

## REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS

Stuart H. Buck, *Tibetan-English Dictionary with Supplement*, pp. 883 + xviii. Washington D.C., The Catholic University of America Press, 1969. \$25.00.

A new Tibetan-English dictionary is an event of great interest to students of Tibetan. The foundation of any such work—and any review of it—is inevitably the great dictionaries of Jäschke (1881) and Das (1902). The progress of Tibetan studies since they were published has naturally contributed words, phrases and meanings not found in them and one looks to a new dictionary to fill in some of the gaps.

Mr. Buck's concern is primarily but not exclusively with additions of another sort—those due to the profound changes in the political and social life of Tibet brought about by Chinese Communist occupation. His stated object is "to provide full and accurate definitions of the vocabulary used in current publications in the Tibetan language, especially those appearing in Communist China. This does not mean, however, that either the colloquial language or the special vocabulary of the Tibetan classics will be ignored" (p. vii).

Several recent publications from Communist China are described by Dr. J. Kolmaš in articles in *Archiv Orientální*, 1961 and 1962, of which the first deals with contributions to Tibetan philology, including three dictionaries, and the second covers some general works such as new editions of the texts of the dramatic *nam thar* and a collection of folk songs. Newspapers in Tibetan are also produced in China and a pictorial magazine, *Mi dmangs brnyan par*—the "Nationalities Pictorial"—to which Mr. Buck refers.

Of the works described by Dr. Kolmaš, Mr. Buck cites as the authority for his Supplement of 46 pages the *Tha snyad gsar bsgrigs*, a work in four volumes. He mentions, also, a two-volume Tibetan-Chinese glossary and a large one-volume Tibetan-Chinese dictionary, both published in 1957, regarding which he says that their definitions "with few exceptions . . . agree closely with those given in the older English or French dictionaries" (p. xiv). They are, presumably, the *rGya bod shan sbyar gyi kha skad tshig mdzod*, and the *brDa dag ming tshig gsal ba of dGe bshes* Chos grags.

The reviewer does not have access to the *Tha snyad gsar bsgrigs* or to the *shan sbyar*, in the production of which Tibetans must have collaborated; but if, as it appears, the "large one-volume Tibetan-Chinese dictionary" is that of Chos grags, originally printed at Lhasa in two volumes in 1949 and republished in one volume with a Chinese translation at Peking in 1957, Mr. Buck gravely undervalues and consequently fails to make effective use of its considerable contributions to Tibetan lexicography.

Other recent works by independent Tibetan scholars to which reference could, with advantage, have been made are the Tibetan-Tibetan dictionary produced in India in 1966 by Loden Sherab Dagyab, the English-Tibetan-Hindi dictionary published at Kalimpong in 1965 by the veteran G. Tharchin, and the glossary in *Musical Tradition of the Tibetan People* by Namkhai Norbu Dewang (Serie Orientale Roma, XXXVI, 1967); even the little English-Tibetan dictionary recently produced for Tibetan schools in India by Robert Poczik and Lobzang Tenzin Rikha is worth a mention.

In addition to publications from Communist China, Mr. Buck cites as his authorities many works by Western scholars and one in which a Russian author and a Tibetan share the credit, *viz.* the *Textbook of Colloquial Tibetan*, by G. N. Roerich and L. Phuntsok; but there is a surprising absentee from his list—the invaluable Tibetan-Russian Dictionary by Semichov, Parfionovich and Dandaron published in Moscow in

1963. That work makes use of the philological works mentioned by Dr. Kolmaš, including Mr. Buck's special source the *Tha snyad gsar bsgrigs*. The last named is also cited by Eberhardt Richter in his *Tibetisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig, 1966, of which, also, mention might have been expected.

Although Mr. Buck concentrates on current Tibetan publications from Communist China, it should be noted that Nationalist China, too, produces works in Tibetan; and, far more important, that the Tibetans in India are adding considerably to current literature. The greater part of their output consists of new editions of classical works on religion or grammar, but I have already mentioned some of their philological contributions; and a lead in writing a new sort of political autobiography has been given by the Dala Lama in his book *Ngos kyi yul dang ngos kyi mi dmangs (My Country and My People)*. In addition, there is at least one daily paper in Tibetan and one monthly magazine; and there are regular broadcasts in Tibetan from All India Radio.

Certainly, the influence of the new Chinese-inspired vocabulary must affect all Tibetans; but the literary activity and the educational policy of those in India ought to be taken into account when considering Mr. Buck's statement that "unless the Tibetan people succeed in breaking away from their present conquerors, a steady evolution of the written language away from the traditions of the past is to be expected".

Mr. Buck appears, also, to have overlooked the possibility of enlisting the help of some of the Tibetan refugees. There are well-educated Tibetans in the U.S.A. and many more in European countries; while in India there is a rich reservoir of Tibetans, scholarly and otherwise, from all sorts of backgrounds and every part of Tibet, who could be drawn on to supplement the current vocabulary of both learned and colloquial speech and to put usage and meaning to the most authentic touchstone. A rare opportunity has been lost; for Western scholars with the experience and determination to make a Tibetan-English dictionary do not arise every year, nor even in every generation, and the older Tibetan scholars are already dying.

Mr. Buck does not quote the source of individual words in his work; and the lack of reference to purely Tibetan sources or to Tibetan advisers compels one to scrutinize the entries with particular care.

Before examining some of the questions that present themselves a few comments may be made on the Introduction. (1) The description there of the early Tibetan kings as "Indian" (p. viii) appears in comparatively late works but finds no support in contemporary documents from Tun Huang. If the royal origin must be sought elsewhere than among the indigenous leaders of the Ch'iang tribes, the suggestion in the T'ang Annals that the first Tibetan king may have been a scion of the Southern Liang (Topa) dynasty (A.D. c.400) deserves at least as much consideration as the half-dozen or so irreconcilable claims for various legendary Indian princelings made by different Tibetan historians from Buston onwards. (2) The sovereignty of the dGe lugs pa came about first in the mid seventeenth century rather than the first quarter of the eighteenth (p. viii). (3) The origins of a truly Tibetan literature can be seen in the eighth and ninth-century documents from Tun Huang, which were unknown to Sarat Chandra Das (p. ix). (4) Tibetan scholars who studied Chinese literature were rare and Chinese influence on Tibetan literature seems to consist mainly in a marginal interest in early Chinese historical records, the probable influence of Taoist ideas on some Tibetan sects, and the borrowing of social and administrative terms; it is hardly to be spoken of in the same breath as that of India (p. ix).

Looking now at the body of the work: the first page provides a disproportionate number of difficulties. *Sum cu pa*, given as a synonym of *ka kha*, "alphabet, primer", appears again in its own right on p. 723 but in neither instance is its further meaning of "a grammatical treatise" given. *Zangs lhu* as a synonym of *ka to ra* "bowl, basin" is not in any dictionary available to this reviewer; the usual synonym is *zhong* or *sangs snod*, while the normal meaning of *lhu* is "part". *Ka 'pan* is orthographically impossible; *ka 'phan* must be intended. *Ka mig* "square enclosed by four pillars" would be clearer if its reference to the size of a room etc. had been brought out: perhaps "floor space between four pillars". *Ka re ko re* "dispute, quarrel, disagreement" is interpreted by Chos Grags as *gya gyu*, which implies underhand behaviour or intrigue, and by

Dagyab as *gya gyu'am le lo snyom las lta bu* which adds the meaning of "laziness". This reviewer has noted it at Lhasa as meaning "delay, fussing about uselessly" in which context it seems to be the equivalent of the Eastern Tibetan *ka ri ka ra* (p. 2) "dilatatory, dawdling, tardy, slow". Both senses, "delay" and "intrigue", are found in Semichov. *Kan rtsa (skas 'dzeg)* "ladder, stairs, staircase" can be traced to Bell's *Dictionary of Colloquial Tibetan* where, failing other evidence, it seems to be simply a phonetic representation of *skas 'dzeg* rather than an authenticated spelling; in Chos grags' dictionary *kan rtsa* is explained as *sor mo dkyil gyi 'og rtsa*, referring to the pulse vein below the middle finger.

Various questions, though not nearly in such numbers, arise in the rest of the work and a few examples may be given of different kinds. It is not clear, without access to the dictionaries of Giraudeau and Go, whether words described as Eastern Tibetan are found in written form or whether they represent the local pronunciation of words that have an accepted orthography in Jäschke and Das: e.g. is *ku bzung rgyab pa* (p. 2) simply a provincialism for *khu tshur rgyab pa*, which the author records as an alternative, or is it found in some book? And is *tho ri tho ri* (p. 237) simply a local pronunciation of *tho re ba*?

A few words seem to have slipped through the mesh intended to exclude the "obscure and impractical" (p. viii), e.g. *hor se* and *hor chams* as synonyms of *ko sgam*, "leather box, leather trunk" (p. 3) are both in Das, but the second component of each is perhaps a Hor pa word and neither can be described as current. *Nyos mi* "slave" (p. 200) is cited by Das from Csoma. It appears to be a gloss, as intelligible to Tibetans as "bought man" would be to us, but not a current word unless the Communists have introduced it. *Ma zug pa* "to remember, recollect" (p. 454) is unfamiliar to Tibetans this reviewer has consulted. *Ma re*, "hopeless" (p. 455) has an unconvincing look. *La stogs pa* "etcetera" (p. 665) together with *las stogs pa* has long been replaced by *la sog pa*.

In some instances reference to the Tun Huang documents would have been helpful. The name of the Tibetan king is always given there as *Srong brtsan sgam po*, not *Srong btsan* as at p. 742. *Pur rgyal* and *spur rgyal* (p. 332) would be seen to be later variants of the original *spu rgyal*, and so the reference to "corpses" is dubious. *dga' shag*, cited as a synonym of *dga' shor ba* "E.T. joke, jest" (p. 96) is perhaps an echo of *kha shags* (Jäschke p. 36); and the word *shags* can be traced back to Tun Huang, e.g. *Sum pa ma shags chen po* where it means "adage, pithy saying". It is also used in the phrase *shags 'gyed pa* meaning "an exchange of repartee" and which applies to a sort of competition at capping verses. *dpa bkong* "cowardly, timid" (p. 334) might be compared with the earlier form *spa bkong* "terror" (Thomas, *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, III, p. 153).

Doubts about the source of some entries could have been removed and a search through available dictionaries saved if the authority for words not found in Jäschke and Das had been identified by a simple code. It would have been useful, too, in view of the primary object of the work, if words regarded as new additions had been clearly indicated.

While many interesting current and colloquial terms have been included, several common words and meanings do not find a place. To give a few random examples: although the verbal use of the particles *kyi*, *gi* and *gyi* is shown, *kyin*, *gin* and *gyin* are not. *Grong gseb* "rural area, countryside" (p. 89) is used of actual villages not merely "the area between villages and towns", and *grong gseb pa* "villager, rustic" would have been worth adding. *Mdaxad sgo* "aim, object" (p. 531) is commonly used to mean "ceremony"—e.g. those of the *Lo gsar* as Chos grags glosses. 'Dza', explained on p. 534 as "interest paid on borrowed money" is the ordinary word for "rate of exchange". Among common expressions that do not find mention are: *gang byung mang byung*, "at random, arbitrary"; *glags 'khel ba*, "to get the better of, take an opportunity"; *mu 'thud pa*, "to continue"; *rang bsod pa*, "to keep on" (e.g. doing something); *skyiid sdug tshogs pa* (or simply, *skyiid sdug*) "a club or association"; *yong srid kyi ma red*, "not likely!"; also a batch of common words meaning "much, many": *'gangs ro*; *'bel po*, and *yo lang*. *Shog dud* "cigarette" (p. 708) was not used at Lhasa or in India today; the

synonym *shig ras*—a phonetic representation of the English word—is sometimes used but the common word is *tha mag*.

