REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS

Anthology of Chinese Literature. From Early Times to the Fourteenth Century, Compiled and edited by Cyril Birch. Associate Editor: Donald Keene. New York, Grove Press Inc., 1965. 492 pp. $10.000

In editing these translations of many hands Dr. Birch has presented a very fair picture of Chinese literature up to the Yuan dynasty. While he shows an understandable preference for works more readily understood by a Western readership, and, perhaps in conformity with the spirit of our own age, a bias towards heretical opinion and acidity of expression, none of the selections is unrepresentative.

Some translations have been done specially for the anthology, but the great majority have been published before. Those chosen have been the best available, in terms both of accuracy and the quality of the English. The "best available" is generally very good indeed, though there are some slightly regrettable exceptions. Some spirited work has gone into the prose translations, while rather less pleasure, though certainly great pains, appears to have been taken with the verse. Of course the problems here are greater. There are poems dealing in a whole range of imagery that means nothing to the Western reader which cannot be excluded from an anthology. More than this, there is the problem of translating poetry into—what? One agrees with Dr. Birch that most attempts at rhymed translation—which presumably aims at making the translation more 'poetic'—are failures. If what is expected from a translator is to know as precisely as may be the sense of a poem, rhyme can be nothing but a hindrance. Whether following this line of reasoning or not, only one of the translators uses rhyme. Given a suitable theme there is still of course every possibility of making a translation which is admirable in its own right. The most remarkable example of that in this collection is Arthur Waley's

> Immeasurable pain!
> Last night my dreaming soul was king again . . . (p. 352)

which succeeds for the simple but ineffable reason that the words fit. By its nature it is an achievement that at this level can only be expected rarely. There is another kind of success that can be had with people like Ezra Pound (if anyone is like Ezra Pound) whom Dr. Birch includes, who often miss the sense, but mistranslate creatively.

The inclusion of J. I. Crump's excellent rendering of the Yuan play "Li K'uei Carries Thorns" deserves special mention, as so far it has enjoyed only limited circulation. Of its kind it is an outstanding play.

Though not necessarily predisposed to concede publishers' claims, they are right, in my opinion, to call this an "ideal introduction" for the uninitiated. As to the "student of Oriental studies" finding much that is "new and revealing", I suppose that depends on the student, but certainly he will be glad to have such a handy collection of reliable translations.

D. E. POLLARD

Studies in Chinese Literature (Harvard-Yenching Institute Studies XXI), edited by John L. Bishop. vi+245 pp. Harvard University Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1965. 36*s*.

The student of Chinese literature has a legitimate grievance in the paucity of serious work published in the field. The occasional paper that appears in learned journals serves only to whet his appetite for more. Here at last is a volume which has gathered

together enough of such morsels for a fairly substantial meal. The eight papers collected here are: (1) Rymeprose on Literature: The *Wên-fu* of Lu Chi by Achilles Fang (2) the *Fu* of T'ao Ch'ien, (3) Some Characteristics of Parallel Prose and (4) the *Wen Hsüan* and Genre Theory by James R. Hightower; (5) The *Shih-shuo hsin-yü* and Six Dynasties Prose Style by Yoshikawa Kōjirō (translated by Glen W. Baxter); (6) Metrical Origins of the *Tz'u* by Glen W. Baxter; (7) A Colloquial Short Story in the Novel *Chin p'ing mei*, and (8) Some limitations of Chinese Fiction by John L. Bishop, who is also the editor of the volume. As can be seen from the titles, the greater part of the papers deals with literature of the Six Dynasties. This far from being a drawback is the strength of this collection, for we are given translations of a number of pieces which will be of great value to the student, considering that the literature of this period is by no means easy to read. In his first paper, Hightower has not only translated T'ao Ch'ien's *Hsien ch'ing fu* and *Kan shih pu yü fu*, but also a number of *fu* on similar topics by his predecessors; in his second, he has translated K'ung Chih-kuei's *Pei Shan i wen* and Hsü Ling's Preface to his anthology the *Yü T'ai hsin yung* while in his last paper he has given us an elaborately annotated translation of the Preface to the *Wen hsüan*. Finally, Baxter also includes some elegant rendering of pieces which were the forerunner of the *tz'u*. All in all this volume is excellent value for money.

D. C. LAU

W. Norman Brown, *Man in the Universe, Some Continuities in Indian Thought*, ix+112 pp. Berkeley and Los Angeles, Universtiy of California Press, May 1966. 32*s* net.

"The Rigvedic poet who celebrated India's victory over Vṛtra as the story of the origin and structure of the universe would have been astonished to hear such teaching as that of the great Shankara . . . He would doubtless have comprehended nothing of what Shankara said . . . Step at a time the search for the Real has gone forward until it asserted reality for what Shankara's Rigvedic ancestor would have been likely to consider only the most insubstantial and vaporous of imaginings. He would not have believed that a tree sprung from early Vedic belief as the seed could produce such strange fruit".

This excerpt (p. 41) from Professor Brown's *Man in the Universe* is short of an epitome to his approach to the gradual stages of growth of India's religious and philosophical speculations. Seldom has a book of this modest size been able to condense so much valuable information and unfold such a lucid and convincing story of the strenuous and tortuous ways by which the human being travelled to pursue, develop, establish and again revise his philosophy of life, his knowledge and relation to other creatures and to the universe. The book's immense value lies in the fact that, unlike some previous and recent attempts at a comprehensive evaluation of the principles underlying Indian philosophy, it has in a simple and natural stream of narrative brought out and underscored the flux of continuous change in the formative stages of the ancient Indian thought. Here we have not only a well-documented outline of the evolutionary progress of outlook, in time and content, from the Vedas into the Upaniṣads, from the Upaniṣads into their exegeses, and from the Vedas and other sources into the relevant aspects of the Yoga, Buddhism and Jaina; but this account is also accompanied by a fascinating guide through the mental and emotional processes which man in India underwent in search of gratification of his increasing empirical and metaphysical fluctuating demands. The book is thus in itself a fine example of the application of the pratītyasamutpāda demonstrating both the differences and interdependence among single ideas emanating from their antecedents in a logical and historical succession.

The book is in a way a work of art, not just for the beauty of language – it consists of four lectures delivered in the fourth series of Rabindranath Tagore Memorial Lectures—and not only because it is one of the most succinct, and yet comprehensive, essays on Indian philosophy (it occupies only 111 pages of small format), but, foremost, because it is a valiant attempt at an enquiry into the gradual development of

thought dependent, as it grows and bends, on concomitant changes in environment and intellectual aspirations. This attempt is supported by good evidence and imaginative research and analysis.

However one may feel about Prof. Brown's division of the Ṛgvedic heavenly establishment into liberals (the Ādityas) and conservatives and reactionaries (the Dānavas), the idea of a jump from the concept of cosmic and eschatological dualism into one of a bipartisan structure of the ruling authority is suggestive, and brings the image of the whole heavenly institution closer to man's imagination than is the awesome and frightening vision of a gigantic duel between Good and Evil. The idea seems, in fact, better to accommodate the mind of a Vedic Indian whose general familiarity with his gods on the basis of a tit-for-tat relationship was far from the sense of aloof fear of God suggested by the Jewish or Christain approach.

Prof. Brown's analysis (pp. 23 ff.) of the shifting in the Vedas of man's attention from one god to another as the result of a change in his attitude to a particular deity, and the repudiation of that deity as no more commensurate with his earthly and otherworldly needs, provides a more probing explanation of the transition from polytheism to monotheism than Max Müller's definition of kathenotheism. While the latter presupposes devotion to the god to whose department, as Dasgupta says, people's wishes belong, Prof. Brown's interpretation suggests that such devotion to an individual god is the result of a change in the mental attitude of the worshipper who, in the course of time, has concluded that the no longer adequate deity has to give way to another, more suited to his new requirements. Max Müller's concept of henotheism suggests a, so to say, simultaneous cult of various gods regulated, as it were, by the priority of the need satisfiable by one, occasionally paramount, god; whereas Brown's interpretation tends to assume, in the shifting of worship from one deity to another, a chain of successive cults; consequently it is not unusual to find that the "abandoned" deity is addressed in the Vedas with scepticism and even mockery. This trend of thought is also carried further and transposed into the realm of pursuit not only of a personal deity but, to use Prof. Brown's formulation, of "the absolute Real . . . ever remaining the object of . . . pursuit while what yesterday was thought might be the Real, has today become only the abandoned Unreal" (p. 42).

