

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS

Khotanese texts I-III (Indo-Scythian Studies). Ed. H. W. Bailey, 2nd edn., Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Sir Harold Bailey's series of *Khotanese texts* is a monumental work of great importance for Iranian and related studies. The volumes have proceeded steadily over the years: I 1945, II 1954, III 1956, IV 1961, V 1963, VI 1967. The volumes differ in various respects. Vol. I contains a large proportion of Sanskrit and Tibetan (over 40%). Vol. II has mainly documents. Vol. III has a medley of texts other than documents. Vol. IV is a small volume containing the Hedin Collection. This volume is the only one with commentary, translation, and indexes. Vol. V is the largest text volume with mostly shorter pieces. It has scattered Sanskrit and Tibetan texts as well. This volume contains an index (useful but inadequate) of the sigla and their distribution over the five volumes. Vol. VI contains no texts, but a discussion of selected words from a text that is not in the series. The first three volumes have now become out of print. Volumes I and II have been extremely hard to obtain for many years. All those who are interested in using the volumes will therefore be grateful that Bailey has been willing to see the volumes reprinted even though he has not had time to make an entirely new edition.

It is convenient to have the three volumes together. It would have made it easier to use the combined volume if a reference number had been given to the separate volumes at the head of each page, as the original pagination has very sensibly been retained. This is particularly important because the system of transcription used is not uniform throughout the volumes, so that it is necessary to know exactly where one is. In this connexion it should be noted that the system of transcription used for the Supplement, which begins at III, 139, is *not* the same as that otherwise used in Vol. III. The corrections printed at II, 131-4 and III, 140 have not been reprinted but have, on the whole, been incorporated into the text of the new edition. Although only Vol. I contains on its title-page the addition of the words "second edition", we have in fact a new "edition" of all three volumes as the jacket indicates. This carelessness on the part of the press has already led to the confusion of some scholars and librarians, who have assumed that Vols. II and III were straight reprints.

While the first volume has benefited from considerably greater improvement than the others, any scholar wishing to work at the texts will need to check the readings in the new edition of all three volumes. Thus,* the first line of Vol. III has *mu'lysdije* for *mu'ysdije*, and on the same page 6r2 has *ṣkālśina* for *ṣkāljsina*, which is an improvement, but it is still wrong as the correct reading is *ṣkālśina*. In the same text there are other improved readings, e.g. 14v3 *mamāne*, *pa'jsina*; 14v5 *haṣ < ʃ > ā ysārā*; 19r2-3 *muysdy-ūnauñā dukhitoñā*. But further improvement is possible: read *yudeme* 6v3, *bañāñā* 21v5. Similarly incomplete are the corrections of the *Vajracchedikā*, III, 19-29. Thus, *gyatsa* at 22b3 is corrected to *gyasta*, but *dvāradīrsa* for *dvāvaradīrsa* remains at 23a3. Any number of further corrections could have been made, e.g. insert *vā* after *dātā* at 2b3; read *arahaṃdauñā* 18a4-18b1, *ṣā'* 27a2, *kiṇa* 31b4, *dyāñā* 40a3, *trāṃa* 43a3, *ṣā' vipākajā bhrrāntā* 43b1, etc. As a matter of interpretation, I believe *nīṣi'mā* should be read as one word instead of three at 44a1. Further matters I reserve for my own edition.

* I use an apostrophe to indicate the subscript hook even when citing from a place where Bailey prints a subscript hook.

As for the documents in Vol. II, the situation is the same: some improvements, but not complete. Take for example ch. ii, 001 at II, 57-9. *ai* in the original edition had *mama jsyā ysādā*, which in the new edition is almost correct as *ma majjyā ysādā*. But read *ysyādā*. The text here is also an improvement over that in Bailey's *Saka Documents Text Volume, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum*, London 1968, 104-5 (see my review in *BSOAS*, XXXII, 2, 1969, 401-2, where further corrections can be found).

In Vol. I, most changes are to be found in the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts and in the Khotanese *Suvarnaprabhāsa*. Five parallel passages from Caraka are added at I, 195-6. In this volume also the changes are random. Thus, in the Tibetan text at 138v2 *bya-bahi* has been changed to *bya-baho*, but in the line above the unintelligible reading *bug-rū* (misreading of *zug-rū*) has been retained. At 139r4 *dag* is improved to *naḡ*, but at 139r1 *nus-kyi* (for *dus-kyi*) is retained. At 140v7 *śas che-ba* is improved to *śas chuñ-ba* but at 141r6 *lu mex* (for *lums*) is retained. So throughout the text. Similarly in the Sanskrit text at I, 106 ff. some corrections are made but many more remain for the future. Thus, at 1v5 *śaran* improves on *saran* of the first edition, but on the same page the unintelligible reading *vayo* at 1v6 (for *cayo* = Tibetan *gog*) is retained and *jirñās tac* at 2r1, equally unintelligible, is reprinted instead of the correct reading *jirñānte* (= Tibetan *kha-zas zu-bahi mjug-tu*). On the next page (p. 107) at 2r4 *āśritau* is retained from the first edition despite the correction to *āśrito* in II, 133 of the original edition. *āśrito* is, of course, necessary to agree with *vāyuh*. In the same line *sthitaḥ* is replaced by *sthitam* (better *sthitaṃ* as II, 133) to agree with *pittam*, but the unintelligible misreading *yaknāsāya* has been retained instead of *pakvāsāya*, which is not only the correct reading but it can be paralleled e.g. from *Suśruta*. In 2v1 the unintelligible reading *samā yesām* is retained instead of being replaced by the correct reading *sam-āyāsām* (*samāya* = Tibetan *zi-bar bya-bahi phyir*). In 2v1-2 *āmlānulomano* is reprinted as *āmlō 'nulomano*, which is an improvement, but it is not quite right yet (read *amlō*). And so one could continue. But here it should be said that Bailey is dealing with corrupt MSS. and an extremely difficult script. He has already done a great deal, but it is only to be expected that much more must be done before a satisfactory text can be provided.

The Khotanese in Vol. I is characterized first and foremost by the insertion of all the "unetymological" *anusvāras*. This will considerably lighten the work of those using the volume. In the case of the *Siddhasāra* the most noticeable feature of the presentation of the text is the wholly chaotic paragraphing, which has been retained in the reprint. I suppose it would have been too much to expect this kind of change in a reprint, and that is what we really have, a corrected reprint rather than a new edition. In one case, however, where a new paragraph begins in the middle of a word (!), a limited objective might have been attained by at least making a word division. Thus, read at 140r5 I, 78 *ju tte*, where *tte* begins a new paragraph. That the word could have been separated is shown by the successful separation of *ā skaphai* at 109r5 (the *ḡ* is still missing). In a number of places, however, words that ought to have been joined have not. Thus, at 138v4 read *śahera* and at 144r3 read *micu*. Some minor improvements have been made, e.g. *vanāstā* 134r3, *nirāme* 13r2, but more have not, e.g. read *tīi zora*, *baññā* 143r2. Sometimes footnotes emend, e.g. *vasta* for *varva* at 129r3, but there is no systematic attempt to present a readable text. Thus, *ttai dā* at 142v2 ought to be emended to *ttaudā* (cf. 145v1, 3 153r3). Similarly, the Tibetan text is occasionally emended as *darbha* for *bha* at 144v1 but is usually not, e.g. read *sahe* for *paheba* 142r1, *piyala* for *pilaya* 142r2. At 142v4 *plaba* is correctly emended for *sla-ba*, but *pala* is printed instead of *sala*. At 144r7, however, *chagavirigi* is correct, although it is found only in the Derge edition, the others having *cha-ba*.

The question of emendations arises especially in connexion with the *Jātukastava*. A considerable number of important emendations made by Bailey were used in Dresden's edition, but they have often failed to get into the present edition. Thus we have the unintelligible *rhinai* at 9v4 (38) without the emendation *mārinai*. Moreover, the *anusvāra* has been missed: read *rhīnai* (not *rhī nai* as Dresden).

In the *Bhadracaryādesanā* also there are a number of improvements, most of them known already from the edition of Asmussen, who had them from Bailey. Note,

however, that at 57v3 *tinka-masām* should be read, as in Asmussen's edition. In 54v4 the reading *dai* of the first edition is improved to *daītā* as in Asmussen. The correct reading is *daittā*.

Many improvements have been made in the *Suvarnaprabhāsa*. Suffice it to add one further correction: read *ysernu* in 36v7. This text I hope to re-edit myself before long. Kha. i. 99 at I, 256 was re-edited by Bailey at V, 140-1.

The Supplement at III, 139-49 contains some important new material. Kha. i. 219.1 at III, 142 was published in my recent work *The Book of Zambasta*, OUP 1968, 432, where note that *uskyā]lsto* should be read for *u]skya]lsto*.

If, of course, we had had to wait for a perfect edition of all these difficult texts, we should never have had one at all. The way in which they have been revised for this volume may seem haphazard, but then we must be grateful for the many new readings that have been incorporated in this important work.

R. E. EMMERICK

J. A. Boyle (Ed.) *The Cambridge History of Iran. Vol. 5: The Saljuq and Mongol Periods*. C.U.P., 1968.

The Cambridge History of Iran is planned in eight volumes. The volume under review, although one of the two first to appear, is in fact volume five. The series adopts the traditional pattern of Cambridge Histories, in which each volume is the responsibility of an editor, who invites specialists to contribute chapters on chosen subjects. Although the form has many obvious advantages it does involve some repetition, and some loss of unity and readability.