The difficulty of achieving, in the same work, a balance between the usage of modern communist publications and the extensive special terminology of the Tibetan classics is suggested by the omission from the religious vocabulary of some words that one would expect to find: e.g. *dkyil 'khor*, on p. 9, is explained as "circle, disk, circumference, globe", but there is no reference here to the maṇḍala (see, however, *man da la*, p. 457). There is no indication of the special meaning of *bsgrubs pa* and *yab yum*; and one misses such terms as *chos dbyings*, *mchod bshams*, *jo bo rje*, *jo bo rin po che*, *rje rin po che*, *gnas gzigs*, *bskyed rim* and *rdzogs rim*, and *rtsa ba'i bla ma*.

The Supplement purports to contain new terms from the Chinese publication *Tha snyad gsar sgrigs* which Mr. Buck obtained after the manuscript was almost ready for publication. Some of its entries duplicate those in the main work; and, although it includes many communist-coined words connected with politics, technology, geography etc., there are some of much more venerable origin, e.g. *dkor nor* "wealth" (p. 788) which is found in an inscription of the ninth century. Examination of the communist magazine *Mi dmangs brnyan par* shows, also, that some new words have been omitted, e.g. *rgol gtam*, "protest"; *rgyang bsgrags*, "broadcast"; *chus* "Ch'ü, municipality" (but see 'chu p. 811); *rgya brgyud*, "sphere, field", etc.; *rgyun 'khyongs*, "carry on, continue"; *'gul bskyod*, "movement, agitation"; *nang bar me 'khor*, "internal combustion engine"; *thal sgra*, "applause"; *lta gnas*, "centre, focal point"; *btso sbyangs*, "smelting"; *ya ling*, "Asia"; and, although *rang rgyal srid gzhung*, "our government", is given, the very common *rang rgyal*, "our country", is not.

A few misprints may be noted: p. xii, for Gough read Gould; p. xiii, for Desdogins (twice) read Desgodins; p. 1, for 'pan read 'phan; p. 50, for *ka hag* read *ka hrag*; p. 108, for "begin" read "behind"; p. 131, *bsgyur* in left hand column is out of place; p. 282, for *shi 'de read shi 'dre*; p. 432, for "rags" read "rage"; p. 611, for *yid brta* read *yid brtan*; p. 789, for *skad gsung mthon po* read *skad gsang mthon po*.

The author gives no information about the process of producing the Tibetan script he has used. It appears to be from some sort of Tibetan typewriter and is constricted and inelegant but serviceable. It must also be expensive, as at \$25.00 the book is rather costly. It will be useful to English-speaking students who want to read contemporary Tibetan publications and who cannot make use of Semichov's dictionary. For other sorts of Tibetan literature Jäschke (an amazing bargain at £3) and Das remain indispensable.

Leaving the invidious business of comparisons: one cannot fail to be impressed by the extent of Mr. Buck's achievement which commands warm admiration. The lengthy and exacting task of searching out, checking, and evaluating so many entries—there must be over 20,000—has called for a wide range of study and for tireless determination. Mr. Buck has provided a large number of useful and interesting words and the stimulus to learn more about them.

H. E. RICHARDSON

1. Nora K. Chadwick and Victor Zhirmunsky, *Oral Epics of Central Asia*, Cambridge University Press, 1969. 75s (\$12.50).
2. H. Munro Chadwick and N. Kershaw Chadwick, *The Growth of Literature*, Vol. III (1940), reprinted 1968. Cambridge University Press. 130s. (\$19.50).

The first of these two very important works is a reprint of Part I ("The Oral Literature of the Tartars") of the second. It is by Dr. Nora Chadwick, with the addition of eighty pages by Professor V. M. Zhirmunsky of the Leningrad Academy of Sciences, entitled "Epic Songs and Singers in Central Asia". Parts II and III of the second publication concern the oral literature of Polynesia and of some African peoples, and Part IV offers a general survey. On grounds of both content and date the purposes of ASIA MAJOR will clearly be best served if attention is confined to the first-named

publication. But the Cambridge University Press must be congratulated on bringing out these two works despite their overlap, first for recognizing that there is a growing demand for the Chadwicks' *Growth of Literature*, a great pioneering work of comparative literature; second for enabling the theme of its Volume III, Part I (now wisely renamed "The epic poetry of the Turkic peoples of Central Asia") to be pursued up to the present.

The theme of the *Oral Epics of Central Asia* is vast. The two authors would be the first to admit that their book, so rich in information and insight unobtainable elsewhere, can no more than set up the signposts for an advance on an objective that would take a whole commission of scholars, working for several generations, to reach. The courage and application with which they attacked their tasks are admirable. Neither claims to be an orientalist or a turcologist. When Mrs. Chadwick felt the tremendous pull of her theme, the essential tools of the job were largely absent in Western Europe. There was, for example, no Kirgiz dictionary. Undaunted, Mrs. Chadwick began to read Ottoman Turkish at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London and with the help of Radlov's unwieldy *Versuch eines Wörterbuchs der Türk-dialekte* / *Opyt' slovarya tyurkskikh narechii* (1899), a veritable white elephant of scholarship, was even able to correct some of the inaccuracies of Radlov's German renderings of Kirgiz heroic poetry in the fifth volume of his *Proben*. With the help of translations into the usual Western European languages and into the, for us, less usual vehicle of Russian, Mrs. Chadwick succeeded in presenting a first conspectus of the subject, so informative that the second contributor, Professor Zhirmunsky, with the advantage of a quarter of a century's further study by local experts of his country whom he had largely activated himself, paid her the great compliment of asking her to reprint her study.

Seeing how all external circumstances were against Mrs. Chadwick, how proud British scholars in the field of the comparative study of heroic poetry should be that, to use Professor Zhirmunsky's own words, "*The Growth of Literature* [III, I] seems to me today to be the most comprehensive, competent and exhaustive study of the subject", and that it was written so long ago.<sup>1</sup>

The two contributions are so distinctive that they are rightly kept apart. Mrs. Chadwick's part is the work of the born discoverer. One feels the thrill of new things seen, sensed, divined, on every page. She has much of the vatic gift of which she writes so stimulatingly in her *Poetry and Prophecy* (Cambridge, 1942). Her writing has many of the characteristics of this gift, and scholars who are capable only of accuracy should remember that for one of her, with her vivid and sensitive imagination, there are ten or twenty of them. Out of respect for Mrs. Chadwick's generosity in permitting a reprint of her work after twenty-nine years, this reviewer will argue with her text only where it conflicts specifically with his own impending publications. In the various engaging specimens of Kirgiz heroic poetry which she offers in English, Mrs. Chadwick understandably could not always make good Radlov's abundant errors. But her renderings are spirited and beautiful, and Sir Maurice Bowra seems to have been happy to follow her.<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Chadwick broke new ground. Goethe had guessed the importance of Serbian heroic songs for the understanding of the evolution of heroic epic poetry without being in a position to apply it. Radlov had stated the lessons that were to be gained from Kirgiz heroic poetry for the Homeric problem with astonishing insight, yet, strangely without being able to deal in a satisfactory manner with his own priceless texts; the Italian Homeric scholar Comparetti had gone to the Finnish *Kalevala* and the living tradition of Finnish oral poetry to learn from the comparison. But none had surveyed a new field of heroic poetry as vast as Mrs. Chadwick's or in so orderly a fashion, paying attention to the various genres of utterance, and their overlaps.

Fate conspired to give Professor Zhirmunsky many of the advantages denied to Mrs. Chadwick. Like her, he was thoroughly grounded in the philology and interpretation of Germanic heroic poetry, then advancing swiftly, thanks to W. P. Ker,

<sup>1</sup> Publisher's note, p. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Chadwick-Zhirmunsky, p. 42 and C. M. Bowra, *Heroic Poetry*, London, 1952 etc., p. 189.

H. Munro Chadwick and the Swiss Andreas Heusler.<sup>3</sup> Mrs. Chadwick is the widow of the second, Professor Zhirmunsky was the pupil of the third, and he was subsequently a Professor of German in his own right. Life took Zhirmunsky to Uzbekistan, a land with a living bardic tradition—a blessing in disguise. There, with Kh. T. Zarifov, he made an intensive study of oral poetry and above all of heroic poetry,<sup>4</sup> but with so well-founded and open-minded, i.e. *comparativist*, an outlook, that no merely expert turcologist could have acquitted himself so well. Ever since then Zhirmunsky has been the stakhanovite of the field of heroic poetry in Soviet Central Asia and Siberia, educating colleagues and native-speakers new to scholarship in the importance of collecting poems and tales while this still remains possible and of furnishing recordings of live bardic performances on tape and then providing texts of unimpugnable authenticity. His contribution, in short, is to have added a new impetus to the recording of oral literature over a vast area and above all to have hastened the end of amateurism in the edition of texts and of parochialism in their interpretation. If ever the saying were true that the hour will find its man, it is true of Professor Zhirmunsky, for the eastern part of the Soviet Union, together with Mongolia, is the most important surviving area in the world for the study of living heroic traditions. Add to that, it was precisely from the steppe-lands of Eurasia that (inspired by their "heroic" poetry and drawn or borne by their equally "heroic" steeds) so many conquering tribes and nations irrupted on the settled civilizations.

Professor Zhirmunsky's section, Part II "Epic Songs and Singers in Central Asia" is authoritative and, as is the nature of the scholarly process, will need to make fewer concessions to later generations than Part I. Thanks to his coming later, to his tremendous activity, continuing long past the normal age of retirement and to his great influence on others out in the field, his cut is even nearer the mark. His accounts of the poems of *Alpamysh* (p. 292 ff. and 314), *Köroglu* (pp. 300 ff. and 317)<sup>5</sup> and *Dede Qorqut* (pp. 295 f. and 307 ff.) are classic. Only in respect of the Kirgiz *Manas* would the reviewer offer criticism, perhaps because that is what he knows best. On p. 304 ff. Zhirmunsky gives greater prominence to the twentieth-century versions of *Manas* by sophisticated bards. The productions of these bards, however, will not be accurately assessed for content in any comparativist or evolutionary sense until those of the mid-nineteenth century, as recorded by Radlov and Valikhanov, have been fully digested.<sup>6</sup> But of course anything on live performance by the bards is pure gold. In any event, even though he does concentrate on the twentieth-century material, Zhirmunsky's practised eye detects various episodes as non-traditional e.g. The "Great Expedition" (to Peking).

The chapter-headings of this combined study which leaps so successfully over time and space, give an adequate idea of its scope. Part I (267 pages): Introduction. Heroic poetry and saga. The heroic milieu: individualism in the heroic poems. Non-heroic poetry and saga. Historical and unhistorical elements in heroic poetry and saga. Poetry and saga relating to gods and spirits, and mantic poetry. Antiquarian poetry and saga. Gnomonic and descriptive literature; poetry and saga relating to unspecified individuals. The texts. Recitation and composition. The shaman. Part II (80 pages): A bibliographical survey. The epic tales. The singer of tales. There are further bibliographical references to Parts I and II, and an index which embraces the whole.

<sup>3</sup> Zhirmunsky was also the pupil of A. N. Veselovsky, a Russian pioneer in archaic and oral literature who is much neglected in the West.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. *Uzbekskiy narodny geriocheskiy spos* (Moscow, 1947), of which there is a shorter version in German in Paul und Braune's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* (Halle) 80 (1958) p. 111 ff., "Das uzbekische heroische Volksepos".

