

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS

Chinese Civilization and Bureaucracy: Variations on a theme. By Etienne Balazs. Translated by H. M. Wright. Edited by Arthur F. Wright. New Haven and London (Yale University Press, 1964).

As the editor of this collection rightly emphasizes, the great contribution of Etienne Balazs to western sinology was to insist that it ask basic questions about the nature of Chinese society instead of concerning itself exclusively, as it sometimes seemed to be doing, with philological trivia. In asking such questions Balazs was following in the footsteps of Marx and Weber and there were others in his generation who had the same kind of purpose but, in contrast to those who supposed that sociological theory was sufficient in itself, Balazs also brought to Chinese studies a sound scholarly discipline and broad humanistic interests in the best European tradition. With these aims and methods and driven by the passionate concern of a man for whom historical studies were no escape from present reality but an essential means of understanding and confronting that reality, Etienne Balazs was a source of great inspiration to many of us of a younger generation and those who benefited from personal contacts with him will remember and value this as much as his legacy of published works.

The principal items in this legacy are first of all his doctoral thesis, "Beiträge zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte der T'ang-Zeit" (MSOS 1931, 1932, 1933), now perhaps somewhat outdated but a pioneering landmark in its time; then the two extensively annotated and commented translations, *Traité économique du Souei-chou* and *Traité juridique du Souei-chou*. With the *Traité juridique du Tsin-chou*, as yet unpublished but reportedly existing in manuscript and now being edited for publication, these will form a trilogy of basic material on the institutions of China in the period between Han and T'ang. The great co-operative enterprise on the Sung which Balazs initiated and to which he largely devoted himself in the latter years of his life remains unfinished, but a number of preliminary manuals have been produced and a team is carrying on now in Paris which, it is hoped, will in due course bring the work to fruition.

Besides these major works there were many learned articles and the present volume contains the most important of these, translated into English by Mrs. H. M. Wright. The collection was originally planned while he was still alive as a means of making his work better known to the English-speaking world, and it was only by the tragic accident of his death in November 1963 that it became a kind of memorial to him.

The present reviewer is particularly happy to find here Balazs's two extensive articles on the intellectual history of the second and third centuries, "Political philosophy and social crisis at the end of the Han dynasty" and "Nihilistic revolt or mystical escapism", both originally in French, the one published in *T'oung-Pao* in 1949, the other in *Etudes asiatiques* in 1948. This is history of ideas, not as play of intellect in the void, but as the reactions of men deeply involved in the concerns of their own times, in this case the economic and social breakdown of Han civilization. These essays provide exemplary models, which have so far found few imitators, of how to make Chinese philosophy come alive. A shorter article on the same period is "Two songs of Ts'ao Ts'ao". Earlier articles on other aspects of Chinese intellectual history are "The first Chinese materialist", on the fifth-century opponent of Buddhism, Fan Chen, and "A forerunner of Wang An-shih", on Li Kou (1009-1059).

The rest of the articles deal in one way or another with Chinese institutions and the central quest of Balazs's scholarship, the understanding of the structure and

evolution of Chinese society. Two of them, it is true, are placed in a separate section called History, but they too are really variations on the same themes. "History as a guide to bureaucratic practice", taken from *Historians of China and Japan* (1961), discusses the bureaucratic motives that lay behind official history writing in China and goes on to deal specifically with those historical works which describe bureaucratic institutions, the monographs in the official histories and the encyclopaedic works like the *T'ung tien* and *Wen-hsien t'ung-k'ao*. "Tradition and revolution in China" is a fairly popular account, first published in 1954, of Balazs's views on the perennial, constant features of traditional China and how they conditioned her response to the impact of the west and western-inspired revolution. The remaining nine articles, in the section called Institutions, deal in a specialized way with such topics as "Chinese towns", "Fairs in China", "The evolution of landownership in fourth- and fifth-century China", or on a broader canvas with topics related to the development of Chinese society over the centuries, under such titles as "China as a permanently bureaucratic society", "The birth of capitalism in China", etc.

Whether the topic is particular or broad in scope, we in fact find the same themes repeated, with differences of emphasis and greater or less explicitness, in all these articles. Balazs started from a Marxist point of view and always held to that variety of Marxist interpretation which recognizes a specifically "Asiatic" form of society. He derided what he considered to be the vulgar Marxism of the Chinese communists, who insisted on fitting Chinese civilization into the same sequence of developmental stages - slave society, feudalism, capitalism - through which Europe had gone.* He had a much more sophisticated view of Chinese history than theorists like K. A. Wittfogel, for whom the "Asiatic" form of Chinese society allowed for nothing but stagnation. He allowed for growth and progressive development *within* the unchanging matrix, recognizing the Sung period, with its nascent capitalistic features as in some sense the beginning of "modern" times in China (like the non-Marxist Naitō school in Japan). Yet Balazs, like Wittfogel, regarded the state bureaucracy, depending for its position not on landed wealth, still less on commercial or industrial capital, but on the privileges accorded to education and office-holding, as the key factor in explaining the differences between China and Europe. He gave it credit for the great continuity and stability of Chinese civilization but at the same time he considered it the supreme inhibiting factor which kept traditional China from making the break-through to modern-style capitalism. Hence he was willing to grant some truth to the old stereotype of the "unchanging east".

These ideas of Balazs, informed as they always are by well-documented, detailed studies, are always thought-provoking, and one must acknowledge that there is a great deal of truth in many of his strictures on the Confucian gentlemen who governed China for some 2000 years. Yet this theoretical side of his writing is, to me at least, unsatisfying. Like other sociological explanations for history, it seems to try to explain too many things, sometimes, one suspects, contradictory things, by the same causes. It seems to pay too little attention to the grand accidents of history, for example, the fact that the Mongols conquered China but only frightened Europe, or the fateful effects of timing - the fact that China was more advanced than Europe when the two civilizations were brought into contact by the Mongols meant that whereas Europe was stimulated by new inventions coming from China and by the knowledge of a distant, dazzling Cathay, China had no corresponding stimulus to learn from the outside. If one makes contrasts in social structure the one essential reason for the difference between Chinese and European development in the subsequent period, it

*Yet there is an evident self-contradiction when Balazs says that Marx's original scheme "divided the development of society into four successive stages: slave society in antiquity, Asiatic society in Asia, feudal society in the Middle Ages, and capitalist society in modern times" (p. 20, my italics). The question whether Asiatic society was intended to be inserted in the sequence somewhere or was outside the sequence, determined perhaps by geographical factors, is one that has greatly exercised Marxist exegetes. Balazs did not, unfortunately, make his answer to this problem altogether clear.

seems to me that one can scarcely avoid the paradox of also explaining the more rapid advance of China in the preceding period by the same reasons.

These are large issues, however, which will not be resolved before much more study and argument have been deployed on them. It is Balazs's great merit that he insisted on focusing attention on such fundamental problems of world history. The theoretical picture of Chinese society which he presented in these articles was, by his own admission, oversimplified. Yet it does provide ideas which one can take, follow up, test, react against – and whether or not one ultimately retains them, or part of them, or rejects them, they will have served an essential dialectical purpose in putting our understanding of the vast canvas of Chinese history on to a higher level. I am sure that Balazs, with his passionate devotion to the value of free enquiry, would have wished them no other fate.

E. G. PULLEYBLANK

The Golden Casket. Chinese Novellas of two millennia, edited by Wolfgang Bauer and Herbert Franke. London, Allen and Unwin, 1965. 391 pp.

It is true as Professor Franke points out in his introduction to this collection, which appeared originally as *Die Goldene Truhe*, that many of these stories in the classical idiom – why incidentally are they called “novella”? – are translated here for the first time, and that is a good thing. But reading some of these first translations, one begins to wonder whether they have not been justly neglected up till now. The stories of Ch'ü Yu and Li Ch'ang-ch'i which do “indubitably represent the zenith of novella literature” according to Professor Franke's criteria might just as well be regarded as proof that the scholar's day dream was quite played out as material for fiction by the Ming dynasty; they might have some political interest, and do show off, as they are designed to, their author's altiloquence, but as works of fiction they are in my personal opinion, extremely boring.

In the same introduction Professor Franke notes that where there are existing translations they have not been taken into account; the implication is, I assume, that they did not need to be. This is surely to tempt, if not Providence, at least the evil-minded reviewer. By a strange irony, it is precisely in those tales that the most mistakes occur. Admittedly it befits no one to get on his high horse when criticizing other people's translations from Chinese, but some of the mistakes are pretty appalling. For instance, “he scarcely dared to look inside at first” for 本不敢有此望 (“had not dared to expect so much”), p. 174. There is much, too, that I personally would object to in the method of translation. Everyone would agree that a translation should not be literal to the point of stiltedness, and that occasionally there is need to add a word here and there to smooth a transition, but care has still to be exercised in finding the closest equivalent; and if things are added unnecessarily the translator should sign his name as joint author. These qualifications are not observed in the following not untypical paragraphs from *Huo Hsiao-yü chuan* on p. 152. Here a go-between *Pao shih-i niang* (surely not *Maiden Eleven*?) describes the heroine to young Li:

“I have a heavenly girl for you who by a lucky chance has descended to our dusty world. She is not after money or possessions but asks only for good manners and cultured behaviour . . .”

There is no “by a lucky chance” in the text, and if anything its inclusion weakens the extravagance of the old woman's claim. For “descended to our dusty world” read “relegated to these nether regions” (請在下界): “relegated” would presumably encourage the young man to think her conduct less than immaculate. “Good manners and cultured behaviour” for 風流 gives quite the wrong impression: “gallantry and romance” is nearer the mark. The translation continues:

“When the young scholar heard these words he hopped from one leg to the other in his enthusiasm and was ready to fly up in the air like a spirit, so elated was he.” The idea of hopping from one leg to the other seems less peculiar when expressed in German: Eichendorff's *Taugenichts* was given to it, if I remember, though possibly

that was because he was always encumbered by his fiddle; but it is not the way to translate 驚躍 (possibly “electrified” would do?). Then the phrase “so elated was he” has to be supplied simply because 神飛體輕 is rendered so bizarrely: why not, as it says, “his spirit soared, his body felt light as air”? Surely a T'ang man of letters can be credited with knowing what he wanted to say and knowing exactly how to say it? The “freer” the translation, the worse the story reads. To be fair one should add that these criticisms apply only to about half the stories translated. In this English version the translators are anonymous.

Very likely the book ought not to have been sent to a professional journal for review. Since it has been it has to be judged by professional standards.

D. E. POLLARD

The Japanese Enlightenment. A study of the writings of Fukuzawa Yukichi, by Carmen Blacker (Cambridge University Press, 1964).

Fukuzawa was a voluminous and discursive author, and it comes as a slight surprise to find a study of his writings condensed into this deceptively slim volume. Dr. Blacker's theme is Fukuzawa in his role as an advocate of western learning as an indispensable means to liberate Japan from both the futility of its Confucian past and the humiliation of its western-threatened present.

Having set Fukuzawa in his context by a brief biography and an excellently concise account of Japanese attitudes to western learning in the pre-Restoration years, he is then depicted in the closer context of the Enlightenment school of the 1870's. He was one of a group of scholars and officials who set out to educate the benighted Japanese masses not merely to new facts, but to a new outlook on the universe. However, Dr. Blacker shows how the primary motive that impelled Fukuzawa and his fellows to advocate sweeping and revolutionary changes in thinking differed little from that which had led an earlier generation of thinkers to advocate the adoption of western techniques. The new spirit they sought to create was first and foremost a means to guarantee the safety and integrity of Japan against rapacious and unscrupulous foreign powers. Fukuzawa seems even to have owed something to the exclusionists, opposing those who thought that if foreigners were allowed to travel and reside beyond the ten-mile limits fixed by the treaties, greater opportunities for contact with westerners would promote the spread of civilization in Japan. To Fukuzawa, the common people were not yet sufficiently imbued with the spirit of civilization to be able to stand up to the violent, arrogant and predatory behaviour of so many of the foreign merchants!

