

NOTICES OF BOOKS

Lionel Giles, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese Manuscripts from Tunhuang in the British Museum* (The Trustees of the British Museum, London, 1957), xxv + 334 pp.

The publication of Dr. Giles' Catalogue is an important event in the history of Chinese and Buddhist studies. Fifty years have lapsed since Sir Aurel Stein's first visit to Tunhuang and during the greater part of this period Dr. Giles has devoted all his energies to the difficult task of cataloguing the 6980 Chinese manuscripts of the Stein collection.

The texts have been divided into five groups: Buddhist Texts; Taoist Texts; Manichaeian Texts; Secular Texts; Printed Documents. The first group is by far the largest. Moreover most of the printed documents are Buddhist and many texts which are to be found among the secular texts deal with Buddhism in one way or another. According to Dr. Giles' estimate nearly 85 per cent of the manuscripts are Buddhist (*Six Centuries at Tunhuang*, London, 1944, p. 7). Leaving the discussion of the other texts to Sinologists I should like to make a few comments on the description of the Buddhist texts.

The Buddhist texts fall into two main sections: canonical works; uncanonical and doubtful works. The canonical works have been catalogued according to Nanjio's *Catalogue*. As nowadays the Taishō edition is universally used it would have been preferable to follow the catalogue of this edition: *Les Tables du Taishō Issaikyō*, published as an annex fascicle of the *Hōbōgirin* in 1931. Dr. Giles has adopted Nanjio's restorations of the Sanskrit titles which are mostly based on the very unreliable 至元法寶勘同總錄 (N.1612) compiled in 1285-7. It is unfortunate that the Sanskrit titles and expressions have not been checked by a Sanskritist. The number of minor errors, especially as concerns diacritical marks, is considerable and mars this otherwise very carefully printed volume which is remarkably free from misprints. A disturbing error, copied from the catalogue of the Taishō edition, occurs in the title of No. 3781: read *Rūpāvatyāvadāna-sūtra* for *Pūpāvatyāvadāna-sūtra*.

In addition to Nanjio's Catalogue references are given to the Kyōto edition, to the Taishō edition and to Yabuki's *Meisha yoin*. References to the Taishō edition are limited to the first 55 volumes and I have not seen a single reference to the 85th volume which contains many Tunhuang texts.

Almost all colophons have been reproduced and translated. One must be grateful to Dr. Giles for having done so, for they are full of interesting details. Although stock phrases are repeated over and over again some of the longer colophons show clearly the feelings which prompted pious Buddhists to copy texts. Generally speaking the translations are very faithful, but Buddhist terminology seems to have been somewhat unfamiliar to Dr. Giles. Therefore I venture to make a few remarks on some specific points.

Nos. 869 and 1261: 勝 is translated as "equivalent" and "as much as". "Surpasses" would render the meaning better.

No. 1179: 見者受持 "that those who read it may bear its precepts in mind". 受持 refers to the learning of the sūtra and goes back to Skt. *udgryhṇāti* and *dhārayati*, learn and bear in mind. Elsewhere Dr. Giles translates it correctly, see for instance No. 1376. No. 1179: 俱勝常樂. Dr. Giles replaces 勝 by 昇 and translates "may all rise to

enduring felicity" but 勝常 is a well-known expression; it occurs again in the colophon of No. 1735.

No. 1384: No translation is given for 受記. It renders Skt. *vyākaraṇa*, prophecy, prediction.

No. 1396: 既居末劫生死是累 "since he lives in Mo-chieh in danger of his life". The text means "since he lives during the final *kalpa* in the fetters of transmigration".

No. 1693: 於像法之內 "in the illusory conditions of the present state". 像法 renders Skt. *pratirūpaka-dharma*, the Counterfeit Law, see Chavannes, *TP XV* (1915), p. 472, Lévi et Chavannes, *JA*, 1916, II, p. 194, n.1, Pelliot, *TP XXV* (1927-8), pp. 92-94.

No. 1726: 茲福普爲靈法一切衆生 "this stock of merit may be used on behalf of all the sentient beings of the universe . . .". 靈 is puzzling. Should one read 益: "this stock of merit may serve to increase the Law. May all the sentient beings . . ."? No. 2601: 菩薩戒弟子 "disciple of the Bodhisattva-pratimokṣa" 戒 renders Skt. *śīla*. For the meaning of *bodhisattvaśīla* see Hōbōgirin, *bosatsukai*.

No. 3471: 常住三寶 "to abide forever in the Triratna". The same expression occurs in No. 3264 where it is correctly translated as "the ever abiding Triratna".

No. 3748: 婆羅門僧毗尼佛陀僧伽 "the Indian Vinaya monk Buddhacinga and others". This is certainly incorrect. Most probably it means "the brahman monks Vinaya and Buddhasaṃgha and others". For the expression "brahman monk", see Hōbōgirin, p. 54b.

No. 3748: 菩提牙 "perfect intelligence is born". This is rather too loose a translation. 菩提牙 means "the germ of Awakening".

No. 4412: 大乘中宗見解義. "An Essay on the views of the Mādhyamika School concerning Mahāyānism". 大乘中宗 means "the Mādhyamika School of Mahāyāna".

No. 4631: 諸普 is rendered by "Gialbo". Gialbo stands for Tibetan *rgyal-po*, king. It would have been better to render 諸普 by *btsan-po*, the title of the Tibetan king, see Fang-kuei Li, *TP XLIV* (1956), p. 58.

No. 4826: 龍天八部 "the eight tribes of Lung-t'ien". 天 must be corrected to 王. The eight Dragon Kings (*Nāgarāja*) are well-known from Buddhist texts. For their Sanskrit names, see for instance *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*, ed. by Kern and Nanjio, p. 4, ll. 11-13.

No. 5343: 佛[說]相好經 "Sūtra on the lakṣaṇa (marks and signs) of the Buddha". 相好 translate *lakṣaṇa* and *anuvyañjana*, i.e., the 32 marks and the 80 minor marks.

No. 5381: 新西方胡國中來出皇遼樂中. "Extracted from the Imperial Nirvāṇa [sūtra] newly come from the barbarian kingdoms in the west" (?). 出 means "to translate", see Lien-sheng Yang, *HJAS* 20 (1957), p. 373. Dr. Giles' question-mark probably refers to the meaning of this sentence. Reference is made to the text translated by Dharmakṣema, a more extensive version of the *Nirvāṇasūtra* which came from Central Asia, see P. Demiéville, *l'Inde Classique* II (Paris, 1953), §. 2115.

No. 5392: 婆羅門達多羅. A Brahman Ta-to-lo is unknown from other sources. Probably Ta-to-lo is a mistake for 達摩笈多 (Dharmagupta) who is called a Brahman in Jñānagupta's biography, see Chavannes, *TP VI* (1905), pp. 350, 351. Together with Jñānagupta he has translated several texts.

No. 5562: 道場 does not render Skt. *bodhimaṇḍala* but *bodhimaṇḍa*. In China its meaning has evolved, see Yi-liang Chou, *HJAS* 8 (1945), pp. 309-311.

No. 5765: 末代 "to the end of time". The correct translation is "at the final period" as given by Dr. Giles before (No. 1774).

No. 5847: 觀門 is translated as "Contemplative school", 門 means "method".

