

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS

Olov Bertil Anderson, *A Concordance to Five Systems of Transcription for Standard Chinese*. 228 pp. Lund, Studentlitteratur, 1970.

The five systems of romanization for which this book provides a key are Wade, the author's "Simplified Wade", Gwoyeu Romatzyh, Pinyin and Yale. "Simplified Wade" is an adaptation of the Wade system, whose main features are using the letters *v*, *x*, and *z* as suffix to show the second, third and fourth tones respectively, an inserted *h* to mark aspiration, *y* for the vowels *-ih* and *-ü* (as in Gwoyeu Romatzyh) and *r* for *j*- (voiced *sh*-). On looking up a word in any one of the five sections of the book one finds the equivalent in the four other transcriptions. As beginners are often troubled and confused when they have to handle books which use more than one transcription, this concordance should prove useful.

GEORGE WEYS

Traditional Balinese Culture, Essays selected and edited by Jane Belo. New York/London, Columbia University Press, 1970. 157 sh.

Bali, known for its dance and drama, painting and sculpture, textiles and topless fashion, during the 'thirties attracted escapologists from all over the world, but also a remarkable number of artists and scholars, of whom the North Americans are represented in this book. Distances are insignificant in Bali as they were all car owners and so they stimulated one another or even co-operated. The late Jane Belo spends most of the Introduction to this book on those happy days, ending with the outbreak of the German-Polish war, and I still regret vividly that my appointment to Bali only started then and came to an abrupt end with the outbreak of the Pacific war.

The main authors whose articles are reprinted here and who are known for their books are: Jane Belo (a study of customs pertaining to twins in Bali; the Balinese temper; Balinese children's drawing; a study of a Balinese family; 119 pp.); Colin McPhee (the Balinese wayang kulit and its music; children and music in Bali; dance in Bali; 112 pp.); Gregory Bateson (an old temple and a new myth; form and function of the dance in Bali; the value system of a steady state; 50 pp.); Margaret Mead (the strolling players in the mountains of Bali; children and ritual in Bali; the arts in Bali; community drama, Bali and America; 42 pp.) and Claire Holt ("Bandit Island", a short exploration trip to Nusa Penida; form and function of the dance in Bali, with G. Bateson; 22 pp.). From Theodora M. Abel is reprinted "Free designs of limited scope as a personality index"; from Beryl de Zoete and Walter Spies' book *Dance and Drama in Bali* 30 pages are reprinted, and from a hitherto unpublished MS. by Katharine Mershon the fragment "Five great elements, pancha maha bhuta" is given.

It is evident that the attention is centred on the arts and psychology, so that this volume is complementary to the two volumes sponsored in the Netherlands, though they have anthropology in common; they are: *Bali, studies in life, thought and ritual* (Van Hoeve, The Hague, 1960) followed in 1969 by *Bali, Further Studies* (*idem*, *ibid.*)

To begin with, one cannot be too grateful that valuable studies mainly dating from the 'thirties, practically inaccessible, have come within reach again. "Easy reach" would have been too much; the price is high, too high for the imperfect care. The 36 plates are printed together and are of a quality inferior to that of the originals. A uniform system of spelling has been introduced for the benefit of the reader, who should,

however, have been warned that there are small discrepancies of spelling between the originals and the new edition. The vowels *é* and *è*, comparable to the English *u* in *but* and *a* in *van*, have unfortunately frequently been confused.

Jane Belo's opening article has led to a short article by I Wajan Bhadra in 1941, containing some additional material and some corrections, translated into English in "Bali, Further Studies" (1969). Unfortunately both must have escaped the editors.

These minor blemishes are of no importance in comparison with the new availability of these valuable papers and the picture they give of a gifted, co-operative and happy society, studied and described by a gifted, co-operative and happy set of artists and scholars.

C. HOYKAAS

On Thrones of Gold, Three Javanese Shadow Plays, edited with an introduction by James R. Brandon. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1970. £7.25.

This is a most enthusiastic book about the traditional Javanese shadow theatre, on which so little was available in English up till very recently (1967: same author, *Theatre in Southeast Asia*, Harvard Univ. Press; 1967: Clare Holt, *Art in Indonesia*, Cornell Univ. Press; 1970: H. Ulbricht, *Wayang Purwa, Shadows of the Past*, O.U.P., Kuala Lumpur/Singapore; 1970: Jeune Scott Kemball, *The Raffles Collection of wayang purwa*, The British Museum). The 400-page book consists of three presentations of one night's plays, of a hundred pages, preceded by an orientating introduction (80 pp.) and followed by appendixes (45 pp.). The responsible author and initiator of the whole book describes in his Preface at length how "the translations are the result of a group effort"; the subtitle of the whole book runs modestly: "Three Javanese Shadow Plays, edited with an introduction by J.R.B." The author claims only a few colour photographs; the numerous suggestive black-and-white ones, 133 of them, are due to Roger Long. Numerous people helped and encouraged the author in the making of this book and the result is thoroughly enjoyable. The clear aim was to make the reader share his delight in the beauty of the figures and their movements, and make him understand what the play is about and which means (material, movements, music, voice, language, light) are used. In doing so the author preferred repeating some five pages with their photographs, even twice, to the dry "for the beginning of the play, cf. pp. . . ., with the substitution of the word X by the word Y". His aim is to open the eyes, to evoke the sense of drama, for (p. 69) "No theatrical experience in the world is as hypnotically fascinating as watching the ephemeral, yet strangely super-real figures of wayang's shadow-world live, suspended in space against the screen." Knowing that an integral presentation of the performer's words and actions during a nine hours' night would be too much, he simplified and abbreviated to some extent, and even had to invent new puns for the clowns as the Javanese ones were untranslatable. The result of text and photographs is very suggestive and true to the spirit of the original.

For a scholarly book the author depends too much upon his helpers; *kayon* is a derivation of the Indonesian *kayu* and not of Arabic *hayyu*; *Kali-mahā-aṣṣadha*, the great medicine of the Goddess Kālī, has erroneously been connected with the Arabic *kalima šahādat*, words of the profession of faith. The controversial table dealing with Javanese dynastic genealogy and wayang play cycles might have been avoided. The spelling withholds the necessary support to the reader by using one kind of *e* only; Claire Holt set a good example in spelling *gendèr*. The Javanese pronounce the *o* of *lot* in open final and penultimate syllables, as can be seen in the Bibliography: Hardjowirogo, Nojo-wiro/ngko; therefore on p. 172 the exceptional spelling *Mo/ntro-kèndo* is justified. The Javanese often write an *a*, leaving undecided whether to pronounce *a* or *o*, as in Javanese script this is the presupposed vowel, unless *i*, *u*, *é* or *o* is written. The pronunciation on p. 172 therefore should be: *Krésno*, *So/mbo*, *Udowo*, etc.

Since a comparison with Japanese theatre is made, nearer to home are Jeanne Cuisinier with her book on Kélatán shadow theatre, Colin McPhee and J. Ensink with

their papers on Balinese and Javanese shadow theatre, perhaps the principal of too many items missing in the Bibliography. About Bima (Goris, Stutterheim, Bosch) and Nakula (Van Stein Callenfels) more has been written than the author is aware of; four Dutch language items are not representative enough of the contribution in this language to the knowledge of wajang kulit. But we can only be grateful to the author for the recent items of his Bibliography. He should not imagine, however, that they were only published "in recent years" (p. 34); paperbacks have, in fact, been published for half a century or more.

The author is right in considering shadow theatre as art and as entertainment, consequently as a manifestation of Javanese culture; he might have added: magic/religion, for which not only the play *Murwa Kala* is used. We would have been helped greatly if the "Note on Sources" had been extended considerably and distributed over notes on the pages of the Introduction, where "is said to have been" (p. 7) and "is thought to be" (p. 33) are unsatisfactory. Arjuna Wiwaha is not A.'s Meditation but his Marriage, "the vidusaka clown figure of Indian Sanskrit drama is" not (C.H.) "similar to the wajang clown Semar", and so more elucidation proves to be misleading.

Nevertheless, this is a thoroughly enjoyable and useful book, deserving a great number of readers and a speedily revised reprint.

C. HOYKAAS

Early Ming Wares of Ching-te-chen, by A. D. Brankston. pp. [10]+xvi. 102. Frontispiece, pls. 45+3. Hong Kong, Vetch and Lee; London, Lund Humphries, 1970. Reissued with a Biographical and Bibliographical Notice of the author, and a note on "The A. D. Brankston Collection of Chinese Porcelain in the British Museum", by Soame Jenyns (1954).

The re-issue of this small classic in the literature of Chinese ceramics will certainly please many collectors. It remains even now a landmark, for it was the first book, confined to a very short period, to have been written making use of original sources by an author able himself to read Chinese. Unfortunately, it was precisely the knowledge of the language that proved indirectly to be Brankston's handicap, inasmuch as he accepted too much of the literary tradition quite uncritically. The most serious shortcoming with regard to the use of Chinese sources is that the author fails to name the editions he used and he gives no references to the *chüan* or pages. This defect is most noticeable in his quotation from the *Fou-liang Hsien chih* on page 56. W. B. Honey in *The Ceramic Art of China* (p. 11, n. 5) drew attention to a fault stemming from this. He writes "Brankston's book is not free from *ipse dixit* in the manner of old Chinese books on pottery and he seems to have been at times deceived". This is a harsh truth, and a grave fault in one beginning to climb the ladder of scholarship, but one which had he lived would certainly have been overcome. His equipment in this field was good, but at this time too untried, and his easy acceptance of Chinese sources, both verbal and literary, led him into some unfortunate traps, so that some of his *dicta* became rather firmly established and are only now beginning to be set aside. The assumption he made on the subject of Yung-lo wares, for instance, cannot be sustained by any real evidence. On *t'o-t'ai*, "bodiless" wares he was walking on very thin ice, which over the last thirty years has shown every indication of melting away altogether. Even a cursory glance at the drawings of the *an-hua* decorations that are included in the text demonstrate the lateness of pieces of this type, which seem very unlikely to ante-date the K'ang-hsi period, and many examples are later still. On the subject of techniques, it is well known that the Chinese indulged in some strange practices, but to assume because in 1937 the base inside the foot-ring was not cut out until after glazing that the same practice was followed in the Yung-lo period, on the implied ground that the potters were conservative, it to argue without evidence. Similarly the modern use of slip coating of the body before painting in blue does not mean that this was done in the Ming period. Indeed, examination of the wares of Ming makes it clear that it was not, and, as a relatively rare practice, it seems only to have been introduced in the K'ang-hsi period.

When the Ch'eng-hua material comes under review, however, Brankston is on very firm ground and this section is particularly helpful, remaining as convincing now as it was when first written. His discussion of Ch'ing copies of Ch'eng-hua is especially illuminating with its comments on the marks and the quality of the body. The only point upon which one must disagree is with his statement that Ch'eng-hua blue and white was often covered with "more than one thick glaze". This seems to be dealer's talk, and so far as we know only the one layer was applied. The chapter on "Ceramic Alchemy" includes some useful information in a simple form for the uninitiated, but it should be noted that the firing temperatures given are somewhat in excess of normal practice, even using modern kilns; a more realistic range is between 1,275 degrees and 1,350 degrees centigrade, the higher level only being attained with any consistency in the eighteenth century.

In re-issuing this valuable little study, the publishers have included, as an introduction, a short paper on the author and his collection by Soame Jenyns. This paper is basically a tribute to Brankston who for so short a time was such a promising recruit to the Department of Oriental Antiquities in the British Museum.

MARGARET MEDLEY

The Novel in India, its Birth and Development, edited and with an introduction by T. W. Clark. 239 pp. London, George Allen and Unwin, 1970. £3.

Readers drawn to this book on the evidence of the short title "Novel in India" printed on the spine may be disappointed, since it does not offer a comprehensive picture of the development of the novel in the languages of South Asia. The contributors to this book are not for the most part concerned with the work of the major Indian novelists, but rather with a careful examination of the earliest examples of vernacular prose fiction during the last century, and the sources from which these sprang. These were primarily English novels, to which an increasingly wide public was introduced by the spread of Western education in India.

Most of the contributions to the book were first delivered as papers at a Seminar on Asian Literature held at the School of Oriental and African Studies in 1960. T. W. Clark deals with the development of Bengali prose fiction from its origins in the efforts of William Carey at Fort William College down through the developments of the early nineteenth century to the novels of Bankimchandra Chatterji. I. M. P. Raeside and R. S. McGregor cover the similar, though rather later, developments in Marathi and Hindi respectively. Both articles are most scholarly investigations of the often primitive stories, novels and translations or adaptations which preceded the appearance of works of serious literary importance in these languages.

R. Russell's study of nineteenth-century Urdu prose fiction necessarily follows a somewhat different pattern, since the distinctive Muslim heritage of Persian prose writing provided an indigenous model not available for the other languages, whose literary traditions were confined more or less exclusively to poetry and whose prose writers drew overwhelmingly upon English sources. Russell also allows himself to discuss a work of major literary importance, Rusva's fictionalized autobiography of a Lucknow courtesan, *Umrāo Jān Adā* (1899), an indulgence for which readers of the book will be grateful. R. E. Asher, in his study of the principal early Tamil novelists, also discusses and gives excerpts from books which, we are assured, are still read for pleasure. Asher also contributes the final article, of rather different scope from the others, which deals with three modern novelists writing in Malayalam; here too we are introduced to works of great literary interest, including V. M. Basheer's splendidly named "*Nruppuppākkorānēṭṭarmu!*" (*Me Grandad 'ad an Elephant!*), whose promised translation is eagerly to be awaited.

The short introduction by T. W. Clark provides a brief but clear summary of some of the principal factors involved in the development of prose fiction in the languages covered in the book. In this connexion, the importance of the novels of the obscure

G. W. M. Reynolds, then highly popular in India and widely translated and imitated in many languages, is noteworthy.

It is, however, perhaps inevitable that a pioneering book of this kind should not provide a comprehensive picture of the Indian novel itself, even in its earlier stages of evolution. In the minds of most of the contributors there seems to be present the assumption that nineteenth-century prose fiction in India should conform to, or at least be judged by, the standards applied to the contemporary realist novel in Europe. The very different social conditions in which Indian prose writers worked (and still work today) make this equation with Western standards questionable. Most of the articles in the book, for instance, contain extracts from fictional works which have been translated to demonstrate the continuing hold of traditional poetic models in passages of description, and the authors' failure to grasp the techniques of European realism. When even today poetry is more highly regarded as a medium of artistic expression than prose fiction, at least in the languages of the West Pakistan and north-west India, it is perhaps unreasonable to decry prose writing for its dependence on traditional poetic models, since these have a continuing importance long since vanished in most of Europe. There is an interesting contrast here with the situation in Kerala, the state with the most highly educated population in India, where, according to Asher, "it is merely to state the obvious that the most cultivated field in contemporary letters in Malayalam is that of prose fiction" (p. 208).

So far as the themes of the novels themselves are concerned, Clark rightly draws attention in his introduction to the increasing use of subjects drawn from the heroic Hindu or Muslim past in novels of the 1860's onwards. The connexion between the predilection for such themes and contemporary political developments is clearly an important one. A more enduring feature of the Indian novel, to which greater emphasis might have been given, is the fondness for autobiographic themes, noted for Tamil by Asher. One might also compare *Umrāo Jān Addā*, perhaps the best novel in Urdu. The prevalence of such themes in Indian novels written in English has been noted by Mrs. Derrett in her study of the genre, and it can hardly fail to strike the Western reader of any Indian language's modern novels and short stories. Whatever the reasons for this concentration on the first person, it does go far to explain the weaknesses in delineation of subsidiary characters frequently deplored in this book.

It would, however, be unfair to expect a complete comparative picture from the first English book of this kind, which undoubtedly represents an important addition to our understanding of modern Indian literature. The book is well produced, and its value as a work of reference enhanced by a comprehensive index.

C. SHACKLE

Glen Dudbridge, *The Hsi-yu Chi: A Study of the Antecedents to the Sixteenth-century Chinese Novel*, 219 pp. Cambridge, University Press, 1970.

For all the efforts that have been made since Lu Hsün's *Chung-kuo hsiao-shuo shih-lüeh* appeared in 1923, modern studies of the circumstances in which the major traditional Chinese novels came to be written are still in their infancy. The long passage of time and the disregard in which the orthodox-minded Confucian scholar held vernacular literature have rendered the task of such studies a formidable one. There seems often to be a vicious circle in which the particular can only be explained by the general, which in turn can only be elucidated by the particular. The weight of modern writings has been on the minutiae or very limited facets of the novels and there is an undue paucity of reliable general treatises to balance and purify our knowledge of the particular. Dr. Dudbridge's careful but wide-ranging study of the *Hsi-yu-chi* is thus a welcome addition, providing a lucid and healthily sceptical examination of the heterogeneous source material and a useful synthesis of the modern Chinese, Japanese and Western scholarship with his own valuable discoveries and conclusions.

Although it is easy for the modern writer, particularly the Western writer, sometimes to overestimate the amount of distance between the literary and the popular in

ancient China, this book seems well-advised in its distrust of the over-obvious conclusions others have drawn from the writings of ancient literary men on a topic intimately connected with the unlettered or meagrely lettered strata of ancient Chinese society. It attempts to get beyond the surface of the literary records and to reach the world of unwritten traditions and folklore. Judgement of probability is here guided and defined by comparisons with modern and more accessible data on the storyteller's mentality and creative approach, and in thus putting the problems in their wider context this work provides a safer basis for future studies on the subject.