The kernel of the new western learning lay in science, and Fukuzawa was anxious to elevate it to the status of a learning in the Confucian sense of a study leading to moral improvement instead of allowing it to remain a mere technique. He discovered in western science a spirit of doubt and experiment and an assertion of man's independence in the face of nature that required an entirely different approach towards ethical and spiritual values. Luckily, evolutionary materialism was at hand to provide a standard of values independent of revealed moral principles, whether Buddhist, Confucian or Christian. To Fukuzawa, as to many Enlightenment men, the idea of progress was an article of faith. As man grew in knowledge, he would surely grow in virtue. In a progressing world, conceptions of good and bad could not be fixed and unchanging, and men must learn to value things not for themselves but for the way they worked. However, while Fukuzawa maintained that progress was a natural law, he also maintained that man possessed an original and essential nature that was absolutely good. As Dr. Blacker points out, this again is remarkably reminiscent of the neo-Confucian perfect man seeking his original nature. Fukuzawa's perfection was the old one, but by a new route; a perfection not to be attained in one's own lifetime, but after many succeeding generations.

While Fukuzawa made no attempt to write a detailed history of Japan, he was the first consistent critic of the traditional Confucian approach to history. Instead of providing examples of virtue and vice, history now provided the reader with clues to the

"trend of the times". The virtue of the citizen lay in fitting in with this trend; the virtue of the ruler in serving his country's interest by promoting the progress to which man by his nature was inevitably destined. It was by this standard that Fukuzawa weighed the Tokugawa Bakufu and found it wanting.

As for practical advice on conduct appropriate to the new age, Fukuzawa singled out the subjection of children to parents and women to men, so lauded by the Confucians, for some of his sharpest barbs. This subjection sprang not from nature, he maintained, but grew out of an equally artificial elevation of ruler over subject. He was thus anxious to remodel the Japanese family into a "group of friends", and to reduce the Japanese government to the status of a group of ordinary men enjoying positions of authority simply to guarantee the people in their rights of life, property and honour, in a society as yet so imperfect that the strong might infringe the rights of the weak. Government was a necessary evil, and should keep within definite bounds. Where, as in Japan, the government was regarded by the people as the sole effective agent and the only channel of ambition, there was little likelihood of progress.

From 1879 to 1881 Fukuzawa therefore became a tireless advocate for the opening of a National Assembly, hoping that the cabinet would be composed of the leaders of the majority party within it. He had little respect either for the Sat-Chō oligarchs or their political party opponents. But in spite of his strictures on the actual working of Japanese politics, he was curiously optimistic about Japan's political progress. He never seems to have lost his faith in the inevitable evolution in politics towards the freedom of the individual and the disappearance of the institution of government, even after the Meiji Constitution had been promulgated.

This optimism is all the more curious in the light of his pessimism in another direction. By 1881 his growing fears of western aggression had brought him firmly back to the priority of western learning as a means to hold one's own in a brutal international struggle, to the perceptible eclipse of its value as a means towards social and individual perfection. In 1882 he thus proclaimed that "the one object of my life is to extend Japan's national power. . . . Even if the government be autocratic in name and form I shall be satisfied with it if it is strong enough to strengthen the country." As Dr. Blacker comments, this is a far cry from his earlier argument that it was precisely because the Bakufu was autocratic that it had failed to strengthen the country.

In short, Fukuzawa had become an imperialist. To save Asia from the west and to assume leadership in the Far East, Japan "would do better to treat China and Korea in the same way as do western nations". After Japan's victory over China in 1895, Fukuzawa felt that Japan could rest on its laurels somewhat, now that its steady progress was assured. Patriotism, he could now generously declare, was from the point of view of man's true nature merely laughable, no more than a necessary remedy for a sick world.

On his death in 1901, Fukuzawa was widely acclaimed as a philosopher and teacher. But his success in changing the way of thinking of the whole people from its very foundations was minimal. Even in his own way of thinking, the new wine had not escaped the taint of the old skin. As a person he was probably more attractive than an account of his ideas would suggest. His quick intelligence, sharp wit and robust humour appear in several passages quoted by Dr. Blacker, and mitigate his philistine insensitivity to many of the deeper values of both the Confucian civilization that he despised and the western civilization that he admired.

Dr. Blacker makes no apology for the fact that her book is a book about ideas, pointing out that studies in the ideas of the Meiji period are less numerous than those about people and institutions. However, an important aspect of a study of ideas must surely lie in the recognition of the sad fact that a man's ideas, especially as expressed to a public from which he makes a living, are often conditioned by factors other than those of the pure processes of thought. For all his brave talk of independence, Fukuzawa needed money for his school and jobs for his graduates, and his financial difficulties after 1880 to some extent affected his expressed ideas in a way that helps to explain some of their inconsistencies. His awkward circumstances did not encourage too much independence from the government, and Fukuzawa, one feels, had perforce to take

refuge in his own definition of the good citizen and fit himself in with the trend of the times. On the other hand, to know what Fukuzawa's ideas were is clearly the first step towards evaluating and explaining them, and this primary task has been accomplished by Dr. Blacker in a study that is a model of conciseness and scholarship.

A. FRASER

Kenneth K. S. Ch'en, *Buddhism in China, A Historical Survey*. Princeton, 1964. £5.

This historical survey, which extends from the still controversial date of the introduction of Buddhism into China to the present day, addresses itself more to the general reader than the specialist and for him it will no doubt satisfy a long felt need since the many books in Japanese and Chinese are not accessible to him. Older works on the subject written in English are out of date and more recent publications either provide a mere outline of the development of Buddhism in China or are devoted to the study of a particular period or phase of its development.

The most welcome feature of this book is the honest attempt on the part of the author to help his readers to comprehend the unusual and intricate metaphysical ideas of the Indians and their inevitable simplification and distortion in the hands of the Chinese believers after they had been transplanted. He has done so in language comprehensible to the general reader but without any sacrifice in scholarly standards. The specialist who wishes to go more deeply into the doctrinal aspects of Chinese Buddhism might be disappointed with the ease with which the author takes him through the indigenous developments and the eventual establishment of the various sects, but dwelling further on these would have, perhaps, created an imbalance in the continuity of the survey. For those who wish to pursue this study in detail the bibliography provided near the end of the book will be a reliable guide. For the "uninitiated" there is a short list of Buddhist terms. As a continuous story of the developments and vicissitudes of the Buddhist "church" against the background of an often complicated political set up in China, from the beginning up to our own time, this is an excellent book, as it imparts solid knowledge with a simplicity and a breadth that are seldom found together in a general survey of this kind.

K. P. K. WHITAKER

W. A. C. H. Dobson, *Late Han Chinese: A study of the Archaic-Han shift*, xxiv, 134 pp. Toronto University Press, 1965.

Professor Dobson's first work on Chinese grammar was *Late Archaic Chinese* (1959). In this he took samplings from four Classical Chinese texts of the Late Chou period - Mencius, Chuang-tzu, Mo-tzu and Tso-chuan - and proposed a grammatical framework to describe the language he found there. Rather surprisingly, in view of Karlgren's demonstration of the grammatical distinctness of the Tso-chuan and Lu dialects, he regarded these as constituting a homogeneous language which he labelled Late Archaic Chinese. The book had a mixed reception. On the one hand it received praise, as a pioneering work in an extremely difficult field. On the other hand it was subjected to severe criticism from a number of specialists, both for its confused and imprecise terminology and its often very shaky foundations in linguistic theory and for specific mistakes and inadequacies in the treatment given to the samples of Chinese that were discussed.

Professor Dobson next published, with the collaboration of Professor C. C. Shih, *Early Archaic Chinese* (1962), applying the same basic structural framework to the language of the genuine parts of the Shu Ching and certain bronze inscriptions. He has now turned his attention to a later period, the end of the Han dynasty. He has had the attractive idea of comparing the language of one of his principal LAC texts,

Mencius, to that used by Chao Ch'i, who wrote an extensive commentary of Mencius including a running paraphrase. The idea is attractive, because it is apparent that Chao Ch'i was trying to make the text as clear as possible to his readers and one may assume that he was therefore using a kind of literary Chinese not too far removed from the current speech of his day. One may expect to find that some expressions and grammatical constructions in the original will have become obsolete and that new expressions and constructions, unknown in Mencius, will appear in the commentary. A detailed comparison of text and paraphrase should reveal these and show how the language has changed.

There are, of course, obvious difficulties and dangers. One may too readily assume that what is merely an alternative way of saying something is a necessary substitution; or conversely, that if an old method of expression is retained, it is actually still living in the current language of the commentary. A comparison, especially a piecemeal comparison such as Professor Dobson has undertaken, is no substitute for an exhaustive analysis of Late Han texts. Nevertheless, by drawing attention to many individual points of difference between text and commentary he has certainly made possible a number of hypotheses which could be tested on further material.

From this point of view Professor Dobson's book is undoubtedly instructive. At the same time the weaknesses in his analysis of the language of Mencius greatly muddle and confuse the issues. Some quite far-reaching conclusions seem to be based on very inadequate evidence and at times one is frankly appalled at some of the statements that are made. (What is one to make for instance of a linguist who uses "diachronic" in the sense of "synchronic" and *vice versa* (pp. xiii, xiv)?)

Let us begin, however, with some examples on the positive side. Professor Dobson notes what he calls a "blunting of usage" of the particle *chih* 之 between two nouns, i.e. an extension of its use from that of marking possession or class membership to include the relation of attribute to the following noun. Examples such as 聖之人, 不正之道 are certainly not Classical. We also find 之 after demonstratives, as in 於是之際 "in these extremities". (But in 如此之用 "usages of this kind", 此 "this" is object of 如 and 之 makes the whole phrase attributive, as in 不正之道 above.) This is an interesting grammatical shift which one can correlate with another of Professor Dobson's observations. He notes that 其 *ch'i*, which in the language of Mencius is used only as a possessive pronoun ("determinative anaphoric" in Dobson's terminology) is extended to use as a demonstrative, e.g. 其人 "this man". Since 其 in Classical Chinese is a substitute for noun + 之, this is quite parallel to the extended use of 之. (The further post-classical extensions of 其 noted by Lü Shu-hsiang are apparently not attested in Chao Ch'i's commentary to Mencius.)

On the other hand I am very doubtful about what Professor Dobson says about the "blunting of distinction" between 其 and the object pronoun 之. Professor Dobson does have one case in which 之 in the commentary replaces 其 in the text but we find a verb immediately preceding and it looks as if this has had the effect of attracting the pronoun into the object form, thus: 勿視其巍巍然 "Don't look at their awesomeness" becomes in the commentary 勿敢視之巍巍 "do not venture to look on them as awesome". The other alleged examples of 之 for Classical 其 are even less convincing. 當本之志 should be translated "One ought to base it [one's interpretation] on the intention", not "you should take for the basis [of interpretation] its [i.e. the poem's] intention". The phrase which follows, 害其辭 "do violence to its phrasing", is not grammatically parallel as alleged. Professor Dobson translates 奪之貨 as "takes away their property", but 奪 is a verb which regularly takes two objects and this should be translated "takes property away from them". (Cf. 天奪之食 "Heaven takes away their food from them" [*Kuo-yü* 17].)

In the remaining example which Professor Dobson gives he supposes not simply that 之 is used for 其 but that 諸 (which he alleges can be used for 之 in Late Han) is used for 其. The example is 比諸見放也, which he translates "by the time that he was exiled". 比 "by the time that" is a well established usage but in this case it unfortunately makes nonsense of the passage. 比 here has its other very common sense of "compare" and 諸 = 之於, so that we may translate the sentence "It was that they

compared him with one who had been exiled." The point of the story is that Shun enfeoffed his wicked brother Hsiang but put an official in charge who only handed over the revenues to Hsiang so that the people did not suffer. Hsiang was not actually banished but only treated in some respects as if he had been.