In planning this volume Professor Boyle has adopted the method of asking scholars who have already written at length on a particular subject to present a revised summary of their views. This has had valuable results in making available work which, for one reason or another, was not, previously, generally accessible, in particular the views of Professor Lambton on Saljuq institutions and of Professor Petrushevsky on the economic development of Iran under the Mongols. The principal exceptions to this generalization are the two outline historical chapters by Professor Bosworth and by Professor Boyle himself.

These two historical chapters between them occupy almost half the book and constitute a history within a history. Neither makes easy reading, being formed in the traditional, dynastic mould. This is partly owing to the fact that non-military and non-political aspects are abstracted for treatment elsewhere, but partly also because neither writer is himself an historian by training and, lacking that disciplinary foundation, allows his sources to impose their own pattern upon his writing. Historians may well raise their eyebrows at some expressions. Professor Boyle's description of Sulṭān Muḥammad's treatment of the envoys of Chingiz as "a wanton breach of international law" (p. 305) appears wholly anachronistic, while even more unhistorical is the writer's comment that "what is certain is that the Middle East would today bear an altogether different aspect if the House of Hülegü had retained its full vigour for a decade or two longer" (p. 417). None the less, despite these reservations, these two chapters constitute a very valuable outline for which English students, hitherto dependent upon Claude Cahen's chapter in the *Pennsylvania History of the Crusades* for the Saljuqs and lacking anything whatsoever for the Ḳhāns, will be very grateful.

Instead of considering the other chapters separately it may be more useful to look at them in the light of two general problems which are raised by the volume as a whole. These are, first, whether it is possible to write an intelligible history based on a unit called Iran, and second, whether the Mongol invasions mark a definite turning point within this period.

There is at first sight an apparent absurdity in a history of Iran which bears the names of two Turanian dynasties and which devotes rather more space to Central Asia and Asia Minor than it does to southern Iran. In some ways it is the story of two power centres - one in the north-west, centred on the Arran-Azerbaijan area, and the other in the north-east, centred on Khurasan. But the authors concede this obvious

point and argue that there is a distinct Iranian world, even if it does not coincide with present-day Iran. The theme of Professor Bosworth's chapter is the steady influx of Turkish nomads and their adoption of Iranian culture and traditional political organization. Professor Boyle appears to trace a similar development with the Mongols and even goes to the extent of saying that the *Il-Khāns* "created at least the pre-conditions for a national state; Iran ceased to be a mere geographical expression" (p. 355) although it is difficult to reconcile this with the political developments of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Professor Lambton speaks of the "fundamental fact of the unbroken thread of Persian history in Islamic times" (p. 203), although elsewhere she writes of a continuing dichotomy between Islamic and Persian traditions, albeit diminished in the Saljuq period (p. 215). Professor Petrushevsky even writes of "the Iranian economy" (e.g. p. 494). The writers on Iranian culture, however, seem much less sure that something which can be called by that name really exists. Professor Rypka, in his very useful chapter, which summarizes the results of his *History of Iranian Literature* (Dordrecht, Holland, 1968) never really faces the problem of distinguishing between Iranian and Persian literature, and although Amīr Khūsrau is given detailed attention, that notable historian Barāni receives only a bare mention. Professor Bausani, in his two chapters on religion, and Professor Hodgson, in his chapter on the Ismā'īlīs, find the Iranian framework unworkable and stress that the movements with which they are concerned are common to the whole Muslim world and do not conform to any exclusively Iranian pattern. In his consideration of the exact sciences Professor Kennedy would not appear to dispute this, although he states firmly that scientists in Iran were "the best of their age" (p. 679). The most significant statement of all, however, comes from Professor Graber who writes on the visual arts. Although he does show the development of particular forms of art in Iran, notably the Iranian mosque and miniature painting, he argues, following Minorsky in his article on the "Geographical Factors in Persian Art" (*BSOS*, IX), that there is no evidence that particular developments in one region of Iran were general, although they might spread to certain other regions. From this and other evidence from literature it could be argued that there was not one Iranian culture but many local cultures in Iran, at this period.

It would seem reasonable therefore to have considerable doubts about both the political and cultural unity of Iran in this period. Where then does the unity lie? It is claimed that it is to be found in common institutions and, particularly, in the centralized system of government, which is enshrined in the traditions of an Iranian bureaucracy, which functions throughout the period. It is true that this concept comes through the sources very strongly, but it must be pointed out that the major sources, Rashīd al-Dīn, Vaṣṣāf, Ḥamd Allāh Mustaufī Qazvīnī, like Nizām al-Mulk himself, are all themselves members of this bureaucracy, supporters of a centralized policy, and the enemies of particularist forces. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that they should present the history of their times in this way. Regional histories, written from the viewpoint of local forces, would bring out the strength of regional, political and institutional differences throughout Iran. The existence of these differences makes it very difficult to write in terms of "Iran", as opposed to the multiplicity of separate political, social and economic systems within the area. As Professor Lambton remarks (p. 261) the directly administered area, even at its greatest extent, under Malik Shāh, never amounted to as much as half the empire. Professor Lambton regards the Saljuq ideal as centralization, from which it declines to provincial separatism. But an alternative would be to see the provincial grouping as the basic unit and to see the empire as a loose and short-lived artifact, agglomerated by the careful bargaining and judicious use of power of a capable ruler. The ideal of Rashīd al-Dīn is not necessarily the norm.

The second point concerns the extent to which the Mongol conquest constituted a turning point in the history of the area. All the writers consider this point in various ways, but the most extreme and detailed statement is that of Professor Petrushevsky. His chapter is one of the most interesting in the book, both for the stimulating ideas which it presents and for the information contained within it, although this amounts to only a summary of the Russian original. But his picture of the tremendous economic

decline of Iran needs some qualification. Like other Soviet historians he rejects Barthold's modified picture of the effects of the Mongol invasions and reverts to the traditional picture of destruction, now buttressed by a wealth of detail. He claims that the thirteenth century saw the "colossal economic decline of Iran" (p. 483), measured by a massive fall in population, urban life, and production. But interesting as his evidence is it needs some closer evaluation. With some hesitations he accepts, by and large, the figures of contemporary chroniclers for Saljuq Iran and for the destruction wrought by the Mongols. He says "we cannot doubt that between 1220 and 1258 the population of Iran declined several times over" (p. 486). But since this involves accepting such fantastic statistics as a population of nearly two million for Herat and district, and similar figures for other areas, we can and must easily doubt it. He contends that the rule of the *Il-Khāns* was characterized by a continuing high rate of taxation. But this presupposes that the author knows what the gross national product was since the statement means simply that the national revenue was an unduly large percentage of the gross national product. Of course he has no means at all of discovering the size of the gross national product, and indeed, the national economy is confused with the national revenue throughout. A decline in the national revenue, in the situation which obtained, is more likely to be evidence of a decline in the power of the central government than of "the general economic decline of Iran" (p. 499). The evidence of an alleged decline in the number of villages is hardly conclusive in the absence of a uniform definition of a village, quite apart from inherent doubts about the way in which the statistics were compiled by the chroniclers. The fact that the chroniclers say very little about urban life is quoted by Professor Petrushevsky as evidence that urban life declined. In rural areas the author makes much of the flight of peasants from their land and of attempts to attach them to the land. This is indeed consistent with a shortage of labour and parallels developments in England in the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. But the experience of other areas suggests that a shortage of labour and the sort of oppression described by Professor Petrushevsky are not compatible. There is a difference between peasants who take to the hills in despair and those who move to other areas in response to more attractive offers.

I have used this review to express some disagreements with ideas in this volume. Space, unfortunately, does not allow one to write of the innumerable points which the writers illuminate. Suffice it to say that this well-edited book will still yield a rich harvest after many readings.

M. E. YAPP

Beginning Burmese by William S. Cornyn and D. Haigh Roop. xxiii+pp. 501.
Yale University Press, New Haven, 1968. 35s (paperback).

This introductory course for modern colloquial Burmese is a welcome revision of Professor Cornyn's manual, *Spoken Burmese*, which was originally prepared in the early forties. The introduction of the book states "Beginning Burmese constitutes a general introduction to the Burmese language. It contains the essential grammatical materials for learning to speak everyday Burmese, and its vocabulary, though small, is built around a number of useful common situations and current topics." The 25 lessons are presented both in transcription and in Burmese script; there are sections on the sounds of Burmese and on pronunciation, and the basic features of the writing system are explained. The amount covered is called a first-year course, though it is not stated how many hours a week would be involved. Students doing a full-time language course (minimum 8 hours classwork per week) would probably exhaust this material in 1½ terms; they would need a considerable amount of supplementary material before being ready to proceed to the second year of a degree course.