Apart from the Buddhist pilgrim Hsüan-tsang's (d. A.D. 664) own account of his famous pilgrimage to India, there are three near-contemporary biographies of him. The earliest known developments made by legend and popular creation upon these historical or quasi-historical accounts show few points of solid contact with them. These early developments are, moreover, attested to by only the meagrest source material. After presenting the frail and sparse evidence available for the formation of an early "Tripitaka cycle", this book opens its main discussion with the first solid material on the cycle: the two texts found in Japan, collectively dubbed the *Kōzanji* version and considered to have been composed in the thirteenth century. Poems by Liu K'o-chang (1187-1289) and also carved relief figures found on two pagodas built c. 1228-37 and 1238-50, respectively, in the ancient port of Zayton are mentioned as contributory evidence. Next, fragments of a fourteenth or fifteenth-century (?) *Hsi-yu chi* preserved in the Ming encyclopaedia the *Yung-lo ta-tien* (compiled 1403-8) are examined. The popular manual of colloquial Chinese current in ancient Korea and known as *Pak t'ongsa onhae*, possibly deriving from the fifteenth or even fourteenth century, contains other fragments of a story in the *Hsi-yu chi* tradition. Various early dramas from the Yuan (or possibly even the Kin) to the Ming were on *Hsi-yu chi* themes. All these supposedly pre-"Wu Ch'eng-en" works, together with a number of others such as the verse-composition *Hsiao-shih Chen-k'ung pao-chüan*, the ballad narrative *Shuo-ch'ang Hsi-yu chi* and a Japanese manuscript *Hsi-yu chi*, claimed by others to precede or have contemporaneity in part or whole with "Wu Ch'eng-en's" novel, are submitted to chronological and other assessments. Chapter 7 serves to provide some general conclusions on all this source material.

Subsequent chapters deal with the central figure of the novel, the monkey Sun Wu-k'ung, and compare him with the monkeys in other traditions: The White Ape of the T'ang story *Pai-yuan chuan*, the monkeys in the various *tsa-chü* plays of the Yuan or Ming, and the monkey-god Wu-chih-ch'i of a local legend from Kuei-shan on the River Huai. In each case it is concluded that these parallel legends do not seem to lead to the origins of Sun Wu-k'ung. The final chapter discusses some other, more abstract and far-reaching theories on his origins and entry into the *Hsi-yu-chi* story. Comparisons made with monkey progress through incarnations in early Buddhist literature, local monkey cults in Fukien and the fascinating parallel of the monkey Hanumat of the Indian epic *Rāmāyana* (? fourth-third centuries B.C.) all yield largely negative conclusions, but are more akin in spirit to the comparative folklore approach which the author suggests as the most promising for future research. The concluding paragraph conditionally proposes that Sun Wu-k'ung may in origin have been a "personification" of a facet of Hsüan-tsang's own character.

A large amount of difficult material is thus dexterously combined. Elaborate annotations and precise reference indications will further commend this book to those desirous of taking up where it leaves off.

W. DOLBY

The Chinese World Order: Traditional China's Foreign Relations, edited by John King Fairbank. xiii+416 pp. Notes, Bibliographies, Glossary, Index, Maps. Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard University Press, 1968. £4.75.

This volume, dedicated to Professor Yang Lien-sheng, was largely the result of

three conferences held between 1963 and 1965. The fourteen papers by thirteen contributors (Professor Fairbank contributes two) from various fields of historical scholarship and national background reflect the complexity of this important problem which, as the editor points out, "has some indeterminate relevance to the world's China problem of today". The emphasis is undoubtedly on the Ch'ing period although considerable attention is also paid to the evolution of the Chinese world order from Chou to Ming. The geographical spread ranges from the faithful Koreans to the defiant Muslim Turmurids and the Protestant Dutch. An impression of disparateness is, however, avoided by a genuine and, to a large extent, successful attempt to arrive at some agreement over definitions of terms without, at the same time, detracting the rich methodologies and interpretations therefrom.

The editor opens with a preliminary framework consisting of fifteen assumptions and a useful tabulation of the aims and means in China's foreign relations. The discrepancy between myth and reality is revealed by Professor Yang Lien-sheng, who also examines several key terms (or concepts) that had become part of the tradition in handling foreign relations. Professor Wang Gungwu's contribution, interpretive yet careful, examines the growth of Chinese superiority from Ch'in and Han to Ming as reflected in the dynastic histories, and the effect of the Mongol dynasty on the policy of the early Ming emperors towards Southeast Asia. Professor Mark Mancall's interpretative essay on the Ch'ing tribute system is then followed by four studies on tributary relations within the Sinic zone under the Ch'ing: Professor Hae-jong Chun on Korea; Professor Robert K. Sakai on Satsuma-Ryukyu relations; Professor Ta-tuan Ch'en on Liu-ch'iu; and Dr. Truong Buu Lam on Vietnam. The next three papers deal with the Inner Asian zone: the Hsiung-nu during the Han and Tibet during the Ch'ing by Professor Chusei Suzuki; Manchu-Mongolian relations mainly before 1644 by Professor David M. Farquhar; and Islamic Central Asia during the Ming and the Ch'ing periods by Professor Joseph F. Fletcher. Sino-Western relations are the subject of study by Professor John E. Wills (the Dutch in early Ch'ing) and Professor Fairbank (the treaty system in the middle decades of the nineteenth century). The volume concludes with the reflections of Professor Benjamin I. Schwartz from the viewpoint of an historian of thought.

Professor Schwartz's reflections, in fact, are provocative. He suggests that what really is involved is not the existence of a Chinese world order as an "objective" fact, but their perception of it. The perception persisted by virtue of the strength of its inner cosmological foundations and the absence of any universal state that could challenge China in cultural terms. However, the Sinocentric world order did have a reality to a limited extent. Schwartz does admit that Korea accepted the Chinese world view, and one may also add the Liu-ch'iu islands as a poor second. For example, the King of Liu-ch'iu, despite Japanese domination, insisted on the performance of his investiture in its full form and glory at Naha even when circumstances recommended its performance at Foochow by proxy (Ch'en's paper). The fact that Java, Vietnam, and Siam adapted the Chinese world view to their advantage when dealing with lesser neighbouring states (Wang and Mancall's papers) may or may not have any significance here. Indeed, we know little of the ideological reactions of other peoples to Chinese claims (no doubt reflective of our neglect in the scholarship of these areas).

The vast gap between theory and reality necessitated the use of a number of approaches from coercion, the *chi-mi* 羁縻 ("loose rein") policy, bureaucratic control, to the policy of limiting foreigners to border areas, all could be rationalized within the framework of the Chinese world view (Yang, Wang, and Wills' papers). (The argument that the barbarians had a "different mind" never seemed to have been fully integrated into the theory of human nature—a loophole in the inclusive world view?) Thus there developed a tradition of Chinese diplomacy over two thousand years of history, which, Fairbank suggests, accounts for the early treaty system being largely a Chinese creation in terms of their own tradition.

Implicit in this volume is the barbarian contribution to the shaping of Chinese diplomatic tradition and, to a smaller degree, the Chinese world view. Wang Gungwu, for example, shows how reflections on the Mongol conquest led to the "rediscovery" of

the old winning combination: "a hard core of *wei* 威 [force] and a soft pulp of *te* 德 [virtue]". Equality in Sino-foreign relations proved more difficult to accommodate and presents analytical problems. Suzuki maintains that Chinese relations with the northern peoples depended on their relative strength, and "incomplete conquest" of the Hsiung-nu in early Han and the Tibetans in early Ch'ing led to the development of fraternal relationships. Sung relations with Chin and Liao can also be regarded in this light (although they can be viewed as incomplete conquest by the dynasties of conquest). On the other hand, Fletcher's study shows that fraternal relations could also arise when China was strong: the Yung-lo and the Ch'ien-lung emperors, the one a full-blooded Chinese and the other a fully Sinicized Manchu, dealt with the Timurids and the Tibetans on equal terms. The only difference seems to have been that both emperors maintained a façade of Chinese superiority within the administrative boundaries of the empire. Moreover, the *hukhsu-dānapati* (priest-patron) relationship between the Tibetans and the Ch'ing emperors was not necessarily one of real equality as the experience of the Northern Dynasties and the Sui shows. After all, such a relationship was basically a religious one, and the Tibetans (and to a lesser extent, the Manchus) did draw a distinction between the religious and the secular (a point reinforced by Farquhar), and it must not be forgotten that, under the Manchus, Sino-Tibetan relations were handled by the Li-fan yuan, an integral organ of the tribute system. Indeed, the religious outlook of the various peoples involved seems to have had an important effect on China's external relations (Mancall's examination of Sino-Siamese relations also comes to mind) and deserves further investigation.

The link between trade and tribute is generally recognized. As Mancall points out, even tribute itself was commercially profitable. Indeed, in many cases, trade was the sole rationale for tribute, the ceremonial aspects of which were often ridiculed (Suzuki's paper). Korea seems to have been the only country which suffered financial loss, even in the purely commercial aspect of tributary relations. This is illustrated by Chun's meticulous calculations of the costs of tribute exchanges. But he does not explain why the Koreans wished to send tribute three times a year instead of once every three years as the Chinese desired in early Ming times, assuming that the cost to each party remained proportionally the same during the Ming and the Ch'ing periods as the author seems to do (p. 90 and n. 3, p. 302).

The volume under review considerably enlarges our present repertoire of defined historical terms. However, there are still areas of ambiguity, particularly regarding the division of the Chinese world order into zones. In the first place, zonal division can begin within China itself as indicated by the terms *chung-kuo* 中國, when meaning the central states, and *chung-wai* 中外 (not discussed), referring to the capital area or the court and the country at large. *Chung-kuo*, of course, also has the meaning of the Middle Kingdom, and its usage can be traced back to the *Shu-ching* (the *Book of History*) and the *Ta-hsüeh* (the *Great Learning*) (and therefore pre-Han?). However, this term entails less ambiguity as the latter meaning became dominant from Han onwards. But the term *chung-wai* is more problematical for it has the additional meaning of China and the foreign countries (first used in this sense in the *Shih-chih*). Both meanings remained current until the end of the Ch'ing dynasty, thence the second meaning came to be used exclusively. Secondly, beyond the Chinese boundaries, the problem becomes complicated mainly due to the fact that the various means of zonal division do not correspond with each other. Fairbank's division of the Chinese world order into Sinic, Inner Asian, and Outer zones is useful, but one author misleadingly speaks of it in terms of concentricity (a slip of the pen?) But how does one relate the five or nine zones and the Inner (China) and Outer (barbarians) divisions to this schema? Furthermore, the category of *pu-cheng chih kuo* 不征之國 ranges from Korea to Java and Srivijaya, defying zonal "boundaries". In any case, the Chinese invaded one and threatened to do so to another. Finally, zonal division generally implies preferential treatment on the part of the Chinese, but the "Sinic" Japanese were penalized, whereas the Inner Asian Timurids were not, for their intransigence.

The often asked question of whether Mao or the People's Republic would return to the traditional world view is tackled mainly by Schwartz. Wang Gungwu has earlier

argued that the Chinese are adaptable enough not to do so. Schwartz further adds that from the 1890's, nationalism has rapidly replaced universalism as the foundation of the Chinese perception of world order. However much the Chinese struggle for world leadership, they can only go for leadership in a multistate system.

Taken as a whole, this volume represents a significant contribution to our understanding of the traditional Chinese world order and puts the present Chinese world view into perspective. A topical review such as this one inevitably does injustice to the fourteen very fine papers. Generous bibliographies are also provided by Farquhar, Fletcher, and Wills, although the reader would appreciate a map to go with Wang's essay.

DAVID PONG
University of Delaware

Faiz Ahmed Faiz, *Poems by Faiz*, translated with an introduction and notes by V. G. Kiernan, 288 pp. London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1971. £3.75.

Western interpreters of Urdu literature are a small and select band, among whom Professor Kiernan occupies an unusual place in view of his labours in very different fields. Professor Kiernan is well known as an able expositor of European diplomatic history; and as a witty and formidable analyst of Anglo-Chinese relations in the late nineteenth century as well as of the *folies de grandeur* of that high noon of imperialist expansion. However, Urdu poetry is an old love of his. The verse translations offered here were begun in Kashmir in 1945 beside the beautiful Wular Lake and were first printed in Delhi in 1958. Both the original poems and their translations have been revised in subsequent years, and we now have them in this handsome English edition, the Urdu originals in a good modern Pakistani *nasta'liq* hand, facing – in descending order – poetic translation, literal translation and romanized transliteration. The long introduction is a competent and sympathetic exposition of the intellectual environment of this modern Pakistani poet.

Fayz Ahmad Fayz (b. 1911) is certainly among the most important and widely recognized of poets writing in Urdu on the Indian subcontinent today, though critics may differ on his exact rating *vis-à-vis* his contemporaries. He has been an influential innovator in Urdu prosody, favouring a relaxation of the tight medieval forms of verse which have restrained and disciplined the traditional versifier. As Professor Kiernan points out, his roots are firmly in the earlier and more formal poetic tradition. His metrical departures from it seem very carefully judged, the structural irregularities of his verse being a most effective device for abruptly attracting the attention of a hearer or reader who can only too often be lulled and stupified by the predictable cadences and recurring rimes of the enormous and still growing corpus of traditional Urdu verse.

Fayz's thematic range is a narrow one. He is a poet of vanished dreams and images of happiness which were not substantial when first apprehended and appear to have become yet more phantasmal in recollection. His verse is a haunted, ruinous landscape of suffering, pain and deprivation: not directly experienced by the poet, but perceived by him as experienced by others, by the friend and companion to whom a celebrated poem is addressed, a personification of the unprotected and underprivileged masses of his country, to whom the poet addresses a vague but stirring message of revolutionary good tidings. Fayz is author of some well structured and very beautiful poems: as well as of some in which the strength of shared political convictions blind both poet and translator to ordinary aesthetic considerations and bring them perilously close to tub-thumping.

The verse translations are usually competent and sensitive and reflect an enduring understanding and personal friendship between the poet and his translator. Fayz's verse is too much a diaphanous web of dust and dreams for the renderings to stand as memorable English poems, comparable to the same translator's versions of Iqbal: but then Iqbal's was a more dynamic and weightier, though not necessarily a more sympathetic talent. Fayz's *œuvre*, at first sight thin and pale beside the great heritage

of traditional Indo-Muslim culture from which it springs, is an apt symbol of the civilized life of West Pakistan today. Its modernity and its aspirations survive our initial deprecatory comparison with a formidable past and induce an unexpected sympathy with the present.

This is a handsomely produced book, designed – according to the introduction – “to assist Western students of the language, who are beginning to be rather less few than they used to be”, as well as “some East Pakistanis and Indians desirous of acquainting themselves with the Urdu literature of West Pakistan”. One may doubt the wisdom of the overvocalized though handsome *nasta'liq* transcription, which may hinder rather than help the reading of a fairly proficient student of Urdu. The vocalizations and the frequent and distracting employment of *sukūn* are supererogatory when there is a facing romanization, even though this on occasion does not correspond with the *nasta'liq* spellings! If the romanizations and the word-for-word translations had been printed in a smaller type face this book would have been less prodigal of paper and could perhaps have been offered to the student at a more tempting price than £3.75; but these are minor criticisms of a welcome and attractive volume.

SIMON DIGBY

Peking Opera, by Elizabeth Halson, pp. 92. Oxford University Press, 1966. HK \$20.00.

This book is meant to be “A Short Guide” and so is suitable for readers who require an “instant” explanation of the Peking Opera. It includes a short and much simplified history of Chinese drama. It describes the rigours of training for the actors and explains the roles in Peking Opera, illustrates and describes stage costumes, make-up, properties and musical instruments used. Coloured basic designs of the “painted faces” (rather than wearing masks) for specific roles on the Chinese stage are given and the dramatic gestures and posturings, which are a highly stylized type of symbolic representation, are listed and explained, to help the uninitiated to understand their significance, as the author says. The book ends with the *résumés* of plots of the most popular and the most frequently performed pieces, which will enable readers of this book to enjoy the Peking Opera like a well-guided tour.

K. P. K. WHITAKER

Zdeňka Heřmanová-Novotná, *Affix-like Word-formation Patterns in Modern Chinese*. Dissertationes Orientales, Vol. 21. Prague, Oriental Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, 1969.

The subject matter of Heřmanová-Novotná's monograph is the type of word-formative patterning characterized by the occurrence of newly constituted affixes (or “affix-like formatives” as Heřmanová-Novotná prefers to call them) which has become the most widely applied device for coining technical terms of any kind in Modern Standard Chinese. In a sense, this is a successfully developed tool for rendering in Chinese the equivalents of items constructed in European languages of a mixture of Greek, Latin, and native elements, which are beginning to permeate its vocabulary to the same alarming degree their models have reached in the West.

