

Ananda Coomaraswamy, *Buddha and the Gospel of Buddhism*, IX, 370 pp. and 29 plates. University Books, New Hyde Park, New York, 1964.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

*Sources of Japanese tradition*, compiled by Ryusaku Tsunoda, Wm. Theodore de Bary and Donald Keene. 2 vols. Vol. I: xxiii, 506 pp., 2 maps; Vol. II: xiv, 406 pp., map. New York and London, Columbia University Press, 1964. \$3.25, \$2.75.

Although this work, which first appeared in 1958, has not previously been reviewed in *Asia Major*, there can be few students of the Far East who have not read, or at least consulted, it. It now appears in paperback form, in two volumes, but still at a very high price. Apart from some minor rearrangement, and the binding, the only difference from the original printing appears to be the title. This was once *Sources of the Japanese tradition*, and one wonders why it was changed, for the form with the definite article seems to give a better idea of the scope of the book, dealing as it does with the religious, philosophical, political and literary sources which lie at the back of Japanese thinking, and not with oral tradition, folklore, or anything of that sort. The work consists, in fact, of a series of translations by various authorities, accompanied by explanatory material, and arranged in 29 chapters. It is an invaluable source of material for all students of every aspect of Japanese history and thought.

C. J. DUNN

*Paternalism in the Japanese economy. Anthropological studies of oyabun-kobun patterns*, by John W. Bennett and Iwao Ishino. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1963. Distributed in Great Britain by Oxford University Press. 52/-, x, 307 pp.

Professors Bennett and Ishino here present a number of papers, based for the most part on data collected by one of the divisions of American military government headquarters during the occupation of Japan. Though different in date, the papers all deal with variants of the *oyabun-kobun* relationship in Japanese society; and as now arranged and edited they offer a picture of the way in which the ideas of the investigators developed from an initial interest in labour boss organizations to a more general structure of ideas about paternalism in its economic context. This is achieved by separate studies of *oyabun-kobun* patterns in, first, construction, mining and similar industries; then, in forestry; finally, in farm tenancy in a northern area of Japan. The *oyabun-kobun* pattern is identified as a relationship between employer and employee of a feudal-familial type, involving a highly developed system of duties, privileges and ceremonial activities, which appears in a number of different forms in different economic circumstances. Thus the very explicit and formalized organization of the *kumi* of a labour boss is contrasted with the relatively diffuse activities of the patron-employer, and the ruthless power-seeking of the entrepreneur-boss, exercising controls over a number of employers in a given locality, is set against the inherited and more pervasive, if no less exploitative, authority of a landlord over his village tenants. The result is to give a number of valuable insights into the nature of Japanese society, though in a book which is by no means easy reading. It is certainly useful as a step towards isolating and examining in detail an element in Japanese life which is usually referred to only in terms of the influence it has had on the organization of modern industrial undertakings.

W. G. BEASLEY

This is the second reprint of Coomaraswamy's book which was originally published in 1916 and reissued in 1927. A book of this importance deserved to be included in the now usefully developing trend towards replenishing the stocks of indological classics of the past. For, even if the work cannot serve as a reference source to a student of history, religion and philosophy of Buddhism, Coomaraswamy's brilliant and almost tender approach to the subject can offer a strong incentive to pursue the study further. In his exquisite and alluringly dynamic style the author managed, sometimes in a scholarly manner and at other times by mere intuition, to present the essentials of Buddha's teachings with the strength of truth that could only be borne out later by the discovery of texts not available at the time when the book was written.

The book has an Humboldtian and Dussenian scope and breadth, and was written in the broad humanistic style; its content embraces Buddhism in all its facets. While the developmental phases of Buddhism are mainly exemplified by sources from the Hināyāna branch, a chapter is added on the Mahāyāna including Zen. A large chapter is also added on the major orthodox religions of India, a section of which is devoted to a comparative analysis of Buddhism and Brahmanism. To perfect the totality of the image a chapter of the book is devoted to Buddhist Art. It is supplemented by now well known samples of photographs of the more representative Buddhist sculptures. In a true Coomaraswamy spirit, copious comparisons are offered in the book between Buddhist (or generally Indian) and Western thoughts and utterances. The latter are perhaps rather the weakness than strength of the convincing power of the author's intentions. The similitudes are felt by Coomaraswamy so strongly that, for instance, the significance of the Yoga (as on page 197) is illustrated by a quotation from Schelling's *Letters upon Dogmatism and Criticism* rather than by a more appropriate Sanskrit text. In another instance, the position of woman in Buddhism is paralleled by that taken up by the long discarded eccentric and misogynist, Weininger. The incessant invocation of the authority of Nietzsche and the alleged likeness of his superman to the Buddha or an Arahat or Bodhisattva is, at least nowadays, difficult to assimilate both for scholarly and sentimental reasons. But in 1916, the superman and the "ariya" (a favourite expression of Coomaraswamy) had different connotations, it seems, and were more easily tolerated as was, e.g., the concept of Indogermanisch, etc.

While new concepts and interpretations of the Hināyāna and Mahāyāna Buddhism based on the mass of literature discovered, mainly in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese, between 1916 and now, give us more opportunity for a more "specialized" study of Buddhism than was the case when "Buddha and the Gospel of Buddhism" was written, the book contains not a single misleading information. The author's universalist approach offers fascinating reading to all who want to grasp the doctrine in all its depth, but do not care for isolated and elaborate details. Seldom has a compilatory work — and it basically is one, even if the reader is not quite fully aware of it — offered such beautiful and logical structure as that which is brought before us again, thanks to the efforts of the publishers. One cannot, however, pay a similar unconditional tribute to the editors.

For, although the reader is told in John C. Wilson's Introduction that the book "is now reprinted without change, except for obvious typographical errors", the transliteration of Sanskrit words is so inadequate that in spite of Coomaraswamy's "guide to pronunciation" (it was given in 1916) the inconsistencies of the transcription amounting to "obvious errors" might have been removed. Having a perfect system of transliteration now, why should the editor preserve the "s" for ś, ṣ and ṣ? The disorderly arrangement of plates which follows neither the alphabetical nor chronological order nor the order of sequence of references in the book, is actually quite annoying; the more so as the plates form an integral part of the chapter on Buddhist Art. Apart from these shortcomings the edition is worthwhile and aesthetical to look at.

ARNOLD KUNST

*Suye Mura: a Japanese Village*, by John F. Embree. University of Chicago Press, seventh impression, 1964. Printed for the first time as a paperback in the publisher's Phoenix Books series. The 1964 impression carries a new introduction by Prof. R. K. Beardsley, the director of the University of Michigan Centre for Japanese Studies.

For most of the twenty-six years that have passed since the book was first published, it has been the only work on Japanese villages in the English language. Its value does not rest on this fact alone, however, and its excellence has assured it a continuing place on the reading lists compiled for students both of social anthropology and of Japanese studies. In lucid prose, it presents an intimate and detailed picture of a small Japanese village on the eve of the Pacific War. Among the topics covered are the life history of the individual, the yearly cycle of village life, the rural family, agricultural methods, farm financial records, recreation, folk songs, religious beliefs and practices, village organization and mutual aid, and the beginnings of central government control of local associations. Eighteen pages of photos evoke the rustic simplicity and poverty of the community. Appendixes disclose village agricultural statistics, a list of non-agricultural occupations, household budgets, speeches by village officials, and sermons and prayers by local priests.

Embree's study is valuable because it gives us a description against which to measure the changes that have taken place in Japanese farm communities since his writing. Unfortunately, although he has described the various categories of villagers with great insight, his study covers the subject of class relations least satisfactorily and is not so useful in measuring the full impact of the land reform.

Perhaps the most noticeable change that has occurred in the past thirty years has been the phenomenal rise in the standard of living throughout Japanese society. In all but the remotest villages, one can see television antennae (90% of Japanese households own a T.V.), tractors and mechanical tillers, automobiles and motor-cycles, electrical appliances and expensive cameras, where before only the wealthiest could have owned even a radio or a motor-cycle. No longer do villagers suffer from lice, and the post-war rice-rationing system enables all farm households to eat rice unmixed with inferior grains. The total number of households engaged in agriculture has risen very slightly in this period to a little under six million, but less than a quarter of these have farming as their sole means of support, as compared to three-quarters in 1935. The small-scale Japanese farm (average size: two acres) is no longer adequate to support a continually rising standard of living. Not only do members of the farm household usually have some outside employment but also increasing numbers of rural youth are leaving their villages for work in the cities.