<sup>5</sup> Now overtaken by B. A. Karryev, *Əpicheskie shazamiya o Kër-ogly u tyurko-yazychnykh narodov*, Moscow, 1968, and by Zhirmunsky's review of it in *Izvestiya Akademii Nauk SSSR, Seriya literatury i yashika*, XXVIII (1969), p. 108 ff.

<sup>6</sup> The reviewer has set himself the task of digesting these poems in a series of articles, the first of which appeared in *ASIA MAJOR* N.S. XIV (1969), p. 217 ff., the second and third in *BSOAS*, XXXII (1969).

In the present state of the comparative study of "epic" and "heroic" literature, it is inevitable that the genre-words "epic", "epos" and "epopee", with others, are used throughout this work with some imprecision, and this is partly because works said to be "epic" or "heroic" are themselves so varied. The members of the London Seminar on Epic, to whom Professor Zhirmunsky read a paper on *Alpamysh* in the early summer of 1965, hope to bring a greater precision into the use of such terms, as one of their objectives. A distinguished contributor to ASIA MAJOR, Arthur Waley, characteristically observed, when the reviewer told him of the foundation of the Seminar: "When I think of epic poems I think how *different* they all are!" True. But it seems possible to isolate criteria, groups of which (of course *never* the total number) can be compared significantly as between various traditions. It was Radlov's great merit to have recognized some of these criteria despite his imperfect understanding of Kirgiz heroic poetry—the passage has been widely quoted from his introduction to the volume that contains it.<sup>7</sup> His statement leads directly to the great break-through in the Homeric and then comparativist field by Milman Parry, who used the oral epic poetry of Yugoslavia to overcome narrow specialization in his approach to heroic poetry. On this revolutionary basis his pupil A. B. Lord has raised a new orthodoxy of which some scholars are already impatient.<sup>8</sup> The present volume of the *Oral Epics of Central Asia*, both earlier and later than Professor Lord's study, offers one way of overcoming this orthodoxy in turn. But its major merit is to point to the simple enjoyment of poetry that is as fascinating as it is remote—and yet strangely familiar after all.

A. T. HATTO

Chang Hsüan, *The Etymologies of 3000 Chinese Characters in Common Usage*, xii+960 pp. Preface by Lo Hsiang-lin. Hong Kong University Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1968.

Mr. Chang Hsüan's book was originally compiled for the use of students at the Language School of Hong Kong University as "a dictionary of the etymologies of some 3,000 Chinese characters, illustrating their evolution from their first known forms on bronze and stone and inscriptions on oracle bones" down to the present. It was completed in 1958, and for some time a bilingual edition had been projected, with the English text to be written by Professor F. S. Drake, which would have brought the fruits of Mr. Chang's researches within the reach of even elementary students. The much-delayed publication of the book in Chinese only is nevertheless to be warmly welcomed.

Any study of the forms and derivation of Chinese characters must begin with Hsü Shen's *Shuo-wen chieh-tzu* (A.D. 100), which in fact is the primary source drawn on in this book. The procedure adopted by the compiler is as follows:

1. For any given character, the "seal" form as it is found in *Shuo-wen* is reproduced, together with the "archaic" form where it also appears in *Shuo-wen*; additionally, forms of Shang, Chou and Han times, where these are known through bone and bronze inscriptions, are reproduced in chronological order, the source of each example being clearly indicated.

2. The *Shuo-wen* definition of the character is then quoted, followed, where necessary, by the supplementary comments or corrections of later scholars and concluding with a summary or further comments by the compiler. For the relatively few characters dating from later than *Shuo-wen*, a brief explanation or reference to an earlier related form is provided.

<sup>7</sup> Radlov, *Proben der Volksliteratur der nördlichen türkischen Stämme*, V (1885), p. xv ff.

<sup>8</sup> *The Singer of Tales*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1960. Cf. G. S. Kirk, *The Songs of Homer*, Cambridge, 1962, p. 86 ff.

The "seal" and other early forms from bone and bronze inscriptions are copied by Mr. Chang in firm and vigorous brush strokes, and the sheer wealth of forms supplied for a fairly large number of characters is undoubtedly the most valuable feature of the book. For these early forms often clarify the meaning and tell their own story of derivation and modification. Even apart from the most obvious pictorial representations of animals and concrete objects, some exceedingly effective examples of visual communication are the early forms for 老 "shaggy man leaning on stick" (p. 636), 漉 "dripping wet" (p. 464), 覆 "man covering face with hand" (p. 316) and 攻 "man attacked in confined space calling out" (p. 28). As regards derivation, one may cite the succession of forms supplied for 延 (pp. 280-1), 射 (p. 240), 文 (pp. 359-60), 得 (pp. 293-4) and 前 (p. 99). Students of the language, as well as those of calligraphy and seal-carving will find the collection of Shang, Chou, and Han character-forms in this book of inestimable service.

The mode of presentation in the explanatory text, however, leaves much to be desired. The arrangement of the 3,000 characters according to the 214 "radicals" as in an ordinary dictionary ill prepares the learner for the definitions from *Shuo-wen*, which employs a far greater number of keys for the classification of characters. Moreover, not all radicals are explained, but only those that figure as characters in their own right among the 3,000. Thus, such radicals as 彳, 冫, 宀, 攴, 耂 (and many more) are not explained nor related to their earlier forms, as a result of which the explanation of those characters listed under them tends to be incomplete. In contrast, where the radical is fully dealt with, e.g. 止 (p. 425), the rest of the section falls easily into place. But indeed the student will also require assistance with the *Shuo-wen* keys, e.g. 艹, 彳, 冫, 宀, 攴, 耂, etc.

This disregard for the needs of the learner in no way detracts from the compiler's scholarship. The comments of others are sifted, but some of the most acute observations are his own, e.g. 方 as the original form of 旁 (p. 366); 既 as "replete" on the analogy of 即 "to reach for food" (p. 371, p. 122); 早 as the abbreviated form of 朝 (pp. 374-5); 異 as "man wearing mask", hence its relation to 戴 (pp. 530-1); the linking of 出 "foot departing from defined area" with 各 (i.e. 格) "foot approaching defined area" (p. 91, p. 139) and of 入 with 矢 (p. 74, p. 564). The connexion between 凡 and 風 is noted but not followed up (p. 90, p. 842), though their common form in bone inscriptions would seem to be the drawing of a sail, as pointed out by Professor Karlgren (*Grammata Serica Recensa*, 625).

The book is reproduced by the offset process from the manuscript carefully transcribed by Mr. Ting Cheng-cho (the early forms of characters being done, as already mentioned, by Mr. Chang himself), and contains several helpful indexes. An isolated, but rather prominent, scribal error on p. 73: 競 for the entry 競 (競 itself is to be found on p. 595) illustrates just the kind of fortuitous misunderstanding which brought about many of the changes in the Chinese script down the ages.

H. C. CHANG

C. J. Dunn, *Everyday Life in Traditional Japan*, x+198 pp. London, B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1969. 30s.

This is an interesting and reliable description of life in Tokugawa Japan. Although no doubt it will interest specialists, it was apparently meant chiefly for general readers. It is easy to think of omissions, but the book is packed with well-chosen information. Among other things, this reviewer learned why, when Japanese people say something confidential, laugh or cough near someone, they usually cup a hand near the mouth: breathing on people was thought to defile them; also, that the *naga-bakama*, the very long trousers trailing about the feet, as seen in *kabuki* plays, worn by high-ranking samurai, were meant to incapacitate them in a fight and so discourage the use of the sword as the ultimate argument.

Dr. Dunn's treatment of the theatre and of other amusements is especially good, as

one would expect from an expert in this field. If his prose fails at times to maintain this level of liveliness, and misses something of the colour of Tokugawa life, the excellent illustrations, many of them line drawings from contemporary wood block prints, more than compensate. There must have been an embarrassment of choice. Perhaps no other people exceed the Japanese in their possession of so extensive an artistic record of traditional life, extending to the minutest details of daily life.

For the historian, the book's principal shortcoming is that it presents rather too static a view of Tokugawa society. The population, which rose from roughly 18 million to about 25 million during the seventeenth century, is overgeneralized as having remained "remarkably static" at slightly under 30 millions for "most of the Tokugawa period". There were important changes in the modes of life with the organization of commerce and the growth of cities in the expanding economy of the seventeenth century, and the spread of a higher standard of living to all classes. Later, troubles piled up with the widening gap between those who succeeded and those who failed to adjust to the growth of the money economy. Economic troubles, it is true, are mentioned, but historical change and causal factors are ignored. The author should not be blamed, however, for not having written a social history, which was clearly not his intent. We only wish that he had attempted to sketch in at least a minimum of historical background or explanation at a few points where the perceptive non-specialist reader no doubt will wonder how and why things became as they were. In fact, some of these difficulties could have been avoided if Dr. Dunn had limited his time span to, say, the period 1800-67.

As a description of how people lived in Japan before the modernizing process began, this is a most useful and recommendable book.

CHARLES D. SHELDON

Russell H. Fifield, *The Diplomacy of Southeast Asia: 1945-1958*, xviii + 584 pp., maps. New York, Harper and Row, Inc. 1958, reprinted in an unaltered and unabridged edition, Archon Books, 1968. \$13.50.

When this book appeared in 1958, it gained immediate acceptance as the standard work on its subject. The author, Professor of Political Science in the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, saw in the pattern of international relations, which developed in South-East Asia after the Second World War, what he truly describes as "a unique opportunity to describe and analyse a new phase of international politics in a strategic part of the globe". The amount of material available when Professor Fifield undertook the preparation of this volume was already growing to vast proportions. He supplemented it by what may be termed intensive field work, going to all the South-east Asian countries involved, consulting teachers concerned with his subject in all their universities, and interviewing outstanding political leaders, journalists and others. In addition, he had discussions with representatives of all the international agencies at work in South-East Asia, with officials of the United Nations in New York, the State Department at Washington, the United Kingdom Commissioner-General in South-east Asia, and so on: the list occupies nearly seven pages of his Appendix and contains the names of practically all the South-East Asian notables of the period he deals with, besides others, such as Jawaharlal Nehru, from neighbouring countries. With so much evidence to absorb, the author must have faced a formidable task in writing his book.

Unlike many political scientists Professor Fifield had an historical training, and provides welcome evidence of it in handling his subject. The bulk of the book is devoted to separate studies of the individual states of South-East Asia. In addition there are chapters on the historical background to independence, the machinery of statehood and on South-East Asia in the United Nations. It is comprehensive in scope, and every student who has occasion to consult it will be grateful for its store of information and for the care with which it is presented. There is an excellent bibliography of nearly fifty pages.

D. G. E. HALL

*Studies in the Institutional History of Early Modern Japan*, edited by John W. Hall and Marius B. Jansen. pp. x + 396. Princeton University Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1968. 81s.