No. 7389: 五百弟子自說本起經等 "500 disciples to recite the *Pēn ch'i* sūtra, etc.". For this title see M. Hofinger, *Le congrès du lac Anavatapta* (Louvain, 1954) who renders it by "Sūtra des avadāna de cinq cents disciples du Buddha contés par eux-mêmes".

Dr. Giles has added to his catalogue a detailed index of all the proper names and titles occurring in the more than 8000 notices which describe the manuscripts. The index contains a number of titles of texts but it is not clear to me why a relatively small number of titles have been included but the greater part has been left out. One should

have welcomed some information on this point. The remaining part of the volume consists of a conversion table of the Stein numbers and the serial numbers and rather too short a bibliography.

The above remarks have been prompted by the interest taken by the reviewer in Dr. Giles' Catalogue. The Tunhuang manuscripts in the British Museum will provide many generations of scholars with most valuable research materials. Dr. Giles' Catalogue will be for them a most useful and indispensable tool.

J. W. DE JONG

Leiden

G. Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, Part II (Serie Orientale Roma, Vol. IX, 2), Rome, 1958.

A. Ferrari, *Mk'yen Brtse's Guide to the Holy Places of Central Tibet*. Completed and edited by L. Petech, with the collaboration of H. Richardson (Serie Orientale Roma, Vol. XVI), Rome, 1958.

The eighth century Tibetan debate between Indians and Chinese is rapidly becoming one of the best-documented events in Buddhist history. Since Professor Demiéville's work of 1952 it has come to be known as the "Council of Lhasa", but now Professor Tucci (pp. 32 sq.) claims that one should rather speak of the "Debate of Bsam-yas", although it appears from pp. 285-7 that Professor Demiéville only imperfectly concurs with this proposal. Wherever it may have taken place, the debate is of great historical and doctrinal interest. Historically it marked, if it did not decide, the preponderance of Pāla Buddhism in Tibet for more than eleven centuries, and the suppression of the Chinese, especially Ch'an teachings, which had been quite strong until then. Doctrinally, it shows the astonishing variety of religious opinion even within the Mahāyāna branch of Buddhism. A Roman Catholic and a primitive Methodist are more likely to agree on the interpretation of the Bible, than Indians and Chinese on the meaning of the early Mahāyāna Scriptures. In India the teachings of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, and so on, had logically developed through Nāgārjuna, "Maitreyanātha" and Candrakīrti into the Pāla synthesis of Haribhadra and Śāntirakṣita. In China the same ideas were transformed out of all recognition by the contact with Neo-Taoism, the vast scholastic apparatus of the Hindus was rejected as so much ballast, and between 400 and 700, through the work of men like Seng-chao, Tao-sheng and Hui-nēng, there emerged an indigenous Chinese quietism, distinguished by the somewhat mysterious and challenging watchword of "sudden enlightenment", which in this form gives no sense from the point of view of the Indian tradition. In 792-4 the two lines of development confronted each other in Tibet, and they could no longer comprehend one another. So great indeed is the divergence of the two viewpoints that even at present no scholar has yet been able to do equal justice to both. To each, one of the two must appear more obvious and plausible. The debate was officially decided in favour of "the Mādhyamikas", and I do not understand why Professor Tucci seems to think that "this did not say very much, because neither school could deny resting on that system for a starting point" (p. 52). It was clearly a verdict in favour of the Indian, as against the Chinese tradition, and the future course of Tibetan Buddhism bears this out.

Kamalaśīla, the spokesman of the "Mādhyamikas", wrote his three *Bhāvanākramas* after the debate was over (p. 41). The first explains the doctrine of the Mahāyāna, the second how it can be meditated upon, and the third what is the result of that meditation. A Sanskrit manuscript of the third *Bhāvanākrama* exists in Lenin-grad, and since Professor Tucci has now succeeded in obtaining a photograph, we may hope to know soon more about it than we can gather from Obermiller's extracts in *JGIS*, 1935, pp. 1-11. The second seems to survive only in Tibetan. The Sanskrit text of the first has now been edited by Professor Tucci (pp. 187-229), together with the Tibetan translation (pp. 229-282), and an English summary of its contents (pp. 157-182). From the rather indifferent Chinese translation, "Le Concile de Lhasa"

(pp. 333-5) had only given an "analyse sommaire", chiefly indicating the quotations it contains. The first *Bhāvanākrama* is now revealed as a straightforward *exposé* of the career of a Bodhisattva according to the tenets of Pāla Buddhism, and its interest lies chiefly in the numerous precise definitions of technical terms. There is little, if any, direct reference to the doctrine of "instantaneous enlightenment", which is not refuted explicitly, but rather disposed of indirectly by the careful enumeration of the steps of the development which gradually proceeds from the "first thought of enlightenment" to the final *buddhabhūmi*, which ensues on the tenth stage of *dharma-meghā* if and when there arises *sarvasmin jñeye sarvākāram asaṅgam apratihatam jñānam*. A further reference to the debate can be seen in the care with which the orthodox meaning of "no-thought" is explained on pp. 211-214.

In addition, Professor Tucci's new book throws considerable light on the history of Ch'an Buddhism in Tibet. On pp. 68-101 he prints the Tibetan text and English translation of an important rNin-ma-pa document, *i.e.*, the chapters of the *bKa' thañ sde lha* which record the Ch'an doctrines and their teachers. "This also implies that after the split, which occurred at the death of Hui-nēng in A.D. 713, the Hva śāñ Mahāyāna considered himself and was considered by his followers as the authentic perpetuator of the teaching of Bodhidharma" (p. 64). Professor Tucci also shows that by no means all the Indians sided with Kamalaśīla, and that some of them, like Vairocana and Vimalamitra, who have had a great influence on Tibetan thought, favoured many of the tenets of Ch'an. Thirdly he maintains that the Ch'an ideas survived, more or less underground, in the rDzogs-chen branch of the rNin-ma-pa, on which a further study is announced for the future (p. 122). Preparatory to it we find here (pp. 122-153) summarized those works in the Tanjur which are ascribed to persons connected with the Debate. One of the most important sources for the rDzogs-chen doctrines is an extremely rare collection of heretical Tantras, the *rNin-ma-pa rGyud 'bum*. Professor Tucci possesses a copy, in 25 volumes, of the sDe dge print, and a manuscript of the same collection, probably from Sikkim, seems also to exist in the India Office Library. Professor Tucci gives us here only two pages of extracts (pp. 62, 3), but more is promised for the future. After we have become better acquainted with the contents of this collection, we will be able to decide whether the undoubted similarities between rDzogs-chen and Ch'an are due to borrowing, or to a parallel unfolding of trends latent in Buddhism for a long time.

This brief summary may to some extent indicate the wealth of new material offered in this book. In addition there is much useful and stimulating comment on questions of detail, like the date of the lDan dKar-ma Catalogue (pp. 46-8).

The second publication of the S.O.R. derives from the posthumous papers of the gifted Alfonsa Ferrari, who died in 1954 at the early age of 35. Mkhyen-brtse (1820-92), a rNin-ma-pa Lama, spent most of his life on pilgrimage in Central Tibet, and from his personal experience and the current *dkar chag* literature he composed his own Guide, which is here edited (pp. 1-33), and translated. Professor Petech has collected an incredible amount of information about places, persons, buildings, and images from the relevant literature, and Mr. Hugh Richardson, for nine years British agent in Lhasa, has added many of his own observations, and also provided 53 photographs. At the end there is a clear map, and three indices (pp. 173-199) facilitate access to the many facts presented here. This sumptuous publication is a model of its kind, and confirms the impression that Rome is now becoming one of the most lively centres of Buddhist learning in Europe, rivalling even the Ecole de Paris in its output.