There is little room for disagreement with what is said in the book. One or two points might cause a slight flutter of uncertainty. Prof. Brown's profound remarks on the principle of ahiṁsā and the resulting doubt of its conventionally accepted universality as the primordial source of various philosophical and moral concepts in India, corrects a great variety of notions still here and there held by traditional inertia. The discrepancy between the ideal of ahiṁsā and its enforcement on the one hand, and, on the other, the acceptance of ahiṁsā by some religious communities in a larger degree than by others, can serve as an important standard of measure for the country's past and present economy and social stratification. In this respect India is as open or shut to economic or social changes connected with the acceptance of the principle of ahiṁsā as are many developing and highly developed countries to progressive legislation in the context of their deeply embedded beliefs and prejudices. It would seem, therefore, desirable that when the status of the cow in India is discussed on a wider plane (see p. 58), such discussion should include not only the broad ramifications of the cow's religious significance, but also the ethical significance of ahiṁsā as juxtaposed against India's economic dilemmas. In fact, some views on the subject of the cow expressed by Prof. Brown in his *The United States and India and Pakistan* (Revised and Enlarged Edition, 1963) would have well fitted in the chapter on the Unity of Life of the book under review.

In his deliberations on the essential concepts of India's philosophies, Prof. Brown has taken the reader (or the listener) through stages of pluralism, theism, realism, monism and idealism and their various modes, and has demonstrated their causal relationship in the logical and psychological sequence. In the chapter "Time is a Noose" it is said that "the Buddhists had much less interest in the question of time than did the Jains or the Hindus", since concentration on this type of speculation, along with speculations on other kinds of things metaphysical, was of lesser import for

them. While the premiss on which the author's conclusion is based is largely valid, events seem to militate against the conclusion. In reality, the Buddhists, and particularly the Vaibhāṣikas and the Yogācāras, devoted a great deal of attention to the philosophy of time in connexion with their speculation on the concept of the dharmas. Moreover, their treatment of the philosophy of time was different both in substance and in method from the speculations found in the Purāṇas or the Sāṁkhya works. There may be some exaggeration in St. Schayer's contention that "India is indebted for real progress in the critical analysis of the Time-problem not to Sāṁkhya but to Buddhism" and that "if the Indian time philosophy is ever written, it will be in a large measure a history of thought"; but Prof. Brown's thesis is in its other extreme a bit difficult to accept.

That "man has made his own past and his own present" (p. 82) and that the result of his deeds leads him "alone" to enter the gates of his further destiny, are largely true; yet, if our understanding of *iṣṭāpūrta* is correct, an element of the sharing in the karman of others is admissible, and so is the karman's social and altruistic aspect.

One can justifiedly hope that Prof. Brown's book, which offers both the Indologist and the non-Indologist so much valuable material, will not before very long, see another edition. This might serve as an opportunity of removing a number of typographical errors including one, which has some bearing on the subject matter. On p. 52, the reference to the migration of the dead people to the moon does not belong to the Katha Upaniṣad, but to the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad. An index to works cited and subjects treated would also be helpful.

Arnold Kunst

Annual Customs and Festivals in Peking by Tun Li-ch'en, translated and annotated by Derk Bodde, second edition, Hong Kong University Press, xxviii + 147 pp., 52*s* 6*d*.

It was a pleasure to read this beautifully produced reprint of Professor Bodde's translation of Tun Li-ch'en's 燕京歲時記, first published by Henri Vetch in 1936. Other works of the same kind as Tun's would have more interest for the anthropologist and enter more into the spirit of the festivals, but they have not the particular interest of having been written at the end of empire, nor have they been supplied with these splendid illustrations or annotations which are just as informative as the text itself. It might have been better if Tun had concentrated more on contemporary life in Peking, but the historical notes on temples and the origins of customs are certainly not a loss, though they cannot be taken as gospel. Readers of literature dealing particularly with Peking even up to the second world war will find much useful information in this book.

Professor Bodde has profited in this second edition from some of the animadversions of the first generation of reviewers. In an effort to be similarly constructive, and as a result of a passive and likely inept piece of "detective work", might I suggest that the mysterious 北京歲華記 that Professor Bodde has been unable to track down is, by another name, the 帝京歲時紀勝 by P'an Jung-pi 潘榮陛 that was reprinted with Tun's work in Peking in 1961? The two passages quoted by Tun correspond with P'an's text, except for the omission of the Mongol word from the entry for the first day of the tenth month, for which there are any number of possible explanations.

The translation of some passages has also been amended now, but it is still shaky in places. For instance, Tun is made to conclude his lament on the decline of the Chinese creative genius with the words "Is it not indeed something for which we should be angry with ourselves?" (p. 81). If our texts coincide—I have 是亦不自憤耳—this should be "This is just from not exerting ourselves!". Incidentally, I find Tun much less enlightened than Professor Bodde's kind introductory words suggest. On the whole, though, congratulations all round.

D. E. Pollard

Wong Lin Ken, *The Malayan Tin Industry to 1914*, published for The Association for Asian Studies by The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, 1965. $6.50 net.

It is difficult to believe that this book will ever be replaced—or need replacing—as the standard work on its subject. The statistical appendix alone is worth its weight in tin, for despite the authors' reservations about what a professional statistician would think of them, the scrupulously compiled series have great value for the economic historian of the region, and the component figures have been combed from scattered material. The bibliography, too, consisting as it does of eleven tightly printed pages of titles is a useful feature of the book in its own right, besides testifying to the thoroughness and diligence of the author's researches. However, the really important question is what kind of use has been made of the raw materials.

The author's purpose is to show why and how the tin mining industry began to develop in Malaya, what factors stimulated development in the industry once launched and the course of its development up to 1914. It was the development of new uses for tin in the industrial countries of the West combined with their lack of stanniferous resources that gave rise to circumstances favourable to the establishment of the Malayan tin industry. As the price of tin rose in mid-nineteenth century, hundreds of Chinese penetrated the jungles of Malaya to prospect and mine. Disturbed socio-political conditions put the infant industry in jeopardy until British intervention in 1874. Thereafter, British rule in the tin states created a framework of law, administration and external economies appropriate to economic development. For the first twenty years it was the Chinese who reaped the benefit, having certain technical, social and economic advantages for the time being. By the 1890s, however, Western—mostly British—companies had begun to take a larger share of production, and by 1914 accounted for a quarter of total output. The reasons for this transition away from Chinese monopoly were technical, economic and political.

Dr. Wong's book comes up with little in the way of major new findings or interpretations. Its value lies in the careful documentation and further elucidation of matters previously known or surmised only in their broad outlines. The first chapter is an extremely useful survey of the industry down to 1874. This includes an interesting discussion of the changing uses for, and consequently demand for and price of, tin. Dr. Wong goes on to show that early British contempt for Chinese labour-intensive methods and confidence that more advanced techniques would soon drive the Chinese from the field were manifestations of a failure to distinguish between technology and economic efficiency—a confusion that was to cost early Western pioneers dear.

This emerges from the second chapter, dealing with the years of expansion between 1874 and 1895. As long as there were rich tin fields where more sophisticated methods were not essential, the Chinese retained the edge by their low reliance on capital. An additional factor of very great importance was that revenue farming and the truck system were an integral part of Chinese mining, enabling the capitalists to sustain losses on the actual tin, if need be, by falling back upon their other sources of income.

In contrast, as the third chapter shows, the earlier Western entrepreneurs faced definite drawbacks, such as difficulties in obtaining labour, and over-ambitious capitalization. Moreover, contrary to popular Western opinion of the time, even in smelting Chinese methods were not only efficient but also economical—the Dutch Vlaanderen furnace used widely in Indonesia was in fact simply a modification of the Chinese furnace. After the establishment of the Straits Trading Company, however, smelting progressively fell into Western hands. This was partly a consequence of the economies of scale, and partly a consequence of the Company's own commercial policies. But, as Dr. Wong emphasizes, it was British administrative policies in respect of freights, duties and the grant of monopolies and exclusive rights that gave the Company decisive economic advantages over its Chinese rivals. It was precisely in this kind of way that classical imperialism paid off.