Professor Dobson also notes changes in the system of personal pronouns. His statements on the subject are, however, confused and contradictory. In 4.1.1 he says "In LAC, where the agent is represented by a personal pronoun, the determinative forms *wu* 吾 (first person) and *eel* 爾 (second person) occur. In Late Han these are almost totally replaced by the pregnant forms *woo* 我 and *ruu* 汝. . . The determinative pronouns occur sporadically in the *Text* [i.e. the Chao Ch'i commentary] in the agential position but never in the post-verbal position." He then cites a number of examples where 吾 in Mencius appears as 我 in the paraphrase, but no examples of the replacing of 爾 by 汝. In 2.1.1 he again notes the "obsolescence of determinative forms". He points out that the determinative role is sometimes indicated by 之 (吾之, 我之, 爾之) as a usage unknown in the Classical period but pointing forward to modern Mandarin 我的, 你的. In 8.1.1 he again sums up the position, referring (1) to the tendency for the determinative forms *wu* and *eel* to become assimilated to the pregnant forms *woo* and *ruu*, and for the pregnant forms to assume indifferently the agential and post-verbal roles; (2) to the tendency for the possessive relationship to be marked with 之 in the case of personal pronouns. He then sets up a paradigm for the possessive adjective with 我之 in the first person and *汝之 in the second person "with the possibility, as variants [*sic*], of *wu* 吾 and *wu jy* 吾之 and *eel* 爾 and *eel jy* 爾之".

From this it might appear that there was an exact parallelism between the first and second personal pronouns, but in fact for the second person the so-called variants are the only forms which occur and the supposedly regular *ruu jy*, which he very properly marks with an asterisk, is not attested. Indeed Professor Dobson does not provide any evidence that 汝 occurs at all in his Late Han text. But even in the Classical period 爾 and 汝 do not stand in the same relation to one another as 吾 and 我, as A. C. Graham very clearly demonstrated in his review of *Late Archaic Chinese* (*BSOAS*, 22 (1959), 556-71). Even with 吾 and 我 the position in Late Han remains obscure. Is 吾 a living pronoun in the language at all at that time or does it only survive sporadically as an archaism?

Professor Dobson demonstrates quite convincingly that the particle 焉 "in it, to it" etc. (equivalent to 於 - 之) was misunderstood by Chao Ch'i. The interrogative 焉 "how, where" was also obsolete, as were 惡 and 惡乎. 安 "how, where" did survive. Dobson notes the frequent use of 寧 as an interrogative but he is wrong in implying that it does not occur earlier. It is found in *Tso-chuan*. The suggestion to connect it with *neng* 能 "be able" is a curious bit of etymologizing. 嘗不 (which should be transcribed *taeng bu* in GR, not *tserng bu*) is also certainly no innovation in Chao Ch'i. Though never very common, it occurs both in Mencius and in *Lun-yü* and still earlier in the *Shih ching*.

It is interesting to note that the interrogative 誰 occurs in post-verbal position when object of the verb in Late Han, which it never does in the Classical period. This tendency to normalize the word order of pronouns is also found in the use of personal pronouns after negated verbs (though occasional examples of the same thing can be found from the earliest times). The examples given of post-verbal 何 "what" are, however, not so straightforward. Professor Dobson quotes only 謂何 and 云何, for both of which one can find classical parallels (see Chou Fa-ko, *Chung kuo ku-tai yü-fa, ch'eng-tai pien* 中國古代語法綱代編, p. 182 ff.) In the case of *wei* 謂 "to call", which is a verb capable of taking two objects in Chinese as in English, it is regular in Classical Chinese to place 何 after the verb when it stands for the second object, before when it stands for the first object. In Chao Ch'i's commentary the usage appears to be a little different. Professor Dobson cites two examples where 何謂 in the text is replaced by 謂何 in the commentary. These are:

2.70 *Text*: 何謂知言 "What does one call 'to know words'?"

Commentary: 丑問知言之意謂何 "Ch'ou asked what was the meaning of 'to

know words'." (Literally: "Ch'ou asked, the meaning of 'to know words' is called what.")

8.81 Text: 何謂何謂信 "What do you call 'good'? what do you call 'true'?"

Commentary: 不害問善信之行謂何 "Pu-hai asked, what was good and true conduct." (Literally: "Pu-hai asked, good and true conduct is called what.")

In the commentary 謂 has to be construed as passive, meaning "is called", hence as equivalent to a copula "is". Yet, though such a usage with 謂 would not be normal in Classical Chinese, the placing of 何 after a word with the value of a copula in an equational sentence is normal from the earliest stages of the language. Only the words which are used as copulas differ at different periods (cf. Hung Ch'eng, "Lun Nan-pei-ch'ao i-ch'ien Han-yü chung li hsi-tz'u", *Yü-yen yen-chiu*, 2 (1957), 1-22). So it is not sufficient to say that 何謂 "has become" 謂何, nor is the occurrence of 謂何 and 云何 (云 is also a kind of copula) sufficient to show that 何 could follow a verb as its object in Late Han. The examples of 何由 which Dobson cites and examples of 何爲 (8.116, 8.111, 8.103, 7.55, etc.) 何以 (1.31, 1.50, etc.) 何如 (1.49, 1.71, etc.) 何暇 (1.69), etc. would seem to indicate that it could not.

There are other cases of this kind in which a word or phrase occurring in the commentary is taken as mechanically equivalent to a word or phrase in the text, when a deeper analysis of the construction would reveal a quite different picture.

There are even some quite trivial cases in which a mere graphic variation is raised to the level of a significant grammatical difference, e.g. the use of 不 for 否, or the Mencian *chia-chieh* use of 由 for 猶, and *vice versa*. This illustrates what in my view constitutes a more generalized weakness in Professor Dobson's work, his ignoring of historical phonology - except for occasional, rather unhappy, ventures into the etymology of particular particles. Of course, it is true that we are far from knowing exactly how Chinese was pronounced in the time of Mencius, or even in Late Han, but this does not alter the validity of the principle that the characters are not themselves the language but only a device for writing what was, or could be, spoken.

Professor Dobson's categories of "mode" and "aspect" of the verb are among the least satisfactory features of his system, rag-bags into which he thrusts a variety of grammatically quite distinct features. I shall not discuss this question fully here but I should like to take up one point of detail where his theories get him into serious difficulties. He regards 有, 無, 爲, 不爲 as marks of "subjunctive mood" and, because he twice finds 貴 "noble" (here, however, used in the verbal sense "to value") apparently replacing 有, he finds it necessary also to imply that 貴 is a mark of "subjunctive mood" in Late Han. The first passage is:

2.116 Text: 故君子有不戰, 戰必勝矣, which he translates "A gentleman should not fight, but if he fights, then inevitably he wins."

This is admittedly a difficult passage about which commentators differ. I should like to take it: "Therefore the superior man will *sometimes* (有) not fight (i.e. will win without even fighting) . . .", which gives 有 its normal partitive sense. This makes a good conclusion to the preceding clauses 以天下之所願攻天下之所畔 "Being one whom the whole world follows, he attacks one from whom the whole world revolts, . . ." Professor Dobson gets some support for his interpretation, however, from Chiao Hsün, who says 有不戰不當戰也. Chao Ch'i on the other hand paraphrases: 君子之道貴不戰耳, for which Dobson's translation, "In the code of gentlemen it is thought honourable not to fight" is unjustified. It should be: "The way of the gentleman puts store on not fighting." According to my interpretation neither Chao Ch'i nor Chiao Hsün correctly interpreted the text. Their paraphrases must be regarded as endeavours to extract what they regarded as the proper meaning from Mencius' words and are very difficult to justify by any normal meanings of 有.

The second passage is at 3.104 where the text has 朋友有信. Professor Dobson's translation "friends should trust [each other]" arbitrarily gives 信 a verbal force in order to justify calling 有 a modal particle rather than simply the verb "have" or "there is"; but this is contradicted by the parallelism of the accompanying phrases: 父子有親, 君臣有義, 夫婦有別 . . . 長幼有序. Legge's translation, "between father and son, there should be affection . . ." brings an injunctive "should" into the passage which

might seem to justify Dobson's "subjunctive" force of 有, but this comes from the context and is not expressed in the Chinese. Chao-Ch'i has 朋友貴信 "between friends one puts store on good faith". Professor Dobson's "friends should regard with honour the trust they have in each other" is very forced.

Professor Dobson mistranslates 貴 in a number of other passages. In 7.73 Chao Ch'i has 人必趨命貴受其正 which Dobson translates, "Man must pursue his fated course, and should honourably accept his proper fate." This should read, "Man must pursue his destiny, he should lay store on receiving his proper fate." (This passage is not from the paraphrase but from Chao Ch'i's chapter summaries.)

For the passage in the commentary (2.24) 貴令後世可繼續而行耳 Dobson has "[The prince] should [so rule] as to make possible the continuance of his works by his descendants." (taking 貴 as "should"). For a correct translation one must include the preceding phrase 君子造業垂統. The whole then reads (in a literal rendering) "When a prince founds an inheritance and hands on what he has begun, he puts store on bringing it about that it can be continued and carried on in later generations."

Even stranger than the treatment of 貴 as a "modal" particle is the idea that because 貴 can allegedly be substituted for 有, 有 can conversely mean "to honour"! Dobson finds this in 6.21 where the commentary reads: 此五人者自有獻子之家, 富貴而復有德, 不肯與獻子友也 and Professor Dobson translates, "These five men, even though they *honoured* [my italics] the House of Hsien-Tzu as being rich and noble but virtuous too, were unwilling to put themselves on the level of friendship with Hsien-Tzu." A full discussion of the passage in Mencius to which this is attached, about which there have been differing opinions, would take us too far. Chao Ch'i's commentary is, however, perfectly straightforward, "If these five men had themselves had such families as that of Hsien-tzu, being wealthy and noble and still having their virtue, they would not have been willing to be friends with Hsien-tzu." (Dobson quite unnecessarily gives 自 the unusual meaning "although", rather than perfectly normal meaning "themselves".) Professor Dobson's interpretation is plainly impossible, since the whole point of the paragraph from which this passage is taken is that the five men in question *were* friends of Hsien-tzu!

It would be a pity if cases of this kind, where adherence to an inadequately based theory has (in my view) led Professor Dobson to mistake the obvious meanings of passages, were to encourage the die-hards who think it is useless to try to analyse the grammar of Classical Chinese. Professor Dobson's aims are right and, as I have shown, he does contribute interesting and valuable observations. One cannot help feeling, however, that the elaborate superstructure that he has raised in his three books needs a much more solid foundation if it is to have any hope of standing.

E. G. PULLEYBLANK

The Archaeology of World Religions, by Jack Finegan. 3 volumes. Princeton University Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1966. Paperbacks, 60s.

It used to be supposed that paperback publishing aimed at providing cheap editions of expensive works, but now one wonders how dear a cheap edition may become. When Finegan's book first appeared in 1952 it was well bound, printed and illustrated, and sold at 63s. Now the reprint appears in three paper-covered volumes, in a cardboard case, at 60s. They are not worth it. The size of the pages has been cut down, and with them the fine printing of the original and the illustrations of many famous temples and statues which were already small enough. Needless to say the paper is inferior. The publishers affirm that the volumes will be obtainable separately, but it is unlikely that any bookseller will split the set and leave himself with a half-empty case. This makes nonsense of the strange manner in which the index is reprinted exactly the same at the end of each volume, thirty pages each time. Prospective buyers, especially libraries, would do much better to save their shillings until they can buy the original hard-covered edition, which is still available, though now at £5.

Finegan's book is still worth getting. It is one of the few in its field in English that is both understandable to the general reader and also scholarly and reliable. The one volume history of religions is often criticized, but is still in demand. Finegan is chiefly concerned with early history and architecture, but he manages to get in a good deal of teaching and quotation of scriptures. His book covers Primitivism, Zoroastrianism, Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, Islam and Sikhism. The first chapter is the weakest, though in such vast fields this is understandable. Modern Indian tribal religions get no mention, but the Indus Valley culture is dealt with at some length. On the other hand two modern American Indian tribes are considered, but there is nothing on the ancient civilizations of Central and South America. With Zoroastrianism there is clearer ground, and this religion is traced from the Aryans to the coming of Islam. This leads on to India, taken through to the twelfth century A.D. This is the general time span, though Chinese religious history is taken through to the fourteenth and Shinto to the nineteenth century.