This gathering into one book of thirteen articles published in various journals between 1952 and 1965, together with a further eight specially written or previously unpublished by the editors, was an excellent idea. Apart from convenience of reference and the incidental charting of some of the landmarks in the development of post-war studies of the Tokugawa period in the West, the collection offers both useful material to the comparative historian and a variety of leads to further research for the student of Japanese history not only through the models it provides for the utilization of local archives and the abundant output of Japanese local historians, but also through its provocative generalizations. A further merit of the book lies in its institutional emphasis. In particular, the seven studies by Professors Hall and Jansen of Bizen and Tosa between the sixteenth and late nineteenth centuries show how much can be added to the understanding of developments in central government when one looks at the policies and practices of local rulers. The editors hardly do the book justice, however, when they state that they felt it necessary to limit their coverage to institutional history. In fact articles on such diverse topics as commerce (E. S. Croucher), law (D. F. Henderson), kabuki (D. H. Shively), taxation and village social structure (T. C. Smith), village government (Harumi Befu), and education (R. P. Dore) provide almost as many insights into different aspects of Tokugawa Japan as would a general survey. Among the many themes of the book, two stand out. One is the inadequacy of any description of Tokugawa Japan which stresses its feudal character. The other, related to the first, is the need for a general rehabilitation of the period. The articles assembled here go a long way towards providing this. They leave no doubts as to the immense political and organizational achievements of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and they give a good idea of the variety and far-reaching nature of subsequent changes, even if occasionally some fairly sweeping conclusions appear to be supported by rather slender evidence. Some of the articles also have some bearing on the positive side of the Tokugawa legacy in the shaping of modern Japan. The cumulative effect should be the final abandonment of the old image of the Tokugawa period as a virtually unchanging, essentially feudal society.

R. L. SIMS

C. T. Hsia, *The Classic Chinese Novel, a Critical Introduction*, xi + 413 pp. (Companions to Asian Studies). New York and London, Columbia University Press, 1968. 81s.

At the outset I would salute the skill with which Professor Hsia manages, within a compass of effectively less than 400 pages, to introduce six major traditional Chinese novels in three different respects. His principal subject-matter is the sequence *San-kuo yen-i*, *Shui-hu chuan*, *Hsi-yu chi*, *Chin P'ing Mei*, *Ju-lin wai-shih* and *Hung-lou meng*. In the case of each work he offers the reader an approach to its content, not merely sketching the shape of the story, but quoting many key passages in careful translation; an exposition of its literary and textual history, which usually involves a survey of extensive and sometimes inconclusive scholarly debates; finally a critical discussion and appraisal of the work as a piece of literary fiction. More general aspects of the subject are treated in an introduction, and a related question is considered in detail in an appendix, "Society and self in the Chinese short story".

Professor Hsia does not hesitate to own to an ambitious programme: he intends the book for "specialists in Chinese literature, non-specialist teachers and students having occasion to discuss these works in the classroom, students of Western and comparative literature desirous of enlarging their knowledge of fiction, and others similarly impelled by curiosity". The collective demands of such an audience are obviously immense. For this reason, and because, having no current rival, the present book is in the nature of things likely to dominate the attention of much of its audience,

it invites judgement by the most exacting standards. The comments which follow are offered on this basis.

To attempt a responsible summary of scholarly literature on these notoriously problematical texts is not a simple task, even if no more is required than detached exposition. But with many vital though disputed questions Professor Hsia naturally needs at least a provisional solution in order to allow his literary discussion to proceed, and this leads to certain inevitable expedients. Sometimes it seems possible to keep different academic options technically open, however ungainly the result, as is attempted in discussing the provenance and authorship of the hundred-chapter *Hsi-yu chi* (cf. pp. 124-5). To do so automatically casts an ambiguity over the rest of the critical discussion, for readers are asked to stand prepared at any future date to withdraw an unknown measure of the credit which is paid here to the conception and treatment of this standard work of fiction. Readers concerned mainly with questions of literary judgement will no doubt feel more comfortable with Professor Hsia's brisker approach to the problem of the *Hung-lou meng*'s last forty chapters. To treat them as integral with Ts'ao Hsüeh-ch'in's work enables him to discuss the novel as a meaningful whole: the procedure is held to be justified on frankly critical grounds (cf. pp. 256-7), and the reader is apparently absolved from further concern about textual demonstration. These two contrasting instances show how the interests of one section of readership can force a compromise on the interests of another. The conflict is inherent in the composite task to which this book addresses itself, and compromise cannot be avoided.

Distinct and probably graver issues are of course involved in the different sections of each chapter taken individually. When reviewing a novel's literary and textual background the commentator's problem is to provide in brief a balanced and adequate account of current knowledge and theory, as well as bibliographical guidance (to which a section is devoted at the end of this book). The task would be impossible without some exercise of judicious selection, and few will protest when Professor Hsia writes (in connexion with *Hung-lou meng*), "I have made no attempt to review all the controversies and conjectures of modern scholarship that would offer little help to the general reader" (p. 256). But in fact the textual history of some of the novels is described here in a degree of detail which leads the reader to feel he is being offered a reasonably full and reliable picture. In such a situation the question of balance becomes doubly important, and in this respect the present book is open to criticism on a number of points. One example is the surprising omission of any reference to Yen Tun-i's full-length study of the evolution of *Shui-hu chuan* (*Shui-hu chuan ti yen-pien*, Peking 1957), a book which, in spite of obvious shortcomings, offered many bold and stimulating ideas on the well-worn traditional questions. The lack is felt particularly on p. 77, which measures the probabilities involved in assigning the early *Shui-hu chuan* to a particular author, and on p. 79, citing a by no means exhaustive range of views on the relationship of the shorter to the longer versions. Another more generalized and more disturbing lack is a total neglect of the voluminous Japanese contribution to the field of Chinese fiction studies. Indeed, an uninitiated reader could be forgiven for gathering from this book the impression that nothing of value had been written on the subject in Japanese. There are two unfortunate results. One is that credit is not always given where it is justly due: if, for instance, it is deemed worth while to acknowledge that Wu Ch'eng-en's authorship of *Hsi-yu chi* has been questioned and yet to pass over the objection (p. 116), then it is only fair to cite the scholar who has argued the sceptical case most fully, namely, Tanaka Iwao ("Saiyuki no sakusha", *Shibun* (N.S.) 8 (1953), 32-9). A more serious result is that because of some bibliographical omission the argument at certain points becomes unadventurous or even out of date. Throughout the general introduction the term "promptbook" is generously used, while simultaneously a careful distinction is built up between oral narrative performance and creative written fiction. No problem is acknowledged here, and the discussion affords no clue that the "promptbook" theory in relation to early fiction has lately been reopened to scholarly debate, one of the key publications - examining the implications of the term *hua-pen* - being again by a Japanese (Masuda Wataru, "'Wahon' to yū koto ni tsuite", *Jimbum kenkyū*, 16, 5 (June 1965), 22-33).

Such criticisms apply at a given point in time, but in the long term the strengths and weaknesses of any literary-historical summary will naturally lose their urgency as new discoveries emerge and the level of knowledge advances. Professor Hsia's more permanent contribution is therefore likely to lie not in this field, but rather in what he has to say about the inherent characteristics and value of the books themselves, and it is here that he has devoted the most care and attention. His critical stance is clear: "all evaluative criticism implies an act of comparison" (p. 15); "it seems to me self-evident that we cannot accord the Chinese novel full critical justice unless, with all our due awareness of its special characteristics that can only be fully understood in historical terms, we are prepared to examine it against the Western novel" (p. 6). On pp. 14-15 Professor Hsia describes the more traditional native habit of judgement which measured fiction by the standards of traditional historical writing: its critical limitations are taken as read. But it seems logical to conclude that by abandoning one alien criterion, the historiographical, for another, in this case that of the modern Western novel, the critic incurs different but no less real limitations. The six works treated here are seen broadly as a progression, slow and sometimes wayward, towards the norm of nineteenth and twentieth-century Western psychological fiction. In consequence, the discussion favours one novel, *Hung-lou meng* (and in the appendix, one short story - see p. 316), at the expense of all others. We are warned that in terms of the definition adopted "the Chinese novel found its true identity only belatedly in an eighteenth-century work which also happens to be its supreme masterpiece" (p. 15), and indeed throughout the book we feel uncomfortably that Flaubert, James and Joyce are waiting impatiently in the wings while Chinese fiction flounders on in its preoccupation with the external. When we finally win through to the *Hung-lou meng* it is borne in upon us that as a work with no equal before or since (p. 246) it is by definition virtually atypical.

The remaining novels suffer not merely by being left relatively in the shade, but also because, in the cause of justifying an austere general value-judgement, discussion of them is sometimes slanted in a way which can leave new readers' needs only partly satisfied. It seems sufficient, for instance, simply to point out that Wu Ching-tzu sometimes made gratuitous use of satirical anecdotes which did not serve his theme directly: the pages devoted to illustrating this incidental weakness (debatable, in the case of Yen Chih-ho's death-bed gesture) could more helpfully have taken a still closer look at the detailed features of narrative prose and diction in which much of the *Ju-lin wai-shih*'s excellence resides, and which are not always apparent to the Western reader. If this is only a minor objection, it seems to me that the problem arises in its most acute form from the discussion of *Shui-hu chuan*. Professor Hsia vigorously defends his right to express critical reservations about the moral values implicit in this novel (pp. 340-1), and in terms of his own assumptions the case is fairly made. Under his fierce scrutiny the *Shui-hu* shrivels to a tangle of different forms of moral ugliness, enlivened though hardly redeemed by a few narrative high moments, even these rarely unblemished. The average Western reader of *Shui-hu chuan* is, however, only too well aware of all this: he is of all readers the least likely to be imposed on by the moral ambiguities which Professor Hsia is at pains to expose. If the task of a critical introduction is merely to articulate a Westerner's characteristic feelings of revulsion and bewilderment then it is here admirably executed. But the non-specialist's problem remains: he wants surely to understand what about the *Shui-hu chuan* has made it for so long such a huge fact in Chinese life; in turning to the specialist he seeks help in gaining admittance to the foreign and disturbing world in which such a book can be conceived and welcomed; and this more urgent need remains unsatisfied.

My qualms about this book's broad critical approach are thus not aroused by any lack of professionalism in its execution. They are concerned rather with the dangers of serving Western judgements to Western readers, sometimes at the expense of the internal initiation without which the best Chinese fiction can seem trivial and frustrating. Newcomers to the subject will draw the predictable and basically unhelpful conclusion that the Chinese tradition was after all not very good at producing modern Western novels. They are led to feel at last on respectable home ground in the *Hung-lou meng* by being once again brought into touch with Dostoevsky. But if their horizons

indeed remain thus circumscribed they will perhaps have missed the very point of seeking to "enlarge their knowledge of fiction".

Having demurred at such length, I am bound to end by making it clear that I find this book rich and stimulating none the less. Few lovers of Chinese fiction can fail to gain much from the fruits of Professor Hsia's wide and sensitive reading. Throughout his critical discussions they will find an abundance of fresh ideas and insights, salutary challenges to accepted habits of reading, lucid formulations of important issues. The test of good criticism is its ability to send us back to the original texts, for us then to re-emerge with clearer judgements of our own. This work will have found its true place when it stands not as the only published attempt at a comprehensive critical view of the Chinese novel, but as one persuasive but individual voice in a general, many-sided debate.

G. DUDBRIDGE

*Chinese Government in Ming Times: Seven Studies*, Edited by Charles O. Hucker.  
285 pp. Columbia University Press, 1969. \$12.

The essays in this volume are a selection, in somewhat revised form, of those prepared for the conference on Ming government which was held in 1965 under the joint sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Association for Asian Studies. It is a pity that more of the original conference papers could not have been included, but as it is the selection covers a wide range of topics: local government, military and economic history, education and the bureaucracy. None pretends to have solved all the problems which it raises, but all successfully delineate certain areas in which further research would greatly enhance our knowledge of the workings of Ming government.