Roughly speaking, the device works in the following manner. First comes a new word constructed of two or more roots, such as, say, *zuòjiā* “writer” (作 *zuò* “to write creatively”, and 家 *jiā* “an expert, adherent of a school of thought”), which may be put forward through any of the complex network of channels within which language fashion operates, usually as a proposed equivalent of a word existing in one of the Western languages. If this word catches on, it may happen that another or many others are subsequently coined by analogy (the analogy being physically expressed by the pattern X家 *Xjiā* in the present case: 畫家 *huàjiā* “painter”, 科學家 *kēxuéjiā*

"scientist", 外交家 *wàijiāojiā* "diplomat", etc.), and when this happens, an instance of the word-formative process discussed in the work under review is triggered off. Apart from further increase in numbers, the main formal aspect of the process is the shift of stress away from the syllable shared by the words in question. Since this is in most cases the last syllable, and since an unstressed syllable preceded by a stressed syllable has a tendency in Modern Standard Chinese towards some loss of its tonal features, which, together with small changes in segmental characteristics, is usually referred to by the somewhat vague term "atonicity", the shared syllable gradually becomes "atonic". At the same time, its meaning becomes abraded, more general, and often modified: X家 *Xjiā* means something like "a person who is good at X and treats it as a profession" (cf. the play of words in Lu Hsün's story 風波 *Fēngbō* "Storm in a Teacup" where an old shrewish lady is described as 不平家 *bùpíngjiā* "complainerist"; the story was written in 1920 when this particular application of the device was still a self-conscious novelty). When this continues for some time, the shared syllable acquires a permanently reduced segmental shape with no distinct tonal features, and it also partly or even completely loses its original meaning (e.g. 父子 *Fǎzǐ* which now means little more than "this word is a noun").

This process has presumably always been in operation in Chinese, but under the impact of Western civilization during the last century it has been applied more recently on an unprecedented scale and out of all proportion to the rest of the lexical system. One thus finds in the language a great number of new words clearly coined in the way outlined above which have not yet reached the final stage. They constitute a set which is distinct not only from words coined otherwise, but also those coined by the same process before the Western impact which have now reached the last stage.

Although Chinese is a rather extreme case, it has to be remembered that the process is by no means peculiar to it: in one way or another, it appears to have been universally applied in all languages which were forced to receive the expansion of Western culture and technology. However, mainly by virtue of its morphemic writing system, Chinese has the unique advantage of retaining a well-documented record of the process. While the script reflects accurately the beginning of the process as well as the underlying etymology, comparison with present-day speech makes it possible to observe how and to what degree subsequent developments took place. In view of this, Novotná-Heřmanová's study could prove of great value for the understanding of word-formative processes in general, apart from being a survey of the application of one of them in Chinese.

It is thus rather disappointing that her treatment of the issue leaves a great deal to be desired. To some extent, her failure to provide an adequate description is due to her choice of the respective conceptual framework. To an historically transitional phenomenon within the limits of which it is clearly impossible to make static cuts and still hope to gain over-all insights, she applied the most rigid variety of the synchronous grid available on the market. This forced her to measure the countless different shades of her material's grey against a strictly black-and-white gauge, and the result is a collection of largely arbitrary decisions delimiting the position of the imaginary either-or lines. A typical expression of this is the very name she chose for the shared components of the described expressions: her half-hearted term "affix-like formatives" reflects the unnecessary dilemma of having to label something which happens to be in the process of motion from root to affix either as one or the other. One does not, of course, solve a problem by giving it a name, and the problem arising from the application of unsuitable concepts remains unsolved in every aspect of the monograph, despite an unusually large amount of name-giving.

Another, perhaps even more serious shortcoming of the work is the lack of any formal criteria in the selection and classification of the items under discussion. Such characteristics as the "delexicalized meaning" or "partial neutralization of the tone" (listed among the set of six features the majority of which "all affix-like constituents possess", see pp. 8-9) are postulated rather than proven, and it is not stated anywhere in the book how and from where the material described in it was obtained. One is left wondering why the particular words were chosen for description, while other possible

candidates were not included (for a rich source of the latter see, for example, 張潤如 *Zhāng Xúnrú*, 北京話輕聲詞彙 *Běijīnghuà qīngshēng cíhuì* "A list of words in Peking Dialect containing atonic syllables", Peking 1957), but it is impossible for the reader to do more than guess, since Novotná-Heřmanová's criteria of recurrence and productivity (see p. 9) are applied to this material of unmentioned origin and scope. I find it difficult not to guess that the described set of words actually represents a collection from heterogeneous sources of the Chinese equivalents of a preconceived group of terminological concepts.

Especially painful is the absence of any statement in the work on the feature of stress shift which is unquestionably of key importance for a study of this kind. The relatively few descriptive notes on the stress and tone properties of the shared syllables reflect the same degree of arbitrary impressionistic name-giving displayed in other parts of the discussion: none of Heřmanová-Novotná's labels relating to prosodic features (e.g. in the tables on pp. 121-3 and 139) is based explicitly on any phonetic properties, and their distribution seems to have been governed entirely by subjective judgement. In this respect, Heřmanová-Novotná shows a rather puzzling lack of communication with at least two major advances made recently (but not all that recently) in the relevant area of research, namely the listing and analysis of expressions characterized by atonicity carried out in Mainland China (see, for example, the list by Zhāng Xúnrú mentioned above), and O. Švarný's pioneering Prague work on atonic syllables (see O. Švarný and Guan Mingzhe, "Zum Problem der Differenzierung der unbetonten Silben im Peking-Dialekt", *Archiv Orientální*, 34, pp. 165-211). It is quite startling, for instance, to find that for as many as ten of her thirteen unambiguously "full tone suffix-like formatives" (pp. 121-3), Zhāng Xúnrú gives examples of words in which they are, in his opinion, atonic. A more general lack of communication is reflected in Heřmanová-Novotná's bibliography which, with its thirteen titles, must be among the briefest of its kind.

Despite these basic faults, Heřmanová-Novotná's monograph will undoubtedly be found useful as an extensive list of selected technical terms characterized by the occurrence of shared syllables. It gives about 1,500 words of this kind in unsimplified characters, with careful *Pinyin* transcription (without tone diacritics), translated into English. The classificatory part of the book, however questionable the principles on which it is built, contains a great number of interesting observations, such as the description of the syntactical properties of the words in question. It is a pity that Heřmanová-Novotná's meticulous and sensitive handling of details was not matched by greater conceptual skill and imagination in the over-all approach to an undoubtedly fascinating subject, and that her arbitrary attitude to language evidence made the theoretical aspect of her work appear, on the whole, quite unconvincing.

PAUL KRATOCHVIL

The Poetry of T'ao Ch'ien, translated with Commentary and Annotation by James Robert Hightower, ix + 279 pp. Oxford University Press, 1970. £4 net.

The Sung poet Mei Yao-ch'ien (1002-60) once remarked that there were only two Chinese poets worth reading: T'ao Ch'ien and Tu Fu. Mei's statement is one which very few of us would be prepared to accept without modification. Wen Yi-to (1899-1946) disagreed with it so vehemently that he once remarked that T'ao was a very inferior poet, whose poetry "though prettier than jewels is always equally useless". Nevertheless, there can be no denying that whatever one's personal predilections, T'ao must be ranked among the very greatest poets China has produced. His position is reflected in the comparatively large number of translations of his verse. In Japan, Tō Emmei (T'ao Yüan-ming) has ranked with Po Chü-yi in popularity. In the West, far more renderings have been made of T'ao than any other Chinese poet. There are complete translations into English and German and partial translations into English, French, Russian, and Czech. By far the best of these until recently was the long and masterly study of

T'ao's life and works by the Russian sinologist L. Eidlin, *Tao Yuan'-min i ego stikhotvoreniia* [T'ao Yuan-ming and his Poems], Moscow, 1967. Eidlin, who is the doyen of Russian historians of Chinese literature, has translated seventy-eight of the poems, providing each of them with a lengthy commentary and prefacing them with a brilliant introduction of some hundred and fifty pages to T'ao's life and his place in literary history. Until the appearance of the present volume, this work (which seems to have escaped Professor Hightower's attention) was far and away the best study of T'ao available in any Western language. However, it suffers from two disadvantages. Firstly, it is written in a language unfamiliar to most sinologists; secondly, it provides us with translations of only about two-thirds of T'ao's poems. What was needed was a scholarly translation into English of T'ao's entire poetic works.

The appearance of Professor Hightower's volume has at last resolved this difficulty. Here, for the first time, the reader has access to a translation which not only fulfils the highest scholarly standards but is also eminently readable. Academic construes are not always fortunate. Many of them tempt one to wonder why, if the translator thought the original was as bad as he has made it sound, he ever bothered to translate it. This could never be said of Professor Hightower, whose feeling for the literary qualities of a text is profound and well-matched by his ability to render it into English of great strength and delicacy. His translations, with their lengthy and meticulous annotations, mark a very great advance on all previous Western versions and on most Japanese renderings too. I was particularly impressed by the masterly way in which he has handled the daunting accumulation of editions, *nien p'u*, commentaries and comments which confront the translator of T'ao's verse without either oversimplifying the often very complex issues involved or yet falling into the opposite error of obscuring the poem with irrelevant detail. One can only applaud his decision to reduce consideration of historical and biographical problems to the minimum necessary for the understanding of the text. To have attempted to include everything would have left us with a work of interest to only a handful of specialists. He has earned our gratitude by knowing, like T'ao himself, "when it would be good to stop".

Occasionally, however, one would have wished for a rather fuller discussion, especially of the more difficult poems. "An Account of Wine", for example, is not only T'ao's most difficult poem but also one of the most notoriously puzzling poems in Chinese, ying for this dubious distinction with the enigmatic poems of Li Ho and Li Shang-yin. As Huang T'ing-chien remarked despairingly: "This poem seems to have been written by someone who had been reading odd books. Much of it is unintelligible." Professor Hightower's translation provides the most lucid rendering I have so far come across in any language, which is in itself no mean feat. Yet even now I feel the poem will not quite make sense, simply because the commentators have not gone far enough or been bold enough in their analysis. I should have liked to see the translator launch out on his own here and give us his personal interpretation of what the poem is about.

In "Returning to My Former Residence" we are confronted with a poem which, as Professor Hightower rightly remarks, "has prompted more dispute than, perhaps, any other in T'ao's collection . . . about its chronology". One possible solution which occurred to me (and which I note has also been suggested by Professor A. R. Davis), would be to take the term *shang-ching* not as a place name but simply as meaning "to go to the capital". This rendering would bring in its wake some modifications in our present version of T'ao's biography, and should be adopted.

The only shortcoming I could find in the book was its lack of an index. I hope the editor of the series in which it appears, Professor David Hawkes, will insist on an index in each of his forthcoming volumes, as this greatly enhances the usefulness of the work.

Roland Barthes has observed that no final verdict is ever available on any great work of art. There is a continual need to reappraise, to ask ourselves not "What does this work mean?", but "What does this work mean to us today?" A good translation provides precisely such a reappraisal. Professor Hightower's versions, which combine painstaking scholarship with an enviable command of the resources of the English language, have at last made T'ao's verse truly meaningful to us. This is, in short, a

treasure of a book, which will hold its place along with Eidlin's volume as a standard work on the subject for decades to come.

J. D. FRODSHAM

The Hikayat Abdullah, by ABDULLAH BIN ABDUL KADIR, translated by A. H. HILL, 353 pp. (Oxford in Asia Historical Reprints), Oxford University Press, London, 1970. £7.25.

Abdullah was a cosmopolitan, of mixed Arab, Tamil, and Malay descent, born in Malacca in 1797; his book tells the story of his life in Malacca and Singapore up to 1842. As a youth he was employed by Raffles on literary and clerical work, and became a language teacher and translator, employed by several of the English administrators and western missionaries of the time. His background is reflected in his writings, which are acute and full of eager curiosity, anglophile, and largely critical of traditional Malay attitudes. He was moreover an innovator of considerable achievement, adopting a more colloquial style than had been customary in earlier Malay writing, and the genre of personal narrative which was without antecedents in the language. Abdullah had no immediate literary successors either, but was preparing the way for modern Malay and Indonesian writing.

Abdullah's autobiography was first published in Singapore in 1849. A partial English translation was brought out by J. T. Thomson in 1874, another by W. G. Shellabear in 1918, and Hill's version in the *Journal of the Malayan Branch, Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 28, Part 3, 1955. Hill aimed at and succeeded in producing a definitive translation, with an introduction and extensive historical and bibliographical notes. He had first intended to "render the text fairly freely into modern English", but considerations of space and the needs of Malayan students persuaded him to adopt a more literal style of translation. Abdullah's experimentation with Malay writing was not always felicitous. A comparison with the Malay text shows that Hill achieved a more flowing and racy style than the original; which is a good thing for Abdullah, because his story of Malacca, and the early days of Raffles' Singapore, and the personalities and events it involved, is one well worth telling.

There are some errors in translation. Hill's identification of Nagore as a province of Mysore is wrong (pp. 5, 6, 31 of the Oxford reprint). The Malay has "*di-tanah Keling, dalam negeri Nagur*", which clearly indicates Nagur, the Muslim suburb of Nagapattinam on the Coromandel coast, the home port of the Tamil Muslim community of Malaya. When the missionary William Milne was about to engage the young Abdullah as a language teacher, Hill has him say "An Englishman has told me that you are well fitted to be a teacher of Malay", whereas Abdullah's Malay ("*Ada orang puteh kata . . .*") suggests a wider claim, that he had a general reputation amongst the European community for aptitude in his profession. But these are small matters: Hill has done Abdullah proud.

As a source book for the history of the Malayan region in the first half of the nineteenth century, this was a proper candidate for inclusion in the Oxford in Asia Historical Reprints. The text has been reset, the chief differences in presentation being that the historical notes, which Hill had cast to the end of the book, have now been placed as footnotes in the text, and the index is in larger and more readable print. There are some misprints, e.g. the spelling of *Shaikh* at p. 31, line 9; and at p. 111, where the conventions of Malay spelling in the Arabic script are being discussed, there are a succession of errors in the reprint, as will be seen by comparing it with Hill's version of 1955. Several of the Malay words in Arabic script are presented out of alignment; the words *jikalau* and *melaikan*, which are referred to as having been written with the long sign *madah* have lost this feature in the reprint, and the word "*madah*" after "sign or" at the bottom of the page has dropped out altogether.

In this reprint, some opportunities for improvements have been missed. The contents page would have been better for having Abdullah's chapter headings included. These are used as heads for the bibliographic references at pp. 317-25, but

without page references to the text. And Hill was a fine Malay scholar, cut off in mid-career in a fatal air crash over Java: a brief biographical note and appreciation would surely have been appropriate.

The price put on this book by the Oxford University Press should not pass without comment. It is of moderate length, and presents no great technical difficulties in the setting. Even when every allowance is made for the generally high cost of printing, and the additional expense of producing a specialized work in a small edition, £7.25 seems far too high; and it is hardly likely to fulfil the intention, expressed in Hill's preface (p. vii), of bearing in mind the needs of Malayan students.

G. E. MARRISON

Twenty Plays of the Nô Theater, edited by Donald Keene, with the assistance of Royall Tyler. Illustrated with drawings by Fukami Tanrô and from the Hôshô Texts. New York and London, Columbia University Press, 1970.

With 240 works in the active Nô repertory, yet only a limited number readily available in English translations of high standard, this new collection is naturally to be greatly welcomed. These particular plays, most of which do not appear elsewhere in English, were chosen to illustrate principal developments in Nô form from the late fourteenth to late sixteenth centuries. The works here provide new insights into the breadth of the tradition, and include pieces by the greatest dramatists as well as some of unknown authorship. But perhaps the most striking aspect of the collection as a whole is its concentration on plays of the third and fourth category of Nô.

Most existing collections give roughly equal attention to plays from all five classifications of Nô: god plays, warrior plays, woman plays, realistic (or mad!) plays, and demon plays, a balance which fails to reflect their unequal representation in the repertory. (The fourth category has, for example, almost twice as many plays as any other.) No doubt this bias of previous collections has led to an over-stressing for English readers of ritualistic and religious aspects of the dramatic content, more especially as these are so apparent in the contemporary performance style. The present collection successfully rectifies this impression by giving us no less than sixteen plays in the third and fourth categories. As a result, one discovers in the Nô a marvellous range of portraits of the more tender, elusive, and "realistic" emotions.

Two plays based on the Komachi legend are included, "Komachi and the Hundred Nights" (Kayô Komachi), and "Komachi at Sekidera" (Sekidera Komachi). Together with a third play, "Sotoba Komachi" (translated in Donald Keene's *Anthology of Japanese Literature*), they give us the opportunity to compare the way in which the Nô form may be used to illuminate different aspects of a theme, as well as to compare the skills of the two greatest Nô dramatists, Kan'ami and Zeami.

Other plays selected for their unique points, as well as for poetic merit, include: "Motomezuka" ("one of the gloomiest"), "Obasute" (an epitome of *yugen*), "Hanjo" (a romantic work with a rare happy ending), "Ashikari" (a sympathetic treatment of marital love), and "Kanawa" (a masterpiece of jealous rage). Three plays take old age as their theme. The programme of five plays at the end of this collection brings one rather sharply back to the more ritualistic aspects of Nô, beginning with a god play of notable splendour.

The Nô as it is now performed is a slow-motion crystallization of rite—almost the rite of the art form itself. But as Professor P. G. O'Neill points out, during the Muro-machi period performances probably took about half the time that they do today, for it was not uncommon for as many as fifteen or seventeen plays to be given on a single occasion.¹ At the original pace, the portrayal of tender and even domestic emotions seems more feasible; even, one might venture, more natural. True woman plays, representing the highest point in the expression of *yugen* (quietness, elegance, and restraint), were Zeami's preference. From this collection we may see why.

¹ P. G. O'Neill, *Early Nô Drama* (London, Lund Humphries, 1958), pp. 88–89.

As a joint effort, this collection of translations deserves highest praise. Hopefully, it should inspire more collective ventures in translation in various branches of Asian studies. It is an example of the best possible use of advanced graduate student time, which is too often given to repetitious "exercise" translations of standard works. Where such effort can be profitably directed to new ground, it should be encouraged.