At a first glance the book raises high hopes. It is spaciouly laid out, beautifully printed with almost no misprints, and, in the paper-back version, reasonably priced. Each lesson presents a number of new words and phrases separately, and combined into sentences to form a simple dialogue (with accompanying English version). Then follow brief grammatical explanations, numerous exercises in the form of substitution

drills and questions to be answered in Burmese, and finally a Burmese-English word list for the lesson. Lessons 7, 13, 19 and 25 are reviews of material so far covered. At the end of the book there is a 42-page English to Burmese word list, and a 30-page Burmese to English word list (in which the forms are ordered in their transcribed form). The difference in the length of these two word lists is partly due to the fact that most Burmese grammatical operators are suffixed bound forms; there is a single page list of these which in fact serves as an index to the grammatical sections of the various chapters. It is suggested in the introduction that the student should learn from the book with the help of a native speaker (or his voice on tapes), who would serve as a model for imitation and a check on pronunciation and usage. "But", it is stated, "it is not the native speaker's function to explain the language: that is the function of this book." One expects therefore a fairly comprehensive coverage of syntax and grammar, with a thorough explanation of the functions of all bound forms. In fact the bound forms and the patterns which occur in the selected basic sentences are adequately explained for the particular structure in which they occur, but not fully enough to enable the student to recognize analogous structures for himself. Once outside the material in the book he would need to ask the native speaker for further explanation, and indeed this need would most certainly arise as several patterns vital to everyday conversation have not been included (such as "how long have you been doing so-and-so?" or NOUN + *mou*. "on account of its being - "). As an example of restricted explanation, there is the occurrence in chapter 18, "In a Village", of the bound morpheme *thama*: "one skilled in his craft", in the word "shoemaker". We are not told that it is a common suffix, found also in such words as *le-thama*: "paddy-farmer", *alou-thama*: "worker", *nain-ngan-yei-thama*: "politician", words vital to any discussion of "current topics" in Burma! Much care and thought have gone into the selection of the vocabulary, and the practical sense of the authors' Burmese assistant, Miss Nu Nu Mae, is evident in the chapters covering dates, months, seasons, money, eating, renting accommodation, buying clothes. These should certainly suffice to help a foreigner make known his needs; on the other hand many expressions basic to Burmese village life are missing, such as "paddy", "paddy-land", "paddy-farmer", "the rice plant", "the monk", "rice offering", even though there is a chapter called "In a Village".

The patterns and vocabulary of each chapter are to be mastered by sets of carefully prepared drills; these are thorough, but rather predictable and repetitive, so that the student may well become bored and the native speaker certainly will. What each lesson lacks, and what was a good feature of the earlier *Spoken Burmese*, is a piece for general comprehension, a conversation or short narrative to be listened to (or read), which would arouse the interest and test the usefulness of knowledge so far acquired. This kind of listening-in passage needs careful preparation for the early lessons, and cannot be made up by the native speaker on the spur of the moment.

On the question of when and how to introduce a student to an exotic script, the reviewer has found that it is more satisfactory with Burmese to start with the script and phonology on their own. Then after about two weeks the student is able to commence the study of structures and vocabulary through the Burmese script itself, only using the transcription to remind himself of irregular pronunciations. Working too long with a transcription can make it difficult to change to the script itself. In *Beginning Burmese* the writing system is not explained as a whole at the beginning of the book but is introduced by stages in chapters 10, 11, 12 and 14. The basic principles involved in writing the syllables of the native Burmese sound system are economically set out but, most inexplicably, no mention is made of any exceptions and inconsistencies, nor of all the special spellings and doubled letters found in the numerous loan words from Pali. These are frequent in everyday speech. It would also have been helpful to mention the unsettled state of Burmese spelling at the present time, and to explain why certain spellings have been adopted (e.g. *mou*: "sky" with final -g, or *hpa* "read" with initial b-).

Finally we come to the question of the overall grammatical analysis and the manner in which this is presented to the student. The analysis, which is essentially the

same as in the earlier book, is inadequate in several ways as it is based on a rather restricted language sample; the explanations, in aiming for clarity and ease of comprehension, present a considerably over-simplified picture of Burmese grammar and syntax. To give a few examples: in lesson 6 three of the most common noun particles (-*kou*, -*ka*, and -*hma*) are explained with example sentences; they may roughly be said to indicate "place to which, place from which, place at which". But it is helpful if one realizes that the use of -*kou*, to mark the destination or object is optional, and depends on emphasis and the need to be explicit, whereas -*ka* and -*hma* must always be used. The sentences given are not wrong, but in normal everyday speech would more usually occur without -*kou*. This optionality of occurrence of certain noun and verb markers (suffixed bound forms) is a very important characteristic of Burmese syntax and should be mentioned at an early stage in order to prevent the student being puzzled. For example, *di-lou hsou-yin* "in that case", occurs as *di-lou hsou*; *mahou-yin* as *mahou-lou.hyi-yin* "if not, otherwise". The noun particle -*ka*, has several functions, one of which is to indicate the "place from which"; in this function it is often followed by one, or two, or three more syllables, *nei-pi: to*. "stay-finish-after", which help to make quite clear that we are concerned with movement from a certain place and not with any other function of the particle -*ka*. The student could be told PLACE + *ka*. means the same as PLACE + *ka.nei* or + *ka.nei-pi*: or + *ka.nei-pi:to*., and it would not be necessary to give special translations of these longer patterns each time they occur in later chapters.

In chapter 4 complex noun expressions are discussed; in relation to the expression *htamin:co* "fried rice" (*co* - "fry") it is stated: "when a verb modifies a noun it regularly follows". This is a considerable over-simplification of the position: firstly there are many compound nouns, such as "sling-bag", "bomber-plane", "exhibition", in which the modifying verb precedes the noun; secondly what may seem obviously analysable as noun head plus verb attribute can be differently analysed. By means of the prefix *a-*, a derived noun may be formed from all Burmese verbs: *aco* "something fried", *pu* "be hot", *apu* "heat, a hot (one)". In compound expressions, nouns with prefix *a-* usually lose the prefix if they come second in the compound - hence *htamin:* [*a*] *co* could be interpreted as "rice- a fried one", or even as "a rice fry". In the case of *yei-pu* "water (a) hot (one) i.e. hot water", and *nei-pu* "the heat of the sun", the transformation of the second, *nei-ye.apu* lit. "sun's heat" shows that not all "verbs" in second place are in fact modifying verbs. If one takes into account various other nominals derived from verbs, such as *ci:ci*: "bigly", *hka'ci:ci*: "rather big" as well as *aci*: "a big one" derived from *ci*: "be big", all of which follow a head noun, it seems better to think of *nga:ci*: "fish-big" as *nga:[g]ci*: "fish - a big one", rather than as "fish be big".

The classification of particles should be done on the basis of their function: however, we find that certain bound forms have been grouped together in a class called general particles, although some of them have quite dissimilar syntactic functions. For example -*le*: "also", and -*to*, "as for, but" occur in mid-sentence, following other enclitics and markers, and indicate the relations between sentences, whilst -*lou* "way, manner", also here classed as a g.p., is a bound subordinate noun occurring in expressions such as *di-lou* "like this", *bama-lou* "like a Burmese". (In fact -*lou* has been left out of the index of bound forms.)

It is a great pity that the authors did not feel able to give a longer introduction to the book in which they might have included a general account of the language situation in Burma. This would have helped the student to realize the difference between the language presented in the course and the language of modern literature and the press. These two languages differ considerably, and although they both have a regular accepted orthographic form, learning to read the modern spoken language in Burmese script does not enable one to progress straight way to reading novels or newspapers. One has in fact to master another, slightly different language.

Beginners will have much to be thankful for in this handsome book, but it must be said with regret, that a fully satisfactory first-year Burmese course still needs to be written.

W. Eichhorn: *Beitrag zur rechtlichen Stellung des Buddhismus und Taoismus im Sung-Staat*: Übersetzung der Sektion "Taoismus und Buddhismus" aus dem *Ch'ing-yüan t'iao-fa shih-lei* (Ch. 50 und 51). 175 pp. (Monographies du T'oung Pao, Vol. VII.) Leiden (E. J. Brill), 1968. hfl. 55.

The penal code of the Sung dynasty, the *Sung hsing-t'ung* 宋刑統, was practically identical with the T'ang code *T'ang-lü shu-i* as far as the penal laws (*lü*) are concerned. Those compilations of the Sung, however, where in addition to the penal laws also the various ordinances (*ling*), edicts (*chih*), regulations (*ko*) and forms (*shih*) were included, are for the greater part lost. The only juridical compilation which has partly survived is the *Ch'ing-yüan t'iao-fa shih-lei* 慶元條法事類. Compiled in 1202, this collection had originally 80 *chüan* of which only 36 are now extant, among them the chapters 50 and 51 on the Buddhist and Taoist clergy. W. Eichhorn has translated and annotated these two chapters and added a list of words and phrases (pp. 73-99) which will prove helpful for further research into the legal history of the Sung. As there is no readily available edition of the Chinese text on the market, the translator has reproduced the text in facsimile. Reference to the original is therefore made easy.

W. Eichhorn's translation is for the greatest part correct, which is no minor achievement considering the difficulty of the text which teems with expressions not to be found in the usual dictionaries. There are a few cases, however, where this reviewer would prefer a different rendering. The frequent term *sheng-chieh* 聖節 is always translated as "Heiligenfest" whereas it means "Kaisers Geburtstag" (emperor's birthday). p. 7: I would prefer to translate *jeng* 仍 by "darüber hinaus" (moreover, in addition) than by "wie üblich" (as usual). Passage 4 on the same page I take to mean rather that the offender who became a monk without proper authorization may within 30 days make good for his offence and therefore enjoys a sort of temporary amnesty, not "Wenn sich jemand zur Zeit einer Amnestie . . .". p. 9: *ch'u-shih* 處士 has been translated as "ortsansässige Scholaren (?)" but means also "private scholar". p. 71: "Goldtauschier-ungsenden" *chin-ts'o-mo* 金鑄末. "Goldstaub" would perhaps be a more appropriate translation (*mo* is "dust, powder").