EDWARD CONZE

R. H. van Gulik, *Siddham, an Essay on the History of Sanskrit Studies in China and Japan* (Sarasvati-Vihara Series, volume 36) Nagpur, 1956: xii + 234 pp.

This volume is a survey of the extent to which the Sanskrit language became known in China and Japan as a result of the importation of Buddhism into those two countries. The general conclusion reached is that before the development of learned

studies in Tokugawa Japan the amount of knowledge of Sanskrit itself in China and Japan was small, but that the variety of Brāhmī script called Siddham, in which it was then usually written, had become more widely known and was also practised in its own right as a branch of calligraphy.

Dr. van Gulik, who had already studied the Siddham script while in Japan before the war, with characteristic energy took the opportunity afforded by his recent tour of duty in the Netherlands Embassy in New Delhi to carry out further work on the part played by Sanskrit in Chinese and Japanese Buddhism, and has produced this most valuable pioneering book.

Pages 3-102 cover Sanskrit Studies in China, and pp. 105-139 those in Japan. The Chinese characters corresponding to names occurring in the main text are listed in pp. 141-149, and pp. 155-231 contain 60 plates, all but two of which are photolithographic facsimiles of Siddham passages reproduced from various Japanese printed books.

The reason why the Siddham script was so much used by priests in China and Japan was the magic significance that was attached to *dhāraṇī* written in Indian script. Many of the early priests undoubtedly knew the script only for the purpose of writing these formulae and knew nothing of the Sanskrit language as such, and it is clear that there were few monks either in China or Japan who were real experts in Sanskrit linguistics. Dr. van Gulik, however, suggests that the claims found in literature to the effect that Chinese and Japanese priests were "thoroughly conversant with the Sanskrit language" should be discredited and that the majority of them could do no more than read the Indian script, without any idea of the functioning of Sanskrit grammar. While he provides good evidence for deflating many of these literary claims, Dr. van Gulik may have gone perhaps a little too far in denying the extent of the knowledge possessed by these priests. The fact that none of them (until Jiun in the Tokugawa period in Japan, p. 133) published an outline of Sanskrit grammar cannot in itself be taken as evidence that they did not understand Sanskrit grammar, for they studied the Sanskrit texts in search of religious, not philological, enlightenment. (In the same way, hundreds of thousands of Japanese from the sixth and seventh centuries onwards must have learnt Chinese fluently, and yet the first scholarly Japanese grammars of Chinese appeared only in the Tokugawa period.) It must be assumed that a fairly extensive knowledge of Sanskrit existed among many of the Chinese priests who took part in the Chinese translation of the Buddhist Canon, and some of the early Japanese who visited China and met Indian priests had a good knowledge of Sanskrit. Especially learned was Kōbō Daishi, as may be judged from an examination of his works collected in the *Kōbō Daishi zenshū*. It may be mentioned in this connection that the work described on p. 66 as "a Japanese reprint (dated 1734) of a Chinese list called *Ta-hsi-t'an-chang*" was not a Chinese work at all but the first printed edition of Kōbō Daishi's *Daishit-tanshō*. It is reproduced in full in plates 7-22.

Dr. van Gulik points out in his Preface that he was dependent on his own personal library in preparing this book since no other reference facilities were available in New Delhi. In such circumstances he has done wonders to cover the subject so widely, and he would not have discovered very much additional original material if he had been able to refer to *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, vol. 84, or *Dainihon bukkyō zensho*, vol. 30, *Shittan gusho* (which also contains a useful bibliography). The printing of a book of this kind in India must have been a task of much difficulty, and there are very few misprints (e.g. 280 for 1280 on p. 97, *Shittanzo* for *Shittanzō* on p. 116, *Jissu* for *Jissū* on p. 137.) The absence of an index is an inconvenience.

Only rarely is it necessary to query Dr. van Gulik's statements. On p. 108 he gives the Sino-Japanese war of 1894-5 as the time when Japan finally turned from China to the West as her source of cultural and material advance, but in reality Japan turned to the West as early as 1860, and China had ceased to be a model as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century. There is also a general theory concerning the spread of Buddhism in China which he advances (pp. 6-8) that does not carry conviction. This theory appears to be that the rapid spread of Buddhism in China was not due to its being a personal religion with a saviour, as is usually suggested, but was the

result of the fact that the Indian priests toned down its foreign elements and gave it as native appearance as possible. Yet although easy assimilability may have been a factor facilitating the spread of Buddhism, it surely cannot be elevated into a basic cause for the popularity of the new religion.

In this, as in his many other works on Far Eastern subjects, Dr. van Gulik combines deep scholarship with a penetrating understanding of the underlying currents of Chinese and Japanese culture. In this book in particular he displays a true feeling for the aesthetic power of calligraphy, and for the spiritual effect of the *dhāraṇī* upon the minds of the Buddhist believers.

E. B. CEADEL

Günther Schulemann, *Geschichte der Dalai-Lamas*. Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1958. pp. 519, 48 plates, one map.

This most impressive volume is the result of a full life's work. Professor Schulemann produced a first edition of a history of the Dalai Lamas in 1911 when he was only 22; this was a far shorter work, the simple product of special interest and youthful enthusiasm. Now in his 70th year he has seen published a second edition, the result of long years of wide reading, laborious research and personal experience. Yet the same youthful enthusiasm still pervades his style, so that this book is a delight to read despite the vast amount of information it contains. It can be read quickly and yet remains an invaluable work of reference. Of a total of eleven chapters the first three are of a general and introductory character, telling of the life of the Buddha, the history of Buddhism in India and China and then of Tibet up to the time of Tsong-kha-pa. Next comes a rather short chapter concerning the Great Reformer and Founder of the dGe-lugs-pa Order, followed by a chapter describing the general character of Tibetan religion (not especially that of the "Yellow Church" as the chapter-title tells us). Finally the last six chapters recount the lives of the fourteen Dalai-lamas right up to 1957, together with many descriptions of events in Mongolia and China, with which the history of the great Tibetan hierarchs is so closely interwoven.