Chapter 4 underlines this again and again. It deals with the period from 1896 to 1914 when the Western sector really succeeded in establishing a beachhead from which eventually dominance was to spring. Economic and technical circumstances had moved

in favour of Western methods, certainly, with the working out of the richer deposits. Success now demanded substantial capital and mechanization, and while some Chinese readily appreciated the need for the latter, few were able to make the cultural jump from traditional Chinese modes of money-raising to the Joint Stock Company. In addition, the labour situation was easing with the adding of Indian, Malay and Javanese labourers to the available pool and with the loosening of traditional methods of controlling the movement of Chinese labourers. Government—that is, British—policy played a significant part in clinching the outcome, however. From 1906 there was constant pressure to abolish the farming system, a pressure acceded to in official steps taken between 1909 and 1912. Concomitantly, opium smoking among Chinese labourers was on the decline as a result of administratively induced price increases, and in 1910–11 government actually took over the monopoly of importing, preparing and selling opium in the Straits Settlements and the Federated Malay States, thus dealing a serious blow to the Chinese capitalists. Finally, the entry of Western companies into the industry was further facilitated, in Dr. Wong's words (p. 227) by ". . . the active land resumption policy of the government, which forced the Chinese and Malay title holders to sell out to the Western companies". The author concludes that from the documentary evidence examined for his book it is indisputable that it had always been the aim of the British administrators to encourage the growth of Western, especially British, mining enterprise, and that after 1896 this desire was both intensified and made more possible of realization.

With this conclusion it is impossible to argue: indeed the evidence marshalled and deployed in support of his general theses is impressive and convincing. Dr. Wong is on the other hand somewhat defensive about his periodization. But in addition to the obvious benchmarks of the Pangkor Engagement of 1874 and Federation in 1895, it should be noted that both 1873–4 and 1895–6 marked fundamental and world-wide changes in the terms of trade, defining a distinct period in economic history. This might have been made more explicit, and expanded upon, since the depreciation of silver (a more superficial phenomenon surely) is briefly dealt with.

The Malayan Tin Industry to 1914, apart from its other merits, is surprisingly readable. It is not, of course, a contender for Book of the Month, but, especially in light of the fact that it is a refurbished Ph.D theses, it is good that it has avoided many of the heavy infelicities of the more turgid academicese. Granted the time and the dedication Dr. Wong is certain to put all economic historians further in his debt in future by blocking in other parts of the currently sketchy picture of South East Asian Economic History, and by doing it with his characteristic combination of keen scholarship and exemplary thoroughness.

MALCOLM CALDWELL

D. M. Lang, *The Balavariani. A Buddhist tale from the Christain East.* London, George Allen and Unwin, 1966. 30*s*.

Many besides the specialists in Caucasian languages and literatures will appreciate Professor Lang's translation of the recently discovered, older, long version of the *Balavariani.* The importance of this Georgian version of the Christian romance of *Barlaam and Josaphat* was established some years ago by Professor Lang in an article appearing shortly after the discovery of the longer version, in which he showed that the Greek *Barlaam and Josaphat*, which is the source of the numerous European texts of the story, is itself an expanded translation of the Georgian text.[1]

The introduction to the present volume is the work of the Georgian scholar I. V. Abuladze, the editor of the Georgian text, whose work on this Christianized version of the life of the Buddha has paralleled that of Professor Lang. The latter, in translating it, has done an excellent service to European scholarship in making available the results of research which would otherwise have remained inaccessible to most of us.

The first section of the introduction traces briefly the transmission of the story from one of the biographies of Buddha to a Manichaean version, of which fragments survive in Iranian and Old Turkish of the sixth and seventh centuries, and thence, by way of lost versions in Syriac and an Arabic text resembling the surviving Book of *Bilauhar and Būdasaf*, a comparatively late product from a Christian Arab environment, to the author of the Georgian text.

In the second section Abuladze traces the history of what might be called Barlaam scholarship, showing that the Greek version, wrongly attributed to St. John Damascene[2] on the basis of interpolations from that author, was in fact, as some of the manuscripts attest, the work of the Georgian translator Euthymius the Iberian from a Georgian version of the story. The Greek text, into which the translator has interpolated much Christian theology and the text of the Christain *Apology of Aristides*, is the source of all the later European and Oriental versions, either directly or by way of a Latin version made in 1048.

The third and fourth sections are concerned with the two versions of the Georgian text, and especially with the longer version found only in MS. Jerusalem, Greek Patriarchate, Georgian 140 of the eleventh century. It is convincingly shown that the more generally known shorter *Wisdom of Balahvar* is abbreviated from the longer text. The date of the longer version is established by linguistic criteria, the presence of loan-words of Middle and New Persian origin, as the ninth to tenth century, and that of the shorter version as the eleventh century or even later. On the source of the text Abuladze accepts Professor Lang's view that it is adapted from a Christianized version of the Arabic *Book of Bilauhar and Būdasaf.* In section six it is shown how the forms of the names of Jodasaph and his father Abenes in the Georgian text are the result of a misinterpretation of the Būdasaf (Bhodisattva) and Janaisar of the Arabic, by a Georgian working probably on an Arabic text without diacritics. Arabic syntactical characteristics in the Georgian are also noted. The last section of the introduction is devoted to the relationship of the Greek and Georgian texts. It is shown clearly, again following Professor Lang, that the Greek text is the work of the Georgian translator Euthymius the Iberian of Mount Athos who lived 955–1028. It is therefore a work of the late tenth century at the earliest. The later diffusion of the legend in East and West is scarcely touched on, and for this aspect, which is probably of more immediate interest to European medievalists, recourse should be had to the recent study of the religious disputation of the false Barlaam by the later Professor Peri.[3]

The present reviewer is not competent to judge of the accuracy of the translation, but it can at once be said that it is in every way a pleasing and satisfying text to read. Professor Lang has adopted a simple straightforward style with a slight flavour of the biblical and hagiographic which is admirably suited to the text he is translating, without at the same time falling into that bogus archaism and pseudo-medievalism of language which lie in wait to trap the translator of old texts. Two lacunae in the Jerusalem manuscript are filled with a translation of the corresponding passage of the abbreviated *Wisdom of Balahvar*. The few footnotes mostly call attention to the, by no means numerous, biblical quotations. In this connexion it might have been worth pointing out that the second fable of Balavar, pp. 76–7, is a paraphrase of the parable of the sower; Matthew 13, 3–9 and 18–23 or Mark 4, 3–9 and 14–20. While not doubting the part played by Manichaeans in the transmission of the *Barlaam and Joasaph* legend I have some reservations concerning the view expressed in the note on p. 125 that King Abenes' objection to asceticism is an indication of a specifically Manichaean element in

[1] D. M. Lang, "The life of the Blessed Iodasaph: a New Oriental Christian Version of the Barlaam and Ioasaph Romance (Jerusalem, Greek Patriarchal Library: Georgian MS 140)" in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, XX, London, 1957, pp. 389–407.

[2] It is particularly unfortunate that this false attribution receives the influential support of the Loeb Classical Library edition of the Greek text: *St. John Damascene. Barlaam and Iodasaph*, eds. G. R. Woodward and H. Mattingly, London, 1914.

[3] H. Peri (Pflaum), *Der Religionsdisput der Barlaam-Legende, ein Motiv abendländischer Dichtung*, Salamanca, 1959.

the Georgian text. It seems to me that the objection to asceticism and sexual abstinence as tending to depopulate the state is equally valid for Christain monasticism. It was in fact the principal count on which Jean de Meung attacked the latter so violently in the second part of the *Roman de la Rose*. I fail, on the other hand, to detect any trace of dualist theology, or of its usual accompaniment of the symbolic light and darkness antithesis, in the *Balavariani* or in the later versions of the story stemming from it. Even the Provençal version, which has been claimed as a Cathar or crypto-Cathar document, is in fact quite orthodox.

An interesting point is the brevity and comparative insignificance in the Georgian text of the account of the episode of Nakhor the false Balahvar, who, employed by Abenes to let himself be defeated in a religious disputation with the heathen so as to encourage Iodasaph to return to the paternal faith, is trapped by the latter into making a genuine defence of Christianity, which not only defeats his opponents' arguments but ends in convincing and converting Nakhor himself. It is undoubtedly the prominence given to this episode by the author of the Greek translation, who has interpolated it heavily with Christian theology and worked into it the text of the *Apology of Aristides*, which has resulted in this originally relatively unimportant episode taking on so central a significance in the European versions of the story. In some of these, notably the Old French poem of Gui de Cambrai and the Middle High German one of Rudolf von Ems, this scene is expanded into a full dress scholastic disputation between the representatives of Christianity and its rivals.[4]

For the iconographer Professor Lang has provided ten illustrations reproduced from Greek and Christian Arabic manuscripts. He has also given a brief bibliography and an excellent index. For all this medievalists of all persuasions owe him a heavy debt of gratitude.