Not everything has changed so drastically. Despite the encroachment of urban and Western ways into the countryside, many of the beliefs, customs and forms of social organization of the middle-aged villagers remain as described in *Suye Mura* a generation ago. Throughout Japanese society—even in the middle-class housing estates or *danchi* which are the *avant-garde* of Westernization and defence of personal privacy—residents of a community must usually co-operate to provide many services for themselves which are handled in Britain by local governments (e.g. street-lighting, refuse disposal). In villages, such self-help practices are most extensive.

A misprint appears on p. 190, where *dōkyūsei* is given as *dōkyōsei*, an error which appears also in a previous edition the reviewer has consulted. In future editions, it would be convenient for comparative purposes if the publishers could give metric equivalents of the old Japanese units used in the tables. These are minor points and detract little from the value of a book which deserves a wide readership among general readers as well as students and scholars.

STANLEY T. FUKAWA

Dr. Hans Herrfurth, Lehrbuch des Modernen Djawanisch, VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, Leipzig, Lehrbücher für das Studium der Orientalischen und Afrikanischen Sprachen, Band IX, 1964.

As this book of moderate size (6 × 8½ in.; 259 pp.) neither pretends to be a grammar, nor to be perfect in its method of teaching, the only remaining question is,

whether one can learn Javanese from it. I should say: yes, to a certain extent. Its lessons, to the number of 21, are not too long; its terminology is the old-acquainted one; its reading pieces are modern, highly interesting and copiously annotated; the material production excellent. This book can be studied in an armchair, which has its advantages. Finally the shortcomings are so obvious that any somewhat critical user of this book within not too much time will get that healthy feeling of uneasiness that cannot be sufficiently applauded in all users of grammars and learning methods and may lead to one's own deductions and combinations, knowledge and delight.

The author asks for advice for future reprints and this I might give him in these wordings: Try to obtain the grammars and methods of teaching Javanese hitherto published and learn from them what good can be borrowed and what mistakes can be avoided and should be avoided in 1964, more than a century after the first publication of serious Javanese grammars started. Students of Javanese may be expected to have reached an age at which they can be told, e.g. that the antepenultimate vowel has a tendency to become inarticulate, instead of pointing three times to different facets of this simple rule.

The hierarchic character of so-called *krama*, unnecessarily dealt with as early as in the very first lesson, is not defined by calling it an "Ersatzwortschatz" and by putting between brackets the explanation "Old-Javanese kromo = höflich", nor is this correct. Sanskrit and Old-Javanese *krama* mean "course, (right) method", i.e. of behaviour. That is why the attitude of the body, the movements of the limbs, the choice of the words, the "colour" of their vowels in several cases, the use of the suffixes *aké* or *akén* all play their role in expressing Javanese *krama*. That is also why in Javanese script (p. 255) the author of a letter has the choice between three different initial signs according to the relation between himself and the addressee. Every language has an endless scale between a modest suggestion and a coarse order, the so-called imperative of the grammars and handbooks; any speaker of any language on earth during the first decennia of his life has to learn the proper course, i.e. *krama*. Hierarchic language in Javanese has shown an extraordinary growth, and in the second part of this book it has induced the author, through excessive interest, to allow too much space to it and to make "groups" of two and three words (out of 454), using "Anhängung" loosely, where we do not have to do with *suffix* but with *substitute*.

I don't think cross-references would have done harm, on the contrary. I agree with the author that formations of the type *pa-root-an* denote a plurality and a place, but I do not agree with his repeating this five times without giving a real translation (p. 89).

Generally speaking it is to be expected that the learning of Javanese is only undertaken after a certain knowledge of the related Indonesian language has been acquired. The author mentions on a separate page three dictionaries for Javanese; the Javanese-Dutch of which (Pigeaud 1936) is out of print, practically unobtainable and cannot be expected to be reprinted; the Javanese-Javanese of which (Poerwadarminta 1939), if obtainable, sends the user from the devil to the deep sea, whereas the third (Prawiroatmodjo, Surabaya 1957) presupposes knowledge of Indonesian. Consequently this presupposed knowledge of Indonesian on the side of the students might have eased the author's task, e.g. by considering most features of nasalisation and prenasalisation as known.

More references to books on Java, written in German, might have been welcome to students and would have found room on several partly-used pages, for, as my senior colleague Blagden, lecturer in Malay at SOAS, once remarked: "Learning is like digestion: much has to be presented that is not necessary for the mere purpose of being assimilated but renders the process of assimilation more agreeable".

These are my wishes for the second impression of this book, to which I look forward.

C. HOOPYKAAS

Christopher Isherwood, *Ramakrishna and His Disciples* (Methuen & Co. Ltd., London, 1965), 348 pp. and 32 illustrations.

According to his own words, Isherwood assigned himself the task of depicting the entire life of Ramakrishna, the saint, the mystic, the avatar. He wrote "the story of a

phenomenon". It is set against a somewhat angelic image of India and is written with the intent to impress upon the reader the saint's genius, the impact on his disciples and the role that he had played in their lives by the force of his mind and the power of his personality. But in the first place, the book is about Ramakrishna the visionary who through the delights and tortures of his visions of Kāli the Mother, and also of other deities of India, of Muhammad and Christ, achieved spiritual heights by attaining the wisdom of the advaita nature of the universe.

But is it also the story of Ramakrishna the saviour of people, or Ramakrishna the reformer, or Ramakrishna the harbinger of better life here or thereafter? At this point one has to stop for a while as the author himself seems to be hesitant on the reply.

The writing of a review of Isherwood's book by a student of Indian religions and philosophy, who finds himself reluctant to probe the intricacies of personal religious experience or to dissect images of mystic visions, is a somewhat precarious task. Isherwood himself has selected his public when he says: "the sort of a reader I am writing for is the one who is not afraid of the marvellous . . . , who is on the lookout for a phenomenon". The "marvellous" and the "phenomenon" would have to be more clearly defined before one decides whether a lookout for historical and philosophical truth enhances or defies the two concepts chosen by the author as his guidelines.

If the book confuses the principles of the Sāṅkhya and Yoga with the Vedānta the reason thereof lies not so much with the author's lack of susceptibility to the subtleties of Indian theologies as with the nature of Ramakrishna's personal religion. It was, of course, possible to avoid certain overgeneralizations such as attributing to India as a whole faiths and views which are the property of specific religious schools or even sects, but are not necessarily shared by other religions or sects of India. To maintain that "in India, the religious ideal has always been to obtain knowledge of the *Ātman*" is to defy the basic principle of the once widely spread in India Buddhist dogmas and the philosophy of the Cārvākas for whom, for different reasons, the *ātman* was anathema. The book indulges in some other liberties in the usage of terminology and general historical facts but these need hardly be discussed here.

Ramakrishna's life, his religious experience and his teaching, together with the cothurni and parables applied as effective pedagogical tools, are not only honestly, factually and convincingly sketched, but are written with Isherwood's usual high literary acumen. Seldom are any apologies for the vivid descriptions offered; they are never needed. Yet, here and there some more or less hasty and not necessarily obvious comparisons with Christian creed or practice are presented as if to exhort the reader: do not ridicule this or that manifestation of Indian faith; if you look well enough you can find in Christianity practices equally or more ludicrous or altogether senseless in comparison with those exercised in India. This method of convincing the reader is only too commonly practised by writers as if India had to be a priori embarrassed by her religious and philosophical legacy and had to prove its value by matching it with its opposites in the West. To my mind, India's magnificence and originality in these matters more often than not stand out more significantly where they rest on their own foundations and operate by their own methods. Such other examples in the book as the non-sexuality of the *līṅga* (compared with the spire and the font of a Christian(?) church), the usurpation of *Īśvara*'s throne compared to the fall of Lucifer, are also accompanied by something of a defence of Hinduism as a polytheistic religion as if polytheism needed any defence and were a lower form of worship than mono- or other-theism. Leaving aside the question of the degree of sophistication in each of the religious doctrines, nobody can say with positive assertion that the social and ethical code based on monotheism is of superior value to that based on polytheism. For instance, the adoption of some of the Christian teachings by Ram Mohan Roy was effected for reasons of political expedience, as admitted by Isherwood, rather than for the need of a better "ethical image".