M. B. SHERIDAN

Étienne Lamotte, *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra)*, avec une nouvelle Introduction. Tome III, chapitres XXXI–XLII. Publié avec le concours de la Fondation Francoqui. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, Vol. II, pp. lxxviii + 1119–1733. Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1970. Fr. 1100.

In 1944 Professor Lamotte published the first volume of his translation of the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* (Taishō 1509) followed in 1949 by a second volume (cf. W. Baruch, *AM*, III, 1952–3, pp. 109–12). The third volume contains the translation of chapters 31–42 (chūan 19–26 and the beginning of 27). In the Taishō edition the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* occupies about 700 pages of which 200 have been translated by Professor Lamotte in these three volumes. One cannot possibly expect L. to translate the entire work. However, the most important part is the first 34 chūan which, according to the colophon, contain a complete translation of the first *parivarta* of the Sanskrit text. The other *parivarta* have been abridged by the translator (cf. P. Demiéville, *J.A.*, 1950, p. 388). It is to be hoped that L. will publish a fourth volume containing a translation of the final part of Kumārajīva's translation of the first *parivarta* (the remainder of chūan 27 and chūan 28–34). On completion of these four volumes only one desideratum would remain: a detailed index which would make this translation one of the most important reference works available to students of Buddhism and India.

The third volume is preceded by a long introduction (pp. v–lx) in which L. deals with several problems relating to the author and the sources of the *Ta-chih-tu-lun*. In his review of Volume II Demiéville had suggested that the original title must have been *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-upadeśa* (*J.A.*, 1950, p. 375, n. 1). In his subsequent publications L. has used this title but without discussing the arguments advanced by Demiéville. On pp. vii–viii he states his reason for assuming that the title must have been *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* or *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtrapadeśa* (cf. also his note in Jacques May's review of K. V. Raman's *Nāgārjuna's Philosophy*, *TP*, LIV, 1968, pp. 334–5). Demiéville quoted a biography of Nāgārjuna which is traditionally attributed to Kumārajīva: *Lung-shu p'u-sa chuan* (Taishō 2047). According to L., Kumārajīva is not the author of this biography (cf. pp. liv–lv). Already in his *L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti* (henceforth: *Vk.*), Lamotte mentions the "rocambolesque Biographie de Nāgārjuna" (*Long-chou p'ou-sa tchouan*, T 2047), attribuée abusivement à Kumārajīva" (p. 71). In his *Early Mādhyamika in India and China*,¹ Richard H. Robinson believes that "In so far as it is genuine, this *Biography* must consist of Kumārajīva's oral account as worded by his disciples" (p. 25; cf. also pp. 21, 22). This conclusion agrees with Demiéville's description of the biography as belonging to "les biographies chinoises de Nāgārjuna, qui doivent émaner de Kumārajīva" (*op. cit.*, p. 375, n. 1). The authorship of the biography is not without importance, because it says at the end that one hundred years have lapsed since Nāgārjuna's death. If this statement is due to Kumārajīva himself, it would indicate that Kumārajīva believed Nāgārjuna to have lived in the third century. However, even in this case it seems difficult to consider it as a decisive argument for

¹ Lamotte does not refer to Robinson's book; neither is it mentioned in the "Supplément à la bibliographie" (pp. lxi–lxviii), although this lists many publications to which no reference is made in the text.

determining the date of Nāgārjuna. Rather surprisingly, L. quotes this statement, although he attaches no value to the biography (cf. *Vk.*, p. 76).²

The *Upadeśa* has traditionally been attributed to Nāgārjuna (cf. *Demiéville, op. cit.*, p. 381, n. 1). In his preface to the first volume L. wrote as follows: "Il [= Nāgārjuna] vécut probablement au II^e siècle de notre ère et joua un rôle de premier plan dans la formation du bouddhisme du Grand Véhicule. Originaire du Sud (pays d'Andhra), il étendit son influence jusqu'au Nord-Ouest de l'Inde" (p. x). In an article, published in 1954: "Sur la formation du Mahāyāna" (*Asiatica*, Leipzig, 1954, pp. 377-96), L. had changed his point of view and wrote: "La critique moderne y va de sa légende à elle et propose de chercher les origines du Mahāyāna dans l'Inde du Sud, en pays Andhra" (p. 386). Nāgārjuna exercised his activity in the north-west of India and his role in the formation of Mahāyāna Buddhism is not primordial: "Nāgārjuna est bien postérieur à l'écllosion des Mahāyānasūtra, car on trouve dans ses œuvres et notamment dans son *Upadeśa* (T 1509) et sa *Daśabhūmivibhāṣā* (T 1522) des références et des citations empruntées à une bonne cinquantaine de sūtra et śāstra mahāyānistes" (p. 391). L.'s change of opinion, which was characterized by *Demiéville* as a "volte-face" (*OLZ*, 1959, Sp. 248), is carried to a logical conclusion in his most recent discussion of the problem of the authorship. Whereas in 1954 he still considered Nāgārjuna to be the author of the *Upadeśa*, in the introduction to Volume III of this translation (henceforth: III, Intr.) the author is said to have lived after the first Mādhyamika: Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva and Rāhulabhadra, probably in the beginning of the fourth century (p. xl). L. even sketches in some detail the spiritual development of the author as a sarvāstivādin converted to the Mādhyamaka (cf. also *Demiéville, JA*, 1950, p. 382). The date of the author depends on two lines of argument. The first shows that Nāgārjuna lived between A.D. 243 and 300. The second that the author of the *Upadeśa* quotes not only Nāgārjuna's works, but also those of his pupil, Āryadeva, and of his contemporary, Rāhulabhadra. The date of Nāgārjuna has been studied by L. in his *Vk.* (pp. 70-7). In III, Intr. L. quotes the same texts but the argumentation is not entirely the same (pp. li-iv). The texts, quoted by him, are well known (cf. *Mochizuki, op. cit.*, p. 4996a-b). According to Tao-an of the Later Chou Kumārajīva adopted 637 B.C. as the date of Buddha's Nirvāṇa (*Vk.* p. 73; III, Intr. p. li). Robinson rightly queries the authenticity of this passage which was written in A.D. 568, a century and a half after Kumārajīva (*op. cit.*, p. 23). In the second place L. quotes a preface to the *Satyasiddhiśāstra*, written by Seng-jui, a disciple of Kumārajīva. This preface is lost, but is quoted by Chi-tsang in his commentaries. According to this quotation Āsvaghoṣa was born 350 years after the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha and Nāgārjuna in the year 530. L. explains that this can be understood in two ways: (1) Āsvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna were born, respectively, 350 and 530 years after the Nirvāṇa; (2) Āsvaghoṣa was born 350 years after the Nirvāṇa and Nāgārjuna 530 years after Āsvaghoṣa. L. tries to prove that the second alternative has to be preferred. However, *Mochizuki* has already pointed out two other quotations of the same preface, in which the addition of *hou* 後 or *ch'i* 其 clearly indicates that 530 years after Āsvaghoṣa are meant.³ Consequently Nāgārjuna was born 880 years after the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha (637 B.C.) = A.D. 243. L. arrives at the date of A.D. 300 for his death by referring to the *Lung-shu p'u-sa chuan*, as mentioned above, and to the *Tibetische Lebensbeschreibung Śākyamuni's* (tr. A. Schiefner, St. Petersburg, 1848, p. 310) according to which Nāgārjuna lived 60 years. Schiefner's work is an abridged translation of a text written in 1734 (cf. *T'oung Pao*, XLIII, 1955, pp. 317-18). Moreover, L. quotes as "un indice, permettant de contrôler l'exactitude de la date 243 p.C. proposée pour la naissance de Nāgārjuna" the fact that

² Thomas Watters already referred to the Biography: "If we regard his Life as having been composed by Kumārajīva, its professed translator, he lived in the latter part of the 3rd century of our era" (*On Yuan Chwang's travels in India*, Vol. II, 1905, p. 204). Cf. also *Mochizuki Shinkō's Bukkyōdaijiten*, Vol. V, 1933, p. 4996b; Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 4996b1-2. *Mochizuki* refers to Taishō 1855 (p. 11921 ff.) and to Hui-ying's commentary on the *Upadeśa* (*Dainihon bukkyō zensho*, Vol. XCIV, p. 110b).

according to two Chinese catalogues Dharmarakṣa translated between 265 and 313 a work described as an extract of the *Daśabhūmikaśāstra* (cf. *Vk.*, p. 76). It is difficult to see how this information, even assuming that it is correct and that Nāgārjuna is indeed the author of the *Daśabhūmikaśāstra*, can confirm 243 as the date of birth of Nāgārjuna. Hikata, from whom L. has taken this indication, argues that the *Daśabhūmika* must have reached Tun-huang before 265 (the date of Dharmarakṣa's departure from Tun-huang) and that the text must have come into existence by 250 at the latest. In that case Nāgārjuna would have written the text at the age of seven at the latest! In III, Intr. L. does not refer any more to the *Lung-shu p'u-sa chuan*, the *Tibetische Lebensbeschreibung Śākyamuni's* and Dharmarakṣa's translation of an extract of the *Daśabhūmika*, but he still seems to consider Tao-an's information concerning the date of Nirvāṇa, accepted by Kumārajīva, and Seng-jui's preface to the *Satyasiddhiśāstra*, as indications sufficient to determine which dates Kumārajīva and his disciples adopted for the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha and the lives of Āsvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna. However, one must remark that Tao-an wrote in 568 and that Seng-jui's preface is only known from quotations. Even admitting that this information is reliable and that it originated in Kashmir where Kumārajīva studied in his youth, it is still difficult to attach much value to it. L. himself points out that the period of more than 500 years ("près de 500 ans") is probably a slip of the pen for "plus de 500 ans") between Āsvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna is not acceptable. He continues: "On n'échappe pas à l'impression que toutes ces datations relèvent de vues théoriques sur les étapes successives de la Bonne Loi et que, en chronologie absolue, leur valeur est plutôt faible" (p. liii).

Much more important is the internal evidence which can be gained from the *Upadeśa* itself. On p. 1370 occurs the following passage: "Tous les dharma dépendent des causes et conditions: dépendant des causes et conditions, ils ne sont pas autonomes; puisqu'ils ne sont pas autonomes, il n'y a pas de Moi, et le caractère du Moi est inexistant, ainsi qu'il est dit dans le *P'o-wo-p'in* (Ātmapratishedhaprakaraṇa) 'Chapitre de la réfutation du Moi'." This passage is followed by a long note (pp. 1370-5) in which L. maintains that *P'o-wo-p'in* 破我品 refers to the tenth chapter of Āryadeva's *Catuhśataka*: "Le Traité ne se réfère pas davantage ici à un chapitre des *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (ou *Madhyamakāśāstra*) de Nāgārjuna car le chapitre XVIII qui y traite de l'Ātman est intitulé 'Examen de l'Ātman' (*Ātmaparīkṣā* en sanskrit, *Bdag brtag pa* en tibétain, *Kouan-wo* en chinois). Le seul chapitre entrant ici en ligne de compte est l'*Ātmapratishedhaprakaraṇa* du *Catuhśataka* d'Āryadeva." L. continues: "Cette citation est d'importance car elle prouve que les premiers auteurs Mādhyamika (Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva, Rāhulabhadra) étaient connus de l'auteur du *Traité* et que par conséquent ce dernier leur est postérieur." There is not the slightest doubt that the author of the *Upadeśa* quotes Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* and Rāhulabhadra's *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* (cf. pp. 1060-5).⁴ However, this fact in itself does not prove that Nāgārjuna cannot have been the author of the *Upadeśa*. He may well have quoted his own work. As to Rāhulabhadra, his relation to Nāgārjuna is not well established. The Indian tradition seems to consider him as Nāgārjuna's teacher (cf. *Lamotte*, "Sur la formation du Mahāyāna", p. 391; *Upadeśa* pp. 1373-4). This is followed by the Tibetan tradition (cf. *Bu-ston's History of Buddhism*, tr. E. Obermiller, II, Heidelberg, 1932, p. 123; *The Blue Annals*, tr. George N. Roerich, I, Calcutta, 1949, p. 35). L. quotes two Chinese texts to prove that Rāhulabhadra was a contemporary of Nāgārjuna and a commentator of his works (*ibid.*), but not much value can be attached to texts written in China in the seventh and eighth centuries.⁵ In any case, there is not enough evidence to

⁴ On this stotra see Uj Hakuju, *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū*, I, Tōkyō, 1924, pp. 339-54 (first published in 1920-1 in the *Tetsugaku zasshi*); W. Baruch, *Asia Major*, III, 1952, p. 112; Edward Conze (ed.), *Buddhist Texts through the Ages* (Oxford, 1954), p. 147-9. Rāhulabhadra is also the author of 20 ślokas in honour of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. The text of these verses has been published in the edition of the SP by Wogihara and Tsuchida (Tōkyō, 1934-5, pp. 37-9).

⁵ Chi-tsang's *Chung-kuan-lun shu* (Taishō, 1824) was probably written in 602, cf. Satō Tatsugen, "Kichizō no senjutsusho ni suite," *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, X, 1962, p. 566.

consider Rāhulabhadra "un successeur proche ou lointain" of Nāgārjuna. For this reason, the quotation from Āryadeva is much more important because in India, China and Tibet Āryadeva is unanimously considered to be a disciple of Nāgārjuna. However, does *P'o-wo-p'in* really refer to the tenth chapter of the *Catuhśataka*? The *Upadeśa* contains a long passage on the ātman (pp. 734-40). L. remarks in a note (p. 734, n. 1): "Il est à remarquer que le Mpps [= *Upadeśa*], attribué à tort ou à raison à Nāgārjuna, ne manifeste, dans sa refutation de l'Ātman, aucune ressemblance spéciale avec les Madh. kārikā de Nāgārjuna, et, pour tout dire, semble les avoir négligées, alors qu'en d'autres endroits il y a eu fréquemment recours." This passage is not based on the eighteenth chapter of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, nor is it based on the tenth chapter of the *Catuhśataka*. The passage, quoted on p. 1370, is too short to enable us to determine its source, but I have not found any evidence in the tenth chapter of the *Catuhśataka* to prove that it has been used by the author of the *Upadeśa*. L.'s only argument seems to be the title of the tenth chapter of the *Catuhśataka* in the Chinese translations (Taishō 1570-1). However, both translations were made by Hsüan-tsang in 650-1 (cf. p. 1371). The name of the Sanskrit version has not been handed down; that of the Tibetan version is **Ātmapratishedhabhāvanāśāṃdarśana* (*Bdag dgag-pa bsgom-pa bstan-pa*).⁶ There is no evidence that the author of the *Upadeśa* was able to use a text of this chapter bearing the name **Ātmapratishedhaprakaraṇa*. Therefore, neither the contents of the tenth chapter of the *Catuhśataka* nor its name confirm L.'s hypothesis.

On the other hand, the possibility is not to be ruled out that *P'o-wo-p'in* refers to the eighteenth chapter of Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. In Sanskrit this text is transmitted together with Candrakīrti's commentary, the *Prasannapadā*. According to this commentary the title of the eighteenth chapter is *Ātmaparikṣā* (in Tibetan: *Bdag brtag-pa*). Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* are transmitted separately in a Tibetan translation, but this version has been corrected with the help of the Tibetan translation of Candrakīrti's commentary (cf. P. Cordier, *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la bibliothèque nationale*, III, Paris, 1915, pp. 290-1: Mdo-'grel, XVII, 1). Therefore the fact that, in this version, the name of the eighteenth chapter is **Ātmaparikṣā* does not prove that this was the original name of this chapter. The Tibetan Tanjur contains three other commentaries on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*: the *Akutoḥayā* (Peking edn. No. 5229; Cordier, *op. cit.*, XVII, 6), Buddhapālita's commentary (Peking edn. No. 5242; Cordier, *op. cit.*, XVII, 20) and Bhāvaviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa* (Peking edn. No. 5253; Cordier, *op. cit.*, XVIII, 8). Both Buddhapālita's and Bhāvaviveka's commentaries are quoted by Candrakīrti. In all these three commentaries the name of the eighteenth chapter is **Ātmadharmaparikṣā* (Tib. *Bdag dan chos brtag-pa*). According to the Chinese versions of the commentary ascribed to Pin-lo-chieh (Taishō 1564) and of Bhāvaviveka's commentary (Taishō 1566) the name of this chapter is **Dharmaparikṣā* (*kuan-fa p'in* 觀法品). Therefore, only Candrakīrti's commentary and the revised Tibetan version of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* give the name *Ātmaparikṣā* to the eighteenth chapter. According to the other commentaries the title is either **Ātmadharmaparikṣā* or **Dharmaparikṣā*. It is impossible to decide whether the original title was *Ātmaparikṣā*, *Ātmadharmaparikṣā* or *Dharmaparikṣā*. The chapter itself contains a refutation of the ātman. It is quite possible that the author of the *Upadeśa* has referred to it by the name **Ātmapratishedhaprakaraṇa*, even though the real name is probably different. Another possibility is that Kumārajīva translated **Ātmaparikṣāprakaraṇa* as *P'o-wo-p'in*. For a similar instance one may compare the Chinese translation of Pin-lo-chieh's commentary (Taishō 1564), in which the names of chapters three and five are **Śaṇḍriyaparikṣā* and **Śaḍdhātuparikṣā* (*Kuan-liu-ch'ing p'in* 觀六情品; *Kuan liu-chung p'in* 觀六種品). However, the text itself refers to these two chapters as **Indriyapratishedhaprakaraṇa* (*P'o-ken p'in* 破根品, p. 24b24) and **Śaḍdhātupratishedhaprakaraṇa* (*P'o liu-chung p'in* 破六種品, p. 24a26). In this case, too, it is impossible to know

⁶ The fragments of the Sanskrit text, published by Haraprasad Sastri, do not contain the name of this chapter. The name *Ātmasuddhyupāyasaṃdarśana*, which is mentioned by L., is a rather fanciful reconstruction from the Tibetan by P. L. Vaidya. Probably Vaidya has misread *dag-pa* for *dgag-pa*.

if this is due to the author or to the translator.⁷ Therefore, it is certainly possible that *P'o-wo-p'in* refers to the eighteenth chapter of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*.