D. J. A. Ross

Bruno Lewin, *Japanische Chrestomathie (von der Nara-Zeit bis zur Edo-Zeit)*. I. Kommentar, xiv+411. II. Texte, vi+126 pp., Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1965.

This invaluable work is the "practical counterpart" to Dr. Lewin's *Abriss der japanischen Grammatik* (1959) which he promised us in the preface to that book. He now presents us with a chrestomathy in sixty-six chapters, each containing a selected passage or passages from a work of traditional, *i.e.* pre-Meiji literature. These passages appear in Japanese script in the text volume and in romanization in the other, where each is accompanied by an introduction and a detailed commentary. In addition, there is a general introduction dealing in some twenty pages with questions of the periodization and categorization of Japanese literature and with the broad outlines of its development. There is also an index of all the words, verb-endings, names etc. treated in the notes.

The selection of passages is good and remarkably wide. While the emphasis is on belles-lettres, important works in other areas such as historiography (*e.g. Gukanshō*), drama, artistic theory (*e.g. Kadensho*), and books for popular entertainment (*e.g.* the Tokugawa *sharebon* and *kibyōshi*, etc.) are also represented. All work written in Chinese, however, has been excluded, as too heterogeneous in form and content.

The range is well illustrated by the case of poetry, of which we find the following examples: *Man'yōshū*—10 poems, including 6 *tanka; Kokinshū*—part of the preface and 18 *waka; Kayanoin-shichishu-utaawase*—part of the introduction and the first three rounds (6 poems) on the theme "cherry blossom"; *Shinsen-zuinō*—the first third of the text with 3 specimen poems; *Saibara*—10 songs; *Ryōjin-hishō*—10 poems; *Shinkokinshū*—the preface and 18 *tanka; Tsukubashū*—extracts from the preface, 13 *tsukeku* and 2 *hokku; Sarumino*—the first 4 lines of each of books 1–4 and half of a 36-link series from book 5; *Oku-no-hosomichi*—two short extracts; *Kyoraishō*—critique of two haiku and a discussion of an aesthetic concept; *Awazu-genjūan-yawa*—a haikai letter of Buson; *Ora-ga-haru*—two short extracts; *Haifū-yanagidaru*—30 *senryū* poems. This is an impressive list indeed, and no major omissions come to mind. Among so much poetry, it is perhaps unfortunate that we are given no example of the rather distinctive verses of Sanetomo, but this is undoubtedly because he does not figure in the *Shinkokinshū* and to include his private collection *Kinkaishū* separately would have given him undue prominence. As a matter of fact, no particular prominence is given to any work. In general, the chapters average about four to six pages, a length exceeded in only a handful of cases. Some may perhaps complain at the allocation of this amount of space to, say, *senryū* poems when only some ten pages each are given to the *Man'yōshū* and the *Kokinshū*, about eight to *Genji*, and seven to *Makura-no-sōshi*. But Dr. Lewin's policy is justified, since greater length in such sections could only have been achieved at the cost of omitting altogether some lesser items of special interest, such as the extracts from a report on a poetry competition or Kintō's work on poetics, or (in prose) the passages from *Otogi-bōko* or *Shunshoku-umegoyomi*. As it is, such works as *Yamato-monogatari*, *Murasaki-shikibu-nikki* and *Gikeiki* are not represented here at all, presumably because other works of the same genre had already been included.

Despite the great variety of texts, the author has succeeded admirably in giving the student a proper perspective and explaining the literary and historical positions of each work treated. Short though his introductions are, they are very meaty, giving all the most essential data on authorship, background, general content and textual history. Put together, indeed, they constitute a kind of potted factual history of Japanese literature, a very useful reference book.

However, the real test of the book is whether the commentary is adequate for the students Dr. Lewin has in mind, those, that is, who are not yet at the stage of fending for themselves with the aid of modern Japanese commentaries. As one who took part in the preparation of the *Selections from Japanese Literature*, edited by F. J. Daniels (London, 1959), a comparable though very much smaller-scale undertaking, I am well aware of the difficulty of providing such a commentary; having been told recently by one of my present students that he would have liked *more* notes in the *Selections*, I realize that only by annotating every single word in a text can one hope to have taken care of all difficulties. In the *Selections*, it is true, a translation was provided, in the pious hope that the student would not consult it until he had made a serious attempt to elucidate the text for himself. Here, the student has no such recourse if the notes fail him. Perhaps for this reason the commentary contains not only information on personalities, customs etc., and explanations of grammatical points (for a fuller treatment of the latter, the reader is given references to the *Abriss*), but also German translations of many individual words, phrases or even sentences. I cannot help commenting that not all of these translations seem equally necessary. Should a chrestomathy try to take the place of a dictionary, except in the case of unusual words, or where the student might have difficulty in selecting the correct meaning? For instance, does a student who has reached the stage of attempting texts of this difficulty really need to be given the meaning of *moto-no gotoku* (p. 118/n. 11), *hōshi* 'priest' (p. 75/n. 36), *sōmoku* 'plants and trees' (p. 222/n. 51) and even *inu* 'dog' (p. 289/n. 12)? [In quoting from the romanized text, I have followed Dr. Lewin's system of hyphenation]. If such words are given, why not *okamisan* (p. 350/line 14)? And why do we find no explanation for *masaki* 柾木 (p. 348/line 2) when a similar-sounding but different word, written in kana, is annotated (p. 164/n. 54)? Which brings me to another matter, that it is certainly not impossible to find points on which the student might well need help, but would look in vain to the notes. For instance, though there are notes on the phrases *tabaramu* (p. 74/n. 24), *karasemu-ya* (p. 75/n. 28) and *okotaru-to-ni-wa-arazameredo* (p. 331/n. 65), they leave unexplained the apparent irregularity of the form of the first (if it is treated simply as an inflected form of *tabu*) and the meaning of *ya* and *to* in the other two. Similarly, the word *oite*, appearing as it does isolated between commas (p. 351/first line), might well be puzzling, but no help is given.

The most important question to be asked concerns the accuracy of the commentary, and on this score it can be said that the student is in very good hands indeed. It

[4] It is this episode which is the subject of Peri's penetrating study.

would of course be surprising if the reviewer were to find himself always in complete agreement with a commentator's interpretations; for instance, I cannot accept Dr. Lewin's statement (p. 366/n. 12) that in the passage from the *kabuki* play—"Osome: '. . . *Washa sonna koto shiranu-wai-no.*'—Zenroku: '*Ie ie, shiranu-to-wa iwasemasenu*'." the causative form *iwasemasenu* functions as honorific. It seems to me plainly causative. Again, I fail to see how *esenu* in the phrase *hōburi-nado esenu-woba* (. . . *kono mon-no ue-ni-zo okikeru*) can be taken as a causative (p. 120/n. 61). It surely is a compound of *e* (potential) and *senu* (from *su*), equivalent to modern *suru koto ga dekinai*. And he is unquestionably wrong in taking *shirushi* in the poem beginning *Shiragumo-to Miyuru-mi shirushi* (p. 66) as a noun meaning "effect, proof, evidence". It must be an adjective, equal to modern *ichijirushii*, an interpretation which is supported by a note in *Kokka Taikei* (IV/p. 120). As far as the information in his introductions is concerned, it appears in general to be up to date, but he can still speak of the *Uji Shūi Monogatari* as having borrowed heavily from *Konjaku Monogatari*, reflecting a view of the correspondences between the two works which has been discredited for several decades. Thus there are chinks in even Dr. Lewin's armour, formidable scholar though he is.

I hasten to add, however, that none of my criticisms is intended to belittle the truly remarkable feat that this book represents. It would be a lucky commentator indeed who could hope to satisfy all who use his work or to avoid all errors, and I feel a wholehearted admiration for the way in which Dr. Lewin has performed his arduous task. Throughout the book one sees evidence of the most painstaking and judicious scholarship, and a careful comparison of certain passages with Japanese commentaries reveals the skill with which he has made available the fruits of his extensive and intensive studies. One can only lament that in the present world of Japanese studies scholarship of this kind is scarcer than it should be .

On first receiving this book I felt that it was a real landmark in Japanese studies since the war. Now I find that it does not stand alone, for I recently received copies of some equally extensive volumes of annotated texts published by the University of Michigan under the editorship of Joseph K. Yamagiwa and others. I have not yet had time to examine these volumes in detail, and will say only that the basis of selection differs somewhat, and the method of procedure quite considerably, the very full notes relating not only to the original texts but also to linguistic points in the modern commentaries accompanying them (the texts are reproduced photographically from modern editions). Certainly it is these Michigan texts which will be most used by English-speaking students, particularly in America, where few students of Japanese can be expected to read German. But for those who do, Dr. Lewin's book will be vastly rewarding. It provides the best possible justification for the retention in Japanese Ph.D. programmes at American universities of the European foreign language requirements.