This is the age of the illustrated book, and larger and more extensive photography of the monuments of many of these religions is available. But to cover them all would require a series of coffee tables for display, if that is the aim of such art books. Finegan's is not a display book, and it achieves a world wide compass in comparatively small space. The photographs are not original but are taken from good sources, and many of the most famous monuments are shown. The ration is about twenty pictures for each religion, with a double allowance for Buddhism and Chinese religion, and half a dozen pictures for the Sikhs. Within its limits this is a good introduction or student's manual.

GEOFFREY PARRINDER

Universität Hamburg: Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde:
Geschichte der alten chinesischen Philosophie, by Alfred Forke. Band 25, xvi + 594 pp.
Geschichte der mittelalterlichen chinesischen Philosophie, by Alfred Forke. Band 41, xii + 410 pp.
Geschichte der neueren chinesischen Philosophie, by Alfred Forke. Band 46, xviii + 690 pp.
 2., unveränderte Auflage, Cram, De Gruyter & Co., Hamburg, 1964.

Alfred Forke (1867-1944) contributed more than any other European to the rediscovery of the neglected Chinese thinkers who are so often, for modern Chinese as well as for Westerners, more interesting than philosophers who remained on the beaten track of Confucianism or Taoism. Apart from the sophists and later Mohists, the sceptic Wang Ch'ung 王充 and the hedonist author in *Lieh-tzu* 列子, on each of whom he did pioneering work, we may notice his sharp eye for the logical passages in *Yin Wen tsü* 尹文子 (Band 25/421-6), the anarchist essay of Pao Ching-yen 鮑敬言 (41/224-6) and the criticism of the concept of a soul separate from the body by Fan Chen 范縝 (41/266-74), all passed over in Fung Yu-lan's *History of Chinese Philosophy*. For orthodox as well as heterodox thinkers Forke's history remains the most comprehensive yet written, and a modern reader still has frequent occasion to consult its convenient summaries and brief but well-chosen Chinese quotations.

However, these three volumes were originally published by the Kommissionsverlag L. Friederichsen & Co. in 1927, 1934 and 1938 respectively, and represent the final fruit of researches begun before the turn of the century. In the present reprint, unaltered except for the title pages, only the words "2., unveränderte Auflage" warn the reader that the book existed before 1964. This may give a false impression of a great scholar who should be judged in relation to his time; it is not Forke's fault that we no longer share his faith in the traditional authorship of many supposedly ancient works, or that we cannot nowadays be satisfied with an account of Neo-Confucianism which depends largely on anthologies rather than on primary sources.

A. C. GRAHAM

Facets of Indian Thought, by Betty Heimann (George Allen and Unwin Ltd, London, 1964), 177 pp.

The posthumous edition of this book was as carefully prepared as the subject-matter and the editors' respect for the author permitted. It consists of eleven chapters; each of the chapters constitutes, in a way, a separate essay. Two of the chapters were, in fact, separately published before. But in the treatment of the general theme the book represents, despite occasional repetitiveness, a well-integrated body which, by and large, would probably have satisfied the author in her quest for "those facets in their [India's concepts] relative and co-operative values for gathering in single images the hidden Whole".

A mere superficial reading of the book almost immediately reveals the impossibility of the task of this size. It is bound to share the fate of any work in which the truth has to be sacrificed for a preconceived image and where much artificiality has to be introduced to shape the edges which would not otherwise let themselves be forced into a smooth surface.

The attraction of Betty Heimann's book and her intention is that she did not seem to be aware herself of the snares and pitfalls facing her undertaking. She was so completely carried away by that concept of the imaginary harmony of "unity in diversity", and managed to convince herself of the reality of the "Whole" so strongly that she saw no flaws in the structure and the mutual relationship of the component parts.

The book presents the reader with a picture of an India of a Walt Disney paradise where living beings do not appear to perform any economic or biological functions but are just there to shine and charm. The resulting impression is that the India the author set herself to reveal as a land of spiritual and intellectual dynamism, appears as an all-knowing, all-understanding, all-foreseeing and all-penetrating static giant, which can only teach but learn nothing, dwarfing everything that has been accomplished in any other part of the world.

Harsh as it may be, a criticism of this type of approach to India is necessary in order to try to convince the student of Indian life and culture that India was and is a real country with real people; that, while she has a highly developed and ancient culture and civilization with, peculiar to her only, spiritual and intellectual achievements second to none, she is also endowed with qualities, and this pertains equally to her philosophy as to her cultural and social development, which can and have to withstand a sober evaluation. For the sake of such an evaluation it is necessary to shake off the notion that India as a people or a conglomeration of peoples has been built by saints and philosophers only. While the latter statement is hardly more than a platitude it has to be made in opposition to those other platitudes with which India herself and her students have been treated so lavishly and for such a long time.

Fortunately for all, however, references to Indian religions and philosophies as heathen and "atheistic", the latter intended in an apologetical sense, are largely behind us and are not taken seriously any longer; consequently references in the book under review in defence against these innuendos are outdated. Equally the repetition of the cliché about the spirituality of India as opposed to the West's materialistic *Weltanschauung* has become, to say the least, tiresome; it is neither true nor necessary. Since time immemorial India has had her share of materialism (whatever this means) and the West has had its share of spirituality (whatever this means). In fact, even among the advocates of this notion some contradictory attitudes are encountered: some (like B. Heimann) tell us that India's uniqueness in her spiritual accomplishments makes her much superior to the West while others (like, for instance, Coomaraswamy, Radhakrishnan a.o.) have gone to much trouble to ascertain the value of Indian philosophical and theological data by checking their sublimity against the corresponding data in the Western material.

One of the primary weaknesses in the treatment of the subject in *The Facets of Indian Thought* is the indiscriminate attribution to India as a whole of various concepts which were, and, at that, in certain periods only, the property of a single school or even a branch of a particular school of thought. The book consequently follows the, by now, completely unacceptable pattern of interpretation given to the total body of Indian

religions and philosophies under the heading of the advaita system. By doing so the book again defies its ostensible purpose of pursuing the gradual development of ideas in their historical evolution, presenting instead a rigidly established philosophical platform where the microcosm is invariably and without modifications juxtaposed against the macrocosm and the phenomenal world against the absolute. So, the reader cannot help concluding from the book, it was in the Rgveda period, and so it is now.

By collecting bits and pieces from the Vedas, the Upaniṣads, some Buddhist and Jaina writings (all with a strong hue of advaita ideas) the book tries to impress upon the reader how Indian biology, religions, sociology, psychology, mathematics, metaphysics, eschatology, logic, grammar and literature neatly fall within the embrace of the "Whole". Yet, the arguments endeavouring to prove the reality of such integration are as artificial as the facts adduced and the theory itself. No theory concerning philosophy and religion can, in fact, hold water if it is merely confined to philosophy and religion and renders all the other phenomena of life subservient to both or either of them.

The book's excursion into climatic stimuli as explanatory of the origination of such and no other beliefs in India can account only very partially for the circumstances accompanying the beginnings of Indian theology. India's climate varies according to geographical areas; moreover, quite a few ideas that contributed to the development of Indian thought were hatched outside India.

In its ventures into the assertion of India's uniqueness (of which, in a sense, nobody doubts) the book finds characteristics which have too much of universal application to cover any specific or unique quality of India. To quote some: "... the Indian world-view cannot be stagnant, and can never be satisfied with the achievements yet reached"; "They [the Indians] considered themselves the centre of the earth, the hub of the Universe"; "... one and the same word will be used as a genuine technical term and from another aspect it may be used even in the same sentence also in a wider and non-technical import"; "It is significant that Sanskrit grammar prefers to present the agent not in the nominative ... but in the ... instrumental."

These truisms seem to disprove rather than prove the existence of the monolithic Indian approach to all facets of thought as, for what they are worth, they can be equally and easily attributed to those philosophies which the book claims to be different from, or even opposed to, the Indian way of thinking. So, for instance, leaving aside the question of dynamism of Western science or technical knowledge, one can hardly determine the theological and philosophical "world-view" of the West as stagnant or "satisfied with the view yet reached" even if, for the sake of argument, one were to agree that it is in terms of value inferior to the Indian *Weltanschauung*. That India considered herself as the "hub of the Universe" is far from unique. Such mythical, philosophical or cosmological concepts are known to have existed in many parts of the world and in many highly sophisticated as well as non-sophisticated civilizations. (Cf. for instance Ezekiel 38:12: "Just as the navel is found at the centre of a human being, so the land of Israel is found at the centre of the world", or Juda-Halevi's: "Israel amidst the nations is like the heart amidst the organs of the body".)

The most disturbing perhaps among the book's speculations is the one attempting an analysis of the Sanskrit language as almost completely subservient to that elusive unitarian system alleged to be guiding and governing the multiplicity of India's intellectual and religious development. Examples of the impact of semantics, etymology, usage of homonyms, the syntax, gender, conjugation and prefixes are among those trying to convince the reader of that monolithic mystique of universal penetration. Even if such thesis could be theoretically upheld the examples cited in the book prove nothing of the kind or, to say the least, are faulty. Some of the ideas advanced in the book are introduced from B. Heimann's previous works such as *Significance of Prefixes in Sanskrit Philosophical Terminology*; *Studien zur Eigenart des Indischen Denkens*; and *Indian and West Philosophy: a Study in Contrast*.

It hardly requires any mention that the use of words as terms and colloquial expressions (even in the same sentence) is a common practice everywhere. In the interpretation of the significance of Indian terminology, however, the book proceeds,

in the first place, with the obvious fallacy that the root and origin of a word are of basically philosophical import and that the developmental history of a word, while strongly linked to the latter's original meaning (a contradiction in itself), can be traced back to the evolution of philosophical ideas. As a result of this kind of, as it were, inverse system of linguistic analysis, the dormant potency of the concept of nirvāṇa is shown as evolved from the meaning-impact of both "swollen" and "empty", a direct derivation from *śun*. Incidentally, the intended demonstration of "polarity" in meaning misses the point, as it is easy to conceive that what is swollen outside is empty inside. Among other examples are verbs such as *yu*, "unite" and "separate", *prj*, "move" and "stand still", etc., etc. While in most cases these and other examples constitute homographs like the English *lie*, "speak falsely", and *lie*, "be in horizontal position", or *die*, "expire", and *dye*, "colour" (in Sanskrit all homophones are also homographs), in other instances they show no more than a development from one meaning to another as is encountered in most or all other language groups. As for the "direction" of this development the tendency to contrasts with the "original meaning" is by no means exceptional (cf. "brave" from Latin "pravus", etc.)

It is particularly difficult to acquiesce in the importance attributed by the author to the "dynamics" of a word gathered by its etymological derivation. Apart from the contradiction involved (to which reference has been made before) it is completely useless, except for a specific historical purpose, to interpret a word (simple or compound, prefixed or unprefixed) from the value and meaning of its primary root. The knowledge that "sycophant" originally means "one who shows figs" or that - as mentioned in our book - *person* comes from *per-sonare*, adds little to the understanding of the meaning of these words when they are in actual operation. Similarly in the plurivalent use of, for instance, the term *dharma* in Sanskrit, little is gained from the knowledge that the word is derived from *dhr*, and so forth.

The alleged peculiarity of the Indian syntax by which the agent is in the instrumental, a grammatical phenomenon purporting to show the Indian passivity in awe of the absolute, is shared by many languages whose speakers are of different philosophical or religious orientation. The German impersonal *man* and the French *on*, as well as the frequently occurring passive voice in Latin, Scandinavian and Georgian (among others), show the inconclusiveness of the book's claim. Moreover, given more space one could also argue in some detail that, in principle, the Sanskrit passive shares many of its forms with the *ātmanepada* which in its meaning sways rather in the direction of the egocentric, *i.e.* action reverting to oneself in isolation from the rest; and this is quod non erat demonstrandum.