There is not enough evidence to support L.'s supposition that the *Upadeśa* was written in the beginning of the fourth century in north-western India. According to Kumārajīva's biography, he studied in Kashmir between the age of nine and twelve (cf. Robert Shih, *Biographies des Moines éminents*, Louvain, 1968, pp. 62-3). Whichever dates we adopt for his life (344-413 or 350-409),⁸ Kumārajīva must have lived in Kashmir in the beginning of the second half of the fourth century, about half a century after the composition of the *Upadeśa*. It seems difficult to admit with L. that Kumārajīva did obtain reliable information on the dates of Nāgārjuna but not on the authorship of the *Upadeśa*. If this work had really been written in the beginning of the fourth century in north-western India, Kumārajīva would almost certainly have met younger contemporaries of the author. For this reason, it seems preferable not to attach too much value both to the computation of the dates of Nāgārjuna and to the attribution of the authorship of the *Upadeśa* to him by Kumārajīva. From the *Upadeśa* itself it is obvious that the author was well-versed in the Abhidharma literature of the *Sarvāstivādin* and that he lived in north-western India. It does not seem necessary to assume that he was a former Sarvāstivādin converted to the Madhyamaka. As L. indicates (III, Intr. p. xlii), even for a Mādhyamika the Abhidharma remained important as belonging to the *saṃvṛtisatya*.

The author of the *Upadeśa* often quotes the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* but, to my knowledge, he does not seem to refer to any of the other works attributed to Nāgārjuna. It is difficult to give a satisfactory explanation of this fact for it seems probable that Nāgārjuna is the author of several works. Some information about the works attributed to Nāgārjuna can be obtained from Candrakīrti's *Madhyamakāśāstrastuti* to which L. refers twice (III, Intr. pp. xliii-xliv; pp. 1373-4). Candrakīrti lived several centuries after Nāgārjuna, but if we compare the list of eight works mentioned by him to the long lists of works enumerated as Nāgārjuna's works by Tibetan and Chinese catalogues, it makes a much more reliable impression. It is not an exhaustive list of the works attributed to Nāgārjuna by Candrakīrti. Recently, Uryūzu Ryūshin has shown that, in his commentary on the *Catuhśataka*, Candrakīrti refers twice to the *Bodhisambhāra* (Taishō 1660), a work also mentioned by Bu-ston (*op. cit.*, II, p. 126 where *Bodhigāṇa* must be corrected to *Bodhisambhāra*).⁹ Bu-ston attributes six works to Nāgārjuna (*op. cit.*, I, p. 51) as mentioned by L., but attention must be drawn to the fact that Bu-ston considers these six to be his logical works. Among other works of Nāgārjuna he enumerates the *Ratnāvalī*, stotras, works dedicated to the practical side of the doctrine: the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, the *Svapnacintāmaṇiparikathā* and works on the conduct of householders and of monks: *Suhyllekha* and *Bodhisambhāra* (*op. cit.*, II, pp. 125-6). The authorship of the *Akutoḥayā* is disputed among the Tibetans. Obermiller refers to Mkhas-grub's discussion of the fact that the *Akutoḥayā* quotes from the *Catuhśataka* with the words: "It has thus been said by the venerable Āryadeva" (*Acta Orientalia*, XI, 1933, p. 4, n. 9). Walleser has already observed that the same quotation occurs at the same place in Pin-lo-chieh's commentary (tr. Walleser, Heidelberg, 1912, p. 189). L. considers Pin-lo-chieh's work to belong to the authentic works of Āryadeva (cf. p. 1373), but it seems more likely that both the *Akutoḥayā* and the commentary attributed to Pin-lo-chieh have been written by authors who knew Āryadeva's works.¹⁰

⁷ According to Seng-jui, Kumārajīva has taken great liberties with the text (cf. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 29).

⁸ The dates 350-409 have recently been proposed by Tsukamoto Zenryū, cf. Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 244-7. Robinson discusses in detail Tsukamoto's arguments.

⁹ Uryūzu Ryūshin, "Bodhisambhāra no Ryūju shinsen ni tsuite", *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, XVII, 1969, pp. 513-19.

¹⁰ On Pin-lo-chieh and his commentary (Taishō 1564) see Mochizuki, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 2793b-4a; Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-30. On the relation between chapters xxiii-xxvii of the *Akutoḥayā* and the corresponding chapters of Buddhapālita's commentary,

The authenticity of Āryadeva's *Satakaśāstra* (Taishō 1569) is also open to grave doubts. U. listed 17 quotations from Āryadeva in Chinese Buddhist texts. He was able to identify 9 with verses of the *Catuhśataka*, but did not discover a single quotation from the *Satakaśāstra* (*op. cit.*, pp. 277-81). The fact that Candrakīrti often quotes the *Catuhśataka* by the name *Sataka* seems also to indicate that Āryadeva did not write both a *Catuhśataka* and a *Sataka*.¹¹

The uncertainty regarding the authenticity of the works attributed to Nāgārjuna makes it difficult to form a reliable picture of his philosophical and religious ideas. In his review of Frederick J. Streng's *Emptiness, A Study in Religious Meaning* (Nashville, New York, 1967) Jacques May rightly remarks that Nāgārjuna has been studied until now chiefly as a philosopher or as a logician (*Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques*, XXIV, 1970, p. 69). The interpretation of the *śūnyatā* concept has given rise to many discussions among scholars. Perhaps it is necessary to study not only the *Mūlamadhyamakahārikā*, but also the other works, attributed by Candrakīrti to Nāgārjuna, in order to determine the place of this concept in Nāgārjuna's thought. In any case, one is rather surprised to see L. describe the *śūnyatā* as "rien que ce soit (*akimci*), 'une simple inexistence' (*abhāvamātra*)" (III, Intr. p. xxxi). L. does not give any references to texts and, as far as I have been able to ascertain, the *Mūlamadhyamakahārikā* do not use these terms to characterize *śūnyatā*.¹² On page 1229 L. quotes a verse from Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra* in which the words *kiṃcin nāstīti* are to be found; however, they do not describe the *śūnyatā*. As the commentary explains, the practice of meditating on the idea that "nothing exists" brings about the cessation of all ideas of voidness and existence (*cf. Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*, ed. L. de La Vallée Poussin, Calcutta, 1901-14, p. 474). As to the expression *abhāvamātra*, this has been discussed by L. in his introduction to his translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra* (p. 57; *cf. J. May, T'oung Pao*, LI, 1964, p. 93), but the *cittam acittam* of the *Prajñāpāramitāsūtra* is not identical with the *śūnyatā* of the Madhyamaka.

It is impossible to discuss fully the many topics treated by L. in his introduction. Two points of minor importance have to be mentioned. On p. xiii L. states that the name Mahāyāna never occurs in inscriptions, but one finds the expression *mahāyānika-Sākyabhiṣṭu-ācāryya* in an inscription from East Bengal dated A.D. 507-8 and inscriptions of the Pāla period mention *mahāyāna-anuśāyin* "followers of Mahāyāna" (*cf. Shizutani Masao, Gupta jidai bukkyō himei mokuroku*, Kyōto, 1968, pp. 12-13, where further bibliographical references are given). On pp. xxxviii-xxxix L. translates a

Continued from previous page—

see Hirano Takashi, "Muichū to Butsugo-chū to no idō ni tsuite", *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, III, 1954, pp. 236-8. The biography of Nāgārjuna, attributed to Kumārajīva, attributes to him an *Akutohayaśāstra* in 100,000 verses (*cf. M. Walleser, "The Life of Nāgārjuna from Tibetan and Chinese Sources", Hirth Anniversary Volume*, p. 447). L. does not believe that this work is identical with the *Akutohayaśā* (III, Intr. p. lv), but the similarity in name and the fact that this work is said to contain the *Chung-lun* 中論 rather suggest a connexion between the two works. Walleser mentioned the possibility that Pin-lo-chieh's commentary was based upon the *Akutohayaśā*, but ruled it out because, in that case, Kumārajīva would not have mentioned the *Akutohayaśāstra* in the way he did in his biography of Nāgārjuna. However, if this biography is not written by Kumārajīva, but reproduces information obtained from Kumārajīva, the mention of an *Akutohayaśāstra* may well indicate a connexion between Pin-lo-chieh's commentary and the *Akutohayaśā* (*cf. Walleser, Die Mittlere Lehre des Nāgārjuna*, Heidelberg, 1912, pp. ix-x).

¹¹ Richard R. Gard's discussion of the authenticity of the *Satakaśāstra* is conducted along different lines: "On the authenticity of the *Pai-lun* and *Shih-erh-mên-lun*", *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, II, 1954, pp. 751-42.

¹² Candrakīrti rejects nihilistic interpretations of *śūnya*, *cf. Prasannapadā*, p. 495. 12-13: yadi tāvat sarvaṃ idaṃ śūnyaṃ sarvaṃ nāstīti parikalpayet tadāśya mithyādr̥ṣṭir āpadyate; tr. J. May, p. 231: s'il suppose que "le donné empirique tout entier est vide" veut dire "tout est non-être", il tombe dans la vue fautive par excellence.

passage from the *Hsi-yü-chih* as quoted in the *Fa-yüan-chu-lin* (Taishō 2122). According to L. this passage is taken from Tao-an's *Hsi-yü-chih* and contains the oldest mention of Nāgārjuna. The same passage is quoted in Mochizuki (*op. cit.*, p. 4996a), but he does not attribute this *Hsi-yü-chih* to Tao-an, because it is well known that the *Hsi-yü-chih*, quoted in the *Fa-yüan-chu-lin*, has nothing to do with Tao-an's *Hsi-yü-chih*. Sylvain Lévi, who translated several passages of the *Hsi-yü-chih* from the *Fa-yüan-chu-lin*, has given the following information on this work: "Les mémoires de Wang Hsien-ts'ue et de Hsien-tsang servirent de base à une compilation officielle, le *Si-iu-tchi* (appelé aussi *Si-kouo-tchi*) en cent chapitres, soixante de textes, quarante de cartes et dessins, qui fut exécutée en 666" (*JA*, 1900, I, p. 298).

In this third volume of his translation of the *Upadeśa* L. shows his great knowledge of the Abhidharma literature. As shown in the table on pp. lxvi-lxvii, chapters xxxi-xxlii deal with the *dharma*s of the Way of Nirvāṇa and with the attributes of the Buddha. The systematic nature of these chapters have made it possible for L. to add preliminary notes, in which useful information is given on the *dharma*s, their treatment in canonical literature, Abhidharma texts and Mahāyāna texts. One must admire L.'s extensive knowledge of the Buddhist literature in Pāli, Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese. L. gives numerous references to the original sources but mentions only rarely secondary sources in Western languages. It is only by consulting these works that one realizes to what extent L.'s knowledge surpasses that of his predecessors. However, one cannot but regret the fact that L. does not seem to have made great use of the works of Japanese scholars apart from reference works. To mention only one example: chapter xlii of the *Upadeśa* treats in great detail of the eighteen *āveṇikadharmas* of the Buddhas. L. mentions that the wording of these *dharma*s is not always the same and that their order varies according to the texts. He refers to many texts but does not indicate in which order they are listed in them (*cf. pp. 1626-7*). This problem has been examined very carefully by Mizuno Kōgen in his study on the classification of the eighteen *āveṇikadharmas* (*cf. Miyamoto Shōson, ed., Daijō bukkyō no seiritsushiteki kenkyū*, Tōkyō, 1954, pp. 292-302).¹³ Mizuno points out, for instance, that the same list of *dharma*s is to be found in two biographies of the Buddha (Taishō 184, p. 472a1-10; Taishō 185, p. 478b16-25) and in Dharmarakṣa's version of the *Lalitavistara* (*cf. Lamotte*, p. 1627). He demonstrates that this list was copied from Taishō 184 by the translator of Taishō 185 which, in its turn, is the source for the list in Dharmarakṣa's translation. In such and similar instances references to Japanese publications would have been very welcome. There is much to be learned from the excellent work done by Japanese scholars, just as Japanese scholars can derive much profit from studying the work of Western scholars. Probably, Japanese scholars could considerably facilitate the access to their publications, which are widely scattered in innumerable periodicals, by publishing regularly annotated bibliographies in a Western language.

L.'s translation of this volume is superior even to that of the two preceding ones. Only rarely would one like to suggest a different rendering, as, for instance, in the following passages:

P. 1140: Les êtres sont dignes de pitié; je dois les sauver et les attacher au séjour inconditionné (*asamskṛtapada*) 衆生可愍。我當拔出著無爲處 (p. 197c14-15). The beings are to be pitied. I must extirpate my attachment to the unconditioned place. Similar instances of the use of *chu* 著 can be found in Gadjin M. Nagao's *Index to the Mahāyāna-sūtrālamkāra* (Tōkyō, 1961), Vol. II, p. 232b: 著財 bhoga-saku; 著諸有 bhavābhiraṃsa.

P. 1144: les choses qu'ils aiment ou dont ils se détachent sont multiples 所樂所解法亦種種 (198a14). The things which they like and which they understand are manifold.

P. 1211: caravanier (*sārhavāha*) 御者 (206a16). Charioteer (*sārathi*).

¹³ One must add to Mizuno's references to Pāli texts the recently published *Vimuttimaggā* (Colombo, 1963, p. 17), a text closely related to Upatissa's *Chieh t'o tao lun* (Taishō 1648). Some information on this text, mainly on the basis of the Sinhalese introduction, can be found in Mori Sōdō, "Shin-shiryō Vimuttimaggā", *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, XVII, 1968, pp. 132-3.

P. 1263: Le bonheur (*sukha*) aimé par tous les êtres est important (*guru*) 樂是一切衆生所愛重 (211a13). Happiness is liked and esteemed by all beings.

P. 1377: Supposons un homme chaussant des sandales: si celles-ci étaient neuves dès le premier jour, elles ne vieilliraient jamais; après coup, elles seraient toujours neuves et n'auraient pas de vieillissement. 如入著履。若初日新而無有故。後雖常新不應有故 (222c10-12). Suppose that a man puts on sandals. If, on the first day, they were new and without aging, then later they would be always new and would not become old.—This is explained in the preceding passage: "tout dharma dont on constate après coup le caractère de destruction doit évidemment posséder dès sa naissance ce caractère de destruction".

P. 1511: qui n'a pas encore détruit les impuretés 未斷結使 (235b8). Who has not yet cut off his bonds (*samyojana*).

P. 1601: le Buddha qui a atteint les félicités du Sommet de l'existence (*bhāvāgra*) y a renoncé 佛乃至有頂樂已離 (245a16). The Buddha has given up even the joys of the Summit of existence.—The expression *nai chih* 乃至 has presented difficulties to the translator, cf. p. 1691: le présent qui ne dure qu'un instant 現在乃至一念中無住時 (254c12). The present does not possess duration even during one moment (Vasumitra admits that *samskāras* possess duration during one instant but not the Sautrāntikas, cf. L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, V, 1937, p. 155); p. 1694: Ainsi des saints comme Avalokiteśvara 乃至觀世音 (253a29). Even saints such as Avalokiteśvara.

P. 1692: Dès qu'il se trouverait dans des dispositions mauvaises (*dustacitta*) et transgresserait ses engagements (*śīla*) antérieurs, ce religieux ne serait plus un bhikṣu. 若現在惡心中住。過去復無戒。是爲非比丘 (255a6-7). If at the present moment [the monk] were in an evil disposition, in the past, too, he would be without morality. He could not be a monk [at all].—The Sarvāstivādin argues that, if past and future were non-existent, all three times would be identical. Therefore, if somebody is sinful at the present moment, he is also sinful in the past. Consequently, it is impossible to be a monk.

P. 1709: qu'est-ce que la petite bienveillance et la petite compassion? Après ces petites, pourquoi parler des grandes? 何等是小慈小悲。因此小而名爲大。 (256b18). What are the small benevolence and the small compassion by reason of the smallness of which [the great benevolence and the great compassion] are called great?

The *Upadeśa* contains the following quotation from the *Kāśyapaparipṛcchā*: "L'Ātman est un extrême, l'Anātman est un autre extrême: éviter ces deux extrêmes est nommé le Chemin du milieu" (p. 1684). In a note L. refers to *Kāśyapaparivarta* §56 but he has overlooked §57: ātmeti kāśyapa ayam eko ntaḥ nairātmyam ity ayam dvitīyo ntaḥ yad ātmanerātmyayor madhyam tad . . . iyam ucyate kāśyapa madhyamā pratipad dharmaṇāṃ bhūtapratyavekṣā. L. believes that the *Upadeśa* quotes the *Sūtra of Kātyāyana*. The *Upadeśa* contains also a long quotation from *Kāśyapaparivarta* §§82-4 (266c28-267a15). Kuno Hōryū has drawn attention to the interesting fact that the quotation in the *Upadeśa* contains the beginning of §84, a passage which is missing in the three oldest Chinese translations of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (*Bukkyō kenkyū*, II, 3, 1938, p. 95).