D. E. MILLS

John Meskill, *Ch'oe Pu's Diary: A Record of Drifting across the Sea* (The Association for Asian Studies: *Monographs and Papers*, No. XVII), iv+177 pp. Tucson University of Arizona Press, 1965. $4.50.

The major part of this book is a translation of Ch'oe Pu's *P'yohaerok*. This tells in diary form of his setting sail from Cheju in February 1488, being caught in a storm and swept to and fro across the East China Sea for nine days, his encounter with pirates and his own arrest as a suspected Japanese pirate in Ning-po, the subsequent examinations of his claim to be a Korean gentleman, his passage along the Grand Canal to Peking, and his eventual safe return to Seoul at Chinese government expense in July 1488.

It makes fascinating reading. It may be, as Professor Meskill states, in an established Chinese literary genre, but it can also be read in this translation for pleasure and interest as easily as the best such works from the west. One might not even have to be interested in it as fact to enjoy it. It is a story so well told that it rivals as a work of literature any fiction from Korea which I have yet read. Yet it is fact. Reports on Ch'oe Pu from China can be found in the Korean court records, also his application to be allowed to return to the capital, the king's order for him to prepare an account of his journey, the presentation of a copy of the diary for the archives, his subsequent presentation of his description of the water wheel which he found in China and thought could "be an inexhaustible benefit to my Koreans for all ages", and so on.

The original author is modest: "I merely ordered my four secondary officials to look at honors lists and inquire about localities every day. I have noted a little and missed much. I have recorded only a summary" (this translation, p. 157), but he is certainly, in John Meskill's words, "an unusually capable man" to have been carried by chance on such a journey. I have no means of measuring the additional light which this record might throw on the China of the time, but it is one of the most graphic revelations which I have ever read of Korea's traditional attitude to China, and, in passing, to Japan and Ryukyu.

Professor Meskill has added to his accurate translation a very full and useful index, and a 25 page introduction on the man, his times in Korea, the picture of China which emerges from this record and the texts of the work itself. There is really little one could add to this. It is best to say only that it is a first-class piece of work, which can be thoroughly recommended but only inadequately summarized in review, and to thank Professor Meskill for having made available to us a work which seems to have been for all practical purposes lost in Korea.

W. E. SKILLEND

Jeannette Mirsky, *The Great Chinese Travellers*, ix+309 pp. London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1965. 30*s*.

This anthology of Chinese accounts of foreign countries consists largely of excerpts from previously published translations. These range from the travels of the Emperor Mu, Chang Ch'ien, Hsüan-tsang, Ch'ang-ch'un chen-jen, Rabban Sauma, Chou Ta-kuan and Cheng Ho, to various short accounts of Western countries during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by Chinese visitors. *Rabban Sauma visits Europe* is translated from a Syriac translation from the original Persian, and not from the Chinese, although there is no indication of this except implicitly through the style. This is taken from Budge, *The Monks of Kublai Khan*, pp. 165–97, given as *The Master of Kublai Khan* among the acknowledgements.

The collection in one volume of Chinese literature on this topic was a good idea, being convenient for the student and more accessible to the general reader. Where the editor has used a number of sources, as in the chapter on Hsüan-tsang's journey, she was clearly obliged to be severely selective for reasons of space. But I think the book would have been more useful if it had been less trimmed, especially where the shorter items are concerned. The chapters on Chou Ta-kuan's description of Cambodia and on Cheng Ho's naval expeditions, when compared with the original articles by Pelliot and Duyvendak, seem flat and thin, clipped here and there and shorn of their notes. Pelliot's kind of scholarship may be unfashionable today, but to read his article *with* his famous apparatus is to gain a real knowledge of the subject. It is to be hoped that readers of this book will be sufficiently interested to go back to the originals.

There are quite a number of misprints, some of them misleading as when they occur in the transcription of Chinese words; for example *hia* for *hai*, pen-chou for *chien-ch'u*, *ku* for *kun*, *shih* for *chie*, *mou* for *mu*. These appear to be due partly to the translator's confusion of the French and English systems of romanization. In the absence of Chinese characters most of them will be unintelligible without recourse to the Chinese text. Worse still, what would Pelliot have said to having "Tout ceci ne peut provenir que de l'action surnaturelle du saint Buddha" rendered "Nevertheless, all this does not prove the supernatural intervention of the Buddha"?

However, this book will acquaint a larger public with the subject and perhaps stir some scholars into doing further work in this field.

GEORGE WEYS

Orientalia Gandensia, i, ii. Jaarboek van het hoger instituut voor oosterse, oosteuropese en afrikaanse taalkunde en geschiedenis bij de rijksuniversiteit te Gent. i, Oosterse Drukkerij, Leuven 1964; ii, E. J. Brill, Leiden 1965.

The Higher Institute for Oriental, east European and African linguistics and history was established in 1958 in the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy of the State University of Ghent. This yearbook contains contributions by members of the teaching staff and graduates of the Oriental and African Institute. It is the aim of the editorial board to give a survey of the Oriental, Slavic, and African Studies in the University of Ghent. All the articles are written in Dutch, some with summaries in English, French or German, except for one article (ii, 25–52) by J. Lothe on the use of Slavisms in the poetic diction of the 19th century Russian poet K. N. Batjuškov, written in Russian with a Dutch summary.

Even this wide field is interpreted liberally enough to include R. Thibau's article (ii, 1–24) on the phonological system of Linear B. He calls for a more precise delimitation of the Linear B spelling system. But the "Oriental Studies" in these volumes include, apart from Egyptian, Semitic and Islamic studies, only Indian studies and Couvreur's articles on Tocharian. There are three useful articles concerning Indian studies. L. Rocher (i, 217–235) discusses Sanskrit *anumāna* as a legal term, and J. Deleus (ii, 145–87) deals with a fragment from the *Viyāhapannatti*, a text belonging to the Śvetāmbara Jain canon. A. Scharpé (ii, 189–257) in his article "Topographica Indica" calls for more method and accuracy in citing modern Indian place-names.

African studies are represented by two articles by J. Jacobs, one (i, 251–68) giving texts in Mbole-Langa with translation and one (ii, 259–97), to be continued, on "The reflexes of the proto-Bantu consonant phonemes in the languages of Zone C", and an article by M. van Spaandonek (ii, 299–314) on the disyllabic verb-stems in five Bantu languages of Zone C.

Islamic and Semitic studies are the object of articles by A. Abel, J. Bauwens, M. van Damme, S. van Riet ("The Latin translation of Avicenna's *Kitab al-Nafs*"), U. Vermeulen, G. Janssens (two articles), and L. de Meyer. H. de Meulenaere writes on the establishment of the Saïtic dynasty (i, 95–103) and on the Mendes stele (ii, 53–65, with photograph and translation).

Medieval and modern Slavic studies, historical, literary and textual, are to be found in articles by C. Soëp, J. Lothe, and F. Vyncke. F. Vyncke, G. de Beul and J. Scharpé, in a joint article (ii, 333–49), deal with an Old Church Slavonic MS in Ghent, providing Slavonic text with facing parallel texts in Greek and Latin. This "Life of Abraham" is then translated into Dutch. E. Voordeckers describes the same MS in i, 63–73. A photograph of the beginning of the MS is provided for *both* articles (after i, 74 and after ii, 314).

Both volumes are splendidly produced. A great variety of scripts is carefully and attractively printed. Only Chinese had to be photographically reproduced from handwriting. A number of excellent plates are included. Most important are the facsimiles accompanying the articles by W. Couvreur on the new Kucean fragments of the *Araṇemijātaka* (i, 237–49 with plates I–VII) and on Kucean syllabaries in slanting Gupta (ii, 111–43 with plates I–XIV). In the former article new meanings are assigned to some Tocharian words.

R. E. Emmerick

K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, *Sources of Indian history with special reference to South India*, viii + 113 pp., Bibliography. London, Asia Publishing House. 25*s*.