It seems to me no disparagement of a work of such wide scope to observe that it is compiled largely of material from secondary sources. In fact it is a great compendium of the works of others, all duly listed and acknowledged, retold by a good writer, who penetrates and comprehends the whole. For good descriptive writing one may turn to the account of the building of the Potala (pp. 237-9, 250-1) or of the visit of the 5th Dalai Lama to the Manchus (pp. 246 ff.). When forced to write in general terms of events and areas, where there is too little first-hand information available, he still manages to somehow make allowance for what he does not know. An example of this is the skilful survey of Tibetan Buddhism in certain Himalayan areas (pp. 263-4); Professor Schulemann can have known nothing of Tibetan monasteries in western Nepal, but he allows almost intuitively for their existence. There are inevitably occasions when one regrets the absence of first-hand material; thus Tsong-kha-pa's *gSung-'bum* is mentioned far too briefly (p. 127). Moreover can Hevajra be interpreted as "Virtue-Thunderbolt" (p. 149)? Can the Five Buddhas be properly classed as *yi-dam* (p. 148)? He writes of the great monasteries of Mongolia as though they were still existent (p. 163), but if he realized under what circumstances they were destroyed, he would not treat so lightly recent events in Tibet itself (p. 442). He refers to Mr. Hugh Richardson on p. 436, but omits any reference in his footnote on p. 70 to the many valuable publications of Tibetan inscriptions for which Richardson has been responsible. Nor do I see any reference to that most important work of Professor Petech, *China and Tibet in the early 18th century* (Leiden, 1950). It would have been of great use in any case to list all the references in a special appendix, for the chief value of this book is precisely the many references it contains. They can often be found by subject-matter through the index, but not always so. I commend especially the accurate spelling of Tibetan place-names. To spell Nepal's capital throughout as Khatmandu is

just one chance mistake. With the exception of the frontispiece, for which a far more beautiful *thanka* of Mañjuśrī could easily have been found, the illustrations are generally interesting and well produced. As a work of interest to a wider public this book deserves to be better known than the present German edition will allow. I would certainly be glad to see an English edition made available.

D. L. SNELLGROVE

Peter H. Lee, *Studien zum Saenaennorae: Altkoreanische Dichtung* (München, 1958) vii + 163 pp.

For a European student of Korean, this work is extremely valuable if only because it sets out in good, readable German research on early Korean poetry, which has hitherto been available only in Korean. The original contributions which Mr. Lee makes are more difficult to assess, but may well have great merit. The introductory chapter, for instance, on the development of early Korean poetry could be an excellent introduction to the studies of early Korean society already published in Korean by Yi Pyōng-do and Ch'oe Nam-sōn, to mention only two great names, but whether the material available for literary studies justifies Mr. Lee's more poetical approach to literary questions, rather than the more sociological approach of Cho Yun-je, is a question which cannot be answered objectively.

The *Saenaennorae* of the title are the poems more generally known as *Hyang-ga*, a fact which might usefully have been mentioned before the long discussion of the term *Saenae* (pp. 20-22), and the central part of the work is a presentation of the 25 *Hyang-ga*, with romanized texts, notes, and literal and free translations. This a very concise précis of Yang's presentation of the same poems in his *Koga Yōn-gu*, but his findings are nevertheless accurately represented.

However, the work is not simply a précis of *Koga Yōn-gu*. The work of Ogura Shimpei on the same subject is also discussed. After small pioneer studies of the *Hyang-ga* had been produced by Kanazawa in 1918 and by Ayugai in 1923, Ogura produced his comprehensive *Kyōka oyobi Ritō no Kenkyū* in 1924, and it is a remarkable fact that Yang did not make a single mention of even the names of the three Japanese scholars in the 950 pages of his work published in 1942. It is only to be expected that Yang's work shows some advance on that of Ogura, and Mr. Lee does give full credit to Ogura for his work, which he describes as "great", "praiseworthy", and "scientific", but one feels that in individual instances he overemphasizes the improvements in the readings made by Yang. The poems were written with Chinese characters used as *Idu* between about 600 and 950, and the very earliest Ōnmun spellings of Korean date from about 1445. If one bears this in mind, one cannot accept as readily as does Mr. Lee that Yang's Ōnmun readings show any fundamental improvement on those of Ogura. In the *Sōdong-yo*, for instance, Ogura leaves the proper name in characters, to be read as Sino-Korean *Sōdong*, while Yang, on the evidence of "books which were written after the fifteenth century . . . in which an interpretation *ma* is given for a character *sō*", reads it *Mattung*. Mr. Lee says (p. 56) that if Ogura had borne in mind the modern *maktung* "youngest child" (the *K'un Sajōn* gives only *maktong-i*), he would have avoided this mistake. But Mr. Lee himself seems not to have borne in mind the modern *mat* (old *māt*) "first-born", and one cannot feel that the seventh century (?) reading of this name is so far beyond doubt that one could call Ogura's *Sōdong* a mistake for *Mattung*. Yang's version of this poem otherwise differs from Ogura's only in eight spellings of words which he interprets in the same way as does Ogura.

The author's chief individual contribution to the study of these poems is to be found in his "Critical analysis of the 25 poems". His approach is vigorous and imaginative, a poet's approach, and a refreshing change from the philologist's approach which is often merely imaginative. The philologist only wonders whether it is really possible to make such a thorough analysis as poetry of such a small number of poems, all that remain from an age of which very little is known, written in a script bristling with

difficulties of interpretation. The comparison of the *Chōyong-ga* with "Hamlet" (p. 131) really seems to be carrying vigour and imagination a bit too far.

The work under review is a photographic reproduction of a typescript doctoral thesis at Munich University, and there are certain improvements one would like to see in any future printing of the work. The frequent references to the *Samguk Sagi*, *Samguk Yusa*, and *Wei Chih* in the first chapter could be covered by a single reference to each of the comparatively short passages in these three works in which all the points of reference occur, and several of the longer notes, for instance note 123, p. 39, would be better incorporated in the text. The McCune-Reischauer romanization is applied with a most gratifying faithfulness and consistency to proper names in the chapters written in German, but it proves inadequate in the transliteration of the texts. The Ōnmun transcription of these texts contains a consonant letter and a vowel letter which are not used in the modern script on which the McCune-Reischauer romanization is based. Some modification of the system which will represent the Ōnmun more faithfully should therefore be considered. It would also be more convenient if the author followed the usual, though perhaps originally less justifiable, practice of romanizing according to their Japanese readings Korean and Chinese proper names as they occur in the titles of Japanese books.

W. E. SKILLEND

Charles Haguenauer, *Origines de la civilisation japonaise, introduction à l'étude de la préhistoire du Japon: Première partie*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1956, xv, 640.

The problem of the origins of the Japanese people has long been, and will probably long remain, a subject of considerable difficulty. When the origins of other civilizations have been investigated, compelling clues towards a solution have often been found within the limits of one single academic study, such as, for example, archaeology or linguistics; when this has happened, it has not taken long to verify these clues by the evidence offered by other disciplines such as anthropology or ethnology. Unfortunately, in the study of the origins of the Japanese no really strong clues have emerged from research in any one discipline. Instead, the tendency has been for scholars, both Japanese and western, to attempt to offer explanations on the basis of insufficient evidence. Many writers have sought a solution by linguistic hypotheses alone, others have based theories merely on archaeological findings, or anthropological research. The divergence in the conclusions reached by them is proof that no approach to the problem that is restricted to the evidence of one field has any chance of success. In this situation the best that can be hoped for is that the small pieces of evidence from all relevant fields of research may be synthesized to form a consistent and convincing explanation of the problem, and it is this large task of synthesis that Professor Haguenauer has undertaken. Scholars who can write with specialist knowledge and (where relevant) field experience upon such a range of subjects as Japanese anthropology, ethnology, linguistics and archaeology must be few indeed even in Japan itself, and western Japanology is fortunate to be able to count Professor Haguenauer among them. He has published in all these four fields, and his work, especially in linguistics, is well known.