The longest, most ambitious and probably in the long run the most important is the discussion by Ray Huang of Ming fiscal administration. This is the first attempt in English at a broad survey of the subject and though inevitably a somewhat skeletal outline it is valuable in that it puts into perspective many topics which have hitherto been treated in isolation. From the first part of the study (which includes a breakdown of all the major sources of revenue of the central government) it emerges clearly how cumbersome and in many ways irrational by modern standards the whole financial structure was. Revenues were too rigidly tied to various expenditures, and the centralized but hopelessly understaffed Ministry of Revenue was quite unable to direct the collection and routing of funds from local sources in the minutely detailed way required by the system. The result was an emphasis on the "minor and inconsequential" to the complete detriment of any long-term planning or even yearly budgeting. The basic problem was that, owing to the weight of tradition and to certain ideological preconceptions, the whole fiscal structure was devised on the assumption of a static and unchanging situation. This meant that tax quotas, once set, could not be revised, and that revenues could not be raised much throughout the dynasty. The effects of this were not greatly apparent in the early Ming, when on the whole peace and prosperity prevailed, but became only too much so in the second half of the dynasty. This was the period when commerce and industry began to develop rapidly, especially in the south-east, and when the huge inflow of silver from the New World further stimulated the already swift growth of a monetary economy. Piecemeal adjustments (like the single-whip reform) were inadequate to keep pace with these developments, but a thorough overhaul of the creaking fiscal machinery was impossible, owing partly to the basic rigidity of the system and also to the short tenure and lack of expertise of finance ministers. As time went on, not only could the government not increase its revenues, it also became increasingly unable to collect those taxes which it did impose.

One of Professor Huang's principal assertions in the second part of the study (which analyses the factors responsible for the fiscal crisis in the early seventeenth century) is that, contrary to the theory of the dynastic cycle, the Ming government was not overtaxing the people towards the end of the dynasty and that it was in fact well

within the capacity of the population to pay the relatively modest surcharges that were imposed. Popular distress was caused, he feels, not by government exactions, but by increasing corruption at the local level which the government was powerless to control. This proposition may be acceptable in the case of the more prosperous parts of central and south China but it is somewhat doubtful whether it entirely applies to economically depressed areas like the north-west, from which the major peasant revolts sprang. Though in theory distressed areas were exempted from the surcharges, the author himself points out on p. 114 that in practice tax remissions etc. were all too often never passed on to the primary producer. Furthermore the surcharges imposed before 1587 and in 1618 were not, like the later ones, confined to the five central provinces. Li Wen-chih in his *Wan-Ming min-pien* (Shanghai, 1948, pp. 20-1) adduces some evidence to show that they contributed to the prevailing distress in the north-west, especially Shensi, the administration of which was notoriously lax and corrupt; the Shensi revolts (admittedly the product of many other factors also) started from 1625 onwards. Thus closer attention to the wide economic differences between regions might have led Professor Huang to modify his conclusions somewhat.

James Parsons, in exploring the background and regional origins of members of the bureaucracy, in general confirms the findings of Ho Ping-ti, albeit by a different approach. Some points in his analysis are open to criticism, however. He claims for instance that clan power was a major reason why certain counties produced large numbers of office-holders though he does not substantiate this in detail and ignores other possible factors, such as that many of these counties were (on the evidence of his own maps) located along major rivers and trade routes, or on the coast, while a substantial number were in the prosperous and densely populated Lower Yangtze region in which there had been a strong tradition of learning and culture for hundreds of years. It is unfortunate that he omits any discussions of all but the highest offices at the capital, as this distorts his picture considerably at times.

The essays of Tilemann Grimm and John Meskill, on the office of Educational Intendant and the relationship between academies and politics in the Ming respectively, complement each other in throwing light on government policies in educational matters on which (apart from the Tung-lin controversy) little has been written in English. It is clear from the latter that academies were vulnerable to repressive measures only when they were unwise enough to become involved with political matters and that the charge of heterodoxy was usually a cloak for disapproval of such potentially dangerous activities. Lo Jung-pang uses the methods of the political scientist to evaluate the process of decision-making in the Ming and to prove, in refutation of Wittfogel, that decisions did not simply reflect the whim of a despot but were reached on a basis of consultation and deliberation. He only considers a fairly small sample of foreign policy decisions, however, and ignores those on matters of internal policy; a great deal of further work is therefore needed if his generalizations are to be entirely substantiated. Romeyn Taylor is concerned to prove that the early Ming guard system was, contrary to the assertions of the *Ming-shih*, directly based on that of the Yuan dynasty. Much of Yang Lien-sheng's paper is not concerned with the Ming at all but he does give a useful summary of some problems in local administration.

In sum, the principal contribution of this useful but somewhat uneven volume will probably be in stimulating others to do further research on the important problems which it raises. Most of them deserve to be treated at far greater length and one may hope that it will not be too long before the studies offered here can be supplemented and superseded.

H. J. BEATTIE

*Journey to the Missouri*, by Toshikazu Kase, edited with a foreword by David Nelson Rowe, pp. xiv. + 282. Archon Books, 1969 (reprint). \$8.50.

When this book first appeared, in 1950, it had a somewhat mixed reception. Although it provided the fullest account till then of the decision-making process in Japan both immediately before and during the Pacific War, it had implications for

occupation policy which were not welcome in all quarters. There was some tendency to see Mr. Kase's account as an attempt to place all the blame for Japan's mistakes on the military and thus to suggest that the pursuit of far-reaching social and political reforms was not an essential object of American foreign policy. Twenty years later it is easier to believe that the Japanese Foreign Office was not completely lacking in responsibility and that the pacific views of the author were not so exceptional as was suspected. It is also possible to believe that if Mr. Kase were to retell his story today, his hinted criticisms of American policy would be more explicit. If the emphasis might be slightly changed in places, however, the basic story would not. Though his account is not in diary form, it is clearly based on some such record. Such discrepancies with other accounts as do occur are slight and of minor importance. The book does not, of course, tell the whole story of Japan's wartime government, even though Mr. Kase fills in some of the gaps in his own documentation from other accounts. Nevertheless, the importance of the author's role as a collector of information and go-between for the "peace party" gives exceptional interest to his version of events. This alone would justify the reprinting of the book, but it is not its only merit. In his handling of his theme, the author steers a skilful course between a topical and a chronological treatment, and, considering that he was writing in a foreign language, his prose is surprisingly readable, if occasionally somewhat literary. More important, he provides a glimpse of the subtleties and intricacies of influence and decision-making in Japan which, though criticized as inconsistent, in fact seems to reflect Japanese realities fairly faithfully. It is regrettable that one such criticism is voiced by the editor and even more regrettable that the present publishers have been content to reprint the original edition without amendment or addition. Not only is the author's background, and particularly his position as head of the foreign office bureau of information, not made known to the reader, but a number of obvious factual mistakes have been left uncorrected, principally in the chapters dealing with the years before 1941. Of the editorial footnotes which have been added a considerable number seem unnecessary and at least two are not free from error themselves. Fortunately however, *Journey to the Missouri* is fully intelligible as it stands. Its importance may have been diminished by other, more comprehensive, accounts, but the position and honesty of the author ensure that it will continue to be read by those who wish to understand why Japan challenged the world and how this decision was eventually reversed.

R. L. SIMS

*Kojiki*. Translated by Donald L. Philippi, with an introduction and notes. viii+655 pp., 9×6 in. Princeton University Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1969. £6.

It is a pleasure to welcome this admirable piece of work. There is virtually nothing to criticize and everything to be grateful for.

In a general way, of course, a translation is of value principally to those who cannot read the original language. But in this case there are two classes of beneficiaries: those for whom the work seems primarily intended, that is to say, those who, having no Japanese, are interested in comparative anthropology, religion, mythology, folklore and so on; secondly, all those, including Japanese who can read English, who study ancient Japanese texts in the original. I know of no Japanese edition of the *Kojiki* as useful as this one; but I should, perhaps, add that I have not seen the critical edition on which this translation is based, published by Heibonsha in 1958 as volume 7 of the *Kojiki Taisei*.

The book is made up as follows: Introduction: 30 pages. Main text with notes: 357 pages. Appendixes: A. 28 additional notes—28 pages. B. Romanized transcriptions of the song texts. Glossary: of all untranslated Japanese words appearing in the text—197 pages. Bibliography. Index.

*Introduction*. By referring readers to existing works in English generally covering

ancient Japanese history, culture and poetry, the author has been able to keep his introduction surprisingly short; with the exception of the very valuable section on the archaic Japanese language, it is very strictly concerned with the *Kojiki* itself, the circumstances of its compilation, its probable sources, its manuscripts and its critical history. In this last section, was it not, perhaps, a little ungracious of Mr. Philippi not to mention his great predecessor, Chamberlain? The latter is mentioned in one footnote to the main text, and in the bibliography, where the second (Kobe, 1932) edition of his *Kojiki* with annotations by Aston is omitted. It must be conceded, however, that this new translation completely supersedes Chamberlain's pioneering attempt.

The section on the archaic language is important, and, indeed, most necessary, since Mr. Philippi rightly insists that "a transcription into Modern Japanese readings blurs many semantically significant distinctions, makes us vulnerable to mistaken interpretations, and obscures unnecessarily the etymologies of the vocabulary". He therefore transcribes all words according to a reconstructed archaic system. If the results are naturally at first rebarbative to those long accustomed to the conventional (modern) transcription they are also a useful reminder of the degree of phonological attrition undergone by the Japanese language in the last twelve centuries or so. The use of an archaic transcription should become standard practice in all specialized writings in this general field. There is a comparative table here of the archaic and modern syllables, while every entry in the glossary is followed by its modern transcription in brackets. (The modern transcription is given in brackets in this review wherever it differs from the archaic.)

*Main text and notes*. The main text is presented rather like the Bible. While the original division into three "books" is retained, the material is subdivided into a single series of chapters, within which the text is set out in numbered "verses"; these verses are either prose sentences ending in full stops or colons, or single lines of songs. The result is excellent, a lightly laden page and a rapid precision of cross-reference. But, since every editor or translator of the *Kojiki* finds it necessary to subdivide the material, and since all such subdivisions seem to be different, I would have liked to see, as a prospective user of this book, a table of contents indicating where the successive reigns begin, and, better still, the Sino-Japanese name of the emperor printed at the head of at least every other page (the practice in fact observed in Aston's *Nihongi*).

The notes are concise and strictly to the point. They seem, moreover, to be very nearly always on hand when we need them. (There was only one occasion, indeed, when, at a first perusal, the absence of a note was surprising. Many readers may wonder where the Sino-Japanese names of the emperors spring from; something about this might either be said in the introduction or else in a note at the very beginning of Book Two.) There are many interesting citations from Motoori, as well as some from Hirata, Tachibana Moribe and other *kokugakusha* of the old school, which give insight into the various attitudes of that school. Mr. Philippi draws most frequently on Matsumura Takeo's four-volume work on Japanese mythology, *Nihon Shinwa no Kenkyū*, where much comparative material has been gathered, while he also often quotes the great textual critic and ancient historian, Tsuda Sōkichi, who had the courage to propound heterodox views during the most repressive period of Japanese nationalism before the second world war. While quoting these and other scholars, Mr. Philippi is often self-effacing to a fault, leaving the reader to judge between conflicting interpretations or theories; but this is preferable to excessive dogmatism.

As to the accuracy of the translation, there can be few scholars outside Japan qualified to challenge Mr. Philippi on this ground, and I do not pretend to be among them. The work commands entire confidence.