From the bibliographical list attached to the book it can be gathered that for general information on Indian religions the author largely relied on material prepared

with a degree of biased inaccuracy. According to Isherwood, non-dualistic Vedānta is "so called because it is the philosophy expounded in the early Scriptures called Vedas". As we know, the Vedas (and even the Vedānta) can be and have, by exponents of all ages frequently and legitimately, been interpreted as propounding doctrines of dualism and pluralism. Non-dualism, however popular, is but one school of interpretation.

In the last lines of the book the author expresses the hope that "it will be obvious" that any attempt at the assessing of Ramakrishna's achievement and "assigning him 'a place in history' would be meaningless". It is seldom easy for the reader unreservedly to accept an author's reservation; in this case the reservation would seem to be completely unacceptable. To quote Isherwood, "the phenomenon [Ramakrishna] has been described. . . . Should it be taken as the starting point of a change in one's own ideas and life?" In any answer to this question an assessment of achievements is immanent. One of the alternatives, ironically perhaps but certainly not frivolously, advanced by the author is to dismiss the "phenomenon" from the mind as "something irrelevant and inconveniently out of line with everyday experience". Such dismissal (or an acceptance) is neither simple or easy, and in this respect the book is not of much help. In circling around the subject it does not assist the reader in reaching a conclusion on how much benefit or damage Ramakrishna or Svami Vivekananda and the other disciples along with the Ramakrishna Mission have or may have wrought. Their impact on the susceptible minds of Indian people and particularly that section of Indian population which is fit and called for to contribute to the economic and social progress of the country, would have to be quite clearly assessed before any responsible reply on acceptance or dismissal of Ramakrishna's role is ventured. Any abrogation of the value of such contribution as a taint of materialism in Ramakrishna's spiritual legacy would constitute an intolerable cliché. Incidentally his influence on the West and particularly the United States, where the Mission has been busily active, is of such minor significance, as to be of little consequence in this respect.

Both Ramakrishna and Isherwood are sufficiently ambiguous not to be able to help the reader in answering the latter's vexing question. Let us consider the question of the caste. Having satisfied his conscience and "the standpoint of democratic thinking" that "caste is an evil since it makes men unequal" and that "its defects are uninterestingly obvious", Isherwood explains the castes' working or rather their "idea" not in terms of injustice but, among others, in terms of their justification by the Bhagavadgītā through the doctrine of karmic soteriology; he finally concludes that castes are interdependent rather than exclusive, as they provide for division of labour. But so do the systems of slavery and feudalism. Ramakrishna himself, though making exceptions at his will as it befits a man of genius and violent emotions, in fact follows strictly the Hindu tradition in the recognition of the caste institution.

Ramakrishna is no reformer, religious or social. He is in fact often depicted as an asocial individual, however tender and loving for his family, with love dispensed perhaps more as a matter of deeply ingrained sense of traditional duty than of affection. More centered on his personal union with the divine, he has not left behind him any guidance or ethical code to show his fellow men how to gain spiritual attainment or how to live otherwise than by the rule of monastic discipline and ego-soteric concentration. Unlike in the case of many other Indian religious leaders there was in his aloofness little room for concern for political, social and economic needs or aspirations of the Indian people. As a man of the world Svami Vivekananda understood and felt these matters more acutely, and subsequently superimposed on Ramakrishna's spirituality that altruistic edifice which his master's teaching lacked almost completely. But even Vivekananda and the mission failed India. The emancipation of India via the emancipation of the West and vice versa may be a splendid idea in the infinitely long run, but India needs food and people to produce it, and she needs speedy development in all areas of social and economic life; any rapid spiritual emancipation of the West through India is also a beautiful vision; as beautiful as was Ramakrishna's vision of Kāli, Jesus and Muhammad.

Gunnar Jarring: *An Eastern Turki-English Dialect Dictionary*. (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N.F. Avd. 1. Bd. 56. Nr.4) (Lund, 1964. 338 pp.)

Gunnar Jarring's *Eastern Turki-English Dialect Dictionary*, although containing vocabulary from the author's other publications and from Raquette's *English-Turki Dictionary of 1927*, is basically an index to the texts of the four volumes of his "Material to the Knowledge of Eastern Turki". These volumes, published between 1948 and 1952, were compiled from texts which the author collected in Kashmir in 1935 from informants—mainly farm workers and caravan men of a low standard of literacy—from the Khotan, Yarkand, Kashgar, Kucha and Guma areas of south western Sinkiang.

The dictionary thus comprises a word list of the colloquial language of an agricultural society of thirty years ago. It does not represent, nor does the author intend it to represent, the forms of the contemporary literary Uigur of the socially more advanced north of Sinkiang with its Russian and ever-growing Chinese influence.

The dictionary contains between 9,000 and 10,000 head-words and employs the author's well-known form of phonetic transcription which is sufficiently narrow to show dialect differences in pronunciation both as regards quality and length of vowels; there is a full and valuable cross reference to variants. It is unfortunate that Jarring did not feel able to include the total word material of all published Eastern Turki texts; his own "Materials" not only have a total word count of under 100,000 words (which is scarcely adequate for compiling a dictionary) but, being mainly unsophisticated folk-tales, have a restricted range of vocabulary and idiom. There are, for example, only six or eight idioms given under each of the common words *tut-* and *tur-/tu-/tu-*. Many more would have been thrown up if the net had been cast wider.

However, within the limits of the author's intention this painstaking and scholarly work will be of great value for the student of the Eastern Turki of the thirties. The book is produced with Lund University's usual standard of excellence.

C. G. SIMPSON

Peter H. Lee, *Korean Literature: Topics and Themes* (The Association for Asian Studies: *Monographs and Papers* No. XVI). Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1965. x + 142 pp. \$3.75.

This is a very short work on a very large subject. Only about ninety pages of it are actual text describing Korean literature. Of these, about sixty are full reprints of, or substantial verbatim quotations from various previous publications of Dr. Lee's. Several sections, indeed, have previously been published more than once. The reprinted passages are on the *hyangga* 樂歌, the Koryô 高麗 poems, the *sijo* 時調, the *kasa* 歌詞, pre-modern prose fiction and twentieth century verse. The new portions are as follows: "The *Hunmin Chôngûm* [訓民正音]", two pages on linguistics; "Early Yi [李] Dynasty Eulogies: the *Akchang* [樂章]", four pages, at first rather difficult to follow, perhaps because the information on the minor poems is so compressed, but clear and interesting on the two main works dealt with under this heading, the *Yongbi Ôch'ôn ka* 龍飛御天歌 and the *Wôrin Sôkpo* 月印釋譜; "The Drama", four pages on a subject which, as is admitted, belongs to the realm of folk-lore rather than that of literature; "Writings in Chinese", six pages which do little more than list a few writers of such literature with brief conventional comments; and "Twentieth-Century Literature: Prose", seven pages, which, together with the chapter on twentieth century verse, give considerable detail of twentieth century literature, with extremely orthodox criticisms, and very harsh judgements of those contemporary writers who are not popular.

The whole text is the same as the draft of the work with a preface dated December 1961 which was duplicated at Columbia University and subsequently made available in photographic reproduction as project 35 in "Research and Studies in Ural and Altaic Languages" by the American Council of Learned Societies.

As it now stands, as a survey of Korean literature, this work does not seem, in spite of its title, to be primarily concerned with the topics and themes of Korean literature. It appears to be rather a summary presentation of the published results of Korean scholarship, illustrated by selections from Dr. Lee's translations of Korean poetry. The coverage of the published results of others' work is wide, but the result is rather a version in English of a Korean textbook than an introduction to the subject specifically designed for western readers. Korean scholarly publications are remarkable for their exclusion of the lively discussion of vital questions which the same Korean scholars carry on outside their published works, and, of course, working from Korean publications alone precludes the raising of questions which westerners have to ask, but which do not need to be asked within the close teacher-student groups of Korean scholars. The genres of Korean literature, for instance, are presented here exactly as they are presented in print by Korean literary historians, without definition, and without comment on the basically different nature of these genres from the normally accepted genres of western literature. To take just one example, the *kasa* is presented simply as one genre of verse, though in fact it overlaps the novel (and therefore the diary and the biography also) to a large extent, occupies a part of the place occupied in western literature by the essay, and is often completely non-literary in content. Again, the chapters dealing with the twentieth century present from time to time in concentrated form a great deal of the factual information on the "literary movements" which has been amassed by Paek Ch'ôl 白德, but there is not a word to help the westerner realise that these movements, identified by such titles as "naturalistic" or "romantic", were essentially experiments in style, often repeated, occurring in a chronological sequence which has no connection at all with the sequence of the movements with the same names in the west, and not necessarily associated with the attitudes which the descriptions indicate when they are used of western writers.