Not without apparent influence of A. K. Coomaraswamy (cf. his "Kha and Other Words Denoting Zero in Connection with the Metaphysics of Space", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, Vol. VII, pp. 487-97) did B. Heimann expound a far-reaching theory of Zero as the symbol of the "Infinite", the "no-or-all-number, *i.e.* supra-empirical, supra-visible notion". She identifies the zero with the nirvāṇa, the nirvāṇa with the śūnya, both expressions, according to her, being "significantly identical". This is, indeed, a sweeping generalization which plays havoc with an imaginary philosophical concept hardly borne out by any authority. It is based on a mere chance selection and its authenticity is suggested to the reader on a purely peremptory basis. The article by Coomaraswamy, on which the speculation is based (see *supra*), approaches the subject with great caution; Coomaraswamy quotes a number of texts in the light of which, as he admits himself (p. 489), he has construed his own exegesis of the zero concept in application to the metaphysics of space.

A reviewer, yearningly pursuing the content of the book to its final chapters in the hope of finding something of a concretely documented evidence in support of the author's theory, peruses the chapter on logic. But, alas, also here he finds little more than attempts at etymological exegeses ("logic is for the Indian only a memory - ānu-smṛti [sic!]), the repetition of the śūna:śūnya polarity, and speculations on mysticism (it is derived from *muḍ*) and the nirvāṇa.

A systematic review of all the points raised in the book would amount to an essay at least as long as the book itself. Hence, only some of the problems had to be selected;

others, treated in the same vein as those touched upon in this review had to be glossed over in spite of some of the odd conclusions encountered. ("Caste is not considered as a momentary historico-social institution, but as a permanent cosmic law of division of labour. It thus gains an importance more lasting than all historical events and regulations" or "Thus it was through no military weakness that, until recent times, conquered India was willing to leave the burden of government to the accidental external ruler. The Indians insisted only on maintaining cultural and spiritual leadership over the masses.")

If the above review, despite the fact that it has not been able to afford greater appreciation of the solutions arrived at in the book, has been written at some length, it is because so much could be expected from the author. Betty Heimann, a brilliant scholar and great enthusiast of Indian culture, past and contemporary, would have perhaps revised some parts of the book had she not died in the middle of her very fruitful scholarly activity.

ARNOLD KUNST

C. Hooykaas. *Perintis Sastra*. New edition. Oxford University Press, Kuala Lumpur, 1965. 477 pp. Malayan \$11.50.

The book reviewed here is an adaptation for Malaya of Dr. Hooykaas's (Indonesian) *Perintis Sastra*, which for the first time appeared in 1951. The Dutch version, *Literatuur in Maleis en Indonesisch*, was published in 1952. This latter version, although published later, is the original one. It was translated into Bahasa Indonesia by the late Raihoel Amar Gelar Datoek Besar, an official of the ITCO, the Institute for Cultural and Linguistic Research of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Indonesia in Djakarta.

In preparing this new edition the author was fortunate enough to secure the assistance of Dr. Ismael Hussein, at present lecturer in the Department of Malay Studies, University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur. On the titlepage it is stated that for this new edition the contents have been rearranged and a number of writings of Malayan authors have been added so as to make the book suitable for use in Malaya. The changes made have not been listed separately in the Foreword, which consists of a mere ten lines and is far too short for this edition which differs a great deal from its predecessors, and therefore it is perhaps worth while to mention them in some detail here. The plan of the book has remained the same: there were, and are now, three main sections, namely: I *Pemandangan*, literally "views", short lectures on a great variety of (literary) topics; II *Himpunan Ikhtisar*, "Epitomes brought together", a collection of summaries; and III *Petikan*, an anthology consisting of two chapters, (1) the modern period with three subsections (prose, poetry and essays), and (2) the classical period.

The only substantial difference in the first section is the addition of a new chapter, namely No. 32 *Perkembangan Sastra Melayu di Semenanjung*, the Development of Malay Literature in the Malay Peninsula, which it may be assumed has been contributed by Mr. Ismael Hussein. Further additions in this section are to be found on pp. 15, 16, 21, 33, 34 and 35, while the final part of chapter 12 on p. 17 has been shortened considerably.

To section II has been added one new paragraph, No. 23 *Riwayat seorang Minangkabau Pedagang Lada*, the Story of a Minangkabau Pepper-trader.

The most substantial changes have taken place in the modern part of the third section, the anthology. Of the ten items of the completely Indonesian prose section of the original only five have remained, and eight items (four Malayan and four Indonesian) have been added, so that the total number of prose items now has become thirteen. The same has happened in the poetry section. Of the ten items in the original edition of 1952 there remain nine, but in a shortened form, while poems of three Malayan and four Indonesian poets have been added, so that the number of poets

represented now is sixteen. The "essay" section has been enlarged considerably. There are now seven Indonesian items (an addition of four) and four Malayan, totalling eleven as against four in the original edition.

With regard to the section of the classical period, the changes here are less spectacular. One item has been added (No. 17), two (Nos. 4 and 15) have been deleted, and in one case where the original edition has two items, these have now been combined, i.e. old 32 and 2 are new 2, so that the total is now 29 as against 31 in the old edition. A further, and obvious, change is that in this Malayan edition the Malayan spelling has been used. The text of the translation itself as originally done by Datoek Besar has been left virtually untouched. Only in a very few instances minor stylistic changes were made.

In the opinion of the present reviewer it is a pity that the author and the publishers have not availed themselves of the opportunity to revise the Indonesian text more drastically, and this mainly for two reasons. In the first place, although in 1952 Datoek Besar's translation perhaps was the best possible at the time, this translation is not always perfect. In places his renderings are clumsy, e.g. p. 65 *bernilai mujarab* for "highly effective" said of a fine pantun; p. 104 *cherita? Hindu yang dibuat* for "adapted" (disadur); in other cases, less correct, e.g. p. 34 *serupa* for "cognate (languages)". Sometimes they are wrong, e.g. p. 52, line 8 where *diterbitkan* gives a wrong impression. What is meant here is not "were published", but "were written", i.e. *dikarang* or *disusun*. This becomes only clear if we compare the Indonesian translation with the original Dutch text. The same is the case with a puzzling sentence like the one on p. 154 *karangannya tidak pernah dichetakkan seluruhnya, tulisan tanganpun tentang naskah2 itu belum pernah diperoleh*, which is grammatically all right, but makes no sense. The difficulty is easily solved if again we have recourse to the Dutch text, which discloses that complete manuscripts have not been found yet. Incidentally, this statement was correct in 1952, and it still is today, but in 1965 mention ought to have been made of the fact that it would now be possible to edit a complete text because in 1960 a manuscript belonging to the Library of the University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur was found to contain the missing third book of the *Bustan* (see *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, Vol. 117 (1961), p. 482). Unintelligible for instance is also p. 104, line 11 ff.: *Mungkin bahwa di Melaka, sebelum jatuhnya dalam tahun 1511, kesustasteraan Melayu amat berkembang, tetapi kemundurannya amat sangat, sehingga tidak hebatnya dapat mengatakan dan menerangkan hal itu dengan kepastian*. The Dutch text has: maar de val is te desastreuus geweest om dit zekerheid te kunnen zeggen, i.e. but the fall (of Malacca) was so disastrous as to make it impossible to say so with any certainty. Further, in a number of cases usage typical for Indonesia could easily have been substituted by words and phrases more familiar to the Malays of Malaya, e.g. p. 1 *roman* (nobel), p. 7 (and elsewhere) *dibikin* (dibuat), p. 19 *supir* (draibar), p. 28 *kesulitan* (kesukaran), p. 89 *koran* (surat kabar) etc. It would not be difficult to give more examples of this kind, but suffice it to say that this reviewer can't help feeling that a future edition of the work under review would greatly benefit from a careful comparison of the present text with the Dutch original. The second reason why it is felt that a revision of the text ought to have been made does not concern matters of language and stylistics, but is the fact that the original work was written for use in Indonesia and intended for Indonesians, whereas this new edition is for use in Malaya and intended for Malay(an)s. There is, however, a considerable difference between the educational systems of the two countries, which need not be elaborated upon here, and as a consequence matters which perhaps are perfectly clear to Indonesian students may need additional explanation in the case of Malayan students. The present reviewer wonders whether a Malayan reader will be familiar with *pendeta Guido Gezelle dari daerah Vlaanderen [sic!]* (p. 7), or with Dutch and Flemish authors like (p. 14) *Ter Braak*, *Marsman*, *Slauerhoff*, *Elschot pengarang Flaming [sic!]*, and with *Du Perron* (p. 18) and *Justus van Maurik* (p. 26). Such passages the present reviewer feels ought to have been rewritten, even if but briefly, for a Malayan public. Also in other instances a slight adaptation would not have been out of place. If for instance on p. 16 line 11 from bottom we read *karangan2 dari sepuluh tahun yang akhir ini* we should realize that this

refers to the period of about 1940-50. It would be possible to give more instances of this kind, but there is no need to do so.

Nor is it necessary to give a detailed list of various little lapses here. Most of them can easily be corrected by the reader. The present reviewer would like to point to the following only: p. 7 line 8 *dalam kebanyakan bahasa Melayu*, read: *dalam kebanyakan bahasa Malayo-Polinesia*; p. 45, l. 13 it was not *Crawfurd* but *Marsden* who wrote *A History of Sumatra*; p. 72 *sha'ir* is not derived from Arabic *shīr* but is without a doubt Arabic *shā'ir*, poet; p. 73, l. 5 from bottom, the puzzling *Sjair* (*Himop* = *Sjair*) *Kompeni Belanda berperang dengan Tjina* already figuring in the Indonesian original should, of course, read: *Sjair Himop* (= *Sjair Kompeni Belanda berperang dengan Tjina*); p. 103, l. 21, *pengetahuan kita*, read *pengetahuan orang Eropah*; p. 104, l. 9 *Pelajaran Pertama*, read *Pelayaran Pertama*; p. 155, l. 13 *dalam tahun 1628*, read *dalam tahun 1634*.

With regard to the views put forward by the author in the first part of his book, it is not always possible to agree with him in all respects, and this is only natural as he has touched upon a great variety of subjects, often in a brief and popular way. In particular his discussion of matters of style and versification is not convincing. This was already pointed out by Professor Teeuw in his review of the Indonesian and Dutch versions (*Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, Vol. 109 (1953), pp. 89-92), and therefore the present reviewer feels justified in not going into these matters again. Generally speaking it may be said that the first section, that of the *Pemandangan*, is very valuable and helpful to a better understanding of Malay and Indonesian literature. It contains a wealth of information, useful to the student and interesting for the general reader. Naturally there are several passages that deserve to be discussed, but to go into details here is not possible for reasons of space. The following points only may be mentioned: the present reviewer fails to understand why Dr. Hooykaas should have devoted two separate paragraphs to one and the same topic, namely §60 and §63, respectively headed *Yang empunya cherit(er)a* and *Sahibul-hikayat*. Surely one paragraph would have sufficed, *Yang empunya cherit(er)a* simply being Malay for Arabic *Sahibul-hikayat*. Further, §49 *Sajak yang tertua dalam Bahasa Melayu* ought to have been fully rewritten. The original Dutch version had a corrigenda elsewhere in the book. In the Indonesian translation this corrigenda was added to the text of the paragraph, thereby losing its character of corrigenda and making the whole fairly confusing. And to make the confusion complete, in this new Malayan edition the poem itself, which consists of eight lines, has been printed as if it were prose, without a separation of the lines.