Before leaving the main text of the translation, it should be added that, from a literary point of view, it reads quite surprisingly well on the whole, while remaining so close to the literal meaning that the very slightest liberty is admitted in a scrupulous note. There is just one thing to regret in this connexion: the rendering of *piko* (*hiko*) as "lad", a word once so rightly described as "one of the most vapid in the language". In glossary entries the alternative "prince" is given; that this is not used is presumably because *piko* so often occurs in names ending in *miko*, also rendered "prince".



*Additional Notes.* These are used to accommodate fuller discussion, at about page length, of certain topics, than could conveniently be handled in footnotes, especially by adding parallel or comparable passages from other works, the *Nihon Shoki*, *Manyō-shū*, and so on. One may regret that the arrival of Aki-kishi (Achi-kishi) and Wani-kishi (Wani-kishi) during Ōjin's reign did not provoke one of these notes on the subject of continental immigrants more generally.

*Glossary.* As the author points out, the nomenclature of the *Kojiki* is of considerable importance, since it comprises some of "the oldest linguistic elements for which we have graphic records", but we are warned of the difficulties and uncertainties of their interpretation, most of them falling "somewhere between the frankly incomprehensible and the quite obvious".

The glossary contains entries for all place names, family and personal names, deities, titles (*kabane*), types or names of songs and the untranslatable names of certain animals and plants.

Traditional etymologies are given, but we are always told when the author is unconvinced. What the glossary does not contain are entries for recurrent single elements in names, so that there is no entry for such items as *mikōtō* (*mikoto*), *miko* or *kami* (*kami*). Perhaps to ask for this would be to ask for something more like a dictionary of the language of the *Kojiki*. Even so, one would like to know if Mr. Philippi attaches any significance to the different ways of writing *miko*, 御子, 王 and so on; he probably attaches none, since he renders them all "prince".

*Bibliography.* The great majority of the titles are, naturally, Japanese, and the list is so specialized as to include no general work by a Japanese ancient historian.

*Index.* This is rather small and will probably not often be useful. There are entries for various subjects such as, at random, polygamy, silkworms, toad, Yayoi culture, for all scholars where cited in the notes or the introduction, and for all persons to whom reference has been made in the body of the work. No human or divine personage of the *Kojiki* itself appears, a severe restriction on the usefulness of the index. There is, oddly, no entry for the *Nihon Shoki* here, either original or translation.

The book is excellently printed and presented, and there seem to be no misprints. I hope that it will be clear from the foregoing description that Mr. Philippi's *Kojiki* is a major contribution in the field of ancient Japanese studies and one of the most distinguished yet made by a non-Japanese scholar.

G. W. ROBINSON

Josef Kolmaš, *Tibetan Manuscripts and Blockprints in the Library of the Oriental Institute, Prague*. 112 pp. (*Dissertationes Orientales*, Vol. 16), Academia Prague, 1969.

Sixty-five works in the above collection – excluding the *bKa'-gyur* and *bsTan-gyur*, which have been the subject of an article by Dr. Kolmaš in *Archiv Orientalní*, 1962 – are arranged in six convenient groups: Canonical Texts and Commentaries; Later Tantrik and Ritual Texts; Philosophical/Theological Texts; Mystery Plays and Fairy Tales; Biographies; Specialized Subjects. The largest number of works – 27 – is contained in the second group.

The majority of the items came to the Oriental Institute from the Náprstek Museum of Ethnography, Prague, to which most of them were presented by Professor Rinchen of Ulan Bator. There are five canonical texts in the beautifully printed Buryat editions; but the greater part are manuscripts of unstated origin. Other books have been lent by Dr. Kolmaš who acquired them recently in Peking.

Neither great age nor especial importance is claimed for the collection in which the most interesting items may be the series of manuscript biographies of Na-ro-pa, Mar-pa, Mi-la-ras-pa, sGam-po-pa, Phag-mo-grub-pa, Gling-ras-pa, and gTsang-pa rGya-ras. All of these, described as very finely written in *dbu-can* on stout paper in black and red, each with two water-colour portraits, were composed by the *rnal-sbyor-pa* 'Od-dpag-dro-rje – unidentified, but presumably a 'Brug-pa bKa'-brgyud-pa – who worked at

the unidentified hermitage of mNgon-dga'. On p. 829 of *The Blue Annals*, translated by G. N. Roerich, there is mention of a Mngon-dga' monastery, apparently near the west end of the Yar-'brog lake and, so, not far from the 'Brug-pa monastery of Ra-lung; but without more information about the provenance of the manuscripts, that is no more than a tentative suggestion.

In addition to the works described in the catalogue Dr. Kolmaš records that the Oriental Institute possesses the title leaves of some 2,300 books from the monastery press of sDe -dge dGon-chen and some 3,300 from that of sDe-dge dPal-spungs. It is feared that the printing blocks there, which had a high reputation for clarity, have been destroyed by the Chinese Communists, but copies of the books were available, at least in 1959 in the Peking National Library. Dr. Kolmaš proposes to write about those collections in detail; in the meantime his note indicates their richness on which, it is to be hoped, favoured scholars will still be able to draw.

Dr. Kolmaš's catalogue of the Oriental Institute's own Tibetica is welcome as a careful and well-presented addition to Tibetan bibliography.

H. E. RICHARDSON

Ireneus László Legeza, *Guide to Transliterated Chinese in the Modern Peking Dialect*, Vol. II. Conversion Tables of the outdated International and European Individual Systems with Comparative Tables of Initials and Finals. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1969, 8vo. 262 pp.

The second volume of Mr Legeza's concordance deals with outdated International and European individual systems of romanization. Twenty-nine such systems are dealt with, bringing the total in two volumes to fifty. A third volume is planned.

As before, Pinyin is taken as the base, and the sounds are listed alphabetically under that system. The 407 different Pinyin spellings are each numbered, the numbering being identical with that of the first volume, so that it is a simple matter to move from one volume to the other in following up the various romanizations of any given sound.

The tables are prefaced by a short description of each system, and by comparative tables of initials and finals which are useful for identifying any romanization encountered and for cross-referring between systems. A separate index for each system is provided at the back of the book.

HUGH D. R. BAKER

*Sentence Analysis in Modern Malay* by M. Blanche Lewis. Cambridge University Press, 1969, xiv+345 pp. £3.

The search continues for that elusive El Dorado – an accurate and definitive grammar of the modern Malay language, based on the principles of modern linguistic science and suitable for use as an educational tool. Miss M. B. Lewis, who already has considerable experience in writing Malay textbooks, is to be admired for launching yet another expedition towards the goal (this time along a route completely unfamiliar to her), at an age when most people are content to be mere spectators.

The prospective buyer of Miss Lewis's "Sentence Analysis in Modern Malay" should not, however, be misled by the scientific-sounding title into thinking that the search is ended. Not only is the term "Modern Malay" a misnomer but the analysis is suspect on several counts.

The author has taken as the corpus for her work two comedies and two short pieces of prose, all written by the same person, namely Zainal-Abidin bin Ahmad (more commonly and conveniently known as Za'ba). This material incorporates three distinct linguistic styles: the language used in the prose-pieces, which represents Za'ba's usual outmoded and convoluted style; that used in the comedies, which is

characteristic of the racy, highly colloquial, regionally flavoured language of the semi-urbanized Malay; and finally the style of the stage-directions which have also been thrown into the melting pot, and which, like stage-directions in any language, are rather atypical of the language concerned.

In her preface, the author states that she has used the spoken language as the basis for her description of Modern Malay, since "it is from the spoken language that the springs well up . . . to keep the [syntactic] patterns alive and fresh and to ensure that established formality does not end in desiccation". Few would dispute this axiomatic statement, but Za'ba's prose writings and stage-directions hardly constitute "spoken language". In fact, none of the material used really qualifies for description as "Modern Malay", which (to this reviewer at least) means the form of the language which has developed since the mid-1950's and which is used in novels, university lectures, parliamentary debates, and radio and television broadcasts.

Miss Lewis's book would still have some value as a detailed description of a particular kind of Malay, if the analysis were consistent, reliable, neatly arranged and easy to read. Unfortunately, it is none of these things.

Of the 345 pages of the book, only the first 184 pages are devoted to the actual analysis. The remainder is made up of three appendices, the four Malay texts with their English translations, a short bibliography, a glossary, an index, and a useful list of all sentences treated in the body of the book. The 184 pages of text present an impenetrable maze of at least six different type-faces, four kinds of parentheses and broken or unbroken lines of various thicknesses, the whole interspersed with what must be the most forbidding collection of footnotes ever to test the ingenuity of the Cambridge University Press compositors. These footnotes (308 in all) are to be found on no less than 163 of the 184 pages of text, on 58 of which they cover half or more of the page area, while at least six pages (i.e. 90, 91, 94, 97, 98 and 165) consist of footnotes and nothing else!

The author's treatment of Malay sentences is based on an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation by E. M. F. Payne entitled "Basic Syntactic Structures in Standard Malay". Although Miss Lewis has enclosed direct quotations from this dissertation in angle brackets, it is difficult to determine, without having seen it, which elements of the analysis are her own work and which are derived from Dr. Payne's work. Nevertheless, judging from Miss Lewis's statements in her preface (p. x) that "the analyses in this book are kept within the grammatical framework . . . deduced from Dr. Payne's thesis", and that she has "resisted the temptation to wander outside the prescribed confines of the basic structures set up in the thesis", it seems likely that she has accepted uncritically a great part of Dr. Payne's work. If this is the case, it is only fair to Miss Lewis to state that some of the criticisms contained in this review should not be laid directly at her door, though this does not, of course, affect their validity (or lack of it).

Apart from a vague reference to "the principles of structural linguistics" on p. x, the theoretical basis of the analysis is nowhere described or even mentioned. It is left to the reader to deduce from Appendices II and III ("A note on the indication of Immediate Constituency" and "A note on Transformational Grammar" respectively) that the analysis is of an immediate constituent (IC) type, incorporating some facets of transformational theory (mainly on pp. 79-82, 125-138 and 195-196). Use of the latter, however, is restricted to the type of transformation known as "conjoining", whereby (for example) two sentences sharing a common Subject are united by the deletion of one of the Subjects, with or without the addition of a linking particle. Much greater use could have been made of simple transformational technique in the derivation of *yang*-clauses and of those interrogative clauses characterized by the presence of interrogative nominals (i.e. *siapa*, *apa* etc.), which are completely ignored.

Miss Lewis's previous work on Malay has been distinguished by its instinctive "feel" for the language. In this book, however, she shows an uncharacteristic tendency to force square pegs into round holes and to rely on the etymology of a word in order to justify a preconceived analysis. Thus in footnote 208 (pp. 116-7), which discusses the sentence *Macham Pa' Pandir 'nak melawak*, we are told that since *macham* is a noun,

and since it can be replaced in this context by *bagai* or *saperti*, the two latter words must be nouns also. Therefore, *bagitu* is likewise a noun, because it is a contraction of *bagai itu* (footnote 118, pp. 70-1). Moreover, in attempting to analyse the sequence . . . *sayap-nya sentiasa terhampar walau pun pada masa ia hinggap di-rumpuk2 dan di-pokok2 padi* (footnote 289, p. 164), the author even goes so far as to suggest that *walau* should be "analysed (in accordance with its origin) as a double connective, the first syllable being a co-ordinating connective . . ."

