in the Chinese original. We might well decide to do nothing at all – simply to forget about *nei* and *wai* altogether, since they add nothing substantial to the meaning. We might decide to substitute another form – iteration, say, instead of antithesis ("gleaming lips" – "gleaming teeth", or something of the sort). We might adopt one of half a dozen different expedients. The one thing we must *not* do, it seems to me, is temporarily abandon the problem of form and treat the lines purely as a question of semantics.

The sort of *fu* translation which could match the glitter and tension of the original would, I suppose, be just about possible if some crazed genius were to devote five or six years of his life to the translating of a single *fu*, and even then it is uncertain that the sacrifice would be worth while. In the meantime this book will give a better over-all idea of the *fu* than any other published to date and probably than any that will be published for a good many years to come.

D. HAWKES