The second section, a collection of 49 abstracts of important works of classical Malay literature, is a most welcome help, the more so because the majority of these works is not easily accessible to students of Malay literature in the secondary schools. Of course, classical Malay literature is more extensive than the works represented here, but still this is a valuable collection of summaries, for which every student of Malay literature will be grateful to Dr. Hooykaas. §20 deals with the *Salasilah Melayu dan Bugis dan sekalian Raja-rajanya*, a work of great importance for our knowledge of eighteenth-century Malay history. The impression given here is that this text occurs under various titles (*Aturan setia Bugis dengan Melayu*, *Hikayat negeri Riau*, *Sejarah Raja2 Riau*), but in reality these names represent as many different texts. For a future edition this reviewer would like to see added short paragraphs on the Malacca Codes of Law and on the Maritime Laws which contain important data on the social and economical life in the flourishing period of the Malacca Sultanate.

The third section contains the anthology, not wholly equally divided between classical Malay (± 150 pp.) and the modern period (± 130 pp.), in respect of which, however, one should realize that the latter must cover the literature in Malay and in Bahasa Indonesia, i.e. of two countries. Whereas the subsection devoted to the classical period (which in the book comes last) gives a good representative picture of the older literature, the subsection dealing with the modern literature really is too meagre. There are only four Malayan prose writers, and nine Indonesians; three Malayan poets and nine from Indonesia; and in the *Kupasan* ("essay") part four Malaysians and seven Indonesians. Another matter is the complete absence of any personal data concerning

these authors, not even an indication as to their nationality whether they are Indonesian or Malayan, to which also the sequence, being alphabetical, gives no clue.

This may not be just pure coincidence. It would seem that the underlying idea is that between Bahasa Indonesia and Modern Malay there is no difference whatsoever, as is stated on p. 35, and not only that, but also that the literature in Bahasa Indonesia on the one hand and the literature in Modern Malay on the other hand have so much in common, are so virtually of the same character, as to make it possible to consider them one and the same, and as a consequence in an anthology which contains literary products of both nations there should be no reason to distinguish between the two.

Interesting as this point of view may be, reasons of time and space forbid to say more of it here. It will be clear, however, that in making a book like the one under review the question of whether the compiler is adhering to this view or is taking a different point of departure, makes all the difference with regard to the plan of the book and the way in which it is arranged.

As has already been said, the subsection devoted to the classical period (*Dari Zaman Dulu*) gives a good representative picture of the older literature. Also some tales in a Malay dialect have found a place here. Whether these tales really belong to the old literature is another question. In any case some of them are fairly recent, for instance the last three items of §4 (*Orally transmitted tales*). They belong to a small collection of tales in the Malay dialect of Deli (east coast of Sumatra) which were written down by the late Datoek Hoesin of Medan in 1949 at the request of the present reviewer. The same year a provisional draft of these tales, not yet ready for publication, was sent to the Institute for Cultural and Linguistic Research of the University of Indonesia, and later, in 1953, edited and published in *Bahasa dan Budaya*, the monthly of the said Institute (No. 3, Tahun 1, February 1953). This may explain the slight differences in spelling between the final redaction as published in 1953 and the version found in Dr. Hooykaas's book, which still contains the version of the provisional draft. For a future edition it is suggested that the final version of these tales take the place of the present one.

Perintis Sastera tries to cover the vast field of classical Malay literature and the modern literature in both Peninsular and Indonesian Malay in one, large, volume. Already in the Indonesian version the modern section was the weaker part, and this is still more the case in this new edition for Malaya. Considerably more space has been devoted to classical Malay literature than to the literature of the modern period. The real strong-point of the book is in the classical section, and therefore the book as a whole does not escape giving the impression of being somewhat imbalanced. In the opinion of the present reviewer this imbalance could perhaps be repaired if the modern section were taken out altogether and, much enlarged, shifted to a separate second volume.

The task of a reviewer is not always an easy one, in particular when he is reviewing a work in which he takes a great interest. After all the detailed and critical remarks that have been made so far the present reviewer has no hesitation in saying that in his opinion Dr. Hooykaas's book is a valuable work and one of the best available in the field. Without a doubt it meets a real and much felt need in an excellent way and students both on the secondary and the academic level will be grateful to have it.

The book is well-produced by Oxford University Press, Kuala Lumpur. A typographical remarkability is that beginning from page 258 a different and slightly smaller type has been used and there are a few more lines to the page.

R. ROOLVINK

Selected Works of George A. Kennedy. Edited by Tien-yi Li. Far Eastern Publications, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, 1964.

The amount of published work which George A. Kennedy left behind him on his death at the comparatively early age of 59 was regrettably small, the more regrettably because what he did publish was so lively and stimulating. Though the grammar of

Classical Chinese which we might have hoped for from him remained unachieved, we must be grateful that his former colleague, Professor Li Tien-yi, has gathered together his most important articles in one volume. Most of the material is already published in journals, but some pieces only appeared in the privately distributed periodical *Wen-ti* and have not been generally available. In the case of the article "Word classes in Classical Chinese", originally intended to be an introduction to a grammar of Mencius, the editor has been able to supplement the text published in *Wen-ti*, 9 (April 1956) with material from Kennedy's own manuscript.

Apart from the early article, "Interpretation of the Ch'un-ch'iu" (demonstrating the untenability of the traditional view that Confucius expressed hidden judgements by his choice of terminology), a short note describing an ingenious method for converting cyclical dates and a few book reviews, all the pieces are on linguistic problems. Kennedy was proud to describe himself as a native speaker of Chinese, in the form spoken in Tangsi, a village near Hangchow, but his training was as a sinologist and his main interests as a linguist were towards understanding the ancient classical language. To this end the insights derived from his intimate knowledge of a Wu dialect were certainly often helpful. In addition he had the advantage of close contacts with the strong school of linguistics at Yale.

He made his greatest contributions in the field of grammar. His ventures into historical phonology were, I think, less successful, though always suggestive. For example, he was certainly right in criticizing Karlgren's theory of four varieties of stops in Archaic Chinese ("Voiced gutturals in Tangsi"), but his own solution was even less tenable. Karlgren's Ancient Chinese γ - and ji - are, of course, members of the same phoneme, as several scholars have pointed out, but one cannot, as Kennedy suggests, simply project this situation back into earlier times. There is quite strong evidence (adduced by Karlgren and not discussed by Kennedy) from *hsieh-sheng* series and word family relationships that at least some of the unyodized γ 's go back to an earlier stop, the voiced correlate of initial k . Instead of this Kennedy wanted to reconstruct a separate, but rare, unyodized gh - (= Karlgren's g' -) in Ancient as well as Archaic Chinese. His justification for doing so was that the Tangsi dialect regularly distinguishes gh - and hh - (i.e. voiced h), the normal reflexes of Ancient g' - and γ - respectively, before both yodized and unyodized finals. But most of the examples which he cites can be accounted for in terms of the loss of *yod* in the presence of labialization, a development which Tangsi shares with Mandarin, e.g. 共 "together", Ancient Chinese $g'juang$ (M. *giang*) giving Tangsi *ghuang*-, Peking *kung*; 狂 "crazy", Ancient $g'juang$, giving Tangsi *ghang*, Peking *k'uang* (in this case Tangsi has lost both *yod* and labialization). Kennedy placed considerable store on the word 茄 "eggplant", Peking *ch'ieh*, Tangsi *gha*, but he was unfortunately mistaken in his interpretation of the *Kuang-yün* reading. The *fan-ch'ieh* spelling 俱迺 does not, as he thought, point to an unyodized final. He was misled by the reading *ka* given for 迺 in Karlgren's *Analytic Dictionary*. The correct reading should be *kid* (see ASIA MAJOR, II (1965), 202-3), giving *g'id* as the reading for 茄.

Similarly, though a detailed demonstration would take up too much space here, I believe that the problems inconclusively raised in "Ancient -an, -on and the J-bomb" (*Wen-ti*, 1954) are to be explained on totally different lines from those envisaged by Kennedy and in terms of developments since the time of the *Ch'ieh-yün* rather than before it.

When we turn to the grammatical studies, we are able to give a much more positive verdict on Kennedy's achievements. His "Study on the particle *yen*" (*JAOS*, 60 (1940)), in spite of the inimitable, almost flippant style, was a model of how to go about analysing the function of a particle. Though we may be sure that we are still far from having got to the bottom of the morphology involved in the relation of 焉 to 於 and 然 to 如, Kennedy's conclusion that 焉 is functionally equivalent to 於 + 之 is a *fait acquis*. He reinforced his argument on this point in a sharp and witty polemic against Father Jos. L. M. Mullie, "Another note on *yen*" (*HJAS*, 1952). The achievement of these articles goes far beyond merely explaining a single particle. It constituted a big step towards treating Classical Chinese as a real language with coherent structural rules.

Kennedy's most ambitious grammatical work was the article "Word-classes in Classical Chinese", originally intended as an introduction to a *Grammar of Mencius*. It tries to analyse one variety of Classical Chinese making no presuppositions based on the grammar of other languages and treating it in terms of its own internal structure. The point of departure is the question whether one can define word classes in Classical Chinese by purely formal means. Though his study was incomplete and he himself called it "an abortive grammar of Mencius", the degree of success which he achieved in distinguishing three classes of lexical items - verbs, nouns and "ambis" (i.e. stative verbs or adjectives) - by their possibilities of occurrence in distinct syntactical patterns was very considerable, enough to call very seriously into question the still widely held dogma that "full words" in Classical Chinese are in principle interchangeable in grammatical function. In my opinion a better approach, indeed an essential preliminary to setting up lexical categories, is to analyse the syntactical patterns of the language, but Kennedy was in effect making a start in this direction. In spite of its incompleteness and some points of detail which I would question, this article remains, in my view, the best attempt so far to give an account of the grammar of a variety of Classical Chinese.

Another important article is "Tsai lun wu wo 再論吾我" ("The Classical pronoun forms *ngo* and *nga*") reprinted in Chinese from "Studies presented to Hu Shih on his sixty-fifth birthday", *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 28 (1956). It seems regrettable that the editor did not find an English version among Kennedy's papers or have the article translated into English, which would have made it more easily available to students, as well as to linguists who are not specialists in Chinese. The hypothesis which Kennedy put forward to explain the variant forms of the first personal pronouns, and some other comparable sets of related grammatical words, is an important one. He rejected Karlgren's interpretation of these forms as vestiges of a case system and suggested instead that differences of stress were involved (see *Revue bibliographique de sinologie*, 3, No. 574, and also ASIA MAJOR, 8 (1960), 36-67, where a similar theory is developed about demonstrative pronouns).

Finally I should like to say something about "The butterfly case", an article first published in *Wen-ti*, in which Kennedy attacked the view that Classical Chinese did not contain disyllabic root words. As an example of an unanalysable disyllable he took the word *hu-tieh* 蝴蝶 "butterfly". With playful wit he ridicules those dictionaries which interpret this word as composed of two separate elements, *hu* and *tieh*, each meaning butterfly and forming together a "synonym compound". He was, of course, quite right in maintaining that *hu* never occurs by itself in the sense of "butterfly". As several scholars pointed out to him, however, when the article first appeared, *tieh* "butterfly" does occur alone and in other combinations". It is a pity that the editor of his *Selected Works* did not reprint the short note from the next issue of *Wen-ti* in which Kennedy acknowledged this. Though he did not develop his argument fully, it would appear that he intended to explain such cases of *tieh* as resulting from abbreviation of the original disyllable. This seems unlikely however, for *tieh* < Middle Chinese *dep* (Karlgren *d'iep*) is undoubtedly cognate to Tibetan *p'ye-ma-leb* "butterfly" (where *p'ye-ma* "flour" no doubt refers to the scales on a butterfly's wings) and to Burmese *lipprā* "butterfly". All these words are no doubt cognate to Chinese *yeh* 葉 "leaf" (with the same phonetic as *tieh*), Tibetan *lo-ma* "leaf" (West Tibetan *lob*), *hdab* "leaf, wing", Burmese *lip* "fold", etc. The prefixed element *hu* remains obscure but this alone is hardly justification for assuming that it must always have been inseparable from *tieh*.