The way this work was compiled also means that it reflects the heavy emphasis in Korean publications on the older works of Korean literature, particularly those of philological interest, and on traditional verse forms, particularly the *sijo*, the popular song form. In areas which have not been so widely treated it is correspondingly weak. There is probably no-one who could deal adequately with Korea's literature in Chinese as a part of Korean literature, and my own feeling is that it would have been better, in a short survey such as this, to have stated this simply and concentrated entirely upon literature in Korean. Of the literature in Korean which is treated here, pre-modern prose is treated in a particularly sketchy and unsatisfactory manner. The process of summarising briefly the generalisations of others, which are in turn based on far too little actual research, has produced a picture of the development of the novel in Korean which hardly touches at any point at all upon the reality of that development. One also notices in more than one chapter that when opinions which are in conflict are summarised, no attempt is made to reconcile the conflicts of opinion. The result is contradictions either within the text, as on the *Sandae* 山叢 (pages 84-85), or between the text, which represents orthodox opinion as held in 1961, and the footnotes, which report the results of some research work published since then, as on the *Kuun mong* 九雲夢 (pages 74-76).

There are minor errors which could easily have been avoided by reference to texts given in the bibliographies, such as *Pae paejang chôn* (not *Pae p'aejang chôn*) 裴裨將傳 for *Pae pijang chôn* 裴裨將傳 (pages 78-79, 80 and 138), and there are striking uncorrected misprints such as 1923 instead of 1913 as the date for the novel *Moran pong* 牧丹峰. I also found that the whole style of the work made it unnecessarily difficult to understand. Others may not be worried by this last feature, but many western readers will certainly not realise that the references to the Korean alphabet, for instance, or, more obviously, to Japan in the twentieth century, are highly charged emotionally. The sympathetic western reader will understand how a Korean can feel so strongly about Japan that he can patently contradict himself on the question of the beginnings of Korea's modern literature after 1905, but he may not realise that the same emotions have led here to an almost complete misrepresentation of the facts of literary history in the period 1880-1905 (page 101). Even more difficult to understand

would be the enthusiasm for the Korean alphabet which results in the rise of the novel in Korean being apparently associated with the invention of the alphabet, though the two are separated, according to Dr. Lee's reckoning, by a period of a hundred and fifty years (page 71), and even this is almost certainly a far too conservative estimate.

The "Comparative Chronology" of "Korea" and "The West", which occupies nine pages, gives no fresh information at all on Korean literature, and seems to be a particularly inconvenient way of tabulating material already presented. It could well have been dispensed with altogether. The lengthy bibliographies, which are given at the end of most of the chapters, appear to be little more than indiscriminate lists of titles such as any westerner interested in the subject will have already compiled for himself, or could easily find elsewhere, if he were well enough versed in the subject to be able to read profitably the works which are listed. Many works in the lists are of no literary interest at all, and one can think immediately of several works which could have been included for the stated purpose of these bibliographies, "the convenience of the reader who wishes to pursue further the matters which interest him" (page ix). If the reader in mind is a western reader, particular care should have been taken to include all the western works on Korean literature. They are, after all, few enough, and if one thinks only of these, not of the hundreds of works in Korean which are omitted, one notices at once the omission of Richard Rutt's article on the *sjjo*, S. E. Solberg's article on the *Kuun mong*, and Gale's translation of the *Ch'unhyang chôn* 春香傳.

This work is, to my knowledge, the first and only book-length survey of Korean literature in English. Its compiler states in his preface that "a literary history of Korea by one author which is at once comprehensive and authoritative over the whole field, is . . . almost impossible." Surely it is absolutely impossible, and the basic mistake was to aim at comprehensiveness and authority in such a work at this stage. To conclude so is not to single out one person as being incapable of the task. Not enough basic work has yet been done, and in fact the situation is far more serious than that. Only a fraction of Korea's pre-modern literature has even been published, in any modern sense of the word. Most of it is lying around in private or semi-private collections in undated, anonymous manuscript copies which few people can even read intelligently. Even to find a reliable text of a twentieth century novel can take years of patient searching, and a great deal of luck. It is much quicker to produce a reader's digest of any or all of the survey histories of Korean literature, but from such a work the westerner will gain no appreciation at all of the present needs in Korean literary studies. Nor will he be shown that he will be welcomed in Korea if he cares to help in doing the vast amount of basic work which must be done before we can aim at comprehensive and authoritative histories of Korean literature. This is a pity, because there is a great deal for the westerner to do if he wishes, and he can gain much enjoyment and satisfaction from sharing the work with Korean scholars.

W. E. SKILLEND

Chu-ting Li, *The Autumn Colors on the Ch'iao and Hua Mountains*. A Landscape by Chao Meng-fu. *Artibus Asiae*, Supplementum XXI. Ascona, 1965, 109 pp., 16 plates, 1 colour plate.

In this monograph, Mr. Chu-ting Li attempts two main tasks: First, a carefully documented study of Chao Meng-fu's famous handscroll of the Ch'iao and Hua Mountains in Autumn, including an extended stylistic analysis; and secondly, a reconstruction of the role of Chao Meng-fu in shaping the course of Chinese *literati* painting, based on Chao's own pictures, *The Ch'iao and Hua Mountains* and *The Water Village*, considered in the light of some earlier and later examples of landscape and of the comments of fellow artists and art historians. The tasks are not necessarily incompatible: the search for an individual style in Chao's landscapes is the link between them. Nevertheless, scrupulous verification of documentary evidence and sweeping generalizations regarding influences and derivation do not go well together,

so that the discussion often moves uneasily between certainty and conjecture. In spite of this dichotomy, the book is valuable and the author's theses, while generally unproved, seem often not far from the truth.

The monograph is divided into nine short chapters or sections. It is too densely packed with matter to be read as a long essay, so that chapter titles and a table of contents would have been helpful. The text is followed by an Appendix, which is a list of the seals, inscriptions and colophons with their positions on the Ch'iao and Hua Mountains handscroll indicated by numbers on a schematic diagram. The inscriptions and colophons are carefully transcribed and translated, and are further discussed in Section III of the text. I note that on p. 102 in the Appendix, the translation of Tung Ch'i-ch'ang's colophon of 1630 (No. 192) contains an error corrected in the version in the text (p. 30). The occasion of the picture, which Chao painted for his friend, Chou Mi, and the relevant inscription are explained in Section II. (It should perhaps be pointed out that the picture was done in the twelfth month of the first year of Yuan-chen, i.e. almost certainly early in 1296 rather than late in 1295.) This, the largely factual, portion of the book is generally sound.

In contrast, Mr. Li's treatment of styles and influences seems boldly speculative; yet it is the more interesting part of his study. The problem of interpreting traditional ideals of excellence in terms of the aesthetic criteria of today is not, however, always resolved. There are perceptive analyses in Sections I and VI of the two handscrolls, *Ch'iao and Hua Mountains* (1296), painted in ink and colours, and *The Water Village* (1302), an ink painting; yet, taken together, they reveal a somewhat ambivalent attitude towards the different styles of the two landscapes. Thus the 'compartmental division' and the arbitrary scale of objects in *Ch'iao and Hua Mountains* are shown to have been deliberately intended:

"The schematic arrangement, the compartmental division, and the arbitrary shapes of objects are all parts of his attempt to fit the elements of nature into an inner vision. In this connection, a most obvious element is his handling of the scale of objects. For example, the mountains seem very small compared with the trees and houses which appear to be near them . . . Yet this arbitrary scale seems to have been chosen for the purpose of achieving a pictorial unity, as if to suppress the potentially overpowering mountains on the one hand and the genre activities of villagers and fishermen on the other in order to present a feeling of calm and quietude." (p. 16)

But the concession to the inner vision is rescinded in the discussion of *The Water Village* as compared with the earlier picture:

"Very skilfully, he has removed the obvious compartmental division by putting the foreground to the right and the distant mountain toward the left. More notably, the relative scale of the objects is more correct, and the progression from the foreground to the background is much smoother, for the field of vision has been greatly extended, making the ground seem much less tilted. Most important of all, the separateness and individuality of the main motifs in the [*Ch'iao and Hua Mountains*] have been replaced by a subordination of mountains, trees, houses, boats and others to the total effect in the *Water Village* . . . In all, the 1302 painting is more unified and expresses a more subtle poetic feeling." (p. 55)