The annotation is very rich; much additional material, chiefly from *Sung hui-yao*, has been adduced. Translations and notes both show the extent to which the Sung state tried to supervise and organize the Buddhist and Taoist clergy. This is in accordance with earlier Chinese traditions; already the Japanese monk Ennin had to complain of Chinese bureaucratic red tape when he travelled in ninth-century China. A deep mistrust against organized religion has pervaded Chinese political thought and administrative practices ever since the Han dynasty. W. Eichhorn's book provides us with a wealth of material which may serve to a better understanding of the religious situation of China not only under the Sung, but also under other dynasties as well.

HERBERT FRANKE

15th Century Illustrated Chinese Primer (Hsin-pien tui-hsiang szu-yen), facsimile reproduction with introduction and notes by L. Carrington Goodrich. Hong Kong University Press, 1967. Distributed by Oxford University Press.

Hong Kong University Press have beautifully reproduced this early illustrated word-list which is claimed to date from the fifteenth century and to be the first of its kind. Altogether 306 common attributes and objects are represented in drawings which are alternately workmanlike, ingenious, quaint and rather laughable. How does one draw a picture of iron? And what in detail does a louse look like? One can sympathize with the artist's difficulties. The meaning and pronunciation for the characters is given in the second part of the booklet, following a short introduction to the text. The book will be mainly of antiquarian interest, but of practical assistance too to us who previously had no idea of the appearance of many of the garments and household objects in Ming China.

D.E.P.

Great Britain and the Taipings, by J. S. Gregory. 271 pp. Canberra, Australian National University Press, 1969.

More than one hundred years after their rebellion was suppressed the Taipings remain a highly controversial issue in Chinese history and even in contemporary polemics. The Communist side see the movement as the first "wave" of the coming social revolution - perfected and completed by themselves - and as such largely deserving of praise, but unfortunately lacking the right ideology and deplorably apt to indulge in superstitions and false ideals. These defects were the cause of its collapse. The non-Communists see the Taipings as a first quasi-Nationalist revolution, flawed by the weaknesses of its leadership, and above all betrayed by the selfish policy of those who should have been its friends - the Western European powers. Finally the Christians are still debating uneasily whether their failure to back a movement which was inspired by some sort of Christianity was not the occasion on which they finally lost their chance of converting China. Dr. Gregory's work is not directly concerned with the fate of the Taipings so much as with the motives and purposes of British policy towards them. Here he has done a very complete research which settles some questions.

The British at first adopted a neutral stand; the officials on the spot, in Hong Kong and in Shanghai (there was at first not yet any Minister in Peking), were dubious of the Taipings ability to win the war, rather contemptuous of and very prejudiced about their religious beliefs, but above all concerned with the problems of trade. Would the Taipings further trade with the West if they won, or would they hinder it, as the rebellion itself was doing. Or so it was feared; actually, the returns showed that the ingenious Chinese merchant could pass his goods through any rebellion, and sell them in Shanghai. The British also feared, with good reason, that even if the Taipings overthrew the Manchu dynasty they might not then be able to control all China; the country would be divided among warring claimants, and trade would suffer. This view ignored the immense prestige which would have accrued to the rebellion which dethroned the dynasty; probably lesser rebels would have flocked to acknowledge the new Son of Heaven and obtain high posts in his service. Their subsequent loyalty would have depended on the quality of his government.

Later the British intervened against the Taipings and helped to destroy them, once again it was on account of trade, and the menace to the Treaty Port of Shanghai. So General (then Major) Gordon was lent to command the somewhat misnamed Ever Victorious Army, and began to build the reputation which was to lead him to Khartoum.

Dr. Gregory has shown that in their despatches and letters the makers of British policy were concerned primarily with the trade question; only secondarily with the fate of the dynasty, or who might succeed to it. On the whole they did not put much faith in the Taiping ability to win the war, and perhaps underrated the effectiveness of the government they had set up. As the struggle proceeded "neutrality" was warped more and more in favour of the Manchus; under the pretext of defending the Treaty Ports against disorder, the Taipings were warned off them, and later forced away from them. But although the officials on the China coast recognized that by doing these things they were in practice conferring upon the Manchu government the great advantage of secure ports and their burgeoning customs revenue, they got out of this moral predicament by arguing that the Manchu government was the legitimate regime which the powers had recognized and therefore was entitled to the revenues and to make what use of the ports it so pleased. They were much happier when neutrality was abandoned for outright intervention against the rebels. The fact that during four years, from 1856 to 1860, Britain and France were actually at war with the Manchu Empire, and imposed a new disadvantageous Treaty on that weak government, did not seem inconsistent with covert opposition to the Taipings at the same time.

Dr. Gregory argues that for these inconsistent actions the explanation is the preoccupation with trade; no idea that as the Manchus had been forced to sign an unequal treaty they were now preferable to the Taipings who might not sign any such instrument, and perhaps give China a strong new regime which would not be amenable to

"gunboat diplomacy", crossed the minds, or rather shows in the official correspondence, of the Foreign Office and the China coast officials. Yet the prejudice against the Taipings, founded on very imperfect knowledge of their aims and actions, is admitted and indeed very obvious from the quoted documents. Had the Taipings not bungled their original advance on Peking, and instead taken the capital and driven the dynasty beyond the Great Wall, one wonders how this attitude would have manifested itself in policy.

Another merit of the book is that it shows conclusively that the prevailing strong religious beliefs of the age had little or no effect on British policy makers. The missionary bodies were at first highly sympathetic to the quasi-Christian Taipings; they could not indeed stomach the claims of their leaders to be respectively the directly inspired prophet of God or the sole recipient of inspiration by the Holy Ghost, but they did not stigmatize these pretensions with the scornful arrogance shown by the officials. Up till the end the missionaries for the most part hoped for better things; if the Taipings were not the Dawn of Faith they were at least a glimmer in the sky, a proof that Christian teaching made an impact, and a forerunner of better things to come. Few of them had any faith in the Manchu dynasty.

Their views had no visible effect on policy, and not much more was the influence of those merchants, a large number, and some of the greatest, who did not approve British policy. Perhaps one of the most important lessons to be learned from this careful and objective study is that in the mid-nineteenth-century public opinion, Christian or mercantile, carried virtually no weight at all with the aristocratic statesmen of the day and their officials. Foreign policy was their preserve; they had their own long-term objective, which in this case was to create or obtain a Chinese government which would faithfully observe any treaty imposed upon it. Any opinion which gainsaid this objective, or postulated an alternative was disregarded. "The dogs bark, but the caravan moves on" - to disaster as it ultimately proved. Britain did not want the Taiping Heavenly King; a century later she got Mao Tse-tung.

C. P. FITZGERALD.

John Whitney Hall, *Das Japanische Kaiserreich* (Fischer Weltgeschichte, Band 20), 380 pp., Frankfurt am Main, Fischer Bücherei, 1968.

This volume is one of a paperback series comprising thirty-five books on world history, described by the publishers as "The new world history for a new world" - which might suggest that the emphasis is placed on modern history. However, this is not so. The proportions of this book are different from those of, say, Richard Storry's Penguin volume on the history of modern Japan. Professor Hall devotes some two-thirds of his space to pre-Meiji history. The result is an extraordinarily well-balanced book on Japanese history as a whole.

Professor Hall is particularly well-suited to write a book of this kind, as his research work has covered a wide range of periods (for his book *Government and Local Power in Japan 500-1700*), and not only the most popular field of Japanese historical studies in the West, that of Tokugawa history. Not that this volume represents the results of individual research. Indeed, as the author himself says, he has not attempted to rival the factual completeness of the average textbook. "What interests me personally in Japanese history," he tells us, "is the way in which the political and social institutions in Japan have changed and developed, and how this basically "eastern" culture became a world power. The facts which I adduce in this volume serve mostly as support for my attempt to present this remarkable history in the form of an analysis."

In my view he has achieved outstanding success. The whole narrative proceeds with admirable smoothness, and the reader is led most naturally from point to point, without needing to make the constant mental adjustments demanded by less fluently written works, that skip backwards and forwards in time, or from one subject to another. The facts, incidentally, are by no means as thin on the ground as Professor Hall might seem to have implied, but certainly there emerges an overall picture which

is first-class. Particularly welcome are the occasional re-assessments of traditional or more recently current theories and interpretations, both Japanese and Western, of specific events and periods. There is, for instance, his discussion of the view of some historians that Japan's rapid development in the seventh and eighth centuries was the result of its sudden realization of the superiority of Chinese culture. Again, he criticizes the view of the Tokugawa period found in standard works on Japanese political development, namely that its main feature was the decline of a dynasty, with a succession of crises and attempts at consolidation which led to its inevitable downfall; he insists that the history of seventeenth-century Japan is much too complex to be regarded as consisting of the history of one ruling house alone. He is conspicuously fair, too, unlike some writers, in his assessment of the motives of the leading figures in Japan before World War II. Throughout the book, one senses the breadth and authority of his personal judgments, which are very stimulating.