Before following the author through his book, the reader may wish to learn in advance what his conclusions are, and to know in what respects they differ from the general assumptions of most scholars. It is generally held that the Japanese derive from a fusion in prehistoric times of successive northern elements of Altaic relationship arriving from the continent and of less extensive southern elements coming perhaps from the area of south China or Indo-China (an area which may have been the centre of the culture which later also spread to Malaya and Polynesia). Haguenauer's main conclusion is that the evidence for the Altaic relationship is strong, that the proofs of it are more numerous than hitherto believed, and that the Altaic element formed one of the bases of the Japanese people. Those who are familiar with his previous writings

will not be surprised that he links Japanese with Altaic. What is, however, unfortunate, from the point of view of the balance of his work, is that the evidence for the southern element is not presented with the same degree of detail or interest. Many factors supporting the existence of the southern element which he rejects may in fact be accepted without in any way jeopardizing the validity of the bulk of the evidence he advances in favour of the northern link.

The work, when completed, will cover the evidence of Japanese anthropology, ethnology, linguistics and archaeology, in that order: of these, the first three are included in Volume I, while the fourth, archaeology, will occupy Volume II (not yet published). Although the opinions expressed in Volume I are described as being only provisional, and although it would have been more satisfactory to review the two volumes simultaneously after the second had appeared, the importance and scope of the first volume justify separate notice.

Some preliminary comments may be made on the contents and layout of the work. Of the four main sections, that dealing with archaeology should surely have been placed first, since archaeological facts must provide a framework within which all other related research has to lie. Deductions drawn from anthropology, ethnology and linguistics can provide confirmation of archaeological findings and can interpret and elucidate them but they are inevitably of diminished value if taken by themselves, as they are in Volume I, before their relationship to the archaeological facts can be assessed. It is possible that it will be in the archaeological evidence that the firmest indications of the origins of the Japanese will ultimately be found: modern methods of dating, together with the study of the distribution of sites, are sure in the course of time to produce a clearer picture of Japanese prehistory than is yet available. In this connection it must not be forgotten that archaeological work by Japanese scholars on sites in Japan had made comparatively little headway before the last war; one reason for this was the interest shown by Japan's leading archaeologists in the archaeology of China, Manchuria, Mongolia and Korea, another was that during the same period archaeologists working on the Japanese mainland felt difficulty about publishing results which might conspicuously clash with the officially-sponsored chronology of the imperial family. Since the war Japanese archaeologists, no longer able to cross to the continent, have turned their energies to their own land and in little over ten years have assembled a mass of new information. Much of it, however, awaits correlation, and it may be for this reason that archaeology has been placed in Volume II, but its relegation to that volume is to be regretted. It seems particularly unfortunate that the section on anthropology should precede that on archaeology, because the skeletons measured were usually found in conjunction with archaeological sites, so that their dating and significance can only be fully evaluated on the basis of the sites.

Another major comment that may be made about the contents of the work is that the evidence of historical source material in Chinese and Japanese texts is almost entirely absent. Scholars dealing with the origins of civilisations which have no early written records have no alternative but to rely on inference from archaeology, anthropology, ethnology and linguistics, but it is strange that when source material exists it should not be given more prominence. This material is of sufficient value to have been collected together in a separate section of the book. The most important material is the series of short but valuable accounts of Japan as it was known to the Chinese in the second century A.D. onwards, to be found in the Chinese chronicles *Hou Han-shu*, *Wei-chih*, *Sung-shu* and later texts. The significance of these accounts lies in the fact that if they can be satisfactorily interpreted they should serve to identify the peoples who lived at some of the archaeological sites in the various areas. These Chinese accounts have been translated and edited by R. Tsunoda and L. C. Goodrich in *Japan in the Chinese Dynastic Histories* (South Pasadena, 1951), and a good summary of Japanese research upon the interpretation of the accounts is to be found in John Young, *The location of Yamatai, a case study in Japanese historiography, 720-1945* (The John Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXXV, No. 2, Baltimore, 1958). Since this summary ends with 1945, attention may be drawn to contributions subsequently made by various scholars under the editorship of

Sakamoto Tarō on behalf of the Kodaishi danwakai in *Yamataikoku* (Tokyo, 1954), by Ōmori Shirō in *Gishi wajinden no kenkyū* (Tokyo, 1955), and by Hashimoto Masukichi in the revised and enlarged edition of his *Tōyō shijō yori mitaru Nihon jōkoshi kenkyū* (Tokyo, 1956, Tōyō bunko ronsō, 38).

To turn from the Chinese to the Japanese sources, the *Kojiki*, *Nihon shoki*, *Fudoki* and other Nara period texts draw on earlier sources and preserve old traditions. References in them to the Kumaso, Kuzu, Tsuchigumo, etc. indicate that even in the eighth century there was still memory of there having been separate groups or races in the earliest period. In addition these Japanese texts give information about customs and manners which deserve to be assembled and analysed as a basis for ethnological comparisons. Yet a further source is to be found in Japanese place names. The pioneer work in this field was B. H. Chamberlain's *The language, mythology and geographical nomenclature of Japan viewed in the light of Aino studies* (Tokyo, 1887). In more recent times much more detailed work has been undertaken on Japanese place names, especially with reference to their distribution. The latest book, *Nihon chimeigaku*, by Kagami Kanji (2 volumes, Tokyo, 1957-8), presents conclusion which have a strong bearing on the study of the origins of the Japanese.

After these preliminary observations, the contents of Volume I may be examined. The section on anthropology (pp. 45-101) is valuable in that it contains a careful summarization of the most detailed textbook yet published in Japan on this subject, *Kodai jinkotsu no kenkyū ni motozuku Nihon jinshuron*, by Kiyono Kenji (Tokyo, 1949). Regrettably, Kiyono's results do not lead to any clear conclusions: there is no identity of measurements between either present-day Japanese or present-day Ainu on the one hand and either prehistoric or protohistoric skeletons on the Japanese mainland on the other hand. As mentioned above, it is a disadvantage to consider the anthropological evidence before the archaeological, because a basic problem in archaeology has been to identify the peoples responsible for the two distinct styles of pottery found in the sites, the *jōmon* and the *yayoi*. Unless it is supposed that one and the same people was responsible for both in succession, the assumption must be that one layer of culture was superimposed on another, and it was long ago suggested that the Ainu (or Proto-Ainu) were the authors of the *jōmon* and the Japanese (or Proto-Japanese) of the *yayoi*. This theory, of course, involves the supposition that the Ainu once occupied the greater part of Japan, a supposition which may gain some support from the fact that the Emishi (or Ebiisu) of the early historical records (whom Japanese scholars regard as identical with the Ainu) occupied a large part of northern Japan in the Nara period. The supposition that the Ainu had once occupied most of Japan in turn led to the view that the Japanese people had come to Japan from abroad and superseded the Ainu, driving them steadily northwards. Kiyono himself, however, expressed the opinion in his book that the prehistoric and protohistoric skeletons all belong anthropologically to the same race as the present-day Japanese, but to this Haguénauer raises the objection that it does not account for the somatological changes that have in fact taken place.

The section on anthropology ends by recognizing implicitly that anthropology has not yet afforded firm clues, but an appendix to the section (pp. 102-139) contains further material collected after the main section had been completed, almost entirely summaries of articles surveying the work of Russian and Japanese scholars upon Tungus, Korean and Ainu anthropology during and since the war. The purpose of this material is apparently to draw attention to the existence of measurements which may serve as a basis for any future attempt to prove anthropological relationships between the Japanese and these races.