Thus it would seem better simply to admit that the artist was attempting different things and following different models in the two pictures than to subject their rival claims to the same kind of scrutiny. That Chao Meng-fu was following different models is in fact the starting point of Mr. Li's investigation. This leads him to compare the *Ch'iao and Hua Mountains* with the stone carving of 1617 of Kuo Chung-shu's copy of Wang Wei's *Wang-ch'uan* handscroll (in Section IV), and to reconstruct the development of the form of the handscroll during the Sung (in Section V). Further, he proceeds (in Section VII) from the *Water Village* to trace the Tung Yuan tradition in landscape. Much of this is too conjectural to be taken seriously as a historical inquiry, but Mr. Li's attention to the geographical setting of landscapes is a definite step

forward. He notes, for instance, on pp. 62-3 that Tung Yüan was a Southerner and painted southern landscapes. And, given a certain bias towards Chao Meng-fu's talents and achievement, Mr. Li's conclusions regarding the artist's aims and development seem on the whole acceptable, as, for example:

"Naturally enough . . . there is a certain eclecticism . . . It is clear that Chao's intention was not simply to continue the northern painting of his own days, but to search into the more remote period of the T'ang, for his new inspiration. In this grouping, he left the Southern Sung style of Hsia Kuei and other academic painters behind, and to a certain degree even turned away from the Northern Sung tradition . . ." (p. 52).

It is Mr. Li's contention that, by creating his own style in landscape, Chao established a new tradition, transforming that of 'T'ang and Northern Sung from a revelation of the all-encompassing spirit that pervades the universe to an expression of personal feeling toward nature in the Chiang-nan landscape' (p. 58). About Chao's precise role in the establishment of such a tradition, one may well argue; but his importance as a landscape painter who certainly anticipated, and very likely influenced, Huang Kung-wang should not be under-estimated, and Mr. Li deserves warm praise for his recognition of this. At the same time, it must be pointed out that Chao's younger contemporaries seem not to have consciously imitated his style to any great extent. Certainly Huang Kung-wang, who wrote poems on Chao's pictures, and Ni Tsan, who praised him highly, do not speak of deriving their own styles from Chao. It may be noted, too, that in an inscription on his own picture, *Mountains in Summer* (*Hsia shan t'u*), Huang recalls Tung Yüan's picture of the same name, which in earlier days he had seen time and again in Chao's home. (See Wen Chao-t'ung (ed.), *Huang Kung-wang shih-liao* 溫肇桐, 黃公逵史料, 1963, p. 28; Huang's poems written on Chao's pictures are on pp. 21-2.)

The effect of Chao's search into the past upon his contemporaries and later men is further discussed in Section VIII, and continued in the concluding Section (IX). Indeed Chao's ideas would seem to have had a greater following than his pictures. On p. 77, Chao's "classicism" (*ku-i*, "spirit of antiquity") is declared to be "epoch-making", in effect the source of all later Chinese painting. There is no doubt that as patron and collector, and as artist and teacher, Chao exerted considerable influence upon taste and thus helped to mould the landscape tradition. We may agree with Mr. Li, too, that in upholding Wang Wei and Tung Yüan, he led men's thoughts to T'ang and Northern Sung examples. Thus it was chiefly as someone who had transmitted the brushwork and spirit of Wang Wei that Chao appealed to Tung Ch'i-ch'ang, whose omission of Chao from his lineage of *literati* painting (p. 84) need therefore cause no particular surprise. (Su T'ung-p'o, Wen T'ung, Kao K'o-kung, Li K'an were also not included.) Indeed by Mr. Li's demonstration in Sections I and VI, Chao's style was not immutable, but a continually evolving one, so that it was natural for other painters to look beyond Chao to Chao's models, as did even his own grandson, Wang Meng (p. 73).

Thus the commonly accepted view of Chao Meng-fu as an eclectic and a virtuoso of the brush is not really altered by this study, but Mr. Li has well brought out the seriousness of purpose behind the eclecticism and the depth of feeling in each brush-stroke of the virtuoso.

H. C. CHANG

*Chinese Newspaper Manual*, edited by Tien-yi Li. Yale Mirror Series No. 15, Yale U.P., 1963.

This newspaper *manual* should not be confused with the newspaper *readers* published in the Mirror Series. It consists mainly of a glossary of names of people, places, government offices and newspapers that one might meet in reading the mainland or Taiwan press. The last year taken into account appears to have been 1961; politicians such as Ben Bella who came to prominence after then are not included. The glossary is followed by nearly 70 pp. of appendixes which usefully classify much of its matter,

with the aid of maps and charts. Inevitably the appendix of simplified characters is by now in need of supplementation. Given that it cannot be right up to date, this book should prove very helpful to the average reader. I have only one complaint, and that is with the way the glossary is arranged. What Prof. Li calls "a convenient system of stroke counting and stroke order" is to me just fiddling: why not alphabetical order? But whatever arrangement is used there should be some notation at the head of the page to enable one to find one's place quickly.

D. E. POLLARD

John Lust (comp.), assisted by Werner Eichhorn: *Index Siniticus: a catalogue of articles relating to China in periodicals and other collective publications, 1920-1955*. Heffer, Cambridge, 1964. £8 8s od

It is now more than forty years since the publication of the supplement to Cordier's *Bibliotheca Sinica*. As Cordier's work was designed as a complete bibliography of Western contributions to sinology, whatever their form, it provided contemporary scholars with a detailed map of the whole field so that even beginners could easily survey what work had been done in their chosen subject of research and make sure that they were preparing new ground. Unfortunately even the best bibliographies soon become out-of-date unless supplements are published regularly, and this is particularly true in the case of Western sinology which made considerable advances in quantity as well as quality during the last few decades. It is all the more surprising that we should have had to wait so long for a continuation of Cordier's work, for Yuan T'ung-li's *China in Western literature*, which dealt with books published after 1921, did not appear until 1958. But as Dr. Yuan's book did not include articles published in journals, the more serious gap still remained, for while seasoned scholars were no doubt familiar with periodical publications on their subject, those new to the field would become aware of them only through references to them in other works, or by chance, while on the other hand they could find some at least of the books arranged according to subjects on the shelves of good sinological libraries. For this reason the publication of the *Index Siniticus* will be welcomed by all students of China, and especially by those who remember long hours spent taking down one volume after another in the hope of coming across a relevant article.

The work contains nearly 20,000 entries, referring to articles in Western languages scattered over hundreds of periodicals, memorial volumes, collective works, and proceedings of congresses. It refers not only to articles written by scholars for specialist journals in Oriental studies, but also to those from other disciplines which have a bearing on China, and many of a less scholarly character. Not all sinologists may welcome the inclusion of work of a more popular character since it must have increased the size and cost of the work considerably, but as the *Index* is explicitly designed for the use of the general reader, as well as of the specialist, the latter can have no grounds for complaint on this score.

The arrangement in the main follows that of Dr. Yuan's work, with minor modifications. There are twenty sections on various aspects of China, all further subdivided into subsections, and additional sections dealing with Manchuria, Mongolia, Tibet, Sinkiang and central Asian connexions, Hsi-Hsia, Hongkong and Macao. The main body of the work is followed by two indices, of authors and subjects.

The compilers have only listed articles which they have been able to examine personally, and they disclaim any pretence of completeness. While one cannot quarrel with such a limitation on principle, one wishes that unavailable articles had nevertheless been mentioned, provided they were marked in some way to warn readers that they had not been inspected personally. Less comprehensible are omissions of contributions to journals which the *Index* does claim to cover, as for instance: W. Eberhard and H. Wist: *Bibliographie China, Ethnologischer Anzeiger*, 4, i (1944), 308-471, and Rudolf Loewenthal: *Works on the Far East and Central Asia published in the U.S.S.R.*, 1937-1947, *FEQ* 8 (1949), 172-183. One also misses some important reviews, such as those of *Grammata Serica* by Chao Yuan-jen and Demiéville in *Language* 17 (1941).

60-67 and *BSLP* 43, ii (1936), 139-144, or of Karlgren's contributions to *BMFEA* 18 by Eberhard in *AA* 9 (1946), 355-364.