Inevitably, I have a few small criticisms. One general one is that perhaps more Japanese terms are mentioned than seems strictly necessary for the non-specialist readers for whom this series is intended. At least, it is questionable whether the reader is not positively misled by uses as loose as the following: after the statement that in 1640 the Tokugawa ordered the registration of all Japanese in some temple, which they were free to choose for themselves, the term *tera uke* is quoted in brackets, but with no indication that what this means is not the process itself, but actually the certificate issued by the temple (*tera uke* = *terauke jō* or *terauke jōmon*). There are other small points of detail. A sentence at the top of p. 33 might be taken as implying that Amaterasu and Susanoo had committed incest in producing deities. It is not clear from the mention on p. 228 of the *kyōka* that its form is that of the *waka* and not of the *haiku*, though of course in style it was undoubtedly closer to the *haiku*. There are, too, several misprints, e.g. Yūroku for Yūryaku (this in the index as well as in the text), and Mills for Mill. And it is surely a little pedantic, particularly in a book of this kind, to talk of Kamo-no-Nagaakira, rather than, as is usual, Kamo-no-Chōmei. But these are mostly rather trivial things. The one point of some importance which I should like to mention is that, whereas in all the pre-modern sections there is some discussion of cultural and artistic developments, there is none in the modern section (not a word, for instance, about the present state of the Japanese novel). This is, to say the least, surprising in a book which is otherwise so comprehensive. Yet one cannot really complain. The book is an outstandingly good short survey of the whole range of Japanese history, and I am only sorry that it has not appeared in English as well as in German.

D. E. MILLS

University of Cambridge

C. C. Huang, *A modern Chinese-English dictionary for students*. (East Asian series reference publication No. 1), xix+648 pp. University of Kansas, 1968, 5 gns.

Assuming there is a need for another simple Chinese-English dictionary for the modern language that only lists words and does not analyse their use, Mr. Huang's is just adequate to supply it. There is such a need, he claims, because existing dictionaries all have serious shortcomings. Simon's *Beginners' Dictionary*, which has many excellent qualities, he leaves out of account; it is chiefly with *Mathews' Dictionary* and the *Chinese-English Dictionary of Modern Communist Usage*, a U.S. Government translation of the Peking *Han-De ci-dian*, that he finds fault. *Mathews'* is not primarily a modern dictionary, so one can concede his point on that ground alone, though as we all know it is also weird and wonderful in its arrangement. With the other it is true that there are a few omissions, and that characters are sometimes difficult to find in the index. Mr. Huang's main claim for his dictionary is that it is, on the contrary, convenient for the novice to use. Indeed I am sure his method of indexing characters without regard to radicals (especially now one has to cope with the simplified versions) is the most sensible, and should save students time. On the other hand, no pronunciation is given

for combinations, which of course make up the bulk of the entries, and this will doubtless add to their labour. It is especially awkward when the second character is not listed separately, which does happen here as in all other dictionaries except the most exhaustive. It was apparently impossible to give the pronunciation because of lack of space, but one could have suggested ways of conserving this so valuable commodity, for example by discarding those characters which one would not expect to come across in a month of Sundays (they are by no means few), and also the spurious "combinations" that one might otherwise have suspected were included precisely to fill up the pages. The other limitation imposed by considerations of economy, also regretted by Mr. Huang, is more important. The main function of a dictionary is after all to define words. Mr. Huang has been forced to keep his definitions very brief, often one-word equivalents. They are mostly borrowed from the other dictionaries, but are markedly shorter than the Chinese-German one, and less instructive than *Mathews'*. As such, his work, though tidier, is not substantially any advance over existing ones. It is probably beyond the capability of any one man to produce the kind of dictionary that would be very helpful, which would be a comprehensive analytical dictionary on the lines of the first part of the Yale *Dictionary of Spoken Chinese*.

D. E. POLLARD

The Peoples of the Soviet Far East, by Walter Kolarz. xii+194 pp. Archon Books, Hamden, Connecticut, 1969, \$6.50.

This reprint of one of the important books by the late Walter Kolarz, originally published in 1954, is sure of a welcome, even though works on contemporary history usually date rather quickly. It is not too easy nowadays, when we have generous access to material, when we can, quite often, travel to and even study in such exotic places as Ulan Bator, Ulan Ude or Irkutsk, when journalists and photographers from western Europe can be carried by helicopter to the Arctic coast of Yakutia, to realize what a task Kolarz set himself in researching on Soviet policies towards the minority populations of its Far Eastern empire. His preface recalls the isolation of his area of study from the world at large during the time when he was working, and it is sobering to remember with him that some of the first reliable news from eastern Siberia was given by former concentration camp inmates. He deplores the difficulty of getting hold of written material. Yet his book is still an indispensable introduction to the subject, and if in some particulars a reviewer, with the advantage of years more study and of richer source material, can set him right on points of detail, a rereading of the book only excites admiration that the author could have discovered so much about such an unpromising field.

In this book Kolarz continues the theme of his earlier book *Russia and her Colonies*. A third book on religion in the U.S.S.R. was to follow just before his death. His interest ranges over the Russians of the Far East, Soviet dealings with Koreans, Chinese and Japanese, the aborigines of the Far East, the Yakuts, the Mongols and Buriats, and the Tuvinians. His work is that of a student of political science, not an ethnographer. To treat so much in a book of some 180 effective pages results naturally in selectivity and lack of proportion, or so at least it appears in retrospect. But to bring the whole book up to date would demand almost impossibly wide reading, and the reviewer proposes to comment only on a few facets of the chapter on Mongolia. It should be said at once that Kolarz was right to include Mongolia in his study, in spite of Mongolia's independence (which was in fact recognized only by the U.S.S.R. and by Tannu Tuva until the latter was annexed by the Russians). The degree to which Mongolian affairs were dictated by the interests of the U.S.S.R. is a point still argued, and the most one can say without the certainty of being contradicted is that the weight of Soviet pressure varied at different times. But the similarities between developments in Mongolia and those within the U.S.S.R., especially during the years of Stalinism, make the consideration of Mongolia as a satellite a perfectly reasonable one.

Though it is possible nowadays to know far more about Mongolia than was available to Kolarz, it is remarkable how often he put his finger on events which perhaps appeared to him isolated examples, but which later knowledge shows to have been typical. For example, he mentions the re-writing of the play *The Three Sharatgol Khans* as illustrating the propagandist use to which the Mongol theatre was soon put. The re-writing of the opera *Three Sad Mountains* turns out to have been a further example of this use of literature for ideological purposes, and as we possess the original and the altered texts it would be possible to study the process in detail.

Some stories outlined by Kolarz can be brought more up to date. Thus we are just now witnessing the rehabilitation of a number of writers liquidated in the thirties, of whom the best known is perhaps Buyannemekh. Kolarz, perhaps taking the accusations made against him at their face value, called Buyannemekh an "anti-Soviet" writer. But he may not have been aware of the victim's real past. Buyannemekh, born in 1902, was orphaned at an early age and came to Urga where he was adopted by the nobleman Togtokh Taiji. He was taught Mongol, Manchu and Chinese by teachers hired by Togtokh. As a young man he joined Sukebator's revolutionary group in Urga and from early 1921 onwards was a member of the Mongol People's Party. He was sent by the Central Committee of this party to Irkutsk to help bring out a newspaper in co-operation with the Far Eastern branch of the Comintern. Returning to Mongolia he joined the newly established League of Revolutionary Youth. In 1922 he was in Moscow for the first international congress of eastern peoples and met Lenin. Back again in Mongolia he held important political posts, as well as writing, until his arrest in 1937. Charges of the sort listed by Kolarz, that he represented an anti-popular school of literature, were kept up against Buyannemekh till some twenty years after his death but the nature of some of his works which have recently been republished, such as poems entitled *October Revolution*, *First of May*, *Sukebator and friendship with the U.S.S.R.*, *Pioneer* and so on, makes it look as if his literary tendencies were the least of the real charges against him, and that he fell victim to the general purge of intellectuals and others whom Choibalsan wanted out of the way in the dreadful years of 1937 and afterwards. This is not of course to say that allegedly anti-socialist literature has not been a very sharp bone of contention in Mongolia as in the U.S.S.R. We know quite a bit about the suppression and even physical destruction of old Mongol books from a booklet published by Damdinsuren, though it says much for the terror of the Stalinist years, that even Damdinsuren had to write an ode in servile praise of the great leader.

Kolarz makes the point that a proper understanding of the Mongol revolution is even more difficult to achieve than one of the Russian revolution. Records have been falsified on a large scale, and there are no alternative sources of information. He himself, however, did a good piece of restoration in rescuing from oblivion the names of several revolutionaries who had fallen foul of the State security organization and been murdered and consigned to oblivion. Yet even now problems remain, one of which, still not satisfactorily settled, is that of the death of Marshal Demid. Demid, the Mongolian War Minister, "died" in the Trans-Siberian express on his way to Moscow in the summer of 1937. His corpse was received with military honours, and *Pravda* reported the funeral at the end of August that year. But then it turned out that Demid had for years past been a paid spy of the Japanese, and, along with the premier Gendung had headed an espionage and sabotage group. Years afterwards Demid was rehabilitated, but his death has never been explained. A belated obituary, published in 1965, stated merely that he had died an "untimely death". So even now, more than thirty years after, we are no nearer knowing whether the NKVD killed Demid, or whether he committed suicide on realizing that his fate was already linked with that of the recently liquidated Tukhashevskii.

Mr. Kolarz's book is fair, but highly critical of Soviet attitudes and activities in its eastern territories. We need now much more detailed studies of the subject he made his own, brought up to date.

C. R. BAWDEN

Ireneus László Legéza, B.A. *Guide to Transliterated Chinese in the Modern Peking Dialect*. I. Conversion tables of the currently used International and European Systems with Comparative Tables of Initials and Finals. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1968, 8vo, 176 pp.