A potentially valuable field of investigation is the study of blood-group relationships. Some data on this subject are provided in a footnote beneath pages 94-95, but more are needed before satisfactory deductions can be drawn. The attempt now being made, in a quite different part of the world, to identify the ancient Etruscan race's affinities by research into blood-groups is an interesting parallel.

The section on ethnology (pp. 141-178) is comparatively short, and in rapid succession covers dental extraction, the blackening of teeth, the reddening of corpses

on burial, tattooing, weapons, clothes, fermentation, temples, houses, *torii*, manner of burial, mythology and religious beliefs. It is in many of these practices that a southern origin has been seen by many scholars, usually with good justification, but Hagenauer tends to reject the connection with southern origins. Although he is doubtless right in stressing the influence of Altaic shamanism on Shinto, he does not leave the reader with a complete conception of the importance of the ethnological evidence or of the strength of much of that evidence in support of a southern relationship.

If the section on ethnology is short, that on linguistics is long, occupying almost three-quarters of the book (pp. 179-640). It starts with an examination of the affinity between Japanese and Luchuan (spoken in the Ryūkyū islands). Hagenauer is undoubtedly right in following the view of Tōjō Misao and other Japanese specialists that Luchuan is only a dialect of Japanese, and not, as Chamberlain believed, a separate language which could be regarded almost as a sister-language of Japanese. That Luchuan is no more than a dialect (though one with special features, because its geographical position isolated it) can be seen by comparison with similar features in such neighbouring dialects as those of Satsuma and Miyazaki.

The Japanese dialects are then listed and grouped as a preliminary to a most thorough and systematic phonetic analysis of Japanese vowels and consonants (pp. 195-365). This phonetic analysis describes the range of sound covered by each vowel and consonant, and is followed in each case by lists of examples of sound-changes and sound-correspondences between standard Japanese and various dialects, or between one dialect and another. This treatment is commendably careful, and represents the first full attempt in a western language to correlate the variants of the dialects and to explain them on a scientific basis of sound-change. While doing so Hagenauer introduces the term "*japonais commun*" which he defines (p. 186, n. 1) as "*le groupe japonais sous tous ses aspects linguistiques*", that is to say, it is used to embrace any form found at any period in a written text and any form found in any dialect (including Luchuan). On the use of this term it may be commented that although it is a convenient one for the author's purpose it is liable to be misleading if it causes the evidence of present-day dialects to be equated in value with that of the earliest written texts.

The descriptions given of the phonetic values of the Japanese vowels serve to underline that the distinction into only five vowel sounds in the *kana* script obscures a wider variety of vowels both in ancient and modern, standard and dialect Japanese, and Hagenauer may be right in supposing (p. 244) that it was the rigid influence of the Indian *Siddham* script on the formation of the *kana* that prevented the latter from making fuller provision for a wider range of script signs for the vowels, even though it is clear that at the time the *kana* syllabaries were formed the vowel system was already becoming simplified. A thorough account is next given of the so-called *Kō* and *Otsu* series of vowels of pre-Nara and Nara Japanese, as indicated by the separate series of *Manyōgana* used in the earliest texts to distinguish them. The existence of these two series in certain syllables was first discovered by Ishizuka Tatsumaro at the end of the eighteenth century, but its significance was not grasped until very recent years, when Hashimoto Shinkichi brought it to the notice of scholars. In spite, however, of careful subsequent study, it has not yet proved possible to discover what exactly was the distinction between the two series or what was the exact pronunciation of each single syllable involved. One possibility, which was first proposed by Arisaka Hideyo (in articles reprinted in his *Kokugo oninshi no kenkyū*, Tokyo, 1944), is that the two series reflect in some way the vestigial traces in Japanese of a system of vowel harmony such as occurs in Mongol, Manchu and Ancient Turkish and of which similar traces have been found in Korean. The opinion that some form of vowel harmony existed in ancient Japanese has been generally accepted by Japanese specialists after Arisaka, and a suggestion about its operation has been put forward by Izui Hisanosuke in an article "*Jōdai Nihongo ni okeru boin soshiki to boin kōtai*" in *Kyōto daigaku bungakubu gojishūnen kinen ronshū* (Kyoto, 1956). Hagenauer does not seem prepared to accept a regular system of vowel harmony in ancient Japanese, but he agrees that it had traces "*d'accommodation vocalique interne*" (p. 367).

One of the most striking features of Japanese in all its known stages is that every word ends in an open syllable (excluding, of course, final *-n* replacing *-mu* and words borrowed from Chinese or European languages). This feature has been taken to support the southern relationship of Japanese, since open syllables are more usual in Malayo-Polynesian than in Altaic languages. For the exponent of the Altaic theory it is a real difficulty; he has to assume that when Altaic words with closed final syllables passed into Japanese they regularly either lost their final consonant or else had a vowel added to the consonant. Although the omission of the final consonants of borrowed words can be often exemplified from later borrowings of Sino-Japanese, the adding of any vowel apart from *u* presents serious problems. Although Hagenauer mentions this difficulty briefly (pp. 292-4 and p. 457) he does not appear to give it the attention that its implications deserve.

At the end of the phonetic study of the Japanese vowels and consonants, he proceeds to compare the sound-changes which he had listed within "*japonais commun*" with sound-changes which are accepted as taking place within the Altaic language family (pp. 365-456). This section of the book is of considerable value, for although comparative linguists have for many years subjected the vocabularies of Mongol, Manchu, Ancient Turkish and other Altaic languages to the most stringent tests, this is the first time that a full-scale and strict examination of Japanese on the same scientific basis has been attempted. Nevertheless two provisos must be observed in connection with this type of comparative study of vocabulary. Firstly (as Hagenauer admits on p. 366) there is great chronological disparity in the period of documentation of the languages compared: thus only Japanese and ancient Turkish have records substantially over a thousand years old, whereas the oldest known forms of some Altaic languages are much less than a hundred years old. When it is remembered how great is the difference between the Nara period form and the present-day form of some Japanese words, it will be readily perceived how dangerous it is to draw conclusions from the comparison of, say, a seventh-century Japanese word and a twentieth-century Tungus word. Secondly, it cannot be automatically assumed that, because certain sound-changes are observed in present-day Japanese dialects, the same or similar sound-changes were possible or likely a thousand or fifteen hundred years ago. The risk inherent in working backwards from present-day dialects is well illustrated by a fact which is mentioned elsewhere in the book (p. 214), that the shift of the vowel *e* into *i* in Luchuan took place comparatively recently, and after the composition of the *Omoro sōshi*. Except where there is early documentation for dialectal forms, there is absolutely no evidence that any of the dialect variants actually existed at an early enough period to warrant placing them side by side with early documented forms in any comparative word-lists. Consequently, when considering the comparisons suggested, the reader would be wise to reflect on the degree of uncertainty that may be attached to any one single example. On the other hand, the accumulation of new comparisons must be deemed to have reinforced the foundation of the opinion that there is a definite stratum of Altaic words in Japanese. The number of comparisons to be found in the word-lists (between p. 196 and p. 443) is about 200: on p. 451 Hagenauer states that he has available 149 more, making a total of 349, but that he awaits the comments of other scholars on the 200 he has given before deciding whether to publish a complete list. He may rest assured that the publication of his complete results would be welcomed. These 349 proposed correspondences (even if they were all to be accepted, and many seen unconvincing) constitute only a quarter of the figure of about 1310 root words which he regards (p. 451) as the basic vocabulary of the ancient indigenous Japanese language. (No information is given about this vocabulary of 1310 words, or about how it was compiled by him: it would be interesting to compare it with the pioneering efforts of B. H. Chamberlain and M. Ueda in "*A vocabulary of the most ancient words of the Japanese language*" in *TASF* (1st series) XVI, 3 (1889), pp. 225-285.) The fact that at least three-quarters of Japanese words cannot be related to Altaic roots leads Hagenauer (pp. 451-6) to admit that the majority of words must have some other origin, and he shows a more receptive attitude towards the view that some vocabulary has a southern origin than he had displayed earlier in the book. Since he does not,