It is natural that a work of such scope and size should contain some mistakes. Some numbers in the index of authors have no counterpart in the body of the work and vice-versa, but mistakes in figures are easy to make and difficult to correct. There are also quite a few spelling mistakes and it is surprising that not more of the obvious ones were corrected at the proof stage. The spelling of names in particular is sometimes unnecessarily haphazard, as for instance when Mánchen-Helfen and Reidemeister are each spelt in three different ways in successive entries (15095-7, 13610-2). Admittedly these mistakes are trifling and so obvious that they are not likely to mislead anyone, but when "substantial complexes" is printed as "substantial complexes" (11494) and "formal characteristics" as "formal characters" (12084), one wonders whether the reader would not be misled about the nature of the articles. More serious still are cases where entries are not listed in the section to which they belong. *Der ert jann and Der jiann in Luencyu VII*, 25 (9551) should be under *Grammar*, not *Philosophy*. *In der Heimat des Konfuzius, Eine Reiseerinnerung* (9556) also has little to do with philosophy, being the account of a journey in Shantung. *Han dynasty tombs in Szechwan* (12458) is listed under subsection *General*, not *West and South China*, where it belongs. *Why Chinese business is not business* (9719) is listed under *Confucianism*, presumably because of its subtitle: *Ways in which Confucian etiquette hinders the industrialization of China*, but it is doubtful whether students of Confucianism will be interested in it. It should at least also have been listed under the sections of *Industry* and *Sociology*. Many of the articles on the Confucian Classics should also have been listed under other sections, as well as under the subsection of *Philosophy* where they occur, in view of the compilers' intention of serving the general reader who would not know that they also cover other subjects. One hopes also that in the ten years' supplement announced on the jacket the list of sources will give the place of publication for each source.

These points do not however invalidate the usefulness of this long overdue work of reference. Few scholars will not find in it much that is new to them outside their special subjects, while many will discover something that has eluded them even within their own field.

GEORGE WEYS

M. D. Raghavan, *India in Ceylonese History, Society and Culture*, Asia Publishing House, London, 1965 (for Indian Council for Cultural Relations), 190 pp. + xvi and 17 pl.

Dr. M. D. Raghavan, formerly Professor of Anthropology at Madras, held for nine years the post of Ethnologist of the National Museums of Ceylon, and now enjoys the title of Ethnologist Emeritus. As a south Indian by birth he is therefore well qualified to discuss the relationships between Indian - mainly south Indian - and present-day Ceylonese culture; and in fact the most interesting portions of this book are those where he does draw on his own knowledge of south India, in particular of Kerala, and make comparisons with cultural features in present-day Ceylon. The first portion of the book is of less interest.

After an initial excursus into the Ramayana, a brief historical resumé indicates the periods at which various immigrant groups first arrived in Ceylon, starting with the Sinhalese and the story of Vijaya. Much of this information is discussed at greater length in Dr. Raghavan's book *The Karava of Ceylon*. The chapter devoted to caste in Ceylon is uninformative and does not consider the contemporary state of affairs. Dr. Raghavan states quaintly that "caste had a traditional vogue in the social structure of the island", but "that the functional differences of the feudal days are steadily giving way especially to the levelling tendencies of Buddhism." He does not give any specific examples of the levelling effects of Buddhism in Ceylon, and though it is true that the Buddhist canonical texts take no official cognizance of caste, it is equally certain that the caste system of the island by 1850 showed few signs of melting away with the effects of 2000 years of Buddhism; any evaporation which may have occurred since

then has been stimulated rather by the imposition of a cash economy together with the levelling tendencies of the colonial government.

The historical section of the book is completed by a review of the independent Sinhalese kingdoms down to 1815. It is not clear what the author means by saying that "the hesitancy of historians to accept the pre-Buddhistic age of Ceylon as historical is unfair to the Mahavamsa chronology"; the Mahavamsa chronology of the immediate successors of Vijaya is notoriously impossible. The occasional quotation from the Yalpana Vaipava Malai is of interest in this section, but since this work is seldom used in general histories of Ceylon it would have been desirable to say something about its date and origin. The Indian period of Ceylonese history is here considered to end with the invasion of Magha in 1214, and though Dr. Raghavan says that "a fresh spell of south Indian contacts is seen to begin" in 1232, it is clear from the brevity of the subsequent summary that he attaches less importance to this. In general, there is little in this historical resumé which is not to be found in many other summaries of Ceylonese history. The erratic (Dravidian?) spelling of many proper names is a minor irritant which is especially noticeable in the historical sections (e.g. Devanampiyya, Kasyappa, Muggalana, Manavanna).

The remainder of the work is much more informative. One chapter is devoted to the Tamil contribution to Ceylonese culture and Tamil legends concerning the early settlements. Here, incidentally, the author quotes with approval G. C. Mendis's statement that "the Sinhalese caste system is so similar to the caste system of south India", whereas earlier (p. 30) he has said that Buddhism operated against the growth in Ceylon of a caste system such as developed in India. An account of the gods worshipped in Ceylon, and of Buddhism in south India, is followed by historical surveys of Sinhalese literature and art. The literary survey is little but a catalogue, inaccurate in some respects, for instance the relative dates of Tisara sandesa and Mayura sandesa. It is hardly correct to say that Pali "developed from a north Indian dialect, Magadhi, which must have been the lingua of the early Indian Buddhist missionaries to Ceylon." Little mention is made of the strong influence of Sanskrit on all except the very earliest surviving examples of Sinhalese literature.

Dr. Raghavan then considers Sinhalese dance and drama at some length. The final section is concerned with cultural affinities with south India observable at the present day, and this is the most interesting section of the book.

In general, this book is good where the author is discussing something of which he has first-hand knowledge, or where he gives historical information (as for instance on the Tamil people in Ceylon) which is usually omitted in general works on Ceylon. Where Dr. Raghavan is merely summarizing the views of others, as he is in many of the earlier portions, the book is less worthwhile.

C. H. B. REYNOLDS

Dietrich Seckel, *The Art of Buddhism*, translated by Ann E. Keep, London, Methuen, 1964, 331 pp., 165 illustrations.

In his foreword, Dr. Seckel admits that his task in this volume, "to provide a comprehensive survey that will do justice to Buddhism as a world religion", presents a serious problem of compression and synthesis. His solution is ingenious and effective. The first half of the book briefly traces the development of Buddhism and Buddhist art in each area chosen, while the second deals in detail with a number of key problems and features in Buddhist art in such a way that we are naturally led from one area to another. The titles of these sections alone show how much that is essential the author has been able to cover by this approach: From the Stūpa to the Pagoda; Monasteries and Temples; The Buddha Image; The Hierarchy of Sacred Figures; Narrative Works; Symbolism and Ornamentation. Only the absence of any reference to Tibet or Burma, which, with Korea, are treated by other authors in a separate volume in this series, prevents this book from being a truly comprehensive introductory survey of the whole world of Buddhist art. Dr. Seckel has read widely, and his material has been selected with care and is, for the most part, up to date. The need to avoid personal bias

and to pack in as much information as possible gives the text somewhat the character of a series of encyclopaedia articles, but this is a small price to pay for a very judicious choice of examples and an unerring eye for the key problems. Altogether the book is highly to be recommended. The plates are mostly good, though often rather too intense in colour. The line drawings in the text are badly smudged, however, owing to having been printed on unsuitable paper.

Dr. Seckel's *Die Buddhistische Kunst Ostasiens* has already established him as a leading specialist in the Buddhist art of China and especially of Japan, and it is not to be expected that his knowledge of other regions should be as extensive. On the whole, he succeeds in unravelling the complex interplay of Hinduism and Buddhism, Hinayāna and Mahāyāna, in the art of South-east Asia, but there are some omissions and oversimplifications. He writes, for example, on page 58, that the Siamese Buddha image at Sukhothai "developed out of a fusion of the Dvāravati tradition with the Buddhist art of Cambodia produced after the Bayon period in the thirteenth century". While this is true as far as it goes, it leaves out of account the very powerful influence on Sukhothai of Ceylon, with which King Ram Kambhēng had close religious and cultural ties after the expulsion of the Khmer. Both the architecture and the sculpture of Wat Mahāthāt at Sukhothai and the colossus at Pisnulok owe at least as much to Polonnāruwa as they do to earlier South-east Asian styles. This oversight is perhaps partly accounted for by the very little space allotted in this book to Ceylon. Again, Dr. Seckel oversimplifies when, in speaking of the effect of the Cham invasion of the Khmer Empire, he writes, "The catastrophe of 1177 . . . brought the extinction of the Hindu tradition." Although the central cult image of the Bayon and, indeed, those of Ta Prohm and Preah Khan were Buddhist, much that was Hindu survived, and Dr. Seckel says himself a few lines further on, "the Bayon is by no means a purely Buddhist monument".