Tables de concordance pour l'alphabet Phonétique Chinois. Préparées par le Centre de Linguistique Chinoise (Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, VI^e Section). Les caractères chinois ont été tracés par M. Hsiung Ping-ming. (Paris, Mouton), 1967, 4to, 116 pp.

Romanization of Chinese has always been a problem, and not the least part of the problem is the failure to find a universally acceptable system. The modern Pinyin romanization may yet sweep the board, but, where so many different systems have found their way into use, the necessity for concordance tables as an aid to clarity will remain. It is, therefore, encouraging to find that efforts are being made to produce such concordances for the many current systems.

Tables de Concordances takes the Pinyin (APC—Alphabet Phonétique Chinois) system as its base, and gives concordances with five other systems—Gwoyeu Romatzyh (G.R.), English (Wade-Giles), French, German, and Russian—and, in addition, with the Zhuyin Fuhao system. Thrown in, allegedly to “illustrate” the romanizations, are a number of common Chinese characters, but, while some romanizations are “illustrated” by five or six characters, others (e.g. *chua* on p. 24) are not illustrated at all. I counted four G.R. spelling mistakes, and the total omission of the sound *o* in the G.R. column. Without explanation the sounds *ei*, *yo* and *yai* are nowhere used in the tables. The work is well indexed, and search is made easy with one compound index for all systems other than Pinyin. Thus, to find any entry it is only necessary to look up the index and/or the main tables. (But there is no index to the Zhuyin Fuhao).

Mr. Legéza also takes Pinyin as his base. Ranged alongside it are eighteen other romanizations, plus transliterations in the International Phonetic Alphabet and the Zhuyin Fuhao systems. Random checking showed three G.R. spelling mistakes—*dyng* for *dyng*, *gwent* for *gwen*, and *yaa* for *yea*. The sounds *ei*, *eng*, *o*, *yo* and *yai* “which exist only as interjections . . . have been left out intentionally from the list” (p. 5), but they *do* exist, while *den*, the existence of which sound is unrecognized by many romanizations and dictionaries, is included in the list. The entries under the French system show markedly fewer variants than do those for the same system in the Mouton *Tables*. This ambitious work does not have a compound index, and it is necessary to know which system of romanization is being used before a spelling can readily be looked up. (The Introduction suggests that this difficulty can be overcome by consulting the comparative tables of initials and finals.)

Each of these works has its uses, and Mr Legéza's in particular is to be applauded for its scale. It is a pity, however, that reference works of this nature cannot be entirely reliable.

HUGH D. R. BAKER

Tien-yi Li, *Chinese fiction: a bibliography of books and articles in Chinese and English*, xiv+356 pp. New Haven, Connecticut, Far Eastern Publications, Yale University, 1968. \$10.00.

This bibliography is divided mainly into four parts: the first is devoted to reference works, not specially limited to, but useful for a study of fiction, subdivided into bibliographies, sources, glossaries and dictionaries, and indexes; the second lists general studies on Chinese literature and Chinese fiction. The main body of the book, which lists works on traditional and modern fiction, is divided into “Special Studies”, i.e. studies not limited to the discussion of single works, and “Major Works”, arranged according to period for traditional fiction, and alphabetically according to authors for modern fiction. Important English translations are also included. Items considered

relatively more important by the editor are marked by an asterisk. There are lists of periodicals and newspapers, of publishers, of pen names, and an index to authors and translators.

This book serves a useful purpose, but it seems a pity that it was thought necessary to limit it to works in two languages. Some useful work has been done in this field in other European languages, to say nothing of Japanese. It is hoped that a future edition may mention the more important contributions in other languages as well. It would also be useful to indicate the number of pages of books mentioned.

GEORGE WEYS

Colin Mackerras, *The Uighur Empire (744–840) According to the T'ang Dynastic Histories* (Occasional Paper 8). xiii+187 pp., 6 maps. Canberra, Centre of Oriental Studies, The Australian National University, 1968.

The manifold task of the interpretation of Chinese historical sources has been accomplished traditionally and generally in the form of translations provided with and sometimes overburdened by useful and necessary notes of varying nature and importance (occasionally involving the related problems or their solutions, too). In this volume, as in a few recent studies, an attempt has been made to obviate this difficulty by limiting the demands and concentrating on a partial aim instead. This kind of approach to a certain domain, though unable and apparently not even intended to replace other types of interpretation (those, e.g., which undertake to unfold the whole intricate complexity of a period, source etc., especially when initiating or summing up researches), by presenting a well-chosen thread of the network of history, results in an illuminating view on the subject concerned, with special possibilities for further research—in spite of the problems arising from this particular way of dealing with sources.

In comparison with other publications, likewise focused on a special text—as, e.g., the series *Chinese Dynastic Histories Translations*—the work under review differs mainly in trying to give a clearly arranged and easy-flowing translation that is to be welcomed, and also in reducing, as far as possible, the treatment of textual problems, variants etc.—to be admitted only in the case of texts of not too problematic character or after fundamental research has been made in the field in question (as in this case). This method seems here to meet no insoluble task, but probably a rational compromise could facilitate the appropriate evaluation of a text, indicating—in the references—those divergencies or other textual difficulties of the sources which may give divergent possibilities of interpretation (the text of the translation being expected to be unambiguous, while in the original text the case may be different).

It is the parallel presentation in this book of the two primary texts on the Uighur Empire which deserves special attention. The corresponding or closely connected passages of the 195th chapter of the *Chiu T'ang-shu* and the 217th chapter of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* (A–B, till 840) are translated side by side, so that they serve by means of instructive examples to demonstrate some characteristics of the nature of Chinese historiography too; and the easy survey of the events is rendered possible by references to other related passages of the texts given, and by the dates on the margin (the source of the date being indicated if it differs from the chapters on the Uighurs). Naturally the number of the confronted texts had to be limited by technical considerations; here the other parallel passages, even long and important texts of the *T'ang-shu's* and of other sources as well, are only referred to in the Notes.

The type and amount of the information given in the Notes are determined on the one hand by the author's basic standpoint (expressed in the Introduction). He is interested only in the history of the Uighur Empire, without treating the earlier fate of its population, and taking it into consideration only in political connexion with China, i.e. from the point of view of Chinese history; as a matter of fact, it is this aspect which is reflected best in the Chinese source material, this being the Chinese

historiographers' viewpoint, too. On the other hand, the author considers "the non-Chinese sources" lying "outside the scope of the present work". Without doubt, there might be good reasons to do so, if possible at a specific phase of the research, the further work being left for another occasion—as, e.g., the study of the linguistic material given by the text concerned, which the author refrains from even referring to here, though the well-founded identifications of names could be of more informative and orientating help than the mere modern transcriptions. By this method, however, special care is needed so that the shortness of the notes should not be misleading; e.g., in the case of the ethnical or tribal names, which lie outside the interest of the author, at least the problematic nature of the information is to be indicated; as in note 66, p. 135, where a certain *Jên Fu* is stated to have been a Tangut leader, without mentioning that in the passage of the *Tzū-chih-t'ung-chien* referred to, a *Tang-hsiang* leader is concerned and not a *Hsi-hsia* (in 764!), even if the author accepts the identification *Tang-hsiang*~*Tangut*. But these simplifications of the notes do not disturb the clarity of the translation which includes also some lessons of the earlier researches, e.g. in the case of official titles, place names, etc., where only summary references are given. (In the Preface Professor E. G. Pulleyblank is thanked for the supervision in the preparation, and Professor Liu Ts'un-yan for the checking of the translation.)

The correct and smooth translation and confrontation of the Uighur chapters of the two main Tang-time sources is not the only reason why this book—submitted as a thesis at the University of Cambridge—may be recommended. After the Preface, we find informations in the Introduction about the sources (pp. ii-vi) and a "Summary of Uighur History", a brief preliminary outline of the events of primary importance for China from the foundation up to the fall of the Uighur Empire (pp. vi-x), with notes (pp. xi-xiii). The subject proper, the translation (pp. 1-124) is followed by notes (pp. 125-54), by the dates of the Chinese court mournings for the Uighur *qayans* (as given in the *Ts'ê-fu-yüan-kuei*, ch. 976), a list of names of the Uighur *qayans*, a "Glossary of Official Terms" (the "Uighur Titles of Turkish Origin" included), the "List of Works Cited", an "Index of Persons and Groups of People" (except for the headings "Uighur" and "Chinese") and an "Index to the Maps" (provided with Chinese characters from the "Notes to the Translations" onwards). Finally maps are presented of Central Asia and Western China; Northern China; The Ho-Lo Region; Environs of Ch'ang-an; Ch'ang-an; and The Ta-ming Palace (in Ch'ang-an).

HILDA ECSEDY

Frank Münzel: *Strafrecht im alten China nach den Strafrechts-Kapiteln in den Ming-Annalen*. Veröffentlichungen des Ostasien-Instituts der Ruhr-Universität Bochum. iv+138 pp. Wiesbaden (Otto Harrassowitz), 1968. DM22.