however, take any steps to trace the origins of the part of the vocabulary which he does not regard as Altaic, attention may here be drawn firstly to the work of Izui Hisanosuke in finding comparisons with Malayo-Polynesian (quoted briefly in Haguenauer, p. 578), and secondly to the important series of articles by J. Rahder, "Comparative treatment of the Japanese language", *Monumenta Nipponica* VII (1951), pp. 198-208, VIII (1952), pp. 239-288, IX (1953), pp. 199-257, X (1954), pp. 127-168, followed by *Etymological Vocabulary of Japanese, Korean and Ainu*, Part 1 (1956-59), *Monumenta Nipponica Monograph* 16 and Parts 2 and 3 (privately printed, New Haven, 1959). In these Rahder has collected correspondences from a large number (perhaps too large a number) of languages, and has given evidence for believing that at an extremely early date there was an active cross-fertilization of vocabulary between central Asiatic, south-east Asian and Pacific peoples.

The remainder of the section on linguistics is concerned with establishing correspondences between case particles and verb terminations in Japanese and Altaic languages (pp. 456-635). Here again, as in the treatment of general vocabulary, the author has performed a service in carrying out a methodical examination of the Japanese particles and terminations using the same manner of approach as specialists in Altaic languages have used in those languages. Sometimes the correspondences are readily acceptable, as that between Korean *ga* and Japanese *ga* as so-called "subject" particles, but many of the suggested parallels are unlikely to carry conviction. Thus it may seem dangerous to assume (p. 484) that there once existed a Japanese locative particle *ta* (related to a *ta* in Altaic language) merely on the evidence of the endings of the words *ashita*, *imada*, *amata* and of a form *maita* (meaning *mae ni*) in the present-day Suō Ōshima dialect, or to relate (p. 483) the object particle *wo* with Tungus *ba* (Manchu *be*) merely on the evidence of a present-day Nagasaki dialect form *ba* (as object particle) and of the classical form *woba* (which actually derives from *wo wa*).

Haguenauer makes only a passing reference (p. 456) to a notable item of similarity between Altaic languages and Japanese, the remarkable identity of sentence structure. This is so strong that a Japanese who learns Mongol, Manchu or Korean can employ these languages almost correctly if he does no more than to substitute their vocabulary for the Japanese vocabulary, still using the sentence structure of Japanese. In the same way it is the custom of Japanese scholars of Mongol and Manchu to publish texts in those languages with an interlinear translation into Japanese which corresponds word for word with the Mongol or Manchu and is nevertheless continuous Japanese. The importance of this uniformity of sentence structure should not be overlooked, for it may be suggested that the nomadic peoples of Altaic origin separated from each other at a very early period in their symbiosis, when their common vocabulary was still small: in consequence, they naturally picked up many new words in the course of their travels while at the same time retaining their sentence structure unchanged. If, as seems possible, the Altaic element preponderated in the formation of the Japanese people, there need be no surprise that an Altaic sentence structure remained the basis of the resultant language even if the bulk of the final vocabulary was non-Altaic. The extent to which extensive borrowing of vocabulary can take place without the sentence structure being significantly modified was shown when the Japanese assimilated nearly the whole of the vocabulary of Chinese in early historical times.

In view of the abundance of material in the linguistics section, it may seem otiose to suggest that certain additional linguistic matters might have been brought into consideration. Nevertheless an account of the phonetic system of ancient Japanese is surely incomplete if it does not offer an explanation of the variation in verb conjugation. If the *yodan* type of conjugation was original, what factors (? shift of accent) produced the *nidan* type? Secondly, the *makura-kotoba* or "fixed epithets" present a special group of vocabulary already obsolescent in the Nara period poetry in which they occur: does the etymology of the *makura-kotoba* show any special features? Thirdly, it would have been interesting to have mentioned Hattori Shirō's experiment in introducing glottochronology as an aid to the dating of Japanese in his article "Gengo nendaigaku sunawachi goi tōkeigaku no hōhō ni tsuite", *Gengo kenkyū* 26-7 (1954), pp. 29-77.

To sum up the book in general terms, probably its most effective contribution, apart from its conclusions and new results, is its detailed documentation of the writings of former scholars. The bibliography of Japanese anthropology, ethnology and linguistics, both in Japanese and western languages, has become so vast that only an experienced and industrious worker, such as Haguenauer himself, could venture on a synthesis of the material. But with the systematic listing of references, and what is even more, with the summarization of the contents of hundreds of vitally important books and articles, the future research worker in this field is saved an immense amount of time and toil. The debt which every scholar in these subjects will owe to the author is immeasurable, because although he may not accept all his opinions or conclusions he will be able to have immediate access to the rich accumulation of material which it must have taken the author himself many years to collect and summarize.

The very richness of the material will be embarrassing unless the Index, promised for Volume II, is a full one, otherwise much useful information and valuable new ideas will remain hidden. The development of the argument in the book is not always easy for the reader, even a specialist reader, to follow, partly because of the complexity of the material assembled, and partly because of a tendency to digressiveness by the author, who often seems intent on introducing any item on which he has some notes almost regardless of whether it has any real bearing on the major subject under discussion. Thus much of the final part of the linguistics section (pp. 456-635) deals not with the strict subject of the argument (the correspondence in form between case particles and verb terminations in Japanese and Altaic), but with various interpretations placed upon the syntactical usages of such particles and terminations. In addition there are often small book reviews, or rebuttals of other scholars' opinions, to be found scattered among the pages, which have been prompted by a reference to the books or opinions in question, even though the main argument is hindered rather than helped by their inclusion. It would have been perhaps better if such material, which is always of great interest and value in itself, could have been published separately.

Despite a 35-page booklet of addenda and corrigenda, and a page of addenda and corrigenda to the addenda and corrigenda, the printing of this book, which must have been a very complicated task, is a credit to the Imprimerie Nationale.

Professor Haguenauer's book is a tribute to his erudition. Any work of its size and scope is bound to evoke disagreement in some aspects of its layout and method, but none of the comments made above detract from the importance of the author's contribution to Japanese studies. The publication of Volume II is expectantly awaited.

E. B. CEADEL

Daisy Lion-Goldschmidt, *Les Poteries et Porcelaines Chinoises*. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1957, 194 pp., 32 plates (8 in colour).