It is perhaps idle to continue the argument as to whether the predominant Western influence on the art of Gandhāra was Greek or Roman, but Dr. Seckel is very definite on this point. "Some Hellenistic elements may have reached Gandhāra by way of the Parthians", he admits, but he states categorically that "the decisive influence on Gandhāran art was that of the Roman Empire". This represents the view current a decade ago, and put forcefully by Sir Mortimer Wheeler, which was itself a reaction against the long-accepted view of Gandhāran art as "Greco-Buddhist". But recent discoveries in Afghanistan suggest that in the early stages of its development Gandhāran art was strongly influenced by that of the Hellenistic world, both directly and through Parthia. As Daniel Schlumberger wrote in 1958, "The finds at Surkh Kotal as well as some other places (Ayrtam on the Oxus, the Kuh-i Kwāja in Sistān), definitely point towards Gandhāra art having taken shape in a world still outside the reach of Roman influence, in a world of Hellenized art at Iranian courts. They point towards this art being originally nothing else than Greco-Iranian art made to serve Buddhism."<sup>1</sup> To these examples we might add the Aśōkan inscription in pure Greek and Aramaic found in 1958 on a rock face near Old Kandahar in southern Afghanistan.

Other points of detail will occur to specialists in one area of Buddhist art or another, but they hardly diminish the great measure of success with which Dr. Seckel has accomplished what might have seemed an impossible task.

MICHAEL SULLIVAN

*Ministers of Modernization. Elite Mobility in the Meiji Restoration 1868-1873*, by Bernard S. Silberman. Tucson, University of Arizona Press, 1964. pp. xi, 135.

This book presents a detailed study of 253 men who held high office in the Meiji government in the years 1868-73, examining their geographical and social origins, educational background, and political experience, with a view to identifying the factors which made for membership of the political elite of early Meiji Japan. Since the sample includes the great majority of those who held ministerial and vice-ministerial positions

<sup>1</sup> "Surkh Kotal", *Antiquity*, 33, 130 (June 1959), p. 87.

in the period 1875-1900, the results also throw light on the determinants of upward mobility within the Meiji bureaucracy itself.

The author begins with a survey of stratification in late-Tokugawa society, in terms of social, economic and legal status. He then examines factors which seem to have determined elite mobility before the Restoration (socio-economic expansion, family status, the values and norms of Tokugawa society) and also the significance of stratum differentials and regional differences in this context. This leads him to state a number of hypotheses which are tested—and for the most part substantiated—in the remaining chapters of the book, where an analysis of the sample is presented in detail, largely in tabular form. Its conclusions might be summarized as follows:

- (1) Major factors in deciding upward mobility were the possession of a knowledge of the West, whether through education or personal contact, and participation before 1868 in non-traditional political activity (the latter being defined as any administrative or political activity which was abnormal in the light of a given individual's background and position).
- (2) Socio-economic pressures were greatest on the lower samurai, who suffered from severe status deprivation in the late Tokugawa period. This gave them a motive for seeking to reassert their relative position in society, which in turn made them more likely than other groups to achieve promotion by non-traditional means.
- (3) Socio-economic pressures also varied regionally. As a result, some domains—chiefly those which had experienced substantial population growth since 1750, like Satsuma, Chōshū, Tosa, Hizen, Owari, and Fukui—contributed more members to the Meiji elite than others.
- (4) The continued importance of certain traditional factors, like inherited family status, meant that few of those from non-elite groups in Tokugawa Japan achieved elite status after 1868. In other words, change was mostly *within* the old elite. For the same reason, some members of the Tokugawa upper elite were able to maintain their position after 1868 even without knowledge of the West or a record of non-traditional political activity though this group decreased sharply in size with the passage of time.

In sum, this attempt to apply sociological techniques to an historical problem is both welcome and rewarding. It gives greater substance to a number of hypotheses about the Meiji Restoration which have been all too often in the past subjects of guess-work or speculation, and it opens up several important avenues for further investigation. Most of its results are themselves acceptable. Nevertheless, the fact that such studies are rare, and that the statistical presentation of information is sometimes more convincing than the evidence strictly warrants, makes it necessary to examine such a book with particular care. I turn, therefore, to a number of points of criticism—though in doing so, I would emphasize that my purpose is not to disparage the author's work, but to contribute, if possible, to the further development of the method he employs, in the hope that it may continue to be applied to the study of this and similar problems.

First, there are a number of possible objections to the analysis of Tokugawa society on which Professor Silberman's elite categories are based. Thus, it seems unwise to treat all *kuge* as belonging to a single stratum (the highest), for economically, at least, many of them have to be placed a good deal lower. Indeed, some attempt to subdivide them might well have strengthened the book's argument as a whole, by bringing out a mobility pattern not so very different from that which obtained for samurai. More important, however, is the matter of subdividing the samurai. To distinguish between upper and lower samurai primarily in terms of income, as is done here, taking approximately 100 *koku* as the dividing line, is an oversimplification which is potentially misleading. It is doubtful whether it coincides with the *formal* status division, as contemporaries would have accepted it, in any of the smaller domains. Nor, for special reasons, does it work very well for Satsuma. By contrast, many Tosa *gōshi* families, who are presumably lower samurai by definition (as *gōshi*), in fact had income of well over 100 *koku*. Together, these considerations suggest that the lower samurai group, as identified in the tables, may be rather larger than the realities of pre-Restoration society entirely justify. This reinforces the author's own plea for more rigorous study of the social structure of Tokugawa Japan, as well as indicating that elite continuity in the earliest years of Meiji may have been even greater in some respects than he asserts.



*Second*, there are some doubts about the argument that socio-economic expansion, as reflected in population growth, explains the geographical distribution of the sample. For one thing, the population figures themselves are only approximate. For another, there are areas, like Izumo and Etchū, which apparently had high rates of population growth without contributing at all substantially to the Meiji elite. Anomalies of this kind need to be accounted for, if the hypothesis is to stand. Geographical distribution, after all, can be explained in another way. Political circumstances in 1868 made it necessary for the new government to have the support of as many domains as possible, in order to remain in power. It achieved this partly by its appointments to office, that is, by choosing men from all domains which had contributed, however hesitantly, to the anti-Tokugawa movement. The question then becomes, why had these particular domains acted as they had? To this the argument about socio-economic expansion is clearly relevant, but it is by no means sufficient in itself. In other words, to argue from geographical differences in socio-economic expansion directly to membership of the Meiji elite is to omit an intermediate stage, consideration of the reasons for the political alignment of the *han*. It thereby narrows the range of factors to be taken into account. *Third*, a similar point can be made about the proportion of *kuze*, *daimyō* and upper samurai to be found in the sample. These, too, represented interests which the new government found it wise to conciliate, though the rapid improvement in the government's position during 1868 meant that few of these men remained in office in the following year. This is implicit in Professor Silberman's comments on length of service (Table 31), but is never linked specifically by him to political events. It would have helped to know, for example, how many of the men in the sample held office only before the administrative reorganization of 15 August 1869. *Finally*, it needs to be emphasized that Professor Silberman limits himself to the study of a political elite. Almost simultaneously there has appeared a book on Meiji entrepreneurs (J. Hirschmeier, *The origins of entrepreneurship in Meiji Japan*, Harvard U.P., 1964) which indicates that mobility patterns for the economic elite, though similar, were not entirely the same. Specifically, the successful entrepreneurs were drawn from a rather wider range of strata in pre-Meiji Japan. This may only mean that traditional restraints on upward movement continued to operate in political life more effectively than they did outside it. On the other hand, it may be that our analysis of Tokugawa society is still inadequate, in the sense that it does not provide satisfactory evidence about systems of stratification. In either event, much important work remains to be done in the kind of study to which Professor Silberman has so fruitfully turned his attention.

W. G. BEASLEY

Benjamin B. Weems, *Reform, Religion, and the Heavenly Way* (The Association for Asian Studies: *Monographs and Papers*, No. XV). Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1964, xi + 122 pp. \$3.75.