The publication of the third volume of the translation of the *Upadeśa* is an important milestone in the history of Buddhist studies. To conclude we express the wish that Professor Lamotte may find the courage and energy to continue his admirable work on this important text!

J. W. DE JONG

Gordon H. Luce, *Old Burma—Early Pagan*, 3 vols., pp. xviii + 422; 337; 455. Published for *Artibus Asiae* and the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University as Supplementum 25. Locust Valley, New York, J. J. Augustin, 1969-70.

In his Preface the author likens his book to a torso "without head or feet", for it confines itself to the brief period in the history of the Burmese kingdom of Pagan from

the accession of Aniruddha (Anawrahta in modern Burmese usage) its founder, in 1044 to that of Cansu (Narapatiṣithu) in 1174. The earlier period would have made too long a story, he explains, "too discrepant in scale, too full of gaps", and there is so much still to be explored. Of the later period up to the Mongol invasions, which destroyed the kingdom at the end of the thirteenth century, the story is "ripe for telling", since there is the evidence of over 500 stone inscriptions and of vast numbers of temples, pagodas and monasteries at the historian's disposal. But it must be reserved for a separate volume. This, he tells us, is largely because of a vital difference in the nature of the written evidence: for the period under treatment it is meagre and mostly in Old Mon, while for the period after 1174 it is abundant and all in Old Burmese, with a style and content very different from Old Mon.

To all but a few scholars working in the field of Asian studies Gordon Luce is little more than a name. Yet, had he not gone to Burma and fallen in love with the country and its peoples, his name might now be an honoured one in English literature. Such indeed was the expectation of the friends of his Cambridge days, notably Rupert Brooke and Arthur Waley. "Tell him to leave oriental studies and return to poetry", said the latter to this reviewer in 1925 when conveying Gordon Luce's greetings to him from Burma. He had gone to Burma in 1912 to teach English literature at the then Rangoon College. There his friendship with the young Pali scholar Pe Maung Tin, and his marriage with the latter's sister, Ma Tee Tee, led him more and more deeply into the study of Burmese antiquities. His first study of the temples of Pagan appeared in 1918 in the *Journal of the Burma Research Society*. In co-operation with Pe Maung Tin he went on to publish English translations of Pali and Burmese texts, and in 1923 the Oxford University Press on behalf of the Burma Research Society published their translation of Parts III and IV of the Burmese *Hmannan Yazawin* under the title of *The Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma*. It was not surprising, therefore, that when the great expansion of higher education in Burma occurred as a result of the foundation of the University of Rangoon in 1920, Gordon Luce transferred from the English Department to that of History where he was to have full scope to pursue his own special interests.

The range of his researches included the exploration of the Chinese sources relating to early Burma; Burmese epigraphy involving Pali, the archaic forms of the Burmese and Mon languages and the long-extinct Pyu language; and Burma's archaeology. He added to them linguistic studies of other languages of Burma, notably of the Tibeto-Burman group. Happily he was not working in a vacuum. Besides the Burma Research Society founded in 1910 by U May Oung and J. S. Furnivall, giants in Burmese studies, there was the Burma Archaeological Department, under two scholars of distinction in succession, the Chinese Taw Sein Ko and the Frenchman Charles Duroiselle. There were British and Burmese scholars co-operating in the compilation of the Burmese-English Dictionary and led by J. A. Stewart, later to become the first Professor of Burmese in the University of London. There were American missionaries engaged upon the study of the Karen languages and cultures. There was a learned ex-official of the Court of Ava, the Pagan Wundauk U Tin, at the university working on Burmese source material, and there was Pe Maung Tin at the head of the Department of Burmese Studies. He dedicates his book to Charles Otto Blagden, whose influence upon his work, especially in the decipherment of inscriptions was greatest. He was also much influenced by Paul Pelliot and the work carried out at the École française d'Extrême Orient at Hanoi.

The fruit of all these labours and contacts showed itself in challenging papers read to the Burma Research Society and published in its *Journal*, in the portfolios of photogravures of rubbings of inscriptions published by the Oxford University Press between 1933 and 1939, in "Notes on the Peoples of Burma in the 12th-13th Century" written for the 1931 *Burma Census Report*, and in the building up of a valuable South-east Asia collection of books and manuscripts in the Rangoon University Library. This was completely destroyed by deliberate Japanese action during their occupation of Burma, together with some 4,000 rubbings of Burmese inscriptions and Gordon Luce's transcriptions and notes, which he had lodged there for safety when forced to flee the country.

When the war ended he returned to Burma to seek to replace what had been lost and, as a member of the post-independence Burma Historical Commission, to direct the search for further material. Between 1950 and 1953 he spent three academic years at the London School of Oriental and African Studies as Visiting Professor in the Department of South East Asia and the Islands, conducting seminars and directing research. It is to this period that belongs his important study "Mons of the Pagán Dynasty" published in 1952 in the *Journal of the Burma Research Society*. Then the University of Rangoon enticed him back with the offer of an emeritus chair carrying with it opportunities for further research and teaching. This he held until 1964 when he and his wife were summarily expelled by the military régime of General Ne Win and retired to the island of Jersey. During the last period at Rangoon University he broadened the scope of his researches and produced the first of a number of papers for the *Journal of the Siam Society*. This was "The Early Syam in Burma's History" (1958). In it he supplemented and corrected "La Fin de la Dynastie de Pagan" (BEFEO, 1909). It was later followed by "Dvaravati and Old Burma" (1965), "Rice and Religion; a Study of Old Mon-Khmer Evolution and Culture" (1965), and "Aspects of Pagán History—Later Period" (1970). When expelled from Burma in 1964 he had long been at work upon a *magnum opus* which would include all his studies of Pagán, in every aspect. These three volumes must therefore be seen as the first instalment of a still larger undertaking covering the whole of the Pagán period, and this then is the setting in which the three volumes under review must be seen.

The first contains the text arranged in three main sections: History, Iconography, and Architecture. The bulk of the second consists of the catalogue of the plates in the third volume, and is packed with information. The remainder of the volume contains the bibliography, classified indexes of proper and place names, of Pagán sites, subjects, Chinese words in characters and botanical terms. There is also an article on the Old Burma Calendar containing the fruits of the researches of U Ka, a former Principal of Rangoon University, relating it to the Julian Calendar. These involved the checking of hundreds of inscriptions, and since the first set of research notes was lost when the university library was destroyed, the work had to be done all over again after the war. The end-pocket of the volume contains an appendix to the Old Burma Calendar in U Ka's handwriting, three large maps and a table of the names, titles and regnal dates of the kings of Pagán. Volume III consists entirely of plates. There are altogether 1,937 prints and drawings, many of them supplied by the Burma Archaeological Department, many reproduced from the archives of the Burma Historical Commission, and no less than 605 made by a brilliant amateur, U Tin Oo, an assistant editor in the Burma Translation Department. No collection comparable to this in scope, arrangement and clarity of reproduction has ever before been published in the field of Burmese art and architecture. Dr. Luce pays grateful tribute to the help given by Alexander Griswold, the distinguished scholar of Siamese and Buddhist art, in achieving so high a standard of reproduction.

For those unfamiliar with the early history of Burma and Pagán's place in it, it is necessary to stress that, the chronicles notwithstanding, very little that can be accepted as historical is known before the accession of Anawrahta in 1044. According to Gordon Luce, the Burmans, who were ultimately to dominate the country, do not appear there before the ninth century A.D., when they descended from Yunnan to the Kyaukse area, south-east of modern Mandalay, seized it from its mainly Mon population, and made it a centre for expansion in various directions. They seem to have fortified Pagán on the Irrawaddy in about 850. Two centuries later the city became the directing centre of a dominion, which within a very short time came to include nearly all the territories occupied by the present Union of Burma. Its rulers became champions of Theravada Buddhism, and active patrons of an art and architecture, the best of which rivals the best of its contemporary Khmer Angkor. The Mons of Lower Burma, brought into subjection by Anawrahta, were the pioneers of this cultural outburst, and during the first century of Pagán's greatness their influence was predominant. It is upon this period that the work under review concentrates.

The history presented in the first section of Volume I represents Gordon Luce's

reconstruction and reinterpretation, in the light of epigraphical and archaeological evidence, of the account of the period found in the chronicles. Students of his past contributions to learned journals will be familiar with his main findings, which indeed were summed up in his Royal Asiatic Society lecture "The Career of Htilaung Min (Kyanzitha), the Uniter of Burma, A.D. 1084-1113", published in the Society's *Journal* for 1966. He is concerned to define the respective roles of Anawrahta and his two immediate successors and their relationship with each other, to construct an authentic account of the earliest impact of Ceylon Buddhism upon Burma, and to explain how the Burmans expanded their original kingdom, running about a hundred miles along the middle Irrawaddy, to form an empire stretching from the Bhamo region in the north to the Isthmus of Kra in the south, a distance of over a thousand miles. These points he has made before, but here there is a detailed analysis of all the evidence with such a wealth of information as to add a new dimension to the story. He has put all his cards upon the table. This is followed by an examination of the reign of Kyanzitha's successor, the half-Mon Cañsū I (Alaungsithu), known best for the beautiful Pali verses of his inscription at the Shwegu-gyi temple, the translation of which, done into Luce's glowing English in co-operation with Pe Maung Tin, was published in 1920 in the *Journal of the Burma Research Society*. Finally there are two chapters on the withdrawal of Mon culture from Pagán, and on the war with Ceylon in which the city itself was captured by surprise, with a resulting interregnum which marks a watershed in its history. Thereafter, until its conquest by the Mongols, Old Burmese art, literature and culture are its dominating features.

The historical section, however, indispensable and interesting as it is, is rather of the nature of a prelude to the main subject of the work which is art and architecture, and the literature, in mural glosses or chiselled inscriptions, found with them. What is offered here is a more or less complete re-examination of the whole field; it is the fullest and most authoritative treatment for the period under review so far published. And in achieving this Gordon Luce has had the full co-operation of the Historical Commission and the Archaeological Department. But he warns us that archaeology in Burma is in its infancy, and that early Pagán cannot be seen in its proper perspective until Vessali and Mahamuni in Arakan, Kanthida and Tagaung in North Burma, and Tenasserim and Khabin in the south, have been excavated. Nevertheless, he is able to provide a wealth of detailed description, explanation and artistic guidance.

Here then are some of the points of special interest to this reviewer. In examining Mahayanist and Tantric influences upon Pagán's sculpture and painting Gordon Luce asks the question why Burma, which was from at least the seventh century A.D. exposed to such influences coming from Eastern Bengal, did not, like Nepal and Tibet, come fully into the Northern Buddhist fold. She was, after all, he contends, deeply indebted to Bengal for her iconography and, probably, much of her architecture. He offers three suggestions by way of reply. In the first place the weakness of the Sanskrit link has, he thinks, to be considered: if East Bengal had been able to offer Anawrahta the texts he wanted, Burma might be Mahayanist today. Secondly, he sees Buddhism in retreat throughout East Asia during this critical time in Burma's religious history. This meant that the Mahayanists coming to Pagán were refugees rather than missionaries. Finally, there was the opening of contact with Ceylon in the later eleventh century, and he asks whether it was just chance that guided the king's steps southwards instead of northwards. On the contrary, he points out, Anawrahta was impelled by the need to seal and extend his eastern frontiers: he had to beat off the Khmers, the conquerors of the Mon states in what is today north and south Siam, and absorb Mon Buddhist refugees. The Mon kingdom of Dvaravati had been strongly Theravadin since the sixth century, he tells us, and could have exerted a strong influence upon the Pyu of Śrī Kṣetra. He accepts the late Pierre Dupont's thesis that Dvaravati was the original diffusion-centre of Theravada Buddhism in mainland South-east Asia. Thus, with Mon cultural influence supreme at Pagán, Vijaya Bahu I's appeals to Anawrahta for help, and the latter's ready response were in no sense fortuitous. And Ceylon could supply Pagán with the sacred texts, of Pali Buddhism.

Pagán's Buddhism, however, remained very mixed. The Vedic gods, for instance,

appear from the first in its iconography. And although Śiva does not appear upon the scene, two of the Pagan temples are dedicated to Vishnu. Kyanzitha himself, whom Gordon Luce shows convincingly to have been mainly responsible for the triumph of Theravada Buddhism in Burma, claimed to be, among other things, an Avatar of Vishnu, and his chief queen was the founder of the Abeyadana Temple, which is pure Tantric Mahayanist.

According to Gordon Luce the key evidence regarding the transmission of Singhalese Buddhism to Pagan is to be found in the Pahtothamya Temple, which is full of Old Mon writings and paintings illustrating the texts of the Singhalese Tripitaka. The Burmese chronicles ascribe its foundation to Saw Rahan, a tenth-century precursor of the Pagan monarchy, but archaeological opinion places it much later. Alexander Griswold assigns it to Kyanzitha's reign*. Gordon Luce, however, sees it as the pioneer in the spread of the Theravadin gospel, and attributes it to the reign of Saw Lu, Kyanzitha's immediate predecessor, when, according to his reckoning, the main impact of the Ceylon scriptures had already begun to be felt. Architecturally he sees it as "the immediate parent" of Kyanzitha's temples, the largest and most splendid of which, popularly known as the Ananda, appears in colour as the frontispiece of his first volume. The Ananda, like the Pahtothamya, was a centre for popular religious education. Many passages in Kyanzitha's inscriptions, we are told, prove that he and his Mahathera Shin Araham had a masterplan to teach Buddhism to his subjects. This, he claims, is why the Ananda has four halls instead of one, and in them and its corridors is to be found the first great storehouse of Buddhist sculpture in Burma, no less than 1,535 images in all. Charles Duroiselle thought that its prototype was the Paharpur Temple in Northern Bengal, but Gordon Luce suggests that a closer model may be found, for it is as well as all "Old Mon" architecture in Burma, in the "Mainamati" excavations on Lal Mai ridge in East Pakistan, but that its radiating arch harks back to the small vaulted brick temples of Śrī Kṣetra. Their ultimate model, he believes, must be sought in Bihar or Bengal under Gupta rule.

Today the architectural remains of Pagan are scattered over an area of twenty-five square miles and are nearly all of brick. But, writes Gordon Luce, this is "only half the story", for inscriptions indicate that there was once a wealth of wood which has disappeared, palaces, schools, colleges, and monasteries. It was in these that Burma's native genius showed itself, and they are our greatest loss, for very little woodwork survives today from the Pagan period. Good stone was rare, and was commonly used to strengthen brickwork, hardly ever for whole buildings. The use of brick came, he thinks, from India, perhaps with Buddhism, since the Pagan inscriptions refer to brick monasteries as Indian.

Although the political changes re-establishing Burman supremacy occupied only some nine years, from Parakrama Bahu's invasion of Burma in 1165 to the restoration of Anawrahta's line in 1174 in the person of Caṅśū II (Narapatisithu), the transition from Old Mon to Early Burmese architecture, Gordon Luce explains, took much longer. It shows itself as early as 1131 with the Shwegu-gyi Temple, which he classifies as Early Burmese Transitional. But Old Mon took a long time to die: he describes the huge Dhammayan-gyi Temple of c. 1160 as its swan song. Before that date, however, must be placed another Early Burmese Transitional building, Alaungsihu's Thatbyinnyu Temple, "the noblest monument of Burmese architecture". Its accepted date, according to Taw Sein Ko's estimate, has been taken to be 1144, but Gordon Luce adduces reasons for dating it later, between 1150 and 1155. But not until 1180, he claims, does Old Burmese reach its full maturity, with the Sulamani Temple. These are the outward signs of a change of fundamental importance in Burma's history. It is tantalizing that so little is known of its social background.

Gordon Luce's treatment of the main features of early Burmese history has never found favour with the followers of the traditional version purveyed by the chroniclers and taught in the schools. How deep the rift is can be realized by examining Maung Htin Aung's treatment of the subject in his *History of Burma* (1967), in which he essays

* In *Burma, Korea, Tibet* (Art of the World Series), London, 1964, p. 28.

to "defend" the Chronicles. What is more important, however, is that few, if any, scholars anywhere are equipped to assess critically Gordon Luce's theses regarding such matters of history as the origin of the Burmans and of the Pagan kingdom, the Thaton story, the coming of Theravada Buddhism and the Singhalese war, to name only the most prominent. Here he is the pioneer. In the case of art and architecture on the other hand he has had at his disposal a great body of work by scholars of distinction. To this his contributions, through the discovery of new material, the application of his unique linguistic and epigraphical knowledge, and not least through his insight, have been in many ways revolutionary. And in these studies he has had the full co-operation of the Burmese archaeologists.

This remarkable work is far ahead of anything ever before published on its subject. Due tribute must be paid to those who have made possible its publication in this excellent edition, and notably to the administrators of the JDR III Fund, which provided the bulk of the heavy subvention needed, and to Mr. Alexander Griswold for indispensable practical help.

D. G. E. HALL

Classical China (Readings in World History, Vol. 5), edited by William H. McNeill and Jean W. Sedlar. xiv+274 pp. New York, Oxford University Press, 1970.

This little book makes the attempt to introduce students of history to classical Chinese antiquity by selections from established translations of a variety of Chinese classical texts, arranged in five sections: Ethics, Politics, History, Religion, and Society. Each extract is preceded by a very short introduction, intended to supply the background.

The reader unacquainted with the civilization of ancient China, for whom this book is intended, will inevitably obtain only a very partial and interrupted view of the many works to which he is here introduced. Yet being made to listen to the classical Chinese authors themselves, he may perhaps be more tempted to go back to the works here quoted than if he had been reading a more homogeneous summary by a historian.