The same footnote, incidentally, provides an example of the frequently incomprehensible manner in which the structure of Malay is described throughout the book. The following extract is presented without comment:

"The S element of such a subordinate clause (deleted by transformation) should be identical with the S element of the main clause (see p. 81.2(a)), i.e.: *Sayap-nya sentiasa terhampar* (Cl<sub>1</sub>) *wa sayap-nya terhampar* (say, Cl<sub>2</sub>) (*ka*)*lau sayap-nya [di-] pada masa ia hinggap di- . . . pokok2 padi*. (Cl<sub>3</sub>) This leaves Clause 5 still to be described as a fragmentary subordinate clause consisting of the P element only, that element being a predicating prepositional phrase."

The distinctions set up in the section on word-classes (pp. 5-15) are entirely capricious, as is the listing of derivational and inflectional affixes (footnote 20, p. 13), in which *pe(r)-* is described as inflectional, *me(~/)-* is placed with the derivational morphemes (the sign '~', presumably indicating nasalization, is nowhere explained), and the prefix *ber-* is completely omitted. In the discussion of verb morphology and clause structure, the crucial question of what constitutes a Malay "passive" is barely touched on (pp. 48-9, 51-2). In the sentence analysis itself, the author relies too much on subjective and unscientific criteria, and the reader is constantly confronted by explanations like the following (footnote 160, p. 92):

" . . . the deliberateness of the words used - the hesitation implied in the duplication, the 'braking' effect of *juga*, and the hint of remonstrance in *mémang* . . . - all this suggests that the author's full-stop between the two sentences was not accidental . . ."

The author refers to intonation only in passing, when it helps to achieve a particular analysis, and even then only in terms of "remembered cadences enjoined by the author himself during rehearsals" (p. ix). The fact that the rehearsals took place twenty years ago is not mentioned!

It is in the section on phrase-structures (pp. 16-37), however, that most inadequacies are found. The very first sentence in this section reads in part: "Phrases are sequences, of two or more words below the rank of clause . . ." Yet in footnote 24 on the same page we read ". . . the noun phrase in its simplest form is a noun."

The author describes a noun phrase as containing four elements: a Measurer (M), expounded by a numeral or a word such as *banyak* 'many'; the Head (H), expounded by a noun or its equivalent; a Qualifier (Q), expounded by a verb or its equivalent; and a Determinant (D) (i.e. *ini* or *itu*). These four elements, of which only H is obligatorily present, always occur in that order. The author's inflexibility in the application of phrase structure rules gives rise to many false analyses. For reasons of space, only two examples can be given here.

Since Q cannot be expounded by a noun, any sequence in which this appears to be the case is analysed not as a noun phrase, but as a "noun group". As a result, sequences like *buku merah*, *barang di-churi* and *orang berchukok* are noun phrases, whereas *buku yang merah*, *barang yang di-churi*, and *orang yang berchukok* are called "noun groups", on the grounds that a *yang*-clause is one of the "syntactic equivalents" of a noun, and therefore may not be an exponent of Q. Further, the sequence *pisau chukok* is analysed (in footnote 29, p. 19) as a noun phrase exactly parallel in structure with *orang berchukok*, since *chukok* is a "verb" and must therefore be expounding Q. This is a misconception reminiscent of the "smoking jacket" puns of one's schooldays!

In analysing sequences such as *dua buah rumah itu* (in which a numeral is linked to a noun by an optional classifier), the classifier and the noun (*buah rumah*) are regarded as immediate constituents. That is, they are described as constituting a noun-group which expounds the Head of the phrase, with *dua* representing M and *itu* representing

D. This approach, which is dependent on the assumption that anything following *M* must be the Head, would ignore the basic difference between the two homophonous sequences *dua ékor kuda* 'two horses' (in which the optional classifier *ékor* is present) and *dua ékor kuda* 'two horsetails' (in which the optional classifier, presumably *buah*, is absent). The difference becomes obvious when the numeral is placed after the noun, giving *kuda dua ékor* for the first phrase and *ékor kuda dua* for the second. A more plausible solution would be to regard *M* as occurring either before or after the Head, and consisting of an obligatory numeral and an optional classifier.

Miss Lewis has written this book "primarily as a working textbook for second-year university students reading Malay", but she also hopes to attract the interest of scholars in this "application of a formal grammatical framework to the sentences of a language which belongs to the Austronesian family". In aiming at this dual audience, Miss Lewis has satisfied neither — her analysis is too involved for the former, and too shaky for the latter.

El Dorado remains undiscovered, but at least some of the cul-de-sac's have been signposted.

D. J. PRENTICE

*The Origins and the Authors of the hua-pen*, by Jaroslav Průšek, 158 pp., Academia, Prague, 1967.

Professor Průšek enlarges on the title of his book on p.15: 'The purpose of this story is to present some new evidence on the subject of the *hua-pen*, their original purpose, what brought them into being, and how they were created.'

There really is not very much new, but there is plenty of fresh discussion, partly on other people's theories, partly developing Průšek's own synthetic view. Thanks to this approach, and to the extensive but discriminating bibliographies, the book provides a very useful résumé of what is currently known and thought about *hua-pen*. The reviewing seriatim of other scholars' hypotheses has however one unfortunate result, which is that the thread is difficult to follow, and this combined with Průšek's contentious tone but guarded comments makes the book unsuitable as an introduction to the subject. It should instead be approached as representing the conclusions of the foremost European authority on Chinese vernacular literature on vital points of scholarship regarding the *hua-pen*. His main conclusion seems to be that the better *hua-pen* were written by members of the kind of literary clubs known as *shu-hui*, both for the benefit of the storytellers and as independent and fully fledged works of literature. Though the *shu-hui* included professional storytellers he implies that the inferior or sketchy *hua-pen* were the work of the run-of-the-mill professionals. He also decides that the *hua-pen* drew principally on written texts for their subject-matter, hardly at all on oral folk literature. In other words, though the art of storytelling cannot be divorced from its social milieu, talent and learning now emerge as the vital qualitative factors. If I have not misrepresented his views this would mark a change of emphasis compared with his earlier analyses.

The study of the origins of the *hua-pen* is a challenging and necessary subject for research, but it is also beset by pitfalls, since evidence is so incomplete. So often one surmise is 'authenticated' by a previous surmise. As one would expect from a scholar of his standing, Professor Průšek is usually careful to distinguish between what is definite and what is only probable, but even he demonstrates at times the power of self-persuasion. So the idea that all the stories mentioned by Lo Yeh in his *Tsui-weng t'an-lu* were already in his time circulated as written and printed texts is described on p.92 as a 'theory', but by p.100 has transformed itself into a 'fact': 'the fact that the various texts Lo Yeh had at his disposal . . . survived to our day' etc.

It seems a pity that this valuable study, like the other volumes in the 'Dissertationes Orientales' series, has only limited distribution, and so will not claim the readership it deserves.

D. E. POLLARD

*Three Mughal Poets: Mir, Sauda, Mir Hasan*, by Ralph Russell and Khurshidul Islam, with a foreword by Anne-Marie Schlimmel. pp. xxiii + 290. London, George Allen and Unwin, 1968. 48s.

An English and an Indian scholar have here collaborated in a courageous and largely successful attempt to introduce to the English reader the pleasures of late eighteenth-century Urdu verse. The difficulties of making this intelligible and enjoyable to non-Urdu-speakers are daunting; and it is also hard to remove the prejudices against late Indo-Muslim culture created by nineteenth-century British Indian narratives, which paint an almost inconceivable picture of silliness, extravagance, cruelty and decadence. A recent would-be popular work on "the splendours and miseries" of early nineteenth century Lucknow (where half a century earlier the three poets of this study had been living) could still quote as chapter headings descriptions of the rulers in such terms as "a crazy imbecile" "surrounded by eunuchs, fiddlers and poetasters worse than either": with no hint that the poetry and music of the period might have deserved patronage, let alone the lexicography and Muslim traditional sciences which these "imbeciles" also encouraged. Urdu poetry has often been judged by similar standards. "The Mughal courts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, depraved and decadent, could foster only the corrupt aspects of the Persian tradition . . . The bulk of Urdu poetry . . . is found . . . with a range of subjects almost exclusively restricted to homosexuality, the cult of the courtesan and rakish and sadistic cynicism . . . There is no Baudelaire among the Urdu poets in question . . ." (J. C. Ghosh in *The Legacy of India*, Oxford, 1937, p. 280).

Against such preconceptions the authors are in a justifiably aggressive mood. Parallels are continually drawn with English and European medieval traditions of courtly love and with the Elizabethan drama, sometimes with the intention of making more acceptable the stylized conventions of Urdu verse and sometimes to combat prudish or inept literary critical judgements. A certain mental accommodation on the part of the modern reader, it is argued, is necessary before he can understand and appreciate medieval European poetry; the accommodation which has to be made to enjoy eighteenth-century Urdu verse is not much greater and the effort is abundantly worth making.

Much unobtrusive labour has gone to make smooth the reader's path in the difficult field of Urdu literary convention. There is also a consistent attempt to relate, somewhat after the manner of Huizinga, historical background and poetic expression, the emotional geography of Indo-Muslim urban and courtly life and the literary conventions of love, the personal circumstances of the poets and the idiosyncrasies of their works. Other than Sorley's *Shah Abdul Latif of Bhit* (Oxford 1940) there are no comparable studies in English of any Indian or Persian poets.

An opening chapter sketches in well-presented details the disasters of the wreck of the Mughal state and the concomitant miseries of the capital city; it shows how the three poets were personally affected by these disasters. Separate studies of each poet then follow. Saudā is a satirist and—since effective satire must contain an element of cumulative narration—passages of some length are rendered into English verse<sup>1</sup>: their wicked wit survives translation. Perhaps the funniest depicts a giutton (the father of the poet Mir Hasan) fumbling his wife in the hope of finding foodstuffs about her person (p. 48). The chapter closes with summaries of complete satires. The "Enchanting Story" of Mir Hasan follows, and the verse here also is reduced to a prose version from

<sup>1</sup> It is commendable that the Urdu originals of all verses are given above the translations, reproduced in a fair but rather crowded *nasta'liq* by a modern Delhi scribe. There is in them one scriptorial innovation not noticed elsewhere by your reviewer: *pesh* is reversed above *wāv* to indicate the long vowel *ū*. Like the false *izāfat* sometimes found in contemporary lithographed publications from India—which in fact is intended to indicate the lack of *izāfat*—this is a borrowing from the *devanāgarī* script. Such clear examples of the influence of bilateralism upon scribes may be of interest to students of the palaeography of earlier scripts.

which much lavish verbal ornament has been pruned. The story is a *dāstān* of the class concerned with love between a *parī* and a mortal prince; it resembles the *Kārnāma-i 'ishq* of Ānand Rām Mukhlis written at Delhi a generation earlier in Persian prose, and the *Gul-i Bakāvālī* of Nihāl Chand Lāhōrī written a generation later in Urdu prose at Calcutta. Beside his peers, Mīr Hasan has not been fairly treated. No individual couplets are rendered into English and analysed; and without this it is difficult to see where Mīr Hasan's originality and excellence lie.