Most of the supporting examples of disyllabic names of insects and small animals which Kennedy cites are cases of partial reduplication, such as *t'ang-lang* 螳螂 "mantis" and *chi-chü* 即且 "millipede". Complete or partial reduplication is an important morphological process in Chinese, used to form words with an especially expressive or affective character, but even when the reduplicated element does not occur alone, this does not seriously detract from the monosyllabic character of the Chinese morpheme. A few unexplained cases where there is no reduplication, such as *hu-tieh*, are hardly a sufficient basis for establishing disyllabic morphemes as a regular part of the old Chinese phonological system.

In the same article Kennedy also attacks the theory of the invariability of the monosyllable in Chinese. In this his intuition was, I believe, correct, even though the evidence he adduced will not stand up to examination. He argues that the noun-forming suffixes of Modern Mandarin, 兒 -r and 子 -tzu were always simply noun suffixes and did not derive as diminutives from the words for "child". With regard to -r Kennedy is able to quote an example of its use as a noun suffix from a poem as early as the eighth century A.D., but at that time the suffix was certainly a distinct syllable, since it must be given such a value to make the poem scan. Moreover, -r, unlike -tzu, often retains a certain diminutive force in Mandarin.

The alleged early examples of 子 as a noun suffix all turn out to be unacceptable. In 獅子 "lion" it is undoubtedly part of the transcription, which must have been based on a form like Tokharian A. *secake* or B. *sisäk* rather than Persian *šēr* or Sanskrit *siṃha* as has often been assumed (see ASIA MAJOR, 9 (1962), 109 and 226). The word 眸子 (Middle Chinese *mju-tsjə*) "pupil of the eye", which occurs in Mencius, surely does not mean "squinter" as Kennedy alleged (the pupil does not squint). It must be for 目子 (Middle Chinese *mju-k-tsjə*), meaning "child in the eye". Parallels to this kind of name for the "pupil" are found all over the world, e.g. Latin *pupilla*, Tibetan *myig-gi-miu* "little man of the eye", Modern Chinese *t'ung-tzu* 瞳子 or *t'ung-jen* 瞳人, where *t'ung* is no doubt etymologically the same as *t'ung* 僮 "boy" (cf. S. Ullmann, *Semantics*, p. 226).

Equally unconvincing is Kennedy's attempt to treat *tzu* in K'ung-tzu, etc., as simply the noun suffix. Though *tzu* has here no doubt moved a long way from the meaning "child", it can hardly be dissociated from the use of *tzu* alone as a polite form of address. It is certainly not simply a bound noun-forming suffix.

The real analogue in Old Chinese to the noun-forming suffixes of Mandarin is the suffix *-s which one has to postulate as the origin of the departing tone in such words as *chi* 騎 < Middle Chinese *gie* "rider" (compare *ch'i* < Middle Chinese *gie* "ride"), *sheng* 乘 < *šjəŋ* "vehicle" (compare *ch'eng* < *šjəŋ* "ride (in a carriage)", parallel to the -s suffix of Tibetan (see ASIA MAJOR, 9 (1962), 216 ff.). It is true that this suffix, both in Old Chinese and Tibetan, had other uses besides forming nouns from verbs. The important thing from our present point of view is that it is now becoming possible to isolate such formative elements in Old Chinese, and Sino-Tibetan generally, and by such means to begin to make a systematic analysis of word-family relationships.

Kennedy's observations are always of interest, even when we cannot accept his conclusions. All serious students of the history and grammar of the Chinese language will want to read and re-read these articles.

E. G. PULLEYBLANK

E. P. J. Mullie: *De Mongoolse Prins Nayan*. Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België. Klasse der Letteren Jaargang XXVI, 1964, nr. 3. Brussel, 1964. 53 pp. 105 B.fr.

This monograph is a study on the Mongol prince Nayan who rose against Qubilai Khan in 1287 and whose domain, situated in modern Manchuria, was brought under imperial control after his defeat. Nayan's revolt has also been described in detail by Marco Polo (for a recently published note on N. see also P. Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo*, Vol. II, Paris, 1963, pp. 788-9). Nayan was, it seems, a Nestorian Christian, a fact not expressly mentioned by the Chinese sources. The passage in the *Cho-keng-lu* quoted by Pelliot and by Mullie (p. 41) which could be interpreted as an allusion to the Christian religion of at least a part of Nayan's followers has been copied from the *Shan-chü hsin-hua* of Yang Yü (H. Franke, *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Chinas unter der Mangolenherrschaft*, Wiesbaden 1936, No. 67, p. 82). Mullie's study of Nayan's revolt is chiefly based on the *Yüan-shih* and later works such as *Yüan-shih hsin-pien*, *Yüan-shih lei-pien* and *Hsin Yüan-shih*. He takes the relevant passages from the *pen-chi* as starting-point and supplements these scanty data by extensive translations from the

ieh-chuan section. The translations are careful and correct, written in a fluent and readable Flemish. Mullie uses a romanization based on the French system but substituting the Flemish pronunciation (-oe- for French -ou-, sj- for French ch-, etc.) in a consistent way. The study is a welcome contribution to our knowledge of Yüan history and the first publication of the Flemish Academy to deal with a Far Eastern subject. It is to be hoped that more will follow this pioneer effort.

Throughout the work non-Chinese names are romanized according to the Chinese transcription. A "Namenlijst" (pp. 47-53) supplies the Chinese characters and also Mongol equivalents. These have been suggested by Father Antoine Mostaert but unfortunately Mullie has in several cases been a victim of the misleading Ch'ien-lung "reformed" orthography. Not even an eminent Mongolist like Father Mostaert can give a satisfactory Mongol equivalent for a name which has been spelt in the impossible Ch'ien-lung transcription. Some Mongol equivalents appearing in the list are therefore based on wrong assumptions; others, though the Chinese orthography is right, seem doubtful to this reviewer. To the latter category belongs Yü-wa-shih 玉哇失. The bearer of this name came from an Alan clan and there is no need to etymologize his name as Mongol. The suggested Mo. *ubasi* (lay Buddhist) is phonetically unconvincing. The syllable *yü* points to a front vowel original, apart from the fact that a distinctly Buddhist personal name seems out of place in this early period of Mongol history. Pelliot (*Histoire des campagnes de Gengis Khan*, pp. 300, 302) reconstructs a tentative *Yuwaš or *Yuyaš, a form which is not explained nor explainable and moreover a back vowel word. "Yun-li-ki-se" 潤里吉思 in the index is reconstructed as Yürgis and thought to be derived from the tribal name Yürgi. But here the Chinese orthography is based on a misprint or a misreading; the correct form should be "K'wo-li-ki-se", 潤 | | | *Körgis, a well-attested Öngüt Christian name meaning "George", cf. L. Hambis, *Le chapitre CVIII du Yuan che*, pp. 26, 120-30. "Si-li-ki-se" 錫里吉思 has nothing to do with *mo.sirigi* but is derived from Sergius. "Poe-liue-ts'i" is a Ch'ien-lung monstrosity for the original (in Wade-Giles) *Po-lan-hsi* 李蘭奚, *Boralgi. This name is not infrequent, cf. Pelliot, *Hist. des campagnes*, p. 121, Hambis, *Le chap. CVII*, index s.v. Būrālyi, Būrālqi; Hambis, *Le chap. CVIII*, index s.v. Buralgi; F. W. Cleaves in HJAS 13 (1950) p. 56, n. 205 mentions variant Mongol pronunciations (Boraliki/Buraliki); the name itself is derived from a title (Paul Ratchnevsky, *Un code des Yuan*, p. LXVIII). The etymology *būriyeci* (trumpeter) for the "Poe-liue-ts'i" of Mullie's text must therefore be rejected.

HERBERT FRANKE

An Indian Dialect of the Parya Group (Hissar Valley, Central Asia). Materials and Investigations, by I. M. Oransky. Part I - Texts (Folklore), (Moscow, 1963).

The existence of an Indo-Aryan form of speech current among a small group in Tajikistan first came to light when the author of the present treatise was engaged in linguistic researches in that region in 1954. The discovery was as interesting as it was unexpected, and at that time, and on a number of occasions since, a considerable amount of material on it was collected. A number of preliminary communications about the language have been made since its discovery, notably at the International Conference of Orientalists held at Moscow in 1960, but the present volume is the first instalment of the comprehensive publication of the material collected.

The linguistic material made available in this volume consists of eighteen texts, mainly folk-tales, in romanized transcription with Russian translation. Most of the remainder of the volume is made up of a detailed introduction in which the problems connected with the origin of the dialect and of its speakers are discussed in detail. There are also a few verbal paradigms and a list of names of relationship compared with various modern Indo-Aryan dialects. A detailed grammar and vocabulary, together with further texts, will be published later.

The language in question is not in any way connected with the Dardic group, in spite of the fact that these are the nearest to it, but belongs evidently to the Western

Section of the Central Indo-Aryan group. A detailed study of its precise position is reserved until the publication of the remaining texts, the grammar and vocabulary. The most noteworthy development that has taken place in the language is replacing of the voiced aspirate stops by unvoiced stops (*tup* "heat of the sun" < *dhūp*, etc. On the other hand the unaspirated voiced stops remain (*giyo* "went", etc.)

The Parya have a number of traditions concerning their origin, according to which they originated in the Panjab and moved to their present habitation after an intermediate residence in Afghanistan. The traditions concerning their origin which could be collected from various informants are discussed in the introduction. One of these traditions connects them with the Cangars, a tribe of migratory agricultural labourers in the Panjab. On the other hand the linguistic information available about the latter does not correspond to the dialect of the Parya.

The publication of the remainder of the material, and of the grammar and vocabulary, will be awaited with great interest by students of the modern Indo-Aryan languages. It should then be possible to define more accurately the exact position of this dialect within the Indo-Aryan family.

T. BURROW

A History of Urdu Literature, by Muhammad Sadiq. pp. ix + 429 (Oxford University Press, London; Karachi, Lahore, Dacca, 1964).

The appearance of a new, substantial work in English on the history of Urdu literature is an event of some importance. Ram Babu Saxena's history was published as long ago as 1927, and T. Grahame Bailey's account – a much shorter and less satisfactory sketch – followed only a few years later in 1932. Since then, though a few studies of particular figures, trends, and periods have appeared, no general history in English has been attempted. The present volume is therefore most welcome, particularly as it marks an appreciable advance upon its predecessors. The historical and social setting of the literature for the first time receives substantial (though still inadequate) attention, the treatment of the literature itself is fuller, a section of references and notes provides some (though not enough) support for the materials presented in the main text, and there is a full index. The book is also beautifully produced.

The author divides his material into two parts: the first dealing with medieval literature and the second with that of the modern period. This division is fully justified, and so also (though some will dispute this) is the inclusion in the former period of the chapter entitled "The Age of Ghālib"; for, broadly speaking, modern Urdu literature does not come into being until the 1860's. Even when it does – and the author should have made this clearer – this does not mark the simultaneous end of medieval literature, particularly in the domain of poetry. Professor Sadiq is aware of this, for he speaks (p. 41) of medieval Urdu poetry as coming "to its end with . . . Dāgh" who, he tells us elsewhere, died in 1905; but this is itself too early a terminal date; vital poetry in the medieval tradition (including some of better quality than Dāgh's) continued to be written long after this. Indeed it is still being written, and is likely to continue for a good many years to come. In a book of more than 400 pages, therefore, the allocation of the first 41 to two chapters on "The Historical Background" and "Characteristics of Medieval Urdu Poetry" is not excessive.