GEORGE WEYS

D. E. Mills, *A Collection of Tales from Uji—A Study and Translation of Uji Shūi Monogatari* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications No. 15). xii+459 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1970.

There are still few western studies of Japanese classics which, by virtue of their authors' combination of mastery of the texts, familiarity with the best of contemporary Japanese scholarship, and critical ability, can stand as original contributions to their subject. Dr. Mills is to be congratulated on adding to the number. His subject is the *Uji Shūi Monogatari*, which with its 197 stories covering some four centuries is one of the most famous collections in the peculiarly Japanese genre of "tale literature". The first portion of the book, a revised version of a doctoral thesis presented some years ago at London University, begins with two introductory chapters on the development of tale literature in Japan to the end of the Kamakura period, and on the problems which academic study of the literature is concerned to elucidate. Japanese scholars did not begin to take much interest in this field till the twenties of this century; and even so, most of the significant work has been done only in the last decade. Dr. Mills provides a critical survey of the Japanese achievement so far, together with some suggestions of his own.

There follow five chapters on the particular problems posed by the *Uji Collection* itself—its literary aspect, parallels with other works, Japanese views on its date, Japanese views on its relationship with other works, and finally some "personal observations on its date, structure and position", leading to the conclusion, based largely

on minute linguistic detective work, that the majority of Japanese scholars may be wrong in their view that the *Collection* is to be dated well after the *Konjaku Monogatari* and was the work of a single writer.

Most of this 130-page study is clearly for specialists only. The layman who ventures to make his way through it may find little of interest to him apart from the brief discussion of the nature of tale literature in general. He may even be put off the *Collection* itself, for Dr. Mills is forbidding enough about its literary value: "... it goes without saying that it is not great literature" (p. 61). Fortunately, however, he softens this judgement a few lines later: "... (the stories) are in many cases written with considerable skill, and they have a real appeal as literature ... The main appeal lies not in their technique but in their human interest." For a moment an academic concern with problems of technique, dating, and so forth—in dealing with which Dr. Mills is masterly—may perhaps have dampened his literary sensibilities; but from his translation of the *Tales* themselves, at once faithful, economical, and sensitive (besides being copiously annotated), it is clear that the lapse, if lapse there was, was very temporary.

For the *Tales* may not be *great* literature, but the unorganized "life-like" juxtaposition of so many types of tale, depicting such a wide range of Japanese life and preoccupations of nearly a millennium ago, and the very artlessness of the telling, assuredly give the *Collection* considerable literary charm as well as sociological interest. Even to look over the titles of the tales is a small feast. There are Court Tales ("About Toshitsuna, the Master of the Bureau of Palace Repairs from Fushimi"; "How the mistress of the Fujiwara Major Counsellor Tadaie broke wind"), popular stories ("About the thief Daitarō"), tales of Buddhist faith ("About the holy man who instituted the Enlightenment Sermons at the Tōhoku-in Temple"; "How a poor layman gained awareness of the Buddha-nature and became rich"), and weakness ("How a priest out visiting sneaked some troutlings"), universal folk-tales with a Japanese flavour ("How a sparrow repaid its debt of gratitude"), Chinese tales ("How an old man wearing a hat quizzed Confucius"), and many others of a vast variety.

The scholar will be impressed and stimulated by Dr. Mills' thorough and incisive study of the many unsolved problems attaching to the *Collection*. The layman may find himself so fascinated by the stories themselves as to wish, churlishly, that they had been placed at the beginning of the book, instead of after the learned study. If so, he will have a special fellow-feeling for the boy in the delightful Tale No. 13, with his reprehensible distaste for the more rarefied things of life.

How a young lad from the country wept on seeing the cherry-blossom falling

Again, long ago a young lad from the country who had entered the monastery on Mt Hiei noticed one day when the cherry-blossoms were at their most beautiful that there was a strong wind blowing, and he began to cry bitterly. A priest happened to see him and went gently up to him to ask, "What are you crying for, my boy? Are you sad because the cherry-blossoms are falling? They don't last more than a short time, and soon fall, as you see. But there's no more to it than that." "There's nothing anyone can do to prevent the cherry-blossoms falling. That's not what grieves me," said the lad. "The reason I am sad is that I am thinking how the flowers will be knocked off my father's barley and the grain will not set," and he set up a great sobbing and wailing.

But as he remembers to pay his tribute of respect to Dr. Mills for his remarkable achievement, he will not disagree with the anonymous story-teller of the *Collection* as he concludes this tiny gem of a tale with his own pithy verdict on the boorish boy:

Really, this was taking things a little far!

KENNETH STRONG

Archaeology of the Ryukyu Islands. By Richard J. Pearson. University of Hawaii Press, 1969.

This is a study of the archaeological materials from Ryukyu. The area is a string of islands which links Kyushu in the north to Taiwan in the south and separates the

East China Sea from the Pacific. The purpose is to present a synthesis of the ancient remains in the form of a chronology consisting of phases and complexes.

Field exploration of Ryukyu was started more than half a century ago, but more intensive investigations have been done only in recent years. From some fifty sites a corpus of miscellaneous finds have been assembled. They are divided into three groups, namely, Satsunan Islands in the north, Amami and Okinawa Islands in the middle and Sakishima Islands in the south. To determine the relationships of the Ryukyu cultures with those of the surrounding regions some of the sites in Kyushu and Taiwan have also been taken into consideration, making a total of seventy-six sites.

As the main bulk of the materials consists of pottery wares the sites are first arranged according to their respective ceramic types. There are ten types in Kyushu, twenty-two in Ryukyu and three wares in Taiwan. Typological research on the Jomon pottery is a unique contribution in the archaeology of Japan and the discipline has been applied to the Ryukyu materials. But one should bear in mind that "Jomon" means literally "cord marks" and all these types of pottery are basically in the tradition of the so-called Corded Ware, the oldest ceramics of East Asia. It has a wide distribution, persisting in some remote areas into modern times. It is interesting to note that while the northern pottery is classified into more than thirty types, the southern material is recognized only as three wares.

Then the characteristics of the Ryukyu pottery are considered together with the aspects of subsistence. They comprise the associated finds, such as implements, weapons, ornaments, dwelling remains, burial rites and ritual objects which are assumed to be the concrete expression of a common social tradition binding the people together. This is described as archaeological phases, amounting to seven in number, and named each after a type site which may be dated. For those that are incomplete in their contents they are grouped under four complexes with no absolute dating.

And finally, through comparative study of these phases the major trends in the evolution of Ryukyu cultures in the five sub-areas are tabulated as follows:

1. South Kyushu—Ichiki Phase (2600 B.C.—A.D. 1000).
2. Satsunan—Ichiki Phase, Hirota Complex and Satsunan Historic Complex.
3. Amami-Okinawa—Yaejima Phase (2000 B.C.—A.D. 200), Noguni Phase (A.D. 200—1250) and Katsuren Phase (A.D. 1250—1600).
4. Sakishima—Nakama Phase (—A.D. 1250) and Kudo Phase (A.D. 1250—1600).
5. East Taiwan—Corded Complex, T'ai Yuan Phase (—A.D. 1250) and Ami Complex.

It is concluded that Ryukyu was populated more than 4,500 years ago but it remained rather isolated throughout the centuries. "This isolation lasted until the thirteenth century when the islands were gradually integrated into the Chinese commercial system." Apart from the crude Jomon or Corded pottery a wide variety of Chinese porcelain and coins have been found. The author has indeed put us in his debt by presenting this systematic survey from such a magnitude of messy materials in this obscure region.

CHENG TE-K'UN

The Invasion Of Nepal: John Company At War, by John Pemble. Oxford, Clarendon Press, £4 50.

Like many conflicts before and since, the Anglo-Nepalese War of 1814-16 was initiated on dubious assumptions, lasted much longer than was expected, and resulted in unanticipated benefits. In his lucid introductory chapters Dr. Pemble shows that while there was a serious frontier problem, Britain's overriding strategic concern should have been to avoid friction with China. The economic justification—that possession of Nepal would enable the Company to reopen a valuable trade route with Tibet—was a complete delusion. In the event, instead of strategic or commercial advantages, the British Raj fortuitously discovered the climatic blessings of the hill

stations such as Simla, and also made the valuable acquisition of the Gurkha regiments, which, strictly speaking, were not composed of Gurkhas at all.

The campaigns of 1814-15 ended in humiliating reverses on the two major fronts, though there were redeeming successes on the flanks. Dr. Pemble demonstrates that, quite apart from the enormous problems posed by the terrain, the time limit imposed by the onset of the "sickly season" and the stiff resistance of the Nepalese, the Bengal army was by this time a badly blunted instrument of war. Thus, for example, the sepoys were poorly armed, ill-trained, underpaid and recruited on a caste and family basis that militated against military discipline and zeal. The proportion of European officers to native troops was declining in the 1800's; and their inferiority to officers in the King's service was continually rubbed in. Worst of all, perhaps, promotion was painfully slow and depended entirely on seniority. Thus the senior generals of 1814 such as Marley, Martindell, and George Wood proved themselves unfitted for command, but were nevertheless rewarded with further promotions. Wood is described as "a bilious old officer, known as 'the Tiger' as much because of his growling and swearing as because of his courage. He abhorred risking his reputation, which he hoarded like a miser."

Dr. Pemble's vivid account of the palsied movements, muddled orders and suicidal tactics of these generals is all too reminiscent of Buller's blunderings in Natal in 1899. The shining exception, and he is really the hero of this book, was a comparatively junior officer, Major-General David Ochterlony. He realized that the problem was to lure the enemy into a pitched battle and destroy him rather than push him back from one nearly impregnable stronghold to another. This he achieved by brilliant manoeuvre, the heroic exertions of his sepoys and elephants, and a large slice of luck in defeating Amar Singh Thapa at Ramgarh and Malaun. His fame and numerous honours (including the G.C.B.) did something to raise the status of the Company's officers, but the dispiriting seniority system remained fundamentally unreformed.

The British victory over Nepal was not the ineluctable, predetermined consequence of overwhelming strength. To the "crude appurtenances of power" there had to be added "good luck and the extraordinary ingenuity, dynamism, devotion and courage of a handful of European officers"—such as the Engineer subaltern Peter Lawtie, to whom Ochterlony owed so much. In his epilogue Dr. Pemble suggests that the decline in the number of these outstanding young Company officers—whose *mores* are now so hard for us to understand—had a great deal to do with the growing disaffection of the sepoys that eventually erupted in the great Mutiny of 1857.

The author has visited the scenes he describes, clearly cares deeply about his subject, and succeeds in conveying his enthusiasm to the reader. It is also an admirable work of scholarship, though most of the references from the original doctoral thesis have been omitted. Dr. Pemble writes extremely well, wielding his pen as effectively as the Gurkhas their *khukuris*, but occasionally he appears to achieve vividness by exercising "historic licence" in imagining what his characters were thinking and feeling, (e.g., "white baboons peered from the foliage, causing hearts to pound", p. 329).

In conclusion, this is a splendid example of the broad treatment that the historian must apply to small wars between unequal contestants if their full significance is to be brought out. It is to be hoped that the numerous, indefatigable chroniclers of Britain's military campaigns will henceforth take Dr. Pemble as their model.

BRIAN BOND

Igor de Rachewiltz and Miyoko Nakano, *Index to Biographical Material in Chin and Yuan Literary Works*. First Series. 69 pp. Centre of Oriental Studies, Canberra. Australian National University Press. 1970. \$3.75.

This index is the first of two volumes designed to supplement the *Combined Indices to Thirty Collections of Liao, Chin and Yuan Biographies* originally published by the Harvard-Yenching Institute and issued in a revised edition by the Tōyō Bunko in 1960. The *Combined Indices* mostly referred to historical works, but did not deal with the

collected works of writers of the period, in which biographical information is also often buried. To fill this gap the compilers have chosen about fifty titles, most of them literary collections 文集, this first volume dealing with 23 collections. The names of the persons to whom the material refers are listed in alphabetical order with source, chapter and page number next to them. The index is thus very simple to use. One only regrets that the Second Series could not have been combined with it in one volume.

GEORGE WEYS

Traditional Chinese Plays: Ssu Lang Visits His Mother and The Butterfly Dream, translated, described and annotated by A. C. Scott, pp. 165. University of Wisconsin Press, 1967. £2.45.

This book is meant for students of Chinese drama and particularly for those who are interested in Chinese stage technique. The author explains that "the Chinese theatre provides a total experience for its audience through the manipulation of sound and movement within space, and is quite unconcerned with logic and psychological analysis in the Western way", pointing out that "the Asian play only becomes intelligible through the actor awakening sensory rhythms within the consciousness of the spectator", and calling it "an evanescent process for which a text leaves no tangible record". To provide the student with more than the mere script, the author takes great pains to describe the Chinese stage, musical instruments used in the theatre orchestra, role categories, costume and make-up, with photographs to illustrate some of them. Each of these plays is worked in with detailed stage directions, explanation of gestures and movements, symbolic or otherwise, over and above the simple plot and the actual text of the piece. This is an innovation in the presentation of Chinese drama to English readers and is perhaps also a valiant attempt on the part of the author to rescue this highly developed art and perfected technique of the Chinese stage from sinking into oblivion under Marxist criticism, referred to on pages 24 and 96.

K. P. K. WHITAKER

Khushwant Singh, *The History of the Sikhs*, Vol. 1: 1469-1839, pp. xiii + 419, 4 plates, 4 maps (1963), 50s; Vol. 2: 1839-1964, pp. xi + 395, 10 illus., 4 maps (1966), 70s. London, University Press; Oxford University Press.

In these two volumes Mr. Singh has presented for the first time a panoramic view of the history of the Sikhs from the birth of Nanak (founder of Sikhism) in 1469 to the death of Jawahar Lal Nehru in 1964. The author does not explain why his narrative should end in 1964, a year which registers no landmark in the history of the Sikhs. Mr. Singh's premise that the history of the Sikhs is the "story of the rise, fulfilment, and collapse of Punjabi nationalism", seems premature in view of the fact that within a year of publication of his second volume in 1966 a Punjabi speaking (and predominantly Sikh) State was created by separating Hindi-speaking Haryana from the Punjab.

The first volume begins with the birth of Sikhism and provides brief sketches of the first ten Gurus of the Sikhs from Nanak to Govind Singh (1666-1708), the last spiritual leader of the Sikhs who turned them into a militant community. Here the history of the Sikhs from 1469 to 1708 is described in a traditional manner - through the lives and deeds of the early leaders. Consequently, the people as such hardly came into focus except when a few hundred of them are assembled for a sermon from their leader or marching under his banner against an enemy. The narrative is hardly critical. The author incorporates some of the "myths", occasionally casting some doubts on the historicity of certain events such as Nanak's tour of Ceylon (p. 33 n.). Soon after the

author is out of the first two centuries of the Gurus, whose thoughts and deeds no faithful Sikh can question, his style assumes a critical flavour. Part three of the first volume offers an excellent study of the rise of Ranjit Singh as the leader of the Punjab, and his government from 1801 to 1839. Though Ranjit Singh is as great a hero of the Sikhs as Shivaji of the Marathas, Mr. Singh is fairly objective and critical in his analysis of the nature and significance of Ranjit's rule. Perhaps Ranjit Singh was more of a banyan tree, beneath which nothing but weeds could thrive, than Shivaji, and his kingdom disintegrated and disappeared in a decade after his death.

Part One of the second volume describes the disintegration of the Punjab, leading to its annexation by the British in 1849. Mr. Singh does not waste space in determining the illegality of the British conquest of the Punjab, as is done in a later work on the British campaigns against the Sikhs (George Bruce, *Six Battles for India*). Lord Dalhousie saw "no escape from the necessity of annexing this infernal country", and he did it. Though the second Sikh war was ostensibly fought against the rebels of the Sikh government (Durbar) it was in reality fought for the annexation of the Punjab to British India.

Peace dawned upon the Punjab soon after the British brought it under a "good government". In 1857, the Punjabis were contented and the Sikh soldiers "did not share the grievances of the Hindustani sepoys". The author underlines special features to explain why the Punjab did not rise against the British during the mutiny (pp. 101-3).

Mr. Singh pursues mainly two themes across the history of the Sikhs from 1858 to 1964. First is the growing assertiveness among the Sikhs that they were not Hindus, especially after the advent of the Arya Samaj movement among the Punjabi Hindus. The second theme arises out of the first and it is the demand for a Sikh homeland in the post-independence period.

Though Mr. Singh does not admit the fact explicitly, it is clear from his own, as well as from other accounts of the Sikh history, that Sikhism, which emerged as a syncretic religion taking into its fold the features of both Hinduism and Islam, was at its origin and has been ever since much closer to Hinduism than to any other religion. Indeed, the Sikhs asserted themselves against Hinduism only when their separate communal identity was challenged by the militant Arya Samaj movement in the Punjab and when the assertion of separate identities, regional or communal, had come to yield political gainstand privileges in the imperial scheme of the British Raj.

In a general study of this nature, covering nearly 500 years, Mr. Singh is hardly expected to tread around every dark corner with firmness and insight. He provides a rather dotted account of the Sikh demand for a Sikh State in the post-independence period. Unavailability of materials, lack of space (less than twenty pages are given to this theme), and fast changing patterns of contemporary history, may account for this lack of depth in his analysis. He maintains that Sikh hopes of getting their own homeland were aroused when in 1948 the Sikh states of the Punjab were merged to form the Patiala and the East Punjab States (PEPSU) in which the Sikhs found themselves in a majority against the Hindus (p. 294). The State became a nucleus of a Sikhistan, but soon the Nehru government deliberately frosted their hopes. "It decided to merge PEPSU with the Punjab and so to create a State in which the Hindus would form a permanent majority of 65% against the Sikh's 35%. Akali leaders were hoodwinked into believing that the merger was a step towards the establishment of a Punjabi Suba. They joined the Congress Party en masse." (p. 297).