This is stated to be a revised version of an M.A. thesis presented at Georgetown University in 1955. It describes the origin of the Ch'ōndogyo 天道教 in its late Yi Dynasty political and social setting, and the development of that religion, both as a religion and as a social and political force, in the course of its involvement in Korean history down to 1950. The part played by the Ch'ōndogyo in the last hundred years of Korea's history has indeed, as the author states, been noteworthy, and one shares his astonishment that no analytical political study of the movement had previously been made. There still seems to be no work in Korean which satisfactorily assembles all the information on the subject, and this work appears to be the only one in any western language which treats it at all fully. It is a clearly written general account of the subject, and welcome as such.

It does, however, have a serious weakness, and that is that it is based almost entirely upon secondary sources. In particular it relies very heavily on the authorised *History of the Origin and Establishment of the Ch'ōndogyo* (Ch'ōndogyo Ch'anggōn-sa 天道教創基史, 1933), with little or no checking in primary sources. Admittedly

this is common practice in Korean studies, admittedly the primary sources are almost always difficult to find and difficult to handle, and admittedly this is essentially a work of ten years ago, when Korean studies were very poorly developed everywhere in every field. This is a very good study by the standards of that time and a good study by present average standards, but it may not be completely unfair to suggest that higher standards might be set now.

Once or twice, on minor points in this book, evidence happens to be produced which conflicts with that of the "*History*". For instance, the "*History*" is quoted as stating that "many tens of thousands" of followers gathered at the palace to petition the King in March 1893, but it is noted that an American report says "forty" (pages 25-26). One would therefore expect the evidence of the "*History*" on more crucial points to be questioned. This never seems to be done. The most crucial point, to my mind, is the attitude of the Ch'ōndogyo towards Japan. On the facts presented here from the "*History*", Son Pyōng-hi 孫秉熙, the third leader of the Ch'ōndogyo, lived in Japan from the spring of 1901 to the early part of 1906 (page 52), in 1903 he urged the Korean government to join Japan actively in the coming fight with Russia (page 53), and after that war started in February 1904 he donated to the Japanese War Ministry 10,000 Yen - which must have been many millions of donations from the faithful of "a spoonful of rice a day" (page 55). Suddenly, however, still in 1904, when Son heard that active assistance was being given to the Japanese forces in Korea by members of the Ch'ōndogyo, he was "disturbed. It was too late, however, for him to take any corrective action" (page 56). We are given only the authority of the "*History*" for this change of attitude, as also for his reported decision in the autumn of 1905 that Korea should not accept Japanese protection because it could not be a step towards Korean independence (page 57). The conclusions drawn from this here colour the view presented of the role and policies of the Ch'ōndogyo for the next few decades. Chapter VI opens: "Events proved the soundness of Son Pyōng-hi's conviction that Japanese 'protection' and Korean independence were incompatible." One takes rather a different view if one has doubts as to which came first, the conviction or the events of November 1905 and later. I have recently had occasion to raise this question of Korean attitudes to Japan in the first decade of this century in connection with the newspaper *Mansebo* 萬歲報 which seems to show that the Ch'ōndogyo was not dissociated from pro-Japanese policies, such as those proposed by the Ilchinhoe 一蓮會, as late as 1908. I do not wish to criticize Mr. Weems for not having referred to this particular source, which has, not untypically, turned up rather mysteriously within the past two or three years after having been completely lost for a very long time. The point is that when we do find sources like *Mansebo*, they seem always to contradict what we knew of any period or subject from our secondary sources. We must clearly be extremely critical in our use of all sources.

Apart from such technicalities, it seems to me that this study in general either raises important questions without investigating them or fails to see that important questions are raised by the account which it gives of the Ch'ōndogyo. It is clear from this account, for instance, that at its founding Ch'ōndogyo bore more than a superficial resemblance to Christianity. An investigation of the "wholly Catholic communities" which Yu Hong-nyōl 柳洪烈 states (*Han'guk Ch'ōnju Kyohae-sa* 韓國天主教會史, pages 579-580) were Ch'oe Che-u's 崔濟愚 main contact with Christianity might show that the Korean government had more reason for executing Ch'oe than his use of one or two terms from Catholicism. Everything which we are told here of the original state of Ch'ōndogyo smacks of a very primitive, socially active type of Christianity. There is also some documentation of supernatural acts performed at Ch'ōndogyo meetings, and direct quotation from that to my mind would illustrate the power of this religion much more clearly than the discussion of its philosophical basis. After all, when one looks at the sources for that philosophy, they are written in almost incomprehensible mystical language. It surprises me to read that "the theology and philosophy . . . were such as to appeal to the scholarly mind". The one thing the scholarly mind of the Yi Dynasty could not stand was the dog-Chinese in which Ch'oe Che-u expressed himself. This sort of thing presumably appealed to certain Korean

instincts in much the same way as did the works of his slightly older contemporary, Kim Sakkat 金筮, but not to the Korean scholarly mind. Again, the question of whether there was any active Japanese support of any sort for the Tonghak 東學 rebellion of 1894 has been more thoroughly investigated than it is here, and the conclusions were exactly the opposite of those presented here (page 43; compare Conroy: *The Japanese Seizure of Korea*, pages 230-231 and 414-415). Those conclusions should either be accepted or specifically refuted, and the Ch'ōndogyo's own account of its attitude or attitudes towards Japan in the period 1894 to 1910 should at the same time, as I have already indicated, be looked at a little more critically. After 1910, the Ch'ōndogyo, as well as other bodies in Korea, and many eminent individuals, adopted a policy of trying to work as Korean patriots within the framework of laws imposed by a government whose policy was deny Korean nationalism. The strain imposed was very great, and its effects were felt in every field of Korean life during the Japanese occupation. It accounts to a large extent for the way apparently trivial differences divided Koreans so bitterly both during the occupation and after the liberation. However, I cannot find any statement of this strain or even any clear statement of just what the policy of the Ch'ōndogyo under the Japanese amounted to. There is a similar lack of clarity in the statement of the Ch'ōndogyo attitude towards communism after 1945. It seems fairly clear that communism offered something very close to the way the Ch'ōndogyo ideal of heaven upon earth would have worked out in practice, but there is so much hesitation and qualification in Mr. Weems' description of this period that one cannot easily see it as a plain, if unpalatable fact which must be faced if we are to assess either movement, the Ch'ōndogyo or the communist movement, accurately.

It is not, of course, fair to any work under review to suggest that it should have done more than it does, but at least there do seem to be omissions of important fact, for instance O Se-ch'ang's 吳世昌 declared support for the communists after the Korean War started in 1950, and several minor points which could have been checked very easily by reference to some source material. The *Nae-sudomun* 內修道文 (page 16) is not "Inner Rules for Conduct" in which Ch'oe Si-hyōng 崔時亨 "formalized [his] religious and ethical principles", but practical rules for women in the running of their households and their own lives, as a glance through them will show. "Kung-i" is not a personal name (page 28), but a transcription as Chinese of the Ch'ōndogyo's mystical characters 弓乙 which are read in Korean *kung-ai*. Che-u 濟愚 is not, strictly speaking, the personal name of the founder of the Ch'ōndogyo, but a name which he made for himself, meaning something like "Helper of the Ignorant", after he undertook his religious mission, and this well-known fact could very easily have been mentioned.

However, there is a great deal of information in this work. At least the facts given are set out clearly enough for the reader to see how the conclusions are reached. There is still room for a fuller work on the Ch'ōndogyo, but there is no reason why full use cannot be made of this work in future. It is, by and large, a firm stepping stone on the edge of the quagmire of Korean studies. One might wish that it had solved all the problems of the last hundred years of Korea's history, but at least one is grateful for its help in solving some of these problems. I was particularly grateful to see the magazine *Kaebiyōk* 開闢 from Mr. Weems' point of view. I had previously known it only as a vehicle for a small, and on the surface rather precious, group of writers in the early 1920's who adopted the naturalistic techniques of western literature. As such they - writers like Yōm Sang-sōp 廉想涉 - had not fitted at all well into the pattern of Korean literature, but when one sees *Kaebiyōk* as a part of the Ch'ōndogyo's policy under the Japanese after 1910, things make much more sense. One feels that literary historians have been basically mistaken in concentrating on literary techniques. If Mr. Weems is correct in describing *Kaebiyōk* as an "official journal of the Ch'ōndogyo" (I have no reason to doubt that he is, but no history of Korean literature mentions the fact, and one would probably have to go to Korea to find a copy of the magazine), then we may be able to rearrange some of the facts of Korean literary history into a more meaningful pattern. Such is the state of Korean studies. Their state is all the better for the publication of this work by Mr. Weems.