This book, based upon three lectures delivered in Bombay in 1961, is a discussion of the sources of the history of India in general (chapter I) and of South India in particular (chapters II and III). As may be expected of the author, who is one of the foremost scholars especially in the history of South India, this is an authoritative survey which will prove of great value to all those interested in knowing on what type of sources

our knowledge of Indian history is based. On the other hand, on account of the great reputation of the author one might have expected to find a more thorough analysis of the relative value of the sources. It has also a few other shortcomings, which limit its usefulness. The most serious of these is the absence of an adequate bibliography. There is a brief list of books at the end but it occupies less than a page. Thus, the interested layman, for whom this work is no doubt in the first place intended, is given no indication of where he can find translations of the sources mentioned or discussed here. Although inscriptions are by far the most important source for the history of India from *c.* 250 B.C. to A.D. 1200 the reader learns little about the kind of information supplied by various sorts of epigraphic texts. A curious omission from the literary sources is that of the Pali chronicles of Ceylon (the *Dīpavaṃsa*, *Mahāvaṃsa*, and *Cūlavaṃsa*); they are indispensable for our knowledge of the history of North India from *c.*550 to 250 B.C. and not negligible for several aspects of the history of South India in much later times. One of the most important aspects of Indian civilization is the influence it exerted on many areas outside India, especially South East Asia. Although the author has made very important contributions in this field he limits himself to some sweeping statements that do not reflect modern scholarship. Thus, it is stated about South East Asia that it "formed part of India during the first milennium of the Christain era" (p. 12). Even if it is realized that this formulation applies only to Indian culture without political implications and that it is limited to a small part of South East Asia during part of the first millennium it cannot be maintained, as it seriously underestimates the contributions of the South East Asian peoples themselves. Another passage (p. 55 f.) implies that the "rise of Hindu kingdoms" in South East Asia is "but an extension and continuation of the process by which South India and Ceylon were colonized and Aryanized". This statement contains a kernel of truth, but an over-simplification masks some striking differences. For is it not remarkable that Ceylon though situated almost within sight of the Indian mainland and subject to innumerable invasions and continuous infiltration from South India always maintained its separate identity? This applies even more to South East Asia, where Indian civilization stimulated the emergence of a number of great cultures.

In addition to these general comments one may object to some details. Was the *Arthaśāstra* really a "manual of practical administration"? There is no evidence that any Indian state ever applied all or most of its injunctions. Why is Tamil called the "oldest of the Dravidian languages"? The intention is probably: "attested in earliest times". The term "popular speech" to indicate the very formal type of Tamil, Telugu or Kannada of the inscriptions is misleading. Finally, there are too many printing errors, some of which unnoticed in the list of *errata* and not immediately obvious, such as Bûro Budur and Prambanam. The spelling Śangha is presumably a cross between Sanskrit Saṃgha (or Saṅgha) and Tamil Śaṅgam.

J. G. de Casparis

(1) Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu Chūgoku Tetsugaku Chūgoku Bungaku Kenkyūshitsu 東京大學文學部中國哲學中國文學研究室: *Tōkyō daigaku bungakubu chūgoku tetsugaku chūgoku bungaku kenkyūshitsu zōsho mokuroku* 東京大學文學部中國哲學中國文學研究室藏書目錄. 14 + 235 + 87 + 100 + 7 pp. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu, 1965.

(2) Tōyōgaku Bunken Sentā [Centre] Renraku Kyōgikai 東洋學文獻センター連絡協議會: Nihonbun chūgokubun chōsenbun tō chikuji kankōbutsu mokuroku 日本文中國文朝鮮文等逐次刊行物目錄, IX, 178 pp. Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1963 [pub. 1964].

Sinologues everywhere have long had good cause to be grateful to Japanese scholars for their excellent bibliographical aids, not least among them the catalogues of their collections, which are regularly consulted even by scholars who have not the opportunity to visit the collections themselves. The publication of two new catalogues is therefore to be welcomed.

The first of these is a catalogue of the contents in 1962 of the libraries of the Seminar rooms for Chinese philosophy and Chinese literature at Tokyo University. It is arranged in two parts. The first contains works written or compiled before the end of the Ch'ing dynasty and the Tokugawa era, as well as later commentaries on or translations of such works. They are listed in the main according to the modified traditional arrangement as used in the catalogue of Chinese books in the Tōhō Bunka Kenkyūjo of 1943. The second part, which is more voluminous and contains modern works, is arranged by subjects in accordance with the Nippon Decimal Classification. There are also two indexes, by titles and authors, which add to the convenience of the catalogue.

The second work is a catalogue of periodicals and other serial publications, in Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Arabic, Tibetan and Mongolian, preserved in the three principal oriental research institutes in Japan: the Tōyō Bunko—including its Seminar on modern China, the Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo of Tokyo University, and the Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo of Kyoto University. Each entry contains exact details on which volumes of the publication concerned are available at each institute. This information will be very useful to those working in Japan, but especially so to visiting scholars who will now be able to plan their timetable more easily in advance.

George Weys

Herschel Webb with the assistance of Marleigh Ryan, *Research in Japanese Sources: A Guide*, ix+170 pp. Columbia University Press, 1965 (published for the East Asian Institute, Columbia University). 35*s*. 6*d*.

This "beginner's guide to the subject of Japanese bibliography" is said to be "designed for three kinds of users: (1) the student in some discipline of the humanities or social sciences who wishes to conduct research on Japan and make use of Japanese-language materials; (2) the student or librarian who knows no Japanese but wishes information about Japan; and (3) the student in any discipline whose special interest may have nothing in particular to do with Japan but who wishes to consult the work done in his field by Japanese scholars". Though the work will no doubt be of some use to persons in categories (2) and (3), it is likely to benefit chiefly students with a knowledge of the language who are about to engage in research. It will tell them many things they need to know and is well arranged for reference.

Of its bibliographical information, it is said that mention of particular works is limited to "those few monuments of scholarship whose unique qualities make it unlikely that they will soon be replaced, and other works of merit chosen to represent more numerous classes". Though the work as a whole is likely to retain its usefulness for some time, some of the representative "works of merit" may need to be replaced when a new edition is called for, and perhaps the opportunity could then be taken to make one or two minor revisions. The following points are mentioned with this in view.

The footnote on p. 71, in referring to Brinkley's *An Unabridged Japanese-English Dictionary*, fails to mention that a photographic reproduction was published in 1963 jointly by W. Heffer & Sons Ltd. and the University of Michigan Press under the title of *Brinkley's Japanese-English Dictionary*, with an introduction by Eric B. Ceadel. The reference to the etymologies in *Dai Genkai* (p. 74) might well include a warning that many of them are more of the nature of speculations than of "information". The account of systems of romanization (pp. 132–3) might be improved. Calling the Hepburn system "the Old Romanization" as if this was a recognized term is misleading and could cause confusion with earlier Portuguese etc. spellings. A student might well be told that the Hepburn system, or rather the modification of it presently in use, is often referred to in Japan as *Hyōjun-shiki* (Standard system) to distinguish it from Hepburn's own original and amended schemes. As for the modified *Nippon-siki* authorized for official use in 1937, and re-authorized in 1954, this time with an "escape clause" allowing the use of *Hyōjun-shiki* for special purposes, it is usually referred to not as *Kokutei-siki* but as *Kunrei-siki* (Cabinet-ordinance system).

F. J. Daniels

Günther Wenck: *A Preliminary Report on the Use of Punchcards for the Structural Analysis of Japanese Texts*. vi+138 pp. 4 plates. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1964.

Though this report relates specifically to Japanese—and it is only from this point of view that I shall try to review it—it should interest language specialists in general. The principles involved in the use of punchcards for structural analysis are clearly of general application, and even some of the broad features of the scheme of analysis for Japanese may well be adaptable to other languages.

Professor Wenck's purpose in entering on the five years of work which has resulted in this report was to devise a means of producing "catalogues of the structural factors of Japanese texts" of any sort or period. He compares and contrasts his scheme with an analysis into morphemes, "the smallest meaningful parts". "Whereas", he says, "the morphemes of some thoroughly studied text are usually compiled into an exhaustive index or concordance, no parallel work has been done in the field of structure. . . . Systematic and inductive studies in syntax will only become possible if the student can avail himself of a tool which is comparable to an index of morphemes in the field of semantics: he needs catalogues of the structural features of individual texts". And further:—"In contrast to morphemes which can be arranged chiefly in only one dimension (—the problem, however, how compounds should be recorded shows that one dimension is not always sufficient—), the order of structural features is mainly hierarchical. Structural factors are interdependent to a much higher degree than morphemes are, and their varying interdependence cannot be checked by a list." If the contrast with morphemes seems to be somewhat overstated, this may be because the author's "structural factors" include many functions of morphemes and morpheme classes, so that in making the contrast he is thinking of morphemes in abstraction from these functions—and perhaps disregarding a possible "structural semantics" approach. Anyway, the point of the contrast is probably clear enough.