The monographs on law and juridical procedure which are part of most dynastic histories are important sources for the legal history of China. They contain, with the exception of the *Yüan-shih's* monograph, not codified law but give a more or less comprehensive survey of general legal tendencies under a dynasty and contain many references to actual trials. There exist translations into Western languages of the monograph in the *Han-shu* (Hulsewé), in the *Sui-shu* (Balázs), in both *T'ang-shu's* (Bünger) and of a part of the *Yüan-shih* monograph (Ratchnevsky). Mr. Münzel has chosen as a subject for his thesis at Bochum University the legal treatise from the *Ming-shih* (ch. 93-5). His publication is an annotated translation of ch. 93 and must be regarded as a pioneer work in so far as Ming law has hardly been studied before in the West. The translation is very accurate and the annotation relies on primary sources such as *Ta-Ming hui-tien*. The book has several useful indexes of names and terms. It must be hoped that the author will also publish his translation of chapters 94 and 95 in the near future. His contribution to the legal history of the Ming dynasty is most welcome and shows both philological accuracy and juridical insight.

HERBERT FRANKÉ

Wolfram Naumann, *Shinkei in seiner Bedeutung für die japanische Kettendichtung* (*Studien zur Japanologie*, Band 8), viii+166 pp. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1967.

Remarkably little has been published in European languages about Japanese linked verse, and few writers have attempted any detailed analysis of its nature. Too often the concern has been with externals, such as the codes of rules governing the frequency and placing within one sequence of certain words or topics—a feature whose study is calculated to arouse not admiration for *renga* but rather scepticism as to its artistic value. Dr. Naumann's book, I am glad to say, goes a considerable way towards remedying this situation, so that the European reader can appreciate that what grew out of a social pastime or game was in fact a significant art-form. Dr. Naumann stresses that important *renga* masters wrongly thought that linked verse had originated in poetry as serious as their own, when it had in reality evolved from a more commonplace form; though they considered their work to be "orthodox", it was really "heterodox", in that it was the product of collaborative, not competitive, effort, no longer simply the result of competitions in witty verse-matching. The point is not perhaps so very important. More significant is the fact that in another sense serious linked verse was orthodox, carrying on the cultural tradition of the *tanka*.

The main part of this study is a detailed examination of the poetics, critical judgements and poetry of a major poet of the fifteenth century, Shinkei. The book is divided into seven chapters, as follows. After a very brief introduction and a biographical section which is of necessity equally brief, since so little is known about Shinkei's life, there is an account of the origins and development of the genre from the earliest times, through its growth in the Heian period, until it blossomed into a serious form in the Kamakura and Muromachi periods. This is followed by a discussion of Shinkei's poetics of linked verse, dealing with its relationship to the *tanka* form (Shinkei was a disciple of the famous Shōtetsu), the influence on it of Chinese poetics (not very important), its religious basis and deviation from the *tanka*, and finally its structure and content. After an examination of the extent to which Shinkei's own poetry alludes to Classical Chinese or Japanese literature, Dr. Naumann proceeds, on the basis of an analysis made by Araki Yoshio, to discuss fundamental motifs in Shinkei's linked verse. The whole book is then concluded with a one-page summary.

Three of these seven sections—the historical section and those on Shinkei's poetics and motifs—are fairly extensive. I cannot help commenting that the first of these three seems to me too long and detailed; at least, the discussion of the controversy about the beginnings of the genre in the earliest times is rather tedious and of minimal relevance to the work of the central figure of the book, Shinkei. This is all the more noticeable since the author passes extremely rapidly over a subject of much greater relevance to the development of *renga* as a serious art, *via*, the evidence of "association and progression" in the arrangement of some Imperial anthologies, notably the one which Shinkei so greatly revered, the *Shinkokinshū*. One's initial impression of this book therefore is rather discouraging. But the reader should persevere, for his patience will be well rewarded. The latter half of the historical section, a survey of *renga* in the century or two before Shinkei, is very enlightening, in particular because its discussion of the main poets is largely a review of Shinkei's own judgements on them. We find him most critical of those poets whose work depended too much on simple verbal associations or word plays, which he found "undesirable" or even "ridiculous". What he looks for is the same kind of serious qualities as are found in *tanka* poetry of the *Shinkokinshū* period, *ushin* and *yūgen* ("intense feeling" and "mystery and depth", to use the terms employed by Brower and Miner).

Underlying Shinkei's view of poetry, of course, is the religion of Zen, and this emerges clearly in the section on his poetics. We find, for instance, that his preference is for "distantly related verses" (*soku*) rather than closely related ones (*shinku*). His ideal verse-link will have no logical connexion with the previous link. The poet must be able so to think himself into the mind of the composer of the previous link that his own will be produced as an inevitable sequel. The connexion is not superficial, but

at a deep level. Thus poetry becomes an almost religious activity, in which one is striving, like Zen painters, to express ultimate truths. In Dr. Naumann's words: "All these objectivized, superficial (literally: 'foreground') methods of linking verses are rejected by Shinkei. Instead he demands 'self-negation' in the approach to the content of the previous verse. The self is to be made empty in the Zen sense, comprehension on an ordinary basis is to be replaced by mystical illumination."

Like many earlier Japanese poetic theorists, Shinkei is capable of setting up and classifying poems according to a somewhat arbitrary number of categories, though one can perhaps feel easier with his ten distinctions than with, say, the ten styles of Tadamine—certainly they are here very ably expounded. A much more interesting categorization, however, is provided by Araki's analysis of the basic motifs in Shinkei's poetry, discussed in the last main section of this book. There is, for instance, the category of "vagueness of perception" or "unclear pictures"—landscapes in mist, haze, twilight, smoke, or seen at a great distance. The element of distance appears also in the minor category of "nostalgia for the classics". Associated with the category of unsharp definition is that of soft or muted sounds. There are two other mutually related categories, both of great importance. First Araki notes Shinkei's tendency to single out objects of a blue-green colour, or even to attribute this coloration to what cannot by its very nature have colour (even, in one case, the autumn wind). For Shinkei, this is a colour suggesting cold, and thus is related to the category of the "frosty and lonely" or the "withered and cold" (*hie-sabi, hie-yase, yase-samushi*). In verses in all these main categories, the essentially Zen character of the inspiration is transparently obvious.

The exposition of this kind of poetry is no easy matter, and we can be grateful to Dr. Naumann for his careful and well-expressed commentaries. I must record that I found one or two mistakes in translation. On p. 21, for instance, *Hitogokoro/Ushi mitsu . . .* is rendered as "Des Menschenherzens Kummer erlebt' ich . . .", but this gives a wrong impression, for the sadness is not "in the human heart", but "caused by the human heart". The literal meaning is something like—"Now I see—the human heart (i.e. your attitude) is saddening (deplorable)", in other words, "Your insensitivity makes me sad." Again, the final couplet of this poetic exchange, *Yume ni miyu ya to/Ne zo suginikeri* means not "Sah ich dich nicht in Traume? Nun ist der Schlaf vorüber", but "Feeling that I might see you in my dreams, I (fell asleep) and overslept." In *Matsu no ha wa/Nururu bakari no/Shigure kana* (p. 63), *bakari* cannot possibly mean, as Dr. Naumann renders it, "nur" ("nur sie" i.e. only the pine-needles); in such cases, it has quite regularly the same meaning as *hodo*. Again, *Tomo ni sumamu to/Iishi okuyama* (p. 96) can hardly mean, as Dr. Naumann believes, that the mountains have said "Let us live together." *Tomo ni* surely implies the existence of some companion of the hermit, who in the second link, beginning *Naki ato ni*, is no longer with him (perhaps because he is dead). The meaning of the first couplet must therefore be "(In) these remote mountains, where I (or: we) said, 'Let us live together.'" This interpretation is, incidentally, supported by the note on this poem in the *Nihon koten bungaku taikai* edition of *Sasamegato* (Vol. 66). Surprising though these errors are, however, they are minor blemishes on a book which is clearly the scholarly result of much exacting work. It is certainly a valuable contribution to European studies of Japanese literature.

D. E. MILLS

A Cultural History of Tibet, by David Snellgrove and Hugh Richardson.
pp. 291. Weidenfeld & Nicholson.

As the authors emphasize, this book is an attempt at "an adequate survey of the history of Tibetan civilization" at a time when that civilization, so rich in human, artistic and literary source materials, is fast vanishing before our eyes. Part of its function is to demonstrate how a great civilization, apparently entrenched in full activity within its homeland, can be suddenly assaulted and overthrown by determined

outsiders. The story of the actual assault has been told in part elsewhere, and the task of Dr. Snellgrove and Mr. Richardson is to trace the development of the civilization in all its manifestations so that at the end they are able to assess those qualities which led both to its achievements and its eventual downfall.

This view of the cultural history of Tibet as a story of growth, maturity and a certain stagnation involves a chronological approach, and accordingly the book begins, after a brief geographical section, with a discussion of the very earliest source materials. The narrative is broken into three main blocks called respectively: "The Early Kings"; "The Middle Ages"; and "The Yellow Hats", bringing the story up to the present day. An epilogue indicates the present remnants of this once vast cultural province (omitting only the surviving monasteries in the Soviet Union—principally in the Buryat Mongol S.S.R.—recently visited by Dr. Lokesh Chandra) and spotlights Bhutan, visited by Dr. Snellgrove in 1967, as the sole independent state with a flourishing Tibetan-style cultural life.

Into this chronological scheme has been fitted a vast amount of information on Tibetan religion, monasticism, art, and literature. "Culture" in Tibet is seen as being closely bound up with religion in all its personal, social, and artistic manifestations, and the reader will find these aspects of culture much more fully treated than, say, social relations, simple crafts, folklore, peasant customs, or economic life. Buddhism undoubtedly gave Tibetan civilization its distinctiveness and unity, and is quite rightly treated as the mainspring of higher culture. The field is still open for a similar treatment of more basic cultural life, which a competent anthropologist might attempt. Peoples of Tibetan ethnic stock and speaking Tibetan dialects everywhere embraced Buddhist practices with much greater enthusiasm than the surrounding peoples, with the partial exception of the Mongols, which would argue for a common set of cultural traits predisposing them toward that religion.