To the more general reader many books on Chinese ceramics must seem to miss the mark in one way or another: either they are long, and so closely packed with detail as to bewilder the uninitiated by sheer weight of unfamiliarity; or they are so brief and light that scant justice is done to the vast range and many subtle nuances which characterise the subject. Given a knowledge of French, therefore, he should find Mme. Lion-Goldschmidt's new volume in that admirable series, *L'Œil du Connaisseur*, a veritable godsend. For here is a comparatively short and manageable survey, comprehensive in scope and of real authority, written in a style so clear and astringent that it is a positive pleasure to read.

Not the least admirable feature of the book is its very practical arrangement, for its three sections—each representing a different aspect of the reader's requirements—may be taken to good purpose either individually, or used together for cross-reference. The first begins with a neat assessment of the status of Chinese pottery, both in its own country and by reason of its striking impact on the world outside. This is followed by an outline sketch of its technical evolution, leading on to successive chapters which deal with favoured shapes, the techniques, motives and symbolism of their decoration,

and the use of marks, concluding with the ever-useful map. Here may be found quickly and easily the answers to many of those queries regarding methods and materials which beset every amateur. The second part is a straightforward, historical account of the various Chinese kilns and their wares taken dynasty by dynasty, in which changes of style are lightly correlated with the political background. Somewhat more factual and condensed than the remainder of the work, these chapters are remarkably thorough and up-to-date in their information.

Mme. Lion-Goldschmidt has specifically designed her last section to be of service to the collector, or indeed to anyone really determined to tackle the subject in their own way and at first hand. On the qualities to be looked for and appreciated in Chinese pots her advice is of the soundest, and her remarks on problems of identification do not ignore the later copy or downright modern fake. Instruction is provided even on such topics as classification, maintenance and display. Some idea is given of recent prices and there is an admirable commented list of public collections throughout the world which deserve to be visited, not to mention a good bibliography. Somehow the publishers have succeeded in compressing one hundred and twenty odd specimens into the plates without any undue impression of overcrowding. One or two of the colour plates are a trifle lurid perhaps, but those in black-and-white are on the whole excellent. Altogether, this is a production on which both they and the author may be warmly congratulated.

JOHN AYERS

W. A. C. H. Dobson *Late Archaic Chinese. A Grammatical Study*. (Toronto, University of Toronto Press [and London, Oxford University Press]) 1959, XXVIII, 254 pp.

The publication of this grammar may well be called a major event in the history of Western Sinology. Apart from the "Preliminary Edition" of the interesting but not generally available *Structural Analysis of Literary Chinese* by H. E. SHADICK and HSIN-MIN WU, published in 1950 by the Department of Far Eastern Studies and Division of Modern Languages, Cornell University, Ithaca N.Y., students of Classical Chinese had so far at their disposal only one German and one Dutch grammar which were exclusively devoted to the Chinese Classical language. The former was published in 1881 and reprinted (with a supplement by E. ERKES) only a few years ago: G. VON DER GABELNTZ, *Chinesische Grammatik, mit Ausschluss des niederen Stiles und der heutigen Umgangssprache* (Berlin, 1953), the latter is Professor Josef L. M. MULLIE's *Grondbeginselen van de Chinese Letterkundige Taal*, Pts. 1-3, Leuven (Louvain), 1945-9. The grammatical system devised by GABELNTZ was adopted by Professor E. HAENISCH in the grammatical sketch (Grammatischer Abriss) in Vol. II (Leipzig 1931) of his *Lehrgang der chinesischen Schriftsprache* (with additions "Zur Sprachlehre" in Vol. IV (Leipzig, 1957).

While it is certainly convenient for English speaking students to be able to consult a grammar of Chinese in English, this is far from being the main merit of the present work. It was intended and may justly claim to be the first grammar of Classical Chinese written in accordance with the exigencies of modern linguistics. As such it places on record its indebtedness to HENRI MASPERO (to whose memory the grammar is dedicated) and to Professor PAUL DEMÉVILLE.

Under "Late Archaic Chinese" we are to understand the language of the fourth and third centuries B.C., or "more specifically, it is the language of certain portions of the texts of Mencius, Micius, Chuang-tzu, and the Tso Chuan, assumed here to be typical of the language of the period".

After a general Introduction, a first short chapter is devoted to the "Lexic and the Word", in which the Chinese distinction between "empty" (i.e. grammatical) words (*shiu tzyh*) and "full" words (*shyr tzyh*) has been retained, though the terms "cematic" and "plerematic" are proffered instead. The grammatical system proper is developed in the following chapters which deal with the word group (Syntagma [II]),

two classes of sentences, viz. the Verbal Sentence [III] on the one hand and the Determinative Sentence [IV] on the other, furthermore the sentence group (Sentences in distribution [V]), and a chapter on Substitution [VI]. After a short chapter "Miscellaneous" [VII], we are given a fairly extensive analysis of "Texts from LAC authors" [VIII] and the Book concludes with three short Appendices ("Orthography", "Phonological Affinities among Cematic Lexics", "The Second Person Pronouns, *ruu*, *ruoh* and *eel*, *erl*, *nae*"), a "List of works mentioned" and a "Lexicon and Index of words treated at some length".

Though the distinction of "Parts of Speech" is rejected for the word in isolation, the author operates with Verbals and Nominals, the principal word of the verbal sentence is said to have the grammatical value "verbal" and all syntagmas (other than those formed with *jee*) are given the grammatical quality or value of "nominal". Among the grammatical determinations of the verb we witness mood, aspect, manner and state of agency (the latter dispensing with the introduction of a "subject"). In the determinative sentence, the author strongly stresses the class inclusion view. The system is certainly very interesting and bound to evoke considerable controversy. Criticisms are likely to be directed more against special features of the description than against the grammatical system as a whole. Few scholars, for instance, would find fault with the dichotomy of sentence structure but many would wish to see *yü* 矣 associated only with the verbal sentence instead of finding both *yee* 也 and *yü* 矣 associated with both types, and one is surprised to read (p. 108) that in the Determinative Sentence "the substitution of *yü* for *yee* creates a continuative form". In a similar way the explanation of *charng* 嘗 as denoting "customary aspect", or the introduction of the "subjunctive mood", the rejection of the "modal *chyi* 其", the interpretation of certain negatives (including *wey* 未) or of certain usages of *suoo* 所 is open to doubt and are unlikely to be accepted without further support on the part of the author (which he may well intend to give in subsequent articles).

As is evident from the Preface, the author was able to take stock of the reactions in general and critical remarks in particular of the various scholars to whom he had sent an earlier (type script) draft of the book and he will therefore be prepared for at least some of the objections that may be levelled against his grammar. However, in my opinion, these are not likely to detract essentially from the main achievement, viz. to have given us a workable new framework for a description of Classical Chinese.

Though the book clearly addresses itself primarily to the Chinese scholar and to the linguist, I should have no hesitation in recommending it to beginners, who may wish to consult in the first instance the "Lexicon and Index" at the end of the book. The mere fact that a (*G[woyeu]R[omatzyh]*) romanization has been added to all examples will greatly facilitate its use at the elementary stage, as will the addition of the (likewise romanized) text passages, which are accompanied by both a detailed analysis and a free translation.

This grammar, which its author modestly calls a "Grammatical Study", clearly is a pioneer work and as such fully deserves a warm welcome and indeed the gratitude of scholars and students alike.

W. SIMON