The details of the analysis are to be recorded on punchcards each with 34 columns of 12 holes (=408 holes, of which 396 are numbered for normal use). The code by which details of the analysis are recorded refers to the numbers of the holes. Each card deals with a "sample", as a rule a single clause. It is explained that sentences, which vary enormously in length, would often contain too much for coding by 396 holes. However, "formal analysis will yield a great number of very short clauses", and so the code "contains several devices which—while maintaining the principle of clause sampling—allow a different treatment of merely formal or over-short or structurally uninteresting clauses".

Although IBM cards would have allowed selection (the drawing from the file of those cards which record some common factor or factors) to be done mechanically, punchcards were chosen instead, for three reasons. First, the apparatus needed is relatively cheap. Second, a punchcard has fairly generous space for typed or written information, whereas an IBM card has room only for a text reference and reproduction of the sample. And third, the time needed for selection would be small in comparison with that which must be given to reading, collating, and concluding, so that a saving of time in selection is comparatively unimportant. Perhaps the second point has most force, since it seems that, with more *en clair* information on the card, it would less often be necessary to refer back to the original text.

The cards and apparatus needed are products of the Allform Co., Berlin. The cards measure $5\frac{13}{16} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ inch, about 130 taking up an inch of file space. (N.b. The reproductions of a specimen card in Figs. 2 and 3 of the report are not quite full-size and slightly distort the shape.) The apparatus comprises, besides a hand-punch, a motor-vibrated selector to shake down—the cards are upside down in the selector—those cards of which the holes traversed by the selector rods inserted at the time have all been punched, *i.e.* joined to the hole below or, if in the bottom row, opened to the edge of the card. A ticket-punch will have to be added if a widespread use of the system should make it desirable to punch a text signature in the card's upper edge, though the cards at present available are not holed for that purpose. Cases or drawers to hold the cards are not mentioned, but will obviously be needed.

A very great deal of work must have gone into accommodating the scheme of analysis to the coding possibilities of the card. For its most economical use, the number of alternatives in any section or sub-section of the scheme should be the maximum which some group of holes can record by binary notation (6 for 4 holes, 10 for 5 holes, etc.), but this, naturally, cannot always be arranged. In general, too, the recording of each small part of the scheme of analysis must be confined to a given "zone" or "field" of the card; otherwise it would not be clear which two (or more) holes belonged together, and the record could not be decoded. As one expedient to enable as much as possible to be recorded, a fairly considerable amount of superimposition has been incorporated in the code, *i.e.* the use of the same combination of holes for two different things where other indications on the card make it clear which of the two is intended. This might sometimes cause irrevelant cards to be drawn from the file; such possibilities are noted in the code. It is beyond my competence to say whether the overall "code economy" is the best obtainable. But the procedure adopted certainly accords with standard punchcard practice. In applying to its present purpose a technique developed in other connexions, Professor Wenck has been breaking new ground. He had, as he says, to proceed by "alternately devising and testing". It is evident that he has done this with great care and thoroughness.

The scheme of analysis is necessarily a compromise between what seemed initially to be desirable and what could be recorded on the card. This may suggest that it must be rather unsatisfactory as a basis for describing the structural features of a text. But such an inference is not borne out by an examination of the scheme. There can be no doubt that it is an extremely thorough and useful one, quite apart from the fact that any analyses it will produce can be recorded on the specified punchcards.

The scheme has a very wide range. In its author's words:— "The range of descriptors comprised within the code is not confined to structural factors proper, but extends to all linguistic features which influence or may influence these structural factors. Thus, for instance, differences as to the kind of utterance, as to the speaking person and as to dialect and style are incorporated broadly into the code". The scheme has seven main heads, as follows. (Figures in brackets are those, respectively, of the number of main sections under each head, and of the number of pages in the report given to specifying what comes under the head.)

I. General characteristics of the language used in the text. (6, 11½)
II. Special characteristics of the language used in the text. (4, 8½)
III. Type of clause. (4, 24)
IV. Relation between sentences or clauses. (5, 19½)
V. The predicate. (6, 23½)
VI. Complementary constituents of the clause. (3, 15)
VII. Style. (4, 9)

The numbers of pages are a better indication of the relative amount of detail under the different heads than the numbers of main sections, these sections being of very irregular length.

To give some idea of the amount of detail entered into, it may be best to reproduce a part of the scheme. Under head V, the third main section, "Judgment mode of the predicate", has four sub-sections: (*a*) *negation*, (*b*) *uncertainty*, (*c*) *certainty and emphasis*, and (*d*) *limitation and other modifications of the scope of the statement*. The first of these sub-sections (*negation*) is reproduced below in a condensed form, without the code numbers and with degrees of subordination shown by different type instead of by indentation as in the report itself. A colon separates descriptors at the same level (mutually exclusive alternatives); a colon-dash shows that what follows is at a lower level; and a dash-colon marks a return to a higher level. Commas are reproduced as in the report and are internal to a descriptor. —

(means of negation)
auxiliary verbs:— *-ji* and *-maji* > *-mai*:— *-ji*: *-maji* —:*-zari*: *-zu*/*-nu* and *-nai* —:**adjective *-nai* (in formal and substantial uses)**:— formally used in the negative form of an adjective (*-ku nai*):— as a simple predicate: as predicate base of a periphrastic predicate: as final periphrasis of a periphrastic predicate: as intermediate periphrasis of a multi-periphrastic predicate: not within the predicate —:formally used in the negative form of the copula:— as simple predicate: as predicate base of a periphrastic predicate: as a simple periphrasis in Modern Japanese —:adverbial phrase consisting of a noun and the adjective of negation (. . *naku*, . . *nashi de*/*ni*) —:**formal verb or adjective:—** *-kaneru*: *-gatai* —:**Sino-Japanese prefix (*fu-*, *bu-*, *mu-*): vocabulary of negative meaning, which may be of structural importance (e.g. in respect of the correlation of adverbs)**:— adverb that usually correlates with negated predicates acts independently as a means of negation (e.g. *kesshite*, *masaka*).

(syntactic features)
negation is expressed within the predicate of the sample clause:— expression of disapproval —:**negative formulation of a constituent outside the predicate (except for the negation by a prefix), which does not affect the statement as a whole (e.g. with an enumeratively structured constituent as *kotoshi de naku rainen ni iku yotei da*): negatory prefix within a complementary constituent and negatory morphemes within a non-sample clause: auxiliary verb of negation is not attached to the final periphrasis of a periphrastic predicate: double negation:—** formulated synthetically: formulated analytically (=periphrastic formulation): using a Sino-Japanese prefix of negation within the predicate: with negatory morpheme outside the predicate ("loose form of double negation"): acting as an expression of certainty —:**correlation with a statement-modifying adverb:—** emphatic adverb: modificatory adverb (expressing for instance limitation, probability, necessity, potentiality):— potential adverb *e* —: **cautious or indirect or circumlocutory negation.**

This reproduced portion amounts, at a rough estimate, to well under two per cent of the entire scheme.

A question one is bound to ask is how far the meanings of the descriptors will be clear to a user. The author says: "Generally speaking, the descriptors . . . must be rather plain and obvious and not require investigations which go beyond the usual understanding of the meaning of the text". On the whole, they probably meet this requirement; they have certainly been framed with great care, and many are amplified by notes. I believe that I myself understand immediately a substantial majority of them, and it may be that, if faced with an example to which any of those not immediately intelligible was applicable, I should then see what was intended. But I cannot be certain that this would always be so. Moreover, one knows from experience that the seeming definiteness of a category description may prove illusory when it comes to deciding on the applicability of the category in actual cases. However, it seems probable that failure to understand the meaning of a descriptor, if it occurred at all, would be rare enough not to cause serious trouble, provided that the user of the scheme had a competent knowledge of Japanese. How far different users with such a competent knowledge would always agree on the descriptor which was appropriate in a particular case is another matter.

Besides the punched cards, the file is to have a head card or, if necessary, more than one. On this will be explained, in particular, the method of reference to the original text and any special features of the code used. Normally, this latter information will be in terms of any modification to the published code. But the author mentions the possibility of using a different code, and he clearly wishes to advocate the use of punch-cards for his general purpose even if his code is not adopted. He thinks it important, however, that the cards used should always be the same, so that they could be handled by the same apparatus.