Nearly half the book is concerned with Mīr, the greatest Urdu lyrical poet of his age. The translators are here faced with problems similar to those of the translators of the older but related tradition of Persian lyrical poetry. Fitzgerald's talents were happily matched with the brevity and coherence of Khayyām's quatrains; but most other translators of Persian lyrical poetry have concentrated with less success upon the ghazals of Hāfiz. By contrast with the ghazals of Mīr and Ghālib (upon whom a larger work of the same authors is in the press), the ghazals of Hāfiz often possess a thematic coherence, a simple stock of hedonistic images and a surprisingly limited vocabulary deployed to express a complex and subtle view of the cosmos. Something of the spirit of Hāfiz survives the English poetic garbs worn by his more talented translators—Sir William Jones (eighteenth-century Anacreontic), Gertrude Bell (*fin-de-siècle*), Arberry (Victorian pastiche with echoes of Isaac Watts) and Avery and Heath-Stubbs (vogueish modern). (Ralph Russell himself favours a fairly innocent mock Elizabethan and Hudibrastic.) In contrast to those of Hāfiz, from Mīr's ghazals it is not usually possible to render more than single unconcatenated couplets into conventional literary English because the Urdu ghazal of the eighteenth century, while possessing strict formal and metrical unity, generally—and with aesthetic justification—has no close thematic coherence. An appendix which translates literally the whole of one of Mīr's most famous ghazals makes this clear to English readers.

At this period Northern Indian Urdu had developed into a language of extreme subtlety. Garcin de Tassy called it "the best conversational language of the East". Mīr and Saudā exploited in their verse all its conversational resources. The point of many of Mīr's couplets, which are rendered more complicated by omission of pronouns and inversions of sentence order, often depend on the exact understanding of nuances of expression. The translators have endeavoured to preserve in their English verses the points made, the substance rather than the accident or external form of the originals.

Many excellences of the originals do not survive translation: but some weaknesses are also concealed by an English poetic dress. The formal imagery of the Persian garden appears merely exotic in English: it has not the abstract and unreal quality found in the Urdu originals, of similes drawn from flowers, trees and birds alien to the Indian environment and never in their lives seen by these poets. Relative excellence or worthlessness can scarcely be perceived in the translations. For instance, the authors present a most untypical ghazal of Mīr's, which does possess thematic coherence and draws heavily upon the stock images of Persian pleasure common to Hāfiz, Sa'dī and Khayyām (p. 196). Its consecutive train of thought resembles that of an English poem; and the naïve English reader, hungering for the gorgeous East, may be drawn towards it than towards most of the translations of this book. Yet considered in its period and context, this is a ghazal on an old tired theme, devoid alike of the originality, profundity of thought and aptness of language of this poet.

It is impossible to do justice to the riches of this book even in an extended review. The enthusiasm of the authors is communicated by their vigorous and memorable expositions (which contrast sadly with Professor Schlimmel's turgid foreword and only marginally relevant additional notes). The moving spirit of Mīr's poetry is described as "the experience of a man driven by the single spiritual force of love, manifesting itself simultaneously in love of women, love of God, love of his fellowmen, and a love of a high ideal in life, as well as in the indomitable power to resist unbroken the persecution of the enemies of love in all these fields" (p. 231). Something of Mīr's spirit would appear to have passed to the authors themselves. Though only fragments of the Urdu poetry can be presented in English, the human predicament of these three eighteenth-century poets, their moral dignity and their individuality are singularly well conveyed.

The realities of Mughal power had changed to the courtly background of dust and shadows in which these men passed their lives; but no reader of this book will be likely to dismiss, in the manner of the older Anglo-Indian historical narratives, their age as one of unrelieved decadence and "imbecility". The classical period of Urdu poetry, spanned by the lives of Mīr and of Ghālib, was the last great age of Indo-Muslim civilization.

SIMON DIGBY

*A Diplomat in Japan*, by Sir Ernest Satow, with an introduction by Gordon Daniels, xii+427 pp. (Oxford in Asia Historical Reprints), Oxford University Press, Tokyo, London, New York, 1968. 90s.

This reprint of *A Diplomat in Japan* is very welcome. Satow's vivid account of diplomacy at both its higher and lower levels during the eventful years leading up to the Meiji Restoration remains, nearly fifty years after its first publication, in many ways the best introduction to British attitudes towards Japan at a time when these really mattered. Nevertheless the book's obvious merits have sometimes led scholars to treat the opinions and reflections of this able but very junior interpreter as if they were straightforward expressions of official policy. The publishers, therefore, have been well-advised to add an introduction by a specialist, Dr. Daniels, who, by comparing episodes from *A Diplomat in Japan* with Satow's original diary in the Public Record Office and with the reports of the British minister in Japan, Sir Harry Parkes, shows clearly with what caution the book must be treated in this respect. It is, perhaps, a pity, from the point of view of university students, that footnotes have not been added where Satow's narrative requires comment or elaboration, and that the Japanese personages he refers to have not been identified by their later or more commonly used names. For the general reader, however—and this book deserves many—the brief but excellent introduction contains all the information necessary for a proper appreciation of this minor classic.

R. L. SIMS

J. P. Sharma, *Republics in Ancient India, c.1500 B.C.-500 B.C.*, xvi+278 pp. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1968. 51 guilders.

The nature of the so-called "republics" of ancient India is a much-vexed question which has suffered in the past from the kind of ethno-centrism which sought desperately to find antecedents of democracy in ancient India. Although the present work is an extremely balanced, scholarly, detailed presentation of all the facts relating to the problem, and a most fair-minded evaluation of the major theories which have been imposed upon these facts, it is by its very existence a part of that ethno-centrism; for, as the work shows in spite of itself, there is remarkably little evidence that anything approaching a true republic ever existed in ancient India; their historians were interested primarily in the details of monarchy, and it is a Procrustean feat of main strength to collect the documents pertaining to non-monarchical governments and to flesh them out with hypotheses.

J. P. Sharma's book is very likely to remain the final word on the subject, if only for the thoroughness and intelligence with which he marshals and translates the relevant materials, some of which, such as the Jain *prākṛit* sources and anthropological studies of chieftainless tribes, are not usually referred to in works of this nature. He settles, at least in so far as the scanty evidence allows, the question of the "election" of the king in Vedic times: the *viś* are said to approve or choose their king, although this may be little more than ratification and certainly does not imply a true election; moreover, the *viś* almost certainly did not represent the total adult population, and the Vedic election is thus reduced at best to a kind of oligarchical advisory board. Sharma

describes and distinguishes four different kinds of aristocratic government in Vedic times, contrasting clearly for the first time the important terms *sabhā* and *samiti*. None of the Vedic forms of government is republican, but each limits considerably the powers of the leader; here again oligarchy would seem to be the Western term most closely approximating the power structure. The *gaṇas*, too, were little more than oligarchies ruled by several *rājas* instead of by one, in spite of the claims that they were "governments by discussion". In view of this evaluation, it is unfortunate that Sharma has retained the traditional, but very misleading, term "republics"; "non-monarchical governments", though clumsy, would be far more accurate.

For historians of political ideas, therefore, this book has little to offer other than a useful compendium of facts and theories; but little more could have been expected on a topic which *should* be of secondary importance. As a work of political history, however, Sharma's essay is far more original. He traces with intelligence and an impressive range of documentation the development of the *gaṇas*, presenting and supporting the interesting hypothesis of their development from the fourth or "nobles-*samiti*" type of Vedic aristocracy. A discussion of the weaknesses of *gaṇas* as described in the ancient (monarchical) texts underlies a description of the disappearance of all but the Licchavis after the death of the Buddha, though Sharma sees in the classical references to republics a survival of "republican ideas" and a possible re-emergence of the republics themselves. (These Greek references, appearing after the period upon which Sharma concentrates, are given rather inadequate attention and tend to be accepted as a more accurate description of Indian political institutions than they probably are; the Greeks were even greater ethno-centrists than the Indian historians of the beginning of this century.)

The great value of the book lies in the remarkably full picture which Sharma has been able to paint of the *gaṇas* and *sanghas* which existed at the time of the Buddha—the Vajjis, Licchavis, Videhas, Nāyas (here the Jain evidence is particularly interesting), Mallas, Sākyas, Koliyas and several smaller "republics" (Moriyas, Bulis, Bhaggas, and Kālāmas). These are discussed in great detail, with particular attention to their political organization and history, and for this alone Sharma's work is to be highly recommended to all historians of Buddhism and Jainism as well as to political historians of ancient India. The great volume of evidence makes it difficult but stimulating reading; it is well-written and precise and should long remain a most useful reference work.

WENDY DONIGER O'FLAHERTY

Percy Sykes, *History of Persia*, 3rd edition, 2 vols., (xxxix, 563 and xx, 616 pp.), London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Sir Percy Sykes' *History of Persia*, first published in 1915, was reprinted twice during the author's life-time, on the last occasion in 1930. Minor changes, including a chapter which took the story into the reign of Reza Shah, were incorporated in the later editions. It now reappears in a straightforward reissue of the third edition and the question must be asked, is it still of value?

Sykes was neither professional historian nor Orientalist. He was a British official whose career was spent in Iran. Although he knew Persian, he made no use of Persian sources in his *History*, except in translation. His own interests were in warfare and diplomacy and these topics are given prominence to the detriment of economic and social developments, although Brown's *Literary History* provides him with the material for some discussion of intellectual life. For Sykes history was a great moral lesson and his two volumes are liberally be-spattered with some curious statements which now appear doubly anachronistic. Inevitably, in so large a work, there were also many factual errors, e.g. he repeats Curzon's confusion of D'Arcy with D'Arcy Todd (ii, p. 309) while the Polish adventurer, Borowski, is translated into the Russian general, Perowski, the would-be conqueror of Khiva (ii, p. 332). None the less, for all its deficiencies, Sykes' *History* was, when it appeared, a remarkably comprehensive

achievement. Not the least of its merits was the genial sympathy for the Persian people with which it was infused throughout.

In 1969 the picture is different. One of the best parts of Sykes' *History* was his account of ancient Iran. But it is here that some of the most striking advances in knowledge have been made, through developments in archaeology, through the use of new sources, e.g. the Chaldean chronicles, and through the closer scrutiny of older sources. Since Sykes wrote there have appeared the works of Christensen on the Sasanians, of Henning on inscriptions, of Soviet scholars on the northern part of the area, to mention only a few. To take one example. In the third edition Sykes hailed Woolley's discoveries at Ur as proof of the truth of the Biblical story of the flood. Subsequent excavations at neighbouring sites, however, have shown that the Ur flood was only a local phenomenon. Most English readers, requiring a general history of ancient Iran, would now turn to the books of Olmstead, Ghirshman and Frye. The advances made in the study of the medieval period may easily be seen by comparing the relevant chapters in Sykes with Berthold Spühler's two volumes and with the Saljuq and Mongol volume of the Cambridge History of Iran. In particular, the depth of treatment of social and economic history is infinitely greater. Sykes dismissed the whole of such history during the period from the 'Abbasids to the Mongols in the following passage,

"Little can be gleaned of the history of the masses of this period, but it is reasonable to suppose that it depended almost entirely on the strength or weakness, the justice or the injustice, of the monarch and his governors. There is no doubt that, as a rule, there was terrible oppression, for this is the normal state in the East under an Asiatic Government." (ii, p. 56)

It would be difficult to have written this after reading the work of Lambton and Petrushevsky. Turning to a rather later period, Minorsky's transformation of the history of the late medieval and early modern periods, like the works of Lockhart, Savory and Bellan, is all subsequent to Sykes' book, as is the multiplicity of studies of Iranian diplomacy in the last 200 years, which have been soundly based upon the study of European archives and which were not available to Sykes. Although it, too, has its imperfections, Peter Avery's *Modern Iran* is a much more useful book for the ordinary reader for this period. Even the most valuable single section of Sykes's *History*, that which deals with World War I, when he himself played a notable role in Iran, although still useful as a source, has been superseded as a general account.

The regretful conclusion must be that students would be better advised to make a careful selection among more recent works, rather than to rely upon this book. Its reappearance, however, serves as a reproof to historians of Iran that no modern, comprehensive history yet exists.

M. E. YAPP