This explanation is weak and incoherent. It implies first that Nehru's administration was anti-Sikhistan, and secondly that the Sikh leaders were naïve and could not understand the simple implication of the merger. Mr. Singh supports neither of these implications with any evidence. There must be more facets to this episode than the author has inferred.

The drawbacks of the volumes seem insignificant in view of the vastness of these period and complexities of the subject they take into their folds. The author has based his study on as many original sources as he could find in Gurmukhi, Persian and English. The facts are fairly accurate (on p. 271, Vol. II read 1947 instead of 1946). It is, in my opinion, the first account of the Sikh history which is authentic, coherent,

scholarly and, above all, readable. These volumes are indispensable for keen students of Indian history.

B. N. PANDEY

The Jongyuan In Yunn: A Guide to Old Mandarin Pronunciation, by Hugh M. Stimson, pp. 485+i-v. Sinological Series No. 12, Far Eastern Publications, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., 1966 (Printed in Japan).

Dr. Stimson, who wrote "Phonology of the Chūng-yüan Yīn-yün" (*Tsinghua Journal of Chinese Studies*, New Series 3.114-59 [1962]), taken from his longer doctoral dissertation, has here produced an extremely useful manual in *The Jongyuan In Yunn* based on his earlier analysis which gives a complete listing of 5,865 entries of this Old Mandarin rhyme book. He assigns a serial code to each item followed by the character with its radical number and residual strokes, Stimson's value for Middle Chinese (Karlgren's Ancient Chinese), the homonym number from the original text, the Old Mandarin reading, the Modern Peking reading and a brief English gloss. The bulk of the book (pp. 41-411) lists the forms according to the order just mentioned. A radical index and a stroke-count index of graphs with obscure radicals follows (pp. 413-85). The items are serialized primarily according to the Old Mandarin readings. Stimson's arrangement makes it very easy to look up any form very readily, and he has thus produced a most important aid to the Chinese phonologist, one which will indeed prove to be indispensable.

Stimson's description of the phonology of the three stages, Middle Chinese, Old Mandarin and Modern Peking, are all based on a type of analysis which stresses similarity and parallelism of the phonological structures of each of the three stages. This procedure makes perfectly clear how individual forms changed (or in some cases were maintained unchanged) and how the forms fit the framework of the particular phonological system. For example, Stimson's Serial 1335 "thread, strand" is phonologically the same for all three stages: *liu* 3. The analysis is similar in its main lines to that designed for Modern Peking by Lawton M. Hartmann III in "The Segmental Phonemes of the Peiping Dialect" (*Language*, 20.28-42, 1944). A very similar system was used by Samuel E. Martin in "The Phonemes of Ancient Chinese" (Supplement to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 16 [1953]). Some of the salient features of Stimson's analysis can be illustrated by Serial 0490a "stone":

Middle Chinese (MC)	Old Mandarin (OM)	Modern Peking (MP)
shiek	sriiq 2	sri 2

In the MC form, Karlgren's initial *ʃ-* is represented as *ʃi-*, a palatal sibilant with voiced aspiration. Karlgren's final *-iək* is represented as *-iek*. In the two later stages, the voicing of the initial has disappeared. In OM the word fell into tone category 2, but a trace of the old *rusheng* was maintained in the *-q* which Stimson believes stood for vocalic shortness if not actually for a glottal feature. In this stage original *rusheng* was still maintained, but in poetic practice old *rusheng* words rhymed with words having original open syllables. In the MP stage, the *rusheng* feature has been completely lost. In the two later stages, the retroflex initial is represented by the digraph *sr-*. The symbol *i* stands for a vowel with high tongue position. In OM this was accompanied in the word "stone" by a high front glide *i*. For MP, the "apical vowel" (which some phonologists analyse as "zero") is adequately represented by *i* alone.

The dictionary part of Stimson's work is preceded by an introduction which describes the organization of the *Jongyuan In Yunn* and gives a brief history of its study. Most of the introduction is given over to an outline of the phonological analysis of the three stages. It is done very concisely. Stimson's phonological analysis of the two later stages, OM and MP, is perfectly clear, logical and consistent, although other analysts might prefer alternate solutions. His presentation of the first stage, MC, is likewise clear. His analysis includes the distinction (not made by Karlgren or Martin) of the medials *i* and *j* where they contrasted after velar and labial initials before a few finals having front vowel quality. For those used to Karlgren's values, it may take some time

to make the necessary adjustment between his system and Stimson's. Although Stimson shows the two systems side by side, there are a number of cases where he does not explain why his system diverges. It would have been helpful had he gone into greater detail here. However, this is a relatively minor criticism since the whole work focuses on Old Mandarin. Old Mandarin is about intermediate in time between Middle Chinese and Modern Peking, but is phonologically much closer to the latter. Dr. Stimson's real contribution consists in having made the phonology of Old Mandarin accessible to the specialist and non-specialist alike.

NICHOLAS C. BODMAN

E. Thio, *British Policy in the Malay Peninsula 1880-1910*, Vol. I, xxxvii + 288 pp. Singapore and Kuala Lumpur, University of Malaya Press, 1969. \$26.00.

In recent years British policy towards the Malay Peninsula has received much attention. Tarling, Parkinson, Cowan and McIntyre brought us up to the important advances on the West coast during the eighteen-seventies. Dr. Thio's carefully researched, thoughtful book begins at 1880. It has two principal concerns: first, the extension of British control in Negri Sembilan, Pahang and Johore (she proposes to deal with the Northern, "Siamese", States in another volume); and, secondly, the administrative consolidation of the British Protected States. The latter covers the discussion leading up to the 1895 Federation decision, and the working of the new scheme up to 1910, in particular the relationship between the Governor/High Commissioner in Singapore and his subordinate the Resident-General on the Peninsula.

At the outset it must be emphasized that Dr. Thio does not try to "tell the whole story". She describes the book as a "study of the formulation of British policy". It is pursued from a British perspective, and is less of a contribution to Malayan than to Imperial history. As such, many questions regarding this period of Colonial expansion remain open. For example, Dr. Thio demonstrates that Johore played a crucial role in Pahang's subjugation, yet its leaders' motives await careful analysis. Likewise, Pahang's response to British intervention has yet to be fully examined. This is not a criticism, but assists in defining the limits of the present book. Nevertheless, there are points where one requires more of the non-British part of "the story". It should, for instance, be strongly emphasized that the official objection to annexation, rather than federation, of the Protected States was not a purely moral one. Swettenham had noted that "there are over 100,000 Malays in Perak alone . . . and when it is remembered what a trouble a mere handful of discontented people recently gave in Pahang . . . it would be a serious mistake to overlook the fact that the Malays and their interests are still the first consideration." British aims were far from being unilaterally determined. Secondly, where the study has gone beyond Imperial policy and deals with Malay affairs it tends to have a British-official bias. The description of Pahang's Sultanate rests too heavily on the opinion of the young and emotional Hugh Clifford; and historians of Malaya desire more than a quote from Winstedt in an assessment of Johore's first "Protected" ruler.

"Set", as Dr. Thio states, "in a period of intensive and competitive European activity overseas" this study has much to interest the Imperial historian. Abu Bakar of Johore is another example (the Sultan of Zanzibar was an earlier one) of a co-operative and "intelligent" chief whose influence was increased by the British in an attempt to solve the problem of a "turbulent frontier". Ceylon, it is argued, constituted an important model for the consolidation of British Malaya. Johore's relatively long-lasting independence makes an illuminating comparison with Thailand; and, incidentally, the former's Sultan was probably influenced by Chulalongkorn's methods of modernization. The debate over the British presence in Pahang has much of the flavour of the great Uganda debate, with Edward Fairfield an elegant Harcourt battling expensive Imperialism from within the Colonial Office. The book provides much information on the men involved in Empire. At home: Kimberley, the Liberal who encouraged British moves on the Peninsula during the seventies, does so again

in Dr. Thio's period; Joseph Chamberlain is seen supporting the "truculent" Swettenham against his more hesitant superior, Mitchell; and finally the departure of Meade and Fairfield from the Colonial Office leaves men of Swettenham's ilk in sole command. "On the spot": we have useful sketches of Weld, Smith, Mitchell, Swettenham and Anderson—of whom all but Mitchell were expansionists.

The whole problem of British Imperialism, and indeed of all policy-making, is illuminated by such detailed studies as this. They permit generalization to be grounded in evidence rather than ideology. In this regard it is to be hoped that Dr. Thio addresses herself to the question of Imperial expansion in a more general manner, perhaps in the second volume. Although she is sensibly cautious, one can see already the direction in which such an essay would lead. Three 'fundamental principles' lay behind British policy in Malaya: the prevention of foreign European intervention in the area, promotion of local commerce, and the need to stabilize "turbulent frontiers". In different instances one or another of these considerations was prominent. Among the Negri Sembilan States, Rembau was primarily a frontier problem, and economic considerations were most important in Jelebu. Fear of another European Power led to the quest for an "irrefutable right to 'protect' Pahang". Later, commercial considerations were fundamental in the establishment there of the full Residential system. (Students still reading "Hobson" will want more information on the role of the Pahang Corporation in this development). Finally, Johore remained independent for so long because "Britain's strategic interests were safeguarded by the 1885 treaty and the Sultan continued to keep peace and order as well as promote economic enterprise".

This short review is not the place to launch into a long discussion but one point deserves more emphasis. Dr. Thio, in pleasing contrast to many other writers on British Imperial history, avoids a too heavy concentration on the London end of policy-making. "The role of local officials", she explains, "can scarcely be over-rated". Thus, at one moment we find the Secretary of State presented with a *fait accompli* regarding actions in Negri Sembilan; at another, a fresh phase of expansion is initiated with the arrival of a new Governor. The crucial function of these "men on the spot" leads one seriously to consider their outlooks and assumptions. The independent contribution made by such factors to Imperial decisions is suggested by the conflict between that cautious Governor, Sir Charles Mitchell, and his more sanguine colleagues. We must then weigh up the importance of assumptions about expansion in individual decisions to extend British control: Governor Weld, for instance, believed "a great nation . . . must either advance or decay". Also, does the bitter argument between Smith and Swettenham over fatherhood of the Federation scheme imply that personal ambition should stand beside less subjective considerations in an explanation of its origins? Might Smith, whom newspapers accused of being a mere Civil Servant alongside his "statesman" predecessor Weld, have felt that extending the "British red" a little further up the Malay Peninsula (i.e. over Pahang) would enhance his reputation? Finally, one should consider to what extent Governors saw themselves as Malay Rajahs competing for power in the Malay world. Weld's despatches tend to give that impression, and we know he slept in a *sarong*.

A. C. MILNER
Cornell University

H. Ulbricht, *Wayang Purwa. Shadows of the Past*. 114 pp. + 5 pls., numerous photographs and drawings. Index. Kuala Lumpur and Singapore, Oxford University Press, 1970. £4.20.

This work is a welcome addition to the existing literature on the Javanese shadow theatre. It describes the manner in which the plays are performed, the shapes and colours etc. of the different *wayang* puppets as well as the contents of the plays. It is richly illustrated, although the absence of at least a few colour plates is regrettable. The descriptions are everywhere accurate and full of interesting observations.

In presenting interpretations of the plays the author has followed the views of

cultured Japanese. These are most interesting, but it would have been an advantage if also the interpretations by modern scholars, especially anthropologists, had been taken into account. In a few cases where the author presents his own interpretations he has been less successful. It may be doubted whether, for instance, Plato's *Symposium* is the best source for the analysis of the figure of Sēmar (who, on this basis, is seen as a hermaphrodite).

The book has a useful glossary and is well presented.

J. G. DE CASPARIS

Crisis Politics in Prewar Japan: Institutional and ideological problems of the 1930s, edited by George M. Wilson. xiii+87 pp. Tokyo, Sophia University, 1970. \$3.25.

This important volume consists of four essays which offer a reinterpretation of Japan's history in the 1930's. The object of the four authors is to examine the internal workings of some of the political crises which Japan suffered during that decade, without being distracted by the notion which has obsessed other historians that all roads led to the Pacific war. This in itself is a refreshing exercise.

The problems examined are central to Japanese history: the influence of the Military Reserve Association (Zaigo gunjinkai) in attacking the "organ" theory of the emperor's role as espoused by Professor Minobe; the co-operation between the civil and military bureaucrats; and the concept of a Showa restoration in (supposed) imitation of the Meiji restoration which many of the revolutionaries sought to introduce. Invidious as it is, I should like to concentrate my comments on one of the essays which is most controversial and whose conclusions are most far-reaching. This is the essay on "The February 26 Affair" by Mr. Shillony. The author's conclusion is that when the rebel regiments held central Tokyo in their grasp in 1936, they came closer to success than has hitherto been assumed, because of their impressive contacts with persons in high places. It has been common to interpret the Affair in terms of a confrontation between the Kodo and Tosei factions in the army; but Shillony remarks:

"It was serious not because extremist junior officers imposed their views on a spineless establishment, but because powerful elements of the establishment had decided to extend their support to a group of fanatic idealists in the lower echelons of the military... If it was an insurrection, then it was the insurrection of a whole segment of the Japanese military, from top to bottom, against another segment wielding power through the General Staff." (p. 49)

The conclusion drawn from the 26 February Affair is that it "was not a major turning point in domestic or foreign policy" (p. xi). Although there may be grounds to support this last view, this reviewer remains sceptical: I have never met anyone, Japanese or foreign, who witnessed the events of February who did not consider it to have had a bombshell effect. It may not have been a turning-point in domestic or foreign policy, but it was certainly a psychological turning-point for Japan's leaders.

These important specialized studies enable us to reassess some of the generalizations towards which less detailed accounts have drawn us in the past. Carefully and cautiously they point the way to new horizons.

IAN NISH

Akira Yuyama: *A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Saddharmapundarikāsūtra*. (Faculty of Asian Studies Oriental Monograph Series, 5.) xxxv, 115 pp., 4 plates. Canberra: Centre of Oriental Studies in association with Australian National University Press, 1970.

There is no need to mention here the importance of the *Saddharmapundarika* in the ideological and linguistic studies of Buddhist texts. The study of the Sanskrit text of

the sūtra which started more than a century ago following the discovery of a Nepalese manuscript by B. H. Hodgson, has engrossed a number of Buddhist and Sanskrit scholars the world over. Particularly in Japan, where the sūtra is still very much alive, the study of the text from various angles has made remarkable progress. The present bibliography, the first comprehensive one ever published to include works done on the text in Japan, is primarily an attempt to give all available information about the Sanskrit texts and manuscripts scattered throughout the world. Certainly the author's labour is to be appreciated by the students interested in this text.

The main body of the bibliography pertaining directly to the Sanskrit texts and manuscripts (pp. 1-53) is preceded by introductory and bibliographical notes about the general description of the sūtra, etc., and is followed by lengthy appendixes (pp. 55-100) which contain information about other versions, works done on the Sanskrit text, etc. The fact that so much space is dedicated to bibliographical notes on other versions and even on ideological matters makes one suspect that the title of the publication should rather be changed to "A Bibliography of the Saddharmapundarikāsūtra". What strikes one as strange is that works on purely ideological and doctrinal problems (pp. 95 ff.) are listed under "Philological works" which is a subsection of "Studies on the Sanskrit Texts and the Language". The author has entered many items which are not directly concerned with the text in question. Edgerton's *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* and the *Mahāvīyutpatti* given under "Linguistic works" (pp. 87-90), for instance, are indeed indispensable reference books for Buddhist students, but it is doubtful whether they should be listed in a scholarly bibliography like this. If an article on the authorship of the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* is to be included (p. 99) just because it has a little reference to the *Saddharmapundarika*, there will be a hundred more books and articles to be listed. It seems that the author has been tempted to make the bibliography as informative as possible, but a footnote like 6, page 11, on the relation between the *Saddharmapundarika* and St. Luke's Gospel is perhaps irrelevant. There are also some works listed which do not seem to deserve their places. The inclusion of general works like S. Watanabe's *Okkyō no Hanashi* in "Description of the Text" (xxviii) will make one wonder whether the bibliography is meant for amateurs or scholars.

There is a misprint in page 13 where "palmleaves" is spelt as "pamleaves". "bhāṇaka-anusamsa-" (p. 27) should be corrected as "bhāṇaka-anusamṣa-". "Tenbon Myōhōrengekyō" (xxvii, 1.9) and "Hokkekyō" (xxviii, 1.17) are mistakes for "Tenbon Myōhōrengekyō" and "Hokekyō", respectively. In the Comparative Table (xxxi), the character 龍 in the title of Chapter XIV, though given in the Taishō Tripitaka, is not usually used in modern texts; it is better to replace it by 涌. "如來神力" for the title of Chapter XX in two Chinese versions is wrongly given as 如來人力. The same mistake is found in page 27, fourth line from the bottom.

"A bibliography never ends", says the author in the Postscript (p. 109) knowing that the information given in the present publication is incomplete. Considering the rapid progress in this field of Buddhist study, it is natural that considerable additions should be made each year to any bibliography published. As regards a more comprehensive bibliography of the *Saddharmapundarika*, I would like to join the author in hoping that the Hokekyō Bunka Kenkyūjo at Risshō University will produce one. However, this bibliography will remain useful for many students in the West who particularly want information about the works done on the text in Japan.

H. INAGAKI