The chronological scheme means that the reader is virtually obliged to read the whole book from start to finish, absorbing the whole story rather than using it as a reference work. Information on any one topic, such as painting, is scattered throughout the book, integrated into its context, and thus may be difficult to find. In books like Stein's *La Civilisation Tibétaine* or Tucci's *Tibet* (the only two comparable works) one can turn immediately to the appropriate chapter. But in a book aiming at a wide readership among people who do not necessarily know anything about Tibet, the chronological approach gives a far better conception of the nature of Tibetan civilization as a whole than either of the other two works.

Thus the earliest period of the eager adoption of Indian Buddhism and the rise of the arts is contrasted with the magnificent, though rigid and conservative period during the domination of the country by the Geluggas, when Tibet, having absorbed all the complex teachings and practices of Indian Mahayana Buddhism, turned its back on the world and prepared itself unwittingly for the final disaster. Such an analysis has never been stated in print before in quite the same way. Another welcome feature is the inclusion of the Bonpos in their place in the mainstream of Tibetan religion, developing continuously to adopt all the Buddhist teachings while retaining their own traditions.

Despite this general appeal, accuracy and scholarship have not been sacrificed. Original sources are freely quoted and the authors' familiarity with the whole range of Tibetan literature is evident. The use of transliteration for Tibetan words will be welcomed by the scholar but not by any reader who is unfamiliar with the weird combinations of letters which result from any accurate transliteration from Tibetan. Such a reader will also be confused by the index where the English and transliterated Tibetan words under their radical letters are mixed together. Some names in the text are provided with phonetic renderings as well, and sometimes the phonetic spelling alone is given (e.g. Tabo on p. 81). It might have been better to use only phonetic spellings in the text and main index, and to give Tibetan spellings in a separate index. The only mistake the reviewer notices is the inconsistency between "dBus-ru-ka-tshal" on p. 34 and "dBu-ru-ka-tshal" on p. 74 and the map. A helpful system of cross-references is marred by occasional mistakes, such as on pp. 33 and 122, where the

pages referred to seem irrelevant (the reference to p. 46 should be 51, and that to p. 197 should be 61); also the lack of page numbers on the plates is confusing. On p. 113 we are referred to p. 81—either the reference should be to p. 83 or we should be told that Vajradhara is the same as Vairocana.

The photographs, all monochrome, are mostly published for the first time and include some excellent architectural shots by Richardson, scenes of life in Dolpo by Jest and in Tibet by Bell, as well as many objects and paintings. Notes, a chronological table, a diagram showing the succession of religious schools, pronunciation rules, a bibliography, two maps and a general index complete what will be the standard work on the subject for some years to come.

P. T. DENWOOD

Isshi Yamada (Ed.), *Karunāpūṇḍarīka*. 2 vols.: (iii) 287 pp.; (vii), 421, 22 pp. London, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1968. (Agents, Luzac.)

I. Yamada's edition of the Sanskrit text of the *Karunāpūṇḍarīka*, an important Mahāyānasūtra, must be accounted a significant contribution to Buddhist studies. His two volumes contain a wealth of careful work and show the editor's considerable competence in handling the three principal languages required for Mahāyāna research: Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese.

The kernel of the work is the edition of the Sanskrit text of the *Karunāpūṇḍarīka* in II, 1, 1-420. This is based on a careful collation of six Sanskrit MSS., from London, Cambridge, Paris, Calcutta, Tokyo, and Kyoto. The apparatus records all significant differences of reading and frequently cites the corresponding Tibetan translation and the two Chinese versions. Larger passages of the Tibetan and Chinese versions are quoted in I, 2, 251-87, where great variation can be seen. The Tibetan text is based (I, 1, 11 ff.) on the Narthang and Peking blockprints, which were found to agree closely. Further work on the Tibetan text would, however, need to be based also on the Lhasa blockprint (Mdo Cha 209b-474a), available in the Cambridge University Library. The British Museum Kanjur manuscript (BM 32, 121), now made accessible by E. D. Grinstead (ASTA MAJOR, n.s. XIII, 1-2, 1967, 48-70), would also provide useful information.

In an appendix (II, 2, 1-22) Yamada gives a critical edition of a related Sanskrit text, the *Sarvajñatākāra-dhāraṇī*.

Vol. I contains (1, 63-120) a summary of the *Karunāpūṇḍarīka* that amounts almost to a translation of the basic text shorn of all clichés and repetitions. This summary is provided with abundant critical commentary and references. The editor is well read in Mahāyāna literature, able to cite frequent parallels from Buddhist Sanskrit and Chinese. It is therefore a pity that the book is not provided with a bibliography. It would also have been more convenient for most readers to quote European translations where possible rather than refer them to passages of the *Taiśhō Issaikyō*. So for example, in the case of the numerous references to "MPP-upadeśa, Taiśhō No. 1509" reference could also (or instead) be made—for the first thirty chapters so far—for E. Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna*, 2 vols., Louvain, 1949 (repr. 1966-7).

The *KP* itself gives an explanation for the name *Karunāpūṇḍarīka* (see I, 102). This text is not to be confused with the *Mahākārunāpūṇḍarīka*, a different Mahāyānasūtra, frequently quoted by Yamada from the *Taiśhō Issaikyō* but not discussed by him.

The editor has regularized the spellings of the Buddhist Sanskrit according to the common practice and has given the details of his procedure (I, 34 ff.). His analysis of the text is deep enough to have enabled him to propose a considerable number of convincing emendations. (Note that on p. 46, last line, *na ca* and *yavat* have been accidentally transposed.)

Particularly interesting is the section (I, 1, 53-8) on the transmission of some of the proper names. An index of the proper names in the *KP* is clearly a desideratum.

Vol. I contains a number of sections that will interest the Buddhologist, such as that on the *vyākaraṇa* literature (I, 149 ff.) and that on the development of the *prajñādhāna* (I, 160 ff.)

The English text is occasionally marred by minor errors, but other languages are presented with great accuracy. The verses from the *KP*, II, 104 are, however, inaccurately rendered in I, 87. The subject can hardly be "profound faith", because it is in the genitive (*bhaktimahato*), as the Tibetan confirms (*gus-pa chen-pohi*). Moreover, *cittaivaryakarim* is an adjective agreeing with *bodhim*, which is not made clear in Yamada's rendering, where *-karim* has been ignored.

Tibetan *mchog-tu dgah-bahi rgyal-po* (I, 155) represents elsewhere the Buddhist Sanskrit name Prāmodyarāja, which is attested (see F. Edgerton's *Dictionary*, s.v.) Many other asterisks are similarly unnecessary.

With *niraya-tiryagyomi-yamaloka-* (I, 201) can also be set *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra* (ed. J. Nobel, Leipzig 1937) 65, 1-2, 81, 12 *naraka-tiryagyomi-yamaloka-*. The offset printing has been done superbly.

R. E. EMMERICK

Henry Yule, *A Narrative of the Mission to the Court of Ava in 1855*, together with the Journal of Arthur Phayre, Envoy to the Court of Ava, and additional illustrations by Colesworthy Grant and Linnaeus Tripe, and an Introduction by Hugh Tinker, Kuala Lumpur. Oxford University Press (Oxford in Asia Historical Reprints), 1968, pp. XLVI+vi+391. Plates, maps and endpaper map £18 15s.

This superb reprint offers much more than the original edition published by Smith, Elder & Co., of Cornhill, in 1858; for Arthur Phayre's private journal of the period 1 September to 22 October 1855, hitherto unpublished, provides an instructive supplement to Yule's account of the negotiations at the Burmese capital, and the additional illustrations, selected from the India Office collection, are especially welcome. For one thing, the reproductions of Colesworthy Grant's water colours are much superior to those in the original publication; for another, the inclusion of his vivid pencil sketches of Phayre himself and of Father Abbona, King Mindon's envoy to announce his accession to the British in 1853 and an influential adviser during the 1855 discussions, introduces a touch of intimacy for which one is grateful. Professor Tinker rightly claims that the new illustrations "contribute a little more towards evoking the contemporary atmosphere of the Phayre mission".

Yule's book covers much more than the record of the mission. There are chapters on Western intercourse with Burma before the first Anglo-Burmese war of 1824-6 and on Burma's subsequent history up to the second war with British India in 1852. Others deal with the religion of Burma, its governmental system, geography and the tributary Shan states. The text is adorned with many of Yule's own remarkably apt pen-and-ink sketches. His skilfully executed architectural drawings of the more important temples of Pagan lend a special interest to his chapter on Burma's ancient capital, which in any case is ahead of anything previously written on the subject. He owed much to Phayre, whose unsurpassed knowledge of Burma's language, culture and history was placed unreservedly at his service by that most modest of men. When Professor Tinker asserts that Yule "virtually saw Burma through the eyes, and ears, of Phayre", it is the simple truth, which the new evidence he adduces amply confirms. His own informative Introduction is another welcome feature of the new volume. He has made good use of the records of the mission in the India Office Library.

Time was in the days of British administration when Yule's great book was recommended as the best introduction to Burma and its people. Reading it again in this new edition confirms one's early impression not only of its value but also of its sheer fascination.

D. G. E. HALL