On the front of all the punched cards a *rōmaji* version of the sample is to be typed, and indications of the original script can be added to this. On finite-clause cards, the whole of the sentence is also to be typed. On all the cards, there will be entered a letter indicating the clause type (one of 15), a reference to chapter, paragraph, sentence, and sample, and a serial number. Other information can be added and, if necessary, continued on a trailer card. On the back of those cards which relate to the finite clause of a

"multi-link compound sentence", the sentence is to be analysed diagrammatically, and a detailed specification is provided for contructing the diagram.

There seem to me to be certain difficulties about the adoption of Professor Wenck's proposals which have not been faced or, at least, have not been brought out in this preliminary report. I am also uncertain about his intentions on two points.

As we have seen, the chief stated purpose is to produce catalogues of the structural factors of individual texts, comparable to exhaustive indexes or concordances of morphemes. But it is also said:— "One further great advantage of punchcard analysis deserves mentioning: the results are directly transmittible. A punchcard file of a particular text has the character of a publication. Anybody who knows the code may use the information stored in it in his own way and for his own research purposes. The user need not read through the text himself if he only wishes to utilize it as a reservoir of material on structural problems. The card file combines the nature of a rather detailed commentary on the structural features of the text with that of some sort of special grammar . . . It would be more or less impossible to publish in print the whole of the learned information amassed within such a file . . . Last not least, punchcards can be duplicated mechanically, at least as regards punched information; and even reproduction of typed or written information on the face of the card has already been made possible by photographic devices".

One point on which I am in some doubt is what is meant by a catalogue of structural factors. Most of what is said in the report seems to suggest that this is something to be compiled from the completed file, by selecting those cards on which a particular factor is recorded. However, this view seems a little difficult to reconcile with the statement that it would be more or less impossible to publish in print the whole of the learned information in a file. This may mean only that the amount of detail would generally be too great for complete publication in print to be practicable, not that the nature of some of the information would cause special difficulties. But the statement that the file itself has the character of a publication also tends to suggest that the catalogues of structural factors do not have to be compiled from it, but are regarded as already compiled once the file is completed.

I am also uncertain what is meant by "publication". Given the possibility of producing copies of a punchcard file, the copies could clearly be made generally available under conditions which would constitute publication—though it may be noted in passing that, because coded information is not open to casual inspection, the file would be unlikely to get the sort of critical review which usually results from publishing works of scholarship. However, the statement that the punchcard file of a text "has the character of a publication" seems to mean that it has this character even if copies of it are not made. If this is Professor Wenck's view, I do not follow him. I do not see how the status of a punchcard file differs in this respect from that of any of a scholar's other notes or records, which would not be regarded as published merely because they were made available from time to time to other workers.

The most serious difficulty about the proposal, to my mind, concerns the inducement, or rather lack of inducement, to make the full analysis proposed. Is a scholar who intends to study certain structural factors or other features likely to record information about all the others covered by the scheme, merely on the off-chance that someone else may someday decide to take up their study? It is not easy to imagine that anyone would gain much in reputation through merely compiling, or indeed through compiling and publishing, a punchcard file. Moreover, the question is not entirely prompted by a cynical view of scholarly human nature; the number of scholars with the knowledge and experience needed to carry through the proposed analysis is limited, and it seems doubtful whether they ought to spend their time on work of problematical usefulness. There seems to be some danger that files might come to be compiled by poorly qualified persons; and also that, whatever the compiler's competence, the recording of anything which he himself did not intend to study further might be done perfunctorily.

Then there is a difficulty about the use of a file by someone other than the compiler, arising from the subjective element in at least some of the coded "information". However "plain and obvious" the descriptors may be, it is hardly likely that competent scholars would always be in agreement about the one which was applicable in a particular case, since a by no means negligible proportion of them call for the exercise of judgement about functions rather than the mere recognition of formal elements. Anyone who wished to study some feature could, it is true, gather together, by selecting cards from the file of a text, all the clauses in the text which the compiler of the file had regarded as containing or comprising examples of that feature. But would it really accord with good scholarly practice to assume, without checking, that these were the only examples of the feature in the text? Or, if more than one text was being used, to assume that different compilers were in agreement as to what constituted an example of the feature? If the user of a file or files which he has not compiled himself is not prepared to make such assumptions, the advantage to him of having the file or files may be rather small or even negligible. Not too much should be made of this difficulty, it is true; no doubt a largish proportion of the descriptors are such that no two opinions would be possible about their application—provided, that is to say, that those concerned were competent scholars.

To sum up—with the proviso that I am expressing tentative opinions about a proposal some details of which I do not completely understand—it seems to me that Professor Wenck's painstaking, ingenious, and carefully tested analytical scheme is of much value, and may well lead to a number of new approaches in studying the working of Japanese. It is full of useful suggestions, and it is hardly fanciful to say that it comprises an advanced course in the language from the points of view of syntactical structure, social background, and style. I have myself learnt a number of things from it and expect to learn more.

I see no reason why those features defined in the scheme which a scholar wishes to study himself should not be recorded on punchcards by means of the code provided. But I doubt whether the production of files embodying the proposed exhaustive analysis of a text is likely to commend itself to many persons with the necessary competence. And I have some doubts about the practicability of the use of a file by someone other than the compiler; unless, perhaps, he was working under the compiler's supervision. Moreover, there seems to be a possible danger in the blind acceptance of the contents of a file by an independent worker.

It should perhaps be remarked that, though a file would in a sense contain, as stated, "a rather detailed commentary on the structural features of the text", its punched information could only be got at by a laborious process of decoding. The use of the file for its coded information would thus be inconvenient for a reader who needed help in understanding the text. Professor Wenck does not, I think, contemplate such a use for it, but the word "commentary" might lead to misconception.

Only two major slips have been noted. On the Descriptor Schedule (unnumbered page = 16), the zone 360–362, marked "Judgment mode (limitation)", should refer, not to VII Cd, but to V Cd; and in note 3 on page 75 the two references to "VI A note 10" should be to "IV A note 10"). Professor Wenck has asked me to add that the following errors in code numbers need to be put right:—

319 should be 322 in two places on p. 88, viz. line 2 (under 215) and line 15 (in 229 + *319* + 3 + 4); and

299 should be 303 in two places, viz. on p. 88 line 35 (under 267, under 213*) and on p. 94, last entry under (*a*) *potentiality* (under 267).

F. J. Daniels

Joseph K. Yamagiwa, editor and compiler: *Readings in Japanese* . . .
. . . *Language and Linguistics*, part I, selections, 6 (unnumbered) + 456 pp./part II, annotations, 8 (unnumbered) + 823 pp. (Texts selected by/Bibliographical headnotes by, Hiroshi Tsukishima), 1965.
. . . *Literature*, part I, selections, 6 (unnumbered) + 312 pp./part II, annotations, 8 (unnumbered) + 572 pp. (Texts selected by/Bibliographical headnotes by, Keiji Inaga), 1965.

. . . *Political Science*, part I, selections, 4 (unnumbered)+239 pp./part II, annotations, 6 (unnumbered)+600 pp. (Texts selected by/Bibliographical headnotes by, Ritsuo Akimoto and Juñnosuke Masumi), 1965.

. . . *Social Anthropology and Sociology*, part I, selections, 6 (unnumbered)+223 pp./part II, annotations, 8 (unnumbered)+ 450 pp. (Texts selected by/Bibliographical headnotes by, Richard K. Beardsley and Kiyomi Morioka), 1966.

. . . *History*, part I, selections, 9 (unnumbered)+254 pp./part II, annotations, 11 (unnumbered)+506 pp. (Texts selected by/Bibliographical introduction by, John W. Hall), 1966.

All: University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

These publications, a series relating to five fields of study, are intended to provide students working in one of these fields with their first specialist reading-material in Japanese. The students are supposed to have done two or three years of preliminary work in the language. This probably assumes that it has been one subject among others, as it would be in many American universities, so that the standard implied would be that attainable in two years or less in a full-time language course. The texts, consisting of extracts from the writings of modern Japanese authorities, have been chosen to give a conspectus of representative views and approaches, and seem admirably suited to their purpose. One of the titles, *Readings in Japanese Literature*, is misleading; its texts relate to literary criticism.

The notes, largely word translations, seem to be generally reliable. They are evidently intended to make the use of a dictionary unnecessary. But even so, it seems silly to have included translations of very many words which are so common and essential that no student unfamiliar with them would be ready to tackle the texts. The inclusion of such words and the repetition of the translation every time a word occurs, even on the same page of the same extract, has swollen the annotation volumes prodigiously. *Sugitaru wa nao oyobazaru ga gotoshi.*

F.J.D.