What the author has to say in these chapters is less satisfactory. He is the latest in a school of Urdu critics which came into being nearly a century ago, who have been profoundly impressed with the achievements of English literature. These critics, often consciously, and still more often unconsciously, have approached their own literature with comparisons with English almost constantly in mind, and the result has not always been enlightening. Of the earliest representatives of this school it is hardly too much to say that their actual knowledge of English literature was minimal, and that their conviction that it must be invincibly superior to their own was a deduction from the fact that all around them they could see in other spheres the superior power of all

things English. Their acute sense of the inferiority of Urdu literature, combined with their very limited knowledge of English literature, has sometimes produced ironical results. They have condemned, for example, features of their classical love poetry as peculiarly and reprehensibly oriental, unaware of the fact that these same features can be found in English poetry too, and in the medieval poetry of French and Italian by which English poetry was profoundly influenced. Professor Sadiq is more knowledgeable than his predecessors, and is fully aware of these resemblances; but it does not help him more than a few steps along the road towards that sympathetic insight into medieval poetry without which a satisfactory treatment of it is not possible; so that, by and large, one is left with the impression that where less knowledgeable historians condemned outright the medieval features of Urdu classical poetry, Professor Sadiq censures it in less extreme terms, pleading (in mitigation of punishment, so to speak) that even European literatures once showed these same features. It is unfortunate that Professor Sadiq's English authorities all too often (though not always) reflect a similar lack of sympathy for the medieval man, and that he seems either unaware of or unimpressed by the work of such writers as C. S. Lewis and Dorothy Sayers (in her introductions to her translations of medieval French and Italian poetry), whose writing helps the modern reader to understand, and in some measure to put himself in the place of, the medieval man, and so appreciate his poetry. Urdu classical poetry still awaits this sympathetic approach, and until it receives it, its supreme achievement – the *ghazal* – will not be seen for what it is, but relegated to the position to which Professor Sadiq, like so many of his predecessors, assigns it "very low in the hierarchy of literary forms" (p. 19).¹

This inadequacy in the author's approach is the major defect in the book. Unfortunately it is not the only one. The title is, in effect, a claim which the contents fail to substantiate, for while the range does indeed extend over the whole period of Urdu literature (to the 1930's), some subjects within this range receive quite inadequate attention; a title such as "Studies in the History of Urdu Literature" would have been at once more modest and more accurate. The main deficiency is the lack of any adequate treatment of the prose literature; in particular, the prose narrative receives very much less attention than its importance warrants. In this connexion the failure to attempt any presentation of the antecedents of modern prose narrative in Urdu is, to put it no more strongly, remarkable. A key theme here is that of the *Dāstān i Amīr Hamsa*, a work which receives in the course of the whole book only one brief, incidental, and unexplained reference in quite another context (p. 47) – where, we may remark in passing, a quite illogical conclusion is drawn about it. Historians of Urdu literature can surely not refuse much longer to face the need for a careful estimate of the degree to which this enormous medieval prose romance, which, though not systematically committed to writing until the last decades of the nineteenth century, had been for at least two generations before that perhaps the best known and most popular Urdu prose narrative, moulded the development of the modern novel. This is not the place to discuss the reasons why the *Dāstān* has been so generally ignored. Professor Sadiq is only the latest in a long line of critics who have chosen to say nothing about it. But at any rate earlier critics did not go into the antecedents of Sarshār's *Fasāna i Ajāib* in the way Professor Sadiq has; and to succeed in doing this without even the smallest reference to *Dāstān i Amīr Hamsa* is quite a remarkable feat. Sarshār himself nowhere acknowledges his debt to it, but the debt is a very evident one for all that, and Sarshār's silence is no warrant for Professor Sadiq's *Fasāna i Ajāib*, a more sophisticated and much shorter work in the *dāstān* tradition, does receive mention; but here again there is no attempt to assess the relationship between it and Sarshār's work, though only such an assessment could make meaningful Professor Sadiq's apparently contradictory statements (both of them in fact true) that it was Sarshār's work "to

¹ The author's lack of any deep sympathy with the spirit of medieval literature has its counterpart, as one might expect, in a rather too uncritically favourable assessment of the impact of the West on Urdu literature; but this is a fault which impairs his judgement much less seriously.

break away from this tradition [i.e. that of *Fasāna i Ajāib*] and lay the foundations of the new prose in Lucknow" (p. 326) and that *Fasāna i Azād* was "written in emulation of *Fasāna i Ajāib*" (p. 335). Such apparent inconsistencies are not rare, and their resolution demands a knowledge of Urdu literature more extensive than can be gained from Professor Sadiq's book.²

A proper treatment of the prose narrative would also have demanded a more thoughtful assessment of the Fort William writers, and especially of Mir Amman's *Bāgh o Bahār*. Professor Sadiq is right to reject T. Grahame Bailey's considerable over-estimation of the influence which the Fort William writers exerted at the time they wrote, but the matter does not end there. The fact that, as Professor Sadiq mentions on p. 144, Sarūr in his *Fasāna i Ajāib* goes out of his way to attack *Bāgh o Bahār* argues that it enjoyed a measure of fame even in Sarūr's day, and if it did not significantly affect the development of Urdu literature at the time when it was written, it came into its own in the 1870's³ and played a significant part in helping forward the development of the new, relatively simple and unadorned narrative prose style; and this influence should have been assessed.

Few students of Urdu literature are equally well acquainted with all writers and all periods, and the present writer is certainly not one of these few. In such a situation one naturally turns with particular interest to the treatment of the writers about whom one knows most, and forms on this basis some sort of estimate of the soundness of the rest of the book. Professor Sadiq does not emerge very well from this test. Thus Mir is stated, in three separate places on p. 94, to have belonged to Allahabad. In fact he came from Agra, and this in fact is so well known that one can only wonder at Professor Sadiq's apparent ignorance of it. Ghālib's father is said, quite incorrectly, to have been "an officer in the Rampur army" (p. 176). Ghālib himself is said to have passed his last days "in comparative ease" (p. 177). On the contrary, he passed them in acute financial, physical and spiritual distress, a fact which would have been evident from the most cursory reading of his letters to the Nawwab of Rampur, published, as Professor Sadiq himself tells us only five lines after the statement we have quoted, nearly thirty years ago. Rusvā's *Umrāo Jān Adā* is described as "the life story of a courtesan in Oudh before its annexation by the British" (p. 355). In fact, the story continues into a period long after the annexation and the revolt of the following year. It is worth remarking in passing that, for some unexplained reason, Rusvā is considered after Prem Chand, though on Professor Sadiq's own showing he was born twenty-two years before Prem Chand, and his greatest novel was published in 1899 while Prem Chand's major works were the product of the 1920's and 1930's. Palpable errors of this kind are all too frequent in the book, and critics will be right to seize upon them, for if an author thinks it necessary to tell his readers where a poet was born, he should tell them correctly. But there are other faults which are much more serious than these, for after all, in a history of literature we are (or should be) much less concerned with writers' birthplaces than with the assessment of their work. Here one enters on dangerous ground, for every man is entitled to his own evaluation, and if, for example, the present writer disagrees (as he does) with Professor Sadiq on almost every point of his assessment of *Umrāo Jān Adā*, that is perhaps neither here nor there. Yet in these matters too there are objective standards, and judged by these Professor Sadiq's picture of *Umrāo Jān Adā* must be held to be a grossly misleading one. According to him realism in *Umrāo Jān Adā* is destroyed by sentimentality and didactic moralizing; and "copious moral seasonings – a sop to his middle-class readers – take the bite out of

² Other contradictions are not merely apparent. Thus the present writer, at any rate, has not been able to think of any way of reconciling the statement on p. 15 that "Urdu poetry . . ." leaves out observation and borrows its imagery wholesale from Persian" with that on p. 202 that "the imagery of Urdu poetry is mostly simple and drawn from the world of familiar observation".

³ A glance at the editions listed in the British Museum catalogue is enough to show this.

his story and make it rather savourless" (p. 356). Nothing could be further from the truth. Rusvā's portrait of Umrāo is sympathetic, but it is unsentimental to the point of ruthlessness, as, for example, in the scene where she describes her treatment at the hands of Akbar 'Ali Khān's womenfolk. She is speaking years after the event, but she can scarcely control the anger and indignation which she feels as she recalls the humiliation to which they had subjected her. Rusvā, whose comments and exchanges with Umrāo as she tells her story appear throughout the book, interrupts her and tells her bluntly that the loathing which they felt for her was entirely justified. The so-called "moralizing" to which Professor Sadiq objects is Umrāo's, not Rusvā's. (The words which he quotes do not, in fact, justify the conclusions which he draws from them, particularly when seen against the whole background of Rusvā's portrayal of Umrāo; but Professor Sadiq does not enable his readers to see this background.) Umrāo herself is shown as abandoning the courtesan's life not only because as she grows older she turns increasingly towards religion – a development in which, incidentally, there is nothing improbable or unconvincing – but also because experiences over the years (which are realistically and unsentimentally described) convince her that unless she does so the only prospect before her is to die a miserable death. And Rusvā's own explicit views are far from conventionally moral, and are stated quite bluntly. Thus he tells Umrāo, "Umrāo Jān, it is one of my principles in life that I look upon every chaste woman – no matter what her community or her creed – as my sister or my mother, and any behaviour towards such women which seeks to undermine their chastity revolts me. I think that people who try to corrupt them or lead them astray deserve to be shot. But I think it no sin to partake of the bounty of generous women" – a speech at which Umrāo exclaims, "Good God!"

Many more examples of this kind of thing could be quoted, but it is time to draw to a close. Professor Sadiq has a disconcerting habit of repeatedly expressing his judgement of Urdu writers in words used by English critics of English writers. Examples are numerous; the most striking is on p. 198, where he expresses his opinion of Ghālib through a 400-word quotation from Priestley on Meredith, but there are many others. Thus, within two pages (308–10), we are told of Akbar that he is "like the Tractarians in England", that "What S. A. Brooke says of Matthew Arnold is true of Akbar also", that "his strictures . . . remind one of Carlyle" and that "This reminds me of what Trollope writes of Thackeray". He will have no cause for complaint, therefore, if we close this review by saying that we may write of him what Samuel Johnson wrote of Isaac Watts, allowing him "to have done better than others what no man has done well".

RALPH RUSSELL

Tseng Ke-tuan, *Two Grand Poet Families in Modern China*. Hong Kong, 1964.

As is explained in five languages in this book, Mr. Tseng diligently collected poems by members of his own family and the Fan family covering a period of four hundred years. It is a very rare occurrence indeed, in any country, to witness two long lines of poets which merged in academic and literary interests, and which maintained an unbroken literary tradition despite the many vicissitudes of fortune and near disaster engendered by traumatic political upheavals. By dint of single-minded perseverance Mr. Tseng collected together his treasured manuscripts. He has now published this volume of selected poems for the enjoyment and edification of readers of Chinese poetry all over the world. This is a fine example of filial piety or family pride giving us a volume of Chinese poetry which allows us to have glimpses into the lives and thoughts of scholarly gentlemen who could still live and write according to the traditional mould.

K. P. K. WHITAKER

Geoffrey Wheeler. *The Peoples of Soviet Central Asia*. Pp. 126, 2 maps. London, The Bodley Head, 1966, 12s. 6d.

In this lucidly written book, the Director of the Central Asian Research Centre in London surveys the mediaeval and modern history of the fifteen million Muslims of Turkic and Iranian race who inhabit Soviet Central Asia. Stress is laid on the Russian conquest and the impact of Tsarist and Soviet rule on traditional patterns of belief and social organization. As a brief background study of Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tadzhikistan and Kirghizia, Colonel Wheeler's well-informed and incisive little book could scarcely be bettered. It is perhaps a pity that the veteran author, who spent many years in the Indian Political Service, is still worried, like Palmerston and Lord Curzon, by the threat of snowy-booted cossacks pouring into Pakistan and India through the Khyber Pass. To a certain Khalifa, who wrote that "Soviet historians are of the definite opinion that for Central Asia to have become part of the British dominions would have been the greatest possible disaster for its peoples", Colonel Wheeler retorts that if these peoples had been embodied in the British dominions they would by now, for better or for worse, have gained their independence. Or else, perchance, been colonized by several million land-hungry Red Chinese? The situation in Soviet Central Asia, as in many other parts of the world, is less simple than Colonel Wheeler would have us believe, but our thanks are due to him for providing an up-to-date background guide. There are two sketch maps, and a handy population table of the main national groupings inhabiting the region.

